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VOLUME I
This thesis explores the life and work of the modern British portraitist Ambrose McEvoy, by focusing on the artistic influences that shaped his work throughout his career. McEvoy was one of the most popular portrait painters of his generation, with his sitters predominantly comprising the glamorous social elite of the 1910s and 1920s, politicians, royalty, and the aristocracy. Yet, despite his impressive oeuvre of famous faces, McEvoy has almost entirely disappeared from art-historical literature. At the peak of his career, he was best known for his ‘ethereal’ portraits of women in beautiful dresses, a subject which in the years following his death in 1927 became regarded as superficial. However, early research for this thesis led to the discovery of the artist’s estate, a large and unique collection of archival and painted material comprising 5000 items. The papers were uncatalogued and unpublished, and had remained in the possession of McEvoy’s family since his death. This material, which I have titled the McEvoy Estate Papers, provides an entirely original view of McEvoy and his work, which stands in stark contrast to the superficiality that haunts his posthumous reputation. The McEvoy Estate Papers has provided a vital foundation for this thesis and has led me to explore an overarching and important theme in the artist’s career, the subject of influence. McEvoy was deeply influenced by a number of different artists throughout his career, from the Dutch Golden Age to his modern contemporaries including James McNeill Whistler, John Singer Sargent, and Gwen John. This thesis will explore McEvoy’s work chronologically across five chapters, from an early period in which he directly copied the work of old masters, to his later interiors and portraits which gleaned compositional tropes and techniques from other artists’ works. By using the influence of other artists, McEvoy was able successfully to cultivate a unique identity as a portraitist working across a transitional period of modern British art; he reintroduces the concept of the ‘New Woman’ to an upper-class audience in the 1920s, and as leading artist of the period, fulfils his wish ‘to be a painter of excellence’.
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The McEvoy Estate Papers is a unique collection of 5000 items belonging to Ambrose McEvoy’s estate, and is printed as an inventory in Appendix II of this thesis. I have catalogued each item with a unique archival number relating to the type of object (for example, a letter is catalogued with LET) and a sequential number. The archival system devised for the McEvoy Estate Papers will be explained in more detail in the Introduction of this thesis.

All of the photographs of the McEvoy Estate Papers have been taken by Lydia Miller unless stated otherwise.

It should be noted that Ambrose McEvoy’s daughter Anna married twice, and she is referred to by different names throughout this thesis and in the inventory of the McEvoy Estate Papers, depending on the period referenced. Anna McEvoy is also referred to as: Anna Bazell or Mrs Bazell, or Anna Hett or Mrs Hett.

Albert Rutherston who began life as Albert Rothenstein, but anglicised his surname in 1916, shall be referred to as Albert Rutherston throughout this thesis for ease of reference.
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INTRODUCTION

I wish to be a painter of excellence...

Weak echoes and imitations of bastard “influences” always trying, for this is always my bane, to surprise people.¹

– Ambrose McEvoy

The career of Ambrose McEvoy commenced in 1893 with his education at the Slade School of Fine Art in London, arguably the most progressive art school in the country at this period. He developed a successful career as a portraitist and worked until his death in 1927. Little has been written about McEvoy’s career as an artist, and biographical accounts of his life have been largely incorrect or exaggerated – often fed by a distorted truth perpetuated by the artist himself. McEvoy is best known for his portraits of fashionable society women, each depicted in a beautiful dress; they are exquisitely coloured and comprise painterly brushstrokes that almost merge the sitter with a dreamlike or ethereal background. It is perhaps the seemingly superficial and overtly-feminised appearance of these portraits that has led to McEvoy being overlooked in the scholarly canon of British art history. These portraits, the primary focus of his later career, were a significant and important period of McEvoy’s oeuvre in which he reintroduces the 1890s concept of the ‘New Woman’ and creates a unique identity for his work. However, there are several other periods of the artist’s career that are less well known, but equally significant, that have come to light – not through existing literature on McEvoy – but through extensive original archival research conducted for this doctoral project. This thesis has been critically shaped by a large collection of previously unpublished and unexplored primary material from Ambrose McEvoy’s estate, which will be cited throughout as the ‘McEvoy Estate Papers’, or abbreviated in footnotes to MEP. The composition of the McEvoy Estate Papers and how this collection has been used for this thesis will be explored in more detail later in this introduction. However, it is vital to highlight the recurring theme that dominates the correspondence, drawings, paintings, notebooks, diaries, reproduction mounts, and postcards of the McEvoy Estate Papers: ‘influence’. McEvoy worked across a number of different genres throughout his career and built a

¹ NOT/364, MEP.
successful practice as one of the leading portraitists of the mid-late 1910s and throughout the 1920s, by being influenced by other artists and their work. These artists spanned almost 500 years of European art, from the Italian Renaissance and the Dutch Golden Age, to McEvoy’s close friends and contemporaries at the Slade School of Fine Art. With so little scholarship on McEvoy, the theme of influence – and how and why influence dominated McEvoy’s career – has never been previously explored as an impactful and extensive subject, nor has it been explored in scholarly detail, until now.

Without the McEvoy Estate Papers, it would have been impossible to have focused on the theme of influence as the subject of this thesis, and thus additional and original scholarship on McEvoy as a measured outcome of this project would have been minimal. Instead, the comprehensive and detailed exploration of McEvoy’s career that follows, which has been informed by the McEvoy Estate Papers to give an entirely original scholarly stance on the artist’s work, not only informs existing literature on McEvoy, but also the wider narrative of this period of British art history – a period that remains largely under-researched. The fluctuating influences of old masters and contemporaries over a number of years on artists of McEvoy’s generation, is a subject that has not been explored fully in art historical literature. This thesis examines key periods of McEvoy’s work chronologically, by focusing on the impact of different artistic influences, and how these artists successfully informed McEvoy’s work. Although several influential artists are explored in this thesis, the list is by no means exhaustive. There are many other artists, both British and European, who arguably influenced McEvoy during his career and who could be explored in greater detail following the completion of this thesis. However, the subject of ‘influence’ for this doctoral project has been driven by discoveries made whilst researching the McEvoy Estate Papers; this thesis therefore initiates the discussion of ‘influence’ in McEvoy’s work with the hope that other scholars may continue this research.

As the subject of influence is undeniably broad, the artistic influences that have been explored in this thesis have been limited to those artists who informed McEvoy’s peopled interior paintings (which arguably paved the way for his pursuit of portraiture) and his female portraits – for which he is best known. McEvoy’s portraits of men, royal sitters, and his work as a war artist have been excluded from this thesis as the theme of influence is arguably less impactful for these subjects – although this is certainly a topic that could be explored in more detail beyond this doctoral project. McEvoy also painted a number of landscapes and cityscapes throughout his career, often for his own enjoyment but rarely as commissions for clients, in contrast to his portraiture. By piecing together McEvoy’s oeuvre, I can conclude that the technique for these paintings was almost certainly influenced by his friend Walter Sickert from 1909. However, the relationships that McEvoy developed with his sitters
and patrons, and how McEvoy depicted particular individuals in his portraits, as well as the influences that underpinned his commissioned works, were all important considerations for this thesis. With this in mind, McEvoy’s landscapes, which were arguably painted for his own indulgence rather than for his clients, have been excluded from this thesis. This is a subject that again could be explored in greater detail and developed further beyond this thesis.

***

In a fragile and discoloured notebook in the McEvoy Estate Papers, Ambrose McEvoy wrote that he wished to be ‘a painter of excellence’, though the parameters of this statement are not defined by the artist himself.\(^2\) Every artist wishes to be excellent and yet excellence, like beauty, is open to interpretation. It is possible that McEvoy measured ‘excellence’ in terms of monetary success, popularity, influence, or fame. He was, after all, well-known in his lifetime as a society portraitist, and at the height of his career was charging up to £3000 a portrait, as well as appearing alongside the fashionable elite in almost every popular newspaper and journal of the period.\(^3\) However, ‘excellence’ could also be interpreted as demonstrating excellent technical skill in his work, whether this was creating an excellent likeness for a portrait, or by layering paint or mixing pigments using a particular method to create an excellent effect. It is possible that McEvoy measured ‘excellence’ in his ability to rival the skills of old masters or modern painters, by copying or reinterpreting their style or compositions – those artists who were already deemed excellent by the educated British public. As this thesis will demonstrate, McEvoy thrived on experimenting with different pigments, and learning techniques and compositional arrangements from other artists. He did this in order to align his work with theirs in proficiency, and glean insight into the methods of individuals that he thought were exceptional. In doing so, he was determined to ‘surprise people’ by creating both excellent and original portraits for which he became known.\(^4\)

The influence of other painters had a profound effect on McEvoy, and although he began by initially creating ‘weak echoes and imitations’ of other artists’ works, as he describes in the opening quotation of this introduction, he quickly became adept at emulating the work of old masters such as Titian, Vermeer, and Rembrandt, and was influenced by his contemporaries including Gwen and Augustus

\(^2\) NOT/364, MEP.
\(^3\) LET/385/1920, MEP.
\(^4\) NOT/364, MEP.
John, James McNeill Whistler, and John Singer Sargent. It is as though he was unable to escape the influence of other artists and was constantly inspired by paintings and drawings on display in public collections and published in books. This type of experimentation – experimenting by drawing on the work of others – is perhaps not the stereotypical avant-garde that we associate with this period today, but stemmed from McEvoy’s progressive education at the Slade, and continued throughout several clearly defined periods of his work. The sources of McEvoy’s inspiration are vast, and he understood the importance of influence as a necessary and powerful tool for his own success. By examining McEvoy’s work in the McEvoy Estate Papers, and in private and public collections, alongside a diverse group of paintings, drawings and etchings by different artists spanning five-hundred years of European art, this thesis will cast McEvoy and his work in a new light. It will define him as a major figure in modern British portraiture, and as an artist who became successful as ‘a painter of excellence’ by positioning himself amongst some of the best-known artists in the canon of history of art.

***

In 1946 Anna Hett (née McEvoy), McEvoy’s daughter, wrote to Charles Cheston, a former student at the Slade with Ambrose McEvoy and his wife Mary. Although Anna’s original letter is untraced, Charles Cheston’s reply, dating to 3rd December 1946, recalls his friendship with the couple following their education at the turn of the twentieth century. In this letter, Cheston provides a detailed physical description of McEvoy, putting a face to this largely unknown artist:

In the early Jubilee Place days Ambrose had the appearance of [a] delicate and undernourished frame. Friends would speak of his health and some would query whether he was consumptive. Recollection of him is a rather slight figure, not too upright, with head inclined a little: in conversation he could look up suddenly with a kind of startled look at times, shewing [sic] his large eyeballs and one felt a certain intensity, if that is the word to convey that his reactions were very alive. A stranger might have guessed his being either a poet or ascetic priest rather than an artist. His voice as you know was so unusual that it had quite repute, it rumbled out in deep bass tones and then would suddenly sideslip as it were into a high treble as though a bow had slid along the strings of the instrument at the crucial point in the sentence then recover to the former deeps [sic] with very odd effect.  

---

5 LET/857/1946, MEP.
Ambrose McEvoy cannot be described as ostentatious, narcissistic, or as a ‘dominating figure’. He does not appear to have had extramarital affairs, like so many of his contemporaries, and he was described as well-liked by everyone who knew him. The artist William Rothenstein described McEvoy as ‘a charming person...affectionate, intelligent and extremely sensitive to beauty’. Even at the peak of his career ‘McEvoy was the same unassuming quietly charming companion and seemed unspoiled by success... He was of course greatly liked by all artists.’ He was a family man who was devoted to his wife Mary, and addressed her in every affectionate letter as ‘Darling’ and signed off as ‘Husband’.

The ‘large eyeballs’ described by Charles Cheston are also mentioned by Mary as being particularly animated whilst painting. ‘As he painted his eyes seemed to become larger & more luminous & they always did this, in spite of the conversation he kept up with his sitters.’ His ‘under-nourished frame’ described by Cheston was also remembered by Augustus John in his handwritten foreword for the Leicester Galleries in 1953:

> The well-carved features which might be thought to verge on the cadaverous were it not for the lively flush of health noticeable under the cheek-bones; the straight fringe correcting a perhaps too high forehead; the fine eyes, one of which was adorned with an unnecessary monocle; the almost clerical collar of subtly modulated white; the black suit swathing the spare figure, and the patent-leather dancing-pumps, all combined to form an ensemble of an unclassifiable elegance & distinction undreamt of & certainly unapproached among the rank and file. McEvoy, nearly always in high spirits, seemed to live in a world of melodrama, a fabulous world, where anything might happen and which later on he was to exchange for the hardly less unreal atmosphere of the beau monde.

Although John knew McEvoy well, and the pair were best friends for several years, John can sometimes be considered an unreliable source, prone to misremembering and exaggeration. To describe McEvoy as ‘always in high spirits’ and living in a ‘world of melodrama’ contradicts the primary sources among the McEvoy Estate Papers, as well as accounts from other contemporaries. Instead, McEvoy appears

---

8 LET/857/1946, MEP.
9 MEP.
10 NOT/197, MEP.
11 NOT/3/1953, MEP.
to have been the calm and quiet onlooker, taking on the role of a flâneur in the society that surrounded him – first the society of his contemporary artists and then his high-society patrons. He also appears to have suffered from bouts of depression, exacerbated by financial pressure, and on more than one occasion he writes to Mary that he is feeling unwell and wanting to return home from visits abroad.\textsuperscript{12}

McEvoy’s unusual appearance, particularly during his years at the Slade, was the result of early influence – the influence of popular artists of the 1890s. Fellow Slade student Daisy Legge, who also modelled for McEvoy, remembered a ‘Tea party at the Johns. McEvoy sat opposite me at tea, looking as like Aubrey Beardsley as he could.’\textsuperscript{13} Beardsley ‘epitomised the fin de siècle in England’ as an important figure in aestheticism, and had a significant impact on McEvoy and his contemporaries.\textsuperscript{14} Although Beardsley died of tuberculosis at the age of twenty-five, he had reached celebrity status with both his controversial graphic art and as the first editor of the popular \textit{Yellow Book}, and would have been a model of aspirational success for McEvoy. The 1890s generation of art students at the Slade were urged by their drawing master Henry Tonks to study ‘the pictures in the National Gallery more and the Beardsley drawings in the fashionable \textit{Yellow Books} less’.\textsuperscript{15} It is not surprising that McEvoy modelled his appearance on this fashionable and influential artist who was set to take British art in a new direction, and even McEvoy’s illustrations in both \textit{Fableland} by William Morant (fig. 1 and 2) and the 1896 edition of \textit{The Quarto} (fig. 3), mimic elements of Beardsley’s style.\textsuperscript{16} McEvoy recalls a letter that he wrote to his Slade friend Benjamin Evans which presented ‘a lot of black on the envelope “like Beardsley”’.\textsuperscript{17} However, Beardsley was not a presiding or lasting influence on McEvoy’s work, nor was he proud of his early interest in ‘black and white’.\textsuperscript{18} Yet the physical resemblance between McEvoy and Beardsley is uncanny when comparing photographs of each artist. Figure 4, a photograph of Ambrose McEvoy in the McEvoy Estate Papers depicts the young artist in c.1898 at the age of roughly 21, and Figure 5 depicts Aubrey Beardsley in 1892 at the age of 20. Both artists are sickly and gaunt in appearance, McEvoy, like Beardsley, has close-cropped hair, a similar air of confidence in his pose, and a similar style of suit. Daisy Legge was not the only student to comment on McEvoy styling himself
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on Beardsley, Augustus John also noted the resemblance between the two artists. However, John notes that McEvoy’s appearance was also influenced by James McNeill Whistler, an artist who deeply influenced McEvoy, and a subject that will be explored in more detail in Chapter 4 of this thesis:

[McEvoy’s] general appearance, owing something to Whistler, whom he knew personally, and to Aubrey Beardsley, whom he didn’t, comprised a straight low fringe of black hair, a monocle, a high collar of modulated white, a black suit and patent leather dancing pumps; he was in fact the perfect ‘arrangement in black and white’.\(^\text{19}\)

McEvoy knew Whistler personally. He was a close friend of McEvoy’s father, and Whistler was another artist idolised by this younger generation. John’s description of McEvoy as a ‘perfect ‘arrangement of black and white” alludes to Whistler’s ‘arrangement’ portraits, which intended to create harmony through colour and form, by drawing a parallel with musical arrangements. The monocle and black and white costume worn by McEvoy in this quotation are also recorded by John in his description of Whistler during a visit to the Slade life drawing class in 1896:

a jaunty little man in black, who had a white lock in his curly hair and wore a monocle. Mr Whistler! An electric shock seemed to galvanise the class: there was a respectful demonstration: the Master bowed genially and retired.\(^\text{20}\)

The descriptions of McEvoy’s physical appearance by his closest friends and contemporaries not only build a picture of an individual who, until this thesis, has remained largely unknown, but these animated and lucid memories also highlight the impact of influence on McEvoy from his initial education at the Slade. McEvoy is representative of an entire generation of modern artists who commenced their careers in the 1890s, and subsequently lived in the shadow of some of the most accomplished Victorian artists of the period. This is almost certainly one of the reasons why McEvoy’s work has been overlooked, particularly in recent years with an increased interest in Victorian art in art-historical scholarship. Not only were McEvoy and his contemporaries working in the shadow of Victorian artists but they had to position their work amongst well-established artists such as Sargent and Whistler in order to gain contemporary recognition.\(^\text{21}\) Although McEvoy was assured a place to exhibit at the NEAC from 1901, the competition to exhibit at other popular venues was fierce, particularly when it was hoped that these exhibitions would lead to sales and commissions. In 1868 it was said that 8000-10,000 new paintings were exhibited in London every year, with 30,000 thought


\(^{20}\) Ibid., 48.

\(^{21}\) Although Whistler died in 1903 his work remained popular.
to have been created and rejected. By the turn of the twentieth century this number was significantly more, with a greater number of exhibiting spaces for artists, including the NEAC, Fine Art Society, and the Contemporary Art Society, which were founded in 1886, 1876 and 1910 respectively, but also an increasing number of art schools and art students. In 1911 there were 13,000 submissions for the Royal Academy Summer Exhibition and only 1500 works were accepted.

However, the turn of the twentieth century also saw high-tier dealers abandoning modern British art that had been produced by well-known Victorian artists, for an increased interest in the secondary market. Prices for paintings by Victorian artists were sharply declining, ‘Edwin Landseer’s Lady Godiva’s Prayer (Coventry, Herbert Art Gallery and Museum) was sold in 1873 by his executors for £3,360, but in 1916 it only achieved £943.66.’ The newly-popular secondary market comprised old masters which by 1900 were reaching unprecedented prices. This resulted in McEvoy and several other contemporary artists copying old masters and imitating the style of these works for a modern market – these were the artists described by Pezzini as aiming ‘to live up to the comparison with the old masters.’ It also led to McEvoy being directly influenced in his own work by old masters such as Rembrandt, whose work was being brought to the fore of London collections. The influence of old masters on McEvoy’s work demonstrates the rapidity of changing tastes from the late nineteenth to the early twentieth centuries. Frank Rutter in Art in my Time, published in 1933, observed that ‘history

---


23 There are several references to increasing student numbers from the 1870s through to the 1930s in Stephen Chaplin, ”The Slade School of Fine Art Archive Reader” (unpublished manuscript at London: UCL Special Collections, 1998). For more information see Pamela Fletcher and Anne Helmreich, The Rise of the Modern Art Market in London: 1850-1939.
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cannot tell us of any half-century during which the changes of style in art have been so extraordinary and revolutionary as they have been during the past fifty years.\textsuperscript{29}

The art market, with an emphasis on old masters, continued to flourish into the second decade of the twentieth century. McEvoy is briefly featured in C. J. Holmes’ \textit{Pictures and picture collecting} in 1910 as an example of a modern artist in whom to invest.\textsuperscript{30} However, the destruction and unexpected continuation of the First World War led to a decline in the contemporary art market. During this period, many exhibiting societies and art galleries closed, and the majority of artists working in Britain were negatively affected. The \textit{Western Daily Press} in 1916 reported that ‘modern art lies under a heavy disability in these days of war.’\textsuperscript{31} The years immediately following the war saw a substantial regrowth of the market, ‘in part due to the market for war memorials and state patronage of the national art projects linked to the Great War.’\textsuperscript{32} However, by the end of 1920, ‘there were clear signs of depression in the art economy as artists suffered from withdrawal of state support and falling demand’, and by the summer of 1921 the effects of increased taxation on luxury goods, which had led to a decrease in demand for original art, were being felt keenly by artists in both Britain and America.\textsuperscript{33} In 1921, McEvoy wrote to his wife Mary from New York about his unsuccessful trip and an international financial crisis, ‘This visit has not been a success like my last one. Everybody thinks they are ruined and I imagine it is the same in London.’\textsuperscript{34}

By 1921 McEvoy was still at the height of his career, a peak which would last until his death in 1927. He was not overly affected by slumps in the art economy, as he was not dependent on the open market. McEvoy instead had protected his practice by building up his own network of private clients who continued to commission portraits throughout the late 1910s and 1920s. Among his sitters were Consuelo Vanderbilt, Duchess of Marlborough, Winston Churchill, Sir John William Alcock and the Russian ballerina Lydia Lopokova, as well as dozens of famous actresses, celebrities and the transatlantic elite of the day. By the late 1920s, almost every country house in England would have
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boasted a McEvoy portrait. His work was also extremely popular in the US: ‘Mr. McEvoy’s vogue is greater in New York than in London’, and his portraits are still part of several international collections from the National Gallery of Canada to the National Gallery of Victoria.\(^{35}\)

When McEvoy died unexpectedly of pneumonia on Augustus John’s birthday, 4\(^{th}\) January 1927, there was an outpouring of grief from friends and patrons alike. Lady Diana Cooper recalled McEvoy’s death as a knife through her heart and former Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald wrote that ‘a most delightful personality has been taken away from us.’\(^{36}\) Obituaries were printed in major newspapers and the well-known art historian and critic R.H. Wilenski defined McEvoy as ‘the modern Gainsborough.’\(^{37}\) However, McEvoy’s posthumous recognition was fleeting, particularly following the Second World War, and by 1953 his portraits were described as displaying a ‘startling vulgarity...as tricky as [Thomas] Lawrence at his very worst.’\(^{38}\) The style of his portraits had fallen out of favour, and in a war-torn Britain that was still restricted by rationing until 1954, glamorous portraits from the 1920s were no longer wanted or welcome. Society had changed. The majority of McEvoy’s portraits in public collections were relegated to art gallery storerooms, and his life and career diminished into art historical obscurity, until the 1970s when Eric Chilston (Eric Akers-Douglas, 2\(^{nd}\) Viscount Chilston), a family friend of the McEvoy’s, decided to revisit McEvoy’s work and write a biography on the artist.

***

Although McEvoy was highly successful during his lifetime, very little has been written about his work prior to this thesis. McEvoy is featured in biographies of his contemporaries, including Augustus and Gwen John, and William Orpen. He is also mentioned in William Rothenstein and Diana Cooper’s autobiographies Men and Memories: Recollections of William Rothenstein 1900-1922 and The Rainbow Comes and Goes. The majority of criticism published during McEvoy’s lifetime comprised newspaper articles reviewing his work in various exhibitions. Many of these articles, written by some of the leading art critics of the day, were invaluable for this thesis in providing accurate contemporary insights into particular works and how they were publicly received. They also provided an overview of

\(^{37}\) "Mr Ambrose McEvoy", obituary, The Times, Jan 5, 1927, 12. LET/776/1933, MEP.
public opinion on McEvoy’s success, recording key achievements in his career and documenting his progression as a portraitist.

In 1919 McEvoy’s close friend and patron, the managing director of Rolls-Royce, Claude Johnson privately published his first tomes cataloguing McEvoy’s oeuvre. The Works of Ambrose McEvoy from 1900 to May 1919 is illustrated with 163 photographs across two volumes; the first volume catalogues and illustrates his oil paintings and the second volume, his watercolours. This early and unofficial catalogue raisonné of McEvoy’s paintings provides no critical interpretation of the artist’s work, but it does provide a comprehensive list of works that had been completed in chronological order as well as information on where each piece had been exhibited and who owned them. This gives a good overview of McEvoy’s oeuvre up until this date. In 1923 Claude Johnson, under his nickname and pseudonym ‘Wigs’, published 1500 copies of a second catalogue of The Work of Ambrose McEvoy with Colour Magazine and The Moreland Press. This offers greater insight into contemporary opinion and compiles several quotations from different critics and art historians discussing some of McEvoy’s most important works across a variety of publications.

Between 1923 and 1927 McEvoy’s contemporary and friend Albert Rutherston edited a series of short monographs titled Contemporary British Artists in which McEvoy was included. The twenty-one pages of text comprising McEvoy’s monograph was written by Reginald Gleadowe, assistant to the Director of The National Gallery and then the Slade Professor of Fine Art at Oxford, who described McEvoy as having a ‘delicate aesthetic sensibility, and a beautifully-trained hand’. Although this monograph again provides some insight into the artist, this is not a substantial text analysing the key portraits of McEvoy’s oeuvre, nor his contribution to British portraiture. More recently, Kenneth McConkey included several catalogue entries of portraits by McEvoy in Edwardian Portraits: Images of an Age of Opulence. He also mentions McEvoy La Basquaise and The Convalescent in The New English: a history of the New English Art Club in relation to both class and literature. Useful literature on this period more generally is by David Peters Corbett and Lara Perry’s English art 1860-1914: Modern artists and identity which provides an excellent definition of British modernism.

The most comprehensive work to date on the life and work of Ambrose McEvoy is Eric Chilston’s biography Divine People, which was researched and written in the 1970s but never published. There

are several letters between Chilston, his publishers, and his solicitors that reveal that his manuscript was lost by the publishers Weidenfeld & Nicolson.\(^4^0\) He had not made a copy of the manuscript and therefore had to rewrite his book with the hope of having it published in the early 1980s. Unfortunately, Chilston died in 1982 before the manuscript was accepted a second time. This unpublished biography lay in storage with the McEvoy Estate Papers and McEvoy’s grand-daughter brought it to my attention at the very beginning of my research. Chilston knew McEvoy personally, as the son of a close family friend. His biography is emotionally charged and written in a non-academic style conducive to the period in which it was written. Completed prior to the age of modern technology, Chilston’s biography was also not fact-checked to the same standards as today and therefore presents several inaccuracies including McEvoy’s date of birth which I was able to clarify by ordering a copy of his birth certificate (fig. 6). However, Chilston’s biography does offer a detailed understanding of McEvoy’s life, personality and career, and was useful in providing a starting point for my research. Chilston’s biography was edited by Lawrence Hendra, Director of Philip Mould & Co., and published alongside a major retrospective exhibition at the gallery whilst I was undertaking my PhD. This is the first biography on McEvoy that has ever been published. I was actively involved in both the exhibition at Philip Mould & Co. and in contributing an annotated chronology to Divine People: The Art and Life of Ambrose McEvoy (1877-1927).

Chilston, like McConkey, Rutherston, Gleadowe, and Johnson, as well as every other author who has written on McEvoy, however briefly, have unfortunately fed into the inconsistencies and falsities surrounding this artist – of which there are many. Authors have failed to check even basic facts about McEvoy, including the year of his birth and the number of years he attended the Slade.\(^4^1\) Several


\(^4^1\) McEvoy was said to have been born in 1878, a date which was not corrected by the artist during his lifetime. I attained a copy of his birth certificate that clarifies McEvoy was born in 1877. This discovery went on to inform Divine People: The Life and Work of Ambrose McEvoy and has subsequently been changed across several online sources. One possible explanation for McEvoy changing his birth date was for his eligibility to apply for a scholarship at the Slade. The Slade offered six scholarships a year of £50 to students under the age of nineteen, tenable for three years. By enrolling at the Slade in 1893 at the age of 15 (with a birth date of 1878) rather than 16 (with a birth date of 1877) McEvoy would have been eligible to apply for this scholarship for an extra year. Another explanation is that it sounded more impressive to have started the Slade and his successful career a year younger. The number of years that McEvoy was enrolled at the Slade was also mis-recorded; Claude Johnson wrote in 1923 that McEvoy had attended the Slade three years ‘in all’ whereas there is an admittance ticket to study at the Slade three days a week until April 1898 (fig. 7) which would mean McEvoy studied at the
inaccuracies have been addressed and amended throughout the course of this thesis using a number of primary sources, predominantly from the McEvoy Estate Papers, but future research into McEvoy will undoubtedly uncover further knowledge of his life and work. The Slade School material at UCL Special Collections was a valuable resource and included several student index cards and signing-in ledgers, correspondence, and newspaper articles relating to McEvoy’s contemporaries. Primary material authored by Edna Waugh (later Edna Clarke Hall), McEvoy’s contemporary, in the Tate Archive and Library was also consulted for this research.

The most accurate and original material that forms the foundation of this doctoral project, and on which all other research has been built, are the McEvoy Estate Papers. This is a unique collection of primary material that has remained almost fully intact and in the possession of McEvoy’s descendants since the death of Mary McEvoy in 1941. Almost all of the McEvoy Estate Papers are unpublished, with the exception of those included in *Divine People*, and until this thesis, it was a collection that had never been researched or catalogued in its entirety. Following my research, it is now known that the McEvoy Estate Papers comprises 5000 objects including hundreds of letters from McEvoy to his wife and from McEvoy’s sitters, friends, contemporary artists, and family, diaries that span several years and include dates of key sittings, photographs, exhibition catalogues, paintings, newspaper articles, drawings, sketchbooks, essays, and several other items that are outlined in Appendix II.

I discovered the McEvoy Estate Papers, which resided in both Canada and the UK, when I traced McEvoy’s grand-daughter through several genealogical websites and online searches. The estate, which includes a large number of paintings was made accessible to me by three out of four families of McEvoy’s descendants. The fourth owner whom I believe is in possession of a number of paintings, would not give me access to their part of the collection and therefore has been excluded from the McEvoy Estate Papers inventory.


material for four weeks. Whilst waiting for the outcome of the grant I negotiated the shipment of the majority of the archival material to London with both the owner and Philip Mould on the condition that I would catalogue the collection. I was generously awarded the Research Support Grant by the Paul Mellon Centre in Spring 2018 and I visited and researched the material in Canada that did not make the shipment in October 2018, including over 160 paintings and three boxes of archival material. During this visit I was also able to view several letters relating to McEvoy at the Houghton Library, Harvard. I also visited London from York on several occasions to catalogue the McEvoy Estate Papers, and transported a lot of this material back to York in order to complete my work. It took five months to catalogue the McEvoy Estate Papers and although the items were contained in labelled boxes, the 5000 objects that ranged in subject and condition were often without context, which further complicated a difficult task. This was an uncatalogued and personal family collection that required sensitivity and meticulous research in order to understand the scope of the material, and how it could impact the posthumous reputation of Ambrose McEvoy and the larger period of British art history. In order to catalogue the McEvoy Estate Papers effectively and efficiently I devised my own archival system that identified the type of object, the number in the sequence (this number was allocated according to when it was found and therefore has no relevance other than identification) and the date of the object, if known. An example of a catalogued item is given below.

I photographed the McEvoy Estate Papers as part of this project for ease of reference and to be used for the continuation of my research at a later date, beyond my PhD. Several of the photographs are included in this thesis but only where there has been a direct reference to items in the McEvoy Estate Papers. It has been essential to include the inventory of the estate that I devised as an appendix (Appendix II) so that the reader is able to cross-reference the material that has been referred to in the footnotes of this thesis. With so little accurate literature published on McEvoy, the McEvoy Estate Papers has also informed a chronology of McEvoy’s life which has also been included as an appendix (Appendix I). This chronology provides a supporting guide for the reader and has been kept separate from the main body of the text so that it can be referred to throughout.
The importance of the McEvoy Estate Papers in forming the foundation of this thesis cannot be sufficiently expressed. Bycataloguing the 5000 objects, I have been able to assemble a more complete understanding of McEvoy’s life and his extensive and significant career, and provide a substantial contribution to the knowledge of this period of British art history. The McEvoy Estate Papers provide this thesis with indisputable evidence of key events in McEvoy’s career, and provide dozens of drawings and sketchbooks that have never been seen or published before. These drawings are vital additions to McEvoy’s oeuvre and were pivotal in answering the research questions of this PhD on the subject of influence.

The research questions that were devised for this thesis were directly informed by the McEvoy Estate Papers. After I catalogued the estate material using my archival system, I then looked in detail at the content of the written material including the diaries and notebooks belonging to McEvoy and his wife Mary, newspaper articles and reviews, and the abundance of correspondence from his friends, patrons and sitters, in order to identify key themes in McEvoy’s work. This written material gave me an unprecedented insight into the artist’s life and oeuvre, including his artistic motivations to develop his work and become a ‘painter of excellence.’ These motivations often resulted in almost ritualistic artistic practices including copying and emulating the work of old masters in London art galleries for several years, reading books on Rembrandt and the human figure, sketching from bookplates, and working alongside his friends including Gwen John and her brother Augustus in order to learn and develop as a modern artist. Once the content of these written items in the McEvoy Estate Papers were determined, I then reviewed the visual material—the paintings, drawings, postcards, and reproduction mounts of McEvoy’s work that were produced throughout his career. These were predominantly peopled interior scenes, sketches of the human figure, and painted female portraits. After carefully reviewing a large number of items in the McEvoy Estate Papers, and taking into consideration the limited scholarly material on McEvoy by previous biographers and art historians, a prevailing subject surfaced that appeared to dominate McEvoy’s consciousness throughout his career. This subject was influence. Although the individual artists that McEvoy used to directly and indirectly influence his work changed over the years, the concept of influence and the constant reminder of artists who had preceded him haunted McEvoy’s work until his death, and caused bouts of severe anxiety to improve as an artist and ultimately reach success as a leading portraitist. After I devised the question of influence in McEvoy’s work as the subject of this thesis, I then worked on collating the primary material from the McEvoy Estate Papers into influential groups of artists and key individuals who were instrumental in helping develop McEvoy’s work as an artist. I also looked at dominant painters of the
late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries including James McNeill Whistler and John Singer Sargent in order to establish whether McEvoy was influenced by these artists’ works.

The recent resurfacing of the McEvoy Estate Papers, as well as an increased interest in the work of modern British artists on the art market in recent years, has provided an opportune moment to research McEvoy and his paintings as a doctoral project. There have been several books published in recent years about McEvoy’s contemporaries including Ida Nettleship, Augustus and Gwen John, William Orpen and William Rothenstein, and it is important that McEvoy is included in the narrative of modern British art, particularly portraiture, at this period. He needs to be understood as a key player among his contemporaries. He was one of the most popular artists of his day, and arguably the leading portraitist of his generation. By cataloguing McEvoy’s estate, I have been able to gain a detailed impression of McEvoy’s career, and understand the important relationships that he had with his contemporaries, with his sitters and patrons, and with his family. It has allowed me to identify patterns in his interests and the prominent influential artists who provided McEvoy with both inspiration and direction. This research has also enabled me to identify key periods or movements in McEvoy’s oeuvre that would have otherwise not been established. The result of cataloguing and researching the McEvoy Estate Papers is an entirely original thesis using a new body of material. This is the first time that Ambrose McEvoy’s oeuvre has been written about in substantial, scholarly detail.

The McEvoy Estate Papers have also served to effectively bookend this project – the collection was catalogued during the first year of my PhD and by the time this thesis is submitted, and with the ongoing co-operation and support of the owners, Adrian Glew the archivist at Tate, Lawrence Hendra at Philip Mould & Co. and myself, this material should have been successfully donated to Tate for posterity.

This thesis is arranged in chronological order and is presented across five chapters, each outlining a different influence or movement in McEvoy’s oeuvre. Chapter 1 focuses on the important early years of McEvoy’s career – his training – which can be split into two distinct periods, his formal and informal educations. As a teenager, McEvoy experienced contradictory feelings about his progress at the Slade. Although it was considered a highly progressive school and its tutors filled a paternal role beyond their paid week, the Slade also maintained more traditional teaching methods through its use of antique sculpture, and drawing on historical rather than modern art to influence its students. The predominant question that will be answered in Chapter 1 is, how did the Slade influence McEvoy? It aims to uncover the configuration of McEvoy’s education and whether it was more than just a school for the artist. It
will also look at whether McEvoy’s possible dissatisfaction with his Slade training encouraged him to embark upon a self-reflective period of independent study, and the outcome of this training as an expansion or rebellion against formal teaching at the school.

During his self-education, McEvoy studied alongside a group of influential contemporary artists that he met at the Slade. These close friends and their ability to influence each other will be the subject of Chapter 2. Perhaps surprisingly, this chapter will not consistently focus on McEvoy as a leading subject, but it will explore the dynamics of this group of artists and the role that McEvoy does and does not play within it. With the Slade’s unusual co-educational environment in which women could enter on equal terms to men, this chapter strives to give a greater understanding of the female artists within McEvoy’s immediate circle, with a particular focus on the influence of Gwen John on McEvoy’s work. This chapter’s exploration of both female and male groups within McEvoy’s friendship circle will also look at the influence of external sources outside their group – the influence of Rembrandt who transposes history to appear to Augustus John in a dream, and the make-believe literary worlds of The Jungle Book and the Three Musketeers. The influence of Rembrandt on McEvoy’s work proves vital in manifesting an ongoing interest in Dutch Golden Age paintings that lasts several years, and which will be explored in greater depth in Chapter 3. By examining several paintings by McEvoy alongside works by Johannes Vermeer, Gerrit Dou, Pieter de Hooch, and Gerard ter Borch, Chapter 3 will question the extent of the influence of Dutch interiors on McEvoy’s work. Between 1900 and 1913 McEvoy’s work changes considerably, and although he continues to be influenced by seventeenth century Dutch artists, his paintings have an increasing element of portraiture. From 1910 to 1913 McEvoy paints the same model, Anäis. By looking at several interior portraits by McEvoy between these dates, this chapter will analyse Anäis as an influential force in his work, and ask whether she was the primary reason for McEvoy pursuing portraiture.

In 1916 McEvoy became one of the most famous portraitists of his generation, but the reasons for his success at this date have been never explored. Chapter 4 will analyse the critical moments that led to his success, and the reasons why, by exploring his full-length portrait Mrs Cecil Baring which was painted the same year. This chapter will begin to examine the significance of the reoccurring theme of the mirror in McEvoy’s work, and the influence of his family friend James McNeill Whistler from 1912 as a contributing factor to McEvoy’s success. It will look at the key paintings that potentially signposted McEvoy’s path to becoming popular with the upper classes. Chapter 5 will then continue with McEvoy’s success throughout the late 1910s and 1920s, but specifically examine the influence of John Singer Sargent, the leading portraitist of the day. It will ask whether McEvoy aspired to be
Sargent’s successor and, through a close comparison of McEvoy and Sargent’s work, both stylistically and taking into consideration the relationships between their different sitters, this chapter will examine the concept of the New Woman. It will look at whether the New Woman was more than just an 1890s phenomenon, or whether McEvoy was able to redefine the New Woman for a modern age. Although there were several other artists including William Orpen, Philip de Laszlo, and John Lavery, who were considered important potential successors to John Singer Sargent following the closure of Sargent’s portrait practice in 1907 and then after his death in 1925, McEvoy has been entirely neglected as a contender for this role. The parallels between Sargent and McEvoy’s wealthy transatlantic and professional female clients are numerous, as are both artists’ explorations of the role of the New Woman in their work. This combined with McEvoy’s aspiration to be a leading painter of his generation, and ultimately a leading portraitist of the early twentieth century, aligns his ambition to that of the leading portrait painter of the Victorian and Edwardian periods, John Singer Sargent. Thus Chapter 5 will focus on McEvoy as Sargent’s primary successor for the first time, in a new argument on the subject.

Across these five chapters, and focusing on artistic influence in McEvoy’s work, this thesis aims to bring the work of Ambrose McEvoy to the fore, as a leading portraitist and a significant contributor to the narrative of modern British art.
CHAPTER 1

THE SLADE AND INDEPENDENT STUDY, 1893-1903

This chapter begins by returning to the fragile and discoloured notebook in the McEvoy Estate Papers which describes McEvoy’s Slade education. It is not known exactly when McEvoy wrote this recollection describing his artistic training, but another entry in the same notebook dated 20th October 1907 may indicate a similar date. It is also possible that he wrote this entry in the late 1890s, directly following his education, although this cannot be verified.

I wish to be a painter of excellence.

Let me examine the ideas that have governed my actions at different times. I left school at Easter 1893 with the definite idea of being an artist. Of course I knew nothing whatever of painting and painters ancient and modern or “art” of any kind except the absurd newspaper accounts. From summer I worked by myself — a [sic] anxious period when I read all the books on art I could get...Then I got “advice” from different artists of both sexes that I knew. The things I did at this time are very amusing (I seem to have looked at things very much more carefully than I did some years later)...Then I went to the Slade School in November 1893. The masters were horrified at what I did and set me to do quick charcoal drawings of antique heads. I was kept at these antique heads and figures for six months and hardly think I learnt anything.

The whole system was absurdly bad. Knowing nothing I was taught nothing. I was simply encouraged to do, without thought [sic] dirty scrawls on innumerable sheets of paper and worst of all I was urged to thoughtlessly “sketch” in sketch books. It is almost impossible to shake off this thoughtless, methodless way of putting down lines, without thinking beforehand of where they were going. Then journals and magazines and newspaper articles that as a young student it was almost inevitable that I should read constantly and the necessarily ignorant talk of my fellow students made progress for one of my character almost impossible...

I went into the “life” in April 1894 and went on in the same way. My different friends about his time were much in the same boat but Evans I think was a great deal better.

I exhibited “things” at sketch club that were weak echoes and imitations of bastard “influences” always trying, for this is always my bane, to surprise people. I don’t remember much about what vague ideas I had at this time.

In the summer of 1894 I went to Crudwell “still up the village” I did some little paintings – quite boyish and what you would expect but not so vulgar as they might have been. I remember I wrote a letter to Evans then with a lot of black on the envelope “like Beardsley”.

Then of course I was full of the Japanese too. But never thought about what I did. Then in the spring of 1895 (18) [sic] I “went in for Durer” Evans was not at the Slade that term.43

43 The ‘(18)’ in this quotation refers to McEvoy’s age in 1895. This is his correct age in spring 1895, having been born in 1877.
I did a thing called the “syrens” for the sketch club then I was full of Millet and Clausen. It is amazing and horrible that during all this period I should never have been taught anything.

I went down to Crudwell (down the village this time) at Easter for a week or a fortnight and tried to paint like Clausen!

These bad influences of course came from the lack of any methodical teaching (which was inevitable because the masters knew nothing themselves and from the presence of a number of young students, considered clever of the most atrocious taste. Then in the summer I did went to Crudwell again this time I was a regular Slade student of that period & painted outdoors in the sun, I did a picture of “Ruth” and of one of a little girl. It was about this time that I spent a great deal of time at “black & white” the worst thing I ever did. The sketching I did that Easter and generally during the spring though absurd were careful and excellent compared to to [sic] the dreadful “black & white” things of the later part of the year.

I went back to the Slade in the autumn again and “worked” more thoughtlessly that ever.44

McEvoy starts this account by writing that he ‘wish[es] to be a painter of excellence’ – a statement that not only voices his aspirations as an artist, but suggests that he has not yet reached this point in his career.45 He then chronologically recalls his years at the Slade which commenced on Saturday 28th October 1893 when he signed in to the Slade register for the first time at the age of sixteen.46 He was enrolled to study ‘every day’ which excluded Sundays, and then from October 1895 three days a week paying half fees of £3 3s until at least April 1898.47 However, instead of recalling halcyon days and looking back on his education with a sense of nostalgia, McEvoy bitterly criticises his tutors and attacks their training, emphasising that he was ‘taught nothing’ during his formal years at the Slade. It is not known what ignited this outburst, or whether at this point in time McEvoy truly did feel that he learnt nothing from his education at the Slade, but taking into consideration McEvoy’s positive relationship with his tutors, which will be explored in more detail later in this chapter, as well as his ongoing friendships with his Slade cohort, this passage can be interpreted as a fleeting diarist’s rant. The Slade provided McEvoy with his only period of formal artistic training, and this education, whether positively or negatively received, would have had a profound impact on his work as an artist. This chapter will look at the training that McEvoy received at the Slade, and how both the school and its tutors influenced McEvoy during these early years. It will explore whether the Slade provided more than just

44 NOT/364, MEP.
45 Ibid.
46 ‘Session 1893-94 First Term, Fine Art Class, Male Students October 93’ in Fine Art Class, Male Students, Slade signing-in/attendance book, UCL Special Collections.
47 POS/299, MEP. Term 2 commenced on January 11th 1898 and finished on 1st April 1898, as stated in UCL, The University College London Calendar for the Session 1897-8 (London: UCL, 1897), 39.
an education for McEvoy, and strive to understand why his years of studying were important to his later career. It will also consider whether McEvoy’s temporary negativity towards the Slade, as outlined in this quotation, ultimately led to his period of self-education from 1898, and what McEvoy achieved through self-directed learning that he did not attain whilst studying at the Slade.

The Antique Room

In the extract from his notebook, quoted at the beginning of this chapter, McEvoy recollects that he was kept in what was known as the Antique Room for six months aimlessly copying sculptural heads, during which time he ‘hardly learnt anything’. He recalls that the sketches he was encouraged to produce were methodless and thoughtless. What McEvoy fails to recognise is that this method of training was typical of art schools at this period. A student had to be deemed proficient in drawing from the antique before they could progress to drawing from life – the same procedure as the Royal Academy Schools. At the Slade, male and female students would work in the Antique Room together copying a cast from 10am until 4pm, with a short break for lunch. It could take a student like McEvoy several months to progress from the Antique Room into Life Class. McEvoy’s friend William Rothenstein remained in the Antique Room for his entire year at the Slade in 1888.

From the Slade’s foundation in 1871, students were encouraged to focus on accurately depicting the human body through a programme of rigorous training, influenced by the French atelier system. There was no direct training for painting landscapes, or still lifes, but large historical subjects were encouraged for the Slade summer composition prize which took place annually. Edward Poynter, the first Slade professor, introduced the ‘foreign’ or French method into the curriculum including a ‘General Course’ which, according to former Slade Archivist Stephen Chaplin, became central to the Slade’s teaching for decades after. The General Course was introduced so that there was not a ‘separate course of study from the antique which is customary in most of our English schools.’ Instead, it allowed students to work from the antique, the nude model, and the draped model at a

---

fixed uniform fee for all students’ and entirely under the direction of the Professor. However, this multifaceted approach to teaching was not often followed by the tutors who insisted on students mastering the antique before drawing from life. This method was also followed at the RA schools but the progress of students at the Slade was significantly faster than at the RA. This was almost certainly the result of greater contact time and direct teaching from the Slade tutors. As William Rothenstein later recalled in his autobiography:

The Slade school, where all the most promising young men and women worked, was turning out competent draughtsmen by the score, leaving South Kensington, and the Royal Academy School, far behind...The ‘decadent’ school was dead, and a more vigorous opposition to the Academy was growing. But the social prestige of the R.A. was still great... Social prestige, however, seemed far from the thoughts of John, Orpen and McEvoy. I remember McEvoy describing a dinner which he found so intolerably pompous, that he got up from the table and danced a jig. This was the Victorian end of the scale; there was also the fashionable Edwardian-bohemian.

As well as implying that the Slade was the most successful art school of the 1890s, in contrast to McEvoy’s damning recollection, Rothenstein describes a new type of student that was emerging at this period, the Edwardian-bohemian, who was not only being taught at a progressive art school but was consciously moving away from the more traditional Victorian artist and the influence of the RA. McEvoy, John and Orpen are prime examples of this new student, with McEvoy physically leading the way with a jig to combat the RA’s pompousness. That being said, McEvoy’s disgust at the pompousness of the RA is, in many ways, in direct contrast to the clientele he would later court – the upper spheres of the transatlantic elite.

In 1871-2, the first UCL calendar to feature the ‘Department of the Fine Arts, including Drawing, Painting, and Sculpture’ outlined the importance of drawing from life from the outset of a student’s education. Drawing from the antique, which also focused on the human form and comprised figural casts from Greek, Roman and Renaissance sculpture, would only be used occasionally to improve style – the argument being that Greek sculpture depicted an idealised human form which was impossible to illustrate successfully without some preliminary understanding of a living human figure. The casts

53 UCL, The University College London Calendar for the Session 1871-2, 43.
54 The RA struggled to adapt to more progressive methods at the dawn of modernism and was failing to teach its students. Early in the 19th century, students received none of the required twenty-four lectures a year. James Charnley. ‘Excavating the Academy’ in Creative License (Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press, 2015), 41.
55 Rothenstein, Men and Memories, Vol I., 31.
that Poynter acquired for the Slade’s Antique Room in the 1870s were the same casts that McEvoy and his contemporaries worked from in the 1890s. These were predominantly Greco-Roman sculptures:

Michelangelo is the only modern – a Moses mask, a Madonna mask, sections of the head of David and ‘Michelangelo’s Slave’ – perhaps the Louvre ‘Dying Slave’ still in the Antique Room in the 1950s.57

Augustus John recalled:

The Student was first introduced to the Antique Room, which was furnished with numerous casts of late Greek, Greco-Roman and Italian Renaissance sculpture: no Archaic Greek, no Oriental, no ‘Gothic’ examples were to be seen. This studio is used by both sexes. The student is set to draw with a stick of charcoal, a sheet of ‘Michelet’ paper and a chunk of bread for rubbing out.58

McEvoy’s contemporaries including William Rothenstein, William Orpen and Mabel Culley recalled working from a cast of The Dancing Faun.59 Although there are three versions of this sculpture that McEvoy and his contemporaries could have worked from, it is most likely that the cast at the Slade was a copy of the Uffizi faun (fig. 8). Evidence for this comes from a chalk drawing of the Uffizi faun produced by student Elinor Proby Adams in 1906 whilst studying at the Slade (fig. 9). With its ambitious contrapposto pose, this cast would have proved challenging for students to copy. Not only is the faun leaning forward, further exaggerating the abdominal muscles and creating a foreshortening of the neck and head when studied from the front, but the difference in height between the two feet results in a different pattern of muscularity across the calves. Although this sculpture would have been arduous to work from, there was no time restriction for producing a sufficient likeness as there would have been with a living model. Producing an accurate copy of this cast would have prepared McEvoy well for any pose instigated in the life class or in subsequent portrait commissions.

Although it is difficult to identify which sketches by McEvoy relate to casts in the Antique Room, if any at all, there are several drawings inspired by Renaissance and classical sculpture amongst the McEvoy Estate Papers. McEvoy made at least eight drawings from The Christ Child by Desiderio da Settignano

58 John, Chiaroscuro, 24.
which have been identified through my research (fig. 10). This sculpture is identifiable in McEvoy’s drawings by the lock of hair curled over the child’s forehead (fig. 11-17). Although these drawings were clearly made from a sculpture rather than a living child, McEvoy has imbued his drawings with a lifelike quality by exaggerating small flaws in the texture of the skin using chiaroscuro. McEvoy’s drawings not only reinforce the Slade’s deeply-instilled attitude towards the importance of working from a substantial repertoire of sculptural examples, but they also show McEvoy’s ongoing and early interest in figural representations, as he bestows lifelike features on his drawings of a sculptural bust.

McEvoy was clearly inspired by this sculpture, demonstrated not only by the number of times that he copied it, but also by the different angles, papers and media he chose for each sketch. This independent exercise goes some way towards discrediting his later account that he learnt very little through copying sculpture in the Antique Room. He experimented with the effects of chiaroscuro in ink, pencil and chalk; an indication that he studied this Desiderio sculpture on multiple occasions. Two out of the eight sketches are dated 20th November 1899 and February 1900; a third sketch is labelled 27th February and may also date to 1900. Although McEvoy had left the Slade by November 1899, it is likely that he copied a cast of this sculpture in the Slade collection, rather than the original Desiderio which is in the National Gallery of Art in Washington. Several of McEvoy’s closest friends were still enrolled at the Slade in 1899, making access to the school all the more likely for the artist. It is possible that the undated sketches of Desiderio da Settignano’s Christ Child were completed by McEvoy whilst he was studying at the Slade.

Evidence that this Desiderio cast belonged to the Slade’s collection can be found in a painting by Maggie Laubser (fig. 18), a South African artist who enrolled at the Slade in 1914 and was taught by McEvoy when he returned to the school as a tutor. Although the precise date for her still life is not known, Laubser produced this work whilst studying in London. It is therefore likely that McEvoy, who was clearly inspired by Desiderio’s sculpture, encouraged his student to paint The Christ Child during her studies. It seems reasonable to suggest that this sculpture was the bridge between McEvoy’s

60 DRA/653, DRA/14, DRA/19 double-sided, DRA/687, DRA/506, SKE/3, MEP.
61 Muller Ballot, Maggie Laubser - A Window on Always Light (Matieland: African Sun Media, 2016), 88 & 92. Elizabeth Cheryl Delmon, ‘Catalogue Raisonne of Maggie Laubser’s Work 1900-1924’ (master’s thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, 1979), 37. Although there is a cast of a boy at the V&A, thought to have been taken from Desiderio da Settignano’s sculpture, in appearance, this is not the same cast from which Laubser and McEvoy worked.
formal education at the Slade and his period of self-education which is thought to have commenced in the latter half of 1898.

Influential Tutors

In McEvoy’s account at the beginning of this chapter, he writes that he was poorly influenced at the Slade, ‘from the lack of any methodical teaching (which was inevitable because the masters knew nothing themselves...).’ \footnote{NOT/364, MEP.} The UCL calendar for the year that McEvoy enrolled at the Slade, 1893-4, states that Frederick Brown was the leading professor of the school, Henry Tonks was his assistant as the master of drawing and George Frampton taught sculpture. There were four courses of study which had a clear focus on the human form: *Drawing from the Antique and Life, Painting from the Antique and Life, Sculpture, and Composition*. Henry Tonks had worked as a medical surgeon prior to his career as an artist and unsurprisingly his teaching concentrated on the production of anatomically correct figure drawings. His scientific approach conformed well to the Slade’s teaching philosophy and would have sufficiently prepared students, such as McEvoy, for pursuing a career in portraiture. Tonks was a skilled drawing master who pushed his students, both male and female, to be the best – sometimes resulting in tears. \footnote{John, *Chiaroscuro*, 42.}

Tonks oversaw the life class which McEvoy recalled entering in April 1894, and which was open to men every day between 9.30am and 1pm. \footnote{Chaplin, “The Slade”, 4:12, 42-3. Women were at a disadvantage, working from a draped model in a separate life room between 10am and 1.30pm every other day.} Drawings in the life class were expected to fill the entire sheet of paper, ‘regardless of the distance between the draughtsman and model.’ \footnote{Reynolds, *The Slade*, 149.} McEvoy would have produced hundreds, possibly thousands, of drawings whilst at the Slade, but the majority of these do not survive. However, there are several small sketches of nudes amongst the McEvoy Estate Papers which indicate the sort of quick sketches that he would have produced during these lessons (figs. 19-24). \footnote{Examples of sketches of nudes by Ambrose McEvoy. MEP: DRA/1239, DRA/1205, DRA/1230, DRA/1245, DRA/1317, and PAI/91.} These sketches of the male and female form are not large in scale but are quickly and proficiently
produced in pencil, charcoal and ink wash. The experimental techniques used for these sketches make each drawing different. They look as though they could have been produced by six different artists and are not consistent with McEvoy’s later style of drawing and painting. This demonstrates the extensive development of McEvoy’s techniques from the Slade through to his mature style of portraiture.

However, the teaching delivered by Henry Tonks would have greatly contributed to McEvoy’s skill in producing accurate likenesses of his sitters in his later portraits. ‘Tonks had a passion for teaching drawing, and the Slade was his mistress’. 67 Mabel Culley, a student who joined the Slade in October 1898, recalled that Tonks’ teaching was unique; ‘he gave us a great deal of Anatomy, and made marvellous drawings on the side of one’s board in explanation.” 68 Joseph Hone, Tonks’ biographer, described ‘the first lesson from [Tonks] might be like a cold douche’; however, he systematically singled out beginners from his group and took:

great pains to explain his methods of construction, all founded on what he called “directions, directions”, and also egg-like shapes. By “directions” he meant the directions of the bones. By mastering the direction of the bones one had (he would say) mastered the direction of a contour. The word “outline” did not exist for him, and he would not allow it. 69

Tonks’ methods of construction can be seen in McEvoy’s portraits from 1916 onwards – those which are made up of more overt brushwork. Using his paintbrush, McEvoy follows the direction of the bones down the arms of his sitters and across the chest with several individual strokes. These ‘directions’ can be contrasted to the work of McEvoy’s contemporary and friend Walter Sickert whose figures, particularly his Camden Town nudes produced between 1905 and 1913, demonstrate short overly-emphasised brushstrokes that go against the direction of the bones, patterned like bands of paint around the sitters’ arms (fig. 25). Just as Tonks would not allow his students to ‘outline’ their figures, McEvoy amalgamates the skin, clothes and background of his later portraits, separating the individual features through changing colours of pigment.

67 John, Chiaroscuro, 41-2.
68 Mabel Culley’s account is quoted in Reynolds, The Slade, 116-7.
Tonks encouraged his students to copy old masters in public art galleries in London, including The National Gallery, which became a regular haunt for McEvoy and his contemporaries. This encouragement had a direct impact on McEvoy and his friends and led ‘John, McEvoy and Orpen as students’ to turn to ‘Rembrandt and an encyclopaedic dialogue with the past’. Chaplin wrote that Tonks and the other members of the teaching staff ‘had the vision and humility to see their students using old masters with a panache way beyond their own capabilities.’ McEvoy’s tutors wanted to push their students beyond their personal limitations, and ultimately can be seen to put their students’ teaching above their own ambition.

Under ‘General Information’ in the UCL calendar it states that ‘A class for painting from the draped model is held three days a week’; this was presumably the life class overseen by the artist Philip Wilson Steer who joined the Slade the same year as McEvoy to teach painting. Steer was already a successful artist by the time he joined the school. His role was as a guest teacher rather than a full-time employee and he often only came in once a week or once a fortnight. Although Steer produced many landscape paintings in his career, often in watercolour, his most substantial compositions and those in oil often focused on a figure or several figures set in an interior or running across a breezy shoreline. His instruction at the Slade was specifically ‘to teach us painting from the head and from the figure’ which would have encouraged McEvoy, in conjunction with Tonks’ figure-drawing classes, to pursue portraiture following his formal education. With its particular focus on the human form, the Slade gave McEvoy the tools to become a successful portraitist. Both Tonks and Steer were accomplished artists and were able to demonstrate their methods to their students successfully, though Steer later doubted his teaching skills. Steer’s feedback during his classes was minimal, but when he did offer direction, it appears to have been valuable:

His not-so-common-sense was allied to a decidedly uncommon sense of colour. According to him, the secret of colour is to be found in ‘the play of warm and cool’...When in the Life Class, taking a student’s brush and palette, he was moved to

70 Chitty, Gwen John, 37 & 38.
71 Chaplin, ”The Slade”, 114.
72 Ibid.
73 UCL, The University College London Calendar 1893-94, 79.
74 Reynolds. The Slade, 117.
75 Not long before Steer’s death in 1942 he said that ‘Tonks was a great teacher; I was no good at it.’ D.S. MacColl. Life Work and Setting of Philip Wilson Steer, 136.
work on the defaced canvas before him with that flickering and voluptuous touch of his, it seemed as if a new and more enchanting world was blossoming before our eyes!  

Steer’s ‘uncommon sense of colour’ had a lasting effect on McEvoy who strove to create harmonious tones in his later portraits with modern pigments that he considered inferior to those used by previous generations of artists. Steer encouraged his students to use small, round brushes over the fashionable square ones and urged them to lay colour on ‘like a breath’ – terminology also strongly associated with Whistler at this date. McEvoy followed this advice throughout his career. The detail made by McEvoy’s small, round brushes can be seen on many of his most accomplished portraits including Mrs Cecil Bar ing (fig. 188) and Silver and Grey: Mrs Charles McEvoy (fig. 198). McEvoy used a broad palette for his work; each colour was laid on as a thin coloured glaze and carefully built up, just as Steer described, like a ‘breath’. 

Alphonse Legros taught at the Slade from 1876 until 1892, the year before McEvoy enrolled. His influence on teaching at the school continued into the twentieth century with Tonks and Steer. Legros was ‘hugely influential in freeing the Victorian artists from their painstaking and ultimately uncreative approach to drawing.’ Legros, then continued by Tonks, favoured the use of the point over the stump in order to train his students to be skilled in constructive drawing. William Rothenstein recalled that, although he spent an entire year in the Antique Room ‘we did draw, at a time when everywhere else in England students were rubbing and tickling their paper with stumps, chalk, charcoal and indiarubber.’ Just as the French ateliers employed masters to pass on their methods and individual styles, Legros actively taught his students through demonstrations at the Slade. Students at the RA schools did not receive such direct teaching. During McEvoy’s enrolment, Tonks and Steer continued Legros’ methods by producing detailed demonstrations on students’ work. Legros’ technique was described by Charlotte Weeks in her article on women at the Slade:

76 John, Chiaroscuro, 42.

77 LET/857/1946 and NOT/364, MEP.


80 The point refers to the end of the material, for example chalk, used, like a pencil, to draw directly on to the paper, compared to the stump, an instrument used to shade and smudge a drawing in order to create a natural roundness of a form.

81 Rothenstein, Men and Memories, Vol I., 22-3.
simple in the extreme; the canvas is grounded with a tone similar to the wall of the room, so that no background needs to be painted. With a brush containing a little thin transparent colour the leading lines and contour are touched in; with the same simple material the broad masses of shadow are put in, then gradually the flesh tones are added, the half-tones and lights laid on, the highest lights being reserved for the last consummate touches.82

This method of building up a composition from a simple ground, adding the shapes and the broader masses with thin coloured glazes and up to the ‘highest lights’, was a method used by McEvoy throughout his career. This technique was important for creating the distinct colour combinations that would result in his portraits being described as ethereal or phosphorescent. He was taught this technique, to work first on a ‘neutral monochrome’ base, during his education at the Slade and continued to hone this method during his self-education from 1898, by studying the ‘greatest masters of Italy, Flanders and Spain.’83 Gwen John’s biographer Mary Taubman and art historian John Rothenstein also described McEvoy’s technique of layering glazes on a monochrome base.84

The Slade also offered about twenty lectures in Anatomy in the second and third terms of the academic year, taught by Professor G.D. Thane, Professor of Anatomy at UCL. This course does not appear to have been included in the price of the termly fees of £6 6s and would have cost the interested student an extra £1 11s. 6d.85 Mabel Culley, who joined the Slade in 1898, recalled that Dr Thane came across from the hospital with pickled specimens in jars as well as a life model to demonstrate different muscle movements.86 These lectures took place twice a week and addressed ‘the Bones, Joints, and Muscles.’87 These specialised classes in anatomy, alongside classes focusing on drawing and painting from life and antique figure casts, are another indication that the Slade encouraged its students to pursue figure painting over other genres. There is no evidence that McEvoy enrolled in these extra classes. However, McEvoy pursued an interest in anatomy during his period of independent study.

85 UCL. The University College London Calendar 1893-94, 80.
86 Reynolds, The Slade, 117.
87 UCL, The University College London Calendar 1893-94, 80.
McEvoy’s recollection of his years at the Slade and his strong criticism that he learnt very little during his training, and that his tutors ‘knew nothing’ can be interpreted as strikingly unfair. The Slade was arguably the most progressive art school in the country during this period and from its foundation in 1871 accepted female students on equal terms to male students. By the time McEvoy enrolled, the Slade was accepting three times as many women students as men.88 This gave the Slade an interesting and modern dynamic, with male and female students interacting and forming important artistic friendships. Some of McEvoy’s closest friends at the Slade, who will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 2, were young women including Gwen John, Gwen Salmond, Edna Waugh, Grace Westray and the Salaman children, described by Augustus John as ‘supreme’ in their abilities.89

Women were able to apply for the same scholarships as men and were actively encouraged to enrol at the Slade ‘by the provision of facilities including their own refreshment room and a female attendant’.90 Remembering Poynter’s inaugural speech in October 1871, Weeks in her article wrote that, ‘Here, for the first time in England, indeed in Europe, a public Fine Art School was thrown open to male and female students on precisely the same terms, and giving to both sexes fair and equal opportunities.’91 The Slade was considered far more progressive than the rival RA Schools. The RA had been accepting women to study at the school since 1860 but the number was extremely limited when compared to the Slade’s modern co-educational environment where men and women could enter equally.92

Not only did the school provide a rigorous programme of training to equip students with the skills to paint and draw the human figure, both from antique casts and from life, but the Slade’s tutors went beyond their duties as teachers, providing their students with extra support and a network of artists and clients beyond their school days. Daisy Legge recalled sitting to McEvoy in the 1890s, wearing an oyster-coloured dress with an orange sash. Tonks would often ask after McEvoy’s portrait and Daisy eventually invited the tutors over one Sunday afternoon for tea to see the portrait themselves.

88 UCL, The University College London Calendar 1871-2, 45. This statistic is clearly supported by the overwhelming number of female signatures, compared to male signatures, in the Slade signing-in ledgers from the 1890s in UCL Special Collections.
Although outside of their teaching week, both Tonks and Steer came to review the work and advise McEvoy on it. Legge recalled that:

After tea I took them up to the studio & and saw nothing of them but their backs as they crouched before the picture revelling in the beauty of it & pointing [at] parts of the painting to each other, surprised by the excellent technique.  

Legge remembers that Tonks and Steer arranged for this portrait to have two special invitations at the NEAC, but McEvoy overworked it and the composition was spoiled, much to everyone’s disappointment - ‘Mr Tonks raged.’ Although Tonks was angry, Legge wrote that, ‘I have had a good deal of satisfaction out of it because after that Sunday tea, Mr Tonks saw that Ambrose’s work was always hung in the NEAC Exhibitions & so he sometimes sold things or got orders.’ From this instance, Tonks singled out McEvoy and made sure his talent was recognised by allowing him to exhibit at the prestigious NEAC. It became a natural rite of passage for students at the Slade to show their work in this exhibition space, located at the Dudley Gallery on Piccadilly. It prepared them to exhibit their work as professional artists – another attribute of the Slade’s training.

The Slade tutors also supported students financially, helping them secure commissions and clients early on in their careers. Frederick Brown bought many of his students’ artworks for his own collection. This gesture not only gave students confidence that their work had value, but Brown was always willing to sell these works to friends and acquaintances, putting students in contact with potentially long-term clients. It is not known if McEvoy was taught by Brown but he did provide McEvoy with professional and financial support. McEvoy admits in his critical recollections of the Slade that in spring 1896 ‘Brown paid my [school] fees for the second term’ which enabled him to stay at the Slade whilst his father suffered financial trouble. Mary McEvoy, Ambrose’s wife, also recalled that Brown bought McEvoy’s The Engraving for £25 to generate income for the struggling young artist. In the original letter dated 28th February 1901, unfortunately now lost, it can be seen that Brown not only praised McEvoy for his painting but incentivised him to improve the composition by offering him more money on its amendment and completion. In this letter, Brown takes on the vital role of a client but also a critical director of McEvoy’s learning:

93 LET/848, MEP.
94 Ibid.
95 Ibid.
96 NOT/364, MEP.
97 NOT/197, MEP. Brown also bought Gwen John’s self-portrait (Ferens Art Gallery)
Dear Mr. McEvoy,

I am willing to give you £20 for your picture or £25 if you can see your way to having another sitting for the face and hands. The red cloth is also a little out of the scheme of colour of the picture or else a bit too light and attractive and I think the sky in the picture (background) a trifle too light. You might perhaps put the picture aside for a bit and then look at it with a fresh eye and see what you think of my suggestions. – Apart from these things I think there is a great deal that is charming in it, the drawing is very good and sensitive and the refinement of the whole thing is remarkable. Its completeness is of good augury for future work though in this case the very completeness of the accessories a little detracts from the face and hands.

Altogether I congratulate you heartily upon it. I hope that you won’t hesitate in the least to refuse my offer (it is but little for the labour you have spent upon it) if you think you have any prospect of getting a higher price for it and I shall be extremely pleased if you can get a better reward for the pains you have bestowed upon it and which you certainly deserve.

Believe me,
Yours truly

Fredk Brown

P.S. If you accept my offer I can at once let you have a cheque for £20 and in case of further work upon it the other 5 later on.
F.B. 98

Brown later sold this painting to Staats Forbes for £60 and gave McEvoy the £35 difference.99 This anecdote not only demonstrates Brown’s endorsement of McEvoy’s work but by providing McEvoy with a client such as Staats Forbes, the wealthy railway engineer and ardent collector of modern art, Brown is inviting McEvoy into an inner circle of clients at this period.

Brown was not the only tutor at the Slade to introduce McEvoy to important clients. Steer and Tonks also encouraged McEvoy’s success by introducing him to Cyril Butler, a commissioner in the Ministry of Food and a founder of the Contemporary Art Society, and McEvoy’s first important patron. Charles Cheston recalled McEvoy’s introduction to Butler, and emphasised Tonks and Steer’s dedication to their students:

______________________________

98 This letter was recorded by Eric Chilson in his unpublished manuscript Divine People. The letter initially existed as part of McEvoy’s estate but its whereabouts is unknown.
99 NOT/197, MEP.
As you know about that date Sir Cyril Butler of Bourton House, Wilts, an early patron of Steer’s, offered them [the McEvoy] a small house at Shrivenham and gave him some commissions to get along with; a kind action inspired no doubt through his intimacy with Steer and perhaps Tonks. Both men followed the fortunes of their students possessed with gifts and grit, and that Steer could be quite troubled by their mistfortunes [sic] I have good reason for saying.\textsuperscript{100}

Cheston not only confirms that Steer and possibly Tonks introduced McEvoy to Butler but he also describes the tutors’ paternal support for their students – they closely followed their former students’ progress and were deeply affected by any problems they faced in their careers. Butler had a reputation for his generosity in supporting young artists and, through his societal position, provided a gateway to other important patrons and financial success. Cheston continues by recalling McEvoy’s ‘remarkable’ ‘transformation in circumstance’ in just a few years following his introduction to Butler through Steer, and that Butler joked that ‘now he always allowed McEvoy to pay his bus fare.’\textsuperscript{101} Mary McEvoy later complained that Butler was given the best of Ambrose’s early work but Butler provided Ambrose, Mary and eventually their son Michael with a farmhouse to stay in at their estate in Bourton, Shrivenham.\textsuperscript{102} This alleviated the desperate financial pressure that McEvoy had been under and allowed the artist to work independently on developing his individual style over a period of three years.\textsuperscript{103} It could be argued that Steer and Tonks’ initial introduction to Butler laid the foundations for McEvoy’s success with wealthy clients.

In 1913, Tonks demonstrated his continued support for McEvoy’s success, in a letter to Lady Cynthia Asquith:

We have been very busy this week just over, in arranging the New English [Art Club summer exhibition]. It is a very fair exhibition. McEvoy whom you remember I wanted to do a portrait of you, has a beautiful picture which I am glad to say he has sold, he is such a delicate artist that he does not instantly appeal and so we are always glad when he has found someone to buy what he does. However delicate the air the artist must live and that is the difficulty.\textsuperscript{104}

\textsuperscript{100} LET/857/1946, MEP.
\textsuperscript{101} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{102} NOT/197, MEP.
\textsuperscript{103} Prior to meeting Butler, Mary had become very ill and was hospitalised for an operation. This put the McEvoy under great financial pressure and had very little money on which to survive.
\textsuperscript{104} Hone. The Life of Henry Tonks, 94.
In this letter, Tonks reveals that he had previously encouraged Lady Cynthia Asquith to sit for a portrait by McEvoy, thus putting McEvoy in touch with another wealthy and influential patron.\textsuperscript{105} Initially, Tonks can be perceived as somewhat callous in his honesty; he states that McEvoy’s work is delicate and does not always instantly appeal to a broad audience. However, he also reports that McEvoy has sold \textit{Myrtle}, his only exhibited work in the NEAC summer exhibition, perhaps a tactic to entice Asquith to sit. In this letter Tonks is cleverly persuading Asquith that McEvoy is an artist from which to commission interesting work. Not only has he quickly sold \textit{Myrtle}, which implies someone else is also interested in his work, but Asquith can display her own discernment by buying his unusual paintings. She is encouraged by Tonks to get ahead of the trend and invest in McEvoy before he reaches his success as a portraitist, which takes place three years later in 1916.

The same year in September 1913, McEvoy was working with Sickert in Dieppe and received a letter from Tonks asking him to return to the Slade, this time to teach. It is clear from McEvoy’s discussion with his wife, Mary, that he does not have any animosity towards the Slade or his former tutors at this period. McEvoy continued close associations with Tonks, Brown and Steer up until his death and readily invited their opinions on his most recent portraits. There are numerous letters and diary entries amongst the McEvoy Estate Papers revealing social visits with both Steer and Tonks.\textsuperscript{106} They became close friends with the artist, and guided and influenced McEvoy beyond his formal education. Their relationship demonstrates an extension of the paternal support offered by Tonks, Steer and Brown during McEvoy’s education at the Slade. McEvoy could not have continued to think negatively of the Slade or their teaching, as outlined in the quotation at the start of this chapter, as he agreed to return to the school in 1913 to teach alongside Steer and Tonks. These letters also provide a good indication of the strength and impact of the support network provided by the Slade over a decade after McEvoy left the school. McEvoy writes from Café Suisse:

\begin{quote}
I have had another letter from Tonks asking me to consider – very carefully the teaching question – evidently very much wanting me. I have told him that I have had two good days on the Butler picture and that I may be able to arrive in England on the 30\textsuperscript{th} of September. The only thing that bothers me about that is that if I do you may not be able to come over.\textsuperscript{107}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{105} Lady Cynthia Asquith and McEvoy became great friends and she did sit for portraits on several occasions, presumably instigated through this initial introduction by Tonks. Asquith’s son, Simon, to whom McEvoy became godfather, also sat to the artist. There are several informal and complementary letters to McEvoy from Lady Cynthia Asquith amongst MEP.

\textsuperscript{106} William Orpen, Augustus and Gwen John amongst others also kept in touch with Tonks and Steer.

\textsuperscript{107} LET/556, MEP.
The second letter:

I have heard from Tonks, saying I have taken a great weight off his mind... I feel very well but rather “just about” by having to go and all his hurry! It has a rather paralysing effect – but I can see that I should have offended the who[le] Slade set for life if I had continued to refuse and I think that is too dangerous.\textsuperscript{108}

This is the only instance amongst the McEvoy Estate Papers where McEvoy directly states that he is part of a ‘Slade set’ of artists, and implies that this group have the potential of being upset by his decisions, and could exclude him from their support network. At the time that McEvoy wrote this letter and took up his teaching post the following month in October 1913, he had not yet reached success as a portrait painter, and was likely still reliant on his connections at the Slade for commissions and client recommendations – as was seen through Tonks’ letter to Lady Cynthia Asquith.

In brief, the Slade provided McEvoy with the necessary training, through its progressive methods, to become a successful artist. The school’s focus on the human body, through its use of casts in the Antique Room and its life classes, enabled McEvoy to produce competent likenesses that would eventually lead to his pursing portraiture as a genre. The Slade’s emphasis on the demonstration of techniques in class left ‘South Kensington, and the Royal Academy School, far behind’ in their teaching.\textsuperscript{109} However, the Slade’s tutors provided more for their students than just schooling. Steer, Tonks and Brown provided McEvoy with a support network of artists and advised him on his work. They provided a space in which to exhibit at the NEAC, and they orchestrated introductions to potential clients – several of whom, including Lady Cynthia Asquith and Cyril Butler, commissioned work from the artist. However, as we return to the initial quotation at the start of this chapter, there was a period in McEvoy’s career during which he felt hostile towards the Slade and disappointment towards his tutors. It is possible that this hostility manifested itself in McEvoy wanting to pursue a period of self-education following the Slade, in order to expand on the teaching offered at the school. McEvoy’s period of self-education commenced in 1898 and lasted until 1903, and was described by The Sunday Times critic Frank Rutter as a ‘period of probation’.\textsuperscript{110} During this ‘probation’ McEvoy arranged his own daily routine and training. He spent many days in public art galleries, including The National Gallery, copying old master paintings and scouring contemporary literature for advice on

\textsuperscript{108} LET/SS3, MEP.


\textsuperscript{110} Rutter, \textit{Art in My Time}, 97.
figure drawing and old master techniques. This period was crucial in consolidating his education at the Slade, and gave him the chance to glean inspiration from old masters and work alongside his Slade contemporaries in a less formal environment.

**Self-Education**

It is not possible to know whether McEvoy paid for extra anatomy classes taught by Professor G.D. Thane whilst studying at the Slade. However, during his self-education between 1898 and 1903, McEvoy revisited anatomy in-depth by looking at contemporary literature specialising in this subject. In one of McEvoy’s sketchbooks, featuring an entry dated October 1903, McEvoy twice refers to Richard George Hatton, ‘R.G. Hatton’, an author of several art and design publications including *Figure Drawing and Composition*, published in 1895.111 McEvoy makes extensive notes on the proportions and muscul arity of the face. He includes sketches of lips, different angles of the nose and the muscul arity around the eye. He strips back the skin from the face to reveal the muscles, tendons and the skull (fig. 26). These drawings are interspersed with his own sketches of figures, several of which appear to have been taken from direct observation. By drawing people undertaking their daily routines, McEvoy is putting into practice Hatton’s teaching which states that all bodies, not just the posed model, should be observed.112

Other drawings in the same notebook illustrate the overall face, the mouth, nose and eyes all divided into different sections, with carefully written notes about distancing and proportion.113 The potential for these anatomical works to be incorporated into later sketches is demonstrated in a drawing by McEvoy of a seated woman wearing an off-the-shoulder dress. The illustration is then reworked to depict the skeleton below the sitter’s skin (fig. 27).114 This practice would have served as a reminder for McEvoy to take into consideration the bone structure of a sitter, in order to create a more exact likeness; this would have also recalled Henry Tonks’ teaching at the Slade. The effect of Tonks’ anatomical training can also be seen in an undated sketch almost certainly torn from one of McEvoy’s

111 SKE/33, MEP.
112 R G Hatton, *Figure Drawing and Composition* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1895), vi.
113 SKE/33, MEP.
114 SKE/30, MEP.
sketchbooks (fig. 2).\textsuperscript{115} This sketch depicts several standing figures, each drawn anatomically with the muscles and tendons exposed alongside some of the shapes responsible for their creation. McEvoy executes the same figure several times in order to practise accuracy.

McEvoy also considers the theory behind anatomy by writing about ‘The Proportions of the Human Form’ as outlined by Vitruvius in the third book of his ‘Treatise on Architecture’, De Architectura. He highlights the importance of the divisions of the human body into four ‘distinctly marked’ sectors of equal measure:

- **First** – from the crown of the head to a line drawn across the nipples
- **Secondly** – From the nipples to the pubis.
- **Thirdly** – From the pubis to the bottom of the patella
- **Lastly** – From the bottom of the patella to the sole of the foot.

He then describes the Vitruvian man’s proportions of the body horizontally and the divisions of the face, before listing several other texts which explore the proportions of the human body.\textsuperscript{116} This meticulous, almost obsessive, and certainly scientific analysis of the human body through books demonstrates McEvoy’s preferred method of learning. In the quotation at the start of this chapter, McEvoy writes that he despises the methodlessness of ‘putting down lines, without thinking beforehand where they were going.’\textsuperscript{117} It is apparent that he was striving for structure and explanation in his teaching at the Slade and that the school’s progressive methods of learning through demonstration, and by copying casts and from life, did not provide him with the methodical education that perhaps he expected from an art school. McEvoy’s need for methodical learning and the scientific accuracy of his compositions, including the tones used, can also be seen through his documented accounts of his working methods during his period of self-education.\textsuperscript{118} Although the Slade’s teaching laid the foundations for McEvoy’s success as an artist, his period of self-education, and consulting literature as part of his learning, was vital in his journey towards finding his own unique style of painting.

In conjunction with this, McEvoy spent the first few years of his career after the Slade copying old master paintings in public collections. He saw these works as exemplary in their draughtsmanship and

\textsuperscript{115} DRA/59, MEP.
\textsuperscript{116} SKE/32, MEP.
\textsuperscript{117} NOT/364, MEP.
\textsuperscript{118} NOT/199, MEP.
use of tone, both of which he wanted to reproduce in his own work. The old masters that McEvoy copied were predominantly collected between the 1860s and 1900 by The National Gallery, the National Gallery for British Art (now Tate Britain) from 1897, and the Wallace Collection which opened to the public in 1900. The National Gallery had been fervently collecting a variety of old master paintings throughout the nineteenth century. Many of these artists were familiar to British audiences but the particular works that were acquired would have been largely unknown. McEvoy spent time in The National Gallery studying old masters with several of his contemporaries, including Augustus and Gwen John, and Benjamin Evans. Augustus John recalled that he spent most of his spare time at the Slade in The National Gallery ‘loading my mind with a confusion of ideas which a life-time hardly provides time to sort out.’ There are also several letters in the McEvoy Estate Papers from fellow Slade student Benjamin Evans asking when the pair should meet at the National:

Dear McEvoy

Thank for your letter (very pleasant). I have long been about to let you know that not caring for Yarmouth I let it after a few days & am in London D.V. I mean to wait outside the National G. Thursday & see you at 5

Yours most etc.

B. Evans

Augustus John also sketched a caricature of McEvoy ‘at the National’ Gallery and then on the reverse ‘leaving the National’ with heavy artist bags in hand (fig. 29-30). McEvoy’s contemporaries will be explored in more detail in the next chapter.

There are very few paintings by McEvoy after works in public collections in London in the McEvoy Estate Papers. However, those he did choose to copy can be divided into three distinctive periods. The earliest period is the Italian Renaissance from which McEvoy copied Saint Jerome in his Study (c.1510) by Vincenzo Catena (fig. 31), The Rape of Europa (c.1570) by Paolo Veronese (fig. 32-33) and Noli me Tangere (c.1514) by Titian (fig. 34-35). All of the original paintings are in the National Gallery collection where McEvoy would have been able to work from them first-hand. The copies of the Titian and the Veronese are still part of the McEvoy Estate Papers, whereas McEvoy’s copy St Jerome in his

---

119 John, Chiaroscuro, 41.
120 LET/757 and LET/778, MEP.
121 DRA/1319, MEP.
122 Paintings by Ambrose McEvoy after: The Rape of Europa, PAI/32 and Noli me Tangere, PAI/46, MEP.
Study was recounted by Charles Cheston. The Rape of Europa is said to have been ‘highly esteemed’ in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but in the twentieth century, on the cusp of which McEvoy is working, it was regarded as second-best ‘a reduction and reversal of Veronese’s painting of the same subject in the Doge’s Palace Venice.’

McEvoy chose these paintings having read Hatton’s book in which he describes the importance of Italian art as it shows, ‘us the grasp of form, of movement, of shading of the solid, uncoloured and coloured, of the play of light and shade beyond mere expression of form till parts become lost in gloom, of the power of colour as almost neutralizing shading, of the representation of foreshortened and difficultly posed figures.’ McEvoy takes this interest a step further by producing a detailed table of Italian artists separated into schools and cities for each column, and then rows separated into dates and periods (fig. 36). To give this table some context, McEvoy has also included key historical figures including Charles I, Julius II and Francis I of France, wars, and artists and architects such as Bramante, Hans Holbein and Velasquez. This is an unprecedented insight into McEvoy’s methodical approach to the history of art and the influences that inspired his own work. By mapping these artists within their different periods, McEvoy was then able to choose paintings available in The National Gallery with an idea of where in history they could be located.

McEvoy’s copy of Noli me Tangere was used as an example by contemporary art critics to describe McEvoy’s dedication to learning the techniques of old masters. Frank Rutter wrote that McEvoy had ‘been a keen student of Titian, whose Noli me Tangere he had copied excellently.’ McEvoy spent almost two years working on Titian’s painting of Christ and Mary Magdalen which he commenced in 1899. This was a challenging painting for McEvoy to copy; Titian introduced a high standard of figure

123 LET/857/1946, MEP.
125 Hatton, Figure Drawing and Composition, 13.
126 NOT/81, MEP.
127 Following McEvoy’s death in 1927, a ‘Valuation of Probate’ was drawn up for his remaining works. On page 12, listed as located ‘In the Shed’ is a painting of ‘Philip IV after Velasquez’. It is not known which version of this subject McEvoy might have copied but it is likely that he worked from the head and shoulders portrait in the National Gallery (NG745). DOC/53/1927, MEP.
128 Rutter, Art in My Time, 97.
129 NOT/3/1953, MEP.
painting, landscape and drapery in this composition that would have appealed to the young and ambitious artist. Titian painted this work at the start of his career at the age of only 22 or 23; the same age as McEvoy when he copied it. It is likely that McEvoy would have been aware that this was an early Titian and through his painted version we see McEvoy aligning both his ambition and enthusiasm with the Venetian master. The copy is surprisingly accurate. Although the varnish on McEvoy’s painting has significantly deteriorated and the yellowing makes it difficult to see the definition on some of the shading of Christ’s figure and the background, McEvoy successfully and confidently captures the identical folds in the drapery around Christ and the slightly awkward and twisted pose of Christ’s figure by Titian.\(^{130}\)

The hands of both Mary Magdalen and Christ have been painted with care and proficiency – an area that artists struggle to execute successfully. McEvoy produced several sketches of hands in the year he commenced Noli me Tangere (fig. 37). Although there is no obvious correlation between the different positionings of the hands in his sketches and the hands in the Titian copy, being able to produce hands accurately was clearly a skill that McEvoy strove to learn and deemed important. All of McEvoy’s hand sketches depicted in Figure 37 are dated between 7th September and 21st November 1899, during McEvoy’s period of self-education.

The only feature that McEvoy fails to include in Noli me Tangere is a man and his dog in the distance, walking down a hilltop track (fig. 38). These figures walking away from the hilltop village and unaware of the divine happenings in the foreground of this painting provide the composition with a sense of normality and continuity – life continues regardless of this divine intervention. It is possible that McEvoy merely forgot to include these figures in his composition, however, the level of detail that he successfully captures in this work makes this seem unlikely. Perhaps he painted the figures in but could not position them correctly and therefore painted them out again, or perhaps he consciously made the decision not to include them as they did not add anything to Titian’s composition.

The second period that McEvoy worked from is eighteenth-century British art, from which he copied Margaret Gainsborough (c.1772) by Thomas Gainsborough (fig. 39-40) and Mrs Salter (1741) by William Hogarth (fig. 41-2), both painted in feigned ovals and both part of the National Gallery of British Art collection, now Tate.\(^{131}\) It is through these works that McEvoy explores the subject of family

\(^{130}\) PAI/46, MEP.

\(^{131}\) PAI/55 and PAI/133, MEP.
portraiture. Margaret Gainsborough was the youngest daughter of the artist and is depicted by her father in her twenties. McEvoys copy is looser in style than Gainsborough's portrait and McEvoys does not attempt to depict the detail of the hand. McEvoys gives Gainsborough's portrait a nineteenth-century appearance by softening the sitters features to create a more modern beauty. Although Mrs Salter by Hogarth does not depict a member of Hogarth's family, when McEvoys was copying it at the turn of the twentieth century, this portrait was thought to depict Hogarth's sister. It was not until 1933, after McEvoys death, that the painting was identified as the wife of Reverend Samuel Salter, Rector of Burton Coggles, Lincolnshire. At the time Hogarth painted this portrait, Mrs Salter was twenty-one and not yet married. McEvoys not only practises historic familial portraits by copying these two works but also attempts the complicated folds of different female drapery that he would later use for his most accomplished portraits.

Mrs Salter was not the only painting by Hogarth that McEvoys copied during his independent education. He also copied a print of Hogarth's The Sleeping Congregation (fig. 43-4). McEvoys chose to copy only the pictorial detail of this print and omits all of the satirical text from Hogarth's print an act which clearly categorises this work as an informal exercise. He excludes the book on matrimony that the young woman holds in her hands, the sermon read by the clergyman and the fitting quotation from Galatians on the pulpit that reads, 'I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain.'

An admittance ticket dated 7th January 1899 which allowed McEvoys to work as a 'student & reader' at Sir John Soane's Museum for a six-month period was discovered amongst the McEvoys Estate Papers, revealing another collection from which he worked in London (fig. 45). Although the Soane boasts thousands of treasures from which a young artist can learn, McEvoys wrote that he 'copied a figure from Hogarth in the Soane Museum in 1899', possibly a figure from A Rake's Progress or the Election series. In McEvoys's diary dated Monday 18th September 1899, he speculates about Hogarth's technique. He thought about how Hogarth worked on a white canvas with a detailed composition in brown paint and tan tints before painting the main colours into the composition.

132 G Campbell, 'Galatians, 4:11' King James Bible (OUP Oxford, 2010).
133 POS/323, MEP.
134 ESS/4, MEP.
135 NOT/199, MEP.
The final period that McEvoy worked from, and perhaps the most interesting, is the Dutch Golden Age. Although McEvoy’s interest in Dutch interiors will be the subject of Chapter 3, McEvoy drew in the same sketchbook as The Sleeping Congregation two Rembrandts from the Wallace Collection and a copy of the Syndics of the Drapers Company (fig. 46).136 A small pencil sketch of Jean Pellicorne with his son Caspar is illustrated in a corner of a page amongst other sketches (fig. 47), whereas the partner double-portrait of Susanna van Collen, Wife of Jean Pellicorne with Her Daughter Anna has been copied twice on a larger scale – once in pencil and once in ink and wash (fig. 48-9).137 McEvoy’s noticeable interest in Susanna van Collen, Wife of Jean Pellicorne with Her Daughter Anna, compared to the male double portrait, predicts McEvoy’s later interest in painting female sitters over male sitters. McEvoy also copied the Rat-Catcher by Rembrandt (fig. 50-51), a version of which is in the British Museum. Just as Noli me Tangere was an early work by Titian, the Rat-Catcher was an early etching by Rembrandt, with several versions dating to 1632. Although this is not one of Rembrandt’s most appealing compositions, it is ambitious, with simpler techniques in the background and complicated and detailed etching in the foreground.

By copying old master paintings from three different European periods – the Italian Renaissance, the British eighteenth century, and the Dutch Golden Age – McEvoy aimed to educate himself in different methods and techniques from across the continent. He then chose what he considered to be the best features of each, to include in his own individual style of portraiture. Although it could be presumed that McEvoy was looking at old masters for ideas in composition, he instead focused on the colours of these works. The variety of colours in McEvoy’s later portraits created an individuality that made his work popular. His use of colour was described on several occasions as ‘ethereal’. From Charles Cheston’s account of McEvoy copying St Jerome by Catena, it can be concluded that McEvoy was fixated on creating the correct tones of a painting even from these early years:

Ambrose had started copying at the National Gallery with Mary and I rather think had a few pupils there too; Evelyn and I met them there sometimes a year or two later. He had a canvas laid out very completely in raw umber (thin and transparent) preparatory to overpainting; this was St Jerome in his study by Catena. No doubt that in those years and in fact all years he was greatly intrigued by colour problems for I recall his saying he had found it impossible to get a certain blue until by experiment he found that an underpainting of a yellow tone resulted in the peculiar quality aimed for, after due lapse of time. He gave the impression that he was always seeking and experimenting to attain those mysteries in colour tones and harmonies which make his work at times almost ethereal [sic]. and to this quality was added the

---

136 SKE/3, MEP.
137 Ibid.
same kind of searching **drawing** – vision as to drawing, the subtle setting down of what
the **good** eye would actually see under the circumstance of the light effect.\(^{138}\)

McEvoy’s experimentations with different pigments and his combinations of colours were also
documented by the artist himself in his 1899 diary. He wrote on the 19\(^{\text{th}}\) September that he worked
on his composition of Christ and Mary Magdalen for some time in watercolour. It is possible that this
is another version of the Titian he copied in *The National Gallery*, or a preliminary study. However, the
watercolour effect for this painting is ‘quite dull, I expected it to be very brilliant and glowing.’ He
concludes that the poor effect of the colours that he chose was partly due to ‘Cheap water colours’;
he then makes a note ‘Don’t buy Reeves’ cheap water-colours again’.\(^{139}\)

McEvoy’s diary entries, scribbled in pencil in a now disintegrating exercise book, meticulously record
his developing techniques, compositional ideas, and paintings that he had been working on during his
period of independent study. Amongst the old masters that he has been copying are Rembrandt’s
etchings, Mantegna’s Gonzaga family, and he notes that he should start looking at painters like Frans
Hals to gain an understanding of delicate shading.\(^{140}\) Although he paints and draws from works in a
number of public collections, McEvoy would have also copied works from postcards and book plates.
Perhaps the most insightful entries are those which record his colour experiments, the surprising
successes and the failures as he develops his personal style of painting:\(^{141}\)

> Then after lunch I took up a little painting I had of a Rembrandt etching – the
> beautiful woman. I had sketched it lighter in black and white then when it was
dry, put pine(?) yellow ochre and vermillion on, I dragged it over the surface so
> that the white showed through. When I glazed this with raw sienna paint it had
>a wonderfully rich and charming appearance
> It looked something like a Rossetti – only better & I put some more paint on and
> tried to get it more definite but rather spoilt the effect but it may be good to
> work on. I found that it was charming to put white with light red and yellow
> ochre in it over the yellow ochre and vermillion glaze which was underneath
>(dry) after this I did some [illegible] I glazed the background with raw sienna and
> it looked rather better...\(^{142}\)

\(^{138}\) LET/857/1946, MEP.

\(^{139}\) NOT/199, MEP.

\(^{140}\) Ibid.

\(^{141}\) McEvoy records one of his failures in a typed essay ESS/4, MEP. He wrote that he spent time beginning
portraits with ‘a sort of Raw Sienna “rub-in”’ and that he tried painting portraits in Russian Blue ‘which did not
look well’.

\(^{142}\) NOT/199, MEP.
This entry gives us an acute insight into the methodical process of layering thin glazes and the effects that he has learnt from old masters that he was trying to imitate. Working independently, rather than in an institutional setting such as the Slade allowed McEvoy to push his experimentations to the limit until he ‘spoilt the effect.’ Whilst working independently he was under no pressure to impress tutors or peers with his paintings, nor was he under the time constraints enforced by fixed class times.

Although McEvoy continued to experiment with different pigments and layering of different colours in order to create certain effects throughout his self-education, on Monday 17th September 1899 he wrote that he had produced a formula for his paintings. This formula was configured from his copies of old master paintings such as Noli me Tangere:

I have an idea that has been a long time in my head about painting. You might decide on a certain composition, draw it out very carefully, then find scientifically and exactly the colour you will have it, then draw it out on a whole canvas with brown paint, put on everything very brightly. Just the local colours scientifically adjusted to paint over then mix up the several colours which the main masses will be in tan tints. Now you know what colour everything will be and you have got it laid in, then. Then take a good drawing of any part and the prepared tint and point it right in and finish it. Go on bit by bit till it is done and there you are. I should like to try something like it.\textsuperscript{143}

This formula was used for McEvoy’s later portraits, although he changed the colour of the ground depending on the different effects he wanted. In the mid-1910s and 1920s he often started a painting with a blue or yellow base colour which was then built up using this same technique.\textsuperscript{144} McEvoy’s formula is similar to Legros’ teaching at the Slade which is known to have been founded on old master techniques. By using a similar technique, and a technique that was passed down to Steer and Tonks at the Slade, it can be concluded that McEvoy, during his period of self-education, was building on the formal training he received at the Slade.

The skills that McEvoy gained at the Slade significantly contributed to his later artistic practice by enabling him to produce accomplished portrait commissions for clients. There is little doubt that McEvoy’s work would have lacked direction and structure following his formal education, and he would have missed and craved the normality of the school’s structured days. Even though McEvoy is choosing

\textsuperscript{143} NOT/199, MEP.

\textsuperscript{144} Daphne Pollen, \textit{I Remember I Remember} (Privately Published, 2008), 158.
what paintings to copy and which books to read during his self-education, and perhaps at times these were different to the Slade’s recommendations, he continues with a similar structure to the Slade’s teaching. He has a tight schedule every day, he records his expenses and his development, tries new colours and continues with Tonks’ encouragement to copy old masters. He also goes to art galleries and museums across London in order to copy works, just as he would have copied work in the Antique Room at the Slade. McEvoy’s significant period of education at the Slade had conditioned him into drawing and painting in a particular way, and his period of self-education expanded this knowledge through the use of different sources of influence. McEvoy does not appear to have been actively rebelling against his initial training. His self-education attempts to mimic elements of Slade teaching, but he is also able to explore the limits of varying tones and different pigments without a time-constraint as he would have experienced at the Slade. McEvoy’s interest in creating a harmony of tones persisted throughout his career, and significantly influenced his most accomplished portraits produced from 1915.

McEvoy’s early years of independence are marked by the production of small interior scenes, that will be explored in more detail in Chapters 2 and 3, and copies of old master paintings from public collections across London. These works are meticulously crafted to meet Slade and NEAC standards – small-scale interiors were popular at the NEAC at the turn of the century and sold well to their regular clients. These small interiors allowed McEvoy to assimilate with both his Slade school peers and the artists he was exhibiting alongside at the NEAC. The Slade had a significant impact on McEvoy’s initial training and the early years of his career, providing the foundation blocks on which McEvoy could build his successful portrait practice. McEvoy was one of several students at the Slade who were considered particularly talented. As Henry Tonks said ‘The Slade continues to produce geniuses, we turn them out every year.’

---

CHAPTER 2
SLADE SCHOOL CONTEMPORARIES, 1893-1898

Those wonderful Slade days! The friends I had and the wonderful moments we spent together\[146\]

– Edna Clarke Hall (née Waugh)

As demonstrated in Chapter 1, the Slade provided McEvoy and his contemporaries with practical, social and financial support that was beyond the remit of more traditional art schools such as the RA. The Slade encouraged sociability amongst its students and tutors, and was responsible for introducing McEvoy to a group of artist friends alongside whom he worked for several years, and who would significantly alter the direction of his work as an artist during this early period. These contemporaries were Benjamin Evans, Augustus and Gwen John, Ida Nettleship, William Orpen, William Rothenstein, Albert Rutherston, Dorothy, Louise and Michel Salaman, Gwen Salmond, Ursula Tyrwhitt, Edna Waugh (later Edna Clarke Hall), her sister Rosa Waugh and Grace Westray. Between 1892 and 1899, these artists, along with McEvoy, dominated their cohort. Edna Waugh (later Edna Clarke Hall) described these individuals in her unpublished autobiography as ‘a generation of students who were brilliant or had arresting personalities’, and Joseph Hone wrote in Henry Tonks’ biography:

Nine out of ten of the new arrivals at the Slade felt that they had come to a school, where masterpieces must be the rule, not the exception...Edna Waugh was a kind of infant prodigy...She had eager periods of work and gay short truancies with other students such as Augustus John and his sister Gwen John, Miss Ida Nettlefold [sic], Ambrose McEvoy; a new spirit of comradeship, unknown in Legros’ time, now prevailed at the Slade.\[147\]

This chapter will focus on McEvoy’s artist friends in order to understand how they influenced each other’s work and whether they can be defined as an artistic group. With so many individuals to consider, and with the changing dynamics within the group over a number of years, this chapter will focus on the artists who directly influenced McEvoy’s work and the two dominating sub-groups of this

\[146\] Edna Clarke Hall, “The Heritage of Ages” (Unpublished Manuscript, n.d.), 27, Tate Archive and Library, TGA8226/2/1.

Slade circle, ‘The Nursery’ and the ‘Three Musketeers’, in order to gain a greater understanding of the artistic environment in which McEvoy was nurtured. It will look at the visual currency with which these artists communicated by considering the type of art that they were creating of themselves and of each other, as well as their shared interest in Renaissance drawings and Dutch seventeenth-century paintings and etchings. These artists were not only inspired by their predecessors but, as this chapter will examine, artists such as Rembrandt were almost accepted into their artistic circle as if they were Slade contemporaries. The art historical groupings that are used today which separate the Dutch Golden Age from the Renaissance or Aestheticism, and which impose artificial historical barriers on the scope of research conducted by art historians, does not impact McEvoy and his friends. The artists that influenced their work span European art. Artists such as Rembrandt or Henri Fantin-Latour were not chosen by McEvoy or Gwen John because they belong to a particular group of artists, but were simply defined as influential by these artists for the creativity they inspired. This chapter is the first time that McEvoy and his contemporaries have been explored as an artistic group alongside the old masters that influenced them.

**Grouping Slade School Artists**

Stephen Chaplin described McEvoy and his contemporaries as the first of two phases of talented students at the Slade. ‘The first is in the 90’s [sic], beginning with the year of Brown’s coming, and lasting until 1899. The second begins in around 1908, and had fallen away before the onset of the Great War.’148 The second phase, which included Dora Carrington, Paul Nash and Stanley Spencer, has been explored in greater detail by David Boyd Haycock in *A Crisis of Brilliance*. The earlier group, the first ‘crisis of brilliance’, which represented the start of a golden age for the London school, has been overlooked in art-historical literature and has not been analysed in detail previously.149 By examining the group of Slade students belonging to the 1890s, this chapter will not only contribute to a greater understanding of McEvoy and his work as an artist during this early period, but will also inform a wider understanding of British art at the turn of the century – a transitional period which contributed to the birth of modern portraiture.

---

Unlike the Bloomsbury Group, the Futurists or the Camden Town Group, McEvoy and his contemporaries were never named as a group during their lifetimes, although McEvoy later described himself as part of a ‘Slade set’ – the only direct reference identifying these artists as a group.\textsuperscript{150} However, they did display several group attributes that should be taken into consideration when researching these artists’ works. They had ‘shared interests and common goals’, the generic criteria outlined by Milton A. Cohen for successfully grouping artists together, and they were painted as a collective in Gwen John’s \textit{Group Portrait} (fig. 52).\textsuperscript{151} Raymond Williams wrote that many artistic and cultural groups start off as a gathering of friends, as can be seen with McEvoy and his closest contemporaries. In relation to one of the most famous early twentieth-century groups in British art, the Bloomsbury Group, Williams takes this a step further and questions whether ‘any shared ideas or activities were elements of their friendship, contributing directly to their formation and distinction as a group’, and whether the ways in which their friendship came about, for example, that many of them met at the University of Cambridge, gave a wider social or cultural commentary.\textsuperscript{152}

Williams’ explanation of the Bloomsbury Group is comparable to McEvoy and his contemporaries – although McEvoy’s group is severely under-researched in comparison – as they came from similarly professional backgrounds and met during their progressive training at the Slade. It was this training that not only allowed the group to form intimate friendships but also encouraged them to pursue comparable artistic ideas by working in the same environments. Unlike the Bloomsbury Group, the Slade school artists, both during and following their education, went through periods of considerable financial hardship. Although they came from professional backgrounds, they did not come from significant means and received only sporadic support from family. Arguably, this made this group of young artists all the more determined to be successful and more reliant on each other for artistic, as well as financial, support.

Augustus and Gwen John had little encouragement from their father and Gwen John lived on the verge of poverty for several periods of her adult life. Edna Clarke Hall recalled the Johns as being ‘terribly

\textsuperscript{150} LET/553, MEP.
\textsuperscript{152} Raymond Williams, \textit{Culture and Materialism: Selected Essays}, (London: Verso, 2005), 166.
poor people’ with Gwen John often coming to the Slade without money or lunch.\textsuperscript{153} Gwen Salmond even took it upon herself to pay Gwen John’s school fees whilst they were studying in Paris in 1898, as Gwen could not afford it. Augustus John described sharing rooms with his sister Gwen and ‘subsisting, like monkeys, on a diet of fruit and nuts. This was cheap and hygienic. It is true we were sometimes asked out to dinner, when not being pedants, we waived our rule for the time being.’\textsuperscript{154} As it has been mentioned previously, McEvoy also suffered financially and was close to leaving the Slade after the collapse of his father’s business, until Professor Frederick Brown paid his fees for the spring term 1896.\textsuperscript{155} Letters amongst the McEvoy Estate Papers reveal that these artists borrowed money and artist’s supplies from each other. Michel Salaman, a close friend and fellow Slade student who did come from significant wealth, often paid for train tickets and lodgings for his friends so that they could travel with him in Europe. These acts of borrowing and lending money, artist supplies and lodgings made this group significantly more resourceful and generous towards each other, and, as a result, closer in their friendships as artists. This early reliance and the necessity of sharing materials and ideas is incomparable with other groups at this period. Between the years 1897 and 1903, McEvoy and his contemporaries built on their initial education by working alongside each other in shared studios and communicated as a group through their work, by painting each other, working from the same models, and through Gwen John’s \textit{Group Portrait}.

Chaplin noted that artistic camaraderie was not unusual at the Slade and continued between friends long after they left the school: \textit{Student groupings} not only determined current student life and artistic directions, but after graduation, so influenced art practice and the notion of artistic behaviour in the country at large.\textsuperscript{156} Although the wider influence of McEvoy and his contemporaries on British art has not yet been realised, the ‘groupings’ and friendships of these artists continued into the early years of the 1900s and, in several cases, were maintained throughout their lives. Under the professorship of Frederick Brown, these were the students who would ‘dominate British art until the 1930s.’\textsuperscript{157} Godfrey Money-Coutts, who had joined the Slade from Eton in 1923, 25 years after McEvoy left the school, wrote that ‘we students were still living in the afterglow of Augustus John, William Orpen, Ambrose
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McEvoy and, more recently, Stanley Spencer. These and a few others had set a pace which seemed almost beyond us. It was, I think, the virtuosity of these painters that we found so admirable.¹⁵⁸

McEvoy and his contemporaries may have met at the Slade but their friendships extended beyond the classroom and the confines of their formal education. They socialised and worked together regularly. They influenced each other’s artwork whilst living and exhibiting together, they shared studios and models, and organised drawing holidays to Vattetot-sur-mer, Amsterdam, Le Puy and the Welsh countryside. After McEvoy left the school in 1898, he remained central to the group and, according to John Rothenstein, directly influenced Gwen John who attended the Slade from 1895.¹⁵⁹ The influence of Gwen John on McEvoy, however, has never been discussed and will be explored for the first time in this chapter.

The intense sociability and closeness of this group, even in the years following their education at the Slade, is demonstrated in McEvoy’s account of Augustus John and Ida’s wedding in January 1901. McEvoy illustrated an environment whereby his artistic practice was undertaken around social events, as though socialising with his fellow artists was part of his artistic ritual in order to produce good work. Unfortunately, the whereabouts of this diary is not known but it was used as a primary resource from the McEvoy Estate Papers by the author Eric Chilston, for his manuscript Divine People, in the late 1970s and 1980s:

**Thursday Jan. 17th and Friday Jan. 18th 1901**

Got up fairly early – worked all day on tablecloth [in The Engraving] till about 2 – had bath and went to the Slade School, met Albert [Rutherston] and Orpen, went to tea with them at the ABC, then to Orpen’s and then to Albert’s, then to Alphonse’s [the Mont Blanc restaurant], then to the Tottenham Distillery, then to the Euston and afterwards to Baroni’s.

Then went to sleep with Albert. In the morning Albert heard the news of John’s marriage from his sister-in-law and I told him; then went to breakfast at the Hope and afterwards sat for Albert till twelve, then went to Newman’s [suppliers of artists’ materials] and then to the National Gallery and back to Chelsea.

Gwen came about 2.30 drew her till 4.30, then went home … and dressed for [William] Rothenstein’s party to which I found an invitation on returning to my room. Got there at 7.40. Had dinner. Gwen and Gus and Ida and Mr. and Mrs. Nettleship were guests after dinner. Mrs. Beerbohm and D.S. McColl and Albert came, then Steer. After dinner smoked

¹⁵⁸ Money-Coutts is quoted in Reynolds, "The Slade", 262.
¹⁵⁹ Rothenstein, Modern English Painters, 162-3.
and went upstairs. Tonks and Michel and Louise Salaman and Gwen Salmond and Mrs. Beerbohm’s daughter came.

Played a charade. I stayed till one and Albert returned with me and slept the night. Heard from Mary and wrote to her. 160

This diary entry is without description or a sense of how McEvoy felt about this series of events – which included his best friend getting married. However, a sense of McEvoys busy life and his constant moving around can be gleaned from this text. The processes of making art, visiting the Slade, and socialising with his friends can be understood as interchangeable for McEvoys in this quotation – all of these events or tasks are vital in his artistic ritual. His experiences are punctuated with mealtimes and errands, but the immersive and intense relationship that McEvoy has with his friends in this quotation gives an initial understanding of how influential these artists were for McEvoys work. This interchangeability between artistic progress and socialising is not only seen in McEvoys diary entries, but can also be seen in the groups paintings and drawings of each other – the prime example of which is Gwen Johns Group Portrait.

Group Portrait by Gwen John

Group Portrait (fig. 52) by Gwen John is the only known painting to depict several of McEvoys contemporaries, and provides an unparalleled insight into the intimacy of these artists’ friendships and their working dynamics. Rosa Waugh, Gwen Johns Slade School contemporary, is depicted to the left of the composition dressed in red, with bohemian red and white striped stockings to match – a contrast to the dark and sober clothing illustrated in more formal group portraits painted during the nineteenth century. 161 She strides forwards with a reel of thread in her right hand. The recipient of the thread is Winifred John, Gwen’s sister, who can be seen seated and sewing in this painting. Winifred’s left hand reaches towards a drawer under a dressing-table mirror, possibly in search of the reel that Rosa is holding. Next to Winifred is Michel Salaman, another Slade student and close friend, who has an intense look of concentration on his face as he copies ‘a single marguerite’, in a vase just out of view. 162 The backdrop for Michel’s flower drawing has been provided by the curtain that has been pulled away from the window and pinned underneath the mirror unit. This humorous motif by John

160 E Akers-Douglas and L Hendra, Divine People, 47.
161 Taubman, Gwen John, 106. Taubman identified the sitters in this work.
162 Ibid.
signifies the young artists’ precarious financial situation, as well as their creativity and resourcefulness as bohemians in this shared studio.163

The small room is significantly populated with Winifred and Michel cramped together at a table and Augustus John looming behind them. Augustus leans awkwardly on the mantelpiece next to the door and is still hatted from being outdoors. On entering the studio, he would have passed a young couple leaving who can still be viewed through the window to the far right of the painting. ‘According to Michel Salaman’s sister Dorothy [one of the owners of this work], Gwen John described the couple in the garden as ‘myself and an admirer’ and the top-hatted figure was thought to be a caricature of Ambrose McEvoy.’164 The phrase caricature conjures an image of McEvoy that is perhaps humorous and exaggerated, and could reference his smart ‘arrangement in black and white’, the Beardsley and Whistler-inspired attire that McEvoy wore early in his career that was described by Augustus John and Edna Clarke Hall on pages 34 and 35 of this thesis. As will be demonstrated later in this chapter, Gwen John and McEvoy were close friends and significantly influenced each other’s work. It is therefore not surprising that John would have included her friend in her work. However, the uncertainty surrounding the identity of this top-hatted figure in Gwen John’s Group Portrait contributes to an understanding of McEvoy as an elusive figure who often appears as a quiet onlooker and gentle influencer within his artistic circle.

Gwen John’s inclusion of the figures leaving the studio and Augustus John entering, demonstrates the fluidity of the occupants of this space. These young artists come and go without invitation. There is a sense of informality and bohemian living and working amongst this group which is further represented by the cluttered work station and the discarded shoe lying forgotten under the window. The shoe is reminiscent of seventeenth century Dutch interiors such as Interior View or The Slippers by Samuel van Hoogstraten (fig. 53) in which a pair of discarded slippers lay in a hallway between two rooms.165 The relaxed, vibrant and creative atmosphere produced by Gwen John can be contrasted with the more formal group portraits created in the nineteenth century, for example A Studio at Les Batignolles (fig. 54) by Henri Fantin-Latour, a painting that is thought to have directly inspired Group Portrait. 

163 John, Chiaroscuro, 49.
164 Taubman. Gwen John, 106.
165 Hoogstraten depicts A Father Admonishing his Daughter by Casper Netscher which is a variant of Gallant Conversation, Known as ‘The Paternal Admonition by Gerard ter Borch, a painting that McEvoy draws reference to in 1905 for his painting In a Doorway, see page 135-6 of this thesis.
Although Fantin-Latour painted *A Studio at Les Batignolles* almost thirty years before John, the similarities between *A Studio* and *Group Portrait* are striking. Both artists painted these conversation pieces with the aim of immortalising their contemporary groups at significant points in their careers. Just as Fantin-Latour painted a group of emerging Impressionists, it is thought that Gwen John used the same compositional format to document her own emerging group, following a vital period of education and independence in Paris. Her return to London at the beginning of 1899 marked a significant period of transition for the artist, resulting in the exhibition of her first work at the NEAC in 1900 and producing her most accomplished self-portraits in c.1900 and 1902 (NPG and Tate). Although it is not known if Gwen John saw Fantin-Latour’s conversation piece first-hand, prior to painting *Group Portrait*, it is likely that she visited the Musée de Luxembourg whilst studying with Whistler in 1898. *A Studio at Les Batignolles* had been added to the museum’s collection just a few years prior in 1892. Gwen John would have almost certainly been drawn to this painting as she would have been aware of the close friendship between Fantin-Latour, Whistler (her tutor in Paris), and Alphonse Legros (Professor of the Slade and succeeded by Frederick Brown), who were known as the Société des Trois.

Rosa Waugh in *Group Portrait* takes the position of Frederic Bazille in Fantin-Latour’s *A Studio*; she is painted with one foot forward and depicted in profile. Both Waugh and Bazille have an infectious confidence characterised by their drawn back shoulders and a distinct serpentine curvature of the spine. Augustus John, standing hatted next to the only picture on the wall, has been placed in the same position as Pierre-Auguste Renoir at the back of Fantin-Latour’s group. Winifred’s gesture, reaching forwards to the drawer of the mirror unit, places her in the position of Edouard Manet in Fantin-Latour’s composition, gesturing with his paintbrush towards the easel. Finally, Michel, who is painted in profile next to Winifred, can be compared to Zacharie Astruc, seated in quiet contemplation.

It is important to have an understanding of when this painting was produced by Gwen John as it provides a particular snapshot of this group working together in a shared studio environment, either whilst studying at the Slade or afterwards as independent artists. If it was produced following McEvoy’s education at the Slade, it demonstrates that McEvoy was still visiting and continuing to work alongside these same peers for a prolonged period. Although the date of *Group Portrait* was inscribed on the reverse ‘1896-7?’ by the previous owner and close friend of Gwen John, Edna Clarke Hall, and UCL Art Museum has catalogued this painting as c.1897, it is possible that this work was produced by John following her education with Whistler in Paris, and at around the same time as the Slade School.
picnic which was photographed in April 1899 (fig. 55). Gwen John attended the Slade picnic and was photographed with her friends, including Edna Waugh who continued her education until at least 1899.

It is not known when Edna inscribed this work but the inclusion of the question mark implies an estimated date written several years after the painting’s completion, and might have been misremembered. Group Portrait is a particularly mature work for Gwen John at the estimated date, and implies a greater confidence than that achieved at the Slade by 1897. John undertook a period of education in Paris, studying under Whistler for several months from September 1898 until early 1899. It is far more likely that the independence and confidence that John gained whilst living with her friends Ida Nettleship and Gwen Salmond, as unaccompanied women in the art capital of Europe, would have been responsible for this unusual conversation piece.

Existing literature has suggested that this painting was produced whilst John was living with her siblings Winifred and Augustus, and their friend and Slade contemporary Grace Westray in a first-floor apartment at 21 Fitzroy Street from autumn 1897. However, the figures outside of the window to the far right of this composition are at street level, making this a ground floor apartment. This not only rules out the apartment at 21 Fitzroy Street as a possible location for this painting but it also throws into question the initial dating of this work. Just underneath the figures through the window is the number ‘182’. It is not known why this number has been inscribed by the artist or whether it has any relevance but it is possible that this number refers to a colour, either for this painting or for a sketch or painting that was intended to be produced on this paper. As a result of Whistler’s teaching [John’s education in Paris] an exquisite sense of tone values became one of the characteristics of Gwen John’s work. She numbered her tones and made notes like the following on the backs of drawings: ‘Road 32, roof 13-23, grass 23, black coats 33’, and it is possible that ‘182’ corresponded to one of the

---

166 Taubman also describes this painting as an unusual painting in Gwen John’s surviving oeuvre. Taubman, Gwen John, 106.


169 Taubman, Gwen John, 106.

170 A curator at UCL Art Museum was asked about the relevance of this number and the response was that the museum did not know.
colours in her set of watercolours.\textsuperscript{171} This would again date this painting to after Gwen John’s education in Paris and her return to London in 1899. If this painting does date to 1899, it demonstrates an ongoing artistic relationship between Gwen John, McEvoy and their contemporaries beyond their training at the Slade, and a new phase of McEvoy’s early career that was influenced by his contemporaries.

Gwen John’s inclusion of an equal number of female and male sitters in her conversation piece, as well as the colours in which she dresses these individuals, should be interpreted as a conscious choice by the artist. Women are conspicuously absent from Fantin-Latour’s interior which includes only male artists and writers, all of whom are depicted in formal, dark-coloured clothes and are set against dark-coloured walls. The only female figure in this composition is a white statuette of Minerva, that stands on a table covered with red fabric. The male figures in Gwen John’s group portrait are comparatively dressed in black and the table, again covered in red, has been recreated as a workstation. However, instead of a white statuette of a female figure atop the fabric, John has placed her central female figure, her sister Winifred, at the table and dressed in white. John has chosen to use the same colours for the clothes of her female sitters as the domestic and aesthetic features of Fantin-Latour’s group portrait – the tablecloth and the statuette.

With this choice of colours, is John commenting on the restrictive and traditional role of women within a domestic or an artistic space during the nineteenth century, or even that women are little more than artists’ muses during Fantin-Latour’s earlier period? All three of John’s female figures; Winifred dressed in white, Rosa in red, and Gwen John through the window dressed in a combination of red and white, have been physically positioned in front of their male counterparts signifying the importance of the women artists in her artistic group. By bringing these accomplished women to the forefront of this bohemian scene, Gwen John successfully created an avant-garde and modernist conversation piece that was passed between her contemporaries. This painting was initially given to Edna Clarke Hall by Gwen John and then in 1950 was given to another Slade contemporary, Dorothy Samuel (née Salaman). The role of women during this period was changing and the figure of the 1890s ‘New Woman’ would have been familiar and welcomed by John and her contemporaries towards the end of the century, a subject that will be explored in greater depth in Chapter 5 in relation to McEvoy’s female portraits.

\textsuperscript{171} Chitty, Gwen John, 48.
Both the statuette of Minerva and the Japanese stoneware in Fantin-Latour’s group portrait serve as reminders of the aesthetic influences on this group of creative individuals. Both objects can be deemed superficial and artistic rather than functional. In comparison, Gwen John has furnished her table with tools: the mirror provides a reflection and a weight to hold down the curtain backdrop, a needle and thread, drawing materials, and a flower taken from nature. None of these objects are pre-existing or complete artworks, in contrast to the statuette and stoneware. John’s modern group of artists are not using the same sort of objects that inspired Victorian artists but instead are choosing everyday objects to draw upon an arguably more creative inspiration. Overseeing this group of artists in *Group Portrait* is a drawing framed on the wall. Although it is difficult to recognise any detail, it is drawn in the same red chalk as the Raphael sketch on the reverse of this painting, a drawing that will be explored in more detail in the next section of this chapter, and is probably a sketch after a similar Renaissance drawing. Gwen John’s inclusion of this work demonstrates the group’s distinctive interest and education in Renaissance and old-master drawings and paintings, an important historical grounding encouraged by the Slade and further developed by Ambrose McEvoy during his period of self-education.

*Group Portrait* was not intended as a saleable painting but was produced instead as a truthful and creative representation of Gwen John’s closest group of friends, in which McEvoy is included. The carefree nature of this composition is not comparable to the paintings fraught with anxiety that Gwen John struggled to complete later in her career. It instead shows a more confident and collaborative period of her artistic career, during which time she had the support of a close network of friends. By drawing inspiration from Fantin-Latour’s *A Studio at the Batignolles*, a painting that can be interpreted as a nineteenth-century avant-garde group portrait, John has aligned herself with her Slade School contemporaries as a collective, and as an emerging group of avant-garde turn-of-the-century artists capable of developing and reinterpreting modernism.

**McEvoy and Gwen John**

*Group Portrait* illustrates several members of this group and the working dynamics between them but also informs scholarship on the relationship between Gwen John and McEvoy as peers. It has been implied by several sources that McEvoy and Gwen John had a romantic relationship prior to his engagement to Mary Spencer-Edwards, and the figures through the window in *Group Portrait* were
described by Gwen John as ‘myself and an admirer’—the admirer being McEvoy. Regardless of their romantic relationship, for which there is little, if any, tangible evidence, the connection between John and McEvoy as friends and artistic equals is a subject that has not been examined previously, but will be explored in detail in this section.

The art historian John Rothenstein (son of William Rothenstein), wrote that Gwen John was greatly influenced by McEvoy and his interest in old master paintings and drawings—a knowledge that he ‘laboriously acquired’ and ‘generously imparted’ during his period of self-education. McEvoy is known to have worked in major public collections, such as The British Museum and The National Gallery, copying artworks that he deemed stylistically important in order to glean techniques. This makes the Renaissance drawings on the reverse of Group Portrait (fig. 56) particularly noteworthy as, if this painting does date after 1897, it is possible that John copied these drawings either with McEvoy or on his recommendation. The source of the drawing in black chalk is difficult to determine but it appears to be two sets of legs covered in drapery. The drawing to the right depicting a man with his hands bound above his head, and drawn in red chalk, is clearer in origin. UCL Art Museum, the owners of this work, have attributed this figure to ‘after Michelangelo’ and was thought to have been copied whilst John was studying at the Slade. However, I can demonstrate through my research that this drawing is after Raphael and is titled Study for a nude soldier in a Resurrection (fig. 57). The original drawing is in the British Museum where John would have almost certainly copied it.

The meticulous detail incorporated into Gwen John’s copy of Study for a nude soldier in a Resurrection suggests that she worked from the original drawing, rather than a reproduction. John’s drawing even includes Raphael’s miniscule signature, ‘RAFFAELLE’, in the bottom right of the original drawing, and only partly visible as ‘RAFFAEL…’ in the bottom right of John’s drawing (fig. 58). John’s ‘RAFFAEL…’ has been overlooked by art historians and UCL Art Museum as it has sustained some damage. Although I


was able to identify that this drawing is after Raphael, it has not been possible to determine conclusively if John copied Raphael's sketch during her earlier years at the Slade, as Edna Clarke Hall's inscription implies, or after she returned from Paris.

Rothenstein wrote that McEvoy directly influenced Gwen John’s painting technique, and yet the influence of Gwen John on McEvoy’s work has never been considered:

For Ambrose McEvoy imparted to her the results of his researches into the methods of the old masters. Without his help, she could hardly have painted the Self-Portrait in a red sealing-wax coloured blouse...This portrait – to my thinking, one of the finest portraits of the time, excelling in insight into character and in purity of form and delicacy of tone any portrait of McEvoy’s – owes the technical perfection of its glazes to his knowledge, as generously imparted as it was laboriously acquired.  

The painting to which this quotation is referring is Gwen John’s Self-Portrait (fig. 59). It was exhibited in spring 1902 at a Slade exhibition for former students, and is thought to have been painted by John between January and April whilst she was staying in Liverpool with her brother Augustus, rather than in London. Although this is an accomplished and experimental portrait for Gwen John at this period, it was also highly regarded by her peers and was bought immediately by Professor Frederick Brown. Brown later included this work in his own self-portrait in 1926 (fig. 60).

It is very possible that Gwen John gleaned the technique of layering thin, coloured glazes over a monochrome base for this painting from studying alongside McEvoy in The National Gallery. However, Rothenstein’s suggestion that John could not have produced this self-portrait without McEvoy’s direction is both patronising and insulting. As will become clear in this chapter, McEvoy and John influenced each other’s work as artistic equals.

John produced a copy of Gabriel Metsu’s The Duet in The National Gallery during this early period of her career, presumably a similar practice to McEvoy copying Titian’s Noli me Tangere, or Veronese’s The Rape of Europa, both previously discussed. Although there is no conclusive evidence for the direct training Gwen John received from McEvoy, as suggested by Rothenstein, McEvoy did offer advice and informally instructed other students whilst working in The National Gallery, and therefore

174 Rothenstein, Modern English Painters, 163.
175 Taubman, Gwen John, 109.
176 Ibid., 22.
it is possible that he also advised John.\textsuperscript{177} Benjamin Evans, a close friend of McEvoy’s at the Slade, and Augustus John both worked alongside McEvoy and presumably these artists advised each other on techniques and pigments. Benjamin Evans writes on more than one occasion to meet McEvoy at the gallery.\textsuperscript{178} Their contemporary Charles Cheston and his wife Evelyn also met McEvoy and worked alongside him at the National, and Cheston recalled McEvoy having ‘a few pupils’ under his instruction at the gallery whilst he experimented with colour.\textsuperscript{179} Daisy Legge was one of these informal ‘pupils’ and in a letter to McEvoy’s daughter, she remembers:

Copying at the N.G. Ambrose was there doing an exquisite copy of “Noli mi Tangere” by Titian & sometimes strolled round to look at my copy of Rembrandt’s woman with folded hands & gave me very useful hints – the background a warm deep colour with a sort of blush on it I could not get. “Put some yellow ochre on it” said Ambrose. I thought he’s gone mad, but he took a brush & a very little Y.O. on it rubbed it thinly over the background – and there was the bloom!\textsuperscript{180}

The painting that Legge was copying at The National Gallery was almost certainly \textit{Portrait of a Young Woman} once attributed to Rembrandt but now attributed to the Dutch school (fig. 61). In this quotation McEvoy can be seen as a skilled artist, and generous enough to share his particular interest in tone with his Slade contemporaries.

Augustus John recalled visiting Le Puy with both Gwen and McEvoy in his autobiography, stating that the trip had been ‘marred by an unfortunate circumstance. Gwen, like me, had been crossed in love but, unlike me, was inconsolable, and spent her time in tears.’\textsuperscript{181} With only the three artists on holiday together, it was almost certainly misinterpreted by Holroyd that McEvoy was responsible for Gwen’s heartbreak.\textsuperscript{182} However, with Gwen John’s sexual orientation being brought into discussion in more recent literature on the artist, it is more likely that this heartbreak was caused by a woman. This would account for Augustus John’s ambiguity as to the identity of the source of Gwen’s upset. An empty

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{177} Ibid., 109. It is not clear which painting by Metsu this refers to in The National Gallery as none of his work appears to be titled this. It is possible that Gwen John copied \textit{The Duet} by Metsu that is in the National Trust collection at Upton House, Warwickshire (NT 446725).
\textsuperscript{178} LET/757 and LET/778, MEP.
\textsuperscript{179} LET/857/1946, MEP.
\textsuperscript{180} LET/848, MEP.
\textsuperscript{181} John, \textit{Chiaroscuro}, 57.
\textsuperscript{182} Holroyd, \textit{Augustus John: The New Biography}, 87-8.
\end{footnotesize}
envelope in the McEvoy Estate Papers suggests that the trio visited Le Puy in autumn 1900.\textsuperscript{183} Had McEvoy been responsible for Gwen John’s tears during this holiday she surely would not have posed for a portrait the following year in 1901, which McEvoy painted at his first studio at 24 Danvers Street, ‘a very small room where he [McEvoy] lived – slept and worked’ (fig. 62).\textsuperscript{184} McEvoy wrote of Gwen modelling for him in this portrait in 1901 in one of his diaries, now unfortunately lost, ‘Gwen came about 2.30 drew her until 4.30, then went home.’\textsuperscript{185} It should also be noted that McEvoy, Gwen and Augustus also lived together in 1901 at 39 Southampton Street, above the Economic Cigar Company, and all three artists are registered to this address in the NEAC’s exhibitor’s list.\textsuperscript{186}

Gwen John was not averse to living alone; she was fiercely independent and would not have moved into 39 Southampton Street with McEvoy and her brother had McEvoy broken her heart. It is also thought that McEvoy stayed with Gwen John for a brief period in c.1903 in France, whilst he was travelling through Europe (refer to Appendix I). In a letter to McEvoy from Augustus John, John states that his ‘students don’t make any progress’ which presumably refers to his students at the Chelsea Art School, a school that he set up with William Orpen in 1903. He then writes as a postscript, ‘why do you regard yourself as a paying guest? Gwen was astonished to receive that money and was very sorry you should have thought advisable to send it. When you are full of money it is foolish to flaunt it in other people’s faces.’\textsuperscript{187}

McEvoy may have been responsible for imparting his knowledge of old masters to John, but her influence on McEvoy’s work is also clearly documented amongst the McEvoy Estate Papers. In 1900, as part of the winter exhibition at the NEAC, Gwen John exhibited only one painting, \textit{Mrs Atkinson} (fig. 63).\textsuperscript{188} This portrait depicts an old lady dressed in black with her hands folded on her lap and holding a handkerchief. She has been consciously placed by John just off-centre in this composition, a position described by Roe as creating a ‘sublime awkwardness’ with a lack of ‘perspectival clarity.’\textsuperscript{189} John may well have been influenced by the portrait of Whistler’s mother, \textit{Arrangement in Grey and Black No. 1}
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(fig. 64), which she would have seen in the Musée du Luxembourg whilst studying in Paris – the same location as A Studio at Les Batignolles by Henri Fantin-Latour – the painting that influenced Group Portrait. If Gwen John did see Arrangement in Paris, then Mrs Atkinson would date to after John’s training with Whistler in Paris in 1898-9.

It is not known exactly who Mrs Atkinson was, although Roe decisively states that she was ‘the cleaning lady’.190 Taubman was told by Michel Salaman, who owned this portrait, that this was a painting of Gwen John’s landlady. It should be noted that this, like Group Portrait, was another work that was passed between Gwen John’s social circle in ownership, rather than being sold through the NEAC or another exhibiting body. It was first owned by fellow Slade student Louise Salaman and was then passed on to her brother Michel.

From late 1899 and throughout 1900 she [Gwen John] lived intermittently at 122 Gower Street. The name Atkinson seems not to be associated with that address or with any of Gwen John’s other known addresses before 1900, though Kelly’s Post Office Directory for 1899 lists a Mrs Emily Adelaide Atkinson who kept a boarding house in Gower Street at no. 56. In 1900 a private hotel is listed close by, at 183 Euston Road. Its proprietor has the name Jacob Atkinson. It is just possible that the picture was painted there for Gwen John did live in the Euston Road at some point after leaving the Slade.191

With many interpretations and few definitive answers on where and when Gwen John painted Mrs Atkinson, it should be noted that the room in which this woman is situated is almost certainly in the same apartment as that depicted in Group Portrait, and was quite possibly painted in the adjacent room.192 Both the room surrounding Mrs Atkinson and that used for Group Portrait have similar distinctive wallpaper (fig. 65), heavily patterned with brown and red colourings. Each have a fireplace set into a wide but shallow chimney breast, although the surrounds are different, and there is a similar atmosphere and a lack of space in each of these interiors. Mrs Atkinson could not have been painted in the same room as Group Portrait as the orientation of the room would have positioned her in front of the door next to where Augustus John is standing in Group Portrait. However, this portrait could have been painted in the room behind, through the closed door of Group Portrait. This would position Mrs Atkinson away from the door but next to the fireplace.

190 Roe, Gwen John, 21.
191 Taubman, Gwen John, 106 & 107.
192 183 Euston Road in this quotation is remarkably similar to the ‘182’ inscribed in ink on Gwen John’s Group Portrait. Could this 182 refer to an address on Euston Road?
The research that I undertook for this thesis uncovered a sketchbook amongst the McEvoy Estate Papers that contains several drawings of Mrs Atkinson.\textsuperscript{193} It is not known whether McEvoy was drawing Atkinson from observation in the same room and at the same time as Gwen John or whether he was copying from John’s finished painting. The orientation of Mrs Atkinson in the most finished sketch (fig. 66), as well as its containment within a square border suggests that McEvoy was working from Gwen John’s finished work rather than from life. However, there are other details from this painting that have been drawn on separate pages by McEvoy which suggest an on-going interest in this work beyond seeing it and sketching it only once. He has drawn Atkinson’s face twice amongst other sketches of women and a street scene (fig. 67 & 68).\textsuperscript{194} It is possible that these surrounding sketches were made from other paintings exhibited alongside Mrs Atkinson at the 1900 NEAC exhibition, or were observations or ideas for compositions by the artist. All of the details taken from John’s Mrs Atkinson are drawn in pencil, which suggests that McEvoy was only interested in the form of John’s portraiture, rather than colour; although there might have been oil sketches after this work which do not survive.

It is interesting to note that both McEvoy and Gwen John exhibited portraits of older women at the winter NEAC exhibition in 1900. This was the first NEAC exhibition in which McEvoy exhibited, and Gwen John had only exhibited in one previous exhibition in summer 1900, with a self-portrait. It is likely that McEvoy and John discussed their similar entries for the winter 1900 exhibition. They may have even worked alongside each other in preparation for this exhibition. This emphasises the camaraderie between these young artists as they entered a progressive and competitive exhibition space together at the start of their careers. Unfortunately, it is impossible to know the extent of the similarities between McEvoy’s exhibited work, Old Woman, and John’s Mrs Atkinson other than the title, as Old Woman has not been identified and its whereabouts is unknown. However, it is possible that McEvoy’s Old Woman was also a portrait of Mrs Atkinson.

\textsuperscript{193} Initially I did not know if this sketchbook, SKE/3, belonged to Mary or Ambrose McEvoy as there was no indication of ownership and the text within it was, unusually, written in French. Having analysed the drawings, the handwriting and the French text (which has been translated by Marte Stinis), it is now thought to have belonged to Ambrose McEvoy rather than his wife Mary. The tone of the text with its focus on colour, technique and an avid interest in Dutch old masters is suggestive of many of McEvoy’s other notebooks and sketchbooks in the estate collection. This sketchbook contains drawings after Rembrandt, Hogarth and Dürer, all artists from whom Ambrose McEvoy is known to have copied, as made evident in this thesis. SKE/3, MEP.

\textsuperscript{194} Mrs Atkinson’s head in Figure 67 is at a slightly different angle to that of Gwen John’s finished painting which could suggest being drawn from life.
In the top left-hand corner of a fourth page (fig. 69), McEvoy has drawn a pencil sketch of the sheep’s skull that is on the mantelpiece behind Mrs Atkinson in Gwen John’s portrait, and has positioned this drawing next to a vague outline of the Virgin and Child.195 It is difficult to identify which version of the Virgin and Child this sketch has been taken from and whether it is the same drawing that is on the wall behind Mrs Atkinson – assumed to be by Raphael in Roe’s analysis of this work.196 Looking through McEvoy’s sketchbook and analysing two other Virgin and Child drawings in a state of greater development (fig. 70-71), I have been able to identify all three of these works as after Virgin and Child Seated by the Wall by Albrecht Dürer (fig. 72). It is likely that McEvoy copied the print by Johannes Wierix after Dürer in the British Museum. Although the Virgin and Child on the wall behind Mrs Atkinson appears to be a reproduction of a drawing rather than a print, and is likely to be by Dürer, and the inclusion of this work signifies an exchange of ideas and influences between McEvoy and John when creating portraiture.

The influence of Gwen John on McEvoy’s portraiture can be clearly seen through his act of copying Mrs Atkinson. However, the lasting effect of this portrait on McEvoy’s work can be seen much later in McEvoy’s career, namely in the portrait of his mother painted in 1915 (fig. 73). Although it has been rightly suggested that McEvoy was also influenced by Whistler’s Arrangement in Grey and Black No. 1 (fig. 64), like Gwen John, the resemblance between The Artist’s Mother by McEvoy and Mrs Atkinson by John is uncanny. Both women are seated in front of a fireplace with art on the wall behind. John includes reproductions torn out of books or possibly sketches made herself after or original drawings which have been pinned to the walls. Whereas McEvoy includes a large original oil painting, a statement that declares he has come further than the financially-strained living arrangements that he shared with Gwen John in his early career. Both women are seated just off centre, they are both dressed in black and their hands are brought together onto their laps. Even the position of their bodies is identical, and although each woman has her head turned slightly in opposing directions, both subjects look beyond the artist and into the distance. Augustus John also painted a similar portrait titled An Old Lady (fig. 74) at a similar time to Gwen John’s Mrs Atkinson. It has been suggested that Augustus John was influenced by his sister’s work. However, this is dependent on the date of Mrs Atkinson. Either way, all three of these paintings, Mrs Atkinson, The Artist’s Mother, and An Old Lady,
demonstrate a vital exchange of ideas between Augustus and Gwen John and McEvoy in their portraiture.

Both Gwen John and McEvoy learnt from each other’s work and techniques in order to deliver different or more accomplished paintings than perhaps they would have otherwise achieved. McEvoy made several pencil sketches after Mrs Atkinson and both Gwen John and McEvoy copied old master paintings from the National Gallery where, it is said, McEvoy imparted his techniques on John. However, it is likely that the influence of these two artists went much further than this — a theory that is not possible to prove without the early sketches and paintings by Gwen John dating to the late 1890s and letters between the pair. On the death of Augustus and Gwen John’s father, Edwin William John, Augustus cleared out the family house and systematically destroyed early works by himself, by his mother, and by Gwen.¹⁹⁷ This act of destruction means that very few early works by Gwen John survive.

‘Supreme’ Women: The Nursery, Two Gwens and Ida

As this chapter has demonstrated, McEvoy and Gwen John artistically influenced each other early in their careers, but where does Gwen John fit in with her female contemporaries, and how did these women artists collectively influence McEvoy — if at all? Mary McEvoy, Ambrose’s wife, is one woman who would have undoubtedly influenced her husband’s work and would have been able to offer comments on his compositions and technique, as she also trained at the Slade. However, it has not been possible to uncover direct evidence for Mary’s influence among correspondence or notes in the McEvoy Estate Papers. Although Mary married Ambrose in 1902, she mixed in a different social circle to her husband at the Slade. Her close Slade friend with whom she shared lodgings was Amy Akers-Douglas (née Jennings-Bramly) who was not introduced to Ambrose McEvoy until after their education at the Slade.¹⁹⁸ Mary herself was not introduced to McEvoy at the school but at The National Gallery by Augustus John. Mary’s separate social circle at the Slade and her later introduction to McEvoy accounts for her having little or no direct influence on McEvoy’s work during this crucial early period. Mary did, however, become close friends with Ursula Tyrwhitt who also studied at the Slade and was

¹⁹⁷ Taubman, Gwen John, 22.
close friends with Ambrose. Several letters and postcards from Tyrwhitt to Mary and Ambrose exist in the McEvoy Estate Papers. In one of these postcards dating to 7th November 1907 and sent from Brussels, Tyrwhitt writes, ‘I have been seeing many pictures by Flemish & Dutch painters in the gallery here, this is one of them.’ On the front of this postcard is Le Repos pendant la fuite en Égypte by Joos van Cleve (fig. 75-6). This is not only a similar composition to Virgin and Child Seated by the Wall by Albrecht Dürer which has already been briefly explored, but at the same date that Tyrwhitt sent this postcard in 1907, Ambrose McEvoy was between two periods of his work in which he was influenced by Dutch paintings. McEvoy’s Dutch interiors will be examined in Chapter 3 of this thesis, but this postcard signifies an ongoing relationship and exchange of ideas within McEvoy’s direct circle of friends that continues beyond their training at the Slade.

An important sub-group within McEvoy’s close circle of friends at the Slade was a group of female students known as ‘The Nursery’ led by Ida Nettleship. Ida had been at the Slade since 1892 and had made friends with a group of girls younger than herself, taking on a matriarchal role within the group. Michael Holroyd, Augustus John’s biographer, argued that ‘The Nursery’ exclusively comprised Ida Nettleship, Edna Waugh and Gwen Salmond. However, taking into consideration other sources, it is likely that Louise Salaman was also included in this close group of girls as one of the leaders. She was given the name ‘The Carroy Salamander’ in Logie Whiteway’s The Slade Animal Land and is said to feast on geniuses such as ‘The Nettlebug’ (Ida Nettleship) and ‘The Waw’ (Edna Waugh) (fig. 77-79). The Slade Animal Land is an exceptional resource in understanding some of the relationships within McEvoy’s cohort. It is a hand-written and illustrated notebook by Whiteway in which she depicts caricatures of her friends and tutors at the Slade. Several of her drawings have been annotated with personal jokes or comments about their characters. Some of the depictions could be interpreted as quite cruel, although there is no doubt that the author meant for them to be humorous. Edna and Ida, both of whom are depicted in Whiteway’s work, were particularly close and they ‘often sat for

199 POS/326, MEP.
201 Logie Whiteway, “The Slade Animal Land, as Seen by the Lo. With Help in Ideas from the Jeff and Other Friendly Animals,” 1898, unpublished manuscript, National Library of Scotland, MS.20347. The author of this work has been incorrectly identified as Logic Whiteway in every known source. However, I conducted genealogical research into Whiteway and have been able to reveal that Logie Whiteway was born in London in 1877, the same year as McEvoy.
each other’ as models – Edna sat as Nabob for Ida’s Slade work, and Ida sat as the Angel Gabriel for Edna.\(^202\) ‘Ida – her darling presence – her voice – my first real friendship. How dearly I loved her!’\(^203\)

Ida assigned pet names to several of her other female Slade friends, who were part of the artistic and wealthy Salaman family, each carefully picked from her favourite book *The Jungle Book*, which had been recently published in 1894. Ida was ‘Mowgli’ the man cub, Dorothy Salaman was ‘Baloo’ the brown bear, Bessie Salaman (Cohen from 1896) was ‘Bagheera’ the panther and Brenda Salaman was ‘Rikki-tikki’ the mongoose.\(^204\) There was then Ursula Tywhitt and Gwen John who were also close friends but who were older than the younger girls of the group. A snapshot of these young women as a collective at the Slade can be seen in Wyn George’s account, in an unpublished diary dating to her first year at the Slade, 1896:

> I think I. Nettleship is simply sweet – so picturesque. Miss Salmond makes me laugh. A girl named Gwen John asked me if my name was “Tubby”. Then sketched me munching an apple...Miss Salaman pulled my hair about and I heard her say to Miss Nettleship, isn’t it pretty? N. – Yes just like a baby.\(^205\)

It should be recognised that both the female and male students at the Slade, within this group of friends, entered the school as teenagers; Edna Waugh was only thirteen when she enrolled at the Slade. This gave them a long-term and close familial bond that would not have been experienced if they had met later in their careers. The relationship between Augustus John and McEvoy which will be explored later in the chapter is reminiscent of a sibling rivalry and is a clear indication of this strong bond. These artists did not consciously influence each other, but their familial relationships led to artistic commonality. There is a charming naïvité and uninhibited imagination demonstrated by this group. Holroyd described Ida and her friends as wanting to remain children indefinitely, thus escaping the grown-up world and the restrictions that marriage would incur.\(^206\) These students utilised literature in order to create the fantasy worlds and the escapism that they craved; the girls took inspiration from Rudyard Kipling’s *The Jungle Book*, and the boys took inspiration from Alexandre Dumas’ *The Three Musketeers*. Although a lot of the early work from the women artists does not


\(^203\) Ibid., 21.


\(^206\) Holroyd, *Augustus John Volume 1*, 76.
survive, The Slade Animal Land by Whiteway is a clear example of the uninhibited imagination of these talented students.

As seen in Gwen John’s Group Portrait, women were central to this group of artists whilst studying at the Slade and in the years immediately following McEvoy’s education. McEvoy and his male contemporaries would have experienced a different dynamic to other art schools of the period, where female students and their work had a profound effect on the school’s teaching and its pupils. In the 1890s, the Slade was accepting more female than male students and its co-educational environment meant that men and women could enter on equal terms.207 Talented students at the Slade were encouraged regardless of gender, although women were restricted in the life class. Women would study from both male and female nudes but the male nudes were never entirely unclothed and wore a pouch, as can be seen in Ida Nettleship’s A Study of a Nude Male Figure (1895) (fig. 80) and as late as 1916 in Thora E. Peppercorn’s painting titled Male Figure Standing (fig. 81). On the entry of a female model in to a life class, the female students would be required to leave the room until preparations were complete.208 However, McEvoy’s closest female friends overcame these limitations on at least one occasion, by hiring a life model and taking him on holiday with them. Edna Clarke Hall recalled that whilst on holiday with Ida Nettleship and Gwen Salmond in Wales, Ida’s mother came to inspect their lodgings: ‘She then went away but she didn’t know that we had a [male] model down from London. Ida wanted to study the colour of flesh in the sunlight instead of knowing about it in the school where the light was very dull. But we had to get rid of him in the end.’209 Although this act of rebellion could be interpreted as a little extreme and unnecessary, it arguably demonstrates the dedication that these female artists had to their professional development by making sure that they were not disadvantaged in relation to their male peers. By learning in this way outside of Slade classes, it is likely that these women found techniques of their own and experimented beyond the school’s curriculum, and they would have shared these techniques and ideas with their male contemporaries. There was certainly an exchange of ideas between McEvoy and his female friends. Edna Clarke Hall remembers sitting ‘knee to knee’ with McEvoy as she drew him and he drew her.210 These two artists working together in such close proximity describes an intensity and intimacy that would have allowed

208 Chitty, Gwen John, 36.
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a distinctive creativity to be born that was not encouraged by the Slade’s teaching – men and women were often segregated and were discouraged from interacting.

The women at the Slade were not only respected as peers but were considered superior by their male counterparts, ‘in talent as well as in looks.’ The male students recognised the talent of these women. Edna Waugh was considered a child prodigy by Tonks who asked if she was ‘going to be a second Burne Jones?’ ‘No’ she replied ‘A first Edna Waugh.’ Unfortunately, several of these young women would marry, despite Frederick Brown’s insistence that the Slade was ‘not a matrimonial agency’, and several of them, including Edna Waugh and Ida Nettleship, would never reach their full potential as artists. This is in stark contrast to the arguably less talented men with Augustus John, McEvoy, and Orpen who had substantial careers and reached commercial success:

In talent as well as in looks the girls were supreme. But these advantages for the most part came to nought under the burdens of domesticity which loomed ahead for most of them and which, even if acceptable, could be for some almost too heavy to bear....

This early period of their careers should be closely explored as it was marked by artistic excellence, collaboration, and a mutual sharing of ideas; not just between the women artists but between women and men in this close group of friends. Between 1889 and 1899 at least ten out of eighteen students awarded with the annual Slade School scholarships were women, including Ida Nettleship and Gwen Salmond in 1895, Madge Oliver in 1896, Elinor M. Monsell in 1897 and Edna Waugh in 1898 – evidence that Augustus John was correct in stating that the girls of their group were naturally more talented. However, in art historical literature, the impact of these female artists has often been overlooked, particularly in relation to their closest male contemporaries. Although, as it has already been described by Augustus John, the female students at the Slade were ‘supreme’, the name ‘The Nursery’, which described several of these female students, trivialised their output as artists by domesticating
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213 O’Keeffe writes that Brown told a student that the Slade was not a matrimonial agency after the male student was seen speaking to a female student. Paul O’Keeffe, Some Sort of Genius: A Life of Wyndham Lewis (London: Jonathan Cape, 2010), 27.
214 Hall is quoting Augustus John in her manuscript. Hall, ‘The Heritage of Ages’, 37.
216 UCL Calendars, UCL Special Collections.
their roles in society as carers for others — seeing them as mothers, with the primary function of raising children.\textsuperscript{217}

Although the figure of the ‘New Woman’ was well established by the late 1890s, and is a topic that will be discussed in Chapter 5, young women at the Slade during this period were still being subjected to the societal norms of the previous generation and, once married, would often be unable to continue with careers as professional artists. This meant that the artistic landscape changed enormously for this generation of artists between their education at the Slade and the years following, as it went from an environment dominated by talented young women, accepted and trained on equal terms, to an environment dominated by male artists like McEvoy. Gwen John and Ursula Tyrwhitt appear to be the exceptions within this group. John never married and continued to pursue a career, and Tyrwhitt married a distant cousin at the age of forty in 1913, to pacify her father. She continued her career after her marriage with the support of her husband. The McEvoys and Ursula Tyrwhitt remained close friends following their education at the Slade, and in 1912 Ursula gave the McEvoy’s a painting of flowers in a vase, possibly as a tenth wedding anniversary present (fig. 82). In a letter to Mary McEvoy, Ursula humorously conveys the fears of her father and the societal changes for the role of women during the 1910s:

\begin{quote}
My dear Mary,
I’m writing to tell you that I’m going to be married — It seems to have been arranged rather suddenly — my father has a fixed idea that unmarried women are certain to become suffragettes if not post impressionists so I’m going to marry a friend of his, a distant cousin next month. If you are in town I’d like to see you & would it be possible to Ambrose to make a drawing of my head (a criticism[?]) I hope you are all well.
Yours with love Ursula.\textsuperscript{218}
\end{quote}

Ursula’s father’s fear is that she will join one of two groups open to women who would encourage her to not marry, the suffragettes and the post-impressionists. Instead of seeing these groups as progressive and liberating, her father sees them as preventing her from conducting her duty as a daughter and a woman — to marry and become a good wife, although forty is a late age to marry during this period.

\textsuperscript{217} There are several sources for the name ‘The Nursery’ but the most reliable and one of the earliest comes from Neve, ‘Drawings and Memories’, 330.

\textsuperscript{218} LET/957, MEP.
Following their education at the Slade, this group of young women began to transmute as they embarked upon a new period of their lives. Augustus John described a new sub-group, no longer the innocent children of ‘The Nursery’, but the ‘two Gwens’ (Gwen John and Gwen Salmond) and Ida Nettleship who moved to Paris for a few months to study at the Académie Carmen, under Whistler, and Colarossi. Whistler was already a profound influence on this group of students and will be discussed in Chapter 4. Gwen John did not intend to enrol at any school whilst in Paris as her father had refused to financially support her trip, but Salmond paid John’s fees for her.\(^{219}\)

It was in the trio’s apartment, 12 Rue Froidevaux in Montparnasse, the centre of Bohemian Paris and which they nicknamed ‘12 Cold Veal Street’, that Gwen John painted her new group, *Interior with figures* (fig. 83).\(^{220}\) In this painting Gwen Salmond can be seen dressed in white reading a book with Ida standing next to her. Although this is not one of Gwen John’s most accomplished works, the atmosphere created in this painting is one of youthful excitement and freedom. The beautifully ornate Parisian room is vast and sparsely furnished, and is reminiscent of some of McEvoy’s early interiors from a similar date. The small smile that can be seen to dart across Ida’s face reveals the young women’s self-sufficiency and modest delight with their situation.

As Taubman described, it was at Académie Carmen that ‘figure painting predominated once more, though Whistler emphasised that it was not the art of portraiture he was teaching but ‘the scientific application of paint and brushes.’\(^{221}\) This ‘scientific’ application of paint and the experimental techniques of different pigments and drying times was something that also interested McEvoy. Although McEvoy had embarked on his own period of self-education following the Slade, it is likely that these three women, who had studied in Paris in 1898 and early 1899, brought back several techniques and methods from Whistler’s school and inspiration from the capital, that could be used by the wider group. The transmission of these techniques would have significantly contributed to McEvoy’s interest in colour and tone, as well as his long-term interest in Whistler’s work. Gwen John certainly shared the techniques that she had learnt in Paris with her contemporaries, including the laying out of colours on to a clean and tidy palette and how to use colours most appropriately. On her return to Britain, she tutored her friend Edna Waugh in these new painting methods:

> From their painting sessions together she [Edna] remembered above all Gwen John’s insistence on a clean and orderly palette, her exacting attention to the rightness of tones – particularly in transitional passages – and her repeated instruction ‘If it isn’t right, take

---


\(^{221}\) Taubman, *Gwen John*, 16.
Orderliness and method and an emphasis on ‘good habit’ were what Whistler preached to his students. The palette was to be set out according to an invariable rule which he dictated, and the colours were then to be mixed and graded to form ‘a systematic transition from light to dark: quite as definite a sequence as an octave on the piano.’

The extra education that the two Gwens and Ida received in Paris was an opportunity that McEvoy did not have. However, he learnt from Gwen John following her French education, and it is likely that McEvoy would have also learnt from Ida Nettleship and Gwen Salmond through a transmission of ideas and direct teaching following the women’s return. Gwen Salmond is known to have collaborated with her male contemporaries in artistic ventures. She was at the forefront of the foundation of the Chelsea Art School with Augustus John and William Orpen in 1903 as the ‘lady superintendent’ in charge of supervising the female students. Although it is difficult to pinpoint exact works by McEvoy that were directly influenced by the female students in his close circle of friends, largely because there is a limited body of surviving work from these women, they would have unquestionably had a significant influence on their male friends.

**The Five Musketeers**

The second sub-group amongst McEvoy’s closest contemporaries, and the group that was responsible for his early interest in Dutch Golden Age paintings, was nicknamed the ‘Three Musketeers’. There has been much debate over who coined the nickname and which artists were represented by the term. William Rothenstein in his memoirs *Men and Memories* wrote that he described his brother Albert, William Orpen and Augustus John as the ‘Three Musketeers’, as ‘they were always together.’ The three young men became close friends following the arrival of Orpen and Albert Rutherston at the Slade in 1897. A painting by Orpen titled *The Old Circus* (fig. 84), depicts the artist, Rutherston and John in front of the statue of Eros in Piccadilly Circus in London and is thought to have been painted in c.1898-9. The three figures, dressed in similar clothes and hats have been positioned in this painting to resemble the three heads of Charles I in Anthony van Dyck’s portrait in the Royal Collection.

---


(fig. 85) – signifying that Orpen, John and Rutherston were such close friends that they can be considered, like the three heads of Charles I, the same person. This painting has even been called the ‘Three Musketeers’, although it was not titled this contemporaneously by the artist.

However, in contrast to Rothenstein’s ‘Three Musketeers’ is Susan Chitty’s understanding of the group, who named the original ‘Three Musketeers’ as McEvoy, Benjamin Evans and Augustus John, an earlier ‘trio’ at the Slade who were inseparable. This ‘trio’, named as such by John himself, were educated together from 1894 until Evans left the Slade in 1897. John had also known Evans previously from a school that he attended in Clifton. The close friendship between these young men has been recorded in several secondary sources and by John half a century after the events. The importance of their friendship, as demonstrated by primary sources, however, has never been analysed, nor has the outcome of their relationship on their work as artists – specifically that of McEvoy. Yet, the uncertainty surrounding the individual members of the ‘Three Musketeers’ and whether McEvoy was a central figure in this named trio reinforces his apparent elusiveness. Just as it is difficult to ascertain whether McEvoy was the top-hatted man in Gwen John’s Group Portrait, his central role in this male group of Slade contemporaries is debated by scholars. This could have suggested that McEvoy was not a central member of this wider group of students, and yet the McEvoy Estate Papers which include correspondence between the artist and his contemporaries, and sketchbooks containing work after Gwen John, provides evidence to the contrary. McEvoy was a central member of the ‘Three Musketeers’ but this was a group that added members when Orpen and Rutherston joined the Slade. It would be more appropriate to name this group the Five Musketeers, an expanding group of friends, who over a number of years significantly impacted each other – McEvoy, John, Evans, Orpen and Rutherston.

In many ways it is unnecessary to conclusively identify the ‘Three Musketeers’ as either Orpen, John and Rutherston or McEvoy, John and Evans. The nomenclature of these two trios is less important than the dynamics between these young men, how they worked together, and the influence they had on each other’s early work. However, to be able to name a group of artists during this period reaffirms
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the strength of their artistic friendship and defines them as like-minded individuals with a common purpose or goal.\textsuperscript{230}

McEvoy was only included in one of these groups and thus this group will be focused on in order to establish the impact it had on McEvoy’s early career. McEvoy, Evans, and John had a close relationship, and several letters from John to McEvoy amongst the McEvoy Estate Papers refer to the trio’s intimacy both socially and artistically. It is important to explore some of these letters to gain an understanding of their friendship and how their common interests influenced the direction of McEvoy’s oeuvre. One of the group’s common interests was the work of Rembrandt which can be seen to permeate both their friendship and their work in a number of different ways.

During the summer holidays at the Slade, John would often go home to Tenby in Wales. From here he wrote to McEvoy and made clear the impact of the Slade’s teaching and the cultural environment he had been exposed to during the term:

But for me living as I am in a town of barbarians who even lack the nerving ferocity of Philistines how can it be expected that I can retain for 3 months the ardour & energy accumulated last time at the Slade & in the company of our Evans and yourself?... Has Evans not come back from visiting the Dutch? Haven’t heard from him am in despair!\textsuperscript{231}

This extract clearly relays John’s frustration at being unable to relate to the locals of his hometown. He describes them as barbarians and implies that the cultural energy soaked up during term-time at the Slade with McEvoy and Evans will only last a finite time - certainly not the three months in Tenby. His direct reference to Evans and McEvoy, and the comparison he makes to his home population, suggests that the two young artists are a preferable substitute family that can provide John with what he needs – artistic inspiration and like-mindedness. This critical view of Tenby did not hold true for every school holiday though, as during the summer of 1897 Augustus John invited McEvoy and Benjamin Evans to join him in Wales for a drawing holiday. This holiday made a lasting impression on John, which he recalled as a youthful adventure in his autobiography \textit{Chiaroscuro}. The trio hired a donkey, a cart, and a tent in Tenby and took only cooking utensils, blankets and sketching materials with them. Some painting was done at Newgale and then enjoying Solva, they spent 2-3 weeks there before walking to St David’s.\textsuperscript{232}

\textsuperscript{230} Cohen. “‘To Stand on the Rock of the Word ‘We’”, 1.

\textsuperscript{231} LET/82, MEP.

\textsuperscript{232} John, \textit{Chiaroscuro}, 28.
Two letters, thought to have been written in 1900 whilst John and McEvoy were looking for a studio to share, convey John’s incessant energy and his need to be in direct contact with McEvoy. John has historically been seen as a womaniser with stereotypical characteristics of someone inherently male. He was later dismissed as a war artist for the Canadian forces in World War I after taking part in a brawl at a pub. By his own admission in his autobiography *Chiaroscuro*, he also threatened to fight the lover of ‘Elinor’, a close member of their Slade circle, if he did not leave her alone. 233 However, the letters that he wrote to McEvoy display a different persona – a dependency on his friend and a constant longing for McEvoy to engage with him:

Dear Ambrose,

Write instantly & tell me you have got a studio – giving the locality terms etc. to satisfy the business cravings of my honoured sire upon which I will post up to town without loss of time & once – once again I shall fall into your embrace – to be washed well down with copious draughts of anything you like. 234

This is just one letter amongst several from John that convey an almost homoerotic or romantic attachment to McEvoy in the form of embraces and a desperate longing to see him. A second letter from John presumably written once the same studio had been found and secured, states that he is coming to London and again he awaits his physical embrace:

Dear McEvoy,

I am coming up by night train on Friday next arriving at the metropolis at 1.30 I think. On Saturday we will look at the studio

Would 9 be too early to ask you to meet me? Recollect – with what impatience I shall await the departure of night and the coming of that glorious sun fit herald of thy appearance worthy spectator of our embraces.

Write and appoint a meeting place – I hesitate to enquire after Evans – but affection bursts the strongest bonds of discretion.

Yours John. 235

---
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At the bottom of this letter is an ink sketch of John waiting impatiently for Friday 3rd August to arrive so that he can see McEvoy again in London (fig. 86). Evans is again mentioned as the third member of this trio, three years after he had left the Slade. It is likely that the studio found by John and McEvoy in 1900 fell through as McEvoy moved into 24 Danvers Street in Chelsea as a lodger in Autumn 1900 and was there for the 1901 census.236

In January 1901, Evans and McEvoy’s roles as members of the ‘Three Musketeers’ were formalised when they were invited to be best man at Augustus John’s impromptu wedding to Ida Nettleship. They were the only guests at the ceremony with Gwen John. Augustus John later wrote to thank McEvoy for his help and attendance:

My dear McEvoy

Let me express in my turn the great privilege which has been mine in having you & Evans to assist at my wedding. I am quite of my wife’s opinion, no such exquisite marriage has ever taken place! I would never have believed the ceremony could have been made so pleasant for me – In fact I wouldn’t mind having it over again under the same conditions You may certainly count on me to repay as well as I can the obligation you have laid me under – whenever called upon on my own and on the part of wife I thank you again – au revoir

John237

John returned the favour with Benjamin Evans and were both best man at McEvoy’s wedding to Mary Spencer Edwards in January the following year.238

Although McEvoy and John’s close friendship was certainly complicated and the pair seem to have shared a rivalry that often ended in McEvoy’s frustration, McEvoy retained his early support and friendship with John for one of the most difficult periods of John’s life – the death of his wife Ida in Paris in 1907 at the age of thirty. John had urged his closest friends not to travel to Paris to attend Ida’s cremation, a decision which William Rothenstein always regretted:

236 An account of these early years can be found in NOT/197, MEP. Also refer to Appendix I.
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I never forgave myself for this hesitation; in my heart I knew I should have gone at once, as McEvoy did, to whom John also telegraphed. I loved no woman more than Ida and I knew John to be in the deepest trouble.

McEvoy ignored John’s advice and travelled to Paris immediately to console his friend. John in a handwritten note intended for the 1953 retrospective McEvoy exhibition at the Leicester Galleries recalled Ida’s death:

having travelled to Paris, to condlone with me on a sad bereavement, he [McEvoy] found me with a companion endeavouring to celebrate the event over a bottle of wine, he at once recognising the factitious nature of our gaiety, & with his customary gusto, he joined in the formalities and even insisted on contributing substantially to them himself. Artist and loyal friend, this was the sort of man he was.

McEvoy expected to spend the day with John and travel back to London that night, however, to comfort the already intoxicated Augustus John, he ‘had the delicacy to keep drunk all the time and was perfectly charming.’ He was unable to travel back to London for a week. Following Ida’s cremation, McEvoy wrote a short postcard to his wife Mary postmarked 16th March 1907, ‘Mrs John was cremated today at Pére La Chaise and I went there. I am glad I came.’

Eight years after McEvoy’s death, in a letter to Mary McEvoy, Ambrose’s wife, the significance of John and McEvoy’s close friendship is expressed with a vulnerability rarely demonstrated by John:

24th July /35

My Dear Mary,

I want to thank you for your letter which I greatly appreciate. I know Ambrose would have been with me. He was of all my old friends the only one I constantly regret losing.

Yrs with love,

Gus

---
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On 5th July 1935, just over two weeks before this letter was written, Henry John, Augustus’ son, was found drowned. His body was pulled from the sea at Perranporth, Cornwall, almost two weeks after he had gone missing. In response to a letter from Mary, presumably offering her condolences, John replied that he knew Ambrose would have been there with him during this personal tragedy, just as he had supported John in Paris, almost thirty years before. It is clear from this letter that the long-term friendship and support provided by McEvoy as part of the ‘Three Musketeers’, had a lasting effect on John.

Finally, the letter that successfully encapsulates the ‘Three Musketeers’, Evans, John, and McEvoy during their early period is one of John’s shortest letters; a letter dominated by ink drawings. Although this correspondence is not dated, it is likely that John is again writing to McEvoy who is with Evans in London during the school holiday whilst John is in Wales alone. On the recto John writes,

Dear McEvoy
I would fain hear from you & Evans. As for me I do nought but wander on the cliffs & caves know my footsteps.

Underneath and dominating the first page is an ink drawing of John standing on the cliff edge, a location he revisits in more than one letter (fig. 87-88). He holds a telescope and looks out to sea, searching for his friends McEvoy and Evans. On the horizon is a ship to offer a degree of perspective and to emphasise the distance of the nearest civilisation to John. Then, over-page on the verso, an ink drawing fills the whole page. Two figures, Evans on the left and McEvoy on the right are seated in the pub at the bar. Each holds a drink as if they are about to make a toast to their absent friend John. To the right of McEvoy is the ghostly figure of John watching over his friends and, easily missed between the drinkers’ feet, is written ‘In thought I am with you always, John.’ The significant bond of friendship, as recorded and understood by Augustus John, is demonstrated by the implication that even when John is absent the trio is still complete.

McEvoy, John and Evans were joined at the Slade in 1897 by Orpen and Rutherston, and together this group of five male artists intermittently shared studio space and models until Evans changed careers.
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to become a sanitary engineer.\textsuperscript{247} Two of these studios would have been particularly important in giving these five friends, as well as their female peers, a base from which to work: John Constable’s former studio at 76 Charlotte Street in Fitzrovia which McEvoy and John are said to have rented for a period in 1898, and 21 Fitzroy Street, the studio incorrectly assumed to be the location of Gwen John’s \textit{Group Portrait}.\textsuperscript{248} Fitzrovia was still a popular location for artists’ studios during this period – Fitzroy Street, with its high concentration of artists, famously led to the formation of the Fitzroy Street Group in 1907. 21 Fitzroy Street and 76 Charlotte Street are on the same stretch of road between Tottenham Court Road and Euston Road, a street that was described by Stephen Chaplin in the Slade Archive Reader as ‘affordable to many students up to the 1930s – to eat at Bertorelli’s; to have a room there, even a studio.’\textsuperscript{249}

Augustus, Gwen and Winifred John, and Grace Westry lived at 21 Fitzroy Street intermittently for over a year and William Orpen took the basement rooms of the building from winter 1899/1900. Charles Conder, a friend of the group, unsuccessfully sought a flat in the same building and McEvoy, amongst others, would have been a frequent visitor to John’s studio.\textsuperscript{250} John wrote to McEvoy from South Wales informing him that several ‘works’ are ready to be collected:

1 Morfa Terrace,  
Manorbier,  
Tenby

Dear McEvoy,

Instead of travelling down to Tenby I found myself wandering through Arcadia – thanks to your book of sweet poetry. How I got here I don’t know but it was a rude awakening. I have come to stay at Manorbier for a few days.  
The works are ready for you at 21 Fitzroy St. when you have time to fetch them to Young’s to be mounted (and signed) You will notice that the composition will be the better for a coat of varnish (I mean the colour of it).  
Imagine me plunged in the whirl of fashionable life – Imagine but don’t believe it.  
On the contrary sir hasten to realise that I am far from it  
I stand on the cliffs gazing across the bleak sea towards where you and other loved ones dwell. Sometimes in an agony I throw myself in, endeavouring vainly to reach you through an element that appears less relentless and hard, than the miles of land which separate us.

---

\textsuperscript{248} Chitty, \textit{Gwen John}, 49-50.  
\textsuperscript{249} Chaplin, "The Slade", 8.  
Although it is not possible to know which ‘works’ awaited McEvoy at 21 Fitzroy Street, whether they were produced by John or McEvoy or someone else, there is such a level of familiarity between John and McEvoy in this letter that we can imagine McEvoy letting himself into the studio at number 21, uninvited, with his own spare key. It is possible that these ‘works’ were paintings by John which McEvoy was collecting to exhibit beside his own. Young’s is presumably Percy Young’s, the dealer in artists’ supplies located opposite UCL and the Slade and down the road from Fitzroy Street.

Edna Clarke Hall also remembered visiting Fitzroy Street in her autobiography. ‘One night the Johns, Ambrose McEvoy, Grace Westry and myself stood in front of a house in Fitzroy Street where we were to spend the night when we discovered that none of us had the key…’ Augustus John, with characteristic recklessness, climbed over the railings and up the front of the house and through an open window on one of the upper floors. ‘It was in that same house that there were occasional drawing evenings with volunteer models taken from among ourselves.’ It is likely that drawings such as Young woman with a violin (Grace Westray) by Gwen John (fig. 89) and Grace Westry [sic] by Augustus John (fig. 90) were painted in their studio at 21 Fitzroy Street.

There were dozens of occasions when these artists sat to each other. Not only did this provide practice with a live model for the artists, but the sitters, as artists themselves, would have been encouraged and would have been able to offer feedback on the sketches produced by their friends. Thus, a group was formed in which progression and improvement were paramount to their striving success. Several of the portraits undertaken by different members of this group illustrate similar traits, including the purposeful detachment of the sitter’s gaze from the viewer. Ida Nettleship in the triple portrait of Ida Nettleship, Ursula Tyrwhitt and Gwen John (fig. 91) has been posed with her eyes cast down and her head slightly tipped to one side, a similar positioning to that which can be seen in William Rothenstein’s portrait of Ida painted in oil (fig. 92). This same positioning has been bestowed on Ursula
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Tyrwhitt in a separate portrait sketch by Augustus John (fig. 93), as well as a drawing of Grace Westry (fig. 94).

John’s disjointed positioning of Ida, Ursula and Gwen at different angles and perspectives, with little interaction between them is comparable to the positioning of both Henri Fantin-Latour’s nineteenth-century painting By the Table (fig. 95) or even Frans Hals’ Regents of the St Elizabeth Hospital of Harlem (fig. 96). This demonstrates that John was also looking at earlier group portraits like his sister Gwen with her Group Portrait. However, instead of an all-male cast of sitters, Augustus John has inverted this for his all-female triple portrait. A similar detachment can be seen in Augustus John’s portrait of Gwen, c.1899, as she is placed in a room facing away from the sitter. This room is almost certainly a studio as a human skull, both a prop and an anatomical learning device, can be seen on the mantlepiece behind her (fig. 97). The aim of this portrait-sketch appears to be the accurate detailing of Gwen John’s hair and clothes rather than her facial features which are set in profile.

Very few paintings by Benjamin Evans are known but a portrait of Augustus John by Evans is in the RA and is thought to date between 1898 and 1900 (fig. 98). This again depicts the same distant gaze so often used in the early portraits by these artists. Although Evans has captured an air of confidence in John’s positioning, it does not portray John’s character to the same extent as William Orpen’s portrait of the same artist dating to c.1899 (fig. 99) and exhibited in 1900. John holds a similar hat and wears a similar overcoat to that in which he is depicted in Gwen John’s Group Portrait. Orpen has successfully captured the narrative of a fleeting visit from John and yet his seated positioning exudes confidence as he sits comfortably in a chair perfectly proportioned for his size.

Augustus John and McEvoy drew and painted each other on a number of occasions. Two drawings by John of McEvoy are in public collections, the Art Institute of Chicago and the National Portrait Gallery (fig. 100-101), and a portrait by McEvoy of John remained in his studio until his death in 1927 (fig. 102). The NPG sketch of McEvoy is almost caricaturesque with one hand on his hip and one hand on his face. This sketch must have been produced relatively quickly, as the position would have been uncomfortable for McEvoy, and yet John demonstrates his dexterity in just a few rapid lines. John’s portrait of McEvoy, part of the Art Institute of Chicago collection, depicts McEvoy much closer to the artist than John’s sketches of female sitters. McEvoy’s profile dominates the paper with the back of his head not fully contained, giving this work an increased sense of intimacy. This is comparable to McEvoy’s portrait of John which is also painted in close proximity to the sitter. Both artists are young
in these portraits, and all three portraits are likely to have been completed whilst both John and McEvoy were at the Slade.

The intimacy communicated by McEvoy and his contemporaries can be seen in their portraits of each other. A particularly poignant example of this is William Orpen’s sketch of Albert Rutherston and ‘his model’ in 1899 in red charcoal (fig. 103), a private view of a personal moment between an artist and his sitter.255 This double-portrait depicts Rutherston, possibly in John and McEvoy’s studio at 76 Charlotte Street, dwarfed by a muscular female nude seated in front of a fireplace to keep warm. The room is cramped and a small Victorian oil lamp sits on the table as a second source of light. Rutherston is smoking a pipe and the couple look surprisingly relaxed in each other’s company. This is an informal, almost documentary sketch by Orpen. Both Rutherston and Orpen have been able to work from this model and Rutherston, unknowingly, has become a model himself for his friend.

76 Charlotte Street was an important location where these artists could work independently from the Slade’s curriculum, and develop new ideas and trade in new methods of working. It was here that Evans, Orpen and Rutherston became frequent visitors, as well as their friends Edna Waugh and Gwen John. In January 1899, Albert Rutherston wrote to his father that, ‘John – Orpen – McEvoy and myself are going to get up a class and have a model in John’s studio once a week at night – it will come to about 7d each.’256 These artists, working together regularly and in close proximity, would have significantly influenced each other artistically, as can be seen from the different portraits they produced of one another. However, they also would have produced similar work by using the same models. One of their models was said to have been found on Tottenham Court Road, a young woman with bright red hair who is written about by Michael Holroyd.257 There are several undated sketches by John, Orpen, McEvoy and Rutherston of models that match the description of this woman but none of them can be identified with certainty. There is a watercolour sketch and an oil by McEvoy that are compelling, as they illustrate a seated nude on a green divan, highlighted with the palest flesh and auburn hair (fig. 104-105).258 This commonality in subject, particularly amongst the male artists of this group, Augustus John, Benjamin Evans, William Orpen, Albert Rutherston and McEvoy not only

255 William Orpen R.A. (1878-1931) Albert Rutherston with his model signed with initials and dated 'WO. 99' (lower right), Modern & Post-War British Art sale, Chiswick Auctions, lot 130.
256 Holroyd, Augustus John, 68.
257 Holroyd, Augustus John Volume 1: The Years of Innocence, 84-85.
extends to paintings and drawings of models, and portraits of each other, but also extends to their interest in old masters such as Rembrandt.

**Rembrandt**

The most significant collective interest of McEvoy, John and Evans was Rembrandt, and it was their idolisation of the seventeenth-century Dutch artist that arguably bound their friendship, fed their rivalry, and encouraged their need to achieve measurable artistic success. As will be explored in this final section, Rembrandt not only provided inspiration for the three young men but became almost a father figure for the group, guiding and teaching them through his 340-year-old art how to become better artists. It was McEvoy, Evans and John’s obsessive interest in Rembrandt that led to McEvoy’s increasing interest in Dutch paintings, specifically Dutch interiors, which was a subject that dominated his work for twelve years between 1901 and 1913, and that will be explored as the subject of Chapter 3 of this thesis.

Evans was described by John as ‘well versed in Rembrandt’ and it was his influence that led McEvoy and John to copy sketches, paintings, and engravings by the Dutch artist. I have been able to identify an undated sketch by Augustus John titled *Mother & Child frightened by a dog* (fig. 106) as being after a Rembrandt drawing in the Collection Frits Lugt, Institut Néerlandais, Paris (fig. 107), although it is likely that he copied this work from a publication or a reproduction of Rembrandt’s work. John also brings Rembrandt into their direct friendship circle in a letter to McEvoy from Vattetot-sur-Mer, during which time John is trying to persuade McEvoy to join him and their friends. He describes the countryside as like ‘the more mountainous of Rembrandt’s etchings’; he then goes on to tell McEvoy about a dream he had, ‘I spent last night in the company of you [McEvoy] and Rembrandt – Rembrandt cuffed my head for making some observation on art.’

Rembrandt’s reputation across Europe during the 1890s increased exponentially, leading to Catherine Scallen deeming it ‘the Rembrandt decade’ in her 2004 publication. From 1897 the first fully illustrated catalogue raisonné of Rembrandt’s paintings was published in eight folio volumes in
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English, French and German; a venture only made possible with improving photographic technology. McEvoy and his contemporaries would have been aware of this publication and of the increasing interest in Rembrandt on the art market. William Rothenstein owned several Rembrandts and other old master drawings which he had picked up from London print shops for mere shillings. Edna Clarke Hall recalled that, ‘Professor Brown had a lot of reproductions of drawings of the old masters. He wanted us to exercise ourselves, doing copies of them. I took a little Rembrandt and John chose a Titian. All our copies were pinned on the wall and the professor went around commenting on them.’ The increasing interest in Rembrandt, and other old masters on the secondary art market, led to these works challenging the already weak contemporary market.

McEvoy, John, and Evans became increasingly interested in Rembrandt’s work in a number of ways: by copying Rembrandt’s work from books, seeing Rembrandt’s work first-hand in the Netherlands, and experimenting with Rembrandt’s techniques and methods including etching. John wrote to McEvoy following the recovery of John’s near-fatal diving accident about a book on Rembrandt and Evans’ etching press:

South Cliff St., Tenby, Friday

Dear McEvoy

I am very grateful for your letter & the extract – It is now that letters become godsend to me – I have heard twice from our friend Mr Evans. Now that he has an etching press we may expect anything.
I have just received a life of Rembrandt published by Grevel with 159 illustrations – you can imagine my delight.
Today for the first time I went out.
I am surprised to hear you are now an habitué of the Crystal Palace – it will no doubt benefit of your patronage; though alas it hasn’t benefited you.
Hast seen the Whistlers at the Earls Court exh?
Next week I hope to come up to town – If that event does not come off I shall die. I know – I feel it – you [illegible] a [illegible] which I will not fail to return you.
My sister tells me the National is more wonderful than ever.
I hear you are doing work for the dealers in your rising prosperity do not wholly forget your friend who however humble will always deem it an honour and a privilege to sign himself
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263 Hall, ”The Heritage of Ages”, 25.
Yours as ever

Aug. John

My sorrow at hearing of your illness is only equalled by my joy at knowing you are now recovered. Adieu – but do not fail to return a letter as delightful as the last.264

Although this letter is not dated, the watercolour sketch on the reverse depicts a seated Augustus John, peering out of a curtained window, with a white bandage wrapped around his head, most likely from the injury he incurred in 1897 (fig. 108).265 This date also coincides with a letter written to Ursula Tyrwhitt in which John offers to lend her the same Rembrandt book mentioned here.266 The Whistlers referred to in this letter, exhibited at the ‘Earls Court exh’, also coincides with the date 1897. The exhibition was almost certainly the ‘Victorian Era Exhibition, 1897, Earl’s Court, London’, in which Whistler exhibited eleven etchings produced between 1859 and 1861. Whistler developed his etching practice from a similarly obsessive interest in Rembrandt’s work, comparable to that of McEvoy, Evans and John. It is likely that John wrote of both his book on Rembrandt and Whistler’s etchings in the same letter as he was familiar with Whistler’s interest in Rembrandt’s work, and perhaps Whistler’s etchings included some of those after Rembrandt.

Etchings are a common theme in this letter, as it is also mentioned that Evans had acquired an etching press, a technique with which John and McEvoy both experimented. In Chiaroscurro, Augustus John wrote that he used Benjamin Evans’ etching press and that ‘my first plate was a portrait of him’; this is almost certainly the etching of Benjamin Evans by Augustus John sold at Halls auctioneers in March 2019 (fig. 109).267 Although McEvoy is not known for his etchings, it was a technique that he undertook at different periods of his career. He would have practised etching with Evans and John in the 1890s but he also produced several etchings with Walter Sickert in 1909, including several versions of Pimlico, which McEvoy drew and Sickert printed.268 Madeline Knox, a former student of Sickert’s,
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recalled that she had visited Sickert’s etching studio in Augustus Street in 1909 with Ambrose McEvoy in order to learn more about etching.\(^{269}\)

In John’s letter he also writes of the book he received on the life of Rembrandt ‘published by Grevel with 159 illustrations.’\(^{270}\) I have determined from my research that this book is *Rembrandt* by H. Knackfuss which was passed between this group of young artists providing a visual resource from which to study.\(^{271}\) As previously mentioned, John offered to lend this book to Ursula Tyrwhitt and it is likely that John’s close friends Albert Rutherston and McEvoy also used his copy of this book.

McEvoy copied several of Rembrandt’s etchings that are featured in *Rembrandt* by Knackfuss. They are all small studies in the McEvoy Estate Papers with many of them drawn in ink on scraps of paper. On 10\(^{th}\) October 1899, McEvoy drew a trio of sketches of a hand, a man that resembles Henry Tonks, and a self-portrait after Rembrandt that also features on page 3 of Knackfuss’ book (fig. 110).\(^{272}\) On the opposite page to this etching, Knackfuss wrote:

> That is, in truth, what Dutch painting amounts to: the honest, truthful picture of country, people and things, the rendering of the simple facts of the home and of everyday life, reflected in the eye of the artist.\(^{273}\)

McEvoy emulates a version of Rembrandt’s ‘truth’ and ‘everyday life’, in several of his early works including *Bessborough Street, Pimlico* (1900), *The Engraving* (1901), *The Thunderstorm* (1901) and *Autumn* (1901) (fig. 111). Each strive to depict Victorian middle-class normality and everyday life, amongst humble interiors similar to those depicted by the Dutch old masters.

McEvoy also copied a portrait of Rembrandt’s mother (1628), *Portrait of a man unknown* (1641), *The Card Player* (1641) and *Man with a Wide-Brimmed Hat* (1630), all of which are featured in Knackfuss’


\(^{270}\) LET/79, MEP.

\(^{271}\) H. Knackfuss, *Rembrandt* (London: H. Grevel & Co., 1899). Knackfuss’ text was published as early as 1897 with Bielefeld; Velhagan & Klasing in German, it does not appear as though Grevel published this book in English until 1899.

\(^{272}\) DRA/675, MEP.

It should be noted, however, that each of these drawings is on a separate piece of paper and there is no proof that McEvoy copied all of these images from Knackfuss’ book. That being said, each of these sketches are small; a similar size to the reproductions in Knackfuss and there are two drawings that provide evidence that McEvoy was copying from this specific book on Rembrandt. Research carried out for this thesis demonstrates that McEvoy made pencil copies of Jan Cornelisz Silvius, Preacher at Amsterdam and The Poet Jan Harmensz Krul on the same piece of paper (fig. 116), just as Knackfuss reproduced these two portraits on the same double page in Rembrandt. McEvoy was clearly looking at these two portraits side-by-side in Knackfuss’ book which led him to copy both together. With evidence that McEvoy was using Rembrandt by Knackfuss and that Augustus John owned and lent this same copy to Ursula Tywhitt, it can be understood that this book was used as a studying aid by McEvoy and his contemporaries and that as a collective, they were influenced by Rembrandt’s work.

As well as copying Rembrandt’s work from Knackfuss in pencil, McEvoy recalled that, ‘About this time I saw the various Rembrandt Exhibitions and tried several paintings in black and white and green and white carried more or less far...’. Along with John and Evans, McEvoy travelled to Amsterdam to see a large collection of Rembrandt’s work first-hand. John, half a century later, recalled their memorable trip to Amsterdam to visit a ‘Centenary Exhibition of Rembrandt’. However, it is more likely to have been the 1898 exhibition of Rembrandt’s work at the newly built Stedelijk Museum. This exhibition displayed 124 paintings and 350 drawings by Rembrandt and was hosted in conjunction with the celebration of the coronation of Wilhelmina, Queen of the Netherlands. The exhibition was a huge success and was visited by 43,000 people in just two months. The Stedelijk exhibition represented a new nineteenth-century interest in the Dutch Golden-Age artist and for McEvoy, John, and Evans it clarified Rembrandt as an inspirational artist, from whom to learn.

This exhibition was documented by McEvoy in one of his sketchbooks – the same sketchbook that contains drawings after Gwen John’s Mrs Atkinson – and a sketchbook that was used over a period of at least a year. It contains copies of works from both Amsterdam and the UK, including sketches after
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Rembrandt’s Jean Pellicorne with his son Caspar and Susanna van Collen, Wife of Jean Pellicorne with Her Daughter Anna which are part of the Wallace collection, and Hogarth’s Sleeping Congregation, explored in Chapter 1 (fig. 47-49 & 44). The painting that McEvoy closely focuses on during his visit to Amsterdam is Rembrandt’s The Syndics of the Drapers’ Guild (fig. 46). McEvoy produced a drawing of this portrait in his sketchbook which he then annotated. His choice of materials for this sketch – pencil, pen and wash – and its unfinished state suggests that McEvoy worked directly from this painting whilst it was on display. He has focused on the sitters’ faces rather than their clothes or the room in which they sit. Volckert Jansz, the figure second from the left, has the most detailed facial features of the sitters, suggesting that McEvoy wanted to capture both his expression and the individual character of this man – a realism demonstrated by Rembrandt that McEvoy describes as ‘talking without moving the lips’.

However, rather than attempting to copy this work over and over again, or sketching several different details from the portrait, McEvoy chose to annotate his sketch in French across three pages of his sketchbook.

The Syndics [of the Drapers’ Guild] is considered the summary of his achievements, or, that is to say, the brilliant result of his [illegible]. They are portraits in a [illegible] not framed, not the best but comparable to the best he had done in the last years. Of course, they don’t recall [illegible].

They no longer have the freshness of tone and the sharpness of defined colours. They were conceived of in the shadow style, fiery and powerful of the young [illegible] or the Louvre, - and much better than the [illegible], which dates from the same year and had already betrayed itself [illegible]. The garments and the painters are dead, but through the black we can feel the deep reds; the linens are white, but strongly placed [illegible]; the faces, exhibited alive, they are animated by the old eyes that are luminous and direct, which don’t exactly look at the spectator and whose gaze, however, follows you, interrogates you, listens to you. They are individual and look just like the citizens, the merchants, but noble, rendered at their home in front of a table on a red carpet, their register open underneath the hands, surprised in their full council. They are busy without being agitated, they are talking without moving the lips. Yet they do not pose, without [illegible]. [illegible] without fading, a hot atmosphere detached from the shade which envelops all [illegible].

The protrusion of the linens, the faces, the hands are also finely observed as if nature herself had given the quality and the measure of it... [dots in original letter] It almost looks like the painting is the most [illegible] and the most moderate, so much is there accuracy in its balances which we did not feel through all this material [illegible] of lots of cold blood [illegible], [illegible] and flame. It is superb. Take some of [illegible] known portraits in the same spirit, and they are numerous, and you [illegible] a
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[continues] of what can be an ingenious combination of [illegible] four or five portraits of the first rank. The whole is superb, the work is decisive. We cannot say what revelation Rembrandt had nor how strong, nor even [illegible] but he managed so that the characters returned the problem many times and he finally found the solution. What I would keep [illegible], here it is: it is simultaneously very real and very imaginatively copied and carefully [illegible], conducted beautifully [illegible]. All efforts by Rembrandt are carried thus; in short, not one of his researches have been in vain as he proposes them. He treats living nature more or less as he treats the fictions, blending [end of page]

[continues] the ideal with the real. Despite some paradoxes, he [Rembrandt] succeeds. This way, he [illegible] all the chains in his illustrious career. The two men who were perfect for a long time, the forces of his spirit sleep in his hand at this time of perfect success. He closes his life in agreement with himself, and with a masterpiece. Was he meant to know the source of his spirit? At least The Syndics signifies that we must believe this day has come.282

Standing in front of this life-size group portrait and seeing it for the first time was clearly a significant experience for McEvoy. He writes about the vivid and lifelike depiction of Rembrandt’s sitters, the luminosity of their eyes that follow you across the room. His annotations suggest that he is more confident writing about this portrait at this early stage in his career than perhaps copying details from it. He is able to relay his thoughts about the way it is constructed and the ideas behind Rembrandt’s execution with the understanding that he can learn from Rembrandt’s group portrait by one day producing his own work with similar impact. McEvoy describes Rembrandt as having a revelation, and finding a solution to this work which makes it a successful collective portrait – a comment that implies that McEvoy, through Rembrandt’s painting, is in fact trying to find his own solution and individual method of working. Although McEvoy goes on to a period of producing Dutch-inspired interiors where portraiture becomes secondary, his interest in portraiture can be seen during this early period of his career through the meticulously detailed faces of Rembrandt’s syndics in McEvoy’s quick sketch.

Rembrandt’s work continued to influence McEvoy and his contemporaries. Only two months after the Stedelijk exhibition of Rembrandt’s work closed, another exhibition of the artist’s work opened in London between January and March 1899 at the RA. This was the largest Rembrandt exhibition that had been held in the capital with 102 paintings and 106 drawings and would have almost certainly been seen by Evans, McEvoy and Augustus John.283 Their close friend Albert Rutherston visited this exhibition and, afterwards, wrote to his parents, ‘I went to the Rembrandt show which almost takes
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one’s breath away it is so marvellous. Of course I shall go again.\textsuperscript{284} McEvoy’s interest in Rembrandt developed throughout 1899 as he not only copied Rembrandt’s etchings but started to experiment with colouring them. This demonstrated an ambition to use Rembrandt’s work as a stepping stone to produce accomplished paintings inspired by the Dutch artist, but enhanced by a modern understanding of tonality and reinterpretation. Three consecutive diary entries dating to September 1899 record McEvoy’s ongoing experimentation with Rembrandt’s work:

\textbf{Monday Sept 18\textsuperscript{th}/99}

Went down to the river early and drew the houses and the mud and the other side for my picture.
All the other side was dark and nearly of one “tone” Ought you to paint it like that or to put in a variety of “tone” and colour? I don’t remember anyone but the “moderns” even attempting to paint the appearance of the river this morning. Note how the Dutch paint places in the distance and note how they do the foreground. I painted myself after breakfast (I copied a Rembrandt etching also before breakfast.)\textsuperscript{285}

Monday commences with McEvoy drawing the Thames from observation. He queries how he should paint this riverscape, and the tones he should use. Within these few lines, he writes about both the ‘moderns’ (of whom he does not seem to consider himself) and the ‘Dutch’ seventeenth-century artists – two juxtaposing artistic periods that McEvoy seems able to negotiate for his river scene. These three diary entries demonstrate that Dutch art provides McEvoy with a variety of subjects from which to copy, from landscapes to religious scenes to portraiture. His diary entry for Tuesday documents a certain ambitiousness by copying a Rembrandt etching that he then colours:

\textbf{Tuesday Sept 19\textsuperscript{th} / 99}

Then after lunch I took up a little painting I had of a Rembrandt etching – the beautiful woman. I had sketched it lightly in, in black and white and then when it was dry, put pure yellow ochre and vermilion on. I dragged it over the surface so that the white showed through. When I glazed this with raw sienna pure it had a wonderfully rich and charming appearance. It looked something like a Rossetti – only better. I put some more paint on and tried to get it more definite but rather spoilt the effect but it may be good to work on. I found that it was charming to put white with light red and yellow ochre and vermilion glaze which was underneath (dry)...\textsuperscript{286}

\textsuperscript{284} Albert Rutherston, letter to Moritz and Bertha Rothenstein, 13 January 1899, Tate Archive TAM 50/4.
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Each of the colours that McEvoy is using would have made the painting progressively warmer – yellow ochre, vermillion and then a raw sienna glaze would change this work from a tonal black and white sketch to a rich and bright composition described by McEvoy as ‘like a Rossetti – only better’. This description brings to mind the bright red hair of Rossetti’s models including his wife, Lizzie Siddal. The most important aspect of this diary entry though is McEvoy’s admission to spoiling his painting by overworking it. He is pushing the redevelopment of Rembrandt’s composition to the extreme and in doing so is trying to establish a balance of what works aesthetically. His enthusiasm and drive for experimenting in this way is almost certainly fuelled by an underlying rivalry between McEvoy, John and Evans. This rivalry and McEvoy’s frustration at John is expressed in the same notebook on Wednesday 11th October 1899 when he writes, ‘John returned from France last Saturday. He takes himself more seriously and pompously than ever.’

By reaching a limit which results in spoiling his reworked Rembrandt, McEvoy has ultimately learnt what does and does not work as a painterly effect. Finally, on Wednesday 20th September 1899, McEvoy describes copying a ‘large Rembrandt etching of Christ preaching, did the woman lying down at the bottom.’ It is likely that this etching is The Hundred Guilder print (fig. 117) which is again featured in Knackfuss’ book on Rembrandt, as well as the British Museum. McEvoy’s dedication both to copying and reinterpreting Rembrandt’s compositions, in order to eventually forge a direction for his own work, would not have been possible without the encouragement of Augustus John and Benjamin Evans – his two ‘Musketeers’.

***

The Slade artists that most directly influenced McEvoy’s work were Gwen and Augustus John, and Benjamin Evans. This chapter has demonstrated that influence was reciprocal, with both McEvoy and Gwen John influencing each other in their work. McEvoy and Gwen John had a close friendship that resulted in sharing ideas for compositions, including Mrs Atkinson, and a joint interest in copying old masters. They deemed old masters to be superior to modern artists, and used their work to glean transferable techniques that could be used then for their own compositions. McEvoy’s friendship with Gwen John, which has been explored in detail for the first time in this thesis, is vital in being able to understand some of the sources of McEvoy’s early inspiration and artistic practice.
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The techniques that Gwen John, Gwen Salmond and Ida Nettleship brought back with them from Paris would have made a lasting impression on their contemporaries – particularly Edna Waugh who was taught by Gwen John following her return to the UK. During this period, this group of students contributed to a continuing co-educational environment in which men and women were working alongside each other without the restrictions of formal education. This would have been a diverse artistic landscape which then diverged and ultimately halved once several of the female students married. All of these artists at this early period were able to travel in search of artistic inspiration, whether it be to Wales, Paris, or Amsterdam and each would have brought back with them a unique set of new ideas and methods to share with the group.

One of the most significant influences on McEvoy’s work was Rembrandt, an interest that he had developed alongside two of his closest friends, Augustus John and Benjamin Evans. McEvoy and his contemporaries saw a domestic and simplistic modernity in Rembrandt’s work which could be initially copied, and then reinterpreted. The collective interest in the work of Dutch masters led to a continuing interest for McEvoy which significantly influenced his work over the next twelve years, from 1901 to 1913. During these twelve years, he continued to study Dutch paintings, evidenced by a number of postcards in the McEvoy Estate Papers, and produced several Dutch-inspired interiors that can be compositionally linked to well-known seventeenth-century Dutch paintings by artists such as Johannes Vermeer, Gerrit Dou, Pieter de Hooch, and Gerard Ter Borch, in London and across European collections. Chapter 3 will not only look at McEvoy’s small interiors and his growing confidence in producing meticulously detailed and original paintings, but it will also look at how these works led to a later period of interiors that demonstrate an increasing element of portraiture in his work.

288 It should be noted that McEvoy and his contemporaries were not the first period of artists to look back at the work of Rembrandt. Whistler saw Rembrandt’s work as hugely important in inspiring his own work, particularly his etchings which have been mentioned in brief earlier in this chapter.
CHAPTER 3
PAINTING ANAÏS:
HOW DUTCH INTERIORS INSPIRED PORTRAITURE, 1900-1913

In a handwritten notebook, Mary McEvoy recalls her husband’s early artistic practice prior to their marriage in January 1902:

McEvoy’s first studio was in Danvers Street – it was a very small room where he lived, slept & worked. The Engraving was painted there and the Thunderstorm [following text crossed out] for both of them I stood – sometimes I stood 3 hours – but then I could have a book – for with the early pictures he painted in silence for the most part - & he did not hurry his pictures.289

Mary modelled regularly for several small interior scenes, reminiscent of seventeenth-century Dutch paintings, that McEvoy painted between 1900 and c.1907. The earliest of these was The Engraving (fig. 118).

Although in this quotation Mary does not write that she was bored or frustrated whilst sitting to McEvoy, surely standing for three hours for a painter who did not talk would be frustrating for anyone. McEvoy’s silence is in direct contrast to accounts of his later portrait practice, where his sitters would comment on his humour and comfortable conversation.290 It is possible that McEvoy painted in silence as he was nervous or shy in the company of a young woman whom he clearly liked, and whom he would later be devoted for twenty-five years of marriage. However, it is also possible that his silence instead came from the intense concentration and pressure required to produce accomplished work to exhibit amongst his peers, or ‘Slade set’, at the NEAC.291 Mary was one member of this ‘Slade set’, having also trained at the school, and with McEvoy was described as one of two ‘new names... coming to the front’ of the NEAC in the 1901 exhibition.292 This was the same exhibition in which The Engraving was shown, and this quotation demonstrates Mary’s talent as a competitor and contemporary to
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McEvoy. It is very likely that as she was sitting to McEvoy in 1901, she was also able to offer him advice and insight into his composition.

In the quotation above, Mary writes that McEvoy ‘did not hurry his pictures’, implying that he was slow and methodical, and determined to get each composition right by reworking his paintings until he deemed them satisfactory. This was an opinion also shared by William Rothenstein and Edna Clarke Hall who both commented on McEvoy’s slow progress during his early years. Hall spoke to McEvoy’s daughter in 1971 at the age of ninety-two. She remembered her twenty-first birthday party as being particularly special, shared with her sister Rosa, at their family home in St Albans:

But chiefly I remember Ambrose McEvoy. We were standing alone in sunlight in a very large field that slanted away on all sides of us. He stood still and looking round as if he were seeing visions he said “I would like to paint the feeling this day has given me.” And I thought to myself “I wonder if you will ever [get] down to painting anything.” He did of course.294

Mary’s face in The Engraving certainly provides evidence for this theory as the impasto is much thicker when compared to other areas of the composition, suggesting that it has been reworked several times. There is also evidence for significant reworking to the face, hands, and the tablecloth in a letter from Frederick Brown who offered to purchase the painting, a letter that was briefly explored on page 60. (fig. 119-120).295

McEvoy must have had another sitting for the hands and face as Brown went on to purchase this work from the artist. Mary recalled in her notebook that McEvoy ‘sold the Engraving to Professor B. for £25 who sold it again to Staats Forbes for £60 giving Ambrose the 35.’ Professor Brown’s interest in this work as McEvoy’s former tutor, as well as his constructive criticism, emphasises the pressure that McEvoy was under to produce high-quality work even after leaving his formal education. He would have been encouraged by Brown to produce paintings that would assimilate with other works exhibited at the NEAC – works that were considered progressive, fashionable or avant-garde. During the earliest years of his career, following his education at the Slade, McEvoy and his contemporaries led the way with a renewed interest in seventeenth-century Dutch paintings.

293 Rothenstein, Men and Memories, Vol II., 3.
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The Engraving is representative of McEvoy’s earliest period of interior paintings which started with this work in 1901 and continued until c.1907. This group of paintings is also the smallest in size measuring between 20 x 15 inches and 25 x 20 inches (50.8 x 38.1cm and 63.5 x 50.8cm). These works were all painted in the same medium, oil on canvas, and were often characterised by an individual woman, often Mary, set in a furnished interior. In The Engraving, Mary is standing in McEvoy’s small room at Danvers Street dressed in Victorian clothes. Behind her is a table covered with a vermillion tablecloth that is reminiscent in colour and embroidery of the sash of Christine Spartali in Whistler’s The Princess from the Land of Porcelain – a painting that will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4. Mary is posed purposefully, with her hands clasped together and thumbs crossed; her head is slightly tilted to look at an engraving on the mantelpiece. It is not possible to confirm the identity of this portrait engraving, although the pose is a portrait-type used by Godfrey Kneller, which suggests that McEvoy was looking at a range of historical subjects to produce his paintings. It is also possible that it could be a Dutch seventeenth-century portrait of a woman (fig. 121).

Although The Engraving is an accomplished picture, demonstrating McEvoy’s skill as an artist, the heavily-varnished Victorian woodwork contributes to the composition’s yellowing hue, which in turn makes it look old-fashioned. The clothes that Mary is wearing are drab in colour and are not particularly fashionable for 1900, when this work was completed. Her pose might be purposeful but it is also slightly awkward – her posture is rigid and unforgiving, and her hands are stiff – almost certainly the result of arduous sittings with McEvoy and his slow painting process. In contrast, The Lute (Anaïs) (fig. 122), has a much more modern quality to it, as would be expected from a painting completed ten years later by McEvoy, and exhibited at the NEAC in 1911.

Anaïs Folin, the young woman modelling in The Lute (Anaïs), was initially brought into the McEvoy household as a French governess. She is dressed in fashionable clothes and looks more relaxed than Mary in The Engraving; her body is in a contrapposto pose with her weight directed through her right leg, which forces her left hip outwards. This creates a subtle serpentine line through her body, which Hogarth described as the Line of Beauty (fig. 123). McEvoy cleverly plays with chiaroscuro in this work and successfully manipulates the light entering the room – this can be compared to the more theatrical and arguably less accomplished lighting of his earlier interiors. The Lute is distinctly different to The Engraving and is one of a number of paintings at this period, 1910-1913, that marks a significant development in the artist’s work. However, it is difficult to pinpoint the specific cause of this
development or transition from McEvoy’s early to late interiors, and what attributes make *The Lute*,
along with other paintings of Anaïs, modern additions to McEvoy’s oeuvre.

This chapter will explore whether McEvoy’s earliest interiors, produced between 1901 and c.1907,
were directly influenced by the artist’s ongoing interest in seventeenth-century Dutch paintings and
their use of light, by looking at comparable works by artists such as Johannes Vermeer, Gerrit Dou,
Pieter de Hooch, and Gerard ter Borch. It will also consider the impact of Dutch-inspired interiors as a
popular subject for emerging artists at the turn of the twentieth century, and how a booming
secondary market for old masters helped McEvoy and other artists to align their work to a revived
interest in the Dutch Golden Age, in order to gain a level of commercial success. There is no doubt
that McEvoy’s interiors progressed in style and compositional merit in the ten years between *The
Engraving* and *The Lute, (Anaïs)*, but it is as though McEvoy was able to consolidate years of Dutch-
inspired interiors whilst producing truly original work from 1910. Something had changed for the artist
by this date. Although Anaïs had modelled for a number of different paintings, drawings and
watercolours between 1910 and 1913, this chapter will examine the paintings of Anaïs, including
*Interior, The Lute (Anaïs), The Ear-Ring* and *La Reprise* (figs. 166, 122, 167, 168). Unlike his close friend
and contemporary Gwen John, McEvoy rarely repeated compositions or created series of works. These
four paintings of Anaïs, all set in McEvoy’s studio, are an exception for the artist and demonstrate a
prolonged interest in Anaïs as a subject. These works are not comparable to his early interiors, and
show a determination to rework and develop Anaïs’ portrait across a number of different paintings.
This second section will explore the role of Anaïs in McEvoy’s work and examine whether she was
responsible for McEvoy’s transition from his early interiors to his late interiors, and what this meant
for his later work and his pursuit of portraiture.

**The Influence of Dutch Masters**

Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries The National Gallery and several other
public art galleries across Europe acquired seventeenth-century Dutch masters for their collections.²⁹⁷
These acquisitions not only increased the interest of Dutch paintings for the public, but were vital in

providing inspiration for young artists, as well as art historians. Publications on Gerard Dou, Rembrandt and Vermeer sought to educate scholars with dozens of detailed black and white plates of paintings in collections across Europe. Many of these paintings had never been seen by British audiences and were therefore perceived as new and exciting works. Interest in Dutch masters had increased significantly with the rediscovery of Vermeer by Gustav Waagen and Théophile Thoré-Bürger culminating in the publication of the artist’s catalogue raisonné in the Gazette des Beaux-Arts in 1866. By 1929 the critic R.H. Wilenski referred to Vermeer as a herald of ‘the Modern Movement of our day’, an accurate observation of Vermeer’s influence on early twentieth-century modern artists.

For artists such as McEvoy working in Britain at the turn of the century, Dutch interiors represented a significant progression from Victorian painting in their shift away from classic Impressionism. At the NEAC, darker and more serious scenes replaced the dappled light and pastel colours of paintings like The Bathers by Mark Fisher (fig. 124) and Hydrangeas by Philip Wilson Steer (fig. 125). McConkey noted that by 1900 there was a ‘distinct preference [for] Dutch and Spanish, as opposed to Italian art… Small, Spartan, perfectly painted interiors became the new distinguishing feature of club exhibitions.’ The interest in Dutch masters was also fuelled by the explosion of the secondary market which saw prices of old masters in 1900 reach ‘unprecedented heights.’ Unfortunately, with a waning contemporary art market, artists of McEvoy’s generation, ‘not only created alternative circuits of commerce in artists’ clubs and associations, but they also latched onto the trade of old masters to market their own works.’ McEvoy ‘latched onto the trade’ by producing small interiors that resembled Dutch masters which he then exhibited at the NEAC. These interiors would have
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fulfilled McEvoy’s intention to create original paintings at this early stage in his career, but they could also be bought as cheaper and unique alternatives to expensive old masters on the secondary market.

The Dutch-inspired interiors by McEvoy and his contemporaries were a reinvention of the old. They were not impressionistic as this style, although still popular, was no longer at the forefront of modernity by the 1900s, as acknowledged by Charles Lewis Hind in *The Academy* in 1902:

*The New English Art Club is not quite what it was. With one or two exceptions experimentalism is out of fashion. The public no longer giggles at the New English Art Club pictures. The pendulum has swung back. Time has made the very class of story pictures that the club once fulminated against – new.... The furniture of a room – flowers, books, vases, the patterns of walls and papers – are no longer beautiful smudges that come together miraculously as you retire from the canvas. They are all painted punctiliously as in pre-Victorian days. They have become novelty – *le dernier cri.*'*

Hind uses the word ‘experimentalism’ here to describe Impressionism, as he goes on to state that the paintings of interiors at the NEAC are no longer ‘smudges,’ or pointillism on a canvas that only come into focus once the viewer steps away from the painting – an effect produced by this genre. Hind writes that these Impressionistic works have now gone out of fashion and have been replaced by paintings like McEvoy’s *The Engraving or Autumn* that were exhibited at the NEAC in 1901 – paintings of interiors that demonstrate a new interpretation of an old style of realism, ‘as in pre-Victorian days.’ McEvoy and his contemporaries at the NEAC were looking back to pre-Victorianism for inspiration in order to produce a style of painting that would become the latest fashion, or the *le dernier cri.* It can be argued that the novelty created by McEvoy’s realistic interiors was experimental in a different way. Just as Whistler or Manet had been inspired by the work of Velasquez, these twentieth-century artists were scouring the seventeenth century for influential Dutch paintings that had been newly discovered and newly exhibited, in order to create their own novel and thus experimental reinterpretations.

An article in the *Burlington Magazine* dating to 1907, five years after the review by Hind, and titled ‘The Case for Modern Painting’, again describes the realistic interiors exhibited at the NEAC by artists such as McEvoy as ‘novelty’.


whose day has long been over.\textsuperscript{306} The NEAC is, in contrast, described as a democracy of new blood which is ‘dominated by men who are engaged in making their reputations’ – this is certainly a statement that could be used to describe McEvoy who, in 1907, was embarking on his first solo exhibition at the Carfax Gallery with the intention of establishing his reputation as a fashionable contemporary artist.\textsuperscript{307} This article describes old-master-inspired interiors as ‘the latest thing’ and that they were hung side by side with impressionistic works. The anonymous author regarded the NEAC as maintaining its position at the forefront of fashionable tastes and a forerunner of artistic movements in British art. It continues:

\begin{quote}
Nor is the club narrow in its tastes, if I may judge by the present exhibition, where works by impressionists pure and simple hang cheek and jowl with the very latest thing in the manner of the old masters. This return to the methods of a bygone age is perhaps the most significant feature in modern English exhibitions. Time after time, the New English Art Club has been the forerunner of movements which have afterwards become the general fashion. Indeed, its comparative lack of success as compared with more conventional institutions is probably due to the fact that it is always several years in advance of its time. It anticipates movement after movement; but before time has been allowed for each movement to be accepted and made successful, it has passed on to some fresh innovation.\textsuperscript{308}
\end{quote}

This quotation praises the NEAC with a slightly barbed comment stating that it is so ahead of its time with its experimental exhibits that it is never able to capitalise on its trendsetting by drawing in a vast audience. However, the author does state that although the NEAC is not as popular with the public as the RA, it does attract collectors ‘and it has the reputation in its small way of being one of the best galleries for selling in all London.’\textsuperscript{309} Both the encouragement to produce avant-garde work at the NEAC, and the potential of selling this work to collectors, would have appealed to McEvoy as a young artist. The balance between creating experimental work and being commercially successful is also reflective of McEvoy’s later portraiture, where he produces recognisable and popular work but with an ethereal quality that can be regarded as highly experimental.

McEvoy was not only influenced by Dutch old masters, but was considered:

\begin{quote}
An example of the class of painting at the New English Art Club to which our contributor refers. It will be seen at once that in this \textit{Mother and Child} the artist’s aim has been to
\end{quote}
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combine something of a modern feeling for light and air with the scientific technique of the great genre painters of Holland.  

This text is accompanied by an image of McEvoy’s *Mother and Child* (fig. 126), a work that is now untraced. This painting is a tender and intimate interior scene of a mother and infant reading at a window together, and is reminiscent of *A Mother’s Duty* by Pieter de Hooch (fig. 127), a sober interior of a mother delousing her child’s hair. It is likely that McEvoy saw this painting when visiting Amsterdam in 1898 with Augustus John and Benjamin Evans and may have bought a postcard of the work as a souvenir. A postcard of this painting (fig. 128), that I have catalogued as POS/97, is in the McEvoy Estate Papers but does not contain a message, date or recipient on the reverse.

The research that I undertook for this thesis discovered hundreds of postcards amongst the McEvoy Estate Papers, a number of which depict reproductions of Dutch masterpieces. It is likely that these postcards would have served as reminders of inspiring artwork that McEvoy had seen across Europe. The increasing popularity of the postcard, following its invention in 1861, allowed art galleries to reproduce images of works in their collections as an effective advertising tool, to reach people across the world. Although several of the postcards in McEvoy’s estate do not contain messages and were clearly bought as souvenirs, some of them are from friends, and are addressed and dated.

Although the dominant light source in de Hooch’s *A Mother’s Duty* (fig. 127) comes from the open doors and windows beyond, the source of light on the figures comes from the high up window to the top right of the composition. Gentle sunlight falls across the child’s back and onto the forehead of the female sitter demonstrating chiaroscuro across her face and neck. Although de Hooch’s interior has been painted more realistically, strong comparisons can be made with McEvoy’s *Mother and Child*. Both mothers can be seen leaning forward, their heads tipped, as if in a position of prayer. Both mothers are undertaking tasks for their children, delousing and reading respectively. Both children are
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simultaneously standing and leaning forward on their parent with their right foot tilted at an angle to show this. This demonstrates that whilst these children are gaining their independence, they are still reliant on their mothers. Their young ages are also demonstrated by the dresses they are wearing, although both children are almost certainly boys. It was not unusual for boys in the nineteenth century to be clothed in dresses for their first few years until they were breeched. Although it is not possible to know definitively if de Hooch’s child is a boy, the subdued colouring of his clothes might indicate a male child. McEvoy’s child, on the other hand, is almost certainly his son Michael standing next to his wife Mary. Michael was born in August 1904, making him almost three years old at the time the *Burlington Magazine* article was published. Although these paintings are stylistically different, McEvoy is reinterpreting de Hooch’s interior by laying claim to certain compositional tropes in order to produce a relevant and avant-garde painting for a twentieth-century audience.

*Mother and Child* almost certainly depicts Mary and Michael McEvoy next to a first-floor window at their home at 107 Grosvenor Road in Pimlico (fig. 129). Although it is difficult to determine from the poor quality black and white image of *Mother and Child*, it looks as though a sailing boat is on the Thames in the distance, and is similar to McEvoy’s composition of *The Thames from the Artist’s House*, dating to 1912 (fig. 193-4). The room in which Mary and Michael are sitting is furnished with a chest of drawers, a small table, and a small, framed painting on the wall, leading me to believe that this is the same room with the same sitters as in *Mother and Son* (fig. 130) which was painted two or three years later in c.1910. Michael in *Mother and Son* is tall enough to look out of the window with his mother, and although this painted sketch depicts the ethereality for which McEvoy became known, the gold and white outline of the same picture frame on the wall can be seen behind, as well as the chest of drawers to the left and a similar table against the back wall.

McEvoy was not the only artist at this period to be compared to the ‘great genre painters of Holland.’[^314] David Muirhead’s *A Girl Reading* was called ‘a simple and powerful study, which, whether as regards conception or technique, is firmly based on the art of Vermeer of Delft.’[^315] In the same article, William Orpen is said to be ‘striving to break through self-imposed barriers’ with his painting, also titled, *Mother and Child* which is ‘suggesting, at one and the same time, old Dutch and modern

[^315]: “New English Art Club,” *Daily Telegraph*, April 6, 1903, 12. It is not known to which painting this refers and the location of this work remains unknown.
The influence of Dutch masters on McEvoy’s generation of Slade contemporaries has never been fully explored, but looking at the work of William Orpen, McEvoy’s close friend and contemporary, as just one example, the influence of these seventeenth-century artists is striking.

As early as 1900, Orpen drew on the motif of the mirror in Jan Eyck’s Early-Netherlandish double portrait, *Portrait of Giovanni (?) Arnolfini and his Wife* (fig. 131), for his portrait of Emily Scoble in *The Mirror* (fig. 132). This would have been a painting well-known to Orpen and McEvoy, as well as their friends, as they worked from paintings in The National Gallery collection – as discussed in Chapters 1 and 2. Further evidence for a collective interest in the Arnolfini portrait is a postcard of this painting which I also discovered in the McEvoy Estate Papers (fig. 133). *The Mirror* by Orpen was described by McConkey as, ‘recalling the surface perfection of the work of seventeenth-century Dutch painters Gerard Terborch or Gabriel Metsu.’ Metsu was an artist also copied by Gwen John. These early examples of Dutch-inspired paintings by Orpen, Muirhead and John clearly demonstrate that McEvoy was not alone in his early exploration of Dutch masters as inspiration for his own work. With paintings such as *The Engraving*, completed prior to its exhibition in spring 1901, McEvoy was at the forefront of this wave of ‘fresh innovation’ at the NEAC.

This interest in Dutch masters amongst McEvoy and his contemporaries continued for at least a decade, as demonstrated by Orpen’s *The Studio* (fig. 134) and *Self-Portrait* (fig. 135) which both address Golden-Age paintings even more overtly. Both of these works include the striking black and white chequered floors of Vermeer’s *The Concert* (fig. 136) and *The Art of Painting* (fig. 137), or Pieter de Hooch’s *An Interior, with a Woman drinking with Two Men, and a Maid servant* (fig. 138), and show a similar use of light being cast through the glass of the leaded-light windows. By fixing a variety of correspondence to the wall around the mirror of *Self-Portrait*, Orpen combines the Dutch interior with a trompe l’oeil in the style of Edwaert Colyer (later anglicising his name to Edward Collier) (fig. 139); a Dutch artist who worked in London for a number of years. *Self-portrait* can be seen as more than an interior – it is a homage to Dutch seventeenth-century painting. De Hooch and Vermeer were similarly
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influential on the work of McEvoy, as has already been shown in the comparison of de Hooch’s *A Mother’s Duty* and McEvoy’s *Mother and Child*, and will be discussed in greater detail with regards to Vermeer later in the chapter. Just as Vermeer can be seen painting his model in *The Art of Painting*, Orpen can be seen painting a draped nude in *The Studio*. Although his model’s statuesque qualities are reminiscent of classical sculpture, Orpen’s painting bears a striking resemblance to Vermeer’s seventeenth-century composition. The complex role of the artist and the model in both *The Art of Painting* and *The Studio*, as well as the relationship between McEvoy and Orpen’s interiors will be explored in more detail later in this chapter with regard to McEvoy’s *Interior* and his model Anaïs.

**Early Interiors, 1901-1907**

McEvoy would have encountered a variety of seventeenth-century Dutch paintings at public galleries and private collections in London and across Europe. As Chapter 2 revealed, McEvoy developed an interest in the work of Rembrandt whilst at the Slade with Augustus John and Benjamin Evans. Whilst in Amsterdam, McEvoy would have encountered an array of Dutch interiors by unfamiliar artists that would have almost certainly served as inspiration for his interiors from 1900.

My research into the McEvoy Estate Papers revealed a painted sketch almost certainly after a seventeenth-century Dutch genre painting – although the identity of the original painting is not known (fig. 140). Two figures, one in black and one in white, are sketched in paint on a piece of loose canvas. The canvas has clearly been taken off of a small stretcher as the pin marks and corner folds are still visible. Both figures appear to be female and the seated figure is playing a lute. This quintessentially Dutch instrument was included in McEvoy’s later interior *The Lute (Anaïs)* (fig. 122). Although this painted sketch of two figures is unfinished and the facial features of both figures are not visible, the composition is engaging with the figure in black clearly listening intently and looking down towards the second figure. This painting is similar in composition to *A Woman playing a Lute to Two Men* (fig. 141) by Gerard ter Borch in The National Gallery, and may have been copied from another painting by the Dutch artist. It is likely that this painted sketch by McEvoy provided inspiration for *The Music Room* (fig. 142) which was exhibited at the NEAC in 1904. *The Music Room* is different from McEvoy’s other early interiors as it feels overpopulated with furniture and figures. There is nowhere for the viewer’s eye to explore beyond this enclosure – no open doors or windows that might allow a temporary release
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from the scene. The inclusion of musical instruments in this painting could be seen as being particularly Dutch in subject matter with a woman to the right holding a violin. She is not playing the instrument but is instead holding it in the same position as lute or theorbo, prominent instruments that featured in Dutch masters.

McEvoy would have also seen a number of Dutch interiors whilst visiting Nuremberg and Frankfurt in Germany in 1903. It is not known where else he travelled on this trip, or with whom, but on 7th September McEvoy sent a postcard to his wife Mary in which he writes that ‘we’ will arrive back in London on the 25th September. On the front of this postcard is a reproduction of an interior by Pieter Janssens, part of the Städel Museum collection in Frankfurt, which is now titled Interior with Painter, Woman Reading and Maid (fig. 143-144). Sending a postcard of a Janssens interior not only demonstrates McEvoy’s interest in Dutch interiors but also signifies the commerciality of these lesser-known paintings at this period. A postcard dating to 1907 in the McEvoy Estate Papers thought to be from Ursula Tyrwhitt, signed UT, depicts Jacobus Vrel’s Dutch Interior (fig. 145-146). This postcard demonstrates that Dutch interiors continued to be popular with these artists in the late 1900s and 1910s. Tyrwhitt writes, ‘How many charming painters one never hears of, there are some here & I’m going tomorrow to find others at Antwerp.’ This postcard also demonstrates the ongoing camaraderie between this group of friends at this date. Tyrwhitt sends one postcard to Ambrose McEvoy, and on the same day, posts a different postcard to Mary McEvoy at the same address (referred to on page 93), highlighting the importance of these individual friendships to Tyrwhitt.

Amongst the collection of postcards in the McEvoy Estate Papers are reproductions of paintings by Pieter de Hooch, Vermeer, Pieter Janssens Elinga and Jacobus Vrel. All of these depict Dutch interiors, with the exception of Vermeer’s Girl with a Pearl Earring (fig. 147). The figures in A Mother’s Duty (fig. 127), Man Handing a Letter to a Woman in the Entrance Hall of a House (fig. 148-149) and Mother with a Child and a Chambermaid by Pieter de Hooch (fig. 150-151), Dutch interior by Jacobus Vrel (fig. 146), and Interior by Pieter Janssens (fig. 143) are dwarfed by the monumental window heights and the architectural features of these interiors. Each painting demonstrates a manipulation of a limited amount of light through the windows and a vast expanse of floor – traits that McEvoy imitates in several of his earliest paintings including Autumn (fig. 152) and The Convalescent (fig. 153).
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The effect of light, whether it was artificial light as in his later portraits, or natural light as in his earlier interiors, was an important feature in McEvoy’s work. The 1907 *Burlington Magazine* article that described both the fashionability of Dutch-style interiors and McEvoy’s *Mother and Child* also commented that ‘The method employed’ by McEvoy for several of his works at the Carfax Gallery exhibition ‘offers a singular combination of advantages, since it enables the painter to get much of the vibrant quality of light obtained by the Impressionists without losing the power of delicate and sensitive manipulation of the brush on which all great painting in the past has depended.’

By copying Rembrandt’s paintings and etchings, as well as the work of other seventeenth-century Dutch painters, McEvoy learnt to successfully imitate the sober atmosphere of sparsely-furnished Dutch rooms, manipulating the light in his compositions in a way that looked effortless to the viewer. In 1909, *Studio Magazine* made this same observation:

> In the “interior” genre which the [New English Art] club has now taken up so much, we find that with the majority of the exhibitors it is still the effects of nature herself that are pursued indoors, where the sun is throwing its beams upon flowers in a room. Their problem is that of the artificial conditions in which these pure elements of nature thus come again together. It is an aspect of “interior” work, however, quite different from that adopted by Mr and Mrs. McEvoy, who would, so to speak, call the sun into the room when they wanted it, for the dramatic setting of a psychological moment, but would not dream of hastening to a room with palette set, though even by some strange contrivance of the hours Helios himself had been entrapped therein. They conceive of interior subjects as being in their very nature quite different from those of the open air. The out-of-door world is significant of every aspect of nature; the indoor world is sacred to human nature only – and, perhaps, some privileged cats and parrots.

In this quotation *Studio Magazine* highlights and criticises the reliance of other exhibitors to bring nature into their interior paintings as if they are clinging onto the dappled light and natural scenes of classic Impressionism – a genre which, as has been previously mentioned, had fallen out of fashion nearly a decade earlier. The author posits that in attempting to combine Impressionism and Dutch-inspired interiors, there is often a visible disjuncture between the two genres of painting in the work of NEAC exhibitors. Although *Studio Magazine* does not directly express it, a balance between the two genres cannot realistically be achieved and an artist must be well-versed in seventeenth-century Dutch art, as the McEvoys were, in order to pursue this genre successfully, without compromising the subject. The McEvoys are described as ‘quite different’ in this quotation, both able to manipulate light
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in their paintings in order to create a ‘dramatic setting of a psychological moment’ in their work. This quotation describes the control the McEvoyss have over their interior settings and pigments. Just as McEvoy was a prime example of a contemporary artist working with the reinvention of Dutch interiors in the 1907 Burlington Magazine article, he continues to be referred to as a leading force in this genre for NEAC artists in 1909 – this time also armed with the expertise of Mary.

Unusually, Mary and Ambrose are described as a husband-and-wife team in this quotation and yet it is thought the pair did not work together on paintings. With the commissions of religious scenes at St Columba’s Church, Long Tower in Derry, it is clear that they did, if only on a couple of projects preceding McEvoy’s success as a portaitist, and the birth of their two children. Mary’s changing role alongside McEvoy is something that deserves further consideration, particularly when exploring the role of Anais later in this chapter. Mary, like Ambrose, commenced her career following a progressive education at the Slade. Prior to, and during the early years of their marriage in 1902, Mary became Ambrose’s model, yet she was a talented artist in her own right. The two paintings that Mary McEvoy exhibited in the 1909 NEAC exhibition, and which are both referred to by The Studio, are Penelope and Autumn Flowers – both of which are currently untraced. Frederick Brown, Professor at the Slade, wrote to Mary before her marriage to Ambrose, praising her work – a picture that he had purchased at the NEAC. He described it as a ‘triumph’ and a painting to be truly admired. Mary’s role changed between contemporary artist, model, and wife, and yet she remained equal and often dominant to McEvoy in these roles. She was six years older than McEvoy, and married him at the age of thirty-one – an older age for the period, and the letters from McEvoy to Mary in the McEvoy Estate Papers demonstrate McEvoy’s continuous devotion to his wife. She ran the household, arranged his schedule and travels, managed the bills and payments from clients, continued to pursue her own painting (although this became side-lined following McEvoy’s success), was McEvoy’s studio assistant, and looked after their children. She also found herself constantly reassuring and supporting McEvoy through his bouts of depression and acute anxiety. Mary was a collaborator in McEvoy’s success both as his early model and as his supportive spouse, and it is likely that this mentality for collaboration
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was easily transferred to McEvoy’s model from 1910, Anaïs; a subject that will dominate the next section of this chapter.

In two of McEvoy’s early interiors, *Autumn* (fig. 152) and *The Convalescent* (fig. 153), the artist successfully recreates the vastness of the Dutch interior by positioning Mary in the maximum amount of space. However, the artist would have almost certainly been restricted with the interiors he could create – particularly early in his career – as he was sharing studios and renting temporary rooms across London. *Autumn* depicts a simple interior scene of a woman seated on a chaise longue holding a letter in her hand and looking pensively out of the large window to her right. The shadow created by her body in front of the window throws the end of the chaise longue into darkness. A similar effect is created by the thick curtains to one side of the window. This manipulation of natural light illuminates the sitter by framing her with shadow. *Autumn* was painted at McEvoy’s Southampton Street studio in 1901, which was described by Mary McEvoy as ‘overlooking the Euston Road. A Squalid neighbourhood & house where rats were sometimes met on the stairs – but of lovely proportion & where he painted Autumn.’

McEvoy changed the composition from his preparatory sketch of *Autumn* (fig. 154) to his finished painting. He excludes the painting on the wall behind his sitter in his final composition, and he changes the sitter so she is actively rather than passively posed. The perspective has changed and is comparable to Vermeer’s *Girl Reading a Letter by an Open Window* (fig. 155-156). He mutes the detail of the outside street and adds a chair under the window. By excluding the art on the wall behind the sitter, McEvoy creates a simpler interior comparable to *Girl Reading*, which also depicts a bare wall behind. *Girl Reading* is one of the paintings reproduced on a postcard found in the McEvoy Estate Papers. By muting the details of the outside street and including another piece of furniture, the chair, McEvoy highlights the architectural and decorative features of the interior of the room rather than what is beyond it.

Two other paintings by McEvoy, *The Convalescent* (fig. 153) and *The Letter* (fig. 157), also depict women directly under or in front of the window, which creates dramatic lighting in both scenes. The light in *The Convalescent* pours downwards from the window and onto Mary, who can be seen in this painting under a blanket reading a book. The curtains are drawn to the centre but pushed back with the window’s shutters, forcing the light away from the extremities of the room and onto the sitter.
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Mary wrote that *The Convalescent* was painted at 13 Jubilee Street just after the couple were married, ‘here Ambrose worked against incredible difficulties – I was suddenly ill – a succession of illnesses culminating in a [sic] operation. I was worse than no help to him & we got absolutely penniless. When I came home rather pale & fragile he painted “The Convalescent”...’.332

*The Letter*, exhibited at the NEAC in London in 1906, and presumably painted earlier that year, then travelled to Bath in January 1907. This painting again shows chiaroscuro across the face of the sitter and throughout the room. It was reviewed by the *Bath Chronicle* as ‘an instructive object lesson in light and shade.’333 The sitter stands directly in the natural light of the window as she pulls back the net curtain. This painting, although it is still considered an early work by McEvoy, lacks the controlled brushstrokes of his other interior scenes. Although in subject *The Letter* can be compared to Vermeer’s *Girl Reading a Letter by an Open Window*, in style and technique it is comparable to Gwen John’s early work, for example *Winifred John* (fig. 158). Gwen John also explores the subject of women reading in front of the window in two paintings produced four years later, *A Lady Reading* (fig. 159) and *Girl Reading at the Window* (fig. 160). *Girl Reading at the Window*, with its inclusion of the net curtain drawn into the interior and chiaroscuro separating the sitter’s face into two distinct halves, is analogous to McEvoy’s *The Letter*.

The influence of Dutch interior painting on McEvoy’s early work is referred to several times in contemporary literature and even after his death. ‘Still more delightful are the little interiors with figures, “The Engraving” of 1900, and the exquisite “Evening” of 1904-5, with its soft, all-pervading lighting worthy of a Dutch seventeenth-century genre painter.’334 “The brilliant young Slade School student, a master of drawing to the entire satisfaction of Professor Tonks, spends his time copying in the National Gallery and painting very slowly and conscientiously those interiors in the Dutch manner.”335 However, one of McEvoy’s most interesting interiors and one that was never reviewed or compared to seventeenth-century Dutch painting was *In a Doorway* (fig. 161), painted in 1905 but not exhibited until 1907 at McEvoy’s solo exhibition at the Carfax Gallery. This is a painting of a young woman wearing a floor-length Edwardian dress, standing in a simple interior reading a book, with her back turned to the viewer, obscuring her face. To her left is a glass-fronted cabinet reminiscent of the
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lead-light windows of several of the Dutch interiors previously mentioned. *In a Doorway* appears to take direct influence from Gerard ter Borch’s *Gallant Conversation, known as ‘The Paternal Admonition’* (fig. 162), purchased by the Rijksmuseum in 1809. It is likely that McEvoy would have seen this work during his trip to Amsterdam in 1899.

Ter Borch has kept the facial features and the expression of his central figure a mystery, and instead the viewer can only admire the delicate textures of her satin dress from behind. McEvoy mimics the sitter’s pose in *In a Doorway* but turns her body to a slight angle to reveal that she is reading. McEvoy keeps his female figure central to the composition by erasing all of the other figures from the scene. Dutch dress is replaced by current material and, although not satin, the dress is delicately gathered from the waist and falls gracefully across the floor. *In a Doorway* is a clear demonstration of McEvoy’s skill to reinterpret one of Gerard ter Borch’s most famous paintings.

By 1907 and his first solo exhibition at the Carfax Gallery (founded by his close friend William Rothenstein in 1899), McEvoy had produced a number of small interior paintings with varying degrees of success. These interiors ‘low in tone, tranquil in mood...McEvoy did not emerge as a quite distinct personality. Frederick Brown, his master, in *Hard Times*, and other members of the New English Art Club had painted pictures which contained, in a somewhat robuster form, most of the elements of McEvoy’s.’ By 1907, McEvoy’s interiors were no longer at the forefront of fashionability and, to an extent, were becoming stale. At this time, Mary was busy producing her own work which she continued to exhibit at the NEAC until 1910, whilst also raising their son Michael who had been born in 1904. These competing responsibilities would have made modelling for McEvoy’s paintings almost impossible. McEvoy’s small interiors were not particularly lucrative, especially when taking into consideration the meticulous detail required for each painting and the time spent producing each work – regardless of their small size. The detailed method of these interiors led to McEvoy being described as the ‘slowest of painters’ by John Rothenstein, whilst his close friend and Slade contemporary Edna Waugh, on remembering McEvoy in his early years, wrote ‘And I thought to myself “I wonder if you will ever get down to painting anything.”’ McEvoy is known to have struggled financially since his education at the Slade until the early 1910s, and was often described by contemporaries including Charles Cheston and his wife Mary McEvoy as being almost penniless. There are also several diaries in the McEvoy Estate Papers in which he jotted down his daily expenditure, in an attempt to keep costs
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to a minimum.\textsuperscript{338} This suggests that he was not making adequate income from the sale of these interiors, even though he was selling them to collectors and exhibiting them at the NEAC.\textsuperscript{339}

Although it has not been possible to locate a copy of the catalogue from McEvoy’s 1907 Carfax Gallery exhibition, it was reviewed in \textit{The Bath Chronicle} in its opening month. The journalist reported:

> Mr. Ambrose McEvoy’s pictures at the Carfax Gallery, London, vary as much in style as in merit. He seems undecided as to whether he shall studiously record detail or work in a freely suggestive fashion. There are paintings in which he essays one plan, others in which he follows an opposite manner, and some that are indicative of an attempt at combination of the two methods.\textsuperscript{340}

Considering some of the paintings that McEvoy exhibited at the Carfax that year, this statement seems apt. The subjects and styles of McEvoy’s paintings varied hugely from \textit{The Rickyard} (fig. 163) and \textit{Le Puy} which are landscapes, to \textit{Autumn, The Convalescent} and \textit{The Thunderstorm} (fig. 164), to \textit{In a Doorway} and \textit{Rosalind and Helen} (fig. 165).\textsuperscript{341} The Bath Chronicle failed to record that these compositions were painted over a period of six years, with McEvoy’s style unsurprisingly subject to change during this early period. However, with such a lack of consistency in McEvoy’s style and ‘merit’, it would have been difficult for patrons to commission McEvoy to produce paintings for fear of receiving inadequate or stylistically incongruous work. McEvoy was an artist in flux, with little direction in either the genre of painting he wished to produce, or the clients he wanted to entice. In order to be a successful artist, capable of gaining regular commissions, McEvoy needed to be more consistent and develop a recognisable and individual style of painting that would attract potential patrons and build his reputation as an artist.

Although it was another eight years from 1907 until McEvoy focused solely on portraiture, there was a transitional period between 1910 and 1913 when his work became more consistent, but continued to draw on the subject of Dutch-inspired paintings. Over a period of three years McEvoy produced a series of works that not only depicted the same model, Anaïs, in the same room, but included several identical decorative features and furnishings. These paintings were larger in scale and arguably more ambitious than McEvoy’s earlier interiors. They also demonstrated an increased element of

\textsuperscript{338} MEP.

\textsuperscript{339} Johnson, \textit{The Work of Ambrose McEvoy, Complied by “Wigs.”}

\textsuperscript{340} “Mr. McEvoy’s Pictures,” \textit{Bath Chronicle}, June 6, 1907, 4.

portraiture where Anaïs took precedence over the setting. As Chilston correctly observed, up until this series McEvoy had been painting compositions where the sitter and the interiors were of ‘equal value and interest.’ Consequently, the paintings of Anaïs demonstrate a significant development in McEvoy’s work that allowed him to focus on the dynamic poses of his model, and explore different elements of portraiture whilst continuing to paint within the confines of a familiar interior setting – his studio. It can be argued that the four main paintings in this series – Interior, The Lute (Anaïs), The Ear-ring and La Reprise (fig. 166, 122, 167, 168) – provided McEvoy with the means to transition from interior paintings to portraiture.

**Later Interiors, 1910-1913**

Genealogical research and research into the McEvoy Estate Papers has demonstrated that Anaïs Folin was the only long-term model that McEvoy had during his career, other than his wife Mary who, as it has already been mentioned, was preoccupied with her own work and raising their son from 1904. McEvoy is thought to have met Mademoiselle Folin in 1910. She was a young woman from the Basque region of south-west France who had been brought into the McEvoy household as a French governess for Ambrose and Mary’s son Michael. McEvoy was said to have been captivated by Anaïs and the artistic potential that she posed for his work – painting Anaïs was certainly a turning point for McEvoy’s interior paintings and she provided him with an outlet for his creativity, away from the pressure and prying eyes of Slade School contemporaries. McEvoy quickly monopolised her time as his model, painting ‘her & only her for [at least] two years’ and possibly until her marriage to the artist – and a friend of the McEvos – Gerald Brockhurst in 1914. Mary McEvoy wrote that Anaïs was ‘the best model he ever had I think – having never sat for any one, her poses were perfectly natural & in
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obedience to his directions & it appeared to her, as a mission in life'; an accurate observation when looking at the ease with which Anaïs is posed and painted by McEvoy in *The Lute (Anaïs)* (fig. 122).\(^{346}\)

Although Mary provides a unique insight into this period of Ambrose’s career by writing her reminiscences in a notebook after Ambrose’s death, it is thought that McEvoy actually painted Anaïs for a period longer than two years. *The Lute (Anaïs)* (fig. 122) was exhibited in spring 1911 at the NEAC and would have commenced months prior, most likely at the end of 1910. Anaïs sat for her last oil painting, *Myrtle* (fig. 169), which was exhibited at the NEAC in summer 1913, and would have almost certainly been completed a few weeks before its exhibition. It is likely that Anaïs also sat for *Interior* (fig. 166) painted in 1910, a nude seated behind an easel in the artist's studio, and exhibited at the NEAC that summer. This was the first painting in this series of later interiors. The face of the nude in profile is certainly similar to that of Anais in *La Reprise* (fig. 170), although the identity of the nude cannot be confirmed.

McEvoy was clearly captivated by Anaïs, but to fully comprehend this series of interior paintings and Anais’ role in them, it is important to recognise the relationship between the artist and his model. Unlike several of his contemporaries, including William Orpen and Augustus John, both of whom had numerous affairs with their models, McEvoy appears to have had a purely professional relationship with Anaïs.\(^{347}\) This theory can be supported by the close friendship between Mary McEvoy and Anaïs. There were several letters and postcards that were exchanged by the two women as friends – several of which are amongst the McEvoy Estate Papers.\(^{348}\)

The platonic nature of the relationship between McEvoy and Anaïs affected the way in which McEvoy painted her. She is depicted in *The Ear-Ring* (fig. 167) *The Lute (Anaïs)* (fig. 122), and *La Reprise* (fig. 168) as feminine but not overtly sexualised. She is illustrated as an equal and a collaborator in McEvoy’s interiors, rather than as an unidentifiable model – she is identified by her name in *The Lute (Anaïs)*, and in another work that is yet to be discussed, *Siana* which is an anagram of *Anaïs* (fig. 171). She becomes a familiar sitter in this series of paintings connected by repeated motifs. These interiors present innocent and thoughtful scenes with Anais immersed in domestic tasks comparable to the
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women in Dutch old master paintings, sewing and fastening jewellery, with very little of her figure on display. *The Lute (Anaïs)* is more suggestive with Anais painted full-length striding into the room holding a lute; her body and face playfully cast into chiaroscuro. Although *Interior* (fig. 166), the fourth painting of this group, is thought to illustrate Anaïs, the nude is depicted at a distance and she is seated in a modest pose. Her legs are crossed at her ankles and her arm can be seen across her torso in a position comparable to an ancient sculpture of Venus. This is very different from the sexualised nudes painted by artists such as Philip Wilson Steer or Henry Tonks ten years previously, when McEvoy commenced his career (fig. 172-174).

The 1911 census records that Anaïs did not live with the McEvoy’s whilst she was employed by them, but was a lodger in a female household in Fulham, with her occupation documented as ‘student’. It is thought that she might have been an art student studying in London at this time, and teaching French to Michael McEvoy for some extra income, although this cannot be confirmed.349 If this was the case then she would have had the opportunity to study McEvoy’s artistic methods first hand, a useful insight for an ambitious young artist. Mary McEvoy confirmed Anaïs’ interest in art in her notebook. ‘She [Anaïs] told me long after that her greatest happiness, up to that time, was his [McEvoy’s] saying he had “got on” – she was inspired by him with a love of pictures & felt it as a vocation.’350

Each of the paintings in McEvoy’s series of interiors depicts Anaïs as part of an individual narrative, and yet they are all set in the same location, McEvoy’s house at 107 Grosvenor Road, London. McEvoy uses several of the same decorative motifs in these paintings, including a painted seascape and a specific carpet and chair, and exhibits the paintings in different biannual exhibitions at the NEAC over a period of three years (except for *La Reprise* which was bought by the Contemporary Art Society (CAS) after its completion and before it could be exhibited). By repeating these decorative motifs across different exhibitions McEvoy’s work would have become familiar to the regular visitors of the club, giving his work a sense of consistency that was lacking in his 1907 solo exhibition at the Carfax Gallery.

The first painting in this series, titled *Interior* (fig. 166), was owned by the founder of the CAS, Cyril Kendall Butler in the 1920s. Unfortunately, the current whereabouts of this work is not known and it does not appear to have been sold on the art market in recent years. *Interior* was an unusual choice
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of both subject and composition for McEvoy. There are very few examples in McEvoy’s oeuvre of nudes painted in oil, and this work is thought to be a unique example of a nude set in a large interior. Although the artist drew and painted several nudes whilst working from life at the Slade, the majority of his other nudes are sketches in watercolour. The only other comparable oil painting by McEvoy is a sketch, *Nude Facing a Mirror* (fig. 175), in the collection of Philip Mould & Co.

It can be argued that *Interior* was the painting that initiated McEvoy’s transition from small Dutch-inspired interiors to a new phase of more ambitious compositions. Rather than being loosely inspired by Dutch Golden Age paintings, McEvoy’s *Interior* directly draws on Vermeer’s *The Art of Painting* (fig. 176), reinterpreting the seventeenth-century work in a modern, pared-down studio setting. At first glance McEvoy’s painting does not compositionally make sense as the easel and the chair, where the artist would sit, are facing the opposite direction to the model. However, on closer inspection it becomes clear that both the artist and the sitter are taking a break from their work. The artist has left the room, and the model has pulled up a chair to the fireplace where it can be imagined that a fire is ablaze. Although most of the hearth and the grate are blocked by the easel, the mantelpiece and part of a fender juts out to one side of the sitter, announcing its presence. It is possible that the viewer of this painting is the artist walking back into the room and surveying the scene that he left momentarily. In creating this composition, it is possible that McEvoy was also inspired by William Orpen’s sketch of their friend Albert Rutherston seated next to his nude model and warming themselves by the fire (fig. 103). This sketch was produced ten years prior to McEvoy’s *Interior* but it is likely that McEvoy would not only have seen this sketch, but possibly even witnessed it being produced in the friends’ shared studio in the late 1890s.

By comparing McEvoy’s *Interior* to Vermeer’s *The Art of Painting*, it can be seen that McEvoy’s model is facing the opposite direction to Vermeer’s female sitter. Just as Whistler inverts Manet’s *Lola de Valence* (fig. 203) in *Harmony in Grey and Green: Miss Cicely Alexander* (fig. 201), inverting Vermeer’s model would have been a conscious decision for McEvoy to make his composition a homage to the original. In both the McEvoy and the Vermeer, the sitters turn to look over their left shoulder with one arm bent across the torso. The arm of McEvoy’s model crosses the torso in order to create a pose of modesty similar to the Venus de Medici, whereas Vermeer’s model clutches a book in order to create the same bend at the elbow. Facing the opposite direction to the Vermeer, McEvoy paints an easel holding a large canvas and an empty chair facing the same direction as the empty chair in Vermeer’s composition. By purposefully concealing his canvas, McEvoy could be interpreted as presenting modesty in his abilities, however, this concealment also leaves the quality of the canvas open to
suggestion and plays on the viewer’s imagination. The viewer is left asking, how did McEvoy interpret his model and what does the composition look like behind the easel?

The stool on which Vermeer sits has been playfully elongated and accentuated into table form in McEvoy’s painting in order to hold a Dutch-style, possibly terracotta, jug. The map on the wall behind Vermeer’s sitter is replaced by several small artworks propped up on the fireplace and surrounding furniture in McEvoy’s interior, including a sparse and modern-looking landscape painting. As a homage to his earlier interiors, McEvoy includes *Bessborough Street* (fig. 177) to the left of the landscape which he painted in 1900. McEvoy recreates the diagonal positioning of the floor tiles in Vermeer’s composition with the patterned carpet; this is a feature of all four of McEvoy’s interiors in this series and an example of a reoccurring motif. The ceiling can be seen in both Vermeer and McEvoy’s paintings but whereas the ceiling in Vermeer’s interior displays an ornate brass chandelier, the ceiling in McEvoy’s painting is modern, minimal and purely functional, delivering the natural source of light for his work through a skylight. It is known that *Interior* was painted in McEvoy’s studio at 107 Grosvenor Road as both McEvoy’s grandson, and McEvoy’s sitter Diana Manners, remembered the studio’s skylight as it has been depicted in this work.\(^\text{351}\)

Vermeer’s interior could be described as lavish, with a heavy curtain drawn back to the left of the painting to reveal an intimate moment between the artist and the sitter. The intimacy in McEvoy’s composition is implied by the model being unclothed and alone in the room. The viewer has a voyeuristic perspective in both compositions, and intrudes on private scenes in which the sitters are unaware. Directly behind the curtain in Vermeer’s painting is a table laden with expensive silk clothes, presumably different costumes for Vermeer’s model to try on in order to create the perfect composition. A sculptural head has been laid to rest on the table along with several different papers. All of these props have been incorporated by Vermeer in order to demonstrate to the viewer the different compositions that he is able to create in different works. The table in McEvoy’s painting is in the same location as the Vermeer but it has been stripped bare to display only what he needs; which from the black and white reproduction appears to be two long-handled paintbrushes. With this gesture, a bare table containing only two tools, McEvoy is making a statement that he is confident in his abilities, and that with a largely unfurnished and sparse interior, and two paintbrushes, McEvoy can create a masterpiece comparable to Vermeer.

\(^{\text{351}}\) I spoke to McEvoy’s grandson in 2020 and he remembers the skylight in McEvoy’s studio. Cooper, *The Rainbow Comes and Goes*, 92.
As has been previously mentioned, McEvoy was not the only artist at this date looking at Vermeer’s *The Art of Painting* for inspiration; Orpen was also using this work to create *The Studio* (fig. 134). Orpen includes the same chequered floor as Vermeer and can be seen seated at an easel. His model, like Anaïs, has been inverted but she is similarly standing with her arm raised almost identically to Vermeer’s sitter. Behind her is a painting in a comparable position to Vermeer’s map wall hanging, and light streams into a bright white studio through the leaded-light windows and Venetian blinds. Although Vermeer’s model has the perspective of being at a distance from the viewer, Vermeer has captured the detail of her face including the reflection of light on her bottom lip and her coy smile. In contrast, Orpen has chosen to paint his model much closer in perspective but has decided to abstract her facial features, only drawing attention to the chiaroscuro on her face created by the window instead of her specific characteristics as an individual. This woman has been stripped of individuality, unlike McEvoy’s paintings of Anaïs, and is almost statuesque in quality, whereas Orpen himself has been painted in considerable detail considering that only part of his face can be seen – there is highlighting on the end of his nose and a translucency to the skin of his ear.

Like Vermeer in *The Art of Painting*, Orpen is in the foreground of his composition. Both of these male artists include themselves as the dominant figure of their work – Orpen paints himself in greater detail than his model and Vermeer is inviting the viewer to watch him paint. This is not the only composition by Orpen to feature himself rather than his model as the primary subject. *Summer Afternoon*, (fig. 178) is set in the same studio and in front of the same window as *The Studio*. A seated nude holds her hands up as if powerless and vulnerable to the artist, and Orpen can be seen just off-centre standing with his legs hip-width apart and gesturing phallically with an unidentifiable object – possibly a palette – towards his sitter. Again, Orpen chooses not to elaborate on the model’s features but emphasises his own in detail. The models are reliant on Orpen and Vermeer, and there is very little, if any, collaboration between the painters and the models of these works. The models serve a purpose for the artists and without Vermeer and Orpen the visual representation of these women would cease to exist – Vermeer and Orpen are all powerful, they are the creators of their own scenes. In contrast, McEvoy does not collude with Orpen and Vermeer in their approach, but instead collaborates with his sitter Anaïs in the *Interior*. She is positioned centrally to the composition and although she is painted at the greatest distance of all three works, she is surprisingly detailed. McEvoy has eliminated himself entirely from the composition and although his easel and canvas are at the centre, the viewer cannot see the progress he has made. Anaïs, however, can view McEvoy’s work from her position next to the
fire, making both model and artist privy to McEvoy’s artistic progress. McEvoy has made his model the focus for the viewer, and thus invited Anaïs as his collaborator.

The second interior painting by McEvoy in this series was *The Lute (Anaïs)* (fig. 122) which was exhibited at the NEAC the season after *Interior*. It was the only painting to be exhibited by McEvoy in the 1911 spring exhibition and depicts Anaïs walking in to the same room, McEvoy’s studio at 107 Grosvenor Road. Although *The Lute* has been painted in a different aspect from *Interior*, the two paintings are constructed on similar-sized canvases, giving these works a sense of partnership. However, in contrast to *Interior*, McEvoy has brought Anaïs’ portrait to the forefront of his composition in *The Lute*, clearly positioning her, rather than the surrounding room as the primary focus of the composition. McEvoy’s studio is recognisable by the green walls and the red and cream patterned carpet on the floor. If there was any doubt that this was the same interior, McEvoy has also included the same chair that was behind the easel in *Interior* but has now been placed in the corner of the room in this composition. Although Anaïs is posed in a different area of McEvoy’s studio, the artist has not attempted to make her surroundings look different; he has, instead, done the opposite, drawing on the similarities of his previous composition by including three of the same decorative features and the same model. This would have been the first painting in this series to look familiar to a NEAC audience having visited the summer 1910 exhibition and having already seen *Interior*. By painting *The Lute*, and exhibiting it the following year at the NEAC, McEvoy was beginning to make his work more consistent and recognisable to potential patrons, with the inclusion of reoccurring motifs.

*The Lute* was positively reviewed in the *International Studio* under the title *Anaïs* whilst it was being exhibited at the NEAC in 1911:

> Anaïs, which marks a development upon preceding works, not in character only, but in interest of style. Mr. McEvoy’s strong literary bent seemed inclined to exclude from his interiors the sensitiveness of still-life interpretation that we have here.\(^{352}\)

Although it is difficult to identify the elements of still-life outlined in this quotation, this painting does mark a development in McEvoy’s interiors. It excludes the literary elements that are present in McEvoy’s earliest works, including the books and letters grasped by his female sitters in *Autumn* (fig. 152), *In a Doorway* (fig. 161) and the *Convalescent* (fig. 153), produced between 1901 and 1907. He instead replaces these with a lute; an instrument that would have had strong associations with Dutch
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Golden-Age paintings for McEvoy and his contemporaries at this period. Not only does this painting draw on the inspiration of Dutch masters through the inclusion of the lute, but it also creates a ‘through-view’ from McEvoy’s studio where Anais stands, to an interior hall up a set of stairs and through to another well-lit doorway. The elongated perspective of a ‘through-view’ was a common feature of Dutch interior paintings and was used across Europe by artists of the early 1900s including Vilhelm Hammershøi. It can be seen in A Mother’s Duty (fig. 127) and Man Handing a Letter to a Woman in the Entrance Hall of a House by Pieter de Hooch (fig. 149), two of the paintings reproduced on postcards amongst the McEvoy Estate Papers. A ‘through-view’ creates a deeper and more complicated perspective to an interior and ultimately creates an ambitious composition that demonstrates the skill of the artist.

Just as McEvoy used chiaroscuro in some of his earliest interiors, such as Autumn and The Convalescent, by manipulating the light through the window, he takes this method a step further in The Lute. The natural light sources in this painting are both behind and in front of Anais, a difficult effect to create, as it casts two thirds of her figure, including her face, into shadow. It looks as though she is walking towards a window, in the direction of the viewer. As she walks forward the light will move up from her torso and hands, which clutch the musical instrument, up to her face. McEvoy has chosen not to light her face but teasingly begins the process of moving the light upwards by gently highlighting the end of her nose, mouth and chin, just enough that her features come into view. By lighting Anais’ hands, which are holding the neck of the lute in two different positions, McEvoy is demonstrating his skill as a painter as hands are known for being notoriously difficult to paint. In The Lute, McEvoy creates a similar fragmentation of light through the net curtains behind Anais, just as the trees and window frames create a fragmentation through the door in de Hooch’s A Mother’s Duty. McEvoy also includes similar reflected light on the open Victorian door as on the door in de Hooch’s composition.

The clothes that Anais is wearing in this composition become an important feature of this series of interiors. The pink embroidered top with a balloon-sleeve white blouse underneath is another repeated and familiar feature of McEvoy’s work. This outfit is reused by McEvoy across at least six different paintings during this period, including Siana (fig. 171), the watercolour In a Mirror (fig. 179), The Letter (fig. 180), The Ear-ring (fig. 167), The Lute (fig. 122) and Myrtle (fig. 169). It is as though McEvoy is building on the number of familiar motifs with each painting, from the green walls, carpet
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and chair, to Anais’ outfit, but making them different enough each time to retain an aspect of novelty and interest for the viewer. The repetition of these motifs in different compositions suggests that McEvoy is experimenting with these paintings, and yet through these motifs he conveys a sense of increased continuity within his work. It is likely that by repeating particular features of these interiors, the audience at the NEAC would recognise his Dutch-inspired interiors as qualitatively different from those of his contemporaries. That being said, *The Lute* bears a striking similarity to Hammershøi’s *Danish Interior, Strandgarde 30* (fig. 181).\(^{354}\) It is not known if McEvo had ever seen this 1902 painting by the Danish artist but the positioning of the lone chair to the left of the composition and the through-view to the rear of the property, as well as the lone female sitter, who will undoubtedly enter the room to the foreground to continue sweeping, are all similarly addressed in McEvoy’s 1911 painting.

The third painting in this series is *The Ear-Ring* (fig. 167), which was exhibited alongside *Siana, The Letter* and *In a Mirror* at the NEAC in the winter exhibition of 1911. Through extensive research into *The Letter* (fig. 180), I have been able to confirm that this is not the same painting as *The Letter* in The New Art Gallery, Walsall (fig. 157) which was exhibited in 1906 at the NEAC, but it is almost certainly a newly discovered painting with the same title.\(^{355}\) This newly discovered composition depicts Anais holding a letter and standing in the same corner of McEvoy’s studio as depicted in both *Interior* and *The Ear-Ring*, with the same wooden panelling, fireplace and seascape painting, as featured in *The Ear-Ring* and *La Reprise*. Although the detail of the seascape cannot be seen, it has an identical gold and wooden frame as the painting in the other two interiors. Anais is almost certainly wearing the same pink embroidered top as in the other five aforementioned paintings, and the same blue skirt and the shawl around her shoulders as in *In a Mirror* (fig. 179). This painting can be compared to several seventeenth-century Dutch interiors depicting women reading, including Vermeer’s *Girl Reading a Letter at an Open Window* (fig. 155). The positioning and expression of Anais’ face in *The Letter*, as well as the use of chiaroscuro, is almost identical to the reflection of Vermeer’s sitter in *Girl Reading a Letter*.

By mid-September 1911, McEvoy wrote that he was progressing well with *The Earring* (fig. 167) in three letters to his wife Mary, dated between the 18\(^{th}\) and the 21\(^{st}\) September, ‘I got on very well with


the earring picture again. It is a [sic] partly in blue – the Kimono but I believe a glaze will finish it.”356 It is possible that McEvoy was describing Anaïs’ fashionable dress in this letter as a ‘kimono’ – a looser fitting embroidered top and skirt which belonged to a more modern style than traditional Edwardian dress. However, it is also possible that the pigment colour that he was using for her blue skirt is named ‘kimono’. Deep blue colours made from lapis lazuli were closely associated with Vermeer, who was known for his copious use of expensive pigments. McEvoy, in painting these Dutch-inspired interiors, had become increasingly interested in the effects of different pigments and the use of blue in his own compositions.357 It is very possible that he was trialling new pigments with modern names and also mixing his own pigments during this process.

*The Ear-Ring* depicts Anaïs seated at a mirror being held by an easel, and fastening an earring into her left ear. The viewer is instantly drawn to her face in the reflection, as McEvoy has carefully illuminated and framed this part of his composition as its own separate portrait. On the wall is, again, the same seascape. This painting has not been identified but it is likely that it is Dutch, as it is reminiscent of the work of Willem van de Velde II (1633-1707); for example, *English Ships at Sea Beating to Windward in a Gale* (fig. 182). An article dating to 1923 in *The Sunday Times* describes *The Earring* as a key example of McEvoy’s earlier style of painting and his reinterpretation of the work of Vermeer:

[McEvoy] made his first appearance as an exhibitor at the New English Art Club about the beginning of this century, when his art appeared to be modelled on that of the Dutch School, and his interiors won general praise for their exquisite illumination and tender precision. “The Earring” of 1911, now at the Tate Gallery and reproduced in this volume, as an admirable example of Mr. McEvoy’s early style, in which the influence of Vermeer dominates.358

Vermeer, as emulated by McEvoy, often painted women performing every-day, yet intimate, tasks such as fastening jewellery; for example, in his painting *Woman with a Pearl Necklace* (fig. 183) in the collection of the Staatliche Museum in Berlin. Vermeer also plays with the theme of reflection as can be seen by *A Lady at the Virginals with a Gentleman* in the Royal Collection (fig. 184), in which a young woman’s face is reflected in the mirror on the wall above her; and *Girl Reading a Letter at an Open Window* in which a young woman is reflected in the leaded-light window.
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The most striking comparison, and almost certainly McEvoy’s primary influence for The Earring is the Dutch Golden Age interior by Gerard, or Gerrit, Dou, A Young Woman at her Toilet (fig. 185), painted in 1667. This painting depicts a young woman, accompanied by her maid, arranging her hair in a mirror. On her left ear she wears a large drop-pearl earring, and it could be mistaken that the reflected gesture is of her fastening the other earring into her opposite ear. The woman’s loosely clasped fingers cupping a lock of hair is almost identical to the pose used by McEvoy in The Earring. Both women’s delicate wrists and forearms are exposed, their loose-fitting upper garments hanging away from the body, both red and pink respectively. Even the colours in the carpet below Anais’ feet in McEvoy’s portrait are mirroring the patterning and colours in the cloth covering Dou’s table. Dou’s painting was displayed in Munich Art Gallery at the time McEvoy painted The Earring and he almost certainly did not see this painting first-hand. However, it was reproduced in at least two publications Masters in Art: Gerard Dou published in 1903 and The Masterpieces of Gerard Dou, published a year before The Earring in 1910.\footnote{Dou, The Masterpieces of Gerard Dou. Masters in Art, A Series of Illustrated Monographs Issued Monthly: Gerard Dou (Boston: Bates and Guild company, 1903).}

A similar effect of the carpet covering Dou’s table in A Young Woman and in Vermeer’s Girl Reading a Letter at an Open Window can be seen in McEvoy’s La Reprise (fig. 168). It is possible that in this last painting McEvoy was continuing to borrow inspiration from these same Dutch works. “La Reprise,” by A. McEvoy, in purple browns, yellows, and low-toned reds, represents a plain-looking girl, but the scheme of colour is convincing.\footnote{“Art Exhibition: Criticism of Pictures at Laing Gallery”, Newcastle Daily Chronicle, Oct 19, 1912, 6.} Just as Dou includes the silver water jug and dish, McEvoy includes a blue and white Delftware-inspired water jug. This would have been recognisable as a Dutch object to the British public and is also reminiscent of Vermeer’s ‘kans’ in Lady at the Virginals (fig. 184) and The Procuress (fig. 186). McEvoy has painted Anaïs working on a piece of cloth, either darning, sewing or embroidering. By including this cloth, McEvoy again harks back to the Dou interior and the linen cloth discarded next to the silver water jug and basin. It can also be seen in direct comparison in subject to The Lacemaker (fig. 187), celebrated by the Impressionists and the Post-Impressionists as a masterpiece. McEvoy, like Vermeer, attempts to intrude on the domestic privacy of the scene. The deep purple grapes and sumptuous oranges on the dish in front of Anaïs emulate the toppling fruit from the bowl in Girl Reading by Vermeer (fig. 155).
This chapter commenced with an analysis of one of McEvoy’s earliest interior paintings, *The Engraving*, exhibited by McEvoy at the NEAC in spring 1901 and representative of McEvoy’s early Dutch-inspired interiors which continued between 1900 and 1907. These interiors were influenced by the work of Vermeer, de Hooch, and ter Borch, and strove to replicate the manipulation of natural light, the sober colours, and the sparsely-furnished interiors achieved by seventeenth-century Dutch artists. McEvoy used every resource available to him to learn about Dutch seventeenth-century artists and how best to incorporate aspects of their compositions and tone into his own work. Hundreds of postcards in the McEvoy Estate Papers have provided evidence of McEvoy having had contact with these artists’ works and he would have seen several Dutch paintings whilst travelling Europe in 1898 and 1903, and in London. During this early period, McEvoy’s paintings were meticulously produced. His process was slow and silent and, although works such as *Autumn* and *The Convalescent* were original and accomplished, they lacked the creativity and modernity expressed in McEvoy’s later interiors – his series featuring Anaïs.

McEvoy’s earliest interiors represent an important first stage in the artist’s career, and help generate an initial understanding of his early motivations for success. They signify his growing interest in producing a genre of painting that was becoming *le dernier cri* at the NEAC from 1900 and it has been demonstrated that McEvoy was at the forefront of this innovative reinterpretation of Dutch interior paintings, along with several of his contemporaries including William Orpen. It has been established that McEvoy’s interiors, although they may look back to the seventeenth century for inspiration, are experimental in their conscious superseding of classic Impressionism – a genre that had, until the early 1900s, dominated the exhibitions at the NEAC. Two articles reviewing NEAC exhibitions in *The Burlington Magazine* in 1907 and *Studio Magazine* in 1909 recorded McEvoy as a leading example of a contemporary artist working within this genre of interiors. Yet McEvoy’s first solo exhibition at the Carfax Gallery in 1907 received mixed reviews and was deemed inconsistent in style and merit.

Anaïs provided a turning point for McEvoy’s work from 1910. She worked with the artist in a way that other models could not, and provided him with a release from his Slade set, giving him an outlet for his creativity. Anaïs was responsible for McEvoy’s transition from his early period of Dutch-inspired interiors, to his later period – a period that would pave the way for portraiture. As it has been seen from Mary’s account of Anaïs, she was a natural model – beautiful, modern, and able to hold a pose for long periods of time. It is as though McEvoy’s paintings of Anaïs between 1910 and 1913 consolidated years of artistic exploration of seventeenth-century Dutch interiors and yet he personalises at least two of her portraits by using her name – *The Lute (Anaïs)* and *Siana*, an anagram
of Anaïs. This is significant as McEvoy presents Anaïs as a person in her own right, not just as a model. McEvoy paints Anaïs in the same location at 107 Grosvenor Road, and often dresses her in the same modern clothes. Although this repetition could be interpreted as McEvoy perfecting his compositions by replaying Anaïs time and again, it can also be interpreted as McEvoy wanting to provide some consistency to his work by using a setting and a model that works well for a contemporary audience. The interiors also become progressively less significant through repetition of the same space and furnishings, and Anaïs, as a subject of portraiture, begins to supersede.

Anaïs’ time with the McEvoy’s was fleeting as she married the artist and McEvoy’s friend Gerald Brockhurst in 1914. The couple relocated to Ireland and eventually returned to London in 1919 – by this date McEvoy had achieved success as a portraitist. Anaïs went on to inspire her husband’s work and was his primary model until the early 1930s when he met sixteen-year-old Kathleen Woodward whom he re-named Dorette. Brockhurst was a domineering individual who controlled those closest to him. Anaïs went on to describe herself, not as a collaborator as she had been with McEvoy, and certainly not respected, ‘I was simple material. But Brock remoulded and moulded it again into what he wanted for his drawing...Mentally I was completely dependent upon Brock.’

Brockhurst demanded of Anaïs that he should be granted sexual freedom in their marriage and when she disagreed, he sent her to Dieppe ‘so he would be free from any emotional restraint.’ After affairs with both Anaïs’ sister and Dorette, who would later go on to describe Brockhurst as psychologically controlling, Anaïs filed for divorce from Brockhurst and won $35,000 a year and custody of their fourteen-year-old daughter.

During the period in which McEvoy painted Anaïs, she can be interpreted as a collaborator in his work. She provided the artist with a new lease of inspiration, and was responsible for creating a defined period of separate interiors that are markedly different to his earliest works. Anaïs not only provides McEvoy with new inspiration from 1910, but the interior paintings in which she is depicted provide McEvoy with a gateway or a transition into his new interest in portraiture – a theory that can be proven by looking at the portraits he produced subsequently. Portraits of Virginia Graham and the artist’s mother (figs. 200 & 73), both of which will be looked at in more detail in Chapter 4, were painted soon after McEvoy’s series in 1914 and 1915 respectively. Both use the same studio setting as a backdrop,
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without the influence of Dutch old masters, and behind both figures is the same seascape on the wall, the fireplace from *Interior*, and the red and cream patterned carpet.
Mr. McEvoy becomes more and more transcendental in his “Honble. Mrs. Cecil Baring,” whom one expects every moment to dissolve into a rainbow. \(^{363}\)

In 1916 McEvoy reached success as a society portraitist. This success resulted from one painting, *Mrs Cecil Baring* (fig. 188), a dazzling full-length portrait of an American sitter, a daughter of the tobacco magnate Pierre Lorillard IV. By the time McEvoy painted Maude Baring, he had invested four years in creating a portrait-type that suggested an intimacy between the artist and the sitter, and which had been significantly influenced by James McNeill Whistler. Whistler had left a noticeable void in British art after his death in 1903, and it is possible that McEvoy was aiming to fill his role. *Mrs Cecil Baring* is markedly different to other works produced by McEvoy up until this point and, according to Claude Johnson, marked the ‘beginning of the second epoch in McEvoy’s artistic career.’ \(^{364}\) It is not a portrait dominated by an interior, it exudes confidence in its unusually large-scale and demonstrates a consistency of accomplished impressionistic technique. This portrait can be understood as the pivotal work in McEvoy’s career, when he became successful with high society and the transatlantic elite, the clientele that he hoped would be responsible for his posterity as an artist. Most importantly, this portrait enabled McEvoy to establish a portrait-type, a recognisable formula inspired by Whistler and the unremitting motif of the mirror, that he would use for portraits until his death eleven years later.

At first glance, it looks as though McEvoy has placed Maude Baring in a ballet pose, her left arm is slightly curved and her right arm is gesturing outwards. However, on closer inspection, this portrait looks to be a reinvention of Whistler’s *The Princess from the Land of Porcelain* (fig. 189) painted between 1863 and 1865. Whistler has placed his sitter, Christine Spartali, in a crowded interior dominated by colour and oriental decoration, including a painted room-divide, three fans, a blue and white carpet, and a vase. There is very little space around Spartali, with her kimono breaching the edge of the canvas. Whistler focuses on variations of blue and red, and although these colours are used several times across the canvas, the array of different patterns in this composition gives it a decorative rather than an ethereal style, as achieved by McEvoy. He strips down Whistler’s

composition and demonstrates that portraiture no longer needs opulent, decorated interiors but instead should demonstrate simplicity. McEvoy has inverted his sitter and if these two paintings were placed side-by-side, Baring would be looking directly at Whistler’s Spartali, challenging her, perhaps as an updated version of aesthetic portraiture. Through *Mrs Cecil Baring*, McEvoy is not only influenced by Whistler’s work, but is offering a reinvention of this earlier portrait.

*Mrs Cecil Baring* can be described as displaying a modern bohemianism. Baring was wealthy and yet, except for her Poiret dress, the artist does not paint her with any trappings of wealth. Instead, McEvoy has stripped her of the luxuries traditionally included in a portrait. She wears very little jewellery, only earrings, and there are no props or furniture that would suggest her status beyond this painting. This is very different to Whistler or Sargent’s carefully chosen furniture and opulent interiors – Sargent’s portraits will be a dominant topic of Chapter 5 of this thesis. McEvoy’s minimalist approach to portraiture may well have appealed to Mrs Baring, as it has enabled the artist to focus entirely on her as a subject. Without a narrative that is often told through the inclusion of material possessions, Baring’s portrait explores her as an individual and as a woman. McEvoy’s focus is not on unnecessary decoration that could have distracted the viewer, but instead the important focus of portraiture, his sitter. This portrait was painted in 1916, during the First World War and, in its minimalism, can be interpreted as demonstrating the changing attitudes towards excessive wealth and opulence.

McEvoy reinforces this minimalism through her pose. Just as Whistler chose to arrange his sitter in a contrapposto pose, with Spartali’s left hand caressing the delicate material of her kimono and her right hand holding a fan, McEvoy has endeavoured to pose Baring identically, without props. McEvoy has cleverly imitated the exact position of Spartali’s left hand, although Baring is facing the opposite direction, and she also runs her fingers through the fabric of her dress (fig. 190). Her right hand, although seen from a different angle to Whistler’s portrait, is also positioned in the same pose as Spartali. By mirroring the gesture of Spartali’s right hand without the floral-patterned fan, McEvoy is not only drawing attention to his lack of props and furniture but also the importance of excluding these trappings of wealth, in order to create an authentic and unhindered likeness.

Mrs Baring is wearing a dress by Paul Poiret, the French fashion designer. Poiret was extremely modern in his design and is best remembered for liberating women from the corset. His clothes were
not tailored but were constructed from rectangular pieces of cloth, carefully draped over the body. He favoured the chemise and was inspired by both the antique and oriental dress such as the kimono. Although Poiret’s reputation waned following the First World War, Maude Baring in 1916 is empowered by Poiret’s liberating and fashionable garment in this full-length portrait. Her evening dress could be interpreted as a modern reinterpretation of Whistler’s kimono, it is feminine but unrestrictive, her arms are laid bare and her décolletage is left exposed.

McEvoy has successfully captured the iridescent material of Mrs Baring’s dress in a way that Whistler has failed to achieve with The Princess. Whistler has attempted to paint the floral details of his sitter’s kimono, and yet the section above the red obi is un compelling with a confusion of half-painted flowers, across broadly painted folds of fabric. Several layers of thin coloured glazes have been used and yet the paint above the obi is so thin that the vertical stripes of the canvas weave have surfaced, shattering the illusion of realistic material. Whistler’s fabric also lacks the lustre expected of kimono silk. McEvoy, in comparison, uses a more impressionistic technique than Whistler, as well as thicker layers of oil paint. His multitude of colours, often with several tones in one stroke, offer a more realistic sheen to the fabric’s surface. On close inspection, the brushstrokes, particularly on the lower half of the sitter’s dress, are almost abstract in form. His paintwork is not the carefully formed flowers of Whistler’s kimono but rapid and fluid strokes of colour.

Whistler believed that creating a harmony of tone was the most important quality for a painting, and yet in his portrait of Maude Baring, McEvoy has used Whistler’s philosophy more effectively than Whistler himself. The aesthetic artist emphasises contrasting colours in his composition and, although these colours have been used consistently across the canvas, they cannot be described as creating a harmony of tone. Each colour stands alone in illustrating defined areas of pattern – a red flower, or green leaves. McEvoy, on the other hand, has used a greater variety of coloured oils across the entire canvas; the same pinks and blues have been used in Baring’s dress as in the background, the floor and even in parts of her face and hair, thus giving his portrait an effective harmony.

McEvoy has taken his composition a step further than Whistler’s inspiration by giving his portrait an ethereal quality, not only in the colours used, but also in the method of its creation, as if Baring is
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being viewed through water or reflected in a mirror. It is this ethereality, inspired by the motif of the mirror, a recurring theme in McEvoy’s work, that sets his portraits apart from other artists of the period. Ethereality is an individual aesthetic choice that McEvoy continues to make for his portraits throughout his career. The topic of ethereality will be discussed in greater detail later in the chapter. Both his intense interest in Whistler’s work, and the ethereal style that resulted in McEvoy’s portraits, were responsible for McEvoy’s success in 1916. It can be argued that whilst being inspired by Whistler, McEvoy succeeds in exploring a new perspective of aestheticism, and fills an artistic void that resulted from Whistler’s death in 1903.

**Introducing Mirrors, 1911**

Mr. A McEvoy, an artist who used to paint accomplished but not very interesting pictures, has suddenly found himself. He has never painted anything that even gave promise of his oil and water-colour portraits in this exhibition (42 and 159). In both he shows a new and very individual sense of form, and this makes his colour, quiet as it is, suddenly significant. He is like a skilful writer whose style is transformed by the fact that he has discovered something new and urgent to say.  

Clutton-Brock defines this exhibition, at the New English Art Club in 1911, as the transformative moment in Ambrose McEvoy’s career. The critical point when he stops producing ‘not very interesting pictures’ and finds his individual style. The two paintings that lead Clutton-Brock to this conclusion are *Siana* (fig. 171) and *In a Mirror* (fig. 179) numbers 42 and 159 in the exhibition. These two paintings are certainly different to previous works by McEvoy both in painterly technique and compositional format. Both works are experimental but neither show the consistency of style or technique that he later masters in 1915 and 1916 with *Madame* (fig. 205) and the portrait of Mrs Cecil Baring.

These two pictures, *Siana* and *In a Mirror*, are certainly important additions to McEvoy’s oeuvre, as was Anais’ role in establishing McEvoy’s success, but *Siana* and *In a Mirror* do not represent the pivotal or critical moment in McEvoy’s career when he establishes himself as a successful society portraitist. Instead, *Siana* and *In a Mirror* demonstrate a notable step in the development of McEvoy’s mature style and introduce the motif of the mirror into the artist’s work. From 1911 until his success in 1916,

---


the mirror motif becomes a medium through which McEvoy is able to work through key pieces in Whistler’s oeuvre, in order to develop his own unique style of portraiture.

*In a Mirror* is an interior set in the same studio as *The Earring* (fig. 167), *La Reprise* (fig. 168) and *Anais, The Lute* (fig. 122). In all four of these interiors, McEvoy does not disguise the fact that they were painted in the same location at 107 Grosvenor Road. Instead, McEvoy produces these works as simple yet accomplished interiors with very few props; the same chair, easel, wall colour and carpet are repeated by McEvoy in several compositions until at least 1915, as previously discussed. *In a Mirror* depicts the same easel as in *The Earring* and in both of these compositions, as well as *Siana* and *Anais, The Lute*, McEvoy has depicted Anaïs in an identical costume. By producing several paintings in the same location, with limited yet recognisable furniture, a sense of coherence is created across these works. However, the reason for McEvoy using the same few pieces of furniture in his interiors was almost certainly due to financial constraints, rather than just artistic effect as explored in Chapter 3. *The Sketch*, a British periodical that focused on high society, mocked McEvoy’s interiors and their lack of furniture:

I remember him in the days when he was devoting himself to painting scantily furnished interiors inhabited by one somewhat disconsolate model. A joke against McEvoy at the period was the inadequacy of his means. “Hullo, McEvoy, got a table at last! Where is it?” a friend asked one day. In the latest picture the acquisition was there for all to see, but in the actual room there was only the same chair, the same easel, the same round mirror, the same vase – not on a table, but on the usual shelf. “No, I’ve not got it yet,” said he; “that’s only So and So, who very kindly for on his hands and knees, with the rug over him. You see, I wanted to paint that vase of flowers in a new light.” Such are the legends that stick all the closer because of McEvoy’s present successes in the world of Duchesses.368

This article has been written to undermine McEvoy by suggesting he was poor and desperate in his early years (which he was) and reminding the affluent readers of the *Sketch* that McEvoy is not one of them. However, what the *Sketch* cannot comprehend is that from these early interiors, which display an overt bohemianism, McEvoy inadvertently advertised a raw, stripped-down version of high society, a new modernism for those tired with the opulence of Sargent and Whistler. From 1916, having seen his sparsely-furnished but delicately painted interiors, McEvoy’s sitters were intrigued by the potential of his work and began to invest in his new simplicity of portraiture. McEvoy plays to this bohemian minimalism in his portrait of Maude Baring, where she is depicted with nothing but her Poiret dress.

---

In a Mirror (fig. 179) depicts Anaïs sat at a table and reflected in a mirror, held by an easel. The wainscoting of McEvoy’s studio can be seen just beyond the frame. Unlike The Earring, which also features a mirror, In a Mirror is a watercolour rather than an oil painting. The fluidity and unforgiving nature of this medium makes it difficult to layer paint and manipulate effects as it dries. There are two accounts which describe McEvoy’s unusual techniques in creating a finished watercolour. The model Irene Dineley described how McEvoy:

would lift the picture off the easel without a word of explanation, run with it to the bathroom, and throw it in the bath which was full of water...At first I thought this was due to temperament, but I understood later that it was just his way of working.369

Daphne Pollen (née Baring), again a former sitter to McEvoy, wrote to Eric Chilston in the 1970s, also describing the artist’s experimentations with watercolour:

He used “double elephant” Whatman paper for his watercolours. He started these with a faint, lightly shade pencil drawing; then daubed this boldly with washes of “Artist’s Black”; then blotted this off or put the whole thing under the tap, dried it with blotting-paper or in front of the fire, introduced some colour and eventually ink lines, using a quill...I once saw him dancing about on a drawing which had been under the tap and which he had put between sheets of blotting-paper on the floor. This was another occasion for merriment.370

From these quotations it is possible to understand how In a Mirror was built up into a final composition. The watercolour was laid on and washed off a number of times before completion. McEvoy scratched into the paint and added definitive lines in graphite to try and contain his subject. He has focused on darker, more muted tones, with only a slight hint of colour in the table and Anaïs’ clothes. It has a haunting, otherworldly quality to it and certainly embodies the ‘ethereal’ quality for which the artist became known. Anaïs’ form is fluid and translucent, and on first glance it is difficult to define where the background ends and her outline begins. It is as though the sitter has been imagined by the artist, created from the reflection itself. The angle that McEvoy has painted this work is the same angle that an artist would use to create a self-portrait in a mirror. This gives the link between the sitter and the artist an even greater intimacy, with the indication that this painting is a collaboration between McEvoy and his sitter. The conscious lack of colour which is described in Clutton-Brock’s review as ‘quiet’, makes this composition appear unfinished. However, it also successfully captures the effect of a reflection which, ‘creates the sensation of an ethereal world
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looming beyond the mirror, inviting the eye to cross through it. Like a prism the mirror can disrupt the field of vision because it hides as much as it shows.\footnote{Melchior-Bonnet, Jewett, and Delumeau, \textit{The Mirror: A History} (London: Routledge, 2001), 101-2.} The reflection in \textit{In a Mirror} channels the viewer’s focus by only depicting the sitter, a chair and a table. The motif of the mirror allows McEvoy to be selective with his inclusion of furniture or other distractions within the room, as well as colour.

In his exhibition catalogue \textit{On Reflection}, Jonathan Miller asks, how can someone distinguish between a reflective and an unreflective surface?\footnote{Jonathan Miller, \textit{On Reflection} (London: National Gallery Publications, 1998), 10.} This is a question that McEvoy would have grappled with when producing \textit{In a Mirror}. Using watercolour allowed McEvoy to wash down the areas of wet paint where he required the effect of a metallic or reflective sheen, thus producing a more convincing mirror surface. In some areas, for example the sitter’s left hand and parts of the shawl, McEvoy has stripped back the watercolour by rubbing it right back to the paper. These palest areas give the effect of light distorting Anaïs’ reflection on the surface of the mirror. By stripping back the paint to create the appearance of a reflective surface, rather than building it up as one would with oil paint, McEvoy has maintained the effect of a reflective surface from every angle of viewing. Oil paint, built up in layers, can become abstracted at close viewing, with the effect of the reflection then lost.

Although Anaïs’ reflection in \textit{The Earring} (fig. 167) is more clearly defined than \textit{In a Mirror}, McEvoy has suggested the surface of the mirror in \textit{The Earring} with patches and streaks of lighter-coloured paint across the mirror’s surface. This is comparable to the ‘white dashes or bars of light’ used in paintings to depict reflections on water, a trope described by the critic John Ruskin as ‘vain and absurd’.\footnote{Miller, \textit{On Reflection}, 16.} The tonal inconsistencies introduced by McEvoy to suggest a reflective surface in \textit{The Earring} are less effective than the surface in the watercolour composition \textit{In a Mirror}. Anaïs is sat close enough to the mirror in \textit{The Earring} that there is no doubt that this is her reflection. The inclusion of the highlighted patches of paint, suggesting a reflective surface, can therefore be deemed unnecessary. The reflective surface depicted in \textit{In a Mirror}, on the other hand, is intrinsic to the overall effect of this composition, which deems reflection the most important feature of this work. In both paintings, McEvoy is experimenting with a challenging motif, the mirror and the effects of reflection. McEvoy was not the only artist to experiment with mirrors during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. His contemporary and friend William Orpen used the motif of the convex mirror.
in his painting *The Mirror* (fig. 132), which was inspired by the fifteenth-century Arnolfini portrait in the National Gallery (fig. 131) and which was mentioned in Chapter 3.

The second painting reviewed by Clutton-Brock in his 1911 NEAC exhibition review is *Siana* (fig. 171). This painting has a ‘jewel-like quality’, set in a purpose-built frame, hand-painted in blue and gold by the artist.\(^{374}\) The frame is intrinsic to this work and gives the object a sense of craftmanship. Although McEvoy has not directly included a mirror in *Siana*, it can be argued that the artist is continuing to experiment with reflection and the motif of the mirror in this painting. Firstly, McEvoy plays with the theme of reflection through his title *Siana*, which is a mirror of the name of his sitter Anaïs. Secondly, considering the composition’s unusual format, the close perspective of the head and shoulders combined with the impressionistic style of painting, it is possible that McEvoy was trying to recreate a face reflected in the surface of a mirror. Anaïs’ features have been painted slightly out of focus with almost a sponged technique. This distortion has softened her likeness and creates the impression that she is not being viewed directly but through a secondary medium, such as water, a mirror or thick glass.

McEvoy has chosen to exclude the streaks of highlighted paint in *Siana* which would have suggested a reflective surface, a feature that he chose to include in *The Earring*. Anaïs is wearing the same pink embroidered top, coral necklace and gold hooped earrings as she wore in *The Earring*. Although *The Earring* is set in an interior and Anaïs is surrounded by furniture, the dominant feature of this painting is her portrait, reflected in the mirror. McEvoy allows the viewer to focus on her face through his manipulation of light, casting the chair, Anaïs’ body and her closest surroundings into shadow. Her reflected image, strongly lit and framed by the mirror, could be lifted out of this interior as a stand-alone portrait. It could be interpreted that *Siana*, dressed in the same clothes and jewellery, is the result of McEvoy removing Anaïs’ portrait from *The Earring*, thus concluding that *Siana* depicts Anaïs’ reflection.

Returning to the quotation from Clutton-Brock’s 1911 review, he wrote that McEvoy’s *Siana* and *In a Mirror* show ‘a new and very individual sense of form’. This form, comprising the impressionistic technique of *Siana* and the haunting and ethereal quality of Anaïs’ reflection in *In a Mirror*, were made possible through McEvoy’s experimentation with the motif of the mirror. Both paintings demonstrate

\(^{374}\) The present owner described this painting as having a ‘jewel-like quality’. It has not been possible to see this painting in person.
an important step in the development of McEvoy’s mature style of painting, a style which was inspired by the effects of reflection and then later the work of James McNeill Whistler. McEvoy employs the motif of the mirror again in 1913 and 1915 to produce Myrtle (fig. 169) and Madame (fig. 205), both of which were inspired by Whistler’s Symphony in White, No. 2, The Little White Girl (fig. 207).

Reflecting Whistler, 1912-1915

Following McEvoy’s success at the NEAC in 1911 with Siana and In a Mirror, he continued to experiment with the theme of reflection and the motif of the mirror in his work. Even as late as 1926, McEvoy was using mirrors to produce ethereal likenesses. Tallulah Bankhead wrote that McEvoy had a peculiar style, ‘He painted me in profile while looking at my reflection in a mirror.’375 From 1912 until 1915, he was interested in Whistler’s use of reflection in both his river scenes and his portraits. It was this interest and the reinterpretation of Whistler’s work that led McEvoy to establish himself as a successful portraitist with his painting Mrs Cecil Baring.

Unlike many of his contemporaries, McEvoy had a familial connection to Whistler. McEvoy’s father, Captain Charles Ambrose McEvoy, became friends with a Dr William Whistler whilst fighting with the Confederates in the American Civil War. When Captain McEvoy emigrated to England and eventually settled in London, Dr Whistler introduced him to his brother, the artist James McNeill Whistler. The two men became good friends and a colloquial letter from Whistler to Captain McEvoy, in the McEvoy Estate Papers, is evidence of their familiarity.376 It has been suggested that Whistler mentored Captain McEvoy’s son Ambrose but there is no evidence for this, other than documented hearsay.377 However, McEvoy was so enamoured with Whistler in his early years that he even modelled his appearance on the aesthetic artist.378 With such a close personal connection to Whistler, it seemed likely that McEvoy would have been artistically inspired by his work. However, up until 1912 McEvoy does not appear to have been influenced by Whistler in any direct way. Instead, as it has already been outlined in the first three chapters of this thesis, McEvoy pursued copying old masters and produced his own small interiors inspired by Dutch Golden Age artists from 1898.

______________________________

375 Bankhead, Tallulah: My Autobiography, 179. Also refer to page 208 of this thesis.
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In 1912 McEvoy was no longer a young artist emerging from the Slade. He had turned thirty-five in August that year and traditionally would have been established in his artistic practice by that stage in his career. However, in 1912, as well as incorporating Anaïs into several of his paintings, McEvoy’s work continued to change as he introduced Whistler’s style and techniques into his own increasingly accomplished portraits. The question that needs to be asked is what changed in 1912 to inspire McEvoy to reinterpret Whistler’s work, as a path to his own success? Was there one defining moment in 1912 that caused McEvoy to change path from his own compositions Siana and In a Mirror to directly reinterpret Whistler’s work?

Although McEvoy was selling some of his paintings, he was not achieving the level of success that he had envisaged when he wished ‘to be a painter of excellence’, and in August 1911 Mary McEvoy gave birth to their second child Mary Annabel, known as Anna.\textsuperscript{379} The financial pressure of another child to support would have certainly contributed to McEvoy’s drive for success as an artist. However, the trigger of 1912 was a loan exhibition of Whistler’s work at the Tate Gallery, the National Gallery of British Art, which ran from July until October that year.\textsuperscript{380} This was the first time that McEvoy would have seen dozens of Whistlers hanging together in one exhibition since the artist’s death in 1905. This exhibition was much anticipated by the British public and proved to be an inspiration to McEvoy. The \textit{Leicester Daily Post} wrote:

\begin{quote}
Whistler has not been seen in bulk in London since the memorial exhibition organised at the New Gallery – now, alas! no longer devoted to art – just after his death. Everyone went to that show, and it is to be expected that the new collection at the Chelsea gallery will draw admirers of Whistler in crowds from America this year.\textsuperscript{381}
\end{quote}

The Tate was an easy twenty-minute walk from McEvoy’s house on the embankment and he is thought to have visited the exhibition during its opening month with Mary, as ‘Tate’ is marked in Mary’s 1912 diary on 17\textsuperscript{th} July that year.\textsuperscript{382} The day after McEvoy visited the Whistler exhibition, The \textit{Times} reviewed it and described Whistler as, ‘the last of the Old Masters, and the slightest and most exquisite of them all. Perhaps there will never be another painter like him again until a new art has arisen and
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grown old. It is not known if McEvoy read this review, however, he appears to interpret the last two lines as a means to challenge Whistler and his former success. The painting that inspired McEvoy in this exhibition was Whistler’s Grey and Silver: The Thames (fig. 191). This painting incorporates the theme of reflection, a theme that McEvoy was already exploring at this date, and the result was a number of paintings directly inspired by the aesthetic artist.

Grey and Silver: The Thames was painted by Whistler between 1871 and 1873 and is classified as one of his nocturnes. It depicts a view of the Thames and south bank from what is now the Savoy Hotel. It was painted with thin oil glazes to give the appearance and texture of a watercolour and depicts a small sailing boat – the focus of this painting – as well as distant buildings and chimneys reflected in the river. Whistler would have seen and been inspired by the river every day as he lived on the embankment at 96 Cheyne Walk, half an hour’s walk from McEvoy’s house on the same side of the Thames (fig. 192).

In response to seeing Grey and Silver at the Tate in July 1912, McEvoy painted his own hazy riverscape, The Thames from the Artist’s House (fig. 193-194). Through the smog, McEvoy also painted the industrialised south bank reflected in the river, with a similarly solitary sailing boat, sat on the calm water. The central focus of this painting is not the boat in the foreground, as chosen by Whistler, but two industrial buildings on the bank behind. McEvoy has captured the detail of these buildings, the gas works, as they loom out of the sunlight. Their reflections have been carefully documented by the artist who has illustrated them as a mirrored sheen on the surface of the water. McEvoy’s confidence in capturing the reflection of these buildings has, fortunately, not led to his use of streaks of highlighted paint, as demonstrated in the mirror of The Earring, or the ‘white dashes or bars of light’ described by Ruskin to clumsily record reflection on water. The resemblance of The Thames from the Artist’s House and Grey and Silver: the Thames is uncanny, with both depicting a calm, misty, murky view of the river. McEvoy’s landscape is a little brighter but in both the sun is trying to force its way through the mist and onto the water. The colours and tones that both artists have used are comparable, although Whistler’s scene is unusual with its unfamiliar perspective and its portrait, rather than landscape, format. There is a preliminary sketch for The Thames from the Artist’s House by McEvoy which is titled The Gas Works (fig. 195). This sketch also highlights the buildings which are depicted in
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ink, rather than the sailing boat which is lightly sketched in pencil. In the McEvoy Estate Papers there is also an early photograph of almost this exact scene, excluding the boat, thought to have been taken by the artist (fig. 196). Finally, there is a similar view of the river with a boat in a sketchbook in the MEP (fig. 197). All of these compositions signify that McEvoy had viewed this scene as an artistic possibility on more than one occasion before painting his own ‘nocturne’ in 1912.

Three years later, McEvoy was again influenced by *Grey and Silver: The Thames* by Whistler, following another exhibition, this time at the Colnaghi Galleries in New Bond Street, London. On the 1\textsuperscript{st} June 1915 during the First World War, a review appeared in *The Times* advertising a ‘Whistler Exhibition’. The proceeds of the exhibition were to raise funds for the Professional Classes War Relief Council and Whistler was described as representing the ‘freedom of the artist’. However, *The Times* did not celebrate Whistler’s work in this review, as it did in 1912. Instead, it described the portrait of the artist’s wife, *Harmony in Red: Lamplight*, as ‘a mere waste of red’ with ‘figures posed for the sake of the pose, colours tinted for the sake of their prettiness.’ However, the review was concluded with some positivity:

“The Thames: Grey and Silver”, and remember that no one could imitate that. There is not the master...but the poet who did succeed now and again, among many failures, and when he succeeds we forget the failures.

Reminded of *Grey and Silver*, McEvoy took the colours from Whistler’s title and formed his own Whistlerian portrait *Silver and Grey: Mrs Charles McEvoy* (fig. 198), a portrait of his sister-in-law Marjorie Gwendoline McEvoy (née Notley). This is arguably one of McEvoy’s most accomplished portraits. The sitter’s delicate features are carefully combined with a balance of tone and simplicity of form. Although the brushwork extends to incorporate McEvoy’s uniquely fluid style, his portrait owes much to Whistler’s earlier portraits in the subtlety of colour. By giving this portrait a Whistlerian title, McEvoy is not only challenging Whistler’s legacy, but is also conferring upon his sitter an intangible status. McEvoy incorporates the ongoing theme of reflection in this portrait by drawing parallels with *The Thames from the Artist’s House*, the initial painting inspired by Whistler’s *Grey and Silver: The
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Thames. Turned ninety degrees clockwise, the background of *Silver and Grey* is comparable in form and tone to the water and its reflections in the foreground of *The Thames from the Artist’s House*, with the colours of Mrs Charles McEvoy’s cardigan gently reflected in the paint behind her (fig. 199).

Using a Whistlerian title for his portrait of Mrs Charles McEvoy not only closely associates McEvoy with Whistler but it also instils a new confidence in his mature, impressionistic style of portraiture. The sitter’s face has been delicately worked up with small brushstrokes comprising thin, coloured glazes. This technique is accomplished and demonstrates the skills of old masters that McEvoy previously studied. The colours in her cheeks have been made up with at least six different tones and McEvoy has used touches of blue to enhance her cheek and around her eye. Her clothes, however, have been painted with a very different method and on close inspection look almost abstract in style. There are areas of paint that are raised from the surface of the canvas, particularly on her clothes and across the background. These are made from quick, broad brushstrokes and a thick, almost dry oil paint. The tones, although often complementary, are various, with multiple colours even in the same stroke. McEvoy has outlined the sitter’s sleeves with rapid serpentine strokes of darker-coloured paint, an intrepid decision implemented by an artist confident in his individual style.

Like *Silver and Grey*, McEvoy painted several portraits of family members in 1915, allowing him to adapt his practice to include Whistler’s influence, without the pressure of a paying client. During this period, he painted his sister-in-law, his mother and his wife, Mary. In his portrait *The Artist’s Mother* (fig. 73), McEvoy uses a more impressionistic technique than he used for *Silver and Grey*. This demonstrates that McEvoy is still in the process of developing his mature style of portraiture by experimenting with different techniques. His mother’s face does not comprise the delicate, glossy brushstrokes used for the portrait of his sister-in-law. Instead, her face is made up of almost mottled paintwork laid on with a broader brush. Her clothes are again loosely painted and it is clear that McEvoy has used a large square brush for some of his last details, for example, the white and grey highlights on her dark clothes. Instead of the serpentine lines detailing the sleeves, McEvoy has worked against the natural direction of the paint with thick perpendicular brushstrokes to create folds in her garments. Although his mother’s clothes are Edwardian in style, McEvoy’s method has made this portrait modern.

*The Artist’s Mother*, a portrait of Mary Jane McEvoy (née Huggins), can be compared to Whistler’s *Arrangement in Grey and Black, No. 1* (fig. 64). On the most basic level both paintings depict the artists’ mothers, yet they were also produced as a visual family history. Creating such a legacy, the paintings
align the artists’ statuses with those of their patrons who could afford to commission family portraits. Just as Whistler alludes to his ongoing experimentation with prints by including *View of the Thames* in the background of his portrait, McEvoy includes a reminder of his earlier interiors, such as *The Earring* and *La Reprise*, by including the same seascape on the wall behind.

Set in this same interior at 107 Grosvenor Road, in front of the same fireplace and seascape, is McEvoy’s portrait of Virginia Graham. Virginia was not a family member but it can be presumed that this was a portrait commissioned by Captain Graham, a family friend or close acquaintance. *Virginia, Daughter of Captain Harry Graham* (fig. 200), also painted in 1915, alludes to Whistler’s *Harmony in Grey and Green: Miss Cicely Alexander* (1872-4) (fig. 201) in stance, with one leg forward, posed in a formal party dress and looking out at the viewer. In using this same pose McEvoy inserts his portrait into a chronology of famous European painters. Francisco Goya painted *The Black Duchess, Portrait of the Duchess of Alba* (fig. 202) in this same stance in 1797, and inspired Edouard Manet in 1862 for his portrait of *Lola de Valence* (fig. 203). Whistler chose to reverse Goya and Manet’s image by painting Cicely facing in the opposite direction. McEvoy then reverses this again for his portrait of Virginia Graham.

McEvoy’s portrait challenges Whistler’s *Harmony in Grey and Green*, not only by reversing the sitter’s pose but also by producing a more ambitious composition. McEvoy eradicates the strict horizontal and vertical contours of Whistler’s room by painting his interior at a more-complicated angle. The chaise longue, almost certainly the same piece of furniture used by McEvoy in *The Convalescent* (fig. 153), replaces Whistler’s black wainscoting in *Harmony in Grey and Green*. Instead of the carefully chosen, subdued grey carpet in Whistler’s scene, Virginia stands on the boldly patterned rug of McEvoy’s studio. This carpet, predominantly red in colour, appears in several of his paintings including *The Earring* and *The Lute (Anaïs)*. McEvoy purposefully eliminates the restrictions of *Harmony in Grey and Green* and introduces a modern bohemianism into his portrait. Virginia is formally dressed yet she stands in a comfortable and inviting room, her blond ringlets move freely in paint. Unfortunately, only black and white images of this painting survive. It is not possible to see the vibrancy of the portrait or understand how McEvoy created this painting, as it was destroyed in a fire at the owner’s home.\(^{391}\)

However, some of the colours were recorded in a review of the Royal Scottish Academy exhibition in May 1916. This review also draws on McEvoy’s comparison to Whistler:

\(^{391}\) Akers-Douglas and Hendra, *Divine People*, 82.
Mr. Ambrose McEvoy, whose art is coming into high repute, and whose name certainly suggests a Northern origin, has one of the most original and powerful pictures in the exhibition, “Virginia Graham” (213), a child who, from her pose, might be a relation of the Miss Alexander whom Whistler made famous. She has flaxen hair, wears a white dress, is seen against an emerald sofa, and is painted with an easy mastery that is quite delightful, while the pictorial value of the colour scheme is great.\(^{392}\)

The combination of the emerald green sofa and the red patterned carpet contrasts Whistler’s dreary tones and sparsely-furnished interior. McEvoy has been influenced by the pose of Cicely Alexander but has made his portrait of Virginia Graham a ‘McEvoy portrait’ in both artistic style and composition.\(^{393}\) All three of these 1915 portraits, *Virginia, Daughter of Captain Harry Graham, Silver and Grey and The Artist’s Mother*, are recognisable as McEvoy portraits and demonstrate a new style of portraiture for the artist, with detailed faces, and drapery and interiors made up of looser brushstrokes. Each portrait is realistically painted and yet, unlike the highly-finished, almost photographic likenesses of John Singer Sargent, McEvoy has introduced an increasingly impressionistic style in to his work, evoking a sense of movement in his sitters.

Although 1915 was the year that McEvoy predominantly worked through the influence of Whistler in order to develop his individual style of portraiture, McEvoy also revisited the motif of the mirror in his painting *Madame* (fig. 205), a portrait of the artist’s wife, Mary. This painting represents a critical point in the artist’s career as its success made McEvoy famous overnight. McEvoy commenced this work in the latter half of 1914 but it was completed in the early weeks of 1915, before it was exhibited at The National Portrait Society in March.\(^{394}\) The society must have predicted that this work would be successful with the British public as it was ‘given a place of honour in the large gallery.’\(^{395}\)

*Madame* depicts Mary McEvoy leaning on a mantelpiece, dressed in a black dress and shawl with her right hand over her shoulder. She looks directly at the viewer and her profile is reflected in a large, gilt mirror. The mirror in *Madame* was described in the *Westminster Gazette* as a ‘remote world of half-being [where] Madame’s soul is poised’, an interesting analogy giving this painting the suggestion of

\(^{392}\) “Royal Scottish Academy,” *Yorkshire Post*, May 9, 1916, 4.

\(^{393}\) Same pose used for portrait of ‘Tink’, Joan Claudia Johnson (fig. 204) (1920) “‘Tink’ by Ambrose McEvoy,” *Colour Magazine*, April 1921.


the supernatural. The strong lighting that McEvoy uses in this portrait gives the room added depth and the sitter displays intense chiaroscuro across her face and body. McEvoy has experimented with this composition previously with a pencil sketch of a woman, presumably Mary, holding a baby above the same fireplace and reflected in the same mirror (fig. 206) and in 1913, with his composition *Myrtle* (fig. 169). Comparisons between both *Myrtle* and *Madame* and Whistler’s Symphony in White no. 2: The Little White Girl (fig. 207) can be made.

However, what is most striking about *Madame* is the visual effect that McEvoy creates using the motif of the mirror. At first glance the reflection recorded by McEvoy in *Madame* is easy to overlook. The sunlight streams into the room from an unseen source and refracts off of the back of the glass, to create a patch of hazy blue colouring. This is a familiar effect but not one that is often captured by artists. This painterly detail was noticed by P.G. Konody, writing for *The Observer*, in his review of *Madame* in the 1915 National Portrait Society exhibition:

>Whilst a full discussion of the unusually interesting exhibition of the National Portrait Society at the Grosvenor Gallery must be deferred until next week, common justice demands that a few words should be said about a picture which is not only the clou of the entire exhibition, but which may without exaggeration be described as a masterpiece. This term is too often lightly used, but Mr Ambrose McEvoy’s “Madame” is one of those rare modern works of art which, without any striving either to rival the achievement of some famous master or to produce a thing from startling novelty, holds you spellbound from the moment you enter the gallery.

>“Madame” represents a woman wrapped in a faded black shawl, standing in a room, with her right elbow and left forearm leaning on a mantel-board, above which is a gilt-framed mirror with a reflection of the woman’s face and bust. That is all. And it is painted with a palette almost exclusively confined to golden yellows and browns and greys. But it is, to use Chardin’s words, not painted with pigments: it is painted by feeling, with the rarest appreciation of values, of the play of light, of surfaces and textures. The very slight blue on the reflection in the mirror is a marvel of subtle observation. The way in which the right hand is lost in the shadow under the chin will make every artist catch his breath. And there is a general cohesion of design and atmosphere, a knowledge of what exactly to accentuate and what to leave out, a loveliness of tone and quiet colour, that are bound to arouse enthusiasm. In some way the picture is Rembrandtesque – but only in so far as it suggests that Rembrandt might have painted like that, if he had lived through the age of Impressionism.


397 Just as Whistler includes a pink azalea in his composition, McEvoy includes a sprig of common myrtle known for its white flowers, giving *Myrtle* its title. By including a white flower in this painting, McEvoy also alludes to Whistler’s ‘white’ title.

What Konody inadvertently reviews is McEvoy’s new-found confidence in producing this portrait. *Madame* is the outcome of several attempts exploring the motif of the mirror over a number of years through works including *In a Mirror, The Earring, The Thames from the Artist’s House* and *Myrtle*. This picture was created from an increased knowledge of technical skill, resulting from both independent and formal training, and the influence of Whistler between 1911 and 1915. Just as Clutton-Brock in 1911 used the adjective ‘quiet’ to describe McEvoy’s use of colours, Konody describes McEvoy’s tones in *Madame* as a harmony of ‘golden yellows and browns’, and suggests that this work was ‘painted by feeling’ rather than pigments. This is a painting that illustrates a cohesion of design and a knowledge of what to accentuate and what to exclude. Almost certainly unaware of McEvoy’s earlier interest in Rembrandt, Konody compares *Madame* to the Dutch golden-age artist, as if it were a modern reinvention of Rembrandt’s work.

*Madame*, ‘hailed by the leading critics of the day as a masterpiece’, has been described as the pivotal work in McEvoy’s career when he reached success as one of the leading portraitists of the early twentieth century. However, he was yet to achieve notable success with the upper classes. *Madame* was well-reviewed and, having taken inspiration from Whistler’s *Symphony in White, No. 2, The Little White Girl* (fig. 207), it continued McEvoy’s association with the aesthetic artist. The *Westminster Gazette* wrote that *Madame* was the ‘finest work’ that McEvoy had produced. However, *Madame* is a portrait of the artist’s wife rather than a portrait commission. It has all the characteristics of an interior rather than a portrait and it is certainly not representative of the portraits for which McEvoy became known, produced between 1916 and his death in 1927. By 1915, McEvoy had created an intimate portrait-type which was becoming increasingly appreciated by the public and increasingly saleable. However, *Madame* is representative of a significant step in the artist’s career but is not the pivotal work responsible for his success as a society portraitist.

*Mrs Cecil Baring, 1916*

*Mrs Cecil Baring* (fig. 188) was the pivotal portrait in McEvoy’s career when he established himself as a successful portraitist. It reinterpreted and challenged Whistler’s work in its compositional format
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and painterly technique and, as it has previously been discussed, is comparable to The Princess from the Land of Porcelain (fig. 189). Although the pose that McEvoy chose for Mrs Baring has been inspired by Whistler’s Princess, it can also be argued that both Whistler and McEvoy’s sitters are posed similarly to Giovanni Arnolfini’s wife in the Arnolfini Portrait (fig. 131). The Arnolfini Portrait inspired a fascination with the motif of the mirror for both McEvoy and Whistler’s generations of artists.

As this chapter has already examined, McEvoy experimented with the motif of the mirror from 1911 until 1915 with paintings such as In a Mirror (fig. 179), The Earring (fig. 167) and Madame (fig. 205). Although, like Siana (fig. 171), McEvoy has not included a mirror in his portrait of Mrs Baring, he is still playing with the effect of reflection in this composition. He chooses to mirror Whistler’s sitter in Princess from the Land of Porcelain by inverting Mrs Baring to face the opposite direction. McEvoy has painted around Mrs Baring’s figure, following the direction of her body rather than the horizontal planes of her surroundings, allowing the body and the background to become almost interchangeable. Although it is likely that this aura of paint covers pentimenti, particularly the position of Baring’s right arm which appears to have changed position (fig. 208), this aura contributes to the overall effect of the reflective surface of a mirror.

The floor, skirting board and wall have been painted as though distant and out of focus, giving the background the effect of a reflected image. Very little detail in the background has been described by the artist. Although Baring’s face can be interpreted as detailed, on closer analysis the impressionistic paintwork does not provide the sharp and focused contours of a realistic likeness, but a clouded effect of an image as if seen through a secondary medium. Although less overt than the reflection in The Earring, McEvoy has created a similar effect in the background of Mrs Cecil Baring to Anaïs’ reflected image. His inclusion of streaks of lighter-coloured paint on the surface of the mirror in The Earring to highlight the glass surface can be seen more subtly through the vertical brushstrokes of paint on either side of Mrs Baring’s dress. The production of Mrs Cecil Baring resulted in McEvoy establishing a unique impressionistic portrait-type, an ethereal formula that he would continue to use for portraits until his death. The detailed face of Mrs Baring, the loose and abstract brushstrokes of her clothes and lower body, and her setting in an impressionistic background, can be seen in dozens of McEvoy portraits thereafter. He replicates several characteristics of Baring’s full-length portrait, including the strong frontal lighting casting a dominating shadow on the wall behind the following year in his portrait of Consuelo, Duchess of Marlborough (fig. 209).
It was important for McEvoy to light *Mrs Cecil Baring* effectively in order to create the portrait’s phosphorescent quality. Daphne Pollen (née Baring), in her memoirs, recalled how McEvoy manipulated artificial light in order to produce her mother’s portrait:

One or two naked electric light bulbs, their flexes recklessly pierced by the drawing-pins which fixed them to handy pieces of furniture, provided warm light from below. It was this use of mixed lighting which enabled him to work all day throughout London winters. The canvas was over 7ft high, and to reach the face area of the picture McEvoy sprang on to a box and leapt back off it to the other side of the room with amazing agility. He worked fast and furiously with great concentration. This picture was shown at the Grosvenor Gallery and, for better or worse, made McEvoy’s name as a “fashionable portrait painter”. It was followed by one of Consuelo Marlborough, now at Blenheim.\(^{401}\)

Although Maude Baring is lit predominantly with artificial light, as seen by the warm glow on her skin, there is the effect of chiaroscuro on her face and neck, and the shadow cast with her body on the wall behind. There is a silver-coloured natural light reflecting from her glossy black hair and on the top of her right shoulder. This light is from a skylight, fitted into the ceiling of McEvoy’s studio and remembered by both Daphne Pollen and McEvoy’s grandson who visited the studio as a small child. This source of natural light, however, would not have been able to produce the metallic effect of the reflective material of Mrs Baring’s dress. By experimenting with light and the way it reflects off of different surfaces in this portrait, McEvoy has been able to create the iridescent quality that made his portraits identifiable amongst the work of his contemporaries.

McEvoy was not the only artist to experiment with light, although he is perhaps one of the earliest artists to use artificial light to create different artistic effects. Several years later in 1930, William Orpen’s newly renovated home and studio was illustrated in an article by *Country Life*. Orpen can be seen experimenting with different effects using natural light, allowing sitters to be lit from both sides with varying strengths. ‘From the ceiling hang a couple of colossal witches’ balls, and here and there on the walls is a convex mirror... the light is set dancing and curving by half a dozen chandeliers and glass balls hanging high up in the roof-shaped ceiling.’\(^{402}\) McEvoy, having also experimented with the use of mirrors in his portraits and interiors, is working much earlier than Orpen on the changing effects of light in his portrait of Mrs Cecil Baring.
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\(^{401}\) Daphne Pollen, *I Remember I Remember*, 156.


Mixing artificial and natural light not only allowed McEvoy to create the effect of reflection on Mrs Baring’s dress but also encouraged the artist to illustrate the separation of different colours across the composition. The inclusion of a multitude of different colours in close proximity, combined with McEvoy’s impressionistic technique of erratic brushstrokes, creates a prismatic effect, as though the light is being refracted between the material of the dress and the surface of the canvas. This effect is described by Truth in a review of Mrs Cecil Baring at the IS exhibition at the Grosvenor Gallery in 1916: ‘Mr. McEvoy becomes more and more transcendental in his “Honble. Mrs. Cecil Baring,” whom one expects every moment to dissolve into a rainbow.’ The prismatic colours combined with McEvoy’s impressionistic technique reinforce the theory that McEvoy is trying to imitate the characteristics of reflection and the surface of a mirror in his portrait of Maude Baring.

From 1916, McEvoy’s portraits are described as ethereal on several occasions, ‘His ethereal vision of his subjects is one of his chief characteristics....’ It is this quality of ethereality that makes McEvoy’s portraits unique and modern during this period. In 1917, Truth reviewed the National Portrait Society exhibition and described McEvoy as:

He has the trick of making all of his sitters phosphorescent – and many women like being phosphorescent and fair and satiny – and he is succumbing to this tendency more and more. It is, of course, very jolly to paint mother-of-pearl better than anyone else, and gleaming skins and satins are no doubt delightful subjects – if you like that sort of thing.

The description of McEvoy painting ‘mother-of-pearl better than anyone else’ draws on his prismatic use of colours and the characteristic iridescent effect he creates. The mixture of artificial and natural light, combined with a rich palette of different tones has led to McEvoy’s portraits being described as both ethereal and phosphorescent. Both descriptions conjure the iridescence of a fairy world belonging to a scene from A Midsummer Night’s Dream or a painting by Edward Robert Hughes (fig. 210). These ethereal and phosphorescent effects, alongside McEvoy’s sparsely furnished interiors and his association with Whistler, certainly made the artist’s work recognisable and increasingly popular with the British and American elite. However, there were other reasons why McEvoy’s style of ethereal portraiture was popular in 1916. At the time McEvoy painted this portrait of Mrs Cecil Baring, Britain
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was half way through the First World War. Although the war did not change ‘the routine of daily life’ for the Barings, like most families they knew several friends and colleagues, as well as a cousin Dermont Browne, who were killed on the front line. Daphne Pollen recalled that ‘one saw sorrow reflected on every face’ during the war. This war was unprecedented in its devastation and McEvoy’s portraiture was able to provide escapism for clients, particularly for women who were unable to contribute to the efforts on the front line.

The success of Mrs Cecil Baring appears to have increased the prices of McEvoy’s portraits even whilst it was being exhibited at the Grosvenor Gallery between May and July 1916. A month into the exhibition, the gallery wrote to McEvoy to confirm the changes made to his price list. Initially McEvoy agreed to paint Mrs Baring for £250 in a 50x40 inch format, a format that later changed to full-length. During this 1916 exhibition McEvoy changed his price to 400 gns (£420) for a 50x40 portrait, a considerable sum of money. Although it is not surprising that McEvoy charged more for an exhibited portrait at the IS as the Grosvenor Gallery would have taken commission on sales, a mark-up of £170 is a substantial increase within a year. This increase is an indication of McEvoy’s accelerating success within just a few months of painting Mrs Baring. This portrait maintained its importance in McEvoy’s oeuvre. It was exhibited at McEvoy’s solo exhibition at the Duveen Brothers galleries in New York in 1920, it was one of the largest portraits exhibited in the exhibition, and it contributed to the artist’s popularity in the United States.

McEvoy, with his portrait Mrs Cecil Baring, had reached a success that would continue until his death in 1927. He had become ‘the only painter in the world.’
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CHAPTER 5
SARGENT AND THE NEW ‘NEW WOMAN’

When John Singer Sargent died in 1925, British art sought to find his successor. Sargent had dominated portraiture as the leading painter of his generation, and although there had been several portraitists such as Giovanni Boldini and Antonio de la Gândara working in Europe and America during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in similar styles, ‘Sargent had no serious competition in the field from the mid-1890s until he painted almost the last of his portraits in oil in 1908.’\(^{411}\) He had, however, inspired a younger generation of artists who became contenders to succeed him, including John Lavery and the eminent Philip de László, who ‘effortlessly... assumed Sargent’s mantle as society’s favourite painter’, according to Richard Ormond and Elaine Kilmurray.\(^{412}\) McEvoy’s friend William Orpen was also considered a contender for the role of leading portraitist by his biographer Bruce Arnold, and most recently Bruce Redford proposed a ‘both/and interpretation’ which argues that both de László and Orpen were equal candidates for the position.\(^{413}\)

However, the portrait that is written about as a highlight of the RA exhibition the year of Sargent’s death, and is mentioned almost in the same breath as the search for Sargent’s successor is *Meraud Guinness* by Ambrose McEvoy (fig. 225):


\(^{412}\) Elaine Kilmurray and Richard Ormond, *John Singer Sargent: Complete Paintings Volume III: The Later Portraits* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 11. Both Sargent and McEvoy had artistic exchanges with the artist John Lavery. Lavery wrote to McEvoy in 1916 to thank him for sending a picture which will be hung in Mrs Peto’s art stall (probably Mrs Ralph Peto), and Sargent and Lavery physically exchanged pictures as gifts — Sargent produced a portrait of Lavery’s wife, Lady Hazel Lavery, which Sargent inscribed ‘To Lady Lavery l’echange amical/John S. Sargent 1923’ and the same year Lavery gave Sargent a portrait of Joe Childs inscribed ‘To John Sargent from John Lavery 1923.’ LET/178/1916, MEP. Sir John Lavery, Portrait of Joe Childs, ‘Irish Pictures’ sale, Christie’s London, May 19, 2000, Lot 60.

The successor to Sargent is not yet in sight. Still there is one portrait at least that may well remain in the memory of the visitor. This is Miss Meraud Guinness, by Ambrose McEvoy. The artist seems to have floated his vision of a young girl on to the canvas by some curious magic. The effect may be for many too ethereal and unsubstantial. It may be said there is a lack of structure beneath the vague drapery, no bones in the hand or fingers. But then it is not in the unseen skeleton of the sitter that the interest in a portrait lies. Doubtless if very many artists saw with the eyes of Mr. McEvoy or Mr. Sims, there would be a sense that the truth that “we are such stuff as dreams are made of” was being insisted on too strongly.\(^{414}\)

There is no evidence amongst the McEvoy Estate Papers, that McEvoy and John Singer Sargent knew each other well, if at all. They would have undoubtedly crossed paths, as both artists exhibited at the same galleries and societies, including the NEAC, and they would have had artist friends in common. However, Sargent was twenty-one years older than McEvoy – he was at the peak of his career when McEvoy was still a child and by the time McEvoy had reached his own fame and success in 1916, Sargent had closed his studio and retired from painting society portraits.

From an early age, McEvoy would have known the work of Sargent. He would have seen his work exhibited in London and it is likely that McEvoy aspired to follow in his footsteps and become the leading portraitist of his generation.\(^{415}\) Superficially, these two artists can be compared as they were both predominantly portrait painters; their sitters were primarily the upper classes, and it can be argued that their most accomplished works were portraits of women. However, Bruce Redford, in his most recent book *John Singer Sargent and the Art of Allusion*, does not even entertain the idea that McEvoy was a contender for Sargent’s succession as the leading portraitist, after Sargent’s death in 1925. De Laszlo and Orpen were considered active contenders but not McEvoy, even though his style of portraiture was directly compared to Sargent after his death:\(^{416}\)

Though he worked with Mr. John and Mr. Sickert, it is questionable if Mr. McEvoy had not more affinity with Mr. Sargent of whose methods in painting his might be called a sublimation. His aim was to get the essence of a scene of a personality by suggestion, reducing the actual statement to the interplay of coloured light, often warm and cold contrasted.\(^{417}\)


Was Redford wrong to discount McEvoy as Sargent’s successor, or was The Times author misguided in comparing these two artists who have, seemingly, so little in common? As this quotation illustrates, both artists strove to capture the personality of their sitters by using an intense understanding of tone, as well as creating an effective likeness of their sitter. Both artists also capitalised on a market of portrait commissions that was driven by the transatlantic elite, and both were later criticised for their success by being undermined as outmoded and old-fashioned:

While John S. Sargent was alive – and especially in his later years – it was the fashion of superior persons to regard him as representative of an outworn mode, or even, where two or three of the very highest brows were gathered together, as a mere mass-producer of decorations for the homes of the idle rich.  

In the same way McEvoy’s attitude, though charming, was “old-fashioned,” or at any rate it was not the attitude that the modern woman likes us to believe she desires from men. For who can deny that the modern woman wants us to think of her not as a romantic individual but rather as one example out of thousands of a new clean-cut, and alarmingly efficient type?

Although it is easy to argue that Sargent and McEvoy only painted the ‘idle rich’, a view that will be explored in greater detail throughout this chapter, both artists also painted a number of upper-class women who were professionally-motivated and wanted to break free of societal restraints.

Sargent was at the height of his popularity during the age of the New Woman in the 1890s, an early feminist movement that surely would have influenced his portraiture. In comparison, McEvoy’s ethereal and contemporaneously impressionistic portraits of women in shapeless, almost androgynous garments of the 1920s also reflect the changing tastes of a new generation of women, and can be considered different in style and subject when compared to the tiny corseted waists and minute feet of Sargent’s delicate beauties of the 1880s and 1890s. It has been argued that the ‘clinched-in waists and tiny feet’ of Sargent’s upper-class portraits ‘declare the women’s exemption from useful labour’. Contrastingly, McEvoy’s upper-class sitters in their loose-fitting and less restrictive garments had the physical ability to undertake a profession and several of these women did, particularly during the First World War.

Although the New Woman was predominantly an 1890s phenomenon that affected the middle-classes, can these upper-class women of the 1910s and 1920s be considered new-age New Women and if so, how? In this chapter it will be argued that McEvoy was responsible for bringing the concept of the 1890s New Woman to portraiture of the upper-classes in the mid-late 1910s and 1920s. However, in order to do this, McEvoy had to establish himself as a leading portraitist of the elite just as Sargent had done twenty years before. In order to assess whether McEvoy was directly influenced by Sargent and his portraiture in order to succeed in gaining a similar class of clients, I will conduct a clear comparison of the two artist’s works early in this chapter. Individual sitters will then be explored to establish the role of the New Woman, if any, in Sargent and McEvoy’s portraits from the 1890s until McEvoy’s death. This will be conducted with the intention of demonstrating that McEvoy did not romanticise his sitters, but by using Sargent’s influence, he capitalised on the changing role of women during this period by giving a new class of New Woman a visual platform with which to express themselves.

A Brief Comparison

As McEvoy and Sargent’s sitters were predominantly upper-class members of the transatlantic elite, there is a distinct overlap in their sitters, with many of these women wishing to have their portraits painted on several occasions over a number of years by the latest modern artists. Several of Sargent’s sitters were also painted by European artists based in France and Italy, for example Giovanni Boldini, and Antonio de la Gandara – a favourite artist amongst the Parisian elite. Gandara, like Sargent, also painted Virginie Amélie Avegno Gautreau (best known as Madame X). With Sargent’s style presiding, it became necessary for McEvoy to produce portraits that to some degree resembled Sargent, but also to produce something novel for his sitters to justify the portrait’s expense. McEvoy achieved this through his ethereal-style, which not only set him apart from other artists, but was partially responsible for his popularity as a portrait painter. Several articles described McEvoy as a leading society portraitist with a distinctive and recognisable style from the mid-1910s. The Tatler in 1917 wrote that, ‘The Ambrose McEvoy’s swarm, of course, for no society beauty is really one, is she, nowadays, until the McEvoy has duly immortalised her features and endowed her, too, with that touch of the spirituelle and devilment which is the most industrious artist’s most priceless charm?’ 421 The Sketch in 1919 wrote that, ‘Mr. Ambrose McEvoy is, perhaps, the most popular Society portrait-painter

of the day, and the list of his sitters includes nearly every beautiful, fashionable and well-known woman. Discussion as to his present method of – apparently – careless and unfinished work is rife.  

Finally, the Illustrated London News wrote that ‘Mr. Ambrose McEvoy has for some time been one of the most popular of Society portrait-painters. His ethereal vision of his subjects is one of his chief characteristics…’.

There are certainly comparisons to be made between Sargent and McEvoy’s portraits. For example, Helen Dunham by Sargent and Mrs Claude Johnson in Blue and Gold by McEvoy (fig. 211-212) have both been similarly posed, as have Sargent’s Mrs Louis Raphael and Mary McEvoy painted by her husband in Madame (fig. 213 & 205), which could suggest that McEvoy was taking direct influence from Sargent’s work. The portraits of McEvoy’s elite do bear a resemblance to Sargent’s portraits – as a comparison of four full-length portraits by McEvoy and by Sargent directly shows (fig. 214). Sargent often places his sitters in classical scenery, drawing inspiration from eighteenth-century portraiture by Reynolds, as well as seventeenth-century portraiture by Velasquez and Van Dyck. McEvoy and Sargent dress their sitters fashionably, they are often directly engaging with the viewer, and each portrait exudes luxury, although McEvoy has stripped back the traditional trappings of wealth from their interior settings, leaving his sitters against mottled, dream-like backgrounds. McEvoy continues Sargent’s tradition of realistically painting sumptuous clothing in a variety of different textures. For example, Sargent has constructed the texture of the Duchess of Portland’s dress by painting it in angular sections of colour (fig. 215); each area is defined by a different tone and it is these combined sections that give the effect of a satin texture when viewed at a distance. This is different to but no less effective than McEvoy’s rendering of the iridescent and metallic shine of Mrs Baring’s dress (fig. 216) which is made up of dozens of individual stripes of varying tones.

There are also some examples of the same sitters commissioning portraits from both Sargent and McEvoy. Eugenia Errázuriz was one such example and was painted and sketched several times by Sargent (fig. 217-218). She went on to be painted by McEvoy in 1919 in his later portrait style including bold strokes of red and black in order to capture the patterning of her dress (fig. 219). This portrait

422 “Much Discussed: Some of the New ‘McEvoy’s,’” The Sketch, October 29, 1919, 159.


424 As it has been stated in Chapter 4, Madame can also be directly related to Whistler’s Symphony in White, No. 2: The Little White Girl.
was exhibited at the IS the year it was completed. Errázuriz would have almost certainly met McEvoy through her nephew, the Chilean diplomat Antonio ‘Tony’ de Gandarillas, and his wife Juanita who was painted along with her children by McEvoy in 1917. Errázuriz herself was considered a patron of modernism and a leader of fashionable society in Paris. Amongst her friends were Picasso, Stravinsky, and Jean Cocteau. She was responsible for introducing Picasso to the art dealers Nathan Wildenstein and Paul Rosenberg, as well as Sergei Diaghilev the founder of the Ballet Russes. McEvoy’s portrait of Errázuriz will not be discussed in detail in this chapter as so little is known about it. There are no surviving letters from Eugenia in the McEvoy Estate Papers and her portrait remained in the possession of Mary McEvoy until it was acquired by Bolton Museum and Art Gallery. It almost certainly remained in the artist’s estate after it was painted as Eugenia Errázuriz did not like it as a portrait, or possibly did not pay for it. Bolton Art Gallery and Museum deaccessioned this work and sold it through Bonhams in 2011 as ‘Madame Errasuiz’ with no research accompanying this work and no mention of the importance of this pioneering modernist sitter. Errázuriz was also painted by several other artists of the period including Paul Helleu, Augustus John, and Giovanni Boldini whose style of portraiture has often been compared to Sargent although Boldini was fourteen years older.

McEvoy and Sargent also painted members of the Astor family. These women were from one of the wealthiest families in the world and each artist chose to interpret their sitters differently. Sargent famously painted Nancy Astor in 1908 (fig. 220), two years after her marriage to Waldorf Astor. Her tiny waist is representative of the Victorian age of beauty rather than that of the New Woman. Although Sargent had predominantly abandoned portrait commissions by this time, he painted Astor in 1909 not in a new or modern style, but as he had depicted women in the 1880s and 1890s, set in a classical landscape, contained by a series of Doric columns with sunlight and trees beyond. This likeness is similar to that of her sister-in-law, Pauline Astor (fig. 221) who was painted by Sargent ten years previously also dressed in white, a blue satin shawl draped over her arms, teasingly pulled at by the King Charles cavalier spaniel at her heels. Pauline Astor is set in a Gainsborough-esque landscape amongst autumn leaves with a lake behind her, presumably taking a walk through her country estate.

Although both portraits of Nancy and Pauline Astor are accomplished, neither break free from the influence of eighteenth-century Grand Manner portraiture, nor challenge public perceptions of these individuals as New Women. They are disconnected from their personal achievements. Nancy Astor was the first female MP to sit in parliament and in 1937 Pauline Astor, who had become Mrs Spender
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425 Lydia Lopokova who McEvoy also painted, toured with the Ballet Russes from 1910.
Clay in 1904, had been asked to stand as prospective Conservative candidate for Tonbridge to replace her late husband.426 Mrs Pauline Spender Clay is almost unrecognisable in McEvoy’s 1916 portrait (fig. 222) which was described by the Newcastle Chronicle as a ‘dainty likeness’. 427 She does not appear to have aged since her 1898 portrait and her slim figure is dressed as a modern bohemian rather than, as in Sargent’s portrait, a Victorian reinvention of an eighteenth-century socialite. Mrs Spender Clay wears a loose-fitting dress drawn in at the waist with a contemporary haori jacket over the top; her hair is loosely pulled back and wrapped around her neck is a string of beads. This painting is a forerunner to portraits of the 1920s, such as Paul Swan’s portrait of Isadora Duncan (1922) (fig. 223) which depicts the dancer wistfully looking over her shoulder, hand at her chest in a loose-fitting dress and a comparable string of beads around her neck. McEvoy has chosen not to depict Pauline Spender Clay in a setting, instead concentrating on her likeness and her clothes in a half-length portrait.

McEvoy also painted the younger generation of Astors in a portrait of the fifteen-year-old Ava Alice Muriel Astor, known as Alice (fig. 224). Alice was described as ‘beautiful in a haunting fashion, bright over a broad spectrum of knowledge and, of course, rich.’ 428 She was the daughter of Ava Lowle Willing and John Jacob Astor IV who died on the Titanic in 1912. This portrait by McEvoy is thought to have been painted five years after her father’s death and seven years before her first marriage to Russian Prince Sergei Platonovich Obolensky Neledinsky-Meletsky in 1924. Although Alice looks more mature than fifteen in this portrait, it is thought to have been completed by McEvoy in August 1917 as two letters mentioning this portrait survive amongst the McEvoy Estate Papers. Her age might also account for the fact that this portrait does not appear to have been exhibited at the time of its completion. 429 McEvoy writes to his wife Mary that, ‘All well, got on with Lady Wimbourne very well today. Alice Astor did not come.’ 430 A half-length portrait of Lady Wimbourne was completed in 1917 and exhibited at the Grosvenor Gallery in November of that year. In a second letter to his wife McEvoy writes ‘I have finished Miss Astor today which is a good thing – a great success. So I feel more cheerful.’ 431 In this


429 Alice Astor did not come out in fashionable society until 1919 when she was presented at court as a debutante. “Fashionable and Personal,” Kent & Sussex Courier, January 10, 1919, 5.

430 LET/995, MEP.

431 LET/993, MEP.
same letter McEvoy wishes his son Michael ‘many happy returns’ presumably in celebration of his birthday which dates the completion of Alice Astor’s portrait to August 1917.

Both portraits by McEvoy of Pauline Spender Clay and Alice Astor contrast strikingly with Sargent’s paintings of Pauline and Nancy Astor. Both of Sargent’s portraits are full-lengths set in exterior scenes and painted with soft and carefully-applied brushstrokes giving these portraits a highly realistic finish. In contrast, McEvoy creates abstracted impressionistic backgrounds and paints both sitters half-length in a more intimate format. It is easier to see McEvoy’s working technique in Alice Astor’s portrait, as the portrait of Mrs Spender Clay is untraced. At first glance it looks as though Alice is looking directly at the viewer, but on closer inspection her eyes look beyond the canvas and the viewer to her left. Similar tones have been used to paint both the background and Alice’s clothes and jewellery. This portrait has been produced quickly, areas of canvas grounding that has not been covered can be seen in the bottom right of the canvas and at the top in the centre. McEvoy uses quick, thin layers of oil paint to produce this likeness, the exception being Alice’s face which, typical for McEvoy, is much more carefully built up and detailed. Her face and neck display chiaroscuro and a warm lighting, suggesting that McEvoy lit Alice using artificial rather than natural light. As the string of beads drops from her neck, their painted detail decreases into shapes almost as abstract as the bold brown and orange brushstrokes that make up her painted clothes. As was noted in one of the letters from McEvoy to his wife, Alice Astor did not turn up for one of her sittings. The result of this may have been a quicker portrait produced in just a couple of sittings, which is why this portrait has the appearance of one of McEvoy’s sketchier but still confidently-produced works. In both portraits McEvoy suggests a change in portraiture from Sargent’s Victorian full-lengths to intimate likenesses enhanced by his unique ethereality. Although there is a distinct overlap in the class and identity of McEvoy and Sargent’s sitters, McEvoy’s portraits are increasingly modern in style, intended to appeal to a new generation of aristocracy and an upper-class New Woman for the twentieth century.

Meraud Guinness, 1925

_Meraud Guinness_ (fig. 225) by McEvoy would have almost certainly been completed by the artist in the months leading up to the RA exhibition which took place in May 1925, and would have been
painted to celebrate Meraud’s twenty-first birthday in June. Unlike many of McEvoy’s other sitters at this time, Meraud is not wearing one of the typical shapeless dresses of the 1920s but is dressed in a party dress reminiscent of a turn-of-the-century debutante. It should be noted that the comparison to Charles Sims’ portrait of Mrs Konstam in the same exhibition, and written about in this quotation is apt (fig. 226). Meraud’s figure, tall and thin, is almost pre-pubescent, with her tiny waist pulled in to contrast the plumes of organza-style fabric that adorns both her skirt and her off-the-shoulder sleeves. Her dress is similar in both style and material to the dresses worn by Sargent’s sitters, including Mrs Carl Meyer and Lady Agnew of Lochnaw (figs. 246 & 249). Meraud is similarly posed, looking out towards the viewer. Although arguably not one of McEvoy’s most accomplished portraits, it was well received whilst on display at the RA and was reviewed as, ‘A triumph of virtuosity is Mr McEvoy’s portrait of Miss Meraud Guinness [sic]. It is altogether a charming thing, the sweetest and prettiest picture any fond mamma could ever desire.’ The Tatler described Miss Meraud Guinness as:

The beauties among the débутantes and young married women are conspicuous by their absence, but the almost solitary one, Ambrose McEvoy’s portrait of Miss Meraud Guinness, in which he has caught the very spirit and aura of youth, would do more towards the reaction to the less modern type of girl than all the wide trousers in the kingdom. It is surely one of the best things he has ever done.

In many ways McEvoy is going against the modern girl in his portrait of Meraud in both her style of clothes, as previously mentioned, and the way she is sitting. As this author implies, McEvoy’s portrait is only as modern as the fashion of ‘wide trousers’ in the way in which he successfully captures her youth. Meraud is described as a ‘girl’ and can be seen nervously fiddling with her fingers, and her doe-eyed expression demonstrates slight bewilderment. The awkwardness or nervousness of Meraud’s pose can also be compared to Sargent’s portrait of Helen Dunham (fig. 211). After McEvoy’s death, the critic Frank Rutter used Meraud’s portrait as an example of McEvoy’s child portraiture, ‘[McEvoy was] Vastly superior to Romney as a draughtsman...Not even Sir Joshua [Reynolds] himself ever painted a child portrait with more charm and winsomeness than McEvoy’s “Daphne” and “Meraud
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Guinness [sic]...”436 However, Meraud was not a young debutante in McEvoy’s portrait, she was not pre-pubescent, she was a twenty-one-year-old woman in 1925 but still single and still under the control of her plutocratic family.

Reproductions of Meraud do not do this portrait justice. Amongst the McEvoy Estate Papers were two poor-quality black and white reproductions of this portrait and at first glance, it appeared as though contemporary reviewers of this work were delusional in their enthusiasm for McEvoy’s skill. However, through substantial investigative research into Meraud’s family and the history of this portrait, I was able to trace this work to a private house in London and had the opportunity to see it in person. Even in the luxurious room in which the portrait of Meraud Guinness hangs, this painting cannot fail to captivate the viewer. It is a 50x40 inches canvas and although the colour looks quite uniform from this photograph, it is made up of fragments of luminescent blues, pinks and whites. Lit from above, this portrait radiates colour and ethereality with the way in which McEvoy has structured the layers of pigments. The face, neck and hands have been painted with careful coloured glazes but the fabric of her dress has been painted entirely differently. The brushstrokes are erratic and abstract. They display a kinetic energy that gives the portrait the illusion of continuous movement or fluidity. This portrait currently hangs next to a portrait of Meraud’s mother, Mrs Bridget Guinness (fig. 227), which is also a 50x40 inches canvas and was probably the painting completed in 1920 and exhibited at the Grafton Gallery.437 Bridget faces the same direction as her daughter but is contrastingly painted in black, exuding confidence through her pose. Both women look directly at the viewer and their familial connection can be seen from their similar coloured hair and hairstyle in these two portraits. It is as though by placing Meraud’s portrait alongside the portrait of her mother, there is an expectation or a longing for Meraud to follow a similar path. However, this was not the case.

Meraud Guinness, as part of the generation of ‘Bright Young Things’ like Lois Sturt and Zita Jungman who will be studied in more detail later in this chapter, became ‘bored with the more vacuous occupations of her own social set’.438 She studied at the Slade School of Fine Art under Henry Tonks, just as McEvoy had thirty years before and went on to continue studying in New York and Paris. Meraud pursued an unconventional life for an upper-class young woman born at the turn of the twentieth century. She became an artist and author, and was involved with the artist Christopher

Wood with whom she planned to elope. She then studied painting with Francia Picabia and at the Gallerias Van Leer in Paris, where Meraud was setting up her work to exhibit, she met Alvaro Guevara, the Chilean artist. The work that Meraud exhibited at this Parisian exhibition is said to have been surrealist in genre and was well reviewed, although considered unusual. She signed her work at that time under the pseudonym Michael.\textsuperscript{439} Three months later, Meraud and Guevara married and they had a daughter, Bridget, who was known as Nini or Alladine. Alladine Guevara published a biography of her mother in 2007 in which she stated that after her mother left her father for an artist known as Maurice, Alladine was taken away from her mother at the age of five by her grandfather Benjamin Guinness. Guinness disinherited his daughter Meraud and kept her child from her for ten years until Alladine eventually made contact.\textsuperscript{440} Although at the time that McEvoy was painting Meraud she was a socialite and art student, and the daughter of a wealthy banker, there were several other women that McEvoy painted including Meraud who would defy their traditional roles as upper-class women to take on an independent and professional life as a new ‘New Woman’ of the 1920s and beyond.

**Butlers, Sitwells and Swintons**

Although McEvoy was directly compared to Sargent in *The Times*’ 1935 article on page 174 of this thesis, and it was implied that McEvoy had the potential to be Sargent’s successor in the RA exhibition review of *Meraud Guinness* in 1925, it is not known if McEvoy either wanted or aspired to be like Sargent. Sargent was known for his accomplished portraits of Victorian and Edwardian women from the 1880s and was ‘among America’s most famous citizens in 1900.’\textsuperscript{441} However, unlike Whistler who maintained a reputation as an experimental artist throughout his career, Sargent’s portraits have sometimes been considered a compromise between traditionalism and modernism.\textsuperscript{442} This could make his work problematic, with some writers expressing that he was merely ‘a populariser or vulgariser of avant-garde methods’, an opinion that was also associated with the later portraits by Ambrose McEvoy.\textsuperscript{443} Art critic Roger Fry criticised Sargent, writing that ‘it seems to me he brings no new or individual insight to the interpretation even of social values. Here he moves, and it is one secret

\textsuperscript{439} “Meraud Guevara”, 17.

\textsuperscript{440} Alladine Guevara, *Meraud Guinness Guevara, Ma Mère* (Monaco: Du Rocher, 2007).

\textsuperscript{441} Prettejohn, *Interpreting Sargent*, 7.

\textsuperscript{442} A viewpoint of art historians that Prettejohn discusses as unjust. Prettejohn, *Interpreting Sargent*, 7.

of his effect, quite naturally in step with the crowd'. Yet Sargent’s popularity, not only as an artist but also as a ‘tastemaker’, sparked ‘a movement within himself’ dubbed Sargentolatry by Walter Sickert in 1910.

It is likely that McEvoy wanted to succeed Sargent as the leading portraitist of his day, as implied by his comment that he ‘wish[ed] to be a painter of excellence.’ However, the work that provides direct evidence that McEvoy was looking to Sargent for inspiration is one of his earliest portraits, a double portrait of the Butler children, Mary and Daphne, painted in 1903 (fig. 228). Mary and Daphne Butler were the children of Cyril Kendall Butler, a commissioner in the Ministry of Food and a founder of the Contemporary Art Society, and one of McEvoy’s most important early clients. Mary McEvoy later described the relationship with Butler and the first painting that McEvoy painted for him:

Suddenly Sir Cyril Butler – advised (I believe) by Tonks or Steer – gave A[mbrose] a commission to paint his two girls at Bourton at the same time offering us a farm house to live in –
There we at once migrated – getting rid of our little home in Jubilee Place & at Bourton we lived for nearly three years.

Mary and Daphne were not painted by McEvoy at Bourton, Shrivenham in Oxfordshire (previously Berkshire), the Butlers’ primary residence, but at their London house, 38 Gloucester Square. It is possible from Mary McEvoy’s account that Mary and Daphne at Gloucester Square (Children of Mr C.K. Butler) was the second commissioned portrait of the children by McEvoy in 1903. However, it is also possible that Mary McEvoy mistook this picture as being painted at their country home when in fact it was painted in London.

Mary and Daphne can be compared to Sargent’s The Sitwell Family (fig. 229) in its interior setting, with each family member surrounded by ornate wooden furniture, small porcelain bowls and statuettes. Every piece of decoration gleams – the table on which Mrs Sitwell stretches out her gloved fingers is so polished that it reflects both the glass bowl filled with flowers and her dress. The glass bowl itself is shiny, as is the bright white and lightly-coloured porcelain on the sideboard behind. The hard

444 Roger Fry, Transformations: Critical and Speculative Essays on Art (New York: Chatto & Windus, 1927), 129.
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surfaces of these delicate objects are contrasted by the soft, delicate material of the sitters’ clothes and the luxurious heavy tapestry wall-hanging. The inclusion of all of these furnishings is a comment on the sitters’ taste and status – Sargent is fulfilling the wish of the sitters to be painted surrounded by their possessions, all carefully chosen to create a visual narrative of their history as seventeenth-century landed gentry.

The indistinct objects surrounding the children in McEvoy’s painting conjure a similar image. Behind the Butler children are two Parian figures, probably copies of well-known classical sculptures, although they are unidentifiable, from McEvoy’s simplified reinterpretations. Above these figures is a painting again unidentifiable but framed similarly to works sold by the Impressionist and modern art dealer Durand-Ruel. On the shelves of the glass-fronted cabinet that radiates light, outstretched across the wall like the sideboard in Sargent’s *Sitwell Family*, is indistinct glassware and porcelain. As in the Sitwell portrait, these objects glisten in the light. Arguably the most intriguing object in the room, under a glass dome on the desk in front of the cabinet, is presumably a piece of natural history, perhaps a large piece of coral, although the twisted shape of it is almost reminiscent of Rodin’s *The Kiss* (fig. 230). McEvoy has purposefully left the identity of all of these objects to the viewer’s imagination. The viewer is not supposed to be able to identify these treasured keepsakes as their purpose is to give an overall understanding of a particular taste in the room. Parian porcelain had been developed around 1847 by both Messrs Minton & Co. and W.T. Copeland. It was a highly vitrified ceramic which was sold as an alternative to marble to the middle classes. Although by the 1880s Parian porcelain had declined in popularity, by the time McEvoy painted this double portrait in 1903, Belleek Pottery in County Fermanagh had begun trading in this material again with Parian making a comeback between 1903 and 1920. Cyril Kendall Butler was from a professional family – his father was a barrister and it is possible that Butler wanted to include these figurines as a means of looking back at his middle-class beginnings and the height of Parian porcelain popularity during his own childhood. This would make these statuettes unfashionable at this period. However, it is more likely that these figurines were included as Butler wanted the revival of Parian to be depicted by McEvoy. Butler had a reputation for wanting to acquire new and exciting works and in doing so supported young artists by buying their early paintings and sculptures. His taste for novelty would surely not have supported the inclusion of outdated Parian figurines in a portrait of his daughters.

449 1881 census.
McEvoy was not the only contemporary artist to take inspiration from *The Sitwell Family* by Sargent; William Orpen recreates this same scene in his group portrait *The Family of George Swinton* (fig. 231). Just as Lady Ida Sacheverell Sitwell dominates Sargent’s composition, dressed in white and towering over her husband in her oversized hat, Mrs Elizabeth Ebsworth Swinton is elegantly dressed in pink with a matching hat and is the only sitter standing in this group portrait. Her ‘Renaissance elbow’ mirrors Edith Sitwell and exudes confidence and authority over her family.\(^{450}\) Orpen even copies Sargent’s inclusion of the family dog, a focus for the youngest children in both compositions, although Orpen offers a humorous pastiche by posing the dog as if it is greedily awaiting food from the youngest child’s sticky hands. It is not a coincidence that Orpen looked at Sargent’s *Sitwell Family* specifically for inspiration. In research for this thesis, I have discovered that George Swinton, the Scottish politician seated in Orpen’s composition, was related to the Sitwells in Sargent’s group portrait (fig. 232). Although several other scholars have noted the similarity between Sargent and Orpen’s compositions, it doesn’t appear as though the family connection between the Sitwells and the Swintons has previously been made in art historical literature.\(^{451}\) This connection, of course, provides the reason for Orpen reinterpreting Sargent’s family composition and it is possible that George Swinton himself requested the visual connection as he was described by his son Osbert Sitwell as having ‘possessed a love and knowledge of the arts and was one of the first patrons – if not the first – of both Orpen and Sargent.’\(^{452}\) Kenneth McConkey notes that ‘*The Swinton Family*, 1901, could almost be a swift riposte to Sargent’s *The Sitwell Family* exhibited at the Royal Academy in that year.’\(^{453}\) Although McConkey is correct that Sargent exhibited *The Sitwell Family* in the 1901 Royal Academy exhibition, I do not believe that Orpen’s intention to reinterpret this composition was as a ‘riposte’, but was instead, like McEvoy, providing a homage to an artist whom he admired, and was outlining the connection between the two families. It could even be interpreted that Orpen was challenging or

---


\(^{453}\) McConkey, *Edwardian Portraits*, 42.
aligning his work with that of Sargent as an upcoming young portraitist eager to impress and gain new clients through modern reinterpretation. Orpen includes a portrait of himself in the oval mirror behind the family, again a homage to the *Arnolfini Portrait*.

Orpen also draws on an earlier portrait of Elizabeth Ebsworth Swinton, known as Elsie, which was painted by Sargent in 1897 (fig. 233). *Mrs George Swinton* depicts Elsie in a full-length satin dress wearing a tiara and holding on to a pink-covered, rococo-style chair that almost matches the colour of her pink sash. Commissioned as a wedding present, this portrait is the epitome of femininity and Sargent has captured his sitter as an upper-class socialite verging on royalty. Orpen has chosen to paint Elsie similarly in pink in *The Family of George Swinton* and positions her in an identical pose to that used by Sargent – even down to her arm on her child’s chair. However, Elsie’s position in Orpen’s painting is one of authority and theatricality. She is standing whilst her husband and children are sitting, and she is cast in the brightest light which draws the viewer’s eye immediately to her. Elsie has been painted by Orpen not as a socialite like Sargent but as a New Woman – she is the matriarch of this scene. Her face is cast in chiaroscuro representing the two roles that she plays – the socialite mother and wife, and her role as an amateur singer ‘of some distinction’ which she continued to pursue after her marriage. Osbert Sitwell, who was one of the children in Sargent’s *Sitwell Family* portrait, wrote that ‘the incomparable warmth of her voice cast a strange spell that served to keep even a fashionable audience quiet.’ Orpen is creating a clever and modern reinterpretation of Sargent’s works by depicting Elsie, her husband George, and their children playing the role of a middle-class family, the sort of rising family that would be commissioning young and fashionable artists like Orpen and McEvoy at this period to paint their portraits. The room is not filled with pretentious decorations and expensive furniture, like those chosen in Sargent’s *Sitwell Family*, but this is a sensible and functional room for a modest family. The year that Orpen painted this family portrait, George Swinton unsuccessfully ran as the Conservative candidate for Paisley, and it is possible that this portrait was intended to depict him as a modest family man intent on working for the public, away from the glamour of high society that had been frequented by his counterpart Sir George Sitwell, the subject of Sargent’s group portrait, and also a Conservative politician.


Although McEvoy’s double portrait *Mary and Daphne at Gloucester Square (Children of Mr C.K. Butler)* (fig. 228) can be compared to *The Sitwell Family*, an even stronger comparison can be made to Sargent’s *The Daughters of Edward Darnley Boit* (fig. 234) – a group portrait of four children, Florence, Jane, Mary Louisa, and Julia Boit, playing in the foyer of their parents’ Parisian apartment. Edward Darnley Boit and his wife Isa (Mary Louisa) can be described as nouveau riche like Cyril Kendall Butler, the father of Mary and Daphne. Edward, known as Ned, had studied law at Harvard but had given up his profession to pursue fine art. The couple lived on Isa’s substantial inheritance that came from the China Trade in Boston and paid for a fashionable apartment in Paris. Looking closely at the quickly-applied brushstrokes of Mary Louisa’s painted dress, the girl to the left of the composition with her hands clasped behind her back as if mischievously concealing something, a close comparison can be made with the painted clothes of McEvoy’s later portraits (fig. 235). McEvoy and Sargent have used a range of different tones with an alla prima technique to create realistic folds across different fabrics. In Sargent’s portrait the fabric is a stiffly starched and pristine white pinafore and in McEvoy’s portrait *Silver and Grey: Mrs Charles McEvoy* a thin, more delicate cardigan has been depicted, possibly made out of cotton. Although the fabrics are clearly different, the way the paint has been laid on to the canvas uses a similar technique.

Although Henry James described the Boit group portrait as a ‘happy play-world…of charming children’, later criticism has explored the psychological qualities, with some even describing the painting as unsettling.\(^{457}\) Whether consciously interpreted or not, McEvoy has recreated the disconcerting atmosphere of Sargent’s portrait in *Mary and Daphne* with the distinct feeling that these girls are out of place in their surroundings. Like the Boit girls who are dressed in white pinafores, the Butler children are also familiarly dressed in white. McEvoy, like Sargent, has used a patterned carpet to provide the room with perspective, emphasising its vastness. The table, the statuettes and the painting on the wall above in McEvoy’s composition replace Sargent’s laden mantlepiece and similarly orientated mirror. Just as Sargent has used the recesses of the room to divide his interior, allowing the continuation of the room to fade ominously into darkness, McEvoy has divided his composition into three, using two walls at a corner and a large alcove. The alcove, with its large glass-fronted cabinet, looms over the children like a giant mouth ready to swallow up their delicate forms. Just as the Boit children are dwarfed by the oversized Japanese vases, McEvoy’s furniture overwhelms his sitters who are almost secondary to the interior in their portrait.

\(^{457}\) For more information on this subject see: Erica Hirshler, *Sargent’s Daughters: The Biography of a Painting* (Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 2019).
Whereas the Butler children look nervously at the viewer, clasping each other’s hands for reassurance as though they have entered the room without permission, the Boit children with their unusual positions imply that the viewer is intruding on a game in which they cannot possibly understand or partake. The Boit children own this space, they are strangely intimidating with three out of the four girls staring at the viewer and the fourth girl on the cusp of being lost to the darkness that pervades the back room. The Boit girls do not reach out for physical contact or support but display confidence both as individuals and as a collective. Their occupation of the space is calculated with Mary Jane, the little girl on the left, mimicking the shape of the vase to her right with her white pinafore pulled in at her waist, whereas her sister Florence, to her right, and seen side-on mimics the half-view of the vase opposite her. These girls in pristine and matching outfits among their parents’ material treasures have been cultivated, like their surroundings, in to a particular function and societal role of young women of this period.

Neither of these rooms – the room featuring the Boits or the room with the Butler children – are locations in which children would traditionally play with an abundance of breakable ceramics. The Butlers are depicted in what appears to be a study; a desk is laid with papers ready to be reviewed. The empty chair which takes the central position in the room is a reminder of their father’s patriarchal absence. He is presumably the dominant inhabitant of this study, the central figure of his family, and the commissioner of this portrait. The colour of the children’s dresses is continued in the white Parian figurines on the table behind them. In contrast to the children, these figures are distant and leaning away from each other. The artist’s juxtaposition of the conjoined children and the detached objects could signify the divergence of the girls’ futures as they embark upon the prospect of married life.

The fragility of their childhood is represented by McEvoy in the glass-fronted cabinet to the left of the Butler girls. McEvoy experiments with reflection in his early works with this double-portrait comparable to Vermeer’s Girl reading a letter at an open window (fig. 155). The large vases that adorn Sargent’s interior, made in Arita, Japan, are also fragile. Their porcelaneous quality is accentuated by the reflecting light from a window just out of view – the window is also seen reflected in the mirror behind the children. Regardless of the vase’s fragility, one of the eldest Boit girls leans precariously against it, perhaps signifying the fragility of her remaining childhood as she enters adulthood.

---
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McEvoy was correct in his premonitory view of the Butler sisters’ separation, though sadly it was not due to marriage. Mary, the eldest girl, seen on the left of the composition, was recorded as ‘completely deaf’ in the 1911 census.460 Presumably she developed this deafness later in her childhood, as her disability was not previously recorded in the 1901 census when she is four years old.461 On 28th December 1914 Mary died following an operation; she was nineteen years old. The double-portrait of Mary and Daphne was one of the only paintings to remain in the family collection following a sale of Cyril Butler’s possessions, thought to have taken place in 1944. Perhaps its survival in the family was at the insistence of Daphne who wanted to remember the close relationship with her sister as captured by McEvoy. Daphne died in 1983 at the age of 85.

Although critics like Roger Fry criticised Sargent’s individuality as a painter, a younger generation including both McEvoy and Orpen sought to emulate Sargent’s compositions early in their careers, in order to establish their own model of contemporary portraiture, and to ensure commissions from upper-class sitters. McEvoy is directly looking at Sargent’s group portraits of the Sitwell family and the Boit children for inspiration for his portrait of Mary and Daphne Butler, and key comparisons between these works have been made. However, this section has only analysed McEvoy and Sargent’s group portraits rather than their individual portraits of women, and the possibility of visually representing the New Woman in the upper classes.

The ‘New Lady’ and the ‘New Woman’

The ‘New Woman’ was an 1890s cultural phenomenon which described ‘the evolving nature of female identity’ and sparked a significant change in attitude towards the role of women outside of the traditional domestic sphere.462

The New Woman – free of the double standard of sexuality, free to dress ‘rationally’, to ride bicycles and, above all, free to reconsider the basis of marriage and work – was a conspicuous figure in the nineties.463
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The term originated from two articles by the novelists Sarah Grand (Frances Elizabeth Bellenden Clarke) and ‘Ouida’ (Maria Louise Ramé) in 1894; the New Woman was educated, aware, independent and often middle-class. ‘By the turn of the century the New Woman type was generally a university-educated suffragist working for progressive reform and remaining unmarried’, though in reality, this ideal was not always fulfilled in conjunction with societal and familial pressures.\textsuperscript{464} The concept of the New Woman does not appear to have penetrated the upper classes to the same degree as the middle classes at this time.

In America, a country closely associated with Sargent and many of his sitters, the Gibson Girl was created in 1898 by American illustrator Charles Dana Gibson. The Gibson Girl had transatlantic appeal, as she was also a popular character in Britain, and represented a modern ideal of femininity. She was educated and accomplished, playing musical instruments and painting, and was athletic enjoying cycling, nature and playing golf (fig. 236-238). Gibson’s wife, Irene Langhorne and her four sisters provided inspiration for the artist. One of Irene’s sisters was Nancy Astor whose portrait by Sargent has already been discussed. The Gibson Girl was not the intimidating or combative New Woman suffragette but a more palatable individual, ‘an authoritative, independent woman working in conjunction with previous more domestic tropes of the feminine.’\textsuperscript{465}

Although Sargent did not paint the archetypal middle-class New Woman, art historians have debated the complex role of Sargent’s women within this first wave of feminism. Sargent painted professional avant-garde New Women including actor and theatre manager Ellen Terry (fig. 239), author and theorist Clementina Anstruther-Thomson (fig. 240), and her lover Vernon Lee (fig. 241) who contributed to work on aesthetics and was an author of supernatural fiction. Besides their professional lives, these women’s personal lives were also unconventional. By the time Ellen Terry was painted as Lady Macbeth by Sargent she had married the artist George Frederic Watts at the age of sixteen, separated from him just ten months later, begun a relationship with the progressive architect-designer Edward William Godwin, and had two children out of wedlock. Vernon Lee and Clementina Anstruther-Thomson lived together openly as lovers and co-authors during a period when being gay was illegal.

\textsuperscript{464} Moore, ‘John Singer Sargent’s British and American Sitters, 1890-1910’, 100.

\textsuperscript{465} Ibid., 102-103.
The double-portrait of *Mr and Mrs I. N. Phelps Stokes* (fig. 242) by Sargent is arguably another example of Sargent’s New Woman. Like the New Woman that has been previously described, Edith Stokes assumed professional and community roles as a modern woman. She became a philanthropist, President of the New York Kindergarten Association, and ran a sewing school for immigrant women. Sargent painted her casually dressed in daywear, wearing a shirt waister or ‘waist’, rather than the evening dress originally intended for this portrait:

The uniform of the New Woman was the ‘tailor made’ and shirt waister, a look which referred to masculinity in its plainness and tailored cut, yet retained the lines of conventionally fashionable female dress.

The black bow tie worn by Mrs Stokes matches that of her husband, giving the pair a sort of masculine unity, even equality. It is not her husband that takes centre stage in this portrait but Edith herself. This portrait, which was commissioned as a wedding present for the young couple, was intended to be a singular portrait of the bride, with the inclusion of her Great Dane by her side.

Edith’s husband Isaac Newton Phelps Stokes, who had wanted to be painted by Whistler, ‘offered to assume the role of the Great Dane in the picture’ after the dog became unavailable. From this quotation Isaac Newton’s role could be considered subservient to Edith, and he is of course seen in the shadow in the background of this portrait. However, although this picture undoubtedly focuses on Edith, her tall and seemingly overbearing husband looms over her from behind. His arms are crossed authoritatively, almost disapprovingly. It is as though Isaac has allowed Edith to monopolise the limelight of this portrait with his permission as an overseer. He stands in the shadow and yet his form has pushed Edith slightly off-centre in her own portrait – she is not centred on the canvas as the viewer would assume on first glance. Although her clothes have been rightly compared to the attire of a New Woman, a prominent engagement ring can be seen on her left hand – a reminder that she is not independent, but tied to her husband through matrimonial vows (fig. 243).

---


Mrs Phelps Stokes in more traditional Victorian rather than New Woman attire was painted by Cecilia Beaux the following year (fig. 244). This second portrait offers an interesting comparison to Sargent’s choice of dress and destabilises the view that Edith was, uncompromisingly, a New Woman. She is instead part of the transition from 1890s Victorian to modern woman, and is representative of the infancy of the concept of the New Woman.

Although Sargent painted Ellen Terry, Vernon Lee, Clementina Anstruther-Thomson and Edith Phelps Stokes, arguably all New Women in their personal and professional pursuits and painted as such, it has also been argued that Sargent depicted a contrasting figure to the New Woman in many of his female portraits:

What might be called “the New Lady” rather than “the New Woman” ... [is] underworked rather than overworked, she exhibits symptoms ranging from listlessness to “stringiness,” exhaustion to hypertension.470

The ‘New Lady’ that has been described by Redford can be interpreted in Sargent’s work in three ways. First, the reclined and sleeping female figure swaddled in countless layers of fashionable dress and most aptly represented by Nonchalair (Repose) (fig. 245) painted in 1911. The conspicuous brushstrokes that make up the drapery of the sitter’s dress in Nonchalair are long and angular, giving the material the crisp texture of taffeta. This is very different from the fabric textures constructed by McEvoy who always used a mixture of different brushstrokes from the pointillistic dabbing of the paintbrush to longer patterns of serpentine lines. The theme of the sleeping upper-class woman is revisited at least a dozen times by Sargent across different interior and exterior settings. These paintings represent the listless and underworked New Lady described by Redford rather than the New Woman. McEvoy’s sitters are rarely depicted in such passive roles.

The second representation of Sargent’s New Lady is the overtly glamorous upper-class wife, a figure that, superficially, can also be seen in McEvoy’s work. These women are often depicted teetering awkwardly on the edge of ornate and uncomfortable furniture and described by Tate as unapologetically wealthy.471 Their tiny feet protruding from ostentatious dresses seem incapable of holding up the heavy layers of frivolous fabric.472 Mrs Carl Meyer (fig. 246) and Mrs Hugh Hammersley
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(fig. 247) are prime examples of the female figures painted by Sargent that have been described by critics and art historians as displaying an intense tenseness. Their carefully choreographed seated positions are clearly uncomfortable for the sitters, and often uncomfortable for the viewer. Their prolonged poses across several sittings have caused the slight parting of the sitters’ lips, displaying a smile easily mistaken for a grimace. Although McEvoy depicts several women seated, their interiors are almost always secondary to his sitters from 1913-4 onwards. His portraits of both Mrs Charles McEvoy in Silver and Grey (fig. 198) and Mrs Claude Johnson in Blue and Gold (fig. 212) are seated on unidentifiable pieces of furniture, set in unidentifiable interiors; the furniture’s only function is to contribute to the sitters’ comfort. McEvoy distinguishes his work from that of Sargent by excluding the traditional trappings of wealth in the form of decorated interiors. Instead, he focuses on the sitter herself, often beautifully dressed, but without possessions and often without jewellery.

From Mrs Carl Meyer and Mrs Hugh Hammersley to Mrs Cecil Wade (fig. 248) and Lady Agnew of Lochnaw (fig. 249), each of their restrained waists produce a painfully perfect triangular torso of forced femininity, irreconcilable with the New Woman’s identity. Yet, Adele Meyer was an important British campaigner for social reform for women. She visited the poor, arranged cooking lessons for women in their own homes and established the first rural health centre in Britain, providing women and children with a dental clinic, a school for mothers, and penny dinners for schoolchildren. Her portrait by Sargent does not depict the straightforward and stereotypical New Woman often described in art historical literature. Mrs Meyer, like many upper-class women, was a New Woman in transition. She took an active role in social reform independent of her husband and yet is depicted as a French rococo object within an interior presumably financially controlled by her husband. Redford accurately describes Sargent’s ‘display of the sitter’s sumptuously clad body rather than her well-furnished mind’. However, to describe her merely as a ‘Jewish plutocrat’s wife’ with no mention of her notable achievements is not only insulting but displays a lack of understanding for the transitionary New Woman painted by Sargent at the fin de siècle.
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As Elizabeth Prettejohn succinctly explains ‘Sargent’s portraits dramatised the precarious glamour of an upper class in rapid transition.’477 Upper class women such as Mrs Meyer were undertaking the roles of New Women, and were often at the forefront of social reform but their publicly displayed portraits continued to portray their feminine and almost ornamental glamour as socialites. The multiplicity of women’s roles at this time reflects the complicated changes in class during this period. No longer was there the simplified three-class system in Britain, but there was now an expanding middle-class and an increasing number of stratifications and overlaps between the middle and upper classes. William Gladstone, the Liberal Party prime minister, ‘concluded that the British aristocracy was no longer behaving as the disinterested trustees of the whole nation, but had become motivated by the narrow, selfish spirit of its own ‘class’ interest’, thus destabilising public support for the upper classes.478 Lloyd George denounced the House of Lords, which comprised only of upper-class men, in stark contrast to men in active employment:

five hundred men chosen randomly from among the ranks of the unemployed’, and the ‘millions of people’ who, by contrast, were ‘engaged in the industry which makes the wealth of the country.’479

There was also an increasing number of ‘super-rich bankers, financiers and businessmen’, a new plutocracy ‘which merged (and bought its way) into traditional aristocracy.’480 Sargent’s portraits encapsulate both traditional and new-monied upper classes that were desperate to hold on to the glamour and leisure of a bygone age. Yet to some extent, with the influence of the middle-class New Woman of the 1890s, women such as Adele Meyer were breaking free of their ‘unemploy[ment]’ as the privileged elite by undertaking new roles as semi-professional women.481

Finally, the third example of Sargent’s New Lady can be seen in his Grand Manner portraiture; full-length portraits of female sitters, often set outside.

The majority of Sargent’s work for aristocrats and plutocrats is marked by a similar aura: Both Millicent Sutherland and Daisy Leiter, the Stuart duchess and the rococo dollar princess, enact “attitudes” that conjure up the past in order to negotiate the present.
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Fear underlies flair; the hyper-theatricality of such portraits suggests a performance anxiety that pervades the old order and the new alike. Simultaneously props, icons, and fetishes, these dazzling images strain to make life imitate art.482

Although the portraits of Millicent, Duchess of Sutherland (fig. 250) and Daisy Leiter (fig. 251) have been compared in this quotation to the Stuart and rococo periods, they clearly attempt to imitate and reinterpret eighteenth-century British portraiture by artists such as Joshua Reynolds. Millicent, Duchess of Sutherland is comparable to Reynolds’ portraits of Jane Fleming, Countess of Harrington (fig. 252) or Lady Bampfylde (fig. 253) in its outdoor setting, classical guise and garden ornaments. The breezy location of Daisy Leiter’s portrait, the inclusion of a rough landscape in the background and rolling clouds is comparable to Mrs Hale as Euphrosyne (fig. 254). However, Sargent’s portrait of Millicent, Duchess of Sutherland seems to bestride the portraiture of Reynolds in the eighteenth-century and ‘an approach to the modern that offers a significant alternative to the avant-garde ‘mainstream’’.483 Sargent is both looking back at established historical portraiture prior to the Victorian age and looking forward to modern portraiture that revives impressionistic techniques. The mixture of modern and classical tropes could be interpreted as ‘strain[ing] to make life imitate art’ and yet in other ways, this portrait paves the way for McEvoys redevelopment of modern portraiture for the New Woman in the late 1910s and 1920s.484

Sutherland stands in a shaded garden with one hand on an ornamental fountain. On her wrist is a delicate gold bracelet that is the same colour as the delicate laurel crown that adorns her red hair. The off-the-shoulder dress that Sutherland is wearing is fashionable and modern, with its rich green colour and embroidered pink roses complementing the natural scene that surrounds her. Sargent has not painted this with the licked finish of a Reynolds portrait. Instead, his bold brushstrokes in a variety of different tones capture the realistic folds of the drapery in an impressionistic style. On close analysis, the bottom of her dress and the olive branch become entwined, and the quickly sketched paintwork of each object become almost indistinguishable. The foliage behind her is thinly painted with areas of the tan-coloured grounding and canvas weave surfacing. This is very different to Reynolds’ richly painted landscape backgrounds which would have been painted by a studio assistant.
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It can be argued that Sargent paints the Duchess of Sutherland in the guise of Greek goddess Athena. The laurel crown, a symbol of victory and triumph in Ancient Greece and Rome, is fitting for a sitter assuming the role of the goddess of warfare. The olive branch that she holds in her left hand, combined with the inclusion of the fountain, also substantiates this new interpretation of Sargent’s Sutherland portrait. In Greek mythology, Poseidon and Athena fought to be the patron of Athens. In an attempt to win over the Athenians, Poseidon struck his trident on the ground and from it water sprung. Athena, on the site of the well, planted an olive tree which not only provided the city with shade but also food, fuel and tools. Athena was declared the winner and Athens was named after her. Although it is not possible to definitively identify the bust behind the Duchess, turned away from her as if mirroring her stance, further investigation would almost certainly determine this to be a bust of Athena.

It is not known why Sargent painted the Duchess of Sutherland as Athena in 1904 or whether it was at the request of the sitter, but it is possible that the choice of Athena is representative of the changing roles of women during this period. Although superficially Sutherland plays the role of eighteenth-century socialite dressed up as a mythical character, the chosen goddess of warfare could be a political statement referring to women’s suffrage and their right to vote – prominent topics in 1904. Perhaps Sargent’s portraits of Mrs Meyer in her frilly pink dress, in the role of a wife and mother, and the Duchess of Sutherland depicted as a socialite in fancy dress have been incorrectly identified as these simplistic portraits. In fact, they are not representative of the upper-class New Ladies described by Redford as underworked and listless, but of New Women with a subtle statement. Sargent may not have overtly painted these women as the campaigner, activist and social reformer for which Mrs Meyer should be celebrated, nor is Millicent, Duchess of Sutherland depicted in her position as a social reformer and author but as Athena, Sargent cleverly brings the role of the New Woman into society portraiture. At a politically-tense period when women across all classes were questioning their roles – both in relation to the New Woman and also women’s suffrage – these two portraits would have been acceptable and non-confrontational to the conservative audience of the Royal Academy exhibitions. Adele Meyer’s portrait was exhibited at the RA in 1897 and Millicent, Duchess of Sutherland was exhibited in 1904. Although the New Woman may have been suppressed below Sargent’s painted surfaces, they were clearly on the walls of the Royal Academy for those who were looking closely enough.
The 20th Century ‘New Woman’

Having considered the New Woman of the 1890s and the dichotomy between the depiction of the New Woman and Redford’s ‘New Lady’ in Sargent’s portraits, it is important to understand whether the concept of the New Woman continued into the twentieth century, and whether McEvoy’s female sitters and their portraits can be considered visual realisations of this same concept in the 1910s and 1920s. Literature on the New Woman often focuses on her emergence and development within the 1890s and early 1900s, then replacing her with the ‘flapper’ in the 1920s. However, in order for McEvoy to become a leading portraitist, working within the same market as Sargent and with the potential of becoming Sargent’s successor, he needed to master the female portrait for the upper classes – a class of women that hadn’t directly benefitted from the New Woman phenomenon of the ’90s, but was becoming increasingly independent and less tightly bound by societal expectations. McEvoy needed to empower his sitters within this changing movement of early feminism. The question therefore remains, did the concept of the New Woman continue into the 1910s and 1920s and if so, how did McEvoy use this concept to become one of the leading portraitists of the day?

An article in the Manchester Courier asked the same question in 1913 in an article titled ‘The New Woman: Is she a spent force? Or a factor in our future history?’ Here the New Woman is described as having:

[a] broader and a wider experience of life than the most modern of men. She need not have been to prison for that. Has she not been for years one of the army engaged in what has developed from a punitive expedition against apathy into a spiritual crusade against a vicious civilisation? Women started to force a ballot box; they may end by remoulding the national ideal. 485

This quotation answers its own question by concluding that the New Woman is part of ‘our future history’ and that they will change the ‘national ideal’ to include women in decision-making alongside their male contemporaries. By 1913 the New Woman is very much spoken about in conjunction with women’s suffrage and gaining the right to vote, rather than in the 1890s with a focus on leisure and social freedoms for the New Woman. Although still called the New Woman, the 1913 version (which could be called the ‘new New Woman’) is politically driven, she has experienced the small freedoms of the Gibson Girl, riding a bicycle or standing ‘posing on a golf course in a stylish suit, while her ardent

admirers feverishly search for her lost ball’ – she has substantially progressed to want equality in both her right to vote and her right to have a profession. She is no longer a woman to be admired by men for her novelty of wanting small freedoms, she is an educated woman with financial means and the ability to force societal change.

An article written in 1921 looked at the changing view and attitude towards the New Woman over the course of a decade from c.1909. This article is important and will be quoted extensively, as it provides a vital understanding of how the New Woman was viewed in the period that McEvoy was working, and the complex views of the public towards this female figure:

At the close of the first decade of the twentieth century the observant might have marked a slight but definite change in the attitude of the sexes to each other. Women everywhere were making a certain tentative reaching out for a freer and less restrained expression of the sex in their practical relations with men; men, dismayed and troubled for want of precedent either opposed or advanced haltingly to meet them. Then the war came, shedding a new light on the status of the female of the race, creating fields of mutual labour with man, sweeping aside old and hitherto valued conventions that had limited possibilities of co-operation. The result has been a deepening of mental and spiritual intimacies, the breaking down of age-long barriers of intellectual intercourse. “Young men and women,” said Sir Michael Sadler, not long ago, “now talk openly about subjects which in former days were regarded as unsuitable for frank discussion.” Out of this changed condition of things has arisen what is termed the problem of the “new woman,” which has for some time been occupying the attention of the London “Daily Telegraph.” For the benefit of the uninitiated [sic], a recent issue categorised the females of the species from the “succubus” through the “grand amoureuse” and the “elective celibate” to the “maternal,” in closely reasoned differentiation, seeking by a process of more or less exhaustive research to discover the essential characteristics of this imagined disturber of modern society. Success, however, has proved somewhat elusive. For this problem of the new woman is but in reality an illusion, arising out of the distorted viewing of two main series of data connected with the woman of the day, against totally false backgrounds.

The author, possibly a woman, goes on to write that the New Woman of today ‘is measured against an artificial type of another and less plastic age’. She is compared to the Victorian woman of the previous generation, and is the woman understood by Redford to have been painted by Sargent – the New Lady – a woman that is dressed appropriately, that acts cautiously and knows her position in
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society. In this quotation, the author writes that the *Daily Telegraph* has been a dominant source of criticism for the New Woman but has failed to categorise her consistently as an abhorrent figure.

It cannot be denied that the new New Woman was different from her 1890s counterpart and was, by comparison, occupying a larger spectrum of society, from being increasingly politically motivated to enjoying social liberties. 'The New Woman [of the 1890s] was essentially middle class and attached to conservative notions of taste. By 1918 and up to the mid-1920s, the term New Woman was identified with the modern woman: the independent, cigarette-smoking, fashionable flapper.'

She was now:

Seated on the pillion of a motor bicycle going full speed ahead in clouds of dust and vapour, and leaving behind her the obnoxious odour of burnt petrol, she flew along the street where the old gentleman in the grey top hat and white spats was standing. He belonged to the old school. One could see by the way his eyes followed the apparition that to him the New Woman – as she is popularly called – was anathema. Turning to me, he said – “Nobody likes to get old, but I am thankful I was born in an age when such spectacles were unknown. What are girls coming to, I wonder?” With a shake of his head he passed on, and was soon lost to view.

Another key difference between the 1890s and the 1920s New Woman was that the new New Woman could drive and was not reliant on her husband for transportation. This ability liberated women, particularly of the upper classes, as they had the potential to travel anywhere, with friends or on their own. In 1926 the *Western Daily Press* covered the Olympia Motoring Exhibition and wrote an article to report the increased interest of the New Woman in motoring:

Three or four years ago Eve was content to play the part of a potential passenger, but to-day she is as intelligent and instructed in her knowledge, and perhaps even a little more critical than Adam. She is no longer satisfied with sampling the comfort of upholstery and the ease of the back seats. She demands to sit at the wheel, to test the driving position, and the accessibility of controls. She asks searching questions about gear change, and insists upon looking under the bonnet and inquiring closely into the quality of the engine and everything relating to the purely mechanical side of the car. The stands of all the popular light car manufacturers yesterday were thronged with eager women, and it was surprising how few were the comments one heard about colour, and how many about general design and engine efficiency. The salesman at Olympia, cunning in psychology, are the first to recognise the new woman, and they treat Eve respectfully, no longer as a passenger, but as a keen and penetrating critic.

---
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Although there is a sinister overtone of male control in this article, in that the New Woman is still able to be manipulated by the clever salesman at Olympia, this article in the *Western Daily Press* does provide an interesting insight into the increased interest women have in purchasing and driving cars. This article, presumably written to attract female readers, is also cleverly placed next to a car advert for the 1927 Essex Coach which depicts a drawing of a large car stopped outside a quaint countryside cottage with a woman behind the wheel (fig. 255).

In the 1910s and 1920s the New Woman was no longer embodied by the Gibson Girl as had been seen in the 1890s but by the characters created by Nell Brinkley, a popular illustrator at this period in both England and America who published in *Harper’s, Cosmopolitan* and *Good Housekeeping*. As Trina Robbins explains, unlike the Gibson Girl, who, ‘despite her pretensions to independence, was a static creature’, Brinkley created a New Woman of the ‘twentieth century, a woman who went to work, played an important part in the First World War, got to vote, removed her corsets, and became a flapper, smoking and drinking with the boys.’\(^{491}\) Whereas the Gibson Girl had come from wealth, Brinkley focused on working women ‘from factory to farm workers.’\(^{492}\) These women did not smile, according to Robbins, but laughed raucously with their mouths wide open.

**McEvoy’s New Women**

Brinkley’s art, with a focus on working-class women, could be considered a world away from the upper-class sitters painted by McEvoy during this same period. However, unlike the 1890s New Woman which had predominantly penetrated only the middle classes, the new New Woman of the 1910s and 1920s seems to have also successfully infiltrated the upper classes. ‘The independent, cigarette-smoking, fashionable flapper’, as described by Fawcett, or the ‘flapper, smoking and drinking with the boys’, as described by Robbins, can be seen amongst McEvoy’s upper-class sitters including Lois Sturt.\(^{493}\) McEvoy painted several members of the Bright Young Things, or Bright Young People, a group of young aristocrats and socialites known for their lavish parties, extravagant lifestyles and bad behaviour – they smoked, drank heavily and consumed drugs – and several of them, including Lois Sturt, died young. Sturt was born into one of the wealthiest families in the country. She was described
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as ‘the most beautiful brunette in England, Lois was perilously wild for the period, turning up to fashionable West End establishments without a hat, smoking cigarettes and showing off her ‘red and blue scars from being savagely bitten on the neck whilst making love’.’

She was arrested in July 1924 for driving at 51 miles per hour through Regent’s Park on a Bright Young People treasure hunt – she told the arresting officer that she had no idea there were speed limits. On a separate occasion she hit and killed a pedestrian with her car in 1926.

Lois was part of a new generation of upper-class women who no longer had to, or wanted to, conform to societal norms. They had enough financial independence and social freedom, as well as the support of several like-minded friends, to do whatever they wanted. The phrase ‘live fast, die young’ could easily have been coined to describe this excessive group of young people who had no comparable role models from which to gauge their impending mistakes. With the role of women fundamentally changing during this period, with women over the age of thirty who met a property qualification able to vote from 1918, these upper-class young women were also bored with their expected roles as society hostesses. Lois was intelligent – she spoke several languages and studied to be an artist at the Slade between September 1915 and 1920, and was almost certainly taught by Ambrose McEvoy. In an undated letter in the McEvoy Estate Papers from Lois, she asks whether McEvoy might be able to recommend a place to work during the Slade summer holiday:

Friday night
38 Portman Square. W.

Dear Mr. McEvoy,

Forgive me for bothering you so much, but I wonder if you could possibly tell me of any place where I could draw for the next 6 weeks as the Slade has shut now – It’s so tiresome having weeks to wait & nothing to do, so I thought that perhaps you knew of some studio or place which would answer that purpose as I shall be up here till the end of July, & its such awful waste of time!

---
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Please forgive me for being such a nuisance.

Yours v. sincerely

Lois Sturt

This letter was presumably written before Lois acquired the studio next to Augustus John in Chelsea. McEvoy, as well as almost certainly teaching Lois, also painted her on several occasions in both oils and watercolours (figs. 256-257), and in each work made her look decidedly different. Lois’ look was both fashionable and versatile and, with her wild reputation, she quickly became one of the most painted and photographed women in Britain during the early 1920s. As well as an artist and exhibiting at the Grosvenor Gallery, Lois also became a racehorse owner (a male-dominated role at this time), and she even learnt to fly after her marriage in 1928 and gained her pilot’s licence. Both driving and being able to fly an aeroplane physically liberated Lois and gave her even more independence as a New Woman – she would often make solo trips to the Netherlands and the Riviera. Although Lois was expected to marry, particularly in her position of wealth, she did not want her freedom curbed by a husband and so married, out of mutual convenience, Evan Morgan, later 2nd Viscount Tredegar, who was known to be gay. The pair lived together but embarked upon separate lives and relationships with other people.

Although Lois was only twenty when McEvoy produced his 1920 oil painting, Lois’ extravagant lifestyle and carefree bohemianism had already solidified her reputation as someone unconventional. In order to represent this new breed of upper-class woman, a new New Woman of the late 1910s and early 1920s, McEvoy had to adapt his painting style. McEvoy would have known that women of Lois’ social status, as a member of the wealthy elite, had and would be painted by every well-known artist of the period. By 1921 she had already become ‘the most popular “subject” of the moment with modern portrait painters’, overtaking the aristocrat Lady Diana Cooper who had previously been most popular and who will be explored in more detail later in this chapter. McEvoy had to produce a portrait that was not only a flattering and realistic likeness of Lois, but also achieved an individual and modern style that was unique to him as an artist. In relation to Sargent who was producing portraiture during the early period of photography, Elizabeth Prettejohn stated that ‘Now, more than ever, the portrait

---
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painter must offer something more than likeness. As Blanc put it: ‘The painter endowed with spirit can evoke the spirit of the sitter; but how can a machine evoke a human soul.’ McEvoy, like Sargent, was competing with even more advanced studio photographers, as well as a new generation of modern portraitists, and an aging generation of pioneering nineteenth-century portraitists including Sargent himself.

At first glance or at a distance, McEvoy’s portrait of Lois (fig. 256) is almost photographic. She sits with her arms across her lap, her face delicately painted – as is typical of McEvoy – with huge almond eyes and a slight shine on her bottom lip. Her hair is not pristine, it is unruly and bohemian, but it is also stylish, beautifully cut and tied with a blue ribbon or small headscarf that matches the lapis lazuli blue of the background. However, on closer inspection, McEvoy has created a painted tapestry of different colours and textures. No one area of canvas is the same, with different thicknesses of paint, different brushes and different paces of line created with every stroke. By painting Lois’ clothes, he has produced an abstract landscape of dozens of different colours laid like a patchwork to accentuate different contours and folds in the fabric (fig. 258). He uses a full palette from whites, blacks and browns to ochres, the most vibrant blues and deep reds, oranges and purples. With so many conflicting tones this portrait should not be harmonious and yet McEvoy has drawn every part of the canvas together by including the same colours throughout. For example, in the top left and top righthand corners of the canvas are vertical patches of orange hues, as well as in her hair, which are the same tones as used in Lois’ clothes. The same blues as the background have been used in Lois’ hair, and through greater mixing, in her clothes. It appears as though McEvoy has painted parts of her hair a number of times and rubbed out the colour and then painted it back on in darker tones, including areas of black in delicate wet wisps of paint (fig. 259-260). He has left huge dollops of congealed paint in places which gives this work both an increased texture and a carefree modernism that could be categorised as abstract, and yet in other areas of the canvas McEvoy has dripped thin, wet oil paint down the surface – a method that he also uses with his watercolours.

Although McEvoy’s watercolour of Lois Sturt (fig. 257) is much less vibrant in tone than his oil painting, Lois is still recognisable from certain characteristics and colours emphasised by McEvoy. It was thought that this work also dated to 1920, and might have been a painted sketch produced at the same time as the oil. The comparable blue background and the flashes of deep oranges on her left arm, cheek and lips may signify that this work was produced at the same period. He has also emphasised the
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shape of her hair with similar wisps of black paint. However, McEvoy has successfully created a very different painting in his watercolour. Lois is no longer posed as an overtly feminine and beautiful socialite but she has been painted as almost androgynous in appearance. Painted in profile, her angularity is comparable to paintings by the Vorticists or the Futurists such as *A Dawn* by Christopher Nevinson (fig. 261) which depicts similarly angular faces emphasised with chiaroscuro, set in a sea of blue and orange tones. The black shadow directly behind Lois’ face partly mirrors her profile but also takes on an identity of its own – a large flick of black looks like a protruding tongue curling out from the shadow’s mouth. This shadow along with the black outline of Lois’ figure is also reminiscent of the shadow created by a sculptural relief and may recall the work of McEvoy’s friend and fellow artist Eric Gill (fig. 262). Lois’ stark white skin, made from paper that has been left unpainted, and her flat chest devoid of detail mimics the white marble busts of Roman emperors. Although comparable to Roman sculpture, this is also one of McEvoy’s most modern and striking watercolours and I do not believe that it was intended as just a sketch for the final oil painting. It was painted as a visual realisation of the new New Woman of this period. This work depicts some of the same experimentalism as displayed in McEvoy’s oil painting – such as the dripping paint down from the neckline (fig. 263) – but using a very different and much less controllable medium. With her modern and bohemian haircut – cut short – with traditionally masculine tones, the blues, greys and blacks, are contrasted with Lois’ full and bright feminine lips, and flushed cheek. McEvoy is blurring the lines of traditional gender in this piece in order bring to the forefront a new interpretation of what the New Woman looks like in 1920. It should be noted that McEvoy’s watercolour of Lois Sturt is quite different in style to the watercolours of her friend and Bright Young Things contemporary Zita Jungman who was also painted by McEvoy on several occasions. In two of McEvoy’s most accomplished portraits of Zita she is depicted with a greater realism than Lois, but is again depicted with a modern androgyny synonymous with the new New Woman – close cropped hair and a military style dark coat with the collar up (fig. 264). The second watercolour by McEvoy of Zita Jungman (fig. 265) displays similar experimentalism as the watercolour of Lois Sturt, but her face and hair are more figuratively painted in a style more typical of his oil portraits.

Finally, the format of McEvoy’s watercolour of Lois Sturt, cut off at the arms to create a triangular and disconnected torso, is reminiscent of Sargent’s earlier portrait *Mrs George Batten* (1897) (fig. 266), and is a format that McEvoy had also used in his portrait of the sculptor Lady Ridley (1916) (fig 267), painted four years before Lois. *Mrs George Batten*, Mabel Batten, was the foremost amateur mezzo-soprano of her day and composed her own music. Sargent painted her mid-song and although The Met has described this work as being deliberately cropped by the artist to emphasise her intense
expression, and other critics remarked that she appeared to be yawning, her expression could be interpreted as overtly sexual.\textsuperscript{502} By cropping the composition and taking Mabel Batten out of context, away from the stage and with most of her clothes out of view, Sargent has positioned Batten, her head tilted back and her mouth open, as if she is having an orgasm. This expression of female sexual liberation seems fitting for a woman who, like Lois Sturt, did not conform to the social conventions of the period. In 1880, Batten had an affair with the poet Wilfred Scawen Blunt and in 1907 she met author Radclyffe Hall with whom she had a long-term relationship. The couple lived together until Mabel’s death in 1916.\textsuperscript{503}

Lois Sturt’s brother, Napier, who was openly bisexual, was a close friend of McEvoy and was also painted by the artist on numerous occasions. Both Lois and Napier, or Naps as he was known by friends, visited McEvoy in Paris in May 1922 and Napier saw McEvoy almost every day whilst he was in New York in early 1921. In a letter which is thought to date to February 1921, Napier writes to Mary McEvoy reassuring her that she has not been forgotten, ‘I can never tell you adequately – how more than charming - & what a help Ambrose is – my existence without him here would have been more than harmful – I see him nearly every day...’.\textsuperscript{504} Napier had been sent to New York by his mother Feo who had set him up with a job in banking, although he spent most of his time out drinking with friends.\textsuperscript{505} It was whilst Napier was in New York that he met Tallulah Bankhead, the rising American star with whom he had a long-term and intermittent relationship, and Teddie Gerard the Argentine film actor and entertainer.\textsuperscript{506} McEvoy painted both of these women in his new New Woman format that he was establishing during this period – an increasingly impressionistic and abstracted form of painting drapery and backgrounds, whilst maintaining a delicately painted face and a sufficient likeness of his sitter. Rather than full-length portraits like Mrs Cecil Baring (fig. 188) or the Duchess of Marlborough (fig. 209), McEvoy was also painting these women as half-lengths at this period. This not only allowed McEvoy to paint these portraits with greater speed, but it also created an intimacy between the sitter and the viewer, and the sitter and the artist. Each of these portraits are personal, and these women are positioned without jewellery or overt wealth. Without an interior surrounding
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them, these individuals should be vulnerable in these stark portraits and yet McEvoy seeks to empower them as New Women.

Like his portrait of Lois Sturt, McEvoy painted Tallulah Bankhead (fig. 268) half-length and seated with her head slightly turned to look directly at the viewer. Bankhead is almost unrecognisable in McEvoy’s painting which dates just prior to McEvoy’s death, though he also painted her earlier in watercolour in 1923, when Bankhead first arrived in London. This portrait was illustrated in *The Graphic* which reviewed McEvoy’s exhibition at the Leicester Galleries in April 1923 (fig. 269). The erratic, brightly coloured, and bold brushstrokes of Lois Sturt represented her wild-child character, but Bankhead is not depicted as the flamboyant, outspoken young woman known for her outrageous behaviour, and her relationships with both men and women. Instead, McEvoy has produced a personal portrait for her away from the bright lights of her stage career. He has captured her in both a calm and reflective state. His tones are muted and his brushstrokes are less elongated than with McEvoy’s portrait of Lois Sturt. Instead, McEvoy has painted Bankhead with a chalkier effect of thicker, drier oil paint in muted tones that we have come to expect from his contemporary, Gwen John. McEvoy’s portrait of Tallulah Bankhead directly relates to a review of McEvoy’s work dating much earlier to 1917. This review, although written almost a decade before McEvoy painted Bankhead, describes the effect of the artist’s portrait style at an exhibition at the National Portrait Society and questions what makes a ‘satisfactory portrait’:

What exactly constitutes a satisfactory portrait is impossible to define. But in order to strike home finally a painter must not play about. Mr. McEvoy, with all his industry, plays about. He has the trick of making all his sitters phosphorescent — and many women like being phosphorescent and fair and satiny — and he is succumbing to this tendency more and more. It is, of course, very jolly to paint mother-of-pearl better than anyone else. And gleaming skins and satins are no doubt delightful subjects — if you like that sort of thing — but it isn’t business. It is indulgence, and such indulgence for a painter of Mr. McEvoy’s capacity is regrettable, the more so that when once you are confirmed a fashionable painter, you may as well bid farewell at once to anything but the fashion you have made, and, incidentally, that has made you. I do not feel that any of these portraits are real people. They are nymphs, sirens, what you will. And both nymphs and sirens are types which are in the end more monotonous than mere mortals.

McEvoy is described as playing about with his work, as if photographic realism or the sort of restrained Edwardian female portraits produced by artists like Sargent, are the only means to produce effective

portraits. The words and phrases that particularly stand out in this quotation are ‘phosphorescent’ and that he can paint ‘mother-of-pearl better than anyone else’. Although the idea of McEvoy’s portraits being ‘phosphorescent’ was touched upon in Chapter 4, this word along with mother-of-pearl, not only describes a unique palette of complementary tones used by McEvoy to create this effect, but conjures up a dream-like quality to his portraits that provide an escapism for his sitters. Although Tallulah Bankhead was painted a decade after this quotation was written, this review provides evidence that McEvoy’s portrait style did not significantly alter between 1917 and 1927 as Tallulah’s portrait can also be described as ‘phosphorescent’, and demonstrating a palette comparable to ‘mother-of-pearl’. Whereas this 1917 quotation is critical of McEvoy’s style, perhaps even insinuating that it will not weather well, McEvoy’s portraits continued to be extremely popular with the wealthy elite, in particular with women, until McEvoy’s death in 1927.

The 1917 review comments that McEvoy’s portraits are not, ‘business. It is indulgence’, implying a triviality to his style. Whereas his freeing and ethereal style of portraits could be interpreted as giving these women a personal and intimate likeness, yet physically freeing them from societal restraints through his impressionistic technique. McEvoy does not physically outline his female figures, and except for their faces, their clothes and bodies cannot be contained within their specific shape. The background, clothes and skin, transpose the painterly restraints of conventional brushstrokes, just as these women transcend the societal norms with which the public expect them to conform. These women, like Tallulah Bankhead, are not surrounded by wealth. Tallulah is not painted as an object within a patriarchally-financed interior, instead this portrait is entirely about the way in which she wanted to be painted, as an independent woman, not identifiable by the clothes or jewellery that she wears. The only jewellery that is visible in McEvoy’s portrait, and that have been faintly outlined by the artist, is a string of pearls. This is an interesting choice for McEvoy and his sitter, as pearls seem to be synonymous with Tallulah and recall several key moments in her life. They symbolise her independently-gained financial security, and her ability to take London by storm as a capable American actor – as outlined in her autobiography. When she first arrived in London, she wrote that her clothes were on the ‘seedy side’ and she had to:

accept the challenge of the well-dressed women in the after-theater restaurants and supper clubs, I splurged, well beyond my means you may be sure. Since a thirty-pound salary was incompatible with the Ritz... I set myself up in a service flat. Even there I felt I must have a personal maid, in addition to the charwoman who kept the place in some semblance of order. To further complicate matters I bought a pearl necklace to prove to the toffs and my fellow players that I knew the score. What I proved was that I didn’t
know the score. Eager to drive my own car, I hocked the pearls to buy a Talbot coupé, sold it after six months that I might redeem the pearls.\footnote{509}

Pearls became a symbol of status for Tallulah. These were a commodity, like her acting, which had the potential to be traded within particular circles of society in order to gain something better. By trading the feminine jewellery of pearls for a traditionally masculine car, we can see the aspirations of the New Woman changing during this period. Tallulah was ahead of her time as a New Woman, as it has already been explored earlier in this chapter through the 1926 Olympia Motor Exhibition review, women during the 1910s and 1920s realised they could gain greater independence if they learnt to drive, and had the finances to buy their own car.

Pearls also became a symbol of Tallulah’s sexual liberty as she recalled Reginald Arkell in \textit{London Calling}:

\begin{quote}
Everybody knows that Tallulah is one of those girls who could lure a Scotch elder into any indiscretion. Positively! Her lips are as scarlet as a guardsman’s coat, and her diamonds make the flashing signs of Piccadilly look like farthing dips. She plays “He loves me, he loves me not” with pearls that are as big as potatoes.\footnote{510}
\end{quote}

Tallulah’s iconic red lips can be seen in McEvoy’s portrait. Here the author insinuates Tallulah’s manipulation of men and yet he implies that she is dangerous in her independence and non-conformity – she is able to lure men ‘into any indiscretion.’ Pearls are mentioned again when Tallulah proudly recalled a weekend holiday with her sister and her sister’s husband in c.1926 in the south of France. Down to her last £50, her pearls in this story represent the façade of her public image. She was so lucky gambling in the local casino that she was able to pay for the trip for them all and stay for three weeks in total. ‘Our first night in the casino a crusty dowager nodded at me, then said to Sister, “Wouldn’t you know that that rich young American in those huge pearls would make a killing?” My pearls were paste, put out by Chanel.’\footnote{511} Along with her lucky streak, her pearls, although fake costume jewellery, had provided Tallulah with a new identity. They contributed to how she wanted to be portrayed, just as McEvoy produced a personal portrait for Tallulah away from her public person, a façade, and overt sexuality.

\footnotesize
\textit{Ibid.}, 164.
\textit{Ibid.}, 106.
It is known that McEvoy’s portrait of Tallulah Bankhead was supposed to be a private rather than a public portrait, as, according to the sitter, it had been promised to her by the artist himself, and was painted as a favour for her sitting to McEvoy at an earlier date. She was also painted by Augustus John three years after McEvoy’s death in 1930 and she wrote that this work is her ‘most valuable possession’ (fig. 270).512 ‘When shown at the Academy my portrait created a great stir. John had done me in pale pastels, after the manner of El Greco, said one critic, wispy, a little gaunt and eerie. One judge called it “the greatest portraiture since Gainsborough’s ‘Perdita.”’513 Neither the comparisons to El Greco or Gainsborough’s *Perdita* are well-founded and although John created a likeness of Bankhead, it is a portrait that is typical of his later style that can be interpreted as garish in finish and caricaturesque.

John would have undoubtedly seen McEvoy’s portraits of Tallulah dating to the 1920s and would have made his portrait decidedly different. It recalls the cartoons of figures like the Brinkley girl, rather than highly-finished fine art. It could be argued, however, that with Tallulah’s established reputation at this period John has also successfully depicted her as a new New Woman, reminiscent of ‘Too Busy’, a sketch of the Brinkley girl which was published in 1914 (fig. 271). In John’s portrait, Tallulah sits with her arms crossed, her index finger pointing upwards as if mid-tap and losing patience with this sitting. Her legs are defiantly crossed and she looks out beyond the canvas, almost entranced. In a similar pose with legs crossed is Brinkey’s New Woman. Unlike John’s sitter who had established her reputation as a New Woman – an actor, successful and wealthy, popular and sexually liberated – Brinkley spells out her fictional character’s achievements. She sits in an oversized chair, initially designed for a larger man, she is immaculately dressed in a modern-style female jacket, skirt and shirtwaister reminiscent of *Mrs Phelps Stokes*, and she is surrounded by objects related to her achievements. Books on art and architecture adorn her desk, plans and drawings, laboratory apparatus, a plaque for ‘Real Estate’ and a book on the floor is titled ‘Medicinal’. On the accompanying image (fig. 272), the outside of her office door can be seen with cupid sat outside patiently waiting with a cigarette in hand. On the New Woman’s door is ‘Miss 1914’ along with a list of her credentials ‘Real Estate, Dr of Medicine, Lawyer, Architect, Chemist, Broke, Politician, Scientist, Consulting Engineer, Editor, Voter’. This is, of course, an idealised version of what women hoped they could achieve in the near future, with ‘Voter’ being a liberty that hadn’t yet been achieved in 1914. However, women such as Tallulah Bankhead, like many of the other women that will be looked at who were
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painted by McEvoy, were the first generation to really gain independence as women – more so than the 1890s New Woman. By 1930 when Tallulah was sitting to John, all women in Britain had gained the right to vote.

Tallulah Bankhead describes John’s likeness alongside McEvoy’s portrait in her autobiography, and it is apparent that perhaps her greatest possession would have been her McEvoy portrait, had she secured it before it was sold:

My insistence on getting the John portrait, even though I had to go in hock, was due to an earlier disappointment. Some years before I had sat to Ambrose McEvoy, who had a great vogue in London as well as connections at Court. He had an odd technique. He painted me in profile while looking at my reflection in a mirror. My sideview brought him a stack of sterling. Since I had sat for him as a favor, McEvoy painted me a second time, full face, with the promise that the portrait would be mine once he had shown it. Shortly thereafter he died. The day my likeness was hung, along with that of Princess Pat, I had a matinee. When I got to the Leicester Galleries the next day I was shocked to find that McEvoy’s Tallulah bore a red seal. This meant it had been sold. But out of respect for his family, I didn’t start a donnybrook. After all, ours had only been a verbal agreement.

When I learned it had been purchased by Anthony Rothschild, of the British branch of that house, I called the gentleman up. Although I didn’t have a guinea to my name I said: “I know you bought the McEvoy portrait for six hundred pounds. I’m prepared to purchase it from you for something more than that.” Mr. Rothschild was gentle but firm. McEvoy was his favorite painter. He had a room full of McEvos, and he was particularly fond of the Bankhead, me in a pale blue dress against a pale pink background, slightly unfinished in the McEvoy style.514

In the McEvoy Estate Papers is a copy of the Leicester Galleries exhibition catalogue dating to May-June 1927, and annotated, presumably by McEvoy’s widow Mary. Portrait Miss Tallulah Bankhead is listed as number 13 and next to it is the figure 600 guineas – £50 more than Bankhead remembers in her autobiography.515

Like Tallulah Bankhead, McEvoy would have almost certainly met the Argentinian actor Teddie Gerard through Napier Sturt. On her arrival in Britain, Teddie became part of a close circle of female friends in London with Radclyffe Hall at its centre – the novelist who was mentioned in relation to Mabel Batten earlier in this chapter. These friends were ‘artistic and theatre types’, several of whom were
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lesbians and bisexuals, including Tallulah Bankhead and Teddie, who was described in Virginia Nicholson’s book *Singled Out*:

There was the American revue star Teddie Gerard, who stunned audiences in 1915 with her appearance in a backless gown while behind her a chorus of male crooners sang, ‘Glad to see You’re Back, Dear Lady’. The defection of Teddie’s lover Etheline to Eileen Bliss got everyone gossiping, but Teddie herself seemed unperturbed. She was a hard-drinking, promiscuous adventuress with a drug habit.516

As Nicholson goes on to describe in her publication, lesbians within the social elite during the interwar years, like Teddie Gerard, experienced unprecedented freedom to express their sexuality more publicly. In London these women would often meet with artists such as McEvoy and Augustus John at the Café Royal, a hub for artistic individuals and bohemians at this period. ‘McEvoy is a living rebuff to the aesthetic hooliganism that flourishes on certain beats between the Café Royal and Flood Street.’517 Unlike gay men, identifying as a lesbian was not illegal in Britain, although it was not an accepted societal norm in the 1920s. That being said, actors like Teddie Gerard and Tallulah Bankhead were extremely popular with the public – regardless of their sexuality which was well-known and discussed – and McEvoy was at the forefront of immortalising these emancipated New Women in paint, often for the first time. By painting portraits of women such as Tallulah Bankhead and Teddie Gerard alongside the upper classes who had not experienced liberation to the same degree until this period, for example Lady Diana Manners who will be described in more detail later in this chapter, McEvoy was creating an *œuvre* of comparable female portraits of like-minded women and successfully bringing the concept of the New Woman to the upper classes.

McEvoy painted Teddie Gerard in 1921 (fig. 273) in a similar style to his portrait of Lois Sturt - he even used similar brown and orange tones to highlight her hair. Teddie’s body has also been painted using the same bold and impressionistic brushstrokes as Lois, which suggest the movement of her body and clothes but does not contain her figure to any one outline. Like the majority of McEvoy’s portraits at this date, he highlights Teddie’s face by painting it in greater detail whilst drawing his palette together by using a variety of similar browns and greens across the entire canvas. Teddie Gerard wrote to McEvoy from the SS France, a luxury transatlantic ocean liner that catered to the international elite,


to thank him for the portrait. From this letter it is clear that Teddie is on her way to Europe, leaving McEvoy and Napier Sturt in New York to continue partying:

Ambrose —

Goodbye. I am sorry to leave you & Nappier [sic, Napier Sturt]— it has been so heavenly this last week – This is a scrawl before the boat pulls off – We are off & I must hurry – Forgive me for making you fall all over yourself. But didn’t you adore the party – it was a good one alright alright [sic] & oh I am desperately tired & you would not think me a bit pretty to look at – Haggard disorder I calls it. Well, see that Naps has a good time – I can’t tell you how much I adore the lovely picture — I am longing to tell every-one & to see it & you soon again.
I send you all the dearest of thoughts

Teddie. 518

McEvoy had a tendency to befriend his sitters which allowed him to produce much more personal and intimate portraits of his subjects. It also ensured that his subjects modelled for him more than once and recommended him as an artist. McEvoy used his sociability as an important tool for his portrait practice, leading him to become arguably the leading portrait painter of the early twentieth century. This can be contrasted to Sargent and Whistler who, although very popular in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as artists, had a reputation for not getting along with their sitters.

McEvoy painted actor Lillah McCarthy twice in 1919, and both portraits were exhibited at the National Portrait Society between March and April that year (fig. 274-5). Although the portrait that is now in the collection of the National Portrait Gallery is larger (40 x 30 ins (101x76.2) and arguably more experimental than the 30 x 25 format (76 x 63cm) at the Crawford Art Gallery, McEvoy maintains the same colours in each portrait and dresses McCarthy in the same clothes. The portrait at Crawford Art Gallery was used to advertise the season of plays featuring Lillah McCarthy at the Kingsway Theatre in 1919 and it is likely that McEvoy produced these two portraits with this outcome in mind (fig. 276). McCarthy is pale and theatrically lit with stark artificial lighting in the Crawford version, and there is a definite contrast between her detailed face and the brightly coloured patterned background which has been made to look like a stage curtain. By positioning McCarthy to look towards the viewer, in contrast to the NPG portrait, she arouses attention from passers-by, drawing them in to read the rest of the advertisement. The NPG portrait is much more abstract in its use of brushwork and is much more typical of McEvoy’s later style as it has already been seen with his portraits of Lois Sturt and Teddie Gerard. McEvoy, however, takes his impressionistic style a step further with this portrait and
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creates almost a patchwork of colour. When looking closely at this work, the thick layering of different pigments has the effect of a collage rather than an oil painting. McCarthy's face has not been delicately painted in this portrait but has been brought into focus by highlights created by larger round brushes of pale flesh colours and even blues on her nose and forehead. McCarthy is dressed in a bohemian-style top, low-cut with flowing sleeves and not pinched in at the waist.

Lillah McCarthy would presumably not have wanted to be painted in a more traditional style and certainly would not have wanted to have been dressed in Edwardian clothes at this date. She was the embodiment of the New Woman, and is the primary representative of McEvoy's New Woman of the late 1910s. Although McCarthy was a lot older than Tallulah Bankhead and Teddie Gerard when McEvoy painted her at the age of forty-four, McEvoy has depicted McCarthy as their contemporary in age and profession. Like McEvoy and his female contemporaries at the Slade, Lillah McCarthy would have been a teenager when the concept of the New Woman was first discussed in the 1890s. Unlike Tallulah Bankhead who was born in 1902 or Teddie Gerard who would have been an infant in the 1890s, McCarthy and McEvoy, as a team, were able to bring their personal experience of the 1890s New Woman to Lillah's portrait and depict her as a New Woman of 1919 – in a modern and more abstract portrait style than that previously offered by artists such as Charles Haslewood Shannon, or Harold Speed.

It can be argued that McCarthy grew up in a progressive household with a father who home-schooled her, and encouraged her to declaim Milton, Shakespeare and Blake. When the opportunity arose to recite part of Shakespeare’s *King John* for Frank Benson’s company of actors, McCarthy’s father arranged for his daughter to audition. After Benson announced that McCarthy had talent, her father moved the entire family to London so that Lillah could study elocution. She acted in London in 1895 and 1896 before joining Wilson Barrett’s company for eight years and touring England, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa.¹¹ When McCarthy returned to London in 1905, she was a talented and well-trained actor, and was cast as the part of Ann Whitefield for George Bernard Shaw’s *Man and Superman* alongside Harley Granville Barker – who would later become her husband. This role was transformative for McCarthy, and she would later describe the effect it had on her in her autobiography *Myself and My Friends*:

---

I played Ann Whitefield in “Man and Superman”. She was a “new woman” and she made a new woman of me. The women of the previous day, on or off the stage, had been of the stage, stagey. Ann was of the earth, earthy. What an affront to tradition! A real woman on the stage! No wonder people were scandalised. They pulled Ann to pieces, and the more they did so the more real she appeared. But oh! The disappointment to look for sawdust and find only flesh and blood. From being a horrid warning, Ann became a model. Men may have looked askance at her – she was not nice – but women with truer courage stared at her and discovered that she was no mannequin owing the semblance of life to draperies. She was a living woman – one of themselves.... She was insistent when she should have been submissive....She had a will of her own instead of one of theirs....Whenever the slim girl of the present day lights up a cigarette whilst she stands waiting for a train, I feel I must go up to her, as Shaw once said to me: “Why, you’re Ann Whitefield,” and when Amy Johnson flies across the deserts and the seas from here to Cape Town and back again, I want to tell her “Ann Whitefield gave you those strong and lovely wings.” Mrs. Pankhurst, who Heaven knows never lacked resolution, herself told me that Ann Whitefield had strengthened her purpose and fortified her courage...At one of the rehearsals, Louis Calvert, touched by the scene, turned to me and said “You would be a great dramatic actress – a great tragedienne – away from plays like this” Maybe! But away from plays like that I should never have developed as a woman.

Although McCarthy claims that this play transformed her into a ‘new woman’, along with pioneering women of the day including suffragette Emmeline Pankhurst and Amy Johnson, the first woman to fly solo from London to Australia, it can be argued that McCarthy was already a New Woman prior to this date. She had been encouraged to pursue a profession by her father at a young age and then travelled internationally as a young woman with a company of actors. She describes the character she played, Ann Whitefield, in the third person and yet what McCarthy describes in this quotation is a merging of herself and Ann in order to discover herself as a modern woman. Ann, as a Shavian character, was well-developed and, according to McCarthy, as the public unpicked her, she became more real – made out of flesh and blood rather than sawdust. Although men on the whole disapproved of her character, New Women in the audience were able understand her motivations.

McCarthy was cast in several Shavian roles, ‘almost all of them parts for passionate, domineering women, including four of five written specifically for her.” She married Barker, and after several of his projects failed, Lillah took it upon herself to fix his problems and leased the Little Theatre in Adelphi in 1911 in order for her husband to direct there. McCarthy acted at the Little Theatre and then managed Kingsway Theatre where she also took on a lead role. She then began managing a series

---
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of Shakespearean plays at the Savoy with her husband ‘that revolutionized British production of the national dramatist.’\textsuperscript{523} Henry Granville Barker is often remembered as the influential driving force behind modern British theatre, with McCarthy’s role often overlooked. However, without McCarthy’s involvement by taking on a managerial position alongside her acting profession, Barker would never have achieved success. After McCarthy was married, she was pursued by several men including Lord Howard de Walden and Lord Lucas. McCarthy successfully capitalised on their interests in her and persuaded Walden to finance her management in 1911, and Lucas to finance the Shakespearean plays at the Savoy, as an entrepreneur.

McEvoy sought to capture McCarthy in her role as a New Woman – as a successful actor but also a businesswoman who managed several theatres. He has chosen not to depict her in any of her acting roles, a typical portrait-type for actors of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and a type that was attempted in at least three earlier portraits of McCarthy by other artists. Charles Haslewood Shannon painted McCarthy twice, once in the role of ‘Donna Anna’ in 1907 (fig. 277) and then a decade later in 1917-18 in the role of ‘The Dumb Wife’ in \textit{The Man who Married a Dumb Wife}, a play by Anatole France (fig. 278). Shannon’s portrait of McCarthy as ‘Donna Anna’ depicts the actor on stage but is also reminiscent in style of Velasquez’s \textit{Las Meninas}, whereas ‘The Dumb Wife’ portrays McCarthy again playing a role but this time heavily costumed with a large headdress decorated with a gold butterfly. The third known portrait of Lillah McCarthy is by Harold Speed (fig. 279) who painted the actor in 1913 in the role of Jocasta, Oedipus’ wife and mother, in \textit{Oedipus Rex} by Sophocles. This highly finished portrait captures a terrified Jocasta with her hands firmly clenched. However, none of these portraits depict Lillah McCarthy as a New Woman, instead they depict her superficially in dramatic roles. McEvoy does not title his work ‘Lillah McCarthy in the role of X’ but instead names her as an independent woman separated from her career. When McEvoy painted McCarthy’s portrait in 1919, she had already divorced Henry Granville-Barker and was single. She would go on to marry the botanist Professor Sir Frederick William Keeble the following year in 1920. Her career by this point was finished according to her Oxford Dictionary of National Biography entry, but, as it has been previously mentioned, McEvoy’s 1919 portrait was used to advertise McCarthy’s productions at Kingsway Theatre which proves her continued involvement in theatre productions at this date.\textsuperscript{524}
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McCarthy also sat to William Rothenstein for a portrait, although the whereabouts of this work, or whether he painted McCarthy in a dramatic role is unknown.\textsuperscript{525}

As well as several actors and members of the Bright Young Things, McEvoy also painted a number of notable women across different professions, all of whom can be considered New Women of the early twentieth century, and all working against the societal norms of the period in order to gain greater female emancipation. Unfortunately, little is known about McEvoy’s relationship with these individuals and his portraits were almost certainly exclusive commissions rather than portraits of friends or close acquaintances, as we have seen previously. The lack of personal connection to these women had an effect on some of McEvoy’s portraits, including his portrait of the ballet dancer Lydia Lopkova (fig. 280) who would become closely associated with the Bloomsbury group, marrying John Maynard Keynes in 1925. This portrait lacks experimentalism and has been posed awkwardly by the artist. Lopkova’s arms, although more realistically painted than some of McEvoy’s other portraits, are devoid of detail and are inelegantly outlined. It is thought that this portrait was cut down in the twentieth century which does not help the overall awkward aesthetic of the work.\textsuperscript{526} McEvoy also painted Rue Winterbotham Carpenter (fig. 281) in 1920, presumably whilst McEvoy was visiting America, although it is possible that it was instead painted in 1921 when McEvoy was exhibiting in Chicago. This is a much more accomplished portrait and demonstrates the skill of McEvoy’s later portrait style. Luritia ‘Rue’ Winterbotham Carpenter was an American philanthropist and art collector, who founded the Arts Clubs of Chicago and McEvoy’s portrait now resides in the collection of the Art Institute of Chicago.

Some of McEvoy’s most accomplished portraits are of the wealthy upper classes and transatlantic elite – Lois Sturt being one example already explored. Although, superficially, these works can be viewed as fashionable society portraits, McEvoy was also instrumental in bringing the New Woman to the upper classes. Not only was he painting professional New Women such as Tallulah Bankhead, Teddie Gerard, Lillah McCarthy and Lydia Lopokova in the same portrait style as the upper classes, but McEvoy was also giving upper class women, who had recently gained greater societal freedom, in fashion, transportation, sexual liberty, and rights to property and money earned, a visual platform in which to express themselves as twentieth-century New Women. A prime example of this upper-class New Woman was Lady Diana Manners, who, like many women of her generation was denied a formal
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education and was educated at home by a governess. Like Lois Sturt who was a member of the Bright Young Things, Lady Diana Manners and her aristocratic and intellectual friends were part of a group known as the Coterie. Although arguably less-overtly wild than the Bright Young Things and slightly older, The Coterie were also a group with new-found freedom and the means to live extravagantly and to excess, often to the detriment of others. The Coterie hosted a party on the Thames in 1914, just before the outbreak of war, and encouraged fellow member Sir Dennis Anson to swim in the river late at night. Anson quickly got out of his depth and drowned. A young musician who was part of the quartet playing that night jumped in after Anson with the hope of rescuing him, and although returning to the shore, also later died. Diana was blamed as the ringleader and this accident haunted her for the rest of her life. It also served as a precursor for the First World War and the many friends she would lose on the front line.

Like Lois Sturt, Diana Manners also studied at the Slade School of Fine Art for a period, and first met McEvoy whilst she was his student:

There was the Slade School season. Letty [her sister Violet Manners] and I both went to Gower Street by bus and sat shivering in the vast studios, absorbed in fixing the Discus Thrower on to our drawing boards. A dear myopic man (the great Ambrose McEvoy, but I didn’t realise it till later) would shily tell me what was wrong – everything, really, but he made it sound as though the hopeless drawing was very nearly first-class...Having no talent and knowing it, I did not hope to improve, but the life was new and absorbing and here I learnt to love McEvoy. Lessons over, he took me to his little slum studio in Millbank. The lean-to in which he painted was not wide or high enough to hold his canvases...

McEvoy would crouch on a camp-stool, his face close to his water-colour. Above me was a cruelly unbecoming skylight and in my eyes a strong electric bulb. He was surprised that I was surprised at the unnatural elaboration of light. That and a stiff toothbrush which he took to his all-but-finished portrait account for the strange etherealness- the blue lights and the yellow, the day and the flame -that strikes one in his pictures. It was a joy sitting to McEvoy. His conversation prattled and laughed, and friends – beautiful women and their admirers – crushed into the lean-to and talked scandal and art and love. Augustine Birrell would sit and read aloud to stop my chattering tongue. McEvoy painted me several times. Some pictures I have lost sight of. One I sought, sorrowing, for years – a water-colour of me in a big black dress and a serious top hat ("That silly Welsh hat Diana wears," Margot Asquith said). One I still have. It was christened "The Call to Orgy." He was fond of orgies and would love to come to our wilder parties. We took him to our hearts, and when he died, too young, a knife went through mine.528
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The little slum studio that Manners describes in this quotation was actually a substantial lean-to at the back of McEvoy’s house at 107 Grosvenor Road which was then extended just before his death. On visiting the house in November 2019, I discovered that the studio no longer exists. The garden had also been substantially reduced in size as a housing development of blocks of flats had been built on the site of Churchill Gardens behind the house between 1946 and 1962. The owner of McEvoy’s house, who has lived there since the McEvoy’s moved out, took down the studio in the 1960s as it became unstable. Manners correctly remembers the skylight in McEvoy’s studio which was explored in Chapter 3, as well as McEvoy’s use of artificial light – a modern and experimental method for the period and at a time when most people did not have electric lights in their homes. Manners also describes, for the first time, how McEvoy created the ethereality of his portraits for which he became known – by using a stiff toothbrush that would have stripped a lot of the paint away, allowing him to build up increasing layers of different colours.

In contrast to Mary who described McEvoy as a silent painter when they first met at the turn of the century (see page 120) Diana Manners comments on McEvoy’s conversation that ‘prattled and laughed’. His studio had become a location of sociability for the elite – a meeting place for them to discuss ‘scandal and art and love.’ McEvoy provided a comfortable environment for his female sitters which allowed them to feel as though they could confide in him and which allowed them to express their experiences and feelings as New Women of a modern age. His painting methods, using a toothbrush, jumping backwards and forwards to the canvas and running watercolours under the tap, as described by Daphne Pollen (née Baring) as well as Manners, conjures an image of a theatrical performance to his art. McEvoy is entertaining his sitters as well as painting them and, unlike Sargent, or Whistler, who was renowned for not getting on with some of their sitters and being purposefully difficult at times, McEvoy had created a portrait practice for the New Woman that could not fail, by being accommodating and offering a non-judgemental space in which to talk. McEvoy was described in one article two days after his death as ‘the friend and painter of all of us and such a “darling”.’ The insight into the lives of his subjects allowed McEvoy to produce arguably more accomplished portraits that would be considered rich in what critics would refer to as the sitter’s character, but it would also encourage the sitter to return to be painted again by the artist, and recommend McEvoy to their friends and acquaintances.
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It is clear from this quotation that McEvoy was accepted by Diana Manners and her group of friends and often attended their wild parties. She speaks of him as a close friend, rather than just an artist responsible for capturing her likeness. However, in her autobiography she does not recall the letters that she sent to McEvoj, which are part of the McEvoj Estate Papers, and which describe a particularly difficult period of her life. Unlike the majority of upper-class women in the 1890s, who did not pursue a profession, whilst the concept of the New Woman significantly affected the middle classes, several upper-class women from 1914 trained to become nurses and became members of the Voluntary Aid Detachment (VAD) to contribute to the war effort. This set them apart from their predecessors and gave them a similar professional responsibility to the middle-class New Women of the 1890s. A black and white reproduction mount of a portrait thought to be by McEvoy (fig. 282), although possibly by his wife Mary, depicts a First World War VAD nurse. It is not known who the nurse was, when it was painted, or where this portrait now resides. It is possible that it was painted whilst McEvoy was in France as an official war artist or it could be a portrait of Diana Manners – although her mannerisms are not as flamboyant as other portraits of her – or perhaps another member of the VAD at a London hospital. A photograph of Diana Manners in her nurse’s uniform (fig. 283) does bear a resemblance to this portrait. The full-length of the nurse’s pinafore and dress suggests that it was painted during the First World War by Ambrose McEvoy rather than the Second World War, which saw its nurses with slightly shorter dresses, just below the knee.

Several of Manners’ letters, thought to date between 1916 and 1918, express the familiar desperation and depression experienced by those left behind during the First World War.\(^\text{531}\) She questioned her own mortality, having seen several of her friends killed in battle, and many injured soldiers during her nursing role as a member of the VAD at Guy’s Hospital in London. She also nursed injured officers at The Rutland Hospital for Officers, established by her parents at their home at 16 Arlington Street. In a letter, dating to 1916, Manners cancels her sitting with McEvoy and informs him of the death of her brother-in-law, Lord Elcho, killed at Katia on Easter Sunday that year:

32 Montagu Square  
Dear Mr McEvoy,  
I am so sorry but I cannot come to you this afternoon – we have had official news that Ego [Hugo] Elcho was killed at Katia. I am really so miserable that I should be of little good to you besides which I cannot leave my poor despairing sister – I am very sorry if I disappoint you – but you are so good & sympathetic & will understand. I know what  

\(^{531}\) Paper amongst MEP lists McEvoy’s sittings on ‘Tuesday 2\(^\text{nd}\) January’ NOT/111, MEP. Diana Manners is listed among them. 2\(^\text{nd}\) January 1917 was a Tuesday and this list of sittings is thought to date from then. This can be confirmed as Mrs McLaren is also listed as a sitter, whose portrait was completed in March 1917.
tortured things we have become. Next week it will be a little better & I will come Monday afternoon – if you will have me. L Diana Manners

Although Manners is evidently upset by the death of her brother-in-law, she remains strong for her sister Letty whom she describes as ‘despairing’, and with whom Manners was particularly close. She writes again to McEvoy having not sat to the artist for some time and it is in this undated letter that she manifests the ‘tortured things we have become.’ She describes feeling dead and that a personified death has been responsible for robbing her. At this point, McEvoy’s sitter is undoubtedly suffering from depression, resulting from the effects of the First World War, and yet she demonstrates a desire for everyday life to continue. She writes that she wants to ‘come back’ and sit to McEvoy and the daily ritual of ‘tea-time’ is mentioned. She finishes the letter like a soldier asking for her ‘orders’:

The Rutland Hospital for Officers – 16 Arlington Street
My Dear MacEvoy [sic] - I have been silent so long because I felt so dead. Death robs me too often. I felt you must not see me in such conditions – but I want to come back – shall I? or will you come & see if I’m worth it at tea-time or before 12 – write me my orders.
Yrs – Diana Manners.

The most striking portrait of Diana Manners which was painted by McEvoy in 1918, was nicknamed a ‘call to orgy’ (fig. 284). It depicts Manners with her arm raised in confidence, flaunting her youthful beauty. This portrait, later exhibited at McEvoy’s solo exhibition at the Duveen Brothers Galleries in New York in 1920, is an empowering portrait of a young woman overcoming grief, death and the destruction of the First World War. In this portrait, Diana was said to have ‘a gesture like Pallas Athene’ the patron of Athens, goddess of wisdom and most notably a warrior, often depicted with a breastplate and helmet. There are similarities between the Athena Mattei at the Louvre (fig. 285) and McEvoy’s portrait of Diana Manners – both gesturing outwards, the material of their clothes creating a dominant v-shape across the chest and decorated with a Medusa head and flowers at the sternum of both figures respectively. The comparison to Athena accurately suggests that Manners is capable of emerging from darkness, the bleak black background of the portrait which could symbolise war, to become stronger, having fought despair and blossoming like the pink flowers at her chest. This is an unusual background colour for McEvoy and may have been at the request of the sitter. This portrait could also symbolise her maturing as an adult – breaking away from the innocence and rebelliousness of The Coterie to becoming a New Woman capable of undertaking a significant role in

---
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caring for soldiers during the war. She is immortalised and renewed by McEvoy in paint and this portrait, that remained in the sitter’s possession until her death, would have served as a reminder that life can recover following tragedy. McEvoy, by painting Diana’s portrait, provides his sitter with a visual platform with which to be viewed as a new New Woman by friends, family and the international public when this portrait was exhibited at the Duveen exhibition in New York in 1920. Sitting to McEvoy had a significant effect on Manners. Her letter, which is not dated but may have been written when sittings had resumed following Lord Elcho’s death in 1916, provides evidence that McEvoy uplifted his sitter in her darkest hour, and encouraged her to enact her role as a New Woman of the post-war age:

16 Arlington Street
Dearest MacEvoy, [sic]

A word to tell you of my thanks & love. You never fail me, always please me with such dear grace and interest.
My life is the better for having you in its present – to say nothing of my chances of perpetuity – always believe that one of my triumphs & enthusiasms is to be your model.

Bless you,

Diana

A small watercolour version of this portrait which depicts Manners in a three-quarter-length format in a large taffeta dress and gesturing with the same arm is recorded in a reproduction mount in the McEvoy Estate Papers (fig. 286). The whereabouts of this watercolour portrait is currently unknown but interestingly Diana’s mother, Violet, sat with her daughter and documented McEvoy working. A reproduction of a drawing titled Diana Sitting to Mr McEvoy 1918 depicts Diana Manners sat close to McEvoy on a sofa, and McEvoy can be seen delicately painting his sitter with a small paintbrush (fig. 287). The scene is intimate and personal and gives a good insight into McEvoy’s practice and the close relationship and trust that he had with his sitters. Violet Manners was an artist, although she had no formal training, and she was a prominent member of The Souls, a group of aristocrats and intellectuals similar to and preceding The Coterie. Although Violet had been part of a circle of intellectuals and in some respects can be considered an upper-class New Woman of the 1890s, although she did not have a profession, she chooses to chaperone her daughter to her sittings with McEvoy on at least one occasion.

535 LET/133, MEP.
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Finally, although perhaps not an obvious New Woman herself but part of a growing generation of upper-class New Women that had gained greater freedom, McEvoy also painted Irene de Pourtalès in 1921 (fig. 288), four years before her marriage to Dominique de Dietrich in 1925. This was a work that remained unfinished in the artist’s estate at the time of McEvoy’s death and was purchased by Cartwright Memorial Hall in Bradford from Mary in 1930. It is impressionistic in style but has certainly been left unfinished as Pourtalès’ arms and hands have not been completed or corrected – her right arm is mis-shaped below the elbow. The composition is quite different to many portraits by McEvoy at this period as Pourtalès stands in an opulent interior – probably belonging to the sitter – with a mirror behind her and objects on the mantlepiece including a statuette of a south-east Asian opera performer. Pourtalès contrasts her green background, dressed in an orange-coloured dress and holding a large pink ostrich-feather fan. Although McEvoy’s style of painting is typical of the period, the traditional trappings of wealth surrounding his sitter is unusual for the artist at this date and recalls portraits of the previous generation by Sargent, as well as mirror paintings including Madame by McEvoy and Whistler’s Symphony in White, No. 2: The Little White Girl (fig. 207) in which the sitter is also holding a fan, and a Chinoiserie vase adorns the mantlepiece. It is possible that the commissioner of this portrait requested a more decorated interior. It is not known why this painting remained in the artist’s estate but it is possible that the sitter did not return for the remaining sittings, they did not like the portrait, or perhaps McEvoy did not feel able to finish it.

The Pourtalès family were probably introduced to McEvoy through the Barings, as the two families were related – Irene was the second cousin of Daphne and Calypso (McEvoy’s portrait of Mrs Baring was examined in detail in Chapter 4 and he painted Baring’s daughters Daphne and Calypso on several occasions). However, it does not appear as though Irene was the person who commissioned this portrait from McEvoy, nor her father who had died several years earlier. Instead, two business cards in the McEvoy Estate Papers belonging to ‘La Comtesse Hermann de Pourtalès’, Hélène de Pourtalès, suggest that Irene’s mother commissioned the portrait of her daughter (fig. 289). Both business cards have handwritten notes scribbled on them in pencil: one has Helen’s Mayfair phone number ‘Mayfair

538 In a letter to Mary from McEvoy dated 18th March 1921 from 222 West 59th Street, New York, McEvoy wrote that ‘I have not finished Lady Granard or her son, so if I come back there will be those two pictures to do in England, and the Pourtalès picture anyway.’ LET/203/1921, MEP. McEvoy returned to England in May 1921 and this portrait would have then been completed.
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1738’ and on the second card is written a New York address ‘c/o Mrs(?) Barbey [Helen’s mother lived in New York and this is possibly her address] 145 E. 35th St. N.Y.’. On the reverse of the Mayfair business card are three words written in ink in McEvoy’s handwriting: ‘oranges’, ‘cohen’ and ‘chenine’. Although the meaning of the last two words is unclear, the first word, ‘oranges’ could refer to the bright orange hues McEvoy used for Irene’s dress in her portrait. Hélène de Pourtalès, Irene’s mother and the owner of these business cards, was a New Woman of the 1890s and would have almost certainly encouraged her daughter to pursue greater interests than just marriage. She represents a generational transition from the rare upper-class New Woman of the 1890s to the liberated upper-class New Woman of the late 1910s and 1920s, embodied by her daughter Irene. Born Helen Barbey, Pourtalès was the first woman to compete at the Olympics and the first woman to win an Olympic gold medal. On the 22nd May 1900, Pourtalès who was then thirty-two, along with a crew that included her husband Hermann, won a gold medal in sailing representing Switzerland on the yacht Lérina. Three days later the same crew won a silver medal.

After exploring several of McEvoy’s most accomplished female portraits, it can be concluded that McEvoy brought a new New Woman to portraiture in the late 1910s and 1920s. He recognised the changing role of women within the upper classes and gave them a visual platform with which to express themselves. These portraits and the unique ethereal style with which he painted them resulted in McEvoy becoming one of the leading portrait painters of his generation, arguably succeeding Sargent after his retirement and certainly after his death in 1925. It is hard to understand why Bruce Redford does not consider McEvoy as a contender to fill the significant void left by Sargent after his death. As this chapter has explored, the two artists pushed the boundaries of female portraiture in their own time. Although it is easy to argue that several of Sargent’s sitters were the idle rich – the New Lady as Bruce Redford described them – and to some extent this argument rings true, there are examples of upper-class women painted by Sargent who do buck the trend. Adele

541 Two business cards for La Comtesse Hermann de Pourtales, NOT/100 and NOT/95, MEP.
543 Bruce Redford in his book John Singer Sargent and the Art of Allusion concluded that although ‘there is no clear consensus...on the identity of the principal heir’, a combination of Philip Alexius de László and William Orpen would have been the most obvious choice. Bruce Redford, John Singer Sargent and the Art of Allusion (Yale University Press, 2016), 189.
Meyer and Millicent, Duchess of Sutherland, as well as actresses and writers including Ellen Terry and Vernon Lee, were New Women of the 1890s.

McEvoy, on the other hand, painted the upper-class women who had broken free of their societal restraints during and following the First World War, and chose to pursue professional positions. These women learnt to drive cars and fly planes, and for the first time had gained a significant degree of sexual emancipation – and their androgenous and liberating fashions reflected this. Like Sargent whose popular reputation led to Sickert coining the term Sargentolatry, McEvoy had a similar cult-following of upper-class women sitters known as:

The Ambrosians. A Scotch name linked with girls, and the effect may sound Bohemian, but, Ambrose McEvoy and his maidens do not really conform to this tradition. McEvoy is a living rebuff to the aesthetic hooliganism that flourishes on certain beats between the Café Royal and Flood Street. High-spirited, high-voiced, he is enthusiastic enough to have flourished in the bitter-sweet Chelsea of the Rossetti and Whistler period. 544

He was also named the ‘prince of fashionable portrait painters’, just as Sargent had been named the ‘prince of the atelier’. 545 McEvoy’s success can be measured by the prices he was charging and receiving for his portraits, particularly in comparison to Sargent who was considered the leading portraitist of his generation. McEvoy wrote to Mary on Monday 3rd May 1920 whilst visiting New York. He had made a list of seven portrait commissions that he had agreed to paint during his stay, ‘This is the list now and I don’t want to start any more’, he tells his wife. 546 These seven portraits total a staggering $32,500, which McEvoy has then worked out to be £8,125. The largest commission is a portrait for a Mrs Sinclair at $12,000 – the letter does not state that this commission was a group portrait, although this is of course possible. Prettejohn wrote that, ‘Late in the 1890s Sargent raised his fee for a full-length portrait to 1000 guineas, equivalent to at least £50,000 in the money of the 1990s; a single portrait by Sargent cost a multiple of the annual salary of a reasonably well-off member of the middle-class.’ Sargent’s 1000-guinea portraits in the late 1890s were the equivalent of £82,080.81 in 2017 using the National Archive Currency Converter. 547 In 1920, McEvoy’s portrait of
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Mrs Sinclair, which was the highest price for a McEvoy at this time at £3000, was equivalent to £87,173.10 in 2017 – more than a Sargent.
CONCLUSION

It took twenty-three years from his first attending the Slade in 1893 for McEvoy to achieve success as a portraitist, and to fulfil his wish to be ‘a painter of excellence.’ He achieved this by expertly positioning his work in relation to other artists – his contemporaries, Dutch old masters, Whistler, and Sargent – learning from their techniques, use of tone, and compositional arrangements, in order to incorporate elements of their work into his own. This was an important tactic that McEvoy employed in order to ensure that his work remained relevant at a time when young artists working at the turn of the twentieth century were living in the shadow of an aging generation of Victorian artists including Whistler and Sargent, and amidst a booming secondary market that was beginning to favour old masters over contemporary art. Pezzini succinctly describes McEvoy’s generation:

in parallel with a thriving art market and growing scholarly investigations, it could be argued that British artists of the turn of the century aimed to live up to the comparison with the old masters and created a diverse cosmopolitan language, part Whistlerian, part French, and significantly inspired by the European art of the past, to generate critical, commercial and popular interest. This art was not modernist, in the sense that it did not present the extreme simplifications and distortions that we have come to associate with that movement, and certainly had strong stylistic connections with British fin-de-siècle aestheticism, but that does not mean that it was not representative of topical concerns. At least until 1910, as shown in the Whitechapel exhibition Twenty Years of British Art, this current represented a vital element of modern art in Britain and possessed enough of its own character to be distinctive and hence worthy of independent consideration.548

By positioning his work in relation to other artists, McEvoy was not only ensuring that he delivered the best paintings possible, with techniques that could rival old masters, but he was also inadvertently gaining the trust of clientele that were familiar and comfortable with established artists of the previous generation.

As was explored in Chapter 1, McEvoy embarked upon an early period of self-education during which he meticulously copied old master paintings in the National Gallery, the Soane and the Wallace Collection, in order to further develop his Slade education. McEvoy’s formal education at the Slade had provided him with progressive artistic training, but his tutors went above and beyond their

548 Pezzini, ‘(Inter)National Art’, 159. McEvoy was represented by three paintings in the Twenty Years of British Art exhibition at the Whitechapel art gallery. Whitechapel Art Gallery, “Twenty Years of British Art (1890-1910) May 10-June 19” (London, 1910).
traditional role as teachers and provided him with introductions to clients, a space in which to exhibit (the NEAC), and encouraged him to study ‘the pictures in the National Gallery’ over more popular works.\textsuperscript{549} This early encouragement to embrace the influence of other artists’ works was fundamental in the development of McEvoy’s artistic practice over a number of years. His early imitation of old masters was complemented by several years working alongside Slade school friends who were also directly responsible for influencing his early work, and who shared his interest in seventeenth-century Dutch old masters.

The impact of this influence placed McEvoy at the inception of a fashionable movement in British art at the turn of the twentieth century – an increasing interest in seventeenth-century Dutch paintings. From 1901, McEvoy was influenced by Dutch masters, on display in London and across Europe, to produce his own Dutch-inspired interiors, and from 1910 until 1913 these interiors became increasingly sophisticated and original. As this thesis has demonstrated, McEvoy’s model Anaïs provided him with the inspiration to transition from interior paintings to portraiture. Anaïs’ influence, as well as the experimental techniques and combinations of pigments that he had learnt during the process of studying old masters and working with his contemporaries, led to McEvoy developing a recognisable portrait-type. This portrait-type was unique amongst his contemporaries, it was popular with his clients, and it was described on several occasions as ‘ethereal’. ‘His art is an art of suggestion, of fragile, brief, unfinished paintings, each conveying an atmosphere, a gesture or an impression…. he realised how transient and ephemeral are human moods and manners.’\textsuperscript{550}

The ethereality of McEvoy’s portraits, as discussed in Chapter 4, was also born from the influence of James McNeill Whistler. Although McEvoy would have been well-versed in Whistler’s work from a young age, it was argued in Chapter 4 that it was not until 1912, several years after Whistler’s death, that the aesthetic artist’s work had a profound impact on McEvoy and his portraiture. McEvoy was deeply influenced by the tone used in Whistler’s nocturnes and portraits, and by imitating these elements of Whistler’s work, it is likely that McEvoy intended to fill the void left by Whistler after his death in 1903.

The majority of McEvoy’s later portraits depict women, and these are the portraits on which this thesis has focused. These women were often painted by McEvoy without an interior or exterior setting, in

\textsuperscript{549} Chitty, Gwen John, 37 & 38.

order to create a singular and uninterrupted narrative of his sitter. McEvoy built his recognisable portrait-type using an ethereality influenced by Whistler and the reoccurring motif of the mirror in his work, and yet his later portraits were also strongly influenced by John Singer Sargent. As Chapter 5 examined, Sargent’s portraits of upper-class sitters started to touch upon the 1890s concept of the New Woman. In McEvoy’s pursuit of succeeding Sargent as the leading portraitist in Britain, McEvoy also revisited the subject of the New Woman and brought the concept to the upper classes for the first time in the late 1910s and 1920s.

McEvoy gave his wealthy and professional female sitters a visual platform on which to define themselves. They were the solitary focus of their portraits, and often it was the sitters themselves who commissioned these works. These women were McEvoy’s friends, he would have encouraged their independence and, as the correspondence from Diana Manners and Teddie Gerard confirm, they confided in him.\(^{551}\) Unlike so many of his contemporary artists, McEvoy fostered an intimacy between himself and his sitters that led to a deeper understanding of his subjects, and their expectations from their portraits. Reginald Gleadowe described the impact of McEvoy’s relationships with his sitters by positioning him alongside several other successful British artists:

> Constable painted not by reason, or guidance, but, in all humility, by eye; first the leaves and grass, and then the wind and showers. And Gainsborough painted by eye not only what he saw but what he felt. He, too, is Reynolds’ opposite – a landscape painter, bored with society and success, and painting his personal reaction to his sitters. He paints his daughters best, as Hogarth his servants, and McEvoy his friends. Hogarth, Gainsborough and McEvoy – these are more English than Reynolds or even Blake. Through them runs the authentic strain of fine calligraphy, of muted harmonies, of cool reticence, of intimacy, of delicate form and pearly colour.\(^{552}\)

Gleadowe defines McEvoy’s portraits as quintessentially English, although it has been concluded in this thesis that his influences were predominantly European and transatlantic, rather than British. The intimacy between McEvoy and his sitters is expressed in the delicate paintwork of the faces of his sitters, as well as the varying degrees of abstraction of the clothes they are wearing. It has been said that McEvoy successfully painted his sitter’s character or ‘spirit’ rather than producing a photographic likeness. This was described by the art critic Martin Wood as particularly innovative:

> I believe that future art will press towards the point at which he [McEvoy] is arriving – striving to reach the spirit of the subject, the spirit of the sitter, impatient of detail

---
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except in the light of personality, and quite unable to dwell on it with the old solemn belief in its importance."

In a letter to the Editor of *The Times*, William Rothenstein wrote that, ‘McEvoy seems to have approached each sitter with an enchanted excitement, drawing and painting with the curiosity, the interest, and the experimental research for colour, pose, and expression that artists usually reserve for their private work.’\(^{554}\) The strength of McEvoy’s relationship with his sitters also meant that he did not have to rely on the open market to sell his work, as the majority of these portraits were commissions with repeat clients.

McEvoy’s tutors, Henry Tonks and Philip Wilson Steer believed, ‘Let an artist’s work be remarkable; but he himself...should pass unnoticed.’\(^{555}\) Although McEvoy’s tutors were not describing McEvoy specifically, this is a particularly poignant statement with which to conclude this project. The word ‘remarkable’ is subjective, and recalls McEvoy’s need to be a ‘painter of excellence’ – the quotation that commenced this thesis. For many of McEvoy’s sitters, and reflected in his transnational popularity, McEvoy’s portraits were remarkable. His likenesses of the wealthy elite and celebrities of the 1920s brought McEvoy’s portraits to the fore of fashionable society and he was celebrated as, ‘the most successful painter of the modern Society woman’.

Over a hundred of McEvoy’s paintings are dispersed across thirty-five public collections across the UK, and international collections boast dozens of McEvoy oils, watercolours and drawings. Regardless of his fame, McEvoy remained ‘the same unassuming quietly charming companion and seemed unspoiled by success.’\(^{557}\)

At the height of his popularity in the 1920s, McEvoy’s ‘touch’ was described as ‘godlike’ by Reginald Gleadowe:

> out of the fire and gossamer of colour and line he can weave beauties which need not be justified by their content, forms which may be divinely insignificant. What he sees are the things eternally worth seeing; you must go to the flowers, the clouds, the waves to match his faultless rhythms, his pure fantasies. Untouched by theory or faction,
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trusting his eye, practising untiringly his hand, he will enrich the world with inventions, born of his taste, and patiently wrought in the image of god.558

The powerful language of this quotation which describes McEvoy's work as remarkable, could have been used to describe any of the great painters in European art history. Gleadowe is attempting to align McEvoy to the reputations of artists who influenced his work. Art critic Martin Wood believed that McEvoy's success would continue for posterity, 'I believe there will never come a time when a really characteristic portrait by Mr. McEvo will not retain its value.'559 However, McEvoy's posthumous legacy significantly deteriorated after his death in 1927. There were of course some articles that continued to praise McEvoy's work, and in 1945 a review of an exhibition at the Beaux Art Gallery at 1 Bruton Place in Mayfair wrote:

Imaginative, intensely refined, McEvo’s place in English art is distinctive. The reputation of this “Shelley among painters” has by no means declined since his death in 1927 – it is indeed likely to rise still higher. It will be to McEvo’s lasting credit that he contrived to combine popularity with artistic integrity.560

A contradictory review of the same exhibition in 1945, this time written by Eric Newton, commented on the precariousness of McEvo’s portraits as if they were temporary in their quality, ‘One has the uncomfortable feeling that his sitter may, at any moment, shatter the dream by rushing off to play tennis.’561 The criticism of McEvo’s work reached a crescendo in 1953 when a review of the Leicester Galleries retrospective exhibition was published in The Times:

...the startling vulgarity of his productions as a fashionable portrait painter, will not do for any but the most uncritical minds...McEvo succumbed so completely that even the best of the portrait sketches and those that were most obviously done to please himself are in this respect as tricky as Lawrence at his very worst.562

However, the precariousness of McEvo’s portraiture, described by Eric Newton, is also a characteristic that makes McEvo’s work inherently modern, as Claude Johnson described:

For the value of Mr. McEvo’s art is that it is so finely expressive of our age. His view of the subject is particularly that of his time, owing nothing whatever to tradition, and

558 Gleadowe, Ambrose McEvo, 1924, 29.
revealing to us that we live in a different world from that which was depicted in eighteenth-century art.⁵⁶³

Although McEvoy’s portrait-type can be considered modern and individual in its ethereal style, this quotation fails to recognise the different historical influences on his work. Johnson writes that McEvoy’s work owes ‘nothing whatever to tradition’ which, as this thesis has illustrated, is simply not the case. There are complex reasons for the decline of McEvoy’s reputation in the years following his death, which deserve further exploration beyond this thesis. However, if Johnson, a close friend of McEvoy writing during the artist’s lifetime, failed to recognise that McEvoy was both original and modern in his portraiture, whilst also being closely influenced by old masters and contemporaries, then how could an art historian working twenty or fifty years after McEvoy’s death be expected to unpick this complicated narrative of an artist and an oeuvre that does not easily fit into the art historical mould of modernist values? Following the 1953 review, McEvoy’s life and work faded into obscurity and eventually ‘pass[ed] unnoticed’ in British art history.⁵⁶⁴

There are a number of possible reasons for the neglect of McEvoy’s work. McEvoy died quietly of pneumonia at the age of forty-nine, and was quickly overshadowed by his gregarious, controversial and long-lived friend Augustus John. McEvoy was working over a transitional period and across the 19th/20th century divide. This divide has led to the separation of Victorian and modernist artists in art history, with many of the artists that fall into neither group – including McEvoy and a number of his contemporaries – having subsequently been excluded from scholarship.⁵⁶⁵ British art has celebrated a number of war artists working during the First and Second World Wars, and with a growing interest in this area over a number of years, it has led to the systematic exclusion of artists, like McEvoy, working during the interwar period. Following the Second World War, as has been briefly mentioned in this thesis, societal tastes also began to change and portraits of the wealthy elite amidst rationing and a war-torn Britain were no longer welcome in the canon of British art. This meant that McEvoy’s portraits were relegated to art gallery storerooms and have never returned to public view. Finally, in the quotation above, Pezzini writes that McEvoy’s generation of artists were not modernists in the sense that they ‘did not present the extreme simplifications and distortions we have come to associate with that movement’, for example, the simple colours and shapes created by the Bloomsbury Group.
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or work by the Vorticists, or Picasso.\textsuperscript{566} Pezzini writes that until at least 1910, ‘this current represented a vital element of modern art in Britain and possessed enough of its own character to be distinctive and hence worthy of independent consideration.’\textsuperscript{567} McEvoy’s portraits, although his work was influenced by other artists in a variety of ways, maintained their own distinctive character and popularity until his death in 1927, and then intermittently in the twenty years that followed.

It was a struggle for McEvoy to reach success, or as McEvoy defined it, ‘to be a painter of excellence’. It took a number of years negotiating the work of Dutch masters, Whistler, Sargent, and his Slade contemporaries, in order to develop a distinctive style of portraiture. This thesis focuses on the work of Ambrose McEvoy, but the narrative of British art in which he sits is broader than his life and oeuvre. McEvoy is representative of an under-researched period in British art which constitutes several artists who have been excluded or side-lined in art historical scholarship. Art historians have cherry-picked convenient areas of modern British art, or specific artists and groups, to research. As more is written on these pockets of British art, so the field becomes increasingly narrow. It is now time to broaden this field and populate British art history at the turn of the twentieth century, and throughout the interwar years, with every artist that contributed to the narrative. The natural progression from this thesis would be to research the female artists that attended the Slade School of Fine Art with McEvoy. As was explored in Chapter 2, these women influenced McEvoy and their other male contemporaries, but often did not reach their potential as artists once entering the domestic sphere as wives and mothers.

This thesis has given a comprehensive and unprecedented insight into the life and work of Ambrose McEvoy from an art historical perspective, but it has also provided a foundation on which to build a new narrative of British art at this period. As the art collector, and friend of McEvoy, Edgar Vincent, 1\textsuperscript{st} Viscount D’Abernon wrote in McEvoy’s obituary in The Times two weeks after his death:

\begin{quote}
What will be McEvoy’s place in the judgement of posterity? What will be his level in the auction rooms of 2027 A.D.?... No one can predict. The verdict will certainly depend upon something entirely different from artistic merit as preached in the jargon of today. But if the tide of Transatlantic fashion, or the fancy of the then richest country, possibly our Colonial Empire or some South American community, turns in the direction of the graceful, the delicate, and the imaginative, we believe that none of the moderns has a better chance of being classified and compared with Gainsborough than the
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{566} Pezzini, ‘(Inter)National Art’, 159.
\textsuperscript{567} Ibid.
strange and illusive painter whose premature death English art has to-day such good reason to deplore.568

Although we live in a very different world from that of 1927, and 2027 now draws near, McEvoy’s work, particularly his focus on women in portraiture, has never been more relevant. This thesis is the beginning of a new generation of scholarship on McEvoy, and the work of his contemporaries, as part of a neglected period of British modernism. McEvoy was an experimental artist who worked through a transitional period of British art at the turn of the twentieth century, an unprecedented world war, and a unique period of intense glamour and reckless indulgence, the 1920s. The McEvoy Estate Papers have confirmed that McEvoy was a leading portraitist of his generation and that he built his successful practice by negotiating the influence of other artists and their work – de Hooch, Rembrandt, Sargent, Titian, Vermeer, Whistler – McEvoy gleaned techniques from these artists, he copied and reinterpreted their compositions in order to create a truly unique and recognisable style of portraiture. These artistic influences truly shaped this ‘painter of excellence.’569

569 NOT/364, MEP.
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VOLUME II
Figure 1: ‘The Ram and the Graven Image’ by Ambrose McEvoy in *Fableland* by William Morant (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1898), 44-45, British Library, General Reference Collection 012305.i.3 (photograph by Lydia Miller).
Figure 2: ‘The Pigeon and the Parrot’ by Ambrose McEvoy in *Fableland* by William Morant (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1898), 44-45, British Library, General Reference Collection 012305.i.3 (photograph by Lydia Miller).
Figure 4: Unknown photographer, *Ambrose McEvoy*, c.1898, photograph, McEvoy Estate Papers, PHO/1.
Figure 5: F. Hollyer, *English illustrator Aubrey Vincent Beardsley (1872-1898)*, 1892, photograph, Getty Images, HE6494.
**Figure 6:** An authorised copy of McEvoy’s birth certificate from Wiltshire and Swindon History Centre, 10th January 2017, signed by R. Hunter, Deputy Superintendent Registrar.
Figure 7: Admittance Ticket, University College London, Slade School of Fine Art, Ambrose McEvoy, 2nd term, 3 days a week, 1897-1898, admitted by Frederick Brown.
Figure 8: Unknown, *Cast of the Dancing Faun*, c.1781, plaster cast, 151cm high, Royal Academy of Arts, 03/1462.
Figure 9: Elinor Proby Adams, *A Faun Playing Cymbals (and a study of a Left Arm)*, 1906, black chalk, unknown dimensions, UCL Art Museum, 8921.
Figure 10: Desiderio da Settignano, *The Christ Child (?)*, c.1460, marble, 30.5 x 26.5 x 16.3cm, National Gallery of Art Washington, D.C.
Figure 11: Ambrose McEvoy, *Drawing after Desiderio da Settignano, The Christ Child*, date unknown, ink on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, DRA/653.
Figure 12: Ambrose McEvoy, Drawing after Desiderio da Settignano, *The Christ Child*, February 27th unknown year, pencil highlighted with white chalk on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, DRA/14.
Figure 13: Ambrose McEvoy, Drawing after Desiderio da Settignano, The Christ Child, 20th November 1899, graphite on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, DRA/19 (recto and verso).
Figure 14: Ambrose McEvoy, Drawing after Desiderio da Settignano, The Christ Child, unknown date, pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, SKE/3.
**Figure 15**: Ambrose McEvoy, *Drawing after Desiderio da Settignano, The Christ Child*, unknown date, ink and pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, DRA/687.
Figure 16: Ambrose McEvoy, Drawing after Desiderio da Settignano, The Christ Child, February 1900, pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, DRA/506.
Figure 17: Ambrose McEvoy, *Drawing after Desiderio da Settignano, The Christ Child*, unknown date, ink on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, SKE/3.
Figure 18: Maggie Laubser, *Still Life with Bust of a Young Boy and Orange*, 1920-21, oil on board, 40 x 31 cm, Stellenbosch University, DM269.
Figure 19: Ambrose McEvoy, *Study of a male nude*, date unknown, pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, DRA/1205.
Figure 20: Ambrose McEvoy, *Sketch of a female nude*, date unknown, pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, DRA/1230.
Figure 21: Ambrose McEvoy, Sketch of a female nude, date unknown, pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, DRA/1239.
Figure 22: Ambrose McEvoy, *Sketch of a female nude*, date unknown, pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, DRA/1245.
Figure 23: Ambrose McEvoy, *Sketch of a female nude*, date unknown, graphite on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, DRA/1317.
Figure 24: Ambrose McEvoy, *Two sketches of male nudes*, date unknown, pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, PAI/91.
Figure 25: Walter Sickert, *The Camden Town Murder or What Shall We Do about the Rent?* c.1908, oil on canvas, 25.6 x 35.6cm, Yale Center for British Art, B1979.37.1.
Figure 26: Ambrose McEvoy, pages from a sketchbook depicting the human head, date unknown, pen on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, SKE/33.
**Figure 27:** Ambrose McEvoy, pages from a sketchbook depicting the human figure, date unknown, pen on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, SKE/30.
Figure 28: Ambrose McEvoy, *Sketch of standing male nudes*, date unknown, pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, DRA/59.
Figure 29: Augustus John, *At the National*, date unknown, ink on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, DRA/1319.
Figure 30: Augustus John, *Leaving the National*, date unknown, ink on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, DRA/1319.
Figure 31: Vincenzo Catena, St. Jerome in his Study, c.1510, oil on canvas, 75.9 x 98.4cm, National Gallery, London, NG694.
Figure 32: Paolo Veronese, *The Rape of Europa*, c.1570, oil on canvas glued to oak panel, 59.5 x 70cm, National Gallery, London, NG97.

Figure 33: Ambrose McEvoy, *The Rape of Europa after Veronese*, date unknown, oil on canvas, McEvoy Estate Papers, PAI/32.
Figure 34: Titian, *Noli me Tangere*, c.1514, oil on canvas, 110 x 91.9cm, National Gallery, NG270.
**Figure 35:** Ambrose McEvoy, *Noli me Tangere after Titian*, date unknown, oil on canvas, McEvoy Estate Papers, PAI/46.
Figure 36: Ambrose McEvoy, *Four Centuries of Italian Painters*, large sheet of paper documenting Italian artists from 1275 to 1650, date unknown, ink on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, NOT/81. (Images 1 and 2 of 6)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Siena</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Jacopo Bellini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perugia</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>Pietro da Cortona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>Antonio da Firenze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padua</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>Bernardino di Pisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>Antonello da Ferrara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombardy</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>Giovanni Bellini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucca</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Fra Luca della Robbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>Fra Filippo Brunellesch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrara</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>Niccolò da Firenze</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vertical lines show the names whose length of the painter's life reached as far as possible about the culminating point of his career.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Painter</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Leonardo da Vinci</td>
<td>School of Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
<td>School of Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Caravaggio</td>
<td>School of Naples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Titian</td>
<td>School of Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Rembrandt</td>
<td>School of Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Vermeer</td>
<td>School of Delft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vertical lines below the names show the length of the painter's life. It is reached as far as possible about the culminating point of his career.
Figure 37: Ambrose McEvoy, several sketches of hands, pen, pencil, graphite, red chalk on paper, date unknown, McEvoy Estate Papers, DRA/1316, DRA/673, DRA/674, DRA/675, DRA/676, DRA/678, DRA/679, DRA/681.
Figure 38: Titian, Detail of *Noli me Tangere*, c.1514, oil on canvas, 110 x 91.9cm, National Gallery, NG270.
Figure 39: Thomas Gainsborough, *The Artist’s Daughter Margaret*, c.1772, oil on canvas, 75.6 x 62.9cm, Tate, N01482.
Figure 40: Ambrose McEvoy, *The Artist’s Daughter Margaret after Thomas Gainsborough*, date unknown, oil on canvas, McEvoy Estate Papers, PAI/55.
Figure 41: William Hogarth, *Mrs Salter*, 1741, oil on canvas, 76.2 x 63.5cm, Tate, N01663.
Figure 42: Ambrose McEvoy, Mrs Salter after William Hogarth, date unknown, oil on canvas, McEvoy Estate Papers, PAI/133.
Figure 43: William Hogarth, *The Sleeping Congregation*, 1762, etching and engraving, 26.7 x 20.8cm, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 91.1.1.
Figure 44: Ambrose McEvoy, *The Sleeping Congregation after William Hogarth*, date unknown, ink on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, SKE/3.
Figure 45: A reader’s ticket for Sir John Soane’s Museum, addressed to Mr A. Ambrose McEvoy. 7th January 1899.

Figure 46: Ambrose McEvoy, *Syndics of the Drapers’ Guild after Rembrandt*, date unknown, ink and pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, SKE/3.
Figure 47: Ambrose McEvoy, Jean Pellicorne with His Son Caspar after Rembrandt, date unknown, pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, SKE/3.
Figure 48: Ambrose McEvoy, *Susanna van Collen, Wife of Jean Pellicorne with Her Daughter Anna after Rembrandt*, date unknown, pen and wash on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, SKE/3.
Figure 49: Ambrose McEvoy, Susanna van Collen, Wife of Jean Pellicorne with Her Daughter Anna after Rembrandt, date unknown, pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, SKE/3.
Figure 50: Rembrandt, *The Rat Catcher*, 1632, etching, 14 x 12.5cm, The British Museum, 1847,1120.5.
Figure 51: Ambrose McEvoy, *The Rat Catcher after Rembrandt*, date unknown, ink on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, DRA/670.
Figure 52: Gwen John, *Group Portrait*, c.1897, watercolour and pen over pencil, 28 x 38cm, UCL Art Museum, 3451.
Figure 53: Samuel van Hoogstraten, *Vue d’intérieur, ou Les Pantoufles (The Slippers)*, c.1658, oil on canvas, 103 x 70cm, Louvre Museum, RF 3722.
Figure 54: Henri Fantin-Latour, *A Studio at Les Batignolles*, 1870, oil on canvas, 204 x 273.5cm, Louvre Museum, RF 729. (Annotated by Lydia Miller)

Figure 55: Unknown photographer, *Slade School country picnic*, April 1899, vintage bromide print, 17.3 x 25.5cm, National Portrait Gallery, NPG x38484.
Figure 56: Gwen John, reverse of *Group Portrait*, c.1897, red chalk, pen and black ink over black chalk, 28 x 38cm, UCL Art Museum, 3451.
Figure 57: Raphael, Drawing, Study for a Nude Soldier in a Resurrection, 1498-1520, pencil on paper, 29.1 x 32.5cm, The British Museum, 1854,0513.11.

Figure 58: Gwen John, Detail of ‘Raffaelle’ signature, bottom right of the reverse of Group Portrait, c.1897, red chalk, pen and black ink over black chalk, 28 x 38cm, UCL Art Museum, 3451.
Figure 59: Gwen John, *Self-Portrait*, 1902, oil on canvas, 44.8 x 34.9cm, Tate, N05366.
Figure 60: Frederick Brown, *Portrait of the Artist*, 1926, oil on canvas, 97.5 x 66cm, Ferens Art Gallery, KINCM:2005.4784.
Figure 61: Dutch School, *Portrait of a Young Woman*, c.1653-5, oil on canvas, 66 x 58.5cm, The National Gallery, NG237.
Figure 62: Ambrose McEvoy, *Gwen John*, c.1900, oil on canvas, 68.7 x 51.1cm, National Museum of Wales, NMW A 12827.
Figure 63: Gwen John, *Mrs Atkinson*, ca. 1897-98, oil on wood, 30.5 x 31.1cm, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1979.135.27.
Figure 64: James McNeill Whistler, *Arrangement in Grey and Black No. 1*, 1871, oil on canvas, 144.3 x 162.5cm, Musée D’Orsay, RF 699.

Figure 65: Gwen John, *Mrs Atkinson*, ca. 1897-98, oil on wood, 30.5 x 31.1cm, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1979.135.27 and Gwen John, *Group Portrait*, c.1897, watercolour and pen over pencil, 28 x 38cm, UCL Art Museum, 3451.
Figure 66: Ambrose McEvoy, *Sketch after Mrs Atkinson by Gwen John*, date unknown, pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, SKE/3.
Figure 67: Ambrose McEvoy, *Sketch after Mrs Atkinson by Gwen John*, date unknown, pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, SKE/3.
Figure 68: Ambrose McEvoy, *Sketch after Mrs Atkinson by Gwen John and other figures*, date unknown, pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, SKE/3.
Figure 69: Ambrose McEvoy, *Sketch of skull after Mrs Atkinson by Gwen John*, date unknown, pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, SKE/3.
Figure 70: Ambrose McEvoy, Sketch after Albrecht Dürer Virgin and Child Seated by the Wall, date unknown, pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, SKE/3.
Figure 71: Ambrose McEvoy, *Sketch after Albrecht Dürer Virgin and Child Seated by the Wall*, date unknown, pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, SKE/3.
Figure 72: Albrecht Dürer, Virgin and Child Seated by the Wall, 1528-1563, etching on paper, 22.4 x 15.6cm, The British Museum, 1845,0809.1430.
Figure 73: Ambrose McEvoy, *The Artist’s Mother*, 1915, oil on canvas, 111 x 98cm, Walker Art Gallery, WAG 3141.
Figure 74: Augustus John, *An Old Lady*, 1898-9, oil on canvas, 68.6 x 55.8cm, Tate, N05259.
Figure 75: Postcard of Joos van Cleve, *Le Repos pendant la fuite en Égypte*, Musées Royaux de Beaux-Art de Belgique, McEvoy Estate Papers, POS/326.

Figure 76: Joos van Cleve, *Le Repos pendant la fuite en Égypte*, date unknown, oak, 54 x 67.5cm, Musées Royaux de Beaux-Art de Belgique, 2928.
Figure 77: ‘The Carroty Salamander’ in Logie Whiteway, “The Slade Animal Land, as Seen by the Lo. With Help in Ideas from the Jeff and Other Friendly Animals,” 1898, unpublished manuscript, National Library of Scotland, MS.20347 (photograph by Lydia Miller).
Figure 78: ‘The Nettlebug’ in Logie Whiteway, “The Slade Animal Land, as Seen by the Lo. With Help in Ideas from the Jeff and Other Friendly Animals,” 1898, unpublished manuscript, National Library of Scotland, MS.20347 (photograph by Lydia Miller).
Figure 80: Ida Nettleship, *A Study of a Nude Male Figure*, 1895, black chalk on paper, size unknown, UCL Art Museum, 6529.
Figure 81: Thora E. Peppercorn, *Male Figure Standing*, 1916, oil on canvas, size unknown, UCL Art Museum, 5212.
Figure 82: Ursula Tyrwhitt, *Flowers*, 1912, watercolour on paper, 40.6 x 38.4cm, Tate, N04814.
Figure 83: Gwen John, *Interior with Figures*, c.1898-1899, oil on canvas, 46 x 33.4cm, National Gallery of Victoria, 1737-4
Figure 84: William Orpen, *The Old Circus: The Three Musketeers*, 1898-9, oil on canvas, 89 x 68.5cm, private collection.

Figure 85: Anthony van Dyck, *Charles I*, 1635-6, oil on canvas, 84.4 x 99.4cm, Royal Collection, RCIN 404420.
and the coming of that glorious event, the appearance of our
embraces.

Write and appoint a meeting place - I hesitate to enquire
after Evans - but effective breaks the
strongest bonds of
discretion.

Yours, John.

Figure 86: Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, no address, McEvoy Estate Papers,
LET/83.
Figure 87: Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, no address, McEvoy Estate Papers, LET/86, recto.

Figure 88: Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, no address, McEvoy Estate Papers, LET/86, verso.
Figure 89: Gwen John, *Young Woman with a Violin (Grace Westray)*, 1897, oil on canvas, 46 x 41cm private collection.
Figure 90: Augustus John, *Grace Westry*, c.1897, red chalk on paper, 20.6 x 18.5cm, National Galleries of Scotland, GMA 860.
Figure 91: Augustus John, Portrait of Gwen John, Ida Nettleship and Ursula Tyrwhitt, ca.1899, black chalk on medium, slightly textured, cream wove paper, 33 × 25.1cm, Yale Center for British Art, B1985.19.7.
Figure 92: William Rothenstein, *Ida Nettleship*, date unknown, oil on canvas, 63 x 51cm, Christie’s Images, CH3060035.
Figure 93: Augustus John, Ursula Tyrwhitt, date unknown, black chalk on paper, 25.2 x 17.7cm, Fitzwilliam Museum, FIT282801.
Figure 94: Augustus John, *Grace Westry*, 1899, red and black chalk on paper, 24 x 22.5cm, Fitzwilliam Museum, FIT423963.
Figure 95: Henri Fantin-Latour, *By the Table*, 1872, oil on canvas, 160 x 225cm, Musée d’Orsay, RF 1959.

Figure 96: Frans Hals, *Regents of the St Elizabeth Hospital of Haarlem*, 1641, oil on canvas, 153 x 252cm, Frans Hals Museum, os l-114.
Figure 97: Augustus John, *Gwen John*, c.1899, pencil on paper, 27.9 x 19.1cm, private collection. Reproduction from Taubman, *Gwen John*.
Figure 98: Benjamin Evans, *Augustus John*, ca.1898-1900, oil on canvas, 76.2 x 63.5cm, Royal Academy of Arts, 03/348.
Figure 99: William Orpen, *Augustus John*, 1899, oil on canvas, 99.1 x 94cm, National Portrait Gallery, NPG 4252.
Figure 100: Augustus John, *Ambrose McEvoy*, date unknown, red chalk on blue wove paper, 20.8 x 19.2cm, Art Institute of Chicago, 1922.5683.
Figure 101: Augustus John, Ambrose McEvoy, date unknown, chalk on paper, 44.5 x 29.8cm, National Portrait Gallery, NPG 3056.
Figure 102: Ambrose McEvoy, *Augustus John*, date unknown, oil on canvas, McEvoy Estate Papers, PAI/28.
Figure 103: William Orpen, *Albert Rutherston with his model*, 1899, red charcoal on paper, 30.5 x 40cm, private collection.
Figure 104: Ambrose McEvoy, *Seated Nude*, date unknown, watercolour on paper, 42.5 x 27cm, private collection.
Figure 105: Ambrose McEvoy, *Seated Nude*, c.1920, oil on canvas, 102 x 94cm, Bradford Museums and Galleries, 1936-003.
Figure 106: Augustus John, *Mother and Child frightened by a dog*, date unknown, pen and ink on paper, 9.5 x 9.5cm, Cyril Gerber Fine Art, Glasgow.
Figure 107: Rembrandt van Rijn, *A woman comforting a child frightened by a dog*, c.1636, ink on paper, 10.3 x 10.2cm, Collection Frits Lugt, Institut Néerlandais, Paris.
Figure 108: Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, no address, McEvoy Estate Papers, LET/79.
Figure 109: Augustus John, *Benjamin Evans*, date unknown, etching, 10 x 8.8cm, Halls Fine Art Auctioneers.
Figure 110: Ambrose McEvoy, *Sketch after Rembrandt’s self-portrait, starring 1630 Rijksmuseum*, 1899, pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, DRA/675.
Figure 111: Ambrose McEvoy, (clockwise from top left): *Bessborough Street, Pimlico*, 1900, oil on canvas, 45.7 x 35.6cm, Tate, N06080; *The Engraving*, c.1900, oil on canvas, 64.7 x 49.5cm, private collection; *Autumn*, 1901, oil on canvas, 48.3 x 43.2cm, whereabouts unknown; *The Thunderstorm*, 1901, oil on canvas, 38.1 x 58.4cm, private collection.
Figure 112: Ambrose McEvoy, *Sketch after Rembrandt’s Mother 1628*, date unknown, pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, DRA/692, alongside corresponding page from Knackfuss, *Rembrandt*, 2.
Figure 113: Ambrose McEvoy, Sketch after Rembrandt’s Portrait of a man unknown 1641, date unknown, ink on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, DRA/497, alongside corresponding page from Knackfuss, Rembrandt, 107.
Figure 114: Ambrose McEvoy, *Sketch after Rembrandt’s The Card Player 1641*, date unknown, ink on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, DRA/494, alongside corresponding page from Knackfuss, *Rembrandt*, 36.
Figure 117: Rembrandt van Rijn, *The Hundred Guilder*, c.1648, etching, 28.1 x 38.8cm, The British Museum, F,4.154.
Figure 118: Ambrose McEvoy, The Engraving, c.1900, oil on canvas, 64.7 x 49.5cm, private collection.
Figure 119: Ambrose McEvoy, Detail of face in *The Engraving*, c.1900, oil on canvas, 64.7 x 49.5cm, private collection.
Figure 120: Ambrose McEvoy, Detail of tablecloth in *The Engraving*, c.1900, oil on canvas, 64.7 x 49.5cm, private collection.
Figure 121: Ambrose McEvoy, Detail of engraving in *The Engraving*, c.1900, oil on canvas, 64.7 x 49.5cm, private collection.
Figure 122: Ambrose McEvoy, *The Lute (Anais)*, c.1910-11, oil on canvas, 60 x 51cm, Johannesburg Art Gallery.
Figure 123: Ambrose McEvoy, Serpentine line in *The Lute (Anaïs)*, c.1910-11, oil on canvas, 60 x 51cm, Johannesburg Art Gallery.
Figure 124: Mark Fisher, *The Bathers*, c.1900, oil on canvas, 61 x 77.5cm, Hugh Lane, Dublin, Reg. 22.

Figure 125: Philip Wilson Steer, *Hydrangeas*, 1901, oil on canvas, 85.4 x 112cm, Fitzwilliam Museum, PD.185-1975.
Figure 126: Ambrose McEvoy, *Mother and Child*, c.1907, oil on canvas, location unknown.
Figure 127: Pieter de Hooch, *A Mother Delousing her Child’s Hair, Known as ‘A Mother’s Duty’*, c.1660-1, oil on canvas, 52.5 x 61cm, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, SK-C-149.

Figure 128: Postcard of Pieter de Hooch, *A Mother Delousing her Child’s Hair, Known as ‘A Mother’s Duty’*, c.1660-1, oil on canvas, 52.5 x 61cm, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, McEvoy Estate Papers, POS/97.
Figure 129: Photograph of one of the bedrooms in McEvoy’s house 107 Grosvenor Road today (photograph by Lydia Miller, Nov 27, 2019.)
Figure 130: Ambrose McEvoy, *Mother and Son*, c.1910, oil on canvas, 30.5 x 23.2cm, Tate, N05611.
**Figure 131:** Jan van Eyck, *Portrait of Giovann(?) Arnolfini and his Wife*, 1434, oil on oak, 82.2 x 60cm, National Gallery, NG186.
Figure 132: William Orpen, *The Mirror*, 1900, oil on canvas, 50.8 x 40.6cm, Tate, N02940.
Figure 133: Postcard of Jan van Eyck, *Portrait of Giovanni (?) Arnolfini and his Wife*, McEvoy Estate Papers, POS/253.
Figure 134: William Orpen, *The Studio*, c.1910, oil on canvas, 96.5 x 80cm, Leeds Art Gallery, LEEAG.PA.1952.0031.
Figure 135: William Orpen, *Self-Portrait*, c.1910, oil on canvas, 101.9 x 84.1cm, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 14.59.
Figure 136: Johannes Vermeer, *The Concert*, c.1664, oil on canvas, 72.5 x 64.7cm, stolen from the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum in 1990, whereabouts unknown.
Figure 137: Johannes Vermeer, *The Art of Painting*, 1666-1668, oil on canvas, 120 x 100cm, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna.
Figure 138: Pieter de Hooch, *An Interior with a Woman drinking with Two Men, and a Maidservant*, probably 1658, oil on canvas, 73.7 x 64.6cm, The National Gallery, NG834.
Figure 139: Edward Collier, *Trompe L’oeil with Writing Materials*, ca.1702, oil on canvas, 51.5 x 63.7cm, V&A, P.23-1951.
Figure 140: Ambrose McEvoy, *Two Figures with Lute after Dutch painting*, date unknown, oil on canvas, McEvoy Estate Papers, PAI/7.
Figure 141: Gerard ter Borch, *A Woman Playing a Lute to Two Men*, 1667-8, oil on canvas, 67.6 x 57.8cm, The National Gallery, NG864.
Figure 142: Ambrose McEvoy, The Music Room, 1904, oil on canvas, 52.1 x 45.7cm, whereabouts unknown.

Figure 143: Postcard depicting Pieter Janssens’ Interior with Painter, Woman Reading and Maid Sweeping, Städel Museum, McEvoy Estate Papers, POS/308.

Explanation of the difference between Fig. 143 and 144:
The Janssens painting on the postcard in the McEvoy Estate Papers (POS/308) looks entirely different to the painting that is in the Städel Museum – Pieter Janssens, Interior with Painter, Woman Reading and Maid Sweeping. The postcard shows a woman sat at a table reading her letters with a greyhound dog at her side whereas the painting in the Städel Museum no longer has the dog and instead has a maid in the foreground sweeping. On contacting the Städel Museum about the differences in these two paintings I received a reply from Samuel Fickinger, Student Assistant, ‘Dutch Flemish and German Painting before 1800’ department on 17th August 2020 to explain that the greyhound was overpaint laid onto the composition to sell the painting as a fake Pieter de Hooch. The de Hooch signature was discovered to be a fake by Cornelis Hofstede de Groot in 1891 and research on the painting’s surface by Prof. A Hauser Junior in 1896 confirmed Hofstede de Groot to be correct. The overpaint was removed in 1971 by H. Tomaschek to reveal the sweeping maid underneath.
Figure 144: Pieter Janssens, *Interior with Painter, Woman Reading and Maid Sweeping*, 1665-1670, oil on canvas, 82 x 99cm, Städel Museum, 1129.
Figure 145: Postcard of J. Koedyck, *Interior*, Brussels, McEvoy Estate Papers, POS/373.
Figure 146: Jacobus Vrel, formerly attributed to Nicolas Koedyck, *Dutch interior*, oil on wood, 71.5 x 59.5cm, Musées Royaux de Beaux-Art de Belgique, 2826.
Figure 147: Postcard of Johannes Vermeer, *Girl with a Pearl Earring*, McEvoy Estate Papers, POS/217.
Figure 148: Postcard of Pieter de Hooch, *Man Handing a Letter to a Woman in the Entrance Hall of a House*, McEvoy Estate Papers, POS/117.
Figure 149: Pieter de Hooch, *Man Handing a Letter to a Woman in the Entrance Hall of a House*, 1670, oil on canvas, 68 x 59cm, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, SK-C-147.
Figure 150: Postcard of Pieter de Hooch, *Mother with a Child and a Chambermaid*, McEvoy Estate Papers, POS/224.

Figure 151: Pieter de Hooch, *Mother with a Child and a Chambermaid*, 1665-1668, oil on canvas, 37 x 42cm, Amsterdam Museum, Amsterdam, SA 7518.
Figure 152: Ambrose McEvoy, *Autumn*, 1901, oil on canvas, 48.3 x 43.2cm, whereabouts unknown.

Figure 153: Ambrose McEvoy, The Convalescent, 1901, oil on canvas, 53 x 43cm, private collection.
Figure 154: Ambrose McEvoy, *Sketch of Autumn*, 1901, watercolour and bodycolour on paper, 29.2 x 25.4cm, private collection.
Figure 155: Johannes Vermeer, *Girl Reading a letter by an open window*, 1657-1659, oil on canvas, 83 x 64.5cm, Gemäldegalerie, Dresden, 1336.
Figure 156: Postcard of Johannes Vermeer, *Girl Reading a letter by an open window*, 1657-1659, McEvoy Estate Papers, POS/101.
Figure 157: Ambrose McEvoy, *The Letter*, 1904-1906, oil on canvas, 48.5 x 38.5cm, The New Art Gallery Walsall, GR.159.
Figure 158: Gwen John, *Winifred John*, c.1900, oil on canvas, 25 x 20cm, Tenby Museum & Art Gallery, TENBM:1983:1385.
Figure 159: Gwen John, *A Lady Reading*, 1909-11, oil on canvas, 40.3 x 25.4cm, Tate, N03174.
Figure 160: Gwen John, *Girl Reading at a Window*, 1911, oil on canvas, 40.9 x 25.3cm, MoMA, 421.1971.
Figure 161: Ambrose McEvoy, *In a Doorway*, 1905, oil on canvas, 55.8 x 43.2cm, whereabouts unknown.

Figure 162: Gerard ter Borch, *Gallant Conversation, Known as ‘The Paternal Admonition’*, c.1654, oil on canvas, 71 x 73cm, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, SK-A-404.
Figure 163: Ambrose McEvoy, *The Rickyard*, 1905, oil on canvas, 43.2 x 53.3cm, McEvoy Estate Papers, PAI/27.
Figure 164: Ambrose McEvoy, *The Thunderstorm*, 1901, oil on canvas, 38.1 x 58.4cm, private collection.
Figure 165: Ambrose McEvoy, *Rosalind and Helen*, c.1903, oil on canvas, 74.9 x 62.2cm, whereabouts unknown.

Figure 166: Ambrose McEvoy, *Interior*, 1910, oil on canvas, 63.5 x 57.2cm, whereabouts unknown.

My correspondence with Cyril Kendall Butler’s descendants has found that the family no longer own this painting and it was almost certainly sold following Butler’s death in 1936. Reproduction from Johnson, *The Works of Ambrose McEvoy* 1919.
Copy of Figure 122: Ambrose McEvoy, *The Lute (Anais)*, c.1910-11, oil on canvas, 60 x 51cm, Johannesburg Art Gallery.
Figure 167: Ambrose McEvoy, *The Ear-Ring*, 1911, oil on canvas, 76.2 x 63.5cm, Tate, N03176.
Figure 168: Ambrose McEvoy, La Reprise, 1912, oil on canvas, 64.2 x 76.4cm, Aberdeen Art Gallery & Museums, ABDAG004458.
Figure 169: Ambrose McEvoy, Myrtle, 1913, oil on canvas, 102.2 x 94cm, whereabouts unknown.

Figure 170: Comparison of Ambrose McEvoy, Interior, 1910, oil on canvas, 63.5 x 57.2cm, whereabouts unknown and Ambrose McEvoy, La Reprise, 1912, oil on canvas, 64.2 x 76.4cm, Aberdeen Art Gallery & Museums, ABDAG004458.
Figure 171: Ambrose McEvoy, *Siana*, 1911, oil on canvas, 30.5 x 25.4cm, private collection.

Top: The owner of this work was asked for a better image but unfortunately this was all that could be provided.

Figure 172: Philip Wilson Steer, *Sleep*, c.1898, oil on canvas, 89.5 x 132.1cm, Tate, N04264.
Figure 173: Philip Wilson Steer, *Seated Nude: The Black Hat*, c.1900, oil on canvas, 50.8 x 40.6cm, Tate, N05261.
Figure 174: Henry Tonks, *The Toilet*, 1914, pastel on paper, 33 x 44.2cm, Tate, N03016.
Figure 175: Ambrose McEvoy, *Nude Facing a Mirror*, date unknown, oil on canvas, 92 x 69 cm, Philip Mould & Co.
Figure 176: Comparison of Johannes Vermeer, *The Art of Painting*, 1666-1668, oil on canvas, 120 x 100cm, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna and Ambrose McEvoy, *Interior*, 1910, oil on canvas, 63.5 x 57.2cm, whereabouts unknown. See figures 137 and 166 for larger images of both.

Figure 177: Comparison between Ambrose McEvoy, *Bessborough Street, Pimlico*, 1900, oil on canvas, 45.7 x 35.6cm, Tate, N06080 and Ambrose McEvoy, *Interior*, 1910, oil on canvas, 63.5 x 57.2cm, whereabouts unknown.
Figure 178: William Orpen, *Summer Afternoon*, c.1913, oil on canvas, 96.5 x 86.4cm, Museum of Fine Arts Boston, 48.582.
**Figure 179:** Ambrose McEvoy, *In a Mirror*, c.1911, graphite and watercolour on paper, 47 x 38.7cm, Tate, N03175.
Figure 180: Ambrose McEvoy, *The Letter*, c.1911, oil on canvas, whereabouts unknown.
Figure 181: Comparison between Ambrose McEvoy, *The Lute (Anaïs)*, c.1910-11, oil on canvas, 60 x 51cm, Johannesburg Art Gallery and Vilhelm Hammershøi, *Danish Interior, Strandgade 30*, 1902, oil on canvas, 41 x 33cm, Private Collection.

Figure 182: Willem van de Velde II, *English Ships at Sea Beating to Windward in a Gale*, c.1690, oil on canvas, 86.4 x 122cm, National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, BHC0899.
Figure 183: Johannes Vermeer, *Woman with a Pearl Necklace*, c.1662-1665, oil on canvas, 55 x 45cm, Gemäldegalerie, Dresden, 912B.
Figure 184: Johannes Vermeer, *A Lady at the Virginals with a Gentleman*, early 1660s, oil on canvas, 74.1 x 64.4cm, Royal Collection Trust, RCIN 405346.
Figure 185: Gerard Dou, *A Young Woman at her Toilet*, 1667, oil on panel, 58 x 75.5cm, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, 1186 (OK).
Figure 186: Johannes Vermeer, *The Procuress*, 1656, oil on canvas, 143 x 130cm, Gemäldegalerie, Dresden.
Figure 187: Comparison between Johannes Vermeer, *The Lacemaker*, 1669-1670, oil on canvas, 24.5 x 21cm, Louvre, Paris, M.I.1448 and Ambrose McEvoy, *La Reprise*, 1912, oil on canvas, 64.2 x 76.4cm, Aberdeen Art Gallery & Museums, ABDAG004458.
Figure 188: Ambrose McEvoy, *The Hon. Mrs Cecil Baring*, 1916, oil on canvas, 214.5 x 102.3cm, Walker Art Gallery, WAG 6616.
Figure 189: James Abbott McNeill Whistler, *The Princess from the Land of Porcelain*, 1863-1865, oil on canvas, 201.5 x 116.1cm, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, F1903.91a-b.
Figure 190: Details of Ambrose McEvoy, *The Hon. Mrs Cecil Baring*, 1916, oil on canvas, 214.5 x 102.3cm, Walker Art Gallery, WAG 6616 and James Abbott McNeill Whistler, *The Princess from the Land of Porcelain*, 1863-1865, oil on canvas, 201.5 x 116.1cm, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, F1903.91a-b.
Figure 191: James Abbott McNeill Whistler, *Grey and Silver: The Thames*, 1871-1873, oil on canvas, 61.3 x 46.1cm, Hunterian Art Gallery, University of Glasgow, GLAHA_46332.
Figure 192: Google map image of McEvoy and Whistler’s houses on the embankment of the Thames.

Figure 193: Ambrose McEvoy, *The Thames from the Artist’s House*, 1912, oil on canvas, 63.5 x 76.2cm Hunterian Art Gallery, University of Glasgow, GLAHA_43755. Taken by Lydia Miller in the Hunterian stores 23rd March 2018.
Figure 194: Ambrose McEvoy, *The Thames from the Artist’s House*, 1912, oil on canvas, 63.5 x 76.2cm. Hunterian Art Gallery, University of Glasgow, GLAHA_43755.
Figure 195: Ambrose McEvoy, *The Gas Works*, 1912, pencil, ink and wash on paper, 25 x 35cm, private collection (previously in the McEvoy Estate Papers, DRA/259).

Figure 196: Photograph of the Thames thought to have been taken by Ambrose McEvoy, c.1912, photograph, McEvoy Estate Papers, PHO/8.
Figure 197: Ambrose McEvoy, sketchbook page of river scenes, date unknown, pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, SKE/4.
Figure 198: Ambrose McEvoy, *Silver and Grey: Mrs Charles McEvoy*, 1915, oil on canvas, 85.8 x 73.4cm, Manchester Art Gallery, 1925.71.
Figure 199: Comparison of a detail of Ambrose McEvoy, *The Thames from the Artist’s House*, 1912, oil on canvas, 63.5 x 76.2cm, Hunterian Art Gallery, University of Glasgow, GLAHA_43755, and a detail of Ambrose McEvoy, *Silver and Grey: Mrs Charles McEvoy*, 1915, oil on canvas, 85.8 x 73.4cm, Manchester Art Gallery, 1925.71.
Figure 201: James Abbott McNeill Whistler, *Harmony in Grey and Green: Miss Cicely Alexander*, 1872-1874, oil on canvas, 190.2 x 97.8cm, Tate, N04622.
Figure 202: Francisco Goya, *The Black Duchess, The Duchess of Alba*, 1797, oil on canvas, 194 x 130cm, New York Hispanic Society.
Figure 203: Edouard Manet, *Lola de Valence*, 1862, oil on canvas, 144.5 x 112.5cm, Musée d’Orsay, RF 1991.
Figure 204: Reproduction of Ambrose McEvoy, Tink, 1920, Colour Magazine, McEvoy Estate Papers, ART/75. Whereabouts of original painting unknown.
Figure 205: Ambrose McEvoy, *Madame*, 1915, oil on canvas, 142.5 x 112.5cm, Musée d’Orsay, RF 1977 236, JdeP 199.
Figure 206: Ambrose McEvoy, *Sketch of a Mother and Child Reflected in a Mirror*, date unknown, pencil on paper, McEvoy Estate Papers, DRA/328.
Figure 207: James Abbott McNeill Whistler, *Symphony in White, No. 2: The Little White Girl*, 1864, oil on canvas, 76.5 x 51.1cm, Tate, N03418.
Figure 208: Detail of Ambrose McEvoy, *The Hon. Mrs Cecil Baring*, 1916, oil on canvas, 214.5 x 102.3cm, Walker Art Gallery, WAG 6616.
Figure 209: Ambrose McEvoy, *Duchess of Marlborough*, 1916, oil on canvas, 228.6 x 113cm (90 x 44 ½ inches), Blenheim Palace.
Figure 210: Edward Robert Hughes, *Midsummer Eve*, 1908, oil on canvas, size unknown, private collection.
Figure 211: John Singer Sargent, *Helen Dunham*, 1892, oil on canvas, 121.5 x 81.3cm, private collection.
Figure 212: Ambrose McEvoy, *Blue and Gold (Mrs Claude Johnson)*, 1917, oil on canvas, 127 x 101.6cm, whereabouts unknown. Reproduction from Bridgeman Images.
Figure 213: John Singer Sargent, *Mrs Louis Raphael*, c.1905, oil on canvas, 149.8 x 99cm, private collection.
Copy of figure 205: Ambrose McEvoy, Madame, 1915, oil on canvas, 142.5 x 112.5cm, Musée d’Orsay, RF 1977 236, JdeP 199.
Figure 214: Top four portraits by Sargent (left to right): Winifred Duchess of Portland, Millicent Duchess of Sutherland, Helen Vincent Viscountess d’Abernon, Lisa Colt Curtis. Bottom four portraits by McEvoy (left to right): Mrs Cecil Baring, Duchess of Marlborough, Mrs Redmond McGrath, Mrs Francis McLaren.
Figure 215: Detail from John Singer Sargent, *Winifred, Duchess of Portland*, 1902, oil on canvas, private collection.
Figure 216: Detail from Ambrose McEvoy, *The Hon. Mrs Cecil Baring*, 1916, oil on canvas, 214.5 x 102.3cm, Walker Art Gallery, WAG 6616.
Figure 217: John Singer Sargent, *Eugenia Errazuriz*, 1883, oil on canvas, 53.3 x 48.3cm, The Metropolitan Museum of Art.
Figure 218: John Singer Sargent, *Eugenia Errazuriz (known as the Lady in Black)*, c.1882, oil on canvas, 81.9 x 59.8cm, private collection.
Figure 220: John Singer Sargent, Nancy Witcher Langhorne, Viscountess Astor CH, MP (1879-1964), 1908, oil on canvas, 175 x 124cm, Cliveden Estate, National Trust, NT 766112.
Figure 221: John Singer Sargent, *Portrait of Pauline Astor (1880-1970)*, c.1899, oil on canvas, 98 x 50cm, on loan to the Huntington Library, Art Museum and Botanical Gardens.
Figure 223: Paul Swan, *Portrait of Isadora Duncan*, 1922, oil on canvas, 99.1 x 71.1cm, private collection, previously with Philip Mould & Co.
Figure 224: Ambrose McEvoy, *Alice Astor*, 1917, oil on canvas, size unknown, private collection.
Figure 225: Ambrose McEvoy, Meraud Guinness, 1925, oil on canvas, 127 x 101.6cm, private collection. Photograph taken by Lydia Miller, Sep 2020.
Figure 226: A page from the Illustrated London News comparing McEvoy’s Miss Meraud Guinness and Charles Sims’ Mrs Komstam. May 9, 1925. ‘The Royal Academy, 1925: Some Outstanding Portraits of Women in this Year’s Exhibition’, Illustrated London News, May 9, 1925, 894-895.
Figure 227: Ambrose McEvoy, *Bridget Guinness*, 1920, oil on canvas, 127 x 101.6cm, private collection. Photograph taken by Lydia Miller, Sep 2020.
Figure 228: Ambrose McEvoy, *Mary and Daphne at Gloucester Square (Children of Mr. C. K. Butler)*, 1903, oil on canvas, 63.5 x 50.8cm, private collection.
Figure 229: John Singer Sargent, *The Sitwell Family*, 1900, oil on canvas, 170 x 193cm, private collection.
Figure 230: Auguste Rodin, *The Kiss*, pentelican marble, 182.2 x 121.9 x 153cm, Tate, N06228.
Figure 231: William Orpen, *The Family of George Swinton*, 1901, oil on canvas, 109.9 x 148.6cm, private collection.
Figure 232: Family tree of the Sitwell and Swinton families. Drawn by Lydia Miller.
Figure 233: John Singer Sargent, *Mrs George Swinton (Elizabeth Ebsworth)*, 1897, oil on canvas, 231 x 124cm, Art Institute of Chicago, 1922.4450.
Figure 234: John Singer Sargent, *The Daughters of Edward Darnley Boit*, 1882, oil on canvas, 221.9 x 222.6cm, Museum of Fine Arts Boston, 19.124.
Figure 235: Comparison of John Singer Sargent, *The Daughters of Edward Darnley Boit*, 1882, oil on canvas, 221.9 x 222.6cm, Museum of Fine Arts Boston, 19.124 and Ambrose McEvoy, *Silver and Grey: Mrs Charles McEvoy*, 1915, oil on canvas, 85.8 x 73.4cm Manchester Art Gallery, 1925.71.
Figure 236: Charles Dana Gibson, *Scribner’s for June*, 1895, zinc engraving, 56.2 x 35.7cm, Library of Congress, POS - US .G52, no. 4.
Figure 237: Charles Dana Gibson, Sweetest story ever told, ca. 1910, pencil and ink on paper, 57.7 x 43.5cm, Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division Washington, CAI - Gibson, no. 55.
Figure 238: Charles Dana Gibson, *The reason dinner was late*, 1912, pencil and ink on paper, 46.7 x 74cm, Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division Washington, CAI - Gibson, no. 60.
Figure 239: John Singer Sargent, *Ellen Terry as Lady Macbeth*, 1889, oil on canvas, 221 x 114.3cm, Tate, N02053.
Figure 240: John Singer Sargent, *Clementina Austruther Thompson*, 1889, oil on canvas, 106.7 x 74cm, private collection.
Figure 241: John Singer Sargent, *Vernon Lee*, 1881, oil on canvas, 53.7 x 43.2cm, Tate, N04787.
Figure 242: John Singer Sargent, *Mr and Mrs I.N. Phelps Stokes*, 1897, oil on canvas, 214 x 101cm (84 ¼ x 39 ¾ inches), The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 38.104.
Figure 243: Detail of John Singer Sargent, *Mr and Mrs I.N. Phelps Stokes*, 1897, oil on canvas, 214 x 101cm (84 ¼ x 39 ¾ inches), The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 38.104.
Figure 244: Cecilia Beaux, *Portrait of Mrs Isaac Newton Phelps Stokes (Edith Minturn)*, 1898, oil on canvas, size unknown, collection of Mr. & Mrs. Newton P.S. Merrill.
Figure 245: John Singer Sargent, *Nonchaloir (Repose)*, 1911, oil on canvas, 63.8 x 76.2cm, National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C., 1948.16.1.
Figure 246: John Singer Sargent, *Mrs Carl Meyer and her Children*, 1896, oil on canvas, 201.4 x 134cm, Tate, T12988.
Figure 247: John Singer Sargent, *Mrs Hugh Hammersley*, 1892, oil on canvas, 232.4 x 133.7cm, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1998.365.
Figure 248: John Singer Sargent, *Mrs Cecil Wade*, 1886, oil on canvas, 167.6 x 137.8cm, Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Kansas City.
Figure 249: John Singer Sargent, *Lady Agnew of Lochnaw*, 1892, oil on canvas, 127 x 101cm, National Galleries Scotland, NG 1656.
Figure 250: John Singer Sargent, Millicent, Duchess of Sutherland, 1904, oil on canvas, 254 x 146cm, Museo Nacional Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid, Inv. no. 732 (1983.12).
Figure 251: John Singer Sargent, *Marguerite 'Daisy' Hyde Leiter (c.1879–1968), Later 19th Countess of Suffolk*, 1898, oil on canvas, 234 x 123cm, Kenwood House, English Heritage, 88029718.
Figure 252: Joshua Reynolds, *Jane Fleming, later Countess of Harrington*, ca.1778-9, oil on canvas, 239.4 x 147.5cm, Huntington Library, Art Museum and Botanical Gardens, 13.3.
Figure 253: Joshua Reynolds, *Lady Bampfylde*, 1776-7, oil on canvas, 238.1 x 148cm, Tate, N03343.
Figure 254: Joshua Reynolds, *Mrs Hale as Euphrosyne*, 1762-4, oil on canvas, 236 x 146cm, Harewood House.
Figure 255: Detail from “Olympia Motor Exhibition – The New Woman in Motoring,” Western Daily Press, Oct 23, 1926, 5.
Figure 256: Ambrose McEvoy, *The Hon. Lois Sturt (later Viscountess Tredegar) (1900-37)*, 1920, oil on canvas, 76.1 x 63.5cm, private collection, previously with Philip Mould & Co.
Figure 257: Ambrose McEvoy, *The Hon. Lois Sturt (later Viscountess Tredegar)* (1900-37), 1920, watercolour on paper, 55.9 x 37.5cm, private collection, previously with Philip Mould & Co.
Figure 258: Detail of Ambrose McEvoy, *The Hon. Lois Sturt (later Viscountess Tredegar) (1900-37)*, 1920, oil on canvas, 76.1 x 63.5cm, private collection, previously with Philip Mould & Co.
Figure 259: Detail of Ambrose McEvoy, *The Hon. Lois Sturt (later Viscountess Tredegar)* (1900-37), 1920, oil on canvas, 76.1 x 63.5cm, private collection, previously with Philip Mould & Co.
Figure 260: Detail of Ambrose McEvoy, *The Hon. Lois Sturt (later Viscountess Tredegar)* (1900-37), 1920, oil on canvas, 76.1 x 63.5cm, private collection, previously with Philip Mould & Co.
Figure 261: Christopher Richard Wynne Nevinson, *A Dawn*, 1914, oil on canvas, size unknown, Sotheby’s, Modern & Post-War British Art sale, Nov 21, 2017, lot 5.
Figure 262: Eric Gill, *Ariel between Wisdom and Gaiety*, 1932, Corsham stone, 122 x 183cm, BBC Broadcasting House, London, MIP1687.
Figure 263: Detail of Ambrose McEvoy, *The Hon. Lois Sturt (later Viscountess Tredegar) (1900-37)*, 1920, watercolour on paper, 55.9 x 37.5 cm, private collection, previously with Philip Mould & Co.
Figure 264: Ambrose McEvoy, Zita, 1923, watercolour, pen, pencil and ink on paper, 51 x 34.5cm, sold at Bonhams, Modern British and Irish Art sale, 4th June 2013, lot 150.
Figure 265: Ambrose McEvoy, *Zita Jungman*, undated, watercolour on paper, size unknown, Laing Art Gallery, Newcastle.
Figure 266: John Singer Sargent, *Mrs George Batten*, 1897, oil on canvas, 88.9 x 43.2cm, The Metropolitan Museum of Art.
Figure 267: Ambrose McEvoy, Vicountess Ridley, 1916, oil on canvas, 76.2 x 63.5cm, whereabouts unknown.

Figure 268: Ambrose McEvoy, *Tallulah Bankhead*, c.1926, oil on canvas, 100.3 x 73.7cm, private collection.
Figure 269: Reproduction of ‘Ambrose McEvoy’s First London Exhibition’, *The Graphic*, Apr 14, 1923, 527.
Figure 270: Augustus John, *Tallulah Bankhead*, 1930, oil on canvas, 123.8 x 62.9cm, National Portrait Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, NPG.69.46.
Figure 271: Nell Brinkley, ‘Too Busy,’ *Hearst*, 1914.
Figure 272: Nell Brinkley, accompanying image to ‘Too Busy,’ *Hearst*, 1914.
Figure 273: Ambrose McEvoy, *Teddie Gerard*, 1921, oil on canvas, 76.4 x 63.8cm, Manchester Art Gallery, 1947.96.
Figure 274: Ambrose McEvoy, *Lillah McCarthy*, 1919, oil on canvas, 101 x 76.2cm, National Portrait Gallery, NPG 5506.
Figure 275: Ambrose McEvoy, *Lillah McCarthy*, 1919, oil on canvas, 76 x 63cm, Crawford Art Gallery, Cork, CAG.2.
Figure 276: Ambrose McEvoy, *Lillah McCarthy*, 1919, poster, colour lithograph, 76.2 x 50.8 cm, V&A, E.3438-1953.
Figure 277: Charles Haslewood Shannon, Lillah McCarthy (1875–1960), as 'Donna Anna' (from 'Don Giovanni' by Mozart), 1907, oil on canvas, 175.5 x 119cm, The Wilson, Cheltenham, 1960.52.
Figure 278: Charles Haslewood Shannon, *Lillah McCarthy (1875–1960), as 'The Dumb Wife', 1917-18, oil on canvas, 97 x 64.4cm, The Wilson, Cheltenham, 1960.53.
Figure 279: Harold Speed, Lillah McCarthy (1875–1960), as Jocasta in 'Oedipus Rex' by Sophocles, 1913, oil on canvas, 156.5 x 92cm, V&A, S.89-1986.
Figure 280: Ambrose McEvoy, *Lydia Lopokova*, c.1920, oil on canvas, 61 x 51cm, private collection, previously with Philip Mould & Co.
Figure 281: Ambrose McEvoy, *Rue Winterbotham Carpenter*, 1920, oil on canvas, 76.2 × 63.5cm, Art Institute of Chicago, 1985.438.
Figure 282: Ambrose McEvoy, *Reproduction of a portrait of a WW1 Nurse*, date unknown, size unknown, whereabouts of original painting unknown, REP/96, McEvoy Estate Papers.
Figure 283: Unknown photographer. Photograph of Diana Manners in her nurse’s uniform, 1917, original source unknown.
Figure 284: Ambrose McEvoy, *Portrait of Lady Diana Cooper (née Manners) (1892-1986)*, 1918, oil on canvas, 86.4 x 101.5cm, private collection, previously with Philip Mould & Co.
Figure 285: After Cephasodotus the Elder, *Mattei Athena*, 1st century AD, marble, 203cm tall, Louvre Museum, Ma 530, LL 300.
Figure 286: Reproduction mount depicting Diana Manners, REP/18/1918, McEvoy Estate Papers.
Figure 287: Reproduction mount depicting Violet Manners’ drawing of Diana Manners being painted by Ambrose McEvoy, 1918, REP/526/1918, McEvoy Estate Papers.
Figure 288: Ambrose McEvoy, *Mademoiselle de Pourtales*, 1921, oil on canvas, 154 x 103cm, Cartwright Hall Art Gallery, Bradford, 1930-025.
**Figure 289:** Two business cards belonging to La Comtesse Hermann de Pourtalès, McEvoy Estate Papers, NOT/95 and NOT/100.
APPENDIX I: CHRONOLOGY OF THE LIFE OF AMBROSE MCEVOY

12th August 1877  Arthur Ambrose McEvoy is born in Crudwell, Wiltshire to Captain Charles Ambrose and Mary Jane McEvoy (née Huggins). His birthdate is incorrectly recorded as 1878 throughout his life and posthumously.

1890  McEvoy is enrolled at Elgin House School in Shepherds Bush, London.

1891  Living with his family at 51 Westwick Gardens, West Kensington, London. He is still living here by April 1896.570

28th October 1893  McEvoy is signed into the Slade School of Fine Art register for the first time to study 6 days a week. He remains at the Slade until at least April 1898, at which point he is only attending three days a week.

Summer 1897  McEvoy, Augustus John and Benjamin Evans embark on a drawing holiday in Pembrokeshire with a donkey, a small cart and a tent. They walk from Tenby to Haverfordwest, then to Solva and finish in St. Davids.

Whilst Augustus John is recovering from a severe diving accident, McEvoy is back in London, working from exhibits in the Crystal Palace.

1898  McEvoy illustrates the children’s book Fableland by William Morant

McEvoy and Augustus John rent a studio together at 76 Charlotte Street. This was John Constable’s old studio. The pair had this studio for two years and shared it intermittently with William Orpen, Benjamin Evans and Albert Rutherston.571

Autumn 1898  McEvoy, John and Evans visit the Rembrandt Exhibition at the Stedelijk Museum in Amsterdam.

Sends Mary Spencer Edwards (later Mrs McEvoy) a postcard from Florence in October.572

1899  Commences a copy of Noli me Tangere by Titian in the National Gallery.

August 1900  McEvoy is looking for a studio to share with Augustus John.573

570 LET/710/1896, MEP.
572 POS/322, MEP.
573 LET/83, MEP.
October 1900
Michel Salaman rents a flat in Le Puy in the south of France, and pays for McEvoy and Gwen John to visit. Augustus John also joins them. Michel Salaman then leaves and it is just McEvoy and the John siblings.

Autumn 1900
McEvoy moves to 24 Danvers Street, Chelsea. Whilst McEvoy is living here, Mary Spencer Edwards visits and models for *The Engraving* and *The Thunderstorm*.

Winter 1900
Exhibits at the New English Art Club (NEAC) for the first time with *An Old Woman*. He exhibits every year until 1917 and then intermittently until his death.

1901
The Census taken on 31st March 1901 records McEvoy as living at 24 Danvers Street. At this address he painted a portrait of Gwen John. He then moves in with Gwen and Augustus John above the Economic Cigar Company at 39 Southampton Street. All three artists record this address in 1901 in the NEAC exhibitor’s list.

Best Man with Benjamin Evans for Augustus John at his wedding to Ida Nettleship on 12th January 1901.

16th January 1902
Ambrose McEvoy and Mary Spencer Edwards marry.

The McEvoys move to 13 Jubilee Place, Chelsea.

Mary McEvoy becomes seriously ill and undergoes an operation.

Winter 1902
McEvoy becomes a member of the NEAC.

1903
Ambrose and Mary McEvoy move to Lower Bourton, Shrivenham in Berkshire, to a farmhouse lent to them by one of McEvoy’s first patrons, Sir Cyril Kendall Butler. The couple remain at the house for three years whilst Ambrose works on commissions for the Butler family. Mary McEvoy writes that this was where Ambrose first discovered his love of landscapes. Michael McEvoy, their son, was born at Lower Bourton. Slade friend Grace Westray is also registered at the NEAC as living at Lower Bourton with the McEvoys in 1903 and then at Freshford (where Mary’s family is from) in 1904.

-------------------------------

574 Chitty, *Gwen John*, 51-2. ESS/4 and LET/1061/1900, MEP.
575 NOT/197, MEP.
576 Ibid.
579 CER/1/1902, MEP.
580 NOT/197 MEP.
7th September 1903  McEvoy writes a postcard to Mary from Frankfurt and Nuremberg in Germany. It is not known with whom he is travelling but he states that he will be arriving back in London on the 25th September.

15th August 1904  Birth of son Michael Ambrose William McEvoy. He was baptised on the 17 November in Freshford, near Bath in Somerset.

1905  The McEvoys leave Lower Bourton and briefly moved to Codicote, Hertfordshire. McEvoy is then registered at the NEAC as living in Freshford.

1906  The McEvoys move to 107 Grosvenor Road on the Embankment, London. Ambrose and Mary remain at this address for the rest of their lives.

1906-1909  Ambrose and Mary McEvoy produce paintings for St Columba's Church, Long Tower in Derry, Northern Ireland including two very large religious works *The Adoration of the Kings* and *The Adoration of the Shepherds*. By 1909 they had completed twenty-three paintings for the church which are still in situ.

March 1907  Travels to Paris to be with Augustus John after Ida's death at the age of thirty. McEvoy sends a postcard to Mary to say that he has 'arrived safely at Dieppe. Good Journey.' The postcard is stamped in London on 16th March but was presumably sent two days before, on the day Ida died. He sends another postcard to Mary written and sent on 'Saturday night' 16th March to say 'Mrs John was cremated today'.

June 1907  First solo exhibition, 'Pictures by Ambrose McEvoy', at The Carfax Gallery, 24 Bury Street, St. James's, London. They continued to promote his work over the following years.

Summer 1909  Spends the summer in Neuville, France with Walter Sickert. The pair travel to Dieppe which is where McEvoy starts to develop his later style, with looser and broader brushwork.

May 1910  Visits Paris.

Summer 1910  Spends the summer in Neuville, France with Sickert and Sickert's brother Robert.

January 1911  Exhibits at the Inaugural Exhibition of The National Portrait Society (NPS) held at The Grafton Gallery, London. It had no permanent space and annual exhibitions were staged at the Grosvenor Gallery (owned by Francis Howard) from 1912 and later at the Grafton Gallery. McEvoy exhibited at the NPS annually until 1922.

581 Ibid.
582 POS/324, MEP.
583 POS/530/1907, MEP.
8 August 1911  
Birth of daughter Mary Annabel McEvoy, known as Anna.

June 1912  
McEvoy elected a member of the International Society of Sculptors, Painters, & Gravers.\(^{585}\)

September 1912  
McEvoy is in Dieppe working with Sickert.\(^{586}\)

September 1913  
McEvoy is in Dieppe working with Sickert.\(^{587}\)

6 October 1913  
Takes up a teaching post at the Slade School of Fine Art. Teaches until the end of the academic year 1917-1918.\(^{588}\)

19 April 1914  
Staying with Lord and Lady Esher at The Roman Camp, Callander, Scotland.\(^{589}\)

4 August 1914  
Britain declares war on Germany. McEvoy is in France on holiday with artist Gerald Brockhurst when the announcement is made.\(^{590}\)

1915  
Exhibits a portrait of his wife Mary, titled *Madame* at the National Portrait Society. It receives great critical acclaim and marks the beginning of McEvoy's ascent as painter of society portraits.

1916  
McEvoy first meets Claude Johnson. They remain close friends for the rest of their lives. McEvoy paints *Mrs Cecil Baring*.

October 1916  
Exhibits at the 21\(^{st}\) Exhibition of the International Society of Sculptors, Painters and Gravers (known as 'the International') held at the Grosvenor Gallery, London. The International was founded by Francis Howard (who was also a patron of McEvoy and owner of the Grosvenor Gallery) as a place to show modern art. McEvoy exhibited with the International regularly between 1916 and 1922 (1916, 1918, 1919, 1921, 1922).

22 March 1918  
Letter from Alfred Yockney, Secretary to the British War Memorials Committee, inviting McEvoy to produce official war art.\(^{591}\)

5 June 1918  
Appointed Temporary Honorary Major to the Royal Marines and later attached to the Royal Naval Division as a war artist.

---

\(^{585}\) ART/70/1912, MEP.  
\(^{586}\) LET/546, MEP.  
\(^{587}\) LET/556, MEP.  
\(^{589}\) LET/229, MEP.  
\(^{590}\) Campbell Thomson, “Foreword.”  
\(^{591}\) LET/1051/1918.
7 August 1918 Arrives in France and is attached to the 63rd (Royal Naval) Division and spends three months paintings soldiers and landscapes on the Western Front. He then joins the fleet in the North Sea.

6 January – 1 March 1919 Exhibits at the Canadian War Memorials Exhibition, Royal Academy, Burlington House, Piccadilly, London.

1919 The Works of Ambrose McEvoy, from 1900 to May 1919, written by Claude Johnson under the pseudonym ‘Wigs’ is published. This two-volume monograph is illustrated with 163 photographs of McEvoy’s work.

Between March and October McEvoy continues painting portraits of soldiers.

12 December 1919 – 7 February 1920 Exhibits at the Imperial War Museum exhibition ‘The Nation’s War Paintings and other records’ at the Royal Academy, London.

28th December 1919 Arrives in New York on the Adriatic. He has been asked to exhibit his portraits in a solo exhibition at the Duveen Brothers gallery in New York. McEvoy rents one of the Gainsborough Studios, 222 West 59th Street, during his stay.

10 – 31 March 1920 Stages first exhibition in America. ‘The Ambrose McEvoy Exhibition’ was held at Duveen Brothers, Fifth Avenue, New York and included thirty-eight oil paintings and several watercolours.


Summer 1920 Paints Marcel Dupré at the Organ of Notre-Dame Cathedral.

2 October 1920 Sails to New York on the Aquitania. McEvoy rents one of the Gainsborough Studios, 222 West 59th Street, New York during his stay.

October 1920 – May 1921 Receives commissions from wealthy American clients including the Phipps and Guest families. Also paints Teddie Gerard. McEvoy is thought to have spent a lot of time with his friend Napier Sturt who was in New York working in banking – the auditing department of the Guaranty Trust Company. There are several letters among the McEvoy Estate Papers which mention Naps or Napier.


21 May 1921 Arrives back in Southampton from New York on the Olympic.
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December 1921  Visits Julia James in Paris who introduces him to new clients. Johnson and his family join and they all travel to Biarritz and then Madrid where McEvoy spends a day-and-a-half in the Prado studying the Old Masters.

February 1922  Returns to London where he remains for a few months painting portraits.

April 1922  Returns to Paris where he works on commissions.

May 1922  Staying at 80 Rue de Lille, Paris 7. Lois and Napier Sturt visit McEvoy.

18 May 1922  ‘Ambrose McEvoy Portraits’ exhibition staged at Duveen Brothers, 20 Place Vendôme, Paris. The show includes twenty-three works including recent watercolours and remains open throughout June. It receives positive reviews.

November 1922  McEvoy travels around Italy. Visits Venice, Padua and Florence.

1923  The Work of Ambrose McEvoy written by Claude Johnson under the pseudonym ‘Wigs’ is published. This is a second and smaller catalogue raisonné of McEvoy’s work.

5 March – 14 April 1923  McEvoy is represented in the ‘Modern British Art’ exhibition at Whitechapel Art Gallery.

April - May 1923  First major one-man exhibition ‘Watercolour drawings by Ambrose McEvoy’ at the Leicester Galleries. Forty-four works are exhibited from early composition studies to recent commissions in America. The exhibition was a success and received positive reviews.

McEvoy’s work is included in the ‘Twenty-Second International Exhibition of Contemporary Painting’ at the Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh.

1924  McEvoy is elected an Associate of the Royal Academy and a member of the Royal Society of Portrait Painters.

Contemporary British Artists: Ambrose McEvoy edited by friend and contemporary Albert Rutherston and written by Reginald Morier Yorke Gleadowe is published.

February 1924  ‘Watercolours by Ambrose McEvoy and Drawings by Augustus John’ exhibition at Scott & Fowles, 667 Fifth Avenue, New York.

Spring 1924  Holiday with Claude Johnson and family in France and Spain. McEvoy remains in Paris in May to contact clients.

Queen Mary’s Dolls’ House is completed. McEvoy is one of 1,500 artists, craftsmen and manufacturers to contribute to the furnishing of the house. It included two miniature paintings by McEvoy including a portrait of Queen Mary’s daughter Princess Mary in her bridal dress for the king’s bedroom. He also painted a miniature copy of Winterhalter’s group portrait of Queen Victoria, Prince Albert and family.
24 April –
15 June 1924  McEvoy’s work is included in the ‘Twenty-Third Annual International Exhibition’ at the Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh. His portrait of Mrs Lucie Rosen is awarded an ‘ Honourary Mention’.

4 November 1924  McEvoy sails from Southampton bound for New York via Cherbourg on the Leviathan. It is his third and final visit to America.

Late November 1924  Visits Pittsburgh and is interviewed by the Pittsburgh Gazette Times.

December 1924  Writes to Mary saying that commissions have been slow, but Bridget Guinness (mother of Meraud Guinness) has been helping him with introductions.

27 March 1925  Arrives back in Southampton on the Leviathan.

May – August 1925  Exhibits at The Royal Academy of Arts, London. Exhibits again the following year. In 1927, after his death, four of his works are exhibited. Paints numerous portraits throughout the year including four portraits of Evelyn Maud Johnson (wife of Claude Johnson) and Tallulah Bankhead.

August 1925  Paints Princess Mary (later Countess of Harewood). He then paints her son the Hon George Lascelles (later 7th Earl of Harewood) the following year.

1926  Throughout this year McEvoy paints some of the most glamorous people of the period including Lady Diana Abdy, Gladys Cooper, Vicomtesse Henri de Janzé (née Phyllis Boyd), Lady Juliet Duff. He also paints the Rt Hon James Ramsay MacDonald and the art critic A.C.R. Carter.

Elected an Associate of the Royal Society of Painters in Water Colours.

McEvoy’s work is exhibited at ‘The Twenty-Fifth International Exhibition’ at the Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh.

13 November –
11 December 1926  Exhibits at the Royal Society of Portrait Painters, Royal Academy, London.

Late December 1926  McEvoy ill with influenza. After a short period of recovery, he returns to bed. Between Christmas and the New Year pneumonia sets in.

4 January 1927  Ambrose McEvoy dies of pneumonia in the Empire Nursing Home, Vincent Square, Westminster at the age of 49. His illness is almost certainly brought on by exhaustion from overwork.

7 January 1927  McEvoy is cremated at Golders Green crematorium, Middlesex and his ashes are interred in the wall of All Saints’ Church in Grosvenor Road, now destroyed. His memorial plaque was designed by friend Eric Gill.593

APPENDIX II: INVENTORY OF THE MCEVOY ESTATE PAPERS

PART A: KEY FOR INVENTORY

ART/1 article
BOO/1 book or book extract
CER/1 certificate
DIA/1 diary
DOC/1 document
DRA/1 drawing
ESS/1 essay
EXH/1 exhibition and sales catalogues
INV/1 invitation
LET/1 letter
NOT/1 notes
PAI/1 painting
PHO/1 photograph
POS/1 postcard
REP/1 reproduction of portraits/mounts
SKE/1 sketchbook
### PART B: INVENTORY FOR THE MCEVOY ESTATE PAPERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry No.</th>
<th>Folder/Box</th>
<th>Inventory No.</th>
<th>Type and Contents of Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Green ringbinder folder 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHO/1</td>
<td>Photograph of McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Envelope '2 letters/Fred Brown to M McEvoy/1936'</td>
<td>LET/1/1936</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Frederick Brown, 31st March 1936 - Ormond House, Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/2/1936</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Frederick Brown, 16th March 1936 - Ormond House, Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/3</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/4</td>
<td>Piece of paper, typed in green, about the 'Derry Journal' article 7th May 1909 and Long Tower Church commissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/5</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Aloysius Brackenbury about Long Tower Church commission - no date 28 Orchard Street, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/6</td>
<td>Letter in French, no recipient, no address, from Andre Gide, French author and winner of Nobel Prize for Literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/7</td>
<td>Letter from Ambrose McEvoy to Mary McEvoy - Freshford 26th August no year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/9/1954</td>
<td>Attached to above: Letter to Colonel Michael McEvoy from Lucie Rosen. She is happy to help with exhibition of Ambrose McEvoy’s work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/10/1954</td>
<td>Attached to above: Letter to Mrs Lucie Rosen, 35 West 54th Street, New York, 10th Dec 1954, in reply to Rosen’s letter saying that she will be happy to help with exhibition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>CER/1/1902</td>
<td>Ambrose McEvoy and Mary Augusta Spencer Edwards marriage certificate - 16th Jan 1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>LET/11A</td>
<td>Envelope from J.M. Whistler to Captain Charles McEvoy, 31st August 1891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>LET/11B</td>
<td>Letter from J.M. Whistler to Captain Charles McEvoy, 31st August 1891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>LET/11C</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter from J.M. Whistler to Captain Charles McEvoy, 31st August 1891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>DOC/1/1902</td>
<td>Tenancy Agreement between Charles Knowles Esq and Arthur A. McEvoy, 13 Jubilee Place, Chelsea, 2nd Jan 1902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>NOT/1</td>
<td>Questions for Augustus John written by Anna McEvoy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>LET/12/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Harry Verney Buckingham Palace, 28th October 1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>DOC/2-11</td>
<td>10 Bank Cheques to and from Chelsea Arts Club 1915-1926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>LET/14/1928</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Martin Hardie, V&amp;A, 22nd August 1928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>LET/15/1927</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Bernard Rackham, V&amp;A, 28th September 1927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>LET/16/1934</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Martin Hardie, V&amp;A, 27th December 1934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>LET/18/1935</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Martin Hardie, V&amp;A, 12th February 1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>LET/19/1935</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Martin Hardie, V&amp;A, 15th February 1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>LET/20/1904</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from father-in-law Charles Ambrose McEvoy 31st Dec 1904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>LET/21/1905</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from father Charles Ambrose McEvoy 8th January 1905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>LET/22</td>
<td>Letter from Ambrose McEvoy to his mother, no date no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>LET/23</td>
<td>Letter from Ambrose McEvoy to his mother about a sitting, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>LET/24</td>
<td>Letter to Mr McEvoy from Alice Wimborne, Tuesday, no year, Vice Regal Lodge, Dublin, 2 SHEETS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>LET/24A &amp; B</td>
<td>Transcript of letter to Mr McEvoy to Alice Wimborne, Tuesday, No year, Vice Regal Lodge, Dublin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>LET/25</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Alice Wimborne Sunday, no year. Vice Regal Lodge, Dublin, 2 SHEETS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>LET/26</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to McEvoy from Alice Wimborne of Vice Regal Lodge, Dublin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>LET/27</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Alice Wimborne, Tuesday, no year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>LET/28</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Alice Wimborne, Tuesday, no year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>LET/29</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Alice Wimborne, no date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>LET/30</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Alice Wimborne, 28th March 1917, Vice Regal Lodge, Dublin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>LET/30A</td>
<td>Transcript of letter to Mr McEvoy to Alice Wimborne, 28th March 1917, Vice Regal Lodge, Dublin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>LET/30B</td>
<td>Transcript of letter to Mr McEvoy to Alice Wimborne, 28th March 1917, Vice Regal Lodge, Dublin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>LET/31</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Alice Wimborne, Tuesday, no year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>LET/32</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Alice Wimborne, Weds?, Ashby St Ledgers, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>LET/33</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Alice Wimborne, Tuesday, no year. Ashby St Ledgers, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>LET/34</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Alice Wimborne, no date. Wimborne House, Arlington Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>LET/35</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Alice Wimborne, no date. Wimborne House, Arlington Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>LET/36</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Alice Wimborne, 31st July, no year. Wimborne House, Arlington Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>LET/37</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Alice Wimborne, no date. Wimborne House, Arlington Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>LET/38</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Alice Wimborne, Sunday, no date. Wimborne House, Arlington Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>LET/39</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Alice Wimborne, 1925? Ashby St Ledgers, Rugby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black ringbinder folder 2:</td>
<td>LET/40/1924</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Lord D'Abernon, 28th April 1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td><strong>LET/41/1917</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Lord D'Abernon, 26th April 1917, Foley House, Portland Place, London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td><strong>LET/42</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Lord D'Abernon, Tuesday, no year, Foley House, Portland Place, London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td><strong>LET/43/1919</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Lord D'Abernon, 5th November 1919, Esher Place, Surrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td><strong>LET/44</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Helene V D'Abernon, Hotel St James, Rue St Jeoire, Paris, 2 SHEETS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td><strong>LET/45</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Helene V D'Abernon, Foley House, Portland Place, 18th Dec Sunday, no year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td><strong>LET/46</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Helene V D'Abernon, Esher Place, Surrey, July 1st, no year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td><strong>LET/47</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Helene V D'Abernon, no date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td><strong>LET/48/1939</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Helen V D'Abernon, The Manor House, Stoke D'Abernon, Surrey, 8th June 1939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td><strong>LET/49/1931</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Lord D'Abernon, 12 Arlington Street, 18th April 1931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td><strong>LET/50/1940</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Lord D'Abernon, The Manor Houe, Stoke D'Abernon, Surrey, 17th June 1940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td><strong>LET/51/1941</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Lord D'Abernon, The Manor House, Stoke D'Abernon, Surrey, 22nd January 1941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td><strong>ART/1/1930</strong></td>
<td>The Times article, 'Books of the Day, Lord D'Abernon's Diary', Tuesday September 9th 1930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td><strong>INV/1/1926</strong></td>
<td>Invitation to Ambrose McEvoy from Lord D'Abernon, 17th November 1926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td><strong>LET/52</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Asquith, 10 Downing Street, London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td><strong>LET/53</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Maude Baring, Friday, no date or year, Grange Court, Chigwell, Essex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>LET/54</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Daphne Baring, Sunday, no date or year, 26A Bryanston Square, London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>LET/55/1927</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Maude? Baring, 4th January 1927, Kenmare House, Killarney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>NOT/2</td>
<td>Note on Baring with quote, from a card index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>LET/56/1937</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from A.M. Hind, British Museum, 23rd November 1937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>LET/57/1936</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from A.M. Hind, British Museum, 22nd December 1936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>LET/58/1936</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from A.M. Hind, British Museum, 25th June 1936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>LET/59/1937</td>
<td>Letter to Miss McEvoy from S.F. Laurence, Lamacraft &amp; Laurence bookbinders, 29th November 1937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>LET/60/1933</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Gerald Brockhurst, 4 Gunter Hall Studios, Gunter Grove, SW10, 3rd October 1933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>LET/61</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Evan Charteris, no date, 96A Mount Street, Grosvenor Square</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>LET/62</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Evan Charteris, no date, Villa Vita, Kingsdown, Deal, Kent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>LET/63</td>
<td>Letter to 'Dr Cadent' (Ambrose McEvoy) from Benjamin Evans, no date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>LET/64</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Benjamin Evans, 121 Charlotte Street, Fitzroy Square, no date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>LET/65</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Betty Cranborne, no date, 20 Arlington street, London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>LET/66</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Jacob Epstein, Thursday, no date, 72 Cheyne Walk Chelsea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>LET/67/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Eleanor Esher, 5th March 1921, The Roman Camp, Callander, Scotland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>LET/68</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Eleanor Esher, Wednesday 3rd June, no year, 2 Tilney Street, Mayfair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>LET/69/1915</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from (Viscount?) Esher, France, 7th July 1915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>LET/70/1914</td>
<td>Letter to Mr and Mrs McEvoy from (Viscount?) Esher, Roman Camp, Callander, 27th July 1914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>LET/71/1914</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from (Viscount?) Esher, Roman Camp, Callander, 24th July 1914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>LET/72</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Benjamin Evans, no date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>LET/73</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Anais 13th September, no year (1913?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>LET/74/1927</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from Eric Gill, 18th March 1927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>LET/75</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Teddie Gerard, on board the 'France', 1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>LET/76/1916</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from the Grosvenor Gallery, 3rd June 1916</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>LET/77/1921</td>
<td>Letter to D (Claude Johnson's brother) from Claude Johnson, 5th January 1921, Ritz, Carlton Hotel, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>NOT/3/1953</td>
<td>A Personal Note' on McEvoy by Augustus John. For Leicester Galleries exhibition 1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>NOT/3A/1953</td>
<td>Transcript of 'A Personal Note' on McEvoy by Augustus John. For Leicester Galleries exhibition 1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>NOT/3B/1953</td>
<td>Transcript of 'A Personal Note' on McEvoy by Augustus John. For Leicester Galleries exhibition 1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>LET/78</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, Tenby Wales. 1898?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>LET/78A</td>
<td>Transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, Tenby Wales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>LET/78B</td>
<td>Transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, Tenby Wales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>LET/79</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, South Cliff, Tenby Wales, Friday, no year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>LET/79A</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, South Cliff, Tenby Wales, Friday, no year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>LET/79B</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, South Cliff, Tenby Wales, Friday, no year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>LET/80</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, 1 Morfa Terrace, Manorbier, Tenby Wales, no date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>File Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>LET/80A</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, 1 Morfa Terrace, Manorbier, Tenby Wales, no date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>LET/80B</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, 1 Morfa Terrace, Manorbier, Tenby Wales, no date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>LET/81</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date or address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>LET/81A</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date or address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>LET/81B</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date or address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>LET/82</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date 32 Victoria St, Tenby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>LET/82A</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date 32 Victoria St, Tenby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>LET/82B</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date 32 Victoria St, Tenby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>LET/83</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>LET/83A</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>LET/83B</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>LET/84</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>LET/85</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>LET/86</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>LET/87</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, Sunday, no date, Alderney Manor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>LET/87A</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, Sunday, no date, Alderney Manor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>LET/87B</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, Sunday, no date, Alderney Manor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>LET/88</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, Matching Green, Essex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>LET/88A</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, Matching Green, Essex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>LET/88B</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, Matching Green, Essex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>LET/89</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, Cite Titaud, Le Puy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>LET/89A</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, Cite Titaud, Le Puy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>LET/89B</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, Cite Titaud, Le Puy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>LET/90</td>
<td>Letter/note to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>LET/91</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, Vattetot-sur-mer seine maritime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>LET/91A</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, Vattetot-sur-mer seine maritime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>LET/91B</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, Vattetot-sur-mer seine maritime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>LET/91C</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, Vattetot-sur-mer seine maritime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>LET/92</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>LET/92A</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>LET/92B</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>LET/93</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, Tenby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>LET/93A</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, Tenby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>LET/93B</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, Tenby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>LET/94</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, Wales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>LET/94A</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, Wales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>LET/94B</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, Wales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>LET/95</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>LET/95A</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>LET/95B</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>LET/96</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>ART/2/1970</td>
<td>Obituary of Mrs Clare Sheridan, 2nd June 1970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>LET/97</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, 46 Wood St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>LET/97A</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, 46 Wood St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>LET/97B</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, 46 Wood St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>LET/98</td>
<td>Letter to Charles McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, Ste. Honorine-du-Pertes Calvados</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>LET/98B</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Charles McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, Ste. Honorine-du-Pertes Calvados</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>LET/99</td>
<td>Letter to Charles McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, 3 Fitzroy Square</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>LET/99A</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Charles McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, 3 Fitzroy Square</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>LET/99B</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Charles McEvoy from Augustus John, no date, 3 Fitzroy Square</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Accession Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>LET/100/1914</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Gwen Salmond, 13th January 1914, Buffet de la Gare et Hotel Terminus, Montauban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>LET/100/1914A</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Gwen Salmond, 13th January 1914, Buffet de la Gare et Hotel Terminus, Montauban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>LET/100/1914B</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Gwen Salmond, 13th January 1914, Buffet de la Gare et Hotel Terminus, Montauban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>LET/101</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, Cite Titand le Puy en Velay Haute Loire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>LET/101A</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, Cite Titand le Puy en Velay Haute Loire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>LET/101B</td>
<td>Typed transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, Cite Titand le Puy en Velay Haute Loire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>LET/102/1935</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Augustus John, 24th July 1935, Fryern Court, Nr Fordingebridge, Salisbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>LET/103/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Augustus John, Fryern Court, Nr Fordingebridge, Salisbury, 19th February 1948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>LET/104/1946</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Augustus John, Fryern Court, Nr Fordingebridge, Salisbury, 7th October 1946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>LET/105/1951</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Augustus John, Fryern Court, Nr Fordingebridge, Salisbury, 19th May 1951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>LET/106/1953</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Augustus John, Fryern Court, Nr Fordingebridge, Salisbury, 17th November 1953?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>LET/107</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Augustus John, Fryern Court, Nr Fordingebridge, Salisbury, Wednesday, no year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>LET/108/1937</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Augustus John, Fryern Court, Nr Fordingebridge, Salisbury, 3rd June 1937?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>LET/109</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Dorelia John, Wednesday no year, Fryern Court, Nr Fordingebridge, Salisbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>DOC/12</td>
<td>Telegram to Anna McEvoy from Augustus John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>LET/110</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs Alan Bazell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>LET/111</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs Bazell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Blue ringbinder folder 3: LET/112</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Lois Sturt, 38 Portman Square, Friday 9th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>LET/113/1928</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Alberta Sandwich, 18th April 1928, Hinchingbrooke Huntingdon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>LET/114/1927</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Alberta Sandwich, 8th January 1927, Hinchingbrooke Huntingdon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>LET/115</td>
<td>Letter to Mr McEvoy from (George) Sandwich, March 1st, Hinchingbrooke, Huntingdon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>LET/116</td>
<td>Letter to Mr(s?) McEvoy from (George) Sandwich, 25th August, no year, Hinchingbrooke, Huntingdon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>LET/117</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from (George) Sandwich, 26th August, no year, Hinchingbrooke, Huntingdon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>LET/118</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from (George) Sandwich, April 26th, no year, Halls Croft, Stratford-Upon-Avon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>LET/119/1917</td>
<td>Letter to Mr(s?) McEvoy from (George) Sandwich, 12th March 1917, Hinchingbrooke, Huntingdon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>LET/120/1917</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Alberta Sandwich, 8th March 1917, Hinchingbrooke Huntingdon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>LET/121</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Alberta Montagu Sandwich, Monday 26th June (1916?) Hinchingbrooke Huntingdon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>LET/122</td>
<td>Letter from Alberta Sandwich. No date, no recipient, Hinchingbrooke, Huntingdon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>LET/123</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Sandwich, 27th October, 3 Hill Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>DOC/13</td>
<td>Christmas card mock up on McEvoy's portrait</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>DOC/14</td>
<td>Postcard of Hinchingbrooke-Priory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>LET/124</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Rosen from Ambrose McEvoy, Chelsea Arts Club, 143 &amp; 145 Church Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>LET/125/1941</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Patricia Ramsay, 8th November 1941, Bagshot Park, Surrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>LET/125/1941A</td>
<td>Envelope for letter to Anna McEvoy from Patricia Ramsay, 8th November 1941, Bagshot Park, Surrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Title and Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>LET/126/1936</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Patricia Ramsay, 12th July 1936, Clarence House, St James's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>LET/127/1929</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Patricia Ramsay, 30th December 1929, Anchor Gate House Portsmouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>LET/128</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Patricia Ramsay, Friday, no year, Clarence House St James's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>NOT/4</td>
<td>Note on Princess Patricia - Lady Patricia Ramsay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>LET/129</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Lady Patricia Ramsay, Thursday, no year, Bagshot park, Surrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>LET/130</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Lady Patricia Ramsay, Wednesday, no year, Clarence House, St James's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>LET/131</td>
<td>Letter to Mr McEvoy from Owen Nairs, 4th June, no year, 20 Marlborough Road, St John's Wood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>LET/132</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from John McCormack, Wednesday 8th October, no date, on board S.S. Majestic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>LET/132A</td>
<td>Transcript of letter to Ambrose McEvoy from John McCormack, Wednesday 8th October, no date, on board S.S. Majestic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>LET/133</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose Mcevoy from Lady Diana Manners, no date, 16 Arlington Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>LET/134</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose Mcevoy from Lady Diana Manners, no date, Claridge's Hotel, Brook Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>LET/135</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose Mcevoy from Lady Diana Manners, no date, 16 Arlington Street, The Rutland Hospital for Officers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>LET/136</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose Mcevoy from Lady Diana Manners, no date, 32 Montagu Square</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>LET/137</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose Mcevoy from Lady Diana Manners, no date, 16 Arlington Street, The Rutland Hospital for Officers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>LET/138</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose Mcevoy from Lady Diana Manners, no date, 16 Arlington Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>LET/139/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Charles McEvoy from Lillah McCarthy, 18th February 1920, 5 Adelphi Terrace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>LET/140</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Consuelo Marlborough, 23rd August, no year, Crowhurst Lingfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>LET/141</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Consuelo Marlborough, Tuesday, no date, Sunderland House Mayfair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>LET/142</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Consuelo Marlborough, Friday, no date, Crowhurst Lingfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>LET/143</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Consuelo Marlborough, 4th August, no year, Crowhurst Lingfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>LET/144</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Consuelo Marlborough, Tuesday, Crowhurst Lingfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>LET/145</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Consuelo Marlborough, 1st September, no year, Sunderland House Mayfair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>LET/146</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Consuelo Marlborough, no date, Eden-Grand Hotel, Cap D’Ail France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>LET/147</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Consuelo Marlborough, Wednesday, no date, Sunderland House Mayfair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>LET/148</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Consuelo Marlborough, 22nd November, no year, 1 Portman Square</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>LET/149</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Consuelo Marlborough, Thursday, no date, Sunderland House, Mayfair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>LET/150/1927</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from unknown (person closely connected with Princess Mary), 6th January 1927, Chesterfield House, Mayfair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>LET/151/1953</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Lady in Waiting to Princess Mary, 30th October 1953, St James's Palace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>LET/152</td>
<td>Telegram to Ambrose McEvoy from Mary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>LET/153</td>
<td>Letter to Mr McEvoy. Ambassadors Court, St James’s Palace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>LET/154/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Harry Verney Buckingham Palace, 4th November 1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>LET/155/1925</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Mary (Princess Mary), 9th September 1925, The Lodge Doncaster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>LET/156/1924</td>
<td>April 1924</td>
<td>Princess Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>LET/157/1926</td>
<td>February 28th 1926</td>
<td>Princess Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>LET/158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>LET/159/1925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>LET/160/1923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>LET/161/1926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>LET/162/1926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>LET/163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>LET/164/1936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>LET/165/1933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>LET/166/1928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>LET/167/1927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>LET/168/1926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>LET/168/1926A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>LET/168/1926B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>LET/169/1926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>LET/169/1926A</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Ramsay McDonald, 18th May 1926, House of Commons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>LET/169/1926B</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Ramsay McDonald, 18th May 1926, House of Commons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>LET/170/1926</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Ramsay McDonald, 19th March 1926, House of Commons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>LET/171</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Pamela Lytton, Friday evening, no date, 10 Buckingham Street, Westminster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>LET/172</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Pamela Lytton, no date, Knebworth House, Knebworth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>LET/173</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Pamela Lytton, 20th February no year, 10 Buckingham Street, Westminster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>LET/174</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Pamela Lytton, 6th March no year, 10 Buckingham Street, Westminster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>LET/175/1917</td>
<td>Double-sided letter to Ambrose McEvoy from E.V. Lucas, 36 Essex Street, Strand, 20th January 1917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>LET/176</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from E.V. Lucas, 36 Essex Street, Strand, no date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>LET/177/1917</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from E.V. Lucas, 36 Essex Street, Strand, 14th May? 1917, Burlington Fine Arts Club, 17 Saville Row, London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>LET/178/1916</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from John Lavery, 7th December 1916, 5 Cromwell Place, London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>LET/179</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Mary Herbert, 23rd November, no year, Pixton Park Dulverton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>LET/180</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Mary Herbert, no date, Pixton Park Dulverton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>LET/182/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Eliott Bailey, International Banking Group, Madrid, Spain, 21st April 1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Catalogue No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>LET/183</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date or address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>LET/184</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date or address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>LET/185</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mary McEvoy, Abbotsleigh, Freshford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>LET/186</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Hichingbrooke, Huntingdon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>LET/187</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Rush to Lambay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>LET/188</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>LET/189</td>
<td>Letter to Michael McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Welbeck Abbey, Worksop, Notts, no date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>LET/190</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Sarah C. Jeays?, Sunday 7th June, no year, Claridge's Hotel, Brook Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>LET/191/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Richard Power, 29th June 1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>LET/192/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 1921, Chelsea Arts Club, 143 and 145 Church Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>LET/193</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Chelsea Arts Club, 143 and 145 Church Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>LET/194/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Clarance H Mackay, 253 Broadway, New York, 24th May 1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>LET/195/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from illegible recipient 21st May 1921, 9 Berkeley Square</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>PHO/2</td>
<td>Photograph of a portrait of Mary Anna Sturt by Ambrose McEvoy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>LET/196</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mary McEvoy, Abbotsleigh, Freshford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>LET/197/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 13th January 1921, Gainsborough Studios, 222 West 59th Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>LET/198/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date or address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>LET/199/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date or address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>LET/200</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, March 1921, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>LET/201</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>LET/202/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Augusta Owen Patterson, Art Editor for Town and Country, 30th March 1921, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>LET/203/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 18th March 1921, Gainsborough Studios, 222 West 59th Street, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>LET/204/1921</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 3rd January 1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>LET/205/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Jessica Phyllis McCall, 13th January, no date, 37 Madison Avenue, thought to be 1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>LET/206/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 19th January 1921, Gainsborough Studios, 222 West 59th Street, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>LET/207/1921</td>
<td>Telegram to Ambrose McEvoy from Vanity Fair Conde Nast and Frank Crowninshield, 2nd February 1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>LET/208/1921</td>
<td>Telegram to Ambrose McEvoy from The Arts Club of Chicago, 26th January 1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>LET/209/1921</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date or address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>LET/210/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 12th February 1921, Gainsborough Studios, 222 West 59th Street, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>LET/211/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 11th February 1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>LET/212</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Napier Sturt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>LET/213/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 24th January 1921, Gainsborough Studios, 222 West 59th Street, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>PIC/1 (DRA/0)</td>
<td>Watercolour of a rabbit, blue background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>LET/214/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Louise Elkins Sinkler, 20th February 1921, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>LET/215/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Louise Elkins Sinkler, 17th March 1921, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>LET/216</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>LET/217</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 7th March, no year, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>LET/218/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Arthur Pollen, Hotel St. Regis, New York City, 23rd February 1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>LET/219/1921</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>LET/220/1946</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Albert C R Carter, 24th October 1946, Orchard House, 44 Arnison Road, East Molesey, Surrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>LET/221</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date or address, presumably written in New York 1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>LET/222/1927</td>
<td>Letter to Miss Spencer Edwards from A C R Carter, 17th January 1927, Orchard House, Arnison Road, East Molesey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>DOC/15</td>
<td>Typed list of purchases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>LET/223/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Frederick Guest, 11th October 1921, Air Ministry, Kingsway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>LET/224/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Christian Brinton, 8th October 1921, The Players, Sixteen Gramercy Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>DOC/16-22</td>
<td>7 receipts for artists materials, E.H. &amp; A.C. Friedrichs Co, 169 West 57th Street, New York, 1920-1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>LET/226</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 8th September 1921, 107 Grosvenor Road, London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>LET/227</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Hugo, Friday, no date, Racquet and Tennis Club, 370 Park Avenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>LET/227</td>
<td>Unfinished reply to Hugo from Ambrose McEvoy, 107 Grosvenor road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>LET/228</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mary McEvoy, Abbotsleigh, Freshford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>LET/229</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy whilst staying at The Roman Camp, Callander, house of the Eshers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Brown card</td>
<td>Brown card folder: McEvoy Ambrose, letters to him, mother and Charlie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Letter to Charles McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>LET/231</td>
<td>Letter to Charles McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date or address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>LET/233/1924</td>
<td>Letter to Charles McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 11th December 1924, 152 East 40th Street, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>LET/234</td>
<td>Letter to Charles McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date or address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>LET/235</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from Irene de Vamvalis? No date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>LET/236/1935</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Duveen, 4 Grafton Street, Bond Street, London, 26th June 1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>LET/238</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Sunday, undated, 80 Rue de Lille</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>NOT/5</td>
<td>Description by Ambrose McEvoy of the Serpentine at sunset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>LET/239</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 1.30, 1916? No address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>NOT/6</td>
<td>Diary entry of appointments, date unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>LET/240</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date or address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>LET/241/1928</td>
<td>Letter to old representative of Mr R. Lutyens (Eyre &amp; Spottiswoode) from Mary McEvoy, 2nd April 1928, 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>LET/242/1928</td>
<td>Letter to D. Crosthwaite Eyre from K.H. Webb, 34-5-6 Paternoster Row, London, 10th October 1928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>LET/242/1928A</td>
<td>Copy of a letter to D. Crosthwaite Eyre from K.H. Webb, 34-5-6 Paternoster Row, London, 10th October 1928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>LET/243/1928</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Eyre &amp; Spottiswoode Publications Ltd, East Harding Street, Fleet Street, 11th October 1928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>LET/243/1928A</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Eyre &amp; Spottiswoode Publications Ltd, East Harding Street, Fleet Street, 11th October 1928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>LET/244/1928</td>
<td>Letter to R. Lutyens from Eyre &amp; Spottiswoode Publications Ltd, East Harding Street, Fleet Street, 11th October 1928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>ESS/2/1926</td>
<td>John Constable, the Painter, by Ambrose McEvoy, A.R.A, copied from English for July 1926, 5 pages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>NOT/7/1902</td>
<td>Typed text about beauty and people, 24th January 1902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>NOT/8</td>
<td>Drawing on a white surface, no date, typed text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>ESS/3</td>
<td>Untitled essay on colour, pigments, beauty, no date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>NOT/9</td>
<td>Note on landscapes and Old Masters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>NOT/10</td>
<td>Discoveries. Month by month account of ideas and techniques. No year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>NOT/11</td>
<td>List of laws in art 1-9. No date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>NOT/12</td>
<td>Note on physical features of sitters and painting, no date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>NOT/13</td>
<td>Note on Old Masters techniques, no date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>ESS/4</td>
<td>Notes/Essay on harmony, Rubens, Rembrandt and what McEvoy painted in the early years, no date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>ESS/5</td>
<td>Essay on art, no date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>NOT/14</td>
<td>Unknown quote on art. No date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>LET/245/1926</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from John ?? Rolls Royce Ltd Derby, 25th January 1926. Information on the Derby Sketching Club attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>LET/246/1928</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Eva Lutyens, 20 Stafford Place, Buckingham Gate, 15th October 1928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>INV/2</td>
<td>Invitation to Ambrose McEvoy's talk St Mark's in-the-Bouwerie, 10th Street, West of Second Avenue, Sunday 25th April, American Art through English Eyes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>NOT/15</td>
<td>Notes for Ambrose McEvoy's talk St Mark's in-the-Bouwerie, 10th Street, West of Second Avenue, Sunday 25th April, American Art through English Eyes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>NOT/16</td>
<td>Speech for Ambrose McEvoy’s talk St Mark’s in-the-Bouwerie, 10th Street, West of Second Avenue, Sunday 25th April, American Art through English Eyes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>ESS/6/1890</td>
<td>Essay by Ambrose McEvoy, Music and its Effect on Society, 19th July 1890, Elgin House School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>ESS/7/1890</td>
<td>Essay by Ambrose McEvoy, Is Corporal Punishment necessary to maintain discipline in a school or not?, 5th June 1890, Elgin House School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>ESS/8/1890</td>
<td>Essay by Ambrose McEvoy, A Visit to Hampton Court, 24th May 1890, Elgin House School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>ESS/9/1890</td>
<td>Essay by Ambrose McEvoy, What good has printing done to civilization, 11th May (1890?), Elgin House School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>ESS/10/1890</td>
<td>Essay by Ambrose McEvoy, The Beauties of Summer, 25th April 1890, Elgin House School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>ESS/11/1890</td>
<td>Essay by Ambrose McEvoy, Essay on Winter, 9th May 1890, Elgin House School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>ESS/12/1890</td>
<td>Essay by Ambrose McEvoy, Columbus and the discovery of America, 31st May 1890, Elgin House School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>NOT/17</td>
<td>Poem by Ambrose McEvoy (probably whilst at Elgin House School) about a Jackdaw, no date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>ESS/13/1890</td>
<td>Essay by Ambrose McEvoy, Essay on Autumn’s Beauties, 2nd May 1890, Elgin House School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>ESS/14/1890</td>
<td>Essay by Ambrose McEvoy, The Wars and the life of Napoleon Bonaparte, 28th June 1890, Elgin House School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>ESS/15/1890</td>
<td>Essay by Ambrose McEvoy, How should a boy prepare himself at school, for business when he leaves school? 14th March 1890, Elgin House School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>ESS/16/1890</td>
<td>Essay by Ambrose McEvoy, Kindness and cruelty to animals, 7th June 1890, Elgin House School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>ESS/17/1890</td>
<td>Essay by Ambrose McEvoy, Birdsnesting, 1st March 1890, Elgin House School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>ESS/18/1890</td>
<td>Essay by Ambrose McEvoy, The importance of being earnest and diligent in all you do, 21st June 1890, Elgin House School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>ESS/19/1890</td>
<td>Examination essay by Ambrose McEvoy, A Visit to Kew Gardens, 6th December (1890?), Elgin House School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>LET/250</td>
<td>Letter to Mary from Mary McEvoy, Codicote, Bolton, nr Welwyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>LET/252/1906</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 11th September 1906, 1 Princes Bdgs, Weston-Super-Mare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>LET/253/1906</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 18th September 1906, Abbotsleigh, Freshford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>LET/254/1906</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 11th September 1906, 1 Princes Bdgs, Weston-Super-Mare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>LET/255/1906</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 20th August 1906, to 107 Grosvenor Road from Bath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>LET/256/1906</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 19th September 1906, Abbotsleigh, Freshford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>LET/257/1906</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 5th March 1906, Abbotsleigh, Freshford from The Chelsea Art School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>LET/258/1906</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from The National Burglary Insurance Corporation Limited, 21st March 1906, 13 Regent Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>A. McEvoy Notes: 1890-1925/School Essays and Misc. Articles: Brown card folder: Irish Church Commission</td>
<td>LET/259/1907</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from W Doherty, 9th August 1907, St Columba's Presbytery, 6 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>LET/260/1908</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from W Doherty, 31st August 1908, St Columba's Presbytery, 3 pages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>DRA/1</td>
<td>Plan of transept interior of St Columba's church Long Tower, Derry where panels are located</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>DRA/2</td>
<td>Plan of south west transept interior of St Columba’s church Long Tower, Derry where panels are located</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>DRA/3/1907</td>
<td>Plan of tryptic at top of nave of St Columba’s church Long Tower, Derry where panels are located, December 1907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>NOT/18</td>
<td>Badly damaged page 1 list panels 1-19 in nave St Columba's church Long Tower, Derry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>A. McEvoy Notes: 1890-1925/School Essays and Misc. Articles: Brown card folder: McEvoy A. 1913</td>
<td>LET/261</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (thought to be 1913), no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>LET/262/1913</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 25th August 1913, from Aldbourne to Abbotsleigh, Freshford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>LET/263</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (thought to be 1913), 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>LET/264</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (thought to be 1913), no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>LET/265</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (thought to be 1913), 54 Trumpington Street Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>LET/266</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (thought to be 1913), no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>LET/267</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (thought to be 1913), The Union Society Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>LET/268</td>
<td>Letter to unknown recipient (presumably Mary McEvoy) in Ambrose McEvoy's hand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>LET/269</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (thought to be 1913), no address, thought to be writing from Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>LET/270/1913</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Charles McEvoy, 31st July 1913, Aldbourne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>LET/271</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (thought to be 1913), no address, thought to be writing from Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>LET/272</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (thought to be 1913), no address, thought to be writing from Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>LET/273</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (thought to be 1913), no address, thought to be writing from Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>LET/274</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (thought to be 1913), no address, thought to be writing from Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>LET/275</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (thought to be 1913), Chelsea Arts Club, 143 &amp; 145 Church Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>LET/276</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (thought to be 1913), Chelsea Arts Club, 143 &amp; 145 Church Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>LET/277</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (thought to be 1913), no address, thought to be writing from Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>LET/278</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (thought to be 1913), no address, thought to be writing from Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>LET/279</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (thought to be 1913), no address, thought to be writing from Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>LET/280</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (thought to be 1913), Windmill Cottage Aldbourne, Wilts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>LET/281</td>
<td>Envelope containing several letters above, 16th August 1913, Mrs McEvoy, Abbotsleigh, Freshford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>LET/283/1913</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 1913, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>LET/284</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>LET/285</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>LET/286</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>LET/287/1913</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Gilbert A Ramsay, Director of the Whitechapel Art Gallery, 15th March 1913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>LET/288</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road, (thought to be 1913)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>LET/289</td>
<td>Empty envelope to Mrs McEvoy, Abbotsleigh, Freshford, from Ambrose McEvoy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>LET/290</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address (thought to be 1913)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>LET/291</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (thought to be 1913), Chelsea Arts Club, 143 &amp; 145 Church Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>LET/292</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (thought to be 1913), Chelsea Arts Club, 143 &amp; 145 Church Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>LET/293</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Nans no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>LET/294/1913</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Maude R. Lousada, The Crofts, Pangbourne, Berkshire, 9th May 1913?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Document Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>LET/295</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address (thought to be 1913)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>LET/296/1913</td>
<td>Letter to Mary from Amy Akers Douglas? 11th September 1913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>LET/297/1918</td>
<td>Letter to Madame (Mary McEvoy) from Jol? Couchoud? Manor House, Brondesbury NW6, 29th November 1918</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>LET/298</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy? From Madame (Anais?) about Michael. Not addressed or dated, incomplete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>LET/299</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address (thought to be 1913)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>LET/300/1913</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 24th July 1913 from Cambridge to 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>LET/301</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address, (presumably 1913 from Cambridge)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>LET/302</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address, (presumably 1913 from Cambridge)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>LET/303</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, (1913?) The Union Society, Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>DOC/23/1913</td>
<td>Invoice for cleaning and mending fur stole, Misses Knowles, 10 Paragon, Bath, 8th September 1913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>LET/304</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, (1913?) no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>LET/305/1913</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, (1913?) no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>LET/307</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, (1913?) no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>LET/308/1913</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 14th April, 1913, Aldbourne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>LET/309</td>
<td>Letter to Michael McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>LET/310/1913</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Wednesday night, no date (1913) Ye Olde Castel Hotel, Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>423</strong></td>
<td>LET/311/1913</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (1913) Ye Olde Castel Hotel, Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>424</strong></td>
<td>LET/312/1913</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (1913) Ye Olde Castel Hotel, Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>425</strong></td>
<td>LET/313</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (1916)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>426</strong></td>
<td>LET/314/1913</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy, Abbotleigh, Freshford, 10th September 1913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>427</strong></td>
<td>LET/315</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>428</strong></td>
<td>LET/316</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, illegible date, Brigue, la gare et l'Hotel Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>429</strong></td>
<td>LET/317</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>430</strong></td>
<td>LET/318</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>431</strong></td>
<td>LET/319</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>433</strong></td>
<td>LET/321</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Horatia Seymour, 23rd March 1920, Eleven Hundred Fifth Avenue, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>434</strong></td>
<td>DOC/24</td>
<td>List of piano albums and solos, Joseph Williams Ltd, 29 Enford St, Marylebone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>436</strong></td>
<td>LET/322/1920</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy, 107 Grosvenor Road, 30th March 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>437</strong></td>
<td>LET/323</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, (1920?) no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>438</strong></td>
<td>LET/324</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy, 107 Grosvenor Road, 27th October 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>439</strong></td>
<td>LET/325/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 3rd December (1920?) 222 West 59th Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>440</strong></td>
<td>LET/326/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, (1920?) no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>LET/327</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Rue Carpenter, no date, 710 Rush Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>LET/328/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from L. B. Hubert, on board the RMS Adriatic, 20th March 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>LET/329/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Gainsborough Studios, 222 West 59th Street, 1st November 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>LET/330/1920</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 2nd July 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>LET/332/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Nathaniel Holmes, 28th June 1920, Pittsburgh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>LET/333</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, (1920?) no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>LET/334</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date or address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>LET/335</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date or address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>LET/336</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date or address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>LET/337</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Knole, Westbury, Long Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>LET/338</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Knole, Westbury, Long Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>LET/339</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Knole, Westbury, Long Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>LET/340</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Knole, Westbury, Long Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>LET/341</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, (1920?) no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>LET/342</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, (1920?) no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457</td>
<td>LET/343</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458</td>
<td>LET/344</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, (1920?) no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>LET/345</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, (1920?) no address came on the Aquitania as with many letters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>LET/346</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, (1920?) no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>LET/347</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>LET/348/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Henry Caro-Delvaille (French artist), 20 East 81st Street, 3rd July 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>LET/349</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 27th October (1920?) no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>LET/350</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (1920?) no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>LET/351/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Thursday 14th October (1920?) Ritz-Carlton Hotel, Madison Avenue &amp; 46th Street, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>LET/352</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (1920) Morristown, New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>LET/353/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (1920) on board the Cunard RMS Aquitania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>LET/354/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Friday 8th October (1920) RMS Aquitania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469</td>
<td>LET/355/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, (2nd October 1920?) RMS Aquitania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>LET/356/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, united states lines (1920)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>LET/357</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Leslie M. Howland, Mrs S. S. Howland, no date, Ritz-Carlton Hotel, Madison Avenue &amp; 46th Street, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>LET/358</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (1920) Villa Vita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>LET/359</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from V Sinclair, no date (1920), Manursing Island, Rye, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474</td>
<td>DOC/26</td>
<td>Business card. Mrs J Henry Alexandre, 10 West 32nd Street, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475</td>
<td>DOC/27</td>
<td>Business card. Mrs Gano Dunn, 20 Washington Square North, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>LET/360</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Miss Helen Choate, 8 East, 63rd Street New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>NOT/19</td>
<td>Poem by Dorothy Cumminges 'Central Park' typed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>LET/361/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Viola Tree Aldwych Theatre, 18th February 1920, 3 pages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479</td>
<td>LET/362/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from unknown sender (name torn off), 2nd February 1920, Wardman Park Hotel, Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>LET/363/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from ??? B Clark? 10th March 1920, The Brook, 7 East 40th Street New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>LET/364</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy no date, no address, (New York 1920?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>482</td>
<td>LET/365/1921</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mary McEvoy, 107 Grosvenor Road, 9th March 1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483</td>
<td>LET/366/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Major Ambrose McEvoy from Mrs Mollie Higgins Smith, no address, 21st January 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>LET/367</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from illegible recipient (John?) 60 Beaver Street New York, 3rd February, no year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td>LET/368</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 7th February writing from New York though no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>LET/371/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 16th January 1920, in New York, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>LET/372</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Tuesday, no date, (presumably 1920 from Gainsborough Studios New York) no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>LET/373</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (1920) 152 East Fortyeth Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>LET/374/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 13th February 1920 no address, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>DOC/28/1920</td>
<td>Invoice to Ambrose McEvoy from Arnold Genthe, 709 Fifth Avenue, New York, 5th October 1920. $25 photographs of portraits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td>LET/375/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Edith Bailey, 14 East 60th Street, New York, 17th August 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>LET/376</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address, New York presumably</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>LET/377/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Gainsborough Studios, 222 West 59th Street, 4th November 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>LET/378</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td>LET/379</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>DOC/29</td>
<td>Business card Martin Birnbaum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>LET/380</td>
<td>Letter to Charles McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Gainsborough Studios, 222 West 59th Street, New York, 15th March 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>LET/381/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 12th April 1920, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>LET/382</td>
<td>Letter to Mr McEvoy from Mary W Harriman? 9th March, no year (1920?) One East 69th Street New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>LET/383/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Lizette Hast, 16th March 1920, 53 East 61st Street, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>LET/384</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Bradley Martin, 9th March no year, 400 Park Avenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>LET/386/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 30th June 1920, Gainsborough Studios, 222 West 59th Street, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>LET/387/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Cornelia B Sage Quinton, The Buffalo Fine Arts Academy, Albright Art Gallery, New York, 24th June 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>LET/388/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 23rd June 1920, Gainsborough Studios, 222 West 59th Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>DOC/30/1920</td>
<td>Tenancy Agreement between Ambrose McEvoy and Captain Richard E Fuller-Maitland, 30th September 1920, Studio 17 Gerald Road, Eaton Square, London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>LET/390</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy 107 Grosvenor Road, 10th Feb (1920?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>LET/391/1920</td>
<td>Telegram to Ambrose McEvoy from Michael McEvoy, 28th March 1920, 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>LET/393</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>DOC/31</td>
<td>List of clients addresses in New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>INV/3</td>
<td>Invitation to Ambrose McEvoy from Mr and Mrs George T Maxwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>NOT/20</td>
<td>Business card and note from Madame G. Baron Fonariova, Russian singer sat to McEvoy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>LET/394</td>
<td>Note to Ambrose McEvoy from illegible recipient, 132 East 19th Street, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>NOT/21</td>
<td>Business card Mr and Mrs William C. Bullitt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>LET/395</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>LET/396/1919</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy Sunday 28th December 1919, on board the RMS Adriatic on the way to New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>LET/397</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy no date or address New York Central Park apartment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>LET/398/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Tuesday 6th January 1920, 222 Central Park South</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>LET/399/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 7th January 1920, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>LET/400</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy 26th March no year, no address New York Central Park apartment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>LET/401/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 12th November 1920, Gainsborough Studios, 222 West 59th Street, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>LET/402/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 8th December 1920, Gainsborough Studios, 222 West 59th Street, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>LET/403</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Longwater from Seyton Brauch, 1736 M. Street, Washington from K6 The Albany Piccadilly London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>ART/3/1920</td>
<td>Newspaper clippings of Duveen Exhibition, Portrait Paintings by Ambrose McEvoy, March 10th-31st 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>LET/404</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Helen Choate, Monday, no date, Juniper Rock North Haven Maine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>DOC/32/1920</td>
<td>Invoice to Ambrose McEvoy from Duveen Brothers, exhibition in London, studio rental etc 8th June 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>DOC/33/1920</td>
<td>Tenancy Agreement between Devon Cromwell and Ambrose McEvoy, Gainsborough Studios, 222-4 West 59th Street, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>DOC/34/1920</td>
<td>Tenancy Agreement between Charles H Willems and Ambrose McEvoy, Gainsborough Studios, 222-4 West 59th Street, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>LET/405/1920</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy 107 Grosvenor Road, from New York 30th October 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>DOC/35</td>
<td>Inventory of Gainsborough Studios, 222 West 59th Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>INV/4/1920</td>
<td>Seating arrangement, Dinner for Sir Auckland Geddes, Tuesday 25th May 1920, Ritz-Carlton hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>INV/5</td>
<td>Violin Recital invitation from Mrs G Baron Fonariova. Home of Adolph Lewisohn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td>LET/406/1920</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy 107 Grosvenor Road, from New York 1st Dec 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538</td>
<td>LET/407/1920</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy 107 Grosvenor Road, from New York 3rd Dec 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>LET/408/1920</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy 107 Grosvenor Road, from New York 12th November 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LET/409</td>
<td>Letter to Mr Field from C.R.W Nevinson. Letter of introduction. 295 Euston Road, no date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>LET/410/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Mitre Hotel Oxford 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>LET/412/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 24th December 1920, Gainsborough Studios, 222 West 59th Street, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>LET/413/1920</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy Abbotsleigh Freshford, from New York 28th December 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>LET/414/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 22nd November 1920, Gainsborough Studios, 222 West 59th Street, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546</td>
<td>LET/415</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy 107 Grosvenor Road, from New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>LET/416/1920</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy, Villa Vita, Kingsdown, Deal, 3rd July 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>LET/417/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Mr(s) Henry? Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, 17th December 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>LET/418/1920</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy, Villa Vita, Kingsdown, Deal, 3rd July 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>DOC/36</td>
<td>White Star Line First Class Ticket to New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>NOT/22</td>
<td>Note on America by McEvoy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>LET/419/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 3rd December 1920, Gainsborough Studios, 222 West 59th Street, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>LET/420</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Chelsea Arts Club, 143 and 145 Church Street, no date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>LET/421</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, University of London, University College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>LET/422</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy 107 Grosvenor Road from New York? 26th March 1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>NOT/23</td>
<td>Note on Mrs Goodenough and Mrs Baring, Ambrose McEvoy's handwriting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>LET/423/1922</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 1922, Hotel Meurice Rue de Rivolo Paris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>LET/424</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>LET/425</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>LET/426</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, University of London, University College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>LET/427</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Aldbourne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>LET/428</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, written from France during First World War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>LET/429</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564</td>
<td>LET/430</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Bourton House Shrivenham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>LET/431</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>LET/432</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567</td>
<td>LET/433</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, on board the RMS Adriatic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568</td>
<td>LET/434</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, University of London, University College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569</td>
<td>LET/435</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Chelsea Arts Club, 143 &amp; 145 Church Street London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>LET/436/1919</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 27th? December 1919, on board the RMS Adriatic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571</td>
<td>LET/437</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date 152 East Fortieth Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td>LET/438</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address, McEvoy has just left Freshford for (London?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>LET/439/1919</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 31st December 1919 Wednesday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576</td>
<td>NOT/24</td>
<td>10 weeks of daily appointments ripped out of diary. Not sure of date. Sittings with lots of different people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577</td>
<td>LET/442/1925</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Kate G Brewster, 232 East Walton Place, 1st February 1925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>LET/443/1925</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from illegible 1st December 1925, 3 Carlton House Terrace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>LET/444/1925</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Eleanor Pedersen, 15th April 1925, 152 East 40th Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>LET/446/1925</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Cynthia Asquith, 14th July 1925, Adelphi Terrace House, Strand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>LET/447/1925</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from David Fincham, on behalf of Mrs Harriman, 8th July (1925?), Cortington, Upton Lovell, Wiltshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583</td>
<td>LET/448/1925</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Madame de Zayas, 19th April, 1925, 22 Rue Gustave Courbet, Paris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
<td>LET/449</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Meme M. FitzGerald, 13th September, no year, Marsden Manor Cirencester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>LET/450/1925</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy Sunday 9th August 1925, Goldsborough Hall, Knaresborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td>LET/451/1925</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Maud Choate, 1st April 1925, 8 East 63rd Street, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
<td>LET/452/1925</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Cynthia Asquith, 27th June 1925, Adelphi Terrace House, Strand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td>DOC/37</td>
<td>Visitor's attendances to Royal Academy of Arts, 4th May to 30th May 1925. Bill school of painting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>LET/454/1925</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Meme M. FitzGerald, 18th August 1925, Grand Hotel Beau-Rivage Geneva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591</td>
<td>LET/455</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy 7th February (from New York?) no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td>LET/456</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593</td>
<td>LET/457</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy 11th March no year, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>LET/458</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595</td>
<td>LET/459</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy no date, 152 East 40th Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596</td>
<td>LET/460</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>597</td>
<td>LET/461</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td>LET/462</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy no date, no address New York?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>LET/463</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, The Ambassador New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>LET/464</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy no date, no address New York?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>LET/465</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy no date, no address New York?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>LET/466</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy 31st December, no year, no address New York?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>LET/468</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy 28th December, no year, 152 East 40th Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>LET/469</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy no date, 152 East 40th Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>LET/470</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy Tuesday 16th December (1924?), The Ambassador New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>LET/471</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy no date, 152 East 40th Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>LET/472</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Monday 8th December New York?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>LET/473</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy no date, 152 East 40th Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>LET/474/1924</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy 107 Grosvenor Road, 8th December 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>LET/475</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy 2nd December no year, 152 East 40th Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>NOT/25/1924</td>
<td>Notes on Ambrose McEvoy's letters and cables (Mary McEvoy's hand?) November 1924- January 1925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>LET/476/1924</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Albert Holmes? Secretary to? Sir Edwin Lutyens, 17 Queen Anne's Gate Westminster, 4th November 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615</td>
<td>LET/478/1924</td>
<td>Letter to Claude Johnson from Robert Witt 15th September 1924, 32 Portman Square, Mayfair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>LET/479/1924</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Robert Witt 15th September 1924, 32 Portman Square, Mayfair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>INV/6</td>
<td>Invitation to photograph McEvoy as Associate of RA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618</td>
<td>LET/480/1924</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Mary H Rumsey, Wheatley Hills, Westbury, L.I., 9th July 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>LET/481/1924</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from illegible sender, 25th July 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td><strong>LET/482/1924</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from G Peter Jonas, 21st October 1924, Greenbank Chester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td><strong>LET/483</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Violet Rutland, 16 Arlington Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622</td>
<td><strong>LET/484/1924</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Violet Rutland, 16 Arlington Street, 13th July 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td><strong>LET/485</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Violet Rutland, 16 Arlington Street, 7th June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624</td>
<td><strong>LET/486</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from ....? Graham, Hill Top, Chaldon, Caterham, 28th May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td><strong>LET/487/1924</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Lady Russell, 27th April 1924, 107 Cheyne Walk, Chelsea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626</td>
<td><strong>LET/488/1924</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Robert Witt 6th May 1924, 32 Portman Square, Mayfair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627</td>
<td><strong>LET/489</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Melissa Yuille, 31st August, Ritz Hotel, Piccadilly London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td><strong>LET/490/1924</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from L. E. Beaufort, 22nd May 1924, Badminton, Gloucestershire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td><strong>LET/492/1924</strong></td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Claudia Elias on behalf of Claude Johnson, 15 Conduit Street, London, 16th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td><strong>NOT/26</strong></td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td><strong>NOT/27</strong></td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633</td>
<td><strong>NOT/28</strong></td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634</td>
<td>NOT/29</td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>NOT/30</td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>NOT/31</td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>NOT/32</td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638</td>
<td>NOT/33</td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639</td>
<td>NOT/34</td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>NOT/35</td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641</td>
<td>NOT/36</td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642</td>
<td>NOT/37</td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>NOT/38</td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>NOT/39</td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>645</td>
<td>NOT/40</td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646</td>
<td>NOT/41</td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>647</td>
<td>NOT/42</td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648</td>
<td>NOT/43</td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649</td>
<td>NOT/44</td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>NOT/45</td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>NOT/46</td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>652</td>
<td>NOT/47</td>
<td>Notes from Claude Johnson on his French and Spanish holiday, McEvoy, Mrs Wigs, John, Tink, Germaine, Betsy, Edith all went. Good Friday 18th April 1924- Wednesday 7th May 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653</td>
<td>LET/493/1924</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, April 1924, Hotel Ritz, Madrid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654</td>
<td>LET/494/1924</td>
<td>Possibly letter to Mary McEvoy, possibly musings of Ambrose's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655</td>
<td>LET/495/1924</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, April 1924, Grand Hotel de Paris Sevilla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656</td>
<td>LET/496/1924</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, April 1924, Hotel Ritz, Madrid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657</td>
<td>LET/497/1924</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, April 1924, Hotel Meurice, Paris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>658</td>
<td>LET/498/1924</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 6th May 1924, Hotel Meurice, Paris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>659</td>
<td>LET/499/1924</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from unknown sender of Scott &amp; Fowles 667 Fifth Avenue, New York, 25th January 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660</td>
<td>LET/500/1924</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Cynthia Asquith, 29th March 1924, 8 Sussex Place, Regent's Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661</td>
<td>LET/501/1924</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Malve Goodenough, 3rd April 1924, Filkins Hall, Lechlade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662</td>
<td>LET/502/1924</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from E Banford, 89 Bloomfield Avenue, Bath, 25th April 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664</td>
<td>LET/503/1923</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Cynthia Asquith, 23rd July 1923, Adelphi Terrace House, Strand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664</td>
<td>LET/504/1923</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Cynthia Asquith, 2nd February 1923, 9 Sussex Place, Regent’s Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>666</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/506/1922</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from unknown sender of Scott &amp; Fowles 667 Fifth Avenue, New York, 5th April 1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/507</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Friday, no year, Grand Hotel Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/508</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Wednesday no year, Grand Hotel Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>669</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/509</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Sunday no year, Grand Hotel Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/510</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Tuesday no year, Grand Hotel Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>671</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/511</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Wednesday 7th no year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>672</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/512</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy no date, Hotel Royal Danieli, Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>673</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/513</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy 5th November no year, Hotel Royal Danieli, Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>674</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/514</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy Saturday, no year, Hotel Royal Danieli, Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>675</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/515</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy Sunday 4th November, Hotel Royal Danieli, Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>676</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/516</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy no date, Hotel Royal Danieli, Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>677</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/517</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy no date, Hotel Ritz, Place Vendrome, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>678</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/518/1922</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy Sunday 8th January 1922, Hotel Ritz, Place Vendrome, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>LET/No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679</td>
<td>LET/519</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy Monday 2nd January? Hotel de Palais, Biarritz with sketch of McEvoy in beret</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>LET/520</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy Monday Wednesday, no date, Hotel Meurice, Paris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>681</td>
<td>LET/521</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy Monday, no date, Hotel Meurice, Paris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>682</td>
<td>LET/522</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy Monday, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road, London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>683</td>
<td>LET/523</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Tuesday, no date, no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>684</td>
<td>LET/524</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy Monday, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road, London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>685</td>
<td>LET/525/1922</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Wednesday May 1922, 80 Rue de Lille</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>686</td>
<td>LET/526/1922</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Friday May 1922, 80 Rue de Lille</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>687</td>
<td>LET/527/1922</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, (May 1922?) no address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>688</td>
<td>LET/528/1922</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, (1922?) Hotel Meurice, Monday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>689</td>
<td>LET/529/1922</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (1922) Hotel Meurice Paris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690</td>
<td>LET/530</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (1922?) Hotel Meurice Paris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>691</td>
<td>LET/531</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date Sunday (1922?) Hotel Meurice Paris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>692</td>
<td>LET/532</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from J de Jaucourt, 1st June, no year (1922?) 46 Rue de Varenne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>693</td>
<td>LET/533</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (1922?) Hotel Meurice Paris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>694</td>
<td>LET/534</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (1922?) Café restaurant d'Orsay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695</td>
<td>LET/535/1922</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Tuesday 2nd May 1922, 80 Rue de Lille</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>696</td>
<td>LET/536</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Le Grand Hotel du Petit Louvre Marseille</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>697</td>
<td>LET/537</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (1922?), Hotel Meurice Paris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>698</td>
<td>LET/538/1911</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 11th September 1911, London writing to Mary in Freshford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699</td>
<td>LET/539/1911</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 30th August 1911, London writing to Mary in Freshford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>LET/540</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, writing from Neuville?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>DOC/38/1922</td>
<td>Work sheet of individual return of taxable income, 1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>LET/541/1910</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Calais 13th May 1910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703</td>
<td>LET/542/1910</td>
<td>Postcard to Michael McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Paris 13th May 1910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td>LET/543/1911</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Fanny Swift? 20th September 1911, West Park, Countorpe Road, Wimbledon, Surrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705</td>
<td>LET/544/1911</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 21st September 1911, writing to Mary in Freshford from London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>LET/545/1911</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 5th September 1911, writing to Mary in Freshford from London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>LET/546/1912</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 107 Grosvenor Road from Café Suisse, Dieppe, 18th September 1912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708</td>
<td>LET/547</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date no address, possibly writing from London to Freshford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Document Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709</td>
<td>LET/548</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Hotel du Commerce, Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>LET/549</td>
<td>Half a damaged letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, probably Dieppe with Sickert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711</td>
<td>LET/550</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Café Suisse, Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>LET/551/1911</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Committee: William Rothenstein, Albert Rothenstein (before he changed his name), P.G. Konody, Martin Shaw, William Strang, 4th November 1911, 50 Clevedon Mansions, Highgate Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713</td>
<td>LET/552/1911</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Gordon Craig, Advisory Committee in the founding of his School of the Theatre, 2nd meeting at Albert Rothenstein’s studio, 22nd November 1911, 7 Smith Square, Westminster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714</td>
<td>LET/553</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Café Suisse, Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715</td>
<td>LET/554</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Café Suisse, Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716</td>
<td>LET/555</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Café Suisse, Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717</td>
<td>LET/556</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Sunday night, no date, Café Suisse, Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718</td>
<td>LET/557</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Café Suisse, Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719</td>
<td>LET/558</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 107 Grosvenor Road, Dieppe, 25th September 1912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720</td>
<td>LET/559</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 107 Grosvenor Road, Arles, 30th November 1911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721</td>
<td>LET/560</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Café Suisse, Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722</td>
<td>LET/561</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Hotel de Commerce, Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723</td>
<td>LET/562</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Café Suisse, Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724</td>
<td>LET/563</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Café de Rouen, Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Catalog Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725</td>
<td>LET/564</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Café Suisse, Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726</td>
<td>LET/565</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Abbotsleigh, Freshford, Dieppe, no date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727</td>
<td>LET/566</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Hotel de Commerce, Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>728</td>
<td>LET/567</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Café Suisse, Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729</td>
<td>LET/568</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Café Suisse, Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>LET/569</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Café Suisse, Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731</td>
<td>LET/570</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Sunday 5 o'clock, no date, Café Suisse, Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732</td>
<td>LET/571</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Monday 1 o'clock, no date, Café Suisse, Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733</td>
<td>LET/572</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Café Suisse, Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>734</td>
<td>LET/573</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Wednesday morning, no date, Café Suisse, Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>735</td>
<td>LET/574</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Café Suisse, Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736</td>
<td>LET/575/1911</td>
<td>Letter card to Mrs McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 107 Grosvenor Road, Dover 27th November, 1911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>737</td>
<td>LET/576/1911</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, writing probably at 107 Grosvenor Road to Abbotsleigh Freshford, 18th September 1911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>738</td>
<td>DRA/4</td>
<td>Figure studies 471ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739</td>
<td>DRA/5</td>
<td>Figure studies 472ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td>DRA/6</td>
<td>Figure studies 473ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>DRA/7</td>
<td>Figure studies 474ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>741</td>
<td>DRA/8</td>
<td>Figure studies 475ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742</td>
<td>DRA/9</td>
<td>Figure studies 476ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743</td>
<td>DRA/10</td>
<td>Figure studies 477ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744</td>
<td>DRA/11</td>
<td>Figure studies 478ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>745</td>
<td>DRA/12</td>
<td>Figure studies 479ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747</td>
<td></td>
<td>Large old archival box: box 6, Small drawings by Ambrose McEvoy, mostly unfinished property of Mrs Bazell, 2: cream folder portraits 468ch, 469ch, 470ch, 480ch-485ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/13</td>
<td>Man in hat, after Rembrandt 486ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>748</td>
<td>DRA/14</td>
<td>Little boy, pencil and chalk. Feb 27th on bottom 485ch. After the Christ Child by Desiderio da Settignano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>749</td>
<td>DRA/15</td>
<td>Woman in a hat, pen 484ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>DRA/16</td>
<td>Woman sleeping, pencil 483ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751</td>
<td>DRA/17</td>
<td>Very simple outline of a child, pencil 482ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>752</td>
<td>DRA/18</td>
<td>Simple figure study with measurements 481ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>753</td>
<td>DRA/19</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch, little boy, pencil and sepia chalk/pastel 20th Nov 99 480ch. After The Christ Child by Desiderio da Settignano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>754</td>
<td>DRA/20</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch, woman standing and woman seated at table with hat, pencil, 470ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755</td>
<td>DRA/21</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch, figure studies of woman with notes, reverse is just shading, pencil, 469ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>756</td>
<td>DRA/22</td>
<td>Study for woman in shawl, pencil, 468ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757</td>
<td></td>
<td>Large old archival box: box 6, Small drawings by Ambrose McEvoy, mostly unfinished property of Mrs Bazell, 2: cream folder unmarked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/23</td>
<td>Double-sided, man in bowler hat, pencil and blue ink, reverse notes and simple figure study, 413ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>758</td>
<td>DRA/24</td>
<td>Study in blue pencil, woman in a hat profile, 414ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>759</td>
<td>DRA/25</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch head and pig, female portrait, 415ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760</td>
<td>DRA/26</td>
<td>Woman sleeping, pencil, 416ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>761</td>
<td>DRA/27</td>
<td>Watercolour and pencil sketch of seated older woman, yellow ochre background 450ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>762</td>
<td>DRA/28</td>
<td>Figure sketch, blue and black pencil on Goldsborough Hall Knaresborough paper 411ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>763</td>
<td>DRA/29</td>
<td>Double-sided figure sketch 410ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764</td>
<td>DRA/30</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of woman in a hat 412ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>765</td>
<td>Large old archival box: box 6, Small drawings by Ambrose McEvoy, mostly unfinished property of Mrs Bazell, 2: cream folder unmarked</td>
<td>DRA/31</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: two figures playing the violin, town view, 419ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>766</td>
<td>DRA/32</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: two sets of legs, nude figures 1166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>767</td>
<td>Large old archival box: box 6, Small drawings by Ambrose McEvoy, mostly unfinished property of Mrs Bazell, 2: cream folder, portraits 2/2</td>
<td>DRA/33</td>
<td>Pencil sketches, woman's head profile, hand, feet 1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>768</td>
<td>DRA/34</td>
<td>Pencil sketch woman's head 174ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>769</td>
<td>DRA/35</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a man, hand to face 179ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770</td>
<td>DRA/36</td>
<td>Seated figure, hands clasped, pencil 177ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771</td>
<td>DRA/37</td>
<td>Pencil and brown wash sketch, woman standing 176ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772</td>
<td>DRA/38</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of seated woman 181ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773</td>
<td>DRA/39</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of seated woman 182ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774</td>
<td>DRA/40</td>
<td>Double-sided: Watercolour waterlillies, print woman standing in front of mirror</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
<td>DRA/41</td>
<td>Print of woman in low cut dress 465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>776</td>
<td>DRA/42</td>
<td>Quick pencil sketch of woman, 746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>777</td>
<td>DRA/43</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of woman small, 810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>778</td>
<td>DRA/44</td>
<td>Sketch of woman, part coloured 505</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>779</td>
<td>DRA/45</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch of man 745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780</td>
<td>DRA/46</td>
<td>Profile sketch pencil of woman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>781</td>
<td>DRA/47</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of woman looking out of window</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>782</td>
<td>DRA/48</td>
<td>Blue pencil sketch of legs, 170ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>783</td>
<td>DRA/49</td>
<td>Small watercolour sketch of head 171ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>784</td>
<td>DRA/50</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch of figures 441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>785</td>
<td>DRA/51</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of small boy (probably Michael) 173ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>786</td>
<td>DRA/52</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of small boy (probably Michael) 502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>787</td>
<td>DRA/53</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of small boy (probably Michael) 482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>788</td>
<td>DRA/54</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of small boy (probably Michael) 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>789</td>
<td>DRA/55</td>
<td>Blue pencil and pen sketch of child's legs (probably Michael) 480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790</td>
<td>DRA/56</td>
<td>Blue ink and pencil sketch of child seated (probably Michael) 478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791</td>
<td>DRA/57</td>
<td>Double-sided: head of young boy (probably Michael) in ink, watercolour sketch of young boy seated (probably Michael)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>792</td>
<td>DRA/58</td>
<td>Sketch on grid of young boy seated (probably Michael) 487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793</td>
<td>DRA/59</td>
<td>Double-sided: anatomical sketches pencil, ink and pencil child seated (probably Michael)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>794</td>
<td>DRA/60</td>
<td>Sepia chalk sketch of child seated (probably Michael) 503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795</td>
<td>DRA/61</td>
<td>Pencil/charcoal sketch of child seated (probably Michael) 484</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796</td>
<td>DRA/62</td>
<td>Print of child seated (probably Michael) 483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797</td>
<td>DRA/63</td>
<td>Ink and watercolour sketch of a child seated (probably Michael) 481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>798</td>
<td>DRA/64</td>
<td>Grey watercolour and pencil sketch of a seated woman 163ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>799</td>
<td>DRA/65</td>
<td>Pencil sketch woman in profile standing 164ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>DRA/66</td>
<td>Ink and wash sketch of woman's head and shoulders 162ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>DRA/67</td>
<td>Sketch of three men in bowler hats talking 160ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>DRA/68</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of woman seated 159ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>DRA/69</td>
<td>Pencil sketch head of a woman 161ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>DRA/70</td>
<td>Sketch of woman seated half profile 158ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805</td>
<td>DRA/71</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of woman standing 156ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806</td>
<td>DRA/72</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of woman seated, hand to face 155ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807</td>
<td>DRA/73</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of woman seated, half profile 153ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>808</td>
<td>DRA/74</td>
<td>Ink sketch of Professor James Ward 448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>809</td>
<td>DRA/75</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch in blue for Myrtle 157ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810</td>
<td>DRA/76</td>
<td>Pencil sketch head of woman 170ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>811</td>
<td>DRA/77</td>
<td>Blue watercolour and pencil sketch, woman standing and turning 154ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812</td>
<td>DRA/78</td>
<td>Double-sided watercolour sketch of woman kneeling and pencil sketches on reverse 84ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813</td>
<td>DRA/79</td>
<td>Double-sided interior sketches pencil 169ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814</td>
<td>DRA/80</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of woman walking 169ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>815</td>
<td>DRA/81</td>
<td>Double-sided: Pencil sketch of woman standing with arm out and children pencil sketches 167ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816</td>
<td>DRA/82</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch, head of woman and woman standing arms up 165ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817</td>
<td>DRA/83</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of woman full-face. Anna McEvoy? 709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>818</td>
<td>DRA/84</td>
<td>Pencil sketch man leaning on womans shoulder from behind.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>819</td>
<td>DRA/85</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of woman seated full-face 451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>DRA/86</td>
<td>Sketch of woman leaning on counter 419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>821</td>
<td>DRA/87</td>
<td>Double-sided four pencil female figure studies, reverse shaded interior 77ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>822</td>
<td>DRA/88</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of woman, hand to face 72ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>823</td>
<td>DRA/89</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of woman, 76ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>824</td>
<td>DRA/90</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of woman leaning 73ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825</td>
<td>DRA/91</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of woman standing, 74ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>826</td>
<td>DRA/92</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of head, 75ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>827</td>
<td>DRA/93</td>
<td>Pen and wash sketch of man seated 81ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>828</td>
<td>DRA/94</td>
<td>Ink sketch of person's head in hat 85ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>829</td>
<td>DRA/95</td>
<td>Blue pencil pair of figure sketches 80ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>DRA/96</td>
<td>Pen and wash sketch of woman's head 79ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>831</td>
<td>DRA/97</td>
<td>Pencil sketch woman's head 452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>832</td>
<td>DRA/98</td>
<td>Pen and wash and pencil sketch of woman seated 78ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>833</td>
<td>DRA/99</td>
<td>Red and black ink sketch of woman standing, 87ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>834</td>
<td>DRA/100</td>
<td>Double-sided: pen and wash sketch of woman seated, pencil of man seated 729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>835</td>
<td>DRA/101</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of woman 411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>836</td>
<td>DRA/102</td>
<td>Pencil figure studies of woman 86ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>837</td>
<td>DRA/103</td>
<td>Ink sketch of woman seated, elbow up, Mrs McEvoy? See Tate picture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>838</td>
<td>DRA/104</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of woman's head 90ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>839</td>
<td>DRA/105</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of two young women seated 427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840</td>
<td>DRA/106</td>
<td>Ink sketch of woman 89ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>841</td>
<td>DRA/107</td>
<td>Blue pencil sketch of woman standing, full-length, 91ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>842</td>
<td>DRA/108</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch of woman looking up, very simple figure study 93ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>843</td>
<td>DRA/109</td>
<td>Double-sided, sketch of woman standing with dog, children heads pencil studies, 92ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>844</td>
<td>DRA/110</td>
<td>Pencil drawing, woman standing hat and bag 209ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>845</td>
<td>DRA/111</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of woman standing, 208ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>846</td>
<td>DRA/112</td>
<td>Black ink sketch of two figures 206ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>847</td>
<td>DRA/113</td>
<td>Pencil sketch mother and two children on Arden House headed paper 207ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>848</td>
<td>DRA/114</td>
<td>Graphite sketch person in interior 456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>849</td>
<td>DRA/115</td>
<td>Double-sided: pencil sketch of man seated and hands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850</td>
<td>DRA/116</td>
<td>Pencil sketch woman in interior 205ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>851</td>
<td>DRA/117</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of woman sewing? 204ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>852</td>
<td>DRA/118</td>
<td>Coloured sketch of woman seated sewing? 203ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>853</td>
<td>DRA/119</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch arms and figure 202ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Accession</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Completion No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>854</td>
<td>DRA/120</td>
<td>Pencil sketch woman standing in interior arm up 201ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>855</td>
<td>DRA/121</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch woman, landscape? 200ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>856</td>
<td>DRA/122</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch seated woman hoop earring (Anais?) rooftops 199ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>857</td>
<td>DRA/123</td>
<td>Charcoal sketch woman standing in interior 198ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>858</td>
<td>DRA/124</td>
<td>Pencil sketch woman standing 197ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>859</td>
<td>DRA/125</td>
<td>Double-sided: pencil sketch woman seated, female figure studies 437</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860</td>
<td>DRA/126</td>
<td>Pencil figure studies of woman 194ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>861</td>
<td>DRA/127</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch, woman sat in interior, female figure studies, 454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>862</td>
<td>DRA/128</td>
<td>Blue watercolour figure study 193ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>DRA/129</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil figure studies, landscape 195ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>864</td>
<td>DRA/130</td>
<td>Simple figure studies 196ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>865</td>
<td>DRA/131</td>
<td>Green watercolour sketch of woman climbing/crawling 192ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>866</td>
<td>DRA/132</td>
<td>Ink sketch of nude 121ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>867</td>
<td>DRA/133</td>
<td>Charcoal sketch of two figures, reverse crossed out 190ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>868</td>
<td>DRA/134</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: person in bowler hat, unidentifiable sketch 189ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>869</td>
<td>DRA/135</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch person sat in window with landscape behind, landscape through window 188ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870</td>
<td>DRA/136</td>
<td>Simple pencil sketch, woman standing in interior 183ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>871</td>
<td>DRA/137</td>
<td>Double-sided: pencil sketch of nudes, pencil sketch of two figures 184ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>872</td>
<td>DRA/138</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of woman looking up seated 1202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>873</td>
<td>DRA/139</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of seated nude 1169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>874</td>
<td>DRA/140</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of nude with earring (Anais?) 1138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>875</td>
<td>DRA/141</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of seated nude 1153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>876</td>
<td>DRA/142</td>
<td>Double-sided standing woman in eastern dancing dress? Pencil, charcoal shading 185ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>877</td>
<td>DRA/143</td>
<td>Double-sided: charcoal figures in interior, interior shading? 186ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>878</td>
<td>DRA/144</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of figure 187ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>879</td>
<td>DRA/145</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch figures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880</td>
<td>DRA/146</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of figure 1126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>881</td>
<td>DRA/147</td>
<td>Ink and pencil sketch of nude seated 1121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>883</td>
<td>DRA/149</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch nude seated 1129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>884</td>
<td>DRA/150</td>
<td>Sketch classical figure with child, reverse shading 111ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>885</td>
<td>DRA/151</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of two women, one standing, one seated blues 108ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>886</td>
<td>DRA/152</td>
<td>Ink sketch of woman's torso 476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>887</td>
<td>DRA/153</td>
<td>Pencil sketch standing nude 109ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>888</td>
<td>DRA/154</td>
<td>Double-sided: standing nude, woman's head profile, both pencil 111ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>889</td>
<td>DRA/155</td>
<td>Ink and pencil sketch of nude standing 104ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890</td>
<td>DRA/156</td>
<td>Pencil sketch seated nude 1153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>892</td>
<td>DRA/158</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: pencil of woman in hat, standing woman 106ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>893</td>
<td>DRA/159</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: Woman with earring looking out of window pencil (Anais?), female figure seated hand to face 105ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>DRA/160</td>
<td>Head of woman in hat, pen and ink sketch 107ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>895</td>
<td>DRA/161</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: watercolour nude standing, pencil sketch nude standing 1127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>896</td>
<td>DRA/162</td>
<td>Pencil sketch, woman stood at window 101ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>897</td>
<td>DRA/163</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of seated nude 1156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>898</td>
<td>DRA/164</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of standing nude 113ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>DRA/165</td>
<td>Double-sided: pen and wash sketch of woman eastern dress, pencil figure studies 103ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>DRA/166</td>
<td>Pencil sketch standing nude 1149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901</td>
<td>DRA/167</td>
<td>Ink sketch of building 102ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>902</td>
<td>DRA/168</td>
<td>Pencil figure sketches on Arden House headed paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>903</td>
<td>DRA/169</td>
<td>Pencil sketch standing woman 99ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>904</td>
<td>DRA/170</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: pencil two men and woman talking, figure studies (one of Anais?) 96ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>905</td>
<td>DRA/171</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: pencil woman standing, woman on ground, 97ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>DRA/172</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: woman sat on ground reaching up, two figures, pencil 98ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>907</td>
<td>DRA/173</td>
<td>Pencil sketch seated nude 1154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>908</td>
<td>DRA/174</td>
<td>Double-sided: ink figure studies 100ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>909</td>
<td>DRA/175</td>
<td>Nude bending down 1137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>DRA/176</td>
<td>Ink and pencil sketch head of man 426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911</td>
<td>DRA/177</td>
<td>Charcoal seated washing nude 1152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>912</td>
<td>DRA/178</td>
<td>Pencil seated washing nude 1150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>913</td>
<td>DRA/179</td>
<td>Nude lying down 1163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>914</td>
<td>DRA/180</td>
<td>Pencil sketch woman catching ball 95ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>915</td>
<td>DRA/181</td>
<td>Pencil hand studies 94ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916</td>
<td>DRA/182</td>
<td>Pencil nude seated washing 1157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917</td>
<td>DRA/183</td>
<td>Pencil dancing woman 110ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>918</td>
<td>DRA/184</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch standing nude, church floorplan 1160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>919</td>
<td>DRA/185</td>
<td>Charcoal sketch standing woman 113ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>DRA/186</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: seated nude, woman standing on terrace/balcony 1139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>921</td>
<td>DRA/187</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch standing nude 1128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922</td>
<td>DRA/188</td>
<td>Watercolour figure study 114ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923</td>
<td>DRA/189</td>
<td>Double sided pencil sketch: woman standing, figure and mirror 115ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>924</td>
<td>DRA/190</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch standing nude 117ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925</td>
<td>DRA/191</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: legs in toga pencil, simple pencil figure 1145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>926</td>
<td>DRA/192</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: watercolour nudes, pencil sketch nude seated 6111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>927</td>
<td>DRA/193</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch: head of woman, woman standing 116ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>928</td>
<td>DRA/194</td>
<td>Double-sided: watercolour sketch of woman in interior, watercolour of figure seated, 118ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>929</td>
<td>DRA/195</td>
<td>Pencil sketch nude bending down 1165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930</td>
<td></td>
<td>Large old archival box: box 5 Landscapes 2/2: Unmarked cream folder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>931</td>
<td>DRA/196</td>
<td>Pencil sketch and address 437ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>932</td>
<td>DRA/197</td>
<td>Pencil landscape on Chilham Castle headed paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>933</td>
<td>DRA/198</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch: landscape, horse and plough 444ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>934</td>
<td>DRA/199</td>
<td>Paper booklet of pencil sketches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>935</td>
<td>DRA/200</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch, buildings 223ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>936</td>
<td>DRA/201</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch woman standing, landscape 225ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>DRA/202</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596</td>
<td>DRA/203</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch, landscape 1035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>937</td>
<td>DRA/203</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of landscape with cows, on reverse writing 455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>938</td>
<td>DRA/204</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of river bank 988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>939</td>
<td>DRA/205</td>
<td>Charcoal sketch, theatre interior 224ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>940</td>
<td>DRA/206</td>
<td>Pencil sketches 995 double-sided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>941</td>
<td>DRA/207</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 222ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>942</td>
<td>DRA/208</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch: woman standing, landscape 883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>943</td>
<td>DRA/209</td>
<td>Double sided: watercolour beach, dark graphite shading 919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>944</td>
<td>DRA/210</td>
<td>Double-sided bridge riverbank landscapes 221ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>945</td>
<td>DRA/211</td>
<td>Pencil landscape sketch 219ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>946</td>
<td>DRA/212</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch, street perspective 220ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>947</td>
<td>DRA/213</td>
<td>Watercolour riverside landscape 864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>948</td>
<td>DRA/214</td>
<td>Watercolour 973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>949</td>
<td>DRA/215</td>
<td>Watercolour 899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950</td>
<td>DRA/216</td>
<td>Watercolour 922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>951</td>
<td>DRA/217</td>
<td>Pencil sketch view out of a window 1049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>952</td>
<td>DRA/218</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape 869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>953</td>
<td>DRA/219</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch 218ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>954</td>
<td>DRA/220</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape 1037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>955</td>
<td>DRA/221</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 218ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>956</td>
<td>DRA/222</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch landscape, figure drawings 1011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>957</td>
<td>DRA/223</td>
<td>Sketch of houses 217ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>958</td>
<td>DRA/224</td>
<td>Pencil sketch landscape 1003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>959</td>
<td>DRA/225</td>
<td>Double-sided: Watercolour abstract landscape, old man in ink 924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960</td>
<td>DRA/226</td>
<td>Watercolour abstract landscape 1048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961</td>
<td>DRA/227</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 216ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td>DRA/228</td>
<td>Church pencil sketch 215ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>DRA/229</td>
<td>Building pencil sketch 930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>964</td>
<td>DRA/230</td>
<td>Bridge plan in ink on tracing paper 214ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>965</td>
<td>DRA/231</td>
<td>Pencil figure on horse 213ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>966</td>
<td>DRA/232</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape 897</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>967</td>
<td>DRA/233</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch: landscape, woman standing. Anais? 212ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>968</td>
<td>DRA/234</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch: landscape, figure in landscape 211ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>969</td>
<td>DRA/235</td>
<td>Landscape pencil sketch 210ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>DRA/236</td>
<td>Harbour view pencil sketch 990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>971</td>
<td>DRA/237</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape 872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc No</td>
<td>Catalogue No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>972</td>
<td>DRA/238</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape 868</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>973</td>
<td>DRA/239</td>
<td>Double-sided watercolour landscape and figure studies 109 landscapes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>974</td>
<td>DRA/240</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape 871</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>975</td>
<td>DRA/241</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape 887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>976</td>
<td>DRA/242</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape 944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>977</td>
<td>DRA/243</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape 1034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>978</td>
<td>DRA/244</td>
<td>Watercolour and pencil landscape 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>979</td>
<td>DRA/245</td>
<td>Watercolour and pencil country track 998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>980</td>
<td>DRA/246</td>
<td>Treed landscape watercolour 867</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>981</td>
<td>DRA/247</td>
<td>Pencil landscape 54ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>982</td>
<td>DRA/248</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch: landscape with figure, landscape 53ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>983</td>
<td>DRA/249</td>
<td>Pencil sketch industrial view 61ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>984</td>
<td>DRA/250</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch: river view, woman seated profile 931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>985</td>
<td>DRA/251</td>
<td>Pencil landscape 63ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986</td>
<td>DRA/252</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape 996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>987</td>
<td>DRA/253</td>
<td>Double-sided landscape sketches, Watercolour landscape, pen and wash trees 60ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>988</td>
<td>DRA/254</td>
<td>Pencil hilltop village 57ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>989</td>
<td>DRA/255</td>
<td>Pencil river scene 56ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>990</td>
<td>DRA/256</td>
<td>Double-sided: tree arch pencil sketch, ink studies of man 63ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>991</td>
<td>DRA/257</td>
<td>Pencil and chalk sketch, boats on a river, 987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>992</td>
<td>DRA/258</td>
<td>Pencil landscape 58ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>993</td>
<td>DRA/259</td>
<td>Double-sided: industrial river view, ink and pencil on grid, watercolour landscape 952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>994</td>
<td>DRA/260</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape 997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>995</td>
<td>DRA/261</td>
<td>Double-sided: pen and wash landscape, cow in pencil 62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>996</td>
<td>DRA/262</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape 1042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>997</td>
<td>DRA/263</td>
<td>Watercolour and pencil pier view 913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>998</td>
<td>DRA/264</td>
<td>Double-sided: Blue watercolour and pencil landscape, pencil woman standing 64ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>999</td>
<td>DRA/265</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil landscape 115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>DRA/266</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape 876</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001</td>
<td>DRA/267</td>
<td>Watercolour and pencil landscape 934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1002</td>
<td>DRA/268</td>
<td>Pencil building 1020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1003</td>
<td>DRA/269</td>
<td>Pencil landscape 54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1004</td>
<td>DRA/270</td>
<td>Pencil and watercolour landscape 889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005</td>
<td>DRA/271</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape 885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006</td>
<td>DRA/272</td>
<td>Urban landscape pencil 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1007</td>
<td>DRA/273</td>
<td>Pencil street view 878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1008</td>
<td>DRA/274</td>
<td>Pencil landscape 65ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009</td>
<td>DRA/275</td>
<td>Simple blue pencil landscape 908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010</td>
<td>DRA/276</td>
<td>Abstract watercolour, two small pencil figures on reverse 1031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>DRA/277</td>
<td>Street view blue watercolour and pencil, pencil face 66ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1012</td>
<td>DRA/278</td>
<td>Pencil landscape 1010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1013</td>
<td>DRA/279</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape 1020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1014</td>
<td>DRA/280</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape 886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1015</td>
<td>DRA/281</td>
<td>Double-sided boat landscape 997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1016</td>
<td>DRA/282</td>
<td>Blue pencil landscape sketch 920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1017</td>
<td>DRA/283</td>
<td>Pencil archway 1023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1018</td>
<td>DRA/284</td>
<td>Double-sided peopled landscape pencil 961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1019</td>
<td>DRA/285</td>
<td>Pencil landscape bridge 957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1020</td>
<td>DRA/286</td>
<td>Pen and watercolour sketch Dieppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1021</td>
<td>DRA/287</td>
<td>Double-sided: watercolour landscape, trees pencil 111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1022</td>
<td>DRA/288</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape 1025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1023</td>
<td>DRA/289</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch 954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1024</td>
<td>DRA/290</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape 893</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025</td>
<td>DRA/291</td>
<td>Pencil street view 67ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1026</td>
<td>DRA/292</td>
<td>Double-sided, pencil landscape and blue landscape 907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1027</td>
<td>DRA/293</td>
<td>Pencil boat 991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1028</td>
<td>DRA/294</td>
<td>Pencil shore view 296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1029</td>
<td>DRA/295</td>
<td>Pencil landscape 69ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030</td>
<td>DRA/296</td>
<td>Double-sided watercolour: landscape, pink figure 970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1031</td>
<td>DRA/297</td>
<td>Pencil shore view 940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1032</td>
<td>DRA/298</td>
<td>Pencil urban view 906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1033</td>
<td>DRA/299</td>
<td>Pencil landscape through opening 999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1034</td>
<td>DRA/300</td>
<td>Pencil landscape 1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1035</td>
<td>DRA/301</td>
<td>Pencil boat 71ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1036</td>
<td>DRA/302</td>
<td>Watercolour and pencil landscape 70ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1037</td>
<td>DRA/303</td>
<td>Pencil sketch French fishing boats 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1038</td>
<td>DRA/304</td>
<td>Watercolour urban landscape 942</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1039</td>
<td>DRA/305</td>
<td>Watercolour and pencil river view 953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040</td>
<td>DRA/306</td>
<td>Pencil landscape 880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1041</td>
<td>Large old archival box: box 2: cream folder Family</td>
<td>DRA/307</td>
<td>Pencil self-portrait 37ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1042</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/308</td>
<td>Double-sided self-portrait pencil and pencil woman in landscape 370ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1043</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/309</td>
<td>Self-portrait watercolour and pencil 367ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1044</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/310</td>
<td>Double-sided: self-portrait and ink figured interior 368ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1045</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/311</td>
<td>Mixed media self-portrait 38ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1046</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/312</td>
<td>Pen and wash self-portrait sketches 387ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1047</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/313</td>
<td>Double-sided: self-portrait pencil sketches and female pencil figures 382ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1048</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/314</td>
<td>Pencil sketches of woman 113 (Mary McEvoy?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1049</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/315</td>
<td>Pencil mother and child 416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/316</td>
<td>Pink pencil sketch of child 371ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1051</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/317</td>
<td>Watercolour figures 372ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1052</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/318</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of child (probably Michael) 375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1053</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/319</td>
<td>Sketch head of woman 744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1054</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/320</td>
<td>Mother and child pencil sketch, prelim for the 'Convalescent'? 439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1055</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/321</td>
<td>Pencil figures, prelim for 'The Convalescent'? 434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1056</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/322</td>
<td>Pencil drawing of people in interior (doctor?) on grid 376ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1057</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/323</td>
<td>Watercolour orange and green sketch of boy's head 374ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1058</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/324</td>
<td>Pencil mother and child in interior 407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1059</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/325</td>
<td>Pencil and chalk head of woman 811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1060</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/326</td>
<td>Pencil sketch woman in interior 436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1061</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/327</td>
<td>Pencil sketches of woman 438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1062</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/328</td>
<td>Mother and child pencil sketch looking into mirror 369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1063</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/329</td>
<td>Figure sketches 430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1064</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/330</td>
<td>Pencil sketch mother and child 373ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1065</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/331</td>
<td>Woman seated in interior, pencil sketch 453, prelim for 'The Book'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1066</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/332</td>
<td>Pencil sketch for Myrtle 385ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1067</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/333</td>
<td>Pencil head of child 380ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1068</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/334</td>
<td>Pencil 3 children 379ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1069</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/335</td>
<td>Ink sketch, prelim for Helen and Rosalind Butler 1904, reverse figure sketches 473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>DRA/Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1070</td>
<td>DRA/336</td>
<td>Pencil and chalk woman and child with measurements 383ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1071</td>
<td>DRA/337</td>
<td>Pencil woman standing in interior on reverse is printed poem by Jennett Humphreys 377ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1072</td>
<td>DRA/338</td>
<td>Pencil head of boy (probably Michael) 379ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1073</td>
<td>DRA/339</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of two women, prelim for 'The Convalescent' 435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1074</td>
<td>DRA/340</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch, woman sleeping hand to face, woman sat in window 433</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1075</td>
<td>DRA/341</td>
<td>Double-sided: ink sketch biblical scene? Self portrait pencil on reverse 386ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1076</td>
<td>DRA/342</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of two women, prelim for 'The Convalescent' on grid 440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1077</td>
<td>DRA/343</td>
<td>Pencil of houses 389ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1078</td>
<td>DRA/344</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil: woman, prelim for Helen and Rosalind Butler 475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1079</td>
<td>DRA/345</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil: sleeping child, street view 821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1080</td>
<td>DRA/346</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketches child figures 384ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1081</td>
<td>DRA/347</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of two women, one playing the violin one sitting on sofa, 422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1082</td>
<td>DRA/348</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil: Woman sat on sofa with broadsheet, nude seated 459</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1083</td>
<td>DRA/349</td>
<td>Pencil woman and child sat at table on grid 388ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1084</td>
<td>DRA/350</td>
<td>Pencil baby asleep 381ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1085</td>
<td>DRA/351</td>
<td>Pencil sketch child walking 384ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1086</td>
<td>DRA/352</td>
<td>Pencil, person asleep on sofa 432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1087</td>
<td>DRA/353</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 353ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1088</td>
<td>DRA/354</td>
<td>Ink soldier sketches 436ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1089</td>
<td>DRA/355</td>
<td>Ink sketch soldier carrying gun 437ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1090</td>
<td>DRA/356</td>
<td>Ink sketch of soldier 336ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1091</td>
<td>DRA/357</td>
<td>Watercolour soldiers in urban setting 338ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1092</td>
<td>DRA/358</td>
<td>War-torn landscape 339ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1093</td>
<td>DRA/359</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil landscape 340ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1094</td>
<td>DRA/360</td>
<td>Pencil landscape 341ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1095</td>
<td>DRA/361</td>
<td>Pencil landscape 342ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1096</td>
<td>DRA/362</td>
<td>Ink soldiers 361ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/363</td>
<td>Ink soldier running 337ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/364</td>
<td>Pencil soldiers working in interior 362ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/365</td>
<td>Double-sided ink head sketches, pencil landscape 363ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/366</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch pencil assembly/court 365ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/367</td>
<td>Pencil war-torn landscape 366ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/368</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil: sketches of soldiers, church with horses and riders down street 364ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/369</td>
<td>Double-sided sketches in a court 350ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/370</td>
<td>Charcoal war-torn landscape 356ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/371</td>
<td>Pencil war-torn landscape 357ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/372</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 358ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/373</td>
<td>Pencil landscape 359ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/374</td>
<td>Ruined church sketches pencil 360ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/375</td>
<td>Pencil landscape 348ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/376</td>
<td>Pencil landscape 900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/377</td>
<td>Watercolour and ink town scene 917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/378</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch 352ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/379</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/380</td>
<td>Charcoal war-torn landscape 354ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/381</td>
<td>Charcoal sketch figure in landscape 355ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/382</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of soldier with pipe 351ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/383</td>
<td>Figures on horses riding through town sepia pastel, 349ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/384</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 346ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/385</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 347ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/386</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 345ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/387</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 344ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/388</td>
<td>War-torn landscape 343ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/389</td>
<td>Pencil and watercolour landscape bridge 933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/390</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch soldiers in town 350ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/391</td>
<td>Watercolour and pencil sketch of soldier on ground with gun 334ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/392</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of the front line 335ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/393</td>
<td>Double-sided military sketches 27ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/394</td>
<td>Watercolour and ink town scene 1024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/395</td>
<td>97 Great War crayon drawing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/396</td>
<td>Watercolour and charcoal interior with helmets hanging on wall 177 Dugout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/397</td>
<td>110 trenches 1914-18 pen and wash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/398</td>
<td>96 No man’s land charcoal 1914-1918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/399</td>
<td>Battlefield/barracks? 32ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1134</td>
<td>DRA/400</td>
<td>War-torn landscape 29ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1135</td>
<td>DRA/401</td>
<td>Charcoal war-torn landscape 30ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1136</td>
<td>DRA/402</td>
<td>Charcoal war-torn landscape 33ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1137</td>
<td>DRA/403</td>
<td>Pencil soldier studies, walking and on horseback double-sided 31ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1138</td>
<td>DRA/404</td>
<td>Calour war damage 1914-1918 99 watercolour and charcoal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1139</td>
<td>DRA/405</td>
<td>1 part of the pine? Hine? Home? 1918 war-torn landscape 1ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1140</td>
<td>SKE/1</td>
<td>WW1 sketchbook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1141</td>
<td>SKE/2</td>
<td>WW1 sketchbook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1142</td>
<td>C30</td>
<td>Watercolour crouching nude, framed paintings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1143</td>
<td>C39</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of woman, framed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1144</td>
<td>C28</td>
<td>Watercolour crouching nude, framed paintings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145</td>
<td>C33</td>
<td>Blue watercolour sketch of two women framed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1146</td>
<td>C11</td>
<td>Self-portrait pencil sketch framed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1147</td>
<td>C26</td>
<td>Double portrait framed, watercolour man in profile on reverse, watercolour woman on front</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1148</td>
<td>C41</td>
<td>Watercolour woman framed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1149</td>
<td>C37</td>
<td>Watercolour woman framed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150</td>
<td>On its own</td>
<td>Charles Letts's Popular Diary for 1926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1151</td>
<td>Grey archival box - Slade Sketches and Engravings, Irish Church Commission: cream folder, Irish Church 1/3</td>
<td>DRA/406</td>
<td>Drawing of a child profile in circle, watercolour and pastel 400ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1152</td>
<td>DRA/407</td>
<td>Pencil and chalk sketch of a woman in a shawl 401ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1153</td>
<td>DRA/408</td>
<td>Pastel sketch of nude from behind 1146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1154</td>
<td>DRA/409</td>
<td>Pastel and graphite sketch of virgin Mary figure 398ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1155</td>
<td>DRA/410</td>
<td>Pencil and chalk sketch of a saintly man 402ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1156</td>
<td>DRA/411</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of person praying on their knees 507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1157</td>
<td>DRA/412</td>
<td>Double-sided study: watercolour two women in interior (Elizabeth biblical scene?), reverse Pencil sketch of three figures in interior scene 399ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Accession No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1158</td>
<td>DRA/413</td>
<td>Pencil and chalk figure studies, double-sided 403ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1159</td>
<td>DRA/414</td>
<td>Pencil female figure study 508</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1160</td>
<td>DRA/415</td>
<td>Double-sided biblical/classical scenes in pencil 408ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1161</td>
<td>DRA/416</td>
<td>Double-sided biblical/classical scenes in pencil 407ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1162</td>
<td>DRA/417</td>
<td>Double-sided: watercolour and chalk temple/church interior, sepia pastel shaded reverse 406ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1163</td>
<td>DRA/418</td>
<td>Double sided: watercolour woman kneeling on grass, biblical? Brown watercolour, figures, 405ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1164</td>
<td>DRA/419</td>
<td>Blue pencil sketch of figure walking with hands to head 404ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1165</td>
<td>Grey archival box - Slade Sketches and Engravings, Irish Church Commission: cream folder, Etchings DRA/420</td>
<td>Etching of 'Pimlico', French pencil writing underneath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1166</td>
<td>DRA/421</td>
<td>Etching of people in café interior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1167</td>
<td>DRA/422</td>
<td>Etching of girl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1168</td>
<td>DRA/422A</td>
<td>Etching of girl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1169</td>
<td>DRA/423</td>
<td>Etching of man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1170</td>
<td>DRA/424</td>
<td>Etching of man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1171</td>
<td>DRA/425</td>
<td>Etching of couple in window, woman reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1172</td>
<td>DRA/426</td>
<td>Etching 'The Public House' drawn and etched by McEvoy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1173</td>
<td>DRA/427</td>
<td>Etching of woman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1174</td>
<td>DRA/427A</td>
<td>Etching of woman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1175</td>
<td>DRA/427B</td>
<td>Etching of woman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1176</td>
<td>Grey archival box - Slade Sketches and Engravings, Irish Church Commission: cream folder, Slade 459ch DRA/428</td>
<td>Drawings in ink of the hunt and horse and carriages, double-sided 461ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1177</td>
<td>DRA/429</td>
<td>Drawings in ink of soldiers and horses 466ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>DRA No.</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1178</td>
<td>Grey archival box - Slade Sketches and Engravings, Irish Church Commission: cream folder, Batches Slade</td>
<td>DRA/430</td>
<td>figures on horses riding through town sepia pastel, 349ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1179</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/431</td>
<td>Double-sided figure sketches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1180</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/432</td>
<td>Watercolour man on horse, woman, farm animals, reverse pencil sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1181</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/433</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: ink landscape, pencil figure 504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1182</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/434</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of man's head profile, bald, moustache 403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1183</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/435</td>
<td>Ink figures studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1184</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/436</td>
<td>Double-sided: ink cherubs/putti, pencil foliage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1185</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/437</td>
<td>Double-sided architectural sketches ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1186</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/438</td>
<td>Architecture and people ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1187</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/439</td>
<td>Architecture and people ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1188</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/440</td>
<td>Milking cows watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1189</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/441</td>
<td>Horse and cart in landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1190</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/442</td>
<td>Church ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1191</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/443</td>
<td>Street view ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1192</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/444</td>
<td>Tiny sketch, man's head profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1193</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/445</td>
<td>Pencil man's head, circle paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1194</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/446</td>
<td>Double-sided ink sketch: woman seated, interior scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1195</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/447</td>
<td>Paper cut in shape of a woman turning, outline in pencil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1196</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/448</td>
<td>Ink figures studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1197</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/449</td>
<td>Ink figures studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1198</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/450</td>
<td>Canal lock ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1199</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/451</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil figure studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/452</td>
<td>Small sketch through a doorway, ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/453</td>
<td>Ink figures studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1202</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/454</td>
<td>Ink figures studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/455</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketches: street scene, woman profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1204</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/456</td>
<td>Double-sided figure sketches ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1205</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/457</td>
<td>Ink head of woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1206</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/458</td>
<td>Ink double-sided: horse and cart on street, head sketches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/459</td>
<td>Tink ink street view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1208</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/460</td>
<td>Pencil sketch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DRA/461</th>
<th>Figure sketch ink</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210</td>
<td>DRA/462</td>
<td>Pencil sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1211</td>
<td>DRA/463</td>
<td>Ink figures studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1212</td>
<td>DRA/464</td>
<td>People carrying stretcher ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1213</td>
<td>DRA/465</td>
<td>Biblical scene? Pencil, heads on back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1214</td>
<td>DRA/466</td>
<td>Woman leaning on theatre balcony ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1215</td>
<td>DRA/467</td>
<td>Interior of stables or barn, ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1216</td>
<td>DRA/468</td>
<td>Pencil drawings of men, double-sided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1217</td>
<td>DRA/469</td>
<td>Pencil figures studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1218</td>
<td>DRA/470</td>
<td>Pencil study man's face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1219</td>
<td>DRA/471</td>
<td>Pencil study man's face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1220</td>
<td>DRA/472</td>
<td>Ink harbour with lamppost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1221</td>
<td>DRA/473</td>
<td>Ink female figure leaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1222</td>
<td>DRA/474</td>
<td>Pencil seated figure studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1223</td>
<td>DRA/475</td>
<td>Ink sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1224</td>
<td>DRA/476</td>
<td>Woman walking past a gate ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225</td>
<td>DRA/477</td>
<td>Man with walking stick street scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1226</td>
<td>DRA/478</td>
<td>Watercolour card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1227</td>
<td>DRA/479</td>
<td>Ink boats in harbour?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1228</td>
<td>DRA/480</td>
<td>Ink steps up to house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1229</td>
<td>DRA/481</td>
<td>Man with beard profile ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230</td>
<td>DRA/482</td>
<td>Pencil interior scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1231</td>
<td>DRA/483</td>
<td>Ink street view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1232</td>
<td>DRA/484</td>
<td>Ink dancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1233</td>
<td>DRA/485</td>
<td>Double-sided figure studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1234</td>
<td>DRA/486</td>
<td>Pencil figures fleeing, mythological?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1235</td>
<td>DRA/487</td>
<td>Double-sided inks, person on horse, figure and landscape sketches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1236</td>
<td>DRA/488</td>
<td>Double-sided inks, figure studies, couple kissing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1237</td>
<td>DRA/489</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil figure studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1238</td>
<td>DRA/490</td>
<td>Ink head of a man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239</td>
<td>DRA/491</td>
<td>Ink park and rooftop view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1240</td>
<td>DRA/492</td>
<td>Pencil woman in large hat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1241</td>
<td>DRA/493</td>
<td>Pencil harbour view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1242</td>
<td>DRA/494</td>
<td>Ink sketch of person. After Rembrandt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1243</td>
<td>DRA/495</td>
<td>Pencil of old woman's head, reverse ink figure studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1244</td>
<td>DRA/496</td>
<td>Ink street view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245</td>
<td>DRA/497</td>
<td>Ink head sketches. After Rembrandt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1246</td>
<td>DRA/498</td>
<td>Pencil hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1247</td>
<td>DRA/499</td>
<td>Pencil hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248</td>
<td>DRA/500</td>
<td>Ink studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249</td>
<td>DRA/501</td>
<td>Ink figures studies, double-sided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/502</td>
<td>Ink street views double-sided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/503</td>
<td>Pencil sketch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/504</td>
<td>Pencil sketch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/505</td>
<td>Ink outside view</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/506</td>
<td>Double-sided: head of man in blue pencil, child bust sculpture Feb 1900. After The Christ Child by Desiderio da Settignano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/507</td>
<td>Ink fountain in square</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/508</td>
<td>Ink sketches double-sided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/509</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil figure studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/510</td>
<td>Ink crouching nude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/511</td>
<td>Ink fountain in square</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/512</td>
<td>Pencil after Rembrandt's self-portrait 1669, National Gallery London, reverse sketch of man in top hat pencil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/513</td>
<td>Pencil sketch, woman lying down</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/514</td>
<td>Pencil sketch man profile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/515</td>
<td>Pencil sketch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/516</td>
<td>Ink Victorian woman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/517</td>
<td>Ink sketch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/518</td>
<td>Double-sided: Man on stage pencil, theatre interior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/519</td>
<td>Two figures pencil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/520</td>
<td>Figured scene ink</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/521</td>
<td>Church interior pen and wash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/522</td>
<td>Ink street view</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/523</td>
<td>Pencil sketch, man profile top hat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/524</td>
<td>Woman walking, man crying for help, pencil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/525</td>
<td>Ink sketch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/526</td>
<td>Pencil woman in hat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/527</td>
<td>Ink street view</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/528</td>
<td>Pencil sketch young man (self-portrait?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/529</td>
<td>Ink boat, man on reverse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/530</td>
<td>Double-sided man on stage, theatre, pencil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/531</td>
<td>Bridge ink view</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/532</td>
<td>Double-sided ink sketches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/533</td>
<td>Ink mouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/534</td>
<td>Ink figures, part of a letter on the reverse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/535</td>
<td>Ink figures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/536</td>
<td>Crowded outside scene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/537</td>
<td>Pencil woman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA/538</td>
<td>Ink figures studies double-sided horse and cart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1287</td>
<td>DRA/539</td>
<td>Double-sided ink woman and child in interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1288</td>
<td>DRA/540</td>
<td>Ink street view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1289</td>
<td>DRA/541</td>
<td>Steps and doorway ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1290</td>
<td>DRA/542</td>
<td>Ink sketches double-sided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1291</td>
<td>Taken from student notebook</td>
<td>DRA/543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1292</td>
<td>DRA/544</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1293</td>
<td>DRA/545</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1294</td>
<td>DRA/546</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1295</td>
<td>DRA/547</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1296</td>
<td>DRA/548</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1297</td>
<td>DRA/549</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1298</td>
<td>DRA/550</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1299</td>
<td>DRA/551</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>DRA/552</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301</td>
<td>DRA/553</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302</td>
<td>DRA/554</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1303</td>
<td>DRA/555</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1304</td>
<td>DRA/556</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1305</td>
<td>DRA/557</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1306</td>
<td>DRA/558</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1307</td>
<td>DRA/559</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1308</td>
<td>Grey archival box - Slade Sketches and Engravings, Irish Church Commission: cream folder, Slade batches 10-20</td>
<td>DRA/560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1309</td>
<td>DRA/561</td>
<td>Double-sided ink figure sketches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310</td>
<td>DRA/562</td>
<td>Pen and wash and charcoal sketches double-sided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311</td>
<td>DRA/563</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1312</td>
<td>DRA/564</td>
<td>Double-sided 'Athenian warrior going to war' ink, profile caricature on reverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1313</td>
<td>DRA/565</td>
<td>People listening to preacher, ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1314</td>
<td>DRA/566</td>
<td>Bus driver? Pencil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1315</td>
<td>DRA/567</td>
<td>Ink figure studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1316</td>
<td>DRA/568</td>
<td>Child scupture, pencil, 11th August 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1317</td>
<td>DRA/569</td>
<td>Pen and pencil two women sat outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1318</td>
<td>DRA/570</td>
<td>Pencil drawing woman profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Catalogue</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1319</td>
<td>DRA/571</td>
<td>Watercolour red trees, horse and cart, people, mountains in background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1320</td>
<td>DRA/572</td>
<td>Pen and wash populated scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1321</td>
<td>DRA/573</td>
<td>Double-sided caricature heads ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1322</td>
<td>DRA/574</td>
<td>Child sculpture heads, pencil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1323</td>
<td>DRA/575</td>
<td>Long landscape with building perspective pencil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1324</td>
<td>DRA/576</td>
<td>Double-sided ink head of woman, athlete top half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325</td>
<td>DRA/577</td>
<td>Mythological? Scene ink sketches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326</td>
<td>DRA/578</td>
<td>Standing woman ink and pencil, other side woman profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1327</td>
<td>DRA/579</td>
<td>Ink head of man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1328</td>
<td>DRA/580</td>
<td>Ink head of man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1329</td>
<td>DRA/581</td>
<td>November evening hoisting up the sail pencil sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330</td>
<td>DRA/582</td>
<td>Ink sketches double-sided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1331</td>
<td>DRA/583</td>
<td>Sketches pencil double-sided tomb?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1332</td>
<td>DRA/584</td>
<td>Ink sketch people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1333</td>
<td>DRA/585</td>
<td>Man pencil sketches double-sided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1334</td>
<td>DRA/586</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketches figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1335</td>
<td>DRA/587</td>
<td>Ink figures in interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1336</td>
<td>DRA/588</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1337</td>
<td>DRA/589</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil figures and woman full-length on reverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1338</td>
<td>DRA/590</td>
<td>Pencil sketch, two men and a woman. Man with shirt off, reverse woman with arm up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1339</td>
<td>DRA/591</td>
<td>Pen and wash, seated woman in interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340</td>
<td>DRA/592</td>
<td>Double-sided: pencils man sat in interior and interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1341</td>
<td>DRA/593</td>
<td>Double-sided figure sketches purple pencil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1342</td>
<td>DRA/594</td>
<td>Double-sided ink sketches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1343</td>
<td>DRA/595</td>
<td>Pencil sketch woman profile 412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1344</td>
<td>DRA/596</td>
<td>Pencil woman seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1345</td>
<td>DRA/597</td>
<td>Double-sided watercolour one side nude sculpture?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1346</td>
<td>DRA/598</td>
<td>Double-sided ink: two people on horses and man standing, woman and child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347</td>
<td>DRA/599</td>
<td>Double-sided pen and wash head of man and nudes on ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348</td>
<td>DRA/600</td>
<td>Pen and wash figure scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1349</td>
<td>DRA/601</td>
<td>Double-sided ink: street view and boats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350</td>
<td>DRA/602</td>
<td>Double-sided ink female figure studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1351</td>
<td>DRA/603</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1352</td>
<td>DRA/604</td>
<td>Ink figure studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353</td>
<td>DRA/605</td>
<td>Ink figure studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1354</td>
<td>DRA/606</td>
<td>Ink park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355</td>
<td>DRA/607</td>
<td>Ink woman standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1356</td>
<td>DRA/608</td>
<td>Double-sided ink figure sketches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1357</td>
<td>DRA/609</td>
<td>Covered outdoor scene ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1358</td>
<td>DRA/610</td>
<td>Woman seated ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1359</td>
<td>DRA/611</td>
<td>Double-sided ink, child and street view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1360</td>
<td>DRA/612</td>
<td>Ink woman looking down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1361</td>
<td>DRA/613</td>
<td>Woman and child outdoors ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1362</td>
<td>DRA/614</td>
<td>Pencil woman and child in interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1363</td>
<td>DRA/615</td>
<td>Ink woman and child in doorway, figure studies on reverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364</td>
<td>DRA/616</td>
<td>Ink woman seated in interior in ink frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365</td>
<td>DRA/617</td>
<td>Double-sided ink, woman and child seated, figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366</td>
<td>DRA/618</td>
<td>Ink sketches double-sided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1367</td>
<td>DRA/619</td>
<td>Ink figure studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368</td>
<td>DRA/620</td>
<td>Pencil female figures, togas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1369</td>
<td>DRA/621</td>
<td>Boat on water ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370</td>
<td>DRA/622</td>
<td>Ink man and woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371</td>
<td>DRA/623</td>
<td>Ink people in interior/café?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1372</td>
<td>DRA/624</td>
<td>Pencil sketch man walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1373</td>
<td>DRA/625</td>
<td>Ink people gathered around archway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374</td>
<td>DRA/626</td>
<td>Ink woman looking out of window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375</td>
<td>DRA/627</td>
<td>Two small children playing ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1376</td>
<td>DRA/628</td>
<td>Pencil sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377</td>
<td>DRA/629</td>
<td>Pencil cityscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378</td>
<td>DRA/630</td>
<td>Double-sided: ink of interior with people and sculptures, female pencil sketches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1379</td>
<td>DRA/631</td>
<td>Ink woman in interior standing at table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380</td>
<td>DRA/632</td>
<td>Ink people sat outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381</td>
<td>DRA/633</td>
<td>Pencil and ink sketch of two men, one seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382</td>
<td>DRA/634</td>
<td>Blue pencil sketch woman standing and turned away, reverse: pencil sketches figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383</td>
<td>DRA/635</td>
<td>Double-sided 'Study for portrait 74' pencil and watercolour woman leaning on mantelpiece, pencil 'Students leaving British Museum'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384</td>
<td>DRA/636</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch: tree stump in field, tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1385</td>
<td>DRA/637</td>
<td>Pencil, couple walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1386</td>
<td>DRA/638</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketches figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1387</td>
<td>DRA/639</td>
<td>Pencil sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1388</td>
<td>Grey archival box - Slade Sketches and Engravings, Irish Church Commission: cream folder, Slade batches 21-30</td>
<td>empty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1389</td>
<td>Grey archival box - Slade Sketches and Engravings, Irish Church Commission: cream folder, Slade 30-40</td>
<td>DRA/640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1390</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1391</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1392</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1393</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1394</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1395</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1396</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1397</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1398</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1399</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1401</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1402</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1403</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1404</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1405</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1406</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1407</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1408</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1409</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Catalogue No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1410</td>
<td>DRA/661</td>
<td>Ink nude figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1411</td>
<td>DRA/662</td>
<td>Charcoal nude seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1412</td>
<td>DRA/663</td>
<td>Chalk and pencil riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1413</td>
<td>DRA/664</td>
<td>Pencil sketch woman's body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1414</td>
<td>DRA/665</td>
<td>Pencil park sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1415</td>
<td>DRA/666</td>
<td>Ink temple interior?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1416</td>
<td>DRA/667</td>
<td>Pencil seated old lady on the back: poem by Jennett Humphreys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1417</td>
<td>DRA/668</td>
<td>Pencil farm, barn, hay bales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1418</td>
<td>DRA/669</td>
<td>Double-sided ink, highly finished sketch history/mythological/biblical scene, figure sketches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1419</td>
<td>DRA/670</td>
<td>Ink sketch highly finished, after another painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420</td>
<td>DRA/671</td>
<td>Double-sided ink and pencil sketches, heads and hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1421</td>
<td>DRA/672</td>
<td>Pencil and charcoal sketches heads and hands, 15th September 1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1422</td>
<td>DRA/673</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil and sepia chalk hands and male figure 1st and 3rd October 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1423</td>
<td>DRA/674</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil and sepia chalk hand and child's face 21st November 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1424</td>
<td>DRA/675</td>
<td>Pencil heads and hands 10th October 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1425</td>
<td>DRA/676</td>
<td>Double-sided charcoal hands 20th September 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1426</td>
<td>DRA/677</td>
<td>Double-sided charcoal hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1427</td>
<td>DRA/678</td>
<td>Double-sided charcoal mythological nude, pencil hands 26th September 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1428</td>
<td>DRA/679</td>
<td>Double-sided charcoal sketch hand and nude 25th September 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1429</td>
<td>DRA/680</td>
<td>Pencil sketch hands February 1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1430</td>
<td>DRA/681</td>
<td>Pencil and sepia chalk hand sketches 8th October 1899, 3rd October 1899 double-sided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1431</td>
<td>DRA/682</td>
<td>Double-sided charcoal hands 18th September 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1432</td>
<td>DRA/683</td>
<td>Ink landscape 1012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1433</td>
<td>DRA/684</td>
<td>Pencil sketch portrait prelim seated man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1434</td>
<td>DRA/685</td>
<td>Ink woman standing (Dorelia?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1435</td>
<td>DRA/686</td>
<td>Pencil classical figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1436</td>
<td>DRA/687</td>
<td>Double-sided: ink and pencil heads of child sculpture, pencil woman in window. After The Christ Child by Desiderio da Settignano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1437</td>
<td>DRA/688</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch, landscape, woman standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1438</td>
<td>DRA/689</td>
<td>Ink women and child standing street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1439</td>
<td>DRA/690</td>
<td>Pencil view over town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1440</td>
<td>DRA/691</td>
<td>Ink parade outside church/temple (possibly St Mark's Venice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1441</td>
<td>DRA/692</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch figures and landscape. After Rembrandt’s mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1442</td>
<td>DRA/693</td>
<td>Pencil running figure with bow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1443</td>
<td>DRA/694</td>
<td>Chalk and pencil houses landscape '94 Pencil drawing landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1444</td>
<td>DRA/695</td>
<td>Double-sided charcoal sketch figures in interiors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1445</td>
<td>DRA/696</td>
<td>More finished ink and purple crayon woman standing in interior similar sketches on reverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1446</td>
<td>DRA/697</td>
<td>Ink figure sketches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1447</td>
<td>DRA/698</td>
<td>Pencil woman seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1448</td>
<td>DRA/699</td>
<td>Double-sided ink figure sketches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1449</td>
<td>DRA/700</td>
<td>Pencil woman's seated hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450</td>
<td>DRA/701</td>
<td>Pencil hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1451</td>
<td>DRA/702</td>
<td>Pencil sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1452</td>
<td>DRA/703</td>
<td>Double-sided figure sketches ink and pencil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1453</td>
<td>DRA/704</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1454</td>
<td>DRA/705</td>
<td>Ink crowd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1455</td>
<td>DRA/706</td>
<td>Pencil landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1456</td>
<td>DRA/707</td>
<td>Pencil boats on shore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1457</td>
<td>DRA/708</td>
<td>Double-sided people in landscape, cows pencil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1458</td>
<td>DRA/709</td>
<td>Print, rooftops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1459</td>
<td>DRA/710</td>
<td>Pencil landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1460</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Hull</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Vincent Galloway, City of Hull, Ferens Art Gallery, 21st July 1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1461</td>
<td>LET/578/1937</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Vincent Galloway, City of Hull, Ferens Art Gallery, 10th February 1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1462</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Huddersfield Art Gallery</td>
<td>Letter to Sir or Madam and Mary McEvoy from Horace Goulden Curator at Public Library and Art Gallery, Huddersfield, 9th December 1938, 2 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1463</td>
<td>LET/579/1938</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy (Mrs Bazell) from Tim Healey enquiring about McEvoy's that he could sell, 8th January 1948, 5c Mount Street, Mayfair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1464</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy (Mrs Bazell) from Tim Healey, cheque for the drawings, £75, 14th May 1948, 5c Mount Street, Mayfair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1465</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Geo. W. Byers, Librarian and Curator, Public Library and Art Gallery, Victoria Avenue, Harrogate, 25th June 1936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1466</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Geo. W. Byers, Librarian and Curator, Public Library and Art Gallery, Victoria Avenue, Harrogate, 26th January 1937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1467</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from George Middlemass, The Royal Glasgow Institute of the Fine Arts, 4th January 1939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1468</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy (Mrs Bazell) from Glasgow Art Gallery and Museums, 16th February 1948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1469</td>
<td>Section of newspaper article, letter from T.J. Honeyman, Director, Glasgow Art Gallery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1470</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from John E Fattorini, 14th October 1938, Grattan Warehouses, Inglesby Road, Bradford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1471</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from John E Fattorini, 19th January 1939, Grattan Warehouses, Inglesby Road, Bradford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1472</td>
<td>Notes on Grattan Warehousesm Fattorini, Arthur Coroland, frames</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1473</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from President of Dunedin Public Art Gallery, 20th December 1939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1474</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from George Atkinson, Department of Education, Dublin, 5th June 1930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder</td>
<td>LET/590/1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1476</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Chenil Galleries</td>
<td>LET/591/1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1477</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Canada</td>
<td>LET/592/1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1479</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Birmingham University (Prof. R. Seddon)</td>
<td>LET/594/1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1480</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/595/1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1481</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/596/1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1482</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/597/1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1483</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/598/1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1484</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXH/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/599/1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Birmingham Art Gallery</td>
<td>LET/600/1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1487</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/601/1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/602/1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1489</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/603/1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1490</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT/49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1491</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Beaux Art Gallery</td>
<td>EXH/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1493</td>
<td></td>
<td>ART/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1494</td>
<td></td>
<td>DOC/40/1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td></td>
<td>DOC/41/1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1496</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Australia</td>
<td>LET/604/1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1497</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/605/1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1498</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/606/1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>LET/608/1926</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from the National Gallery of NSW Sydney, Australia, written on the Orient Line, S.S. Otranto, 16th October 1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501</td>
<td>LET/609/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy (Mrs Hett) from The Arts Council of Great Britain, 12th January 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1502</td>
<td>LET/610/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy (Mrs Bazell) from Gabriel White, The Arts Council of Great Britain, 21st January 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504</td>
<td>LET/612/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy (Mrs Bazell) from Joan Rogers, The Arts Council of Great Britain, 5th January 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1505</td>
<td>LET/613/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy (Mrs Bazell) from John Rothenstein, The Tate Gallery London, 22nd March 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1506</td>
<td>EXH/3</td>
<td>Exhibition of Paintings and Drawings by Ambrose McEvoy, War Memorial Buildings, County Borough of Stockport, 20th may to 17th June 1933, 3 copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1507</td>
<td>EXH/4/1933</td>
<td>Exhibition of Paintings and Drawings by Ambrose McEvoy, War Memorial Buildings, County Borough of Stockport, 20th may to 17th June 1933, Please Return to the Art Exhibitions Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1508</td>
<td>EXH/5/1948</td>
<td>Exhibition of Paintings by Ambrose McEvoy, 3rd April 1948, Royal Leamington Spa Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509</td>
<td>NOT/50</td>
<td>List of works with prices, date unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510</td>
<td>NOT/51</td>
<td>List of works with prices, date unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1511</td>
<td>NOT/52</td>
<td>Paintings and Drawings by Ambrose McEvoy collected by Claude Johnson, Kindly lent by Mrs Archibald Douglas. Intro and list of works, two pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td>LET/614/1949</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Alfred Yockney, Art Exhibitions Bureau, 5th October 1949, list of works and prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1513</td>
<td>LET/615/1949</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Alfred Yockney, Art Exhibitions Bureau, 29th March 1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document ID</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1514</td>
<td>LET/616/1949</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Alfred Yockney, Art Exhibitions Bureau, 1st April 1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1515</td>
<td>LET/617/1949</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Alfred Yockney, Art Exhibitions Bureau, 18th January 1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1516</td>
<td>LET/618/1949</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Alfred Yockney, Art Exhibitions Bureau, 13th January 1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1517</td>
<td>LET/619/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Alfred Yockney, Art Exhibitions Bureau, 31st December 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1518</td>
<td>LET/620/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Alfred Yockney, Art Exhibitions Bureau, 29th September 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519</td>
<td>LET/621/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Alfred Yockney, Art Exhibitions Bureau, 27th September 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520</td>
<td>DOC/42/1948</td>
<td>Cheque for commission on the sale of Daphne at £150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>EXH/6/1948</td>
<td>Exhibition catalogue Exhibition of Paintings and Drawings by Ambrose McEvoy, Corporation Art Gallery Huddersfield 21st August - 18th September 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1522</td>
<td>LET/622/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Alfred Yockney, Art Exhibitions Bureau, 13th July 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1523</td>
<td>LET/623/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Dr Woodall from Anna McEvoy (Mrs Bazell) September 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1524</td>
<td>LET/624/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Alfred Yockney, Art Exhibitions Bureau, 20th May 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525</td>
<td>LET/625/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Alfred Yockney, Art Exhibitions Bureau, 26th April 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1526</td>
<td>LET/626/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Alfred Yockney from Mrs Bazell, 23rd April 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td>LET/627/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Alfred Yockney, Art Exhibitions Bureau, 14th April 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1528</td>
<td>LET/628/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Alfred Yockney from Mrs Bazell, 13th April 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1529</td>
<td>LET/629/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Alfred Yockney, Art Exhibitions Bureau, 12th April 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td>LET/630/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Alfred Yockney, Art Exhibitions Bureau, 17th March 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1531</td>
<td>LET/631/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Alfred Yockney, Art Exhibitions Bureau, 1st March 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1532</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Blackburn</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to R. Ashton, Public Library, Museum and Art Gallery, Blackburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1533</td>
<td>LET/633/1936</td>
<td>5th May 1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1534</td>
<td>LET/634/1936</td>
<td>8th June 1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1535</td>
<td>LET/635/1933</td>
<td>11th January 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536</td>
<td>LET/636/1932</td>
<td>19th February 1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1537</td>
<td>LET/637/1932</td>
<td>11th March 1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538</td>
<td>LET/638/1932</td>
<td>8th March 1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1539</td>
<td>LET/639/1925</td>
<td>3rd June 1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td>LET/640/1938</td>
<td>28th November 1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541</td>
<td>LET/641/1939</td>
<td>18th May 1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td>LET/642/1936</td>
<td>29th August 1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1543</td>
<td>LET/643/1938</td>
<td>23rd July 1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1544</td>
<td>LET/644/1937</td>
<td>27th June 1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545</td>
<td>LET/645/1937</td>
<td>6th April 1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546</td>
<td>EXH/7/1939</td>
<td>19th April - 15th May 1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547</td>
<td>LET/646/1939</td>
<td>10th August 1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Bolton</td>
<td>LET/647/1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1549</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/648/1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Bradford Art Gallery</td>
<td>LET/649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/650/1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/651/1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/652/1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder British Legion</td>
<td>LET/653/1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/654/1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td></td>
<td>ART/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td></td>
<td>ART/7/1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1559</td>
<td></td>
<td>ART/8/1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LET/655/1949</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from G.V. Barnard, Curator, Castle Museum Norwich, 17th January 1949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LET/658/1924</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from S.C. Kaines Smith, Curator, City Art Gallery, Leeds, 13th June 1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LET/660/1946</td>
<td>Letter to Mr Brown from Anna McEvoy (Mrs Hett), 107A Grosvenor Road, London, 26th October 1946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572</td>
<td>EXH/11/1927</td>
<td>May-June 1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Leicester Museum and Art Gallery</td>
<td>LET/666/1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Lincoln Art Gallery</td>
<td>LET/667/1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Liverpool Art Gallery</td>
<td>LET/668/1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>LET/669/1946</td>
<td>22nd November 1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>LET/670/1946</td>
<td>16th November 1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>LET/671/1946</td>
<td>15th November 1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>NOT/53/1946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583</td>
<td>LET/672/1946</td>
<td>26th October 1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>LET/673/1946</td>
<td>Letter to Mr Lambert from Anna McEvoy (Mrs Hett), 20th October 1946, 107A Grosvenor Road, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>LET/674/1946</td>
<td>Wire to Michael McEvoy from Anna McEvoy (Mrs Hett) about Artist's Mother's picture, 25th October 1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>LET/675/1939</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Frank Lambert, Director of Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool, 7th July 1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>LET/676/1939</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Frank Lambert, Director of Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool, 22nd June 1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Manchester</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Robert Bateman, Curator at Manchester Whitworth Institute, 21st March 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>LET/678/1925</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Lawrence Hawaw? Curator of City Art Gallery Manchester, 18th May 1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Wales</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy (Mrs Bazell) from John Steepman, Keeper at National Museum of Wales, Cardiff, 23rd January 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder National Portrait Gallery</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy (Mrs Seccombe-Hett) from Kenneth Clark, National Gallery, 24th June 1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder National Portrait Gallery</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Henry Hake, Director National Portrait Gallery, 28th October 1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>LET/683/1938</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Henry Hake, Director National Portrait Gallery, 28th October 1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>NOT/54/1948</td>
<td>Note 'suggested Winton Portrait 11/2/1948'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>NOT/55</td>
<td>Note, Mrs Giffen, Nat Gal (National Gallery), Winston Churchill portrait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Oldham</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from W.H. Berry Director of the Municipal Art Gallery, Oldham, 25th November 1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>LET/685/1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>LET/686/1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>LET/687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Studio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>LET/689/1947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>LET/690/1947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Studio</td>
<td>DOC/45/1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>LET/692/1946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>DOC/46/1946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder USA Galleries Misc</td>
<td>LET/693/1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>DOC/47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>LET/694/1936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611</td>
<td>LET/695/1939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>DOC/48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Folder Type</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Constable, Boston Museum of Fine Art, Boston, PA, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614</td>
<td>Letter from Martin Hardie, Victoria and Albert Museum, South Kensington, London, 1st February 1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615</td>
<td>Letter from Mrs McEvoy, no date, 1935? 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616</td>
<td>Letter from unknown sender, Heaton Mount, Frizinghall, Bradford, 6th February 1939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>Letter from Alfred Willey, 23 Carlisle Place, Bradford, 16th April? 1939?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>Letter from Alfred Willey, 23 Carlisle Place, Bradford, 6th February 1939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619</td>
<td>Letter from Alfred Willey, 23 Carlisle Place, Bradford, 2nd April 1939?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>Letter from Alfred Willey, 23 Carlisle Place, Bradford, 1st July 1939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Letter from Alfred Willey, 23 Carlisle Place, Bradford, 3rd January 1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Letter/talk about Derby, Midland Hotel, Derby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1623</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 1916? No address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from C.K. Adams, National Portrait Gallery, 1st July 1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from John Steepman, Assistant to the Director, National Portrait Gallery, London, 8th June 1939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627</td>
<td>Sloman's Press Cuttings Service, Weekly Dispatch article, author and newspaper not recorded, 9th January 1927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date/Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Empty envelope with painted scene, man flying a kite and woman pushing a buggy, addressed to A. McEvoy, 51 Westwick Gardens, West Kensington, London, 25th April 1896, Paddington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>The Iveagh Pictures, Seven Modern Painters, McEvoy's Genius, Academy Exhibition Opens, The Morning Post, Thursday 12th January 1928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Martin L Nasmith, H.M.S Lucia, 4th November 1918</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Maeve? Goodenough, Filkins Hall, Cirencester, 9th September 1929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Cynthia Asquith, 8 Sussex Place, Regent's Park, 12th October 1926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Richard D Sandford, H.M.S. Lucia, 7th October 1918</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from A M Hind, Department of Prints and Drawings, The British Museum, London, 3rd March 1937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy (Mrs Seccombe-Hett) from Rex Nan Kivell Director of the Redfern Gallery, 29th May 1946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637</td>
<td>Oxford Arts Club receipt, 6 oil paintings and 9 watercolours, 1st June 1938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1638</td>
<td>Exhibition catalogue, Oxford Arts Club, 38 Beaumont Street, January-June 1938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1639</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Miss Price, Oxford Arts Club, 16th December 1937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Victor Rienarcken?, 32 Beechcroft Road, Oxford, 29th May 1938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td>EXH/14/1935</td>
<td>Exhibition catalogue, Oxford Arts Club, 38 Beaumont Street, Exhibitions 1935, with notes inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1643</td>
<td>LET/720/1937</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from unknown sender, Oxford Arts Club, 31st December 1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1644</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Royal Society Watercolour Painters</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Reginald Hunt, Royal Society of Painters in Watercolours, Gallery 54 Pall Mall East, London, 23rd May 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>LET/722/1933</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Charles Holmes, 17 Cavendish Square, London, 14th February 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Belfast Art Gallery</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Arthur Deane, Public Art Gallery and Museum, Belfast, 18th November 1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Victoria box file 3, brown cardboard folder Rochdale Art Gallery</td>
<td>Article, Art Exhibition: Ambrose McEvoy's Portraits, June 1948, newspaper unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>LET/725/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy (Mrs Bazell) from G.F. Simmonds, Town Hall Rochdale, Assignment of Copyright, 30th July 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>EXH/15/1948</td>
<td>Exhibition catalogue, Corporation Art Gallery, Rochdale, Exhibition of Paintings and Drawings by Ambrose McEvoy, 22nd May-19th June 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>LET/726/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mr Stott from Anna McEvoy (Mrs Bazell), no address, 10th June 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>LET/727/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy (Mrs Bazell) from C. Stott, curator of Art Gallery and Museum Rochdale, 19th June 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>LET/728/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy (Mrs Bazell) from C. Stott, curator of Art Gallery and Museum Rochdale, 11th June 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>DOC/50/1948</td>
<td>Copy of written invoice, Rochdale purchase of Daphne for £150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>LET/729/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy (Mrs Bazell) from G.F. Simmonds, Town Hall Rochdale, Assignment of Copyright, 23rd July 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>LET/730/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Sir (presumably of Rochdale Art Gallery) from G.F. Simmonds, Assignment of Copyright, 28th June 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>LET/731/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy (Mrs Bazell) from G.F. Simmonds, Town Hall Rochdale, Assignment of Copyright, 28th July 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>LET/732/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy (Mrs Bazell) from C. Stott, curator at Art Gallery &amp; Museum Rochdale, 26th June 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>LET/733/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy (Mrs Bazell) from G.F. Simmonds, Town Hall Rochdale, Assignment of Copyright, 21st July 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>LET/734/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy (Mrs Bazell) from C. Stott, curator at Art Gallery &amp; Museum Rochdale, 23rd June 1948, Assignment of Copyright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>LET/735/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy (Mrs Bazell) from C. Stott, curator at Art Gallery &amp; Museum Rochdale, 25th May 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>LET/736/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy (Mrs Bazell) from C. Stott, curator at Art Gallery &amp; Museum Rochdale, 9th June 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1663</td>
<td>#10 Fragments box</td>
<td>DRA/711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1665</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td>Small grey archive box Sketchbooks</td>
<td>SKE/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668</td>
<td></td>
<td>SKE/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669</td>
<td></td>
<td>SKE/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670</td>
<td></td>
<td>SKE/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671</td>
<td></td>
<td>SKE/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td></td>
<td>SKE/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673</td>
<td></td>
<td>SKE/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td></td>
<td>SKE/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675</td>
<td></td>
<td>SKE/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td></td>
<td>SKE/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1677</td>
<td></td>
<td>SKE/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHO/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679</td>
<td>Small grey archive box Sketchbooks</td>
<td>SKE/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td></td>
<td>SKE/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td></td>
<td>SKE/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td></td>
<td>SKE/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td></td>
<td>SKE/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686</td>
<td></td>
<td>SKE/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696</td>
<td>DRA/726</td>
<td>Double-sided ink sketch caricature, pencil figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697</td>
<td>DRA/727</td>
<td>Print of man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td>DRA/728</td>
<td>Pencil figure sketches of women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1699</td>
<td>SKE/20</td>
<td>Exercise book sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>SKE/21</td>
<td>Exercise book sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td>SKE/22</td>
<td>Exercise book sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702</td>
<td>LET/737</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Alexander Huntly, 12th September, no year, Balmoral Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703</td>
<td>LET/738</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Alexander Huntly, 22nd December, no year, Sandringham, Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704</td>
<td>LET/739/1935</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from A M Hind, Department of Prints and Drawings, the British Museum, London, 16th February 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705</td>
<td>LET/740</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Helen H., Tuesday, no date or year, Great Wigsell, Bodiam, Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706</td>
<td>LET/741/1933</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Eric Newton, 67 Great Russell Street, London, 26th September 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707</td>
<td>LET/742/1918</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Alfred Willey, 23 Carlisle Place, Bradford, 14th October 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td>LET/744/1935</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Frank Rutter 1 Gardnor Mansions, Church Row, Hamstead, 12th August, 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>SKE/23</td>
<td>Sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711</td>
<td>DIA/2/1907</td>
<td>Diary from 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>SKE/24</td>
<td>Sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>SKE/25</td>
<td>Sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td>SKE/26</td>
<td>Sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1715</td>
<td>NOT/56</td>
<td>Ambrose McEvoy notebook, The Victoria Writing Tablet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>SKE/27</td>
<td>Sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717</td>
<td>SKE/28</td>
<td>Sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1718</td>
<td>SKE/29</td>
<td>Sketchbook, religious sketches, The Excelsior Exercise Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td>SKE/30</td>
<td>Sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>SKE/31</td>
<td>Sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>SKE/32</td>
<td>Sketchbook and notebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722</td>
<td>SKE/33</td>
<td>Sketchbook and notebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1723</td>
<td>SKE/34</td>
<td>Sketchbook and notebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724</td>
<td>SKE/35</td>
<td>Sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td>NOT/57</td>
<td>Notebook, list of works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Small grey archive box Postcards etc, envelope stereo images</td>
<td>POS/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>POS/2</td>
<td>Postcard of St Paul's Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>POS/3</td>
<td>Postcard of The International Exhibition of 1862, R. Monti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>POS/4</td>
<td>Postcard of matrimony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>POS/5</td>
<td>Postcard of Les Invalides Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>POS/6</td>
<td>Postcard of bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>POS/7</td>
<td>Postcard of Ruines de Pierrefond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733</td>
<td>POS/8</td>
<td>Postcard of Town Hall, Ipswich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>POS/9</td>
<td>Postcard of quarry?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>POS/10</td>
<td>Postcard of Exeter Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>POS/11</td>
<td>Postcard of Gloucester Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>POS/12</td>
<td>Postcard of Registry Office Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td>POS/13</td>
<td>Postcard of abstract shapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>POS/14</td>
<td>Postcard of abstract shapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>POS/15</td>
<td>Postcard of Welsh Group, The Cattage Door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>POS/16</td>
<td>Postcard of Ruins in Church Yard, Bury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742</td>
<td>POS/17</td>
<td>Postcard of Bury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>POS/18</td>
<td>Postcard of The International Exhibition of 1862, P. Magni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>POS/19</td>
<td>Postcard of building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>POS/20</td>
<td>Postcard of abstract shapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>POS/21</td>
<td>Postcard of St Nicholas Church, Ipswich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>POS/22</td>
<td>Postcard of Charles Gross Esq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>POS/23</td>
<td>Postcard of Princes St Edinburgh and Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>POS/24</td>
<td>Postcard of farm buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>POS/25</td>
<td>Postcard of building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td>POS/26</td>
<td>Postcard of Le Pont du Carrousel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>POS/27</td>
<td>Postcard of Abbey Gate Bury St Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td>Small grey archive box Postcards etc, envelope From an album</td>
<td>POS/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td>POS/29</td>
<td>Postcard Goya Budapest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>POS/30</td>
<td>Postcard A Caravaggio Petrograd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td>POS/31</td>
<td>Postcard Brughel, Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td>POS/32</td>
<td>Postcard Titian Duc d'Urbino Uffizi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1758</td>
<td>POS/33</td>
<td>Postcard Titian Cardinal Uffizi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759</td>
<td>POS/34</td>
<td>Postcard artwork Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>POS/35</td>
<td>Postcard Titian Duchess of Urbino, Uffizi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>POS/36</td>
<td>Postcard Execution of Christ Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>POS/37</td>
<td>Postcard Francesco Bianchi Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>POS/38</td>
<td>Postcard Veronese Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td>POS/39</td>
<td>Postcard Titian Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>POS/40</td>
<td>Postcard Watteau Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>POS/41</td>
<td>Postcard Van Dyck Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>POS/42</td>
<td>Postcard Van Dyck Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>POS/43</td>
<td>Postcard Renaud and Armide Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>POS/44</td>
<td>Postcard de Hooch Rijksmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>POS/45</td>
<td>Postcard Execution of Christ Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771</td>
<td>POS/46</td>
<td>Postcard Tintoretto Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>POS/47</td>
<td>Postcard Tintoretto Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td>POS/48</td>
<td>Postcard Claude Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1774</td>
<td>POS/49</td>
<td>Postcard Daughter of Herod Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>POS/50</td>
<td>Postcard Dusart 22 Rijksmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td>POS/51</td>
<td>Postcard P Wouwerman Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1777</td>
<td>POS/52</td>
<td>Postcard Desportas Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1778</td>
<td>POS/53</td>
<td>Postcard Frans Hals Marriage of Isaac Massa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779</td>
<td>POS/54</td>
<td>Postcard people in interior Dutch. Pieter de Hooch in the Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>POS/55</td>
<td>Postcard Ter Borch Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>POS/56</td>
<td>Postcard Mother and Child Rijksmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782</td>
<td>POS/57</td>
<td>Postcard Vienna artwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>POS/58</td>
<td>Postcard Poelenburch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1784</td>
<td>POS/59</td>
<td>Postcard Veronese Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785</td>
<td>POS/60</td>
<td>Double-sided George and the Dragon, Mother and Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>POS/61</td>
<td>Tintoretto Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1787</td>
<td>POS/62</td>
<td>Postcard artwork Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1788</td>
<td>POS/63</td>
<td>Postcard A S Coello, Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789</td>
<td>POS/64</td>
<td>Postcard C E Biset, Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>POS/65</td>
<td>Postcard Haarlam, Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1791</td>
<td>POS/66</td>
<td>Postcard Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>POS/67</td>
<td>Postcard Raphael Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>POS/68</td>
<td>Postcard Andrea Solario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794</td>
<td>POS/69</td>
<td>Postcard Bellini Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>POS/70</td>
<td>Postcard Raphael St John Uffizi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>POS/71</td>
<td>Postcard Giorgione Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1797</td>
<td>POS/72</td>
<td>Postcard Andrea del Sarto Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>POS/73</td>
<td>Postcard Roger van der Weyden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>POS/74</td>
<td>Postcard Rubens Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>POS/75</td>
<td>Postcard Luini Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>POS/76</td>
<td>Postcard Tintoretto Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802</td>
<td>POS/77</td>
<td>Postcard Artwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>POS/78</td>
<td>Postcard Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1804</td>
<td>POS/79</td>
<td>Postcard Study Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805</td>
<td>POS/80</td>
<td>Double-sided George and the Dragon, Mother and Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806</td>
<td>POS/81</td>
<td>Postcard Veronese Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1807</td>
<td>POS/82</td>
<td>Postcard Raphael Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1808</td>
<td>POS/83</td>
<td>Postcard Titian Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>POS/84</td>
<td>Postcard Veronese Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>POS/85</td>
<td>Postcard Van Dyck Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>POS/86</td>
<td>Postcard Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>POS/87</td>
<td>Postcard Tintoretto Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td>POS/88</td>
<td>Postcard Tintoretto Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>POS/89</td>
<td>Postcard Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>POS/90</td>
<td>Postcard Veronese Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>POS/91</td>
<td>Postcard Reynolds Duc de Chartres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>POS/92</td>
<td>Postcard Luini Virgin and Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>POS/93</td>
<td>Postcard Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>POS/94</td>
<td>Postcard Holbein Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>POS/95</td>
<td>Postcard Veronese Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>POS/96</td>
<td>Postcard Molenaer Rijksmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>POS/97</td>
<td>Postcard Hooch Rijksmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>POS/98</td>
<td>Postcard Hooch Rijksmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>POS/99</td>
<td>Postcard Fragonard Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>POS/100</td>
<td>Postcard Meissonnier Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>POS/101</td>
<td>Postcard Delft Dresden, Vermeer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>POS/102</td>
<td>Postcard Lancret Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>POS/103</td>
<td>Postcard Regnault Three Graces Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>POS/104</td>
<td>Postcard Titian Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>POS/105</td>
<td>Postcard Christ Arrested by the Soldiers Kölén</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>POS/106</td>
<td>Postcard Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>POS/107</td>
<td>Postcard Hunting Adventures Hermitage Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>POS/108</td>
<td>Postcard Greuze Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>POS/109</td>
<td>Postcard Andrea Del Sarto Uffizi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>POS/110</td>
<td>Postcard Rosetti Tate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>POS/111</td>
<td>Postcard Gaillard Luxembourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>POS/</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Postcard Isabey Bonaparte Versailles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>PHO/4</td>
<td>Photograph of trees in field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Postcard Fouquet Chantilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Postcard Millais Winter Fuel Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Postcard coloured 18th century engraving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Postcard Hooch Rijksmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Postcard Wien, after Hooch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Postcard Solario Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Postcard Courbet Luxembourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Postcard Fromentin Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Postcard Perreal Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Postcard Gerard Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Postcard St Paul's School Fulham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Postcard Bellini Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Postcard sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Postcard Boucher Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Postcard Fouquet Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Postcard Reynolds National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Postcard Titian Bordeaux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Postcard Landscape by Van Gogh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Postcard Hurlingham Pond by Paul Maze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Postcard Zanetti Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Postcard Zanetti Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Postcard Zanetti Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Postcard Zanetti Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Postcard Van Dyck Charles I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Double-sided 2 Van Eycks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Postcard Pietro Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Postcard Notre Dame Chartres Bas-Reliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Postcard Rubens Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Postcard Alvise Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Postcard Rosetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Postcard Rubens Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Postcard Velasquez Venus and Cupid National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Postcard Ingres Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Postcard Delacroix Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Postcard Bouts Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Postcard Memling Chantilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Postcard Hooch National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Postcard La Hyre Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Postcard Mignard Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Postcard Raphael Bologna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Postcard Regnault Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>POS/Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>POS/154</td>
<td>Postcard Gleyre Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>POS/155</td>
<td>Postcard Vestier Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>POS/156</td>
<td>Postcard Meer Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>POS/157</td>
<td>Postcard Uccelli Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>POS/158</td>
<td>Postcard Goya La Maja Vestida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>POS/159</td>
<td>Postcard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>POS/160</td>
<td>Postcard Steen Petit-Palais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>POS/161</td>
<td>Postcard Charles V Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>POS/162</td>
<td>Postcard Goya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>POS/163</td>
<td>Postcard Santi Three Graces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>POS/164</td>
<td>Postcard Gerard Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>POS/165</td>
<td>Postcard Rosetti Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>POS/166</td>
<td>Postcard Pompeii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>POS/167</td>
<td>Postcard Florentine School Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>POS/168</td>
<td>Postcard Millais Ophelia Tate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>POS/169</td>
<td>Postcard Olona Milan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>POS/170</td>
<td>Postcard Boucher Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>POS/171</td>
<td>Postcard woman standing March 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>POS/172</td>
<td>Postcard Stevens Luxembourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>POS/173</td>
<td>Postcard Delacroix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>POS/174</td>
<td>Postcard Brueghel Musee D'Anvers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>POS/175</td>
<td>Postcard Millais Autumn Leaves Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>POS/176</td>
<td>Postcard Rossetti The Bower Meadow Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>POS/177</td>
<td>Postcard Bonnat Job Luxembourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>POS/178</td>
<td>Postcard Brueghel Musee D'Anvers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>POS/179</td>
<td>Postcard Van Dyck Lady and Child National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>POS/180</td>
<td>Postcard Mabuse National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>POS/181</td>
<td>Postcard Champaigne Chantilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>POS/182</td>
<td>Postcard Corot Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>POS/183</td>
<td>Postcard Gainsborough Mrs Siddons National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>POS/184</td>
<td>Postcard Leonardo de Vinci Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>POS/185</td>
<td>Postcard Fragonard Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>POS/186</td>
<td>Postcard Delaroche Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>POS/187</td>
<td>Postcard Maes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>POS/188</td>
<td>Postcard A Cuyp A Road near a River Dulwich Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>POS/189</td>
<td>Postcard Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>POS/190</td>
<td>Postcard Gericault Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>POS/191</td>
<td>Postcard Durer Koln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>POS/192</td>
<td>Postcard Giovanni Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>POS/193</td>
<td>Postcard Fouquet Chantilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>POS/194</td>
<td>Postcard Jean Goujon Bas-Reliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>POS/195</td>
<td>Postcard Ingres Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>POS/196</td>
<td>Postcard Rossetti Rosa Triplex National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>POS/197</td>
<td>Postcard Titian Venus and Adonis Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>POS/198</td>
<td>Postcard Rubens Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>POS/199</td>
<td>Postcard Raphael Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>POS/200</td>
<td>Postcard Rossetti Miss Siaal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>POS/201</td>
<td>Postcard Boucher Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>POS/202</td>
<td>Postcard Pietro Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>POS/203</td>
<td>Postcard Rubens Dresden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>POS/204</td>
<td>Postcard Ingres Rouen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>POS/205</td>
<td>Postcard John Russell Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>POS/206</td>
<td>Postcard Chasseriau Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>POS/207</td>
<td>Postcard Fountain and Statue of Venus, Bolsover Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>POS/208</td>
<td>Postcard Michele da Verona Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>POS/209</td>
<td>Postcard Rossetti Dante's dream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>POS/210</td>
<td>Postcard Fra Angelico Adoration of the Magi, National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>POS/211</td>
<td>Postcard Jean Goujon Bas-Reliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>POS/212</td>
<td>Postcard Rossetti Andromeda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>POS/213</td>
<td>Postcard Rossetti Girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>POS/214</td>
<td>Postcard Andrea Solario Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>POS/215</td>
<td>Postcard Cranach Adam and Eve Musee Royal D'Anvers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>POS/216</td>
<td>Postcard Greuze Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>POS/217</td>
<td>Set of postcards from Museum Mauritshuis den Haag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>POS/218</td>
<td>Postcard Van Eyck Budapest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>POS/219</td>
<td>Postcard Jungfrau Koln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>POS/220</td>
<td>Postcard Rodin Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>POS/221</td>
<td>Postcard Rubens Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>POS/222</td>
<td>Postcard Champaigne Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>POS/223</td>
<td>Postcard David Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>POS/224</td>
<td>Postcard Hooch Rijksmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>POS/225</td>
<td>Postcard Memlinc Duke of Cleves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>POS/226</td>
<td>Postcard Romney Mr and Mrs Lindow National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>POS/227</td>
<td>Postcard Christus National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>POS/228</td>
<td>Postcard Gainsborough's daughters National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>POS/229</td>
<td>Postcard Bondone National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>POS/230</td>
<td>Postcard Raphael Virgin and children National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>POS/231</td>
<td>Postcard Koln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>POS/232</td>
<td>Postcard David Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>POS/233</td>
<td>Postcard Milk Below Maids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>POS/234</td>
<td>Postcard Van Dyck Sheffield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>POS/235</td>
<td>Postcard &quot;Le Mistral&quot; by Segonzac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>POS/236</td>
<td>Postcard Delacroix Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>POS/237</td>
<td>Postcard Chassériau Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>POS/238</td>
<td>Postcard Christ on the Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>POS/239</td>
<td>Postcard Rigaud Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>POS/240</td>
<td>Postcard Troyon Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>POS/241</td>
<td>Postcard Burne-Jones Sibylla Delphica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>POS/242</td>
<td>Postcard Delacroix Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>POS/243</td>
<td>Postcard Rubens Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>POS/244</td>
<td>Postcard Rembrandt Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>POS/245</td>
<td>Postcard Bellini National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>POS/246</td>
<td>Postcard Grillandajo Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>POS/247</td>
<td>Postcard Gainsborough Musidora National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>POS/248</td>
<td>Postcard Boucher Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>POS/249</td>
<td>Postcard Carle Vanloo La Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>POS/250</td>
<td>Postcard Sanzio Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>POS/251</td>
<td>Postcard Borgognone Virgin and Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National GALLERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>POS/252</td>
<td>Postcard Reynolds Mrs Hartley and Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>POS/253</td>
<td>Postcard Van Eyck Arnolfini National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>POS/254</td>
<td>Double-sided Teilbild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>POS/255</td>
<td>Postcard Fresh Gathered Peas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>POS/256</td>
<td>Postcard Bas-Relief National Portrait Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>POS/257</td>
<td>Postcard Rossetti Astarte Syriaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>POS/258</td>
<td>Postcard Chavannes L'Ete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>POS/259</td>
<td>Postcard Velasquez Christ Crucifixion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>POS/260</td>
<td>Postcard Weyden National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>POS/261</td>
<td>Postcard Goya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>POS/262</td>
<td>Postcard Rossetti Lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>POS/263</td>
<td>Postcard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>POS/264</td>
<td>Postcard Jean Goujon Bas-Reliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>POS/265</td>
<td>Postcard Montagna Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>POS/266</td>
<td>Postcard Woman in profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>POS/267</td>
<td>Postcard Giorgione Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>POS/268</td>
<td>Postcard Bellini Madonna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>POS/269</td>
<td>Postcard Pieta Bellini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>POS/270</td>
<td>Postcard Rossetti Tate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>POS/271</td>
<td>Postcard Giordano Mars and Venus Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>POS/Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>POS/272</td>
<td>Postcard La Tete de Cire Musee de Lille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>POS/273</td>
<td>Postcard French School Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>POS/274</td>
<td>Postcard Fragonard Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>POS/275</td>
<td>Postcard Reynolds Mrs Sheridan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>POS/276</td>
<td>Postcard Van Dyck Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>POS/277</td>
<td>Postcard Boucher Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>POS/278</td>
<td>Postcard Lawrence Angerstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>POS/279</td>
<td>Postcard Champaigne Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>POS/280</td>
<td>Postcard Mantegna Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>POS/281</td>
<td>Postcard Meissonnier Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>POS/282</td>
<td>Postcard Froment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>POS/283</td>
<td>Postcard Zucherelli Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>POS/284</td>
<td>Postcard Carregio Uffizi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>POS/286</td>
<td>Postcard Corrado Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>POS/287</td>
<td>Postcard Titian Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>POS/288</td>
<td>Postcard Foucquet Charles VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>POS/289</td>
<td>Postcard Montagna Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>POS/290</td>
<td>Postcard Leonardo de Vinci Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>POS/291</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs McEvoy from unknown, sent from Amsterdam 18-19 April 1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>POS/292</td>
<td>Postcard to Mr McEvoy from Romitier de Villain? Related to Sickert? on it from Dieppe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>POS/293</td>
<td>Illegible scrap of card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>POS/294</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs McEvoy from Ursula (Tyrwhitt), sent from Bormes Ver 16th February 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>POS/295</td>
<td>Postcard to Miss Marlin and Mrs McEvoy (Mary) from Mrs McEvoy (Marjorie) and Charlie, Christmas 1908, Aldbourne, 24th December 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>POS/296</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, sent to c/o Walter Sickert, Neuville-les-Dieppe, Dieppe, from Wien, 8th September 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>POS/297A</td>
<td>Postcard 3 from Lucie to unknown recipient (to Mary McEvoy?) from Long Pond, Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>POS/297B</td>
<td>Postcard 2 from Lucie to unknown recipient (to Mary McEvoy?) from Mt Desert Island, Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Accession</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>POS/297</td>
<td>Postcard 4 from Lucie to unknown recipient (to Mary McEvoy?) from Lafayette National Park, Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>POS/297D</td>
<td>Postcard 5 from Lucie to unknown recipient (to Mary McEvoy?) from Bar Haror, Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>POS/298</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs Ambrose McEvoy 13 Jubilee Place, Kings Road, Chelsea from Unknown sender 27th April 1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>POS/299</td>
<td>Admittance postcard University College London Slade School of Fine Art, Ambrose McEvoy 2nd term 3 days a week 7-9 admitted by Frederick Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>POS/300</td>
<td>Admittance postcard University College London Slade School of Fine Art, Ambrose McEvoy 1st term 3 days a week admitted by Frederick Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>POS/301</td>
<td>Admittance postcard University College London Slade School of Fine Art, Ambrose McEvoy 3rd term 3 days a week admitted by Frederick Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>POS/302</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from unknown sender, sent from Rhone, 26th April 1912?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>POS/303</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from unknown sender, sent from Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>POS/304</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from unknown sender, 22nd April 1910 from Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>POS/305</td>
<td>Postcard in French, no sender or recipient from San Jean de Luz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>POS/306</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from M. Chulliez, sent from Paris 24th December 1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>POS/307</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from Frank WB, sent from Victoria Falls, Christmas 1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>POS/308</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy? Sent to Lower Bourton, Shrivenham, 9th September 1903 from Berlin?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>POS/309</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from unknown sender, sent from Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>POS/310</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from unknown sender, sent from Siena 12th August 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>POS/311</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs McEvoy from S.A. Pearce sent frm Menton 28th December 1908?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2041</td>
<td>POS/312</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs McEvoy from Sonita? Sent from Chiswick 27th December 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2042</td>
<td>POS/313</td>
<td>Postcard to Maria (Mary McEvoy) from R. Lt. Spencer Edwards 30th June 1918 from Chantilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2043</td>
<td>POS/314</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from unknown sender, sent from Italy, Christmas time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2044</td>
<td>POS/315</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from Margaret Epstein sent from Paris 23rd December 1920?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2045</td>
<td>POS/316</td>
<td>Postcard to Mr and Mrs McEvoy from Maurice (Sickert?) or to Maurice whilst he's staying with the McEvoys, postcard of Dieppe sent in London 1st July 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2046</td>
<td>POS/317</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from Muirhead Bone, sent from Santiago de Compostela, Spain, 29th April 1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2047</td>
<td>POS/318</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from John Dodgson? Sent from Florence 13th April 1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2048</td>
<td>POS/319</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs McEvoy from B.S. Lives, sent from Dieppe 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2049</td>
<td>POS/320</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs McEvoy from unknown sender, sent from Portsaid, Egypt, 26th October 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>POS/321</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs McEvoy from S.W? Edinburgh Castle, no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2051</td>
<td>POS/322</td>
<td>Postcard to Miss Spencer Edwards (later Mary McEvoy) from Ambrose McEvoy, 21st October 1898, from Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2052</td>
<td>POS/323</td>
<td>Admittance postcard Sir John Soane's Museum, for Ambrose McEvoy to study from George H. Birch Curator 7th January 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2053</td>
<td>POS/324</td>
<td>Postcard to home 107 Grosvenor Road, from Ambrose McEvoy from Dieppe, 16th March 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2054</td>
<td>POS/325</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from Charlie McEvoy, sent from Oxford 18th March 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2055</td>
<td>POS/326</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs McEvoy from Ursula Tyrwhitt, sent from Brussels 6th November 1907. Same handwriting as postcard POS/373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2056</td>
<td>POS/327</td>
<td>Postcard Titian Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2057</td>
<td>POS/328</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs McEvoy from Anais, sent from Windsor, 28th March 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2058</td>
<td>POS/329</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs McEvoy from V.L (Mary's father?) posted at Portsmouth 17th September 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2059</td>
<td>POS/330</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs McEvoy from G? Gus? S? from Clovelly 21st April 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2060</td>
<td>POS/331</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs McEvoy from A? (Ambrose?) from Florence 25th May? 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2061</td>
<td>POS/332</td>
<td>Postcard in French, no sender or recipient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2062</td>
<td>POS/333</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from unknown sender, Dunblane Hydropathetic, Perthshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2063</td>
<td>POS/334</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs McEvoy from Maurice (Sickert?) from Puy-de-Dôme 26th November 1915 in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2064</td>
<td>POS/335</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs William? McEvoy from Stella Conder, Venice, 24th April 1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2065</td>
<td>POS/336</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs McEvoy from Anais, sent from London in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2066</td>
<td>POS/337</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs McEvoy from Anais, sent from London 1915? in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2067</td>
<td>POS/338</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs McEvoy from Michel, sent from Strasbourg in French, 1920? 1929?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2068</td>
<td>POS/339</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from A (McEvoy spelt wrong) with Walter Sickert in Dieppe, 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2069</td>
<td>POS/340</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs? McEvoy from unknown sender, Venice, 25th November 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2070</td>
<td>POS/341</td>
<td>Postcard to Miss M Spencer Edwards, from Ambrose McEvoy? From Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2071</td>
<td>POS/342</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from H Stott, Stanton Court, Nr Broadway 22nd March 1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2072</td>
<td>POS/343</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from unknown sender RAP? EAP? Sent from Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2073</td>
<td>POS/344</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from Augustus John, Lisieux 1907?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2074</td>
<td>POS/345</td>
<td>Postcard to Mr McEvoy from famille Claverie? 1911?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2075</td>
<td>POS/346</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from Wigs, 10th April 1923, from Paris and Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2076</td>
<td>POS/347</td>
<td>Postcard in French to Ambrose McEvoy from Maurice Villain, 1916 (Sickert's son)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2077</td>
<td>POS/348</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from EAP? From Lausanne 13th May? 1926?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>POS/No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2078</td>
<td>POS/349</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from unknown sender, from Chiswick 20th January? 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2079</td>
<td>POS/350</td>
<td>Postcard unknown sender and recipient, 15 St James Place SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2080</td>
<td>POS/351</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs McEvoy from Ursula, 18th November 1907 from Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2081</td>
<td>POS/352</td>
<td>Postcard in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2082</td>
<td>POS/353</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs Spencer Edwards from J. M. Carnegy? From Lewisham 24th December 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2083</td>
<td>POS/354</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy, company of Walter Sickert, Neuville-les-Dieppe, Dieppe from A (Ambrose McEvoy presumably), 2nd September 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2084</td>
<td>POS/355</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from Anais, Pangbourne 28th July 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2085</td>
<td>POS/356</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from C.K. Butler, 5th Dec (no year visible), Taj Mahal postcard, from India?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2086</td>
<td>POS/357</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from Gwen Salmond, 21E Zijlwey Haarlem, 26th October 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2087</td>
<td>POS/358</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from unknown sender, Naples 9th October 1904?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2088</td>
<td>POS/359</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from Harold Ratchison, St Remy, 12th May 1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2089</td>
<td>POS/360</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from AVS? ARS? 7th January 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2090</td>
<td>POS/361</td>
<td>Postcard in French, no recipient, from A. Chuffes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2091</td>
<td>POS/362</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from Huiel? 22nd August 1914 from France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2092</td>
<td>POS/363</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from unknown sender (Wigs?) from Nuremberg, 1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2093</td>
<td>POS/364</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from unknown sender, 12th August 1905, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2094</td>
<td>POS/365</td>
<td>Postcard to Mr and Mrs McEvoy from unknown sender. 13th August 1908, Returning from Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2095</td>
<td>POS/366</td>
<td>Postcard to unknown recipient (the McEvos) from Charles and Muriel? Baker, no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2096</td>
<td>POS/367</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from Tommy Lowinsky, 21st March 1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2097</td>
<td>POS/368</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from Mary? McEvoy?, 21st March 1916 from London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2099</td>
<td>POS/370</td>
<td>Postcard Orange, Interior of the antique theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>POS/371</td>
<td>Postcard Musee Royal D'Anvers Breughel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2101</td>
<td>POS/372</td>
<td>Postcard Orange, Rue de Pontillac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2102</td>
<td>POS/373</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from UT (Ursula Tyrhitt) from Brussels, 7th November 1907. Jacobus Vrel’s Dutch Interior. Same handwriting as postcard POS/326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2103</td>
<td>POS/374</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs McEvoy from A? Villain. Relation or Maurice Villain? Sickert's son, Dieppe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2104</td>
<td>POS/375</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from Ursula, writing from Rome, travelling to Naples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2105</td>
<td>POS/376</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from LS? LE? Madrid, 15th November 1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2106</td>
<td>POS/377</td>
<td>Postcard Champaigne Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2107</td>
<td>POS/378</td>
<td>Postcard to Mrs McEvoy from N. Hearim? From Paris, 17th April 1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2108</td>
<td>POS/379</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from Luna? Lucie? 8th March 1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2109</td>
<td>POS/380</td>
<td>Postcard in French to H Folin from A Chuffes, Saint Jean de Luz, 2nd August 1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2110</td>
<td>POS/381</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from Noah Florence 2nd January 1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>POS/382</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from Molly Hogg? 24th December 1905, Chelmsford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2112</td>
<td>POS/383</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from A? (Ambrose McEvoy) 9th July 1925? From Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2113</td>
<td>POS/384</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from GBA? And EMA, 22nd December 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2115</td>
<td>POS/386</td>
<td>Postcard in French, no sender or recipient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2116</td>
<td>POS/387</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from unknown sender 1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>POS/388</td>
<td>Postcard in French to Ambrose McEvoy from Maseinin Dumal? Dumas? From Maussane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2118</td>
<td>POS/389</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from unknown sender, writing from Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2119</td>
<td>POS/390</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe, La Caserne d'Infanterie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2120</td>
<td>POS/391</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe, Le pont tournant de Pollet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2121</td>
<td>POS/392</td>
<td>Postcard General View of Ditchling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2122</td>
<td>POS/393</td>
<td>Postcard Newcastle to Liverpool express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2123</td>
<td>POS/394</td>
<td>Postcard Leeds to Bradford Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2124</td>
<td>POS/395</td>
<td>Postcard Landes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2125</td>
<td>POS/396</td>
<td>Postcard 'Armstrong' and 'Gooch' at Paddington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2126</td>
<td>POS/397</td>
<td>Postcard Cornish Riviera Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2127</td>
<td>POS/398</td>
<td>Postcard Les Locomotives Francaises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2128</td>
<td>POS/399</td>
<td>Postcard Les Locomotives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2129</td>
<td>POS/400</td>
<td>Postcard Old Court Avoncliff Bradford-on-Avon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2130</td>
<td>POS/401</td>
<td>Postcard Old Court Avoncliff Bradford-on-Avon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2131</td>
<td>POS/402</td>
<td>Postcard Liverpool to Brighton passing Wandsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2132</td>
<td>POS/403</td>
<td>Postcard Schooner Head from Champlain Mountain, Bar Haror, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2133</td>
<td>POS/404</td>
<td>Postcard Scavi de Pompei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2134</td>
<td>POS/405</td>
<td>Postcard Aart van der Neer National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2135</td>
<td>POS/406</td>
<td>Postcard London Law Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2136</td>
<td>POS/407</td>
<td>Postcard Environs de Dieppe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2137</td>
<td>POS/408</td>
<td>Postcard of Soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2138</td>
<td>POS/409</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe - Le Paquebot 'Dieppe' en pleine mer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2139</td>
<td>POS/410</td>
<td>Postcard Pomei Il Tempio D'Apollo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2140</td>
<td>POS/411</td>
<td>Postcard Scavi de Pompei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2141</td>
<td>POS/412</td>
<td>Postcard Pompei Tempio di Giove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2142</td>
<td>POS/413</td>
<td>Postcard Scavi de Pompei Portico del Foro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2143</td>
<td>POS/414</td>
<td>Postcard Children in Sea with Dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2144</td>
<td>POS/415</td>
<td>Postcard Landes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2145</td>
<td>POS/416</td>
<td>Postcard Maussane Le Cours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2146</td>
<td>POS/417</td>
<td>Postcard Zanetti Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2147</td>
<td>POS/418</td>
<td>Postcard Mont-de-Marsan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2148</td>
<td>POS/419</td>
<td>Postcard Standard of Germany Private of Hussars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2149</td>
<td>POS/420</td>
<td>Postcard Seine Inferieure Dieppe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2150</td>
<td>POS/421</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe la Plage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2151</td>
<td>POS/422</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe Bateaux dans l'Avant-Port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2152</td>
<td>POS/423</td>
<td>Postcard Muchas Felicidades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2153</td>
<td>POS/424</td>
<td>Postcard Environs de Dieppe Arques la Bataille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2154</td>
<td>POS/425</td>
<td>Postcard Landes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2155</td>
<td>POS/426</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe La Phare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2156</td>
<td>POS/427</td>
<td>Postcard Zanetti Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2157</td>
<td>POS/428</td>
<td>Postcard Zanetti Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2158</td>
<td>POS/429</td>
<td>Postcard Le Sechage des Lignes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2159</td>
<td>POS/430</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe Le Port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2160</td>
<td>POS/431</td>
<td>Postcard Seine Inferieure Dieppe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2161</td>
<td>POS/432</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe Le Steamer 'Tamise'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2162</td>
<td>POS/433</td>
<td>Postcard HRH Princess Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2163</td>
<td>POS/434</td>
<td>Postcard Old Yarn Market Dunster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2164</td>
<td>POS/435</td>
<td>Postcard The Tunnel of Torghatten Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2165</td>
<td>POS/436</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe 'Arrivee du Poisson'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2166</td>
<td>POS/437</td>
<td>Postcard London St Pauls Cathedral Nelson Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2167</td>
<td>POS/438</td>
<td>Postcard Bromotype Gautreau, Langon (Gironde)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2168</td>
<td>POS/439</td>
<td>Postcard The Mansion House, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2169</td>
<td>POS/440</td>
<td>Postcard The Bank and Royal Exchange London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2170</td>
<td>POS/441</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe Le Pont tournant du Pollet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2171</td>
<td>POS/442</td>
<td>Postcard La Prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2172</td>
<td>POS/443</td>
<td>Postcard Les Pyrenees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2173</td>
<td>POS/444</td>
<td>Postcard Interieur de Maison Landaise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2174</td>
<td>POS/445</td>
<td>Postcard Echassier Landais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2175</td>
<td>POS/446</td>
<td>Postcard Rocolte du Pignon ou Semence de Pin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2176</td>
<td>POS/447</td>
<td>Postcard Mont-de-Marsan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2177</td>
<td>POS/448</td>
<td>Postcard Bordeaux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2178</td>
<td>POS/449</td>
<td>Postcard Photograph of woman standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2179</td>
<td>POS/450</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe Le Boulevard Maritime et la Rue Aguado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2180</td>
<td>POS/451</td>
<td>Postcard Kaiferswerth a. Rhein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2181</td>
<td>POS/452</td>
<td>Postcard Venice Porta della Carta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2182</td>
<td>POS/453</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe Pilote entrant dans les Jetees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2183</td>
<td>POS/454</td>
<td>Postcard Barques de Peche en pleine mer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2184</td>
<td>POS/455</td>
<td>Postcard Chapeau de Paille Rubens National Gallery London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2185</td>
<td>POS/456</td>
<td>Postcard Arles Les Avenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2186</td>
<td>POS/457</td>
<td>Postcard Environ de Dieppe Martin Eglise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2187</td>
<td>POS/458</td>
<td>Postcard Seine Inferieure Dieppe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2188</td>
<td>POS/459</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe Les Tourelles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2189</td>
<td>POS/460</td>
<td>Postcard Paris Arc de Triomphe du Carrousel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2190</td>
<td>POS/461</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe L'Heure du Bain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2191</td>
<td>POS/462</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe Le Pont tournant du Pollet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2192</td>
<td>POS/463</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe L'Avant Port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2193</td>
<td>POS/464</td>
<td>Postcard Morcote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2194</td>
<td>POS/465</td>
<td>Postcard Zanetti Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2195</td>
<td>POS/466</td>
<td>Postcard Zanetti Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2196</td>
<td>POS/467</td>
<td>Postcard Corvo Azores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2197</td>
<td>POS/468</td>
<td>Postcard Picco Azores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2198</td>
<td>POS/469</td>
<td>Postcard Pompei Panorama della Citta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2199</td>
<td>POS/470</td>
<td>Postcard Norman Archway Bolsover Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>POS/471</td>
<td>Postcard Pernegg Schloß</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2201</td>
<td>POS/472</td>
<td>Postcard Pompei Casa del Poeta Tragico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2202</td>
<td>POS/473</td>
<td>Postcard Theatre Antique d'Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2203</td>
<td>POS/474</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe L'Avant Port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204</td>
<td>POS/475</td>
<td>Postcard Theatre Antique d'Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2205</td>
<td>POS/476</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe La Poissonerie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2206</td>
<td>POS/477</td>
<td>Postcard Paris Le Moulin Rouge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2207</td>
<td>POS/478</td>
<td>Postcard Types Basques A dos d'ane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2208</td>
<td>POS/479</td>
<td>Postcard Orange L'Arc de Triomphe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2209</td>
<td>POS/480</td>
<td>Postcard Types Basques Monture montagnarde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2210</td>
<td>POS/481</td>
<td>Postcard Arlesienne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2211</td>
<td>POS/482</td>
<td>Postcard Arlesienne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2212</td>
<td>POS/483</td>
<td>Postcard Dans les Landes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2213</td>
<td>POS/484</td>
<td>Postcard St Sever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2214</td>
<td>POS/485</td>
<td>Postcard Maussane La Cueillettes des Olives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2215</td>
<td>POS/486</td>
<td>Postcard Bad Kreuznach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2216</td>
<td>POS/487</td>
<td>Postcard Ludgate Circus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2217</td>
<td>POS/488</td>
<td>Postcard Casa di Sallustio Diana e Atteone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2218</td>
<td>POS/489</td>
<td>Postcard The Tower London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2219</td>
<td>POS/490</td>
<td>Postcard Fontana di Pompei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2220</td>
<td>POS/491</td>
<td>Postcard Scavi de Pompei Casa delle Nozze d'Argento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2221</td>
<td>POS/492</td>
<td>Postcard Statuette de Pleurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2222</td>
<td>POS/493</td>
<td>Postcard The Terrace Bolsover Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2223</td>
<td>POS/494</td>
<td>Postcard Bird's Eye View Aldbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2224</td>
<td>ART/12</td>
<td>Article mentioning a portrait of McEvoy, July 1929, taken from the Connosieur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2225</td>
<td>POS/495</td>
<td>Postcard Tank Engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>POS/496</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe Le Pont tournant du Pollet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2227</td>
<td>POS/497</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe Le Pont tournant du Pollet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2228</td>
<td>POS/498</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe La Criee du Poisson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2229</td>
<td>POS/499</td>
<td>Postcard Concarneau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2230</td>
<td>POS/500</td>
<td>Postcard Pompei Casa dei Vettii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2231</td>
<td>POS/501</td>
<td>Postcard Venice Veronese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2232</td>
<td>POS/502</td>
<td>Postcard Lit-et-Mixe Les Paturages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2233</td>
<td>POS/503</td>
<td>Postcard Entrance Steps and Doorway Bolsover Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2234</td>
<td>POS/504</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe Le Pollet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2235</td>
<td>POS/505</td>
<td>Postcard Aux Bains de Mer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2236</td>
<td>POS/506</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe Vue generale de l'Avant Port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2237</td>
<td>POS/507</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe Ramasseuses de Galets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2238</td>
<td>POS/508</td>
<td>Postcard Lyceum Theatre Dick Whittington and his Cat Pantomine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2239</td>
<td>POS/509</td>
<td>Postcard Lyceum Theatre Dick Whittington and his Cat Pantomine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2240</td>
<td>POS/510</td>
<td>Postcard Zanetti Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2241</td>
<td>POS/511</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe Un Court de l'Avant Port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2242</td>
<td>POS/512</td>
<td>Postcard Pompei Casa di Cornélion Rufo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2243</td>
<td>POS/513</td>
<td>Postcard Kensington Palace and Queen Victoria Statue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2244</td>
<td>POS/514</td>
<td>Postcard Orange Porlique des Arenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2245</td>
<td>POS/515</td>
<td>Postcard Rural Scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2246</td>
<td>POS/516</td>
<td>Photograph of trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2247</td>
<td>POS/517</td>
<td>Postcard Brooklyn Bridge and New York Skyline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2248</td>
<td>POS/518</td>
<td>Postcard Landes Recole de la Resine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2249</td>
<td>POS/519</td>
<td>Postcard New York Skyline from Jersey City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2250</td>
<td>POS/520</td>
<td>Postcard Cavendish Doorway Bolsover Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2251</td>
<td>POS/521</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe Arrivee du 'Sussex' dans l'avant-port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2252</td>
<td>POS/522</td>
<td>Postcard Dieppe Le Brighton devant la Gare Maritime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2253</td>
<td>POS/523</td>
<td>Postcard Marseille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2254</td>
<td>POS/524</td>
<td>Postcard Landes Resiniers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2255</td>
<td>POS/525</td>
<td>Postcard The Terrace Bolsover Castle, At Sunset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2256</td>
<td>POS/526</td>
<td>Postcard St Paul's Cathedral from Cheapside London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2257</td>
<td>REP/1/1916</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Cecil Baring, 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2258</td>
<td>REP/1/1916A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Cecil Baring, 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2259</td>
<td>REP/2/1917</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Helen Morris in London Pride, 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2260</td>
<td>REP/3/1917</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Calypso Baring 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2261</td>
<td><strong>REP/3/1917A</strong> Reproduction of portrait of Calypso Baring 1917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2262</td>
<td><strong>REP/3/1917B</strong> Reproduction of portrait of Calypso Baring 1917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2263</td>
<td><strong>REP/3/1917C</strong> Reproduction of portrait of Calypso Baring 1917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2264</td>
<td><strong>REP/3/1917D</strong> Reproduction of portrait of Calypso Baring 1917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2265</td>
<td><strong>REP/3/1917E</strong> Reproduction of portrait of Calypso Baring 1917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2266</td>
<td><strong>REP/3/1917F</strong> Reproduction of portrait of Calypso Baring 1917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2267</td>
<td><strong>REP/3/1917G</strong> Reproduction of portrait of Calypso Baring 1917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2268</td>
<td><strong>REP/3/1917H</strong> Reproduction of portrait of Calypso Baring 1917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2269</td>
<td><strong>REP/3/1917I</strong> Reproduction of portrait of Calypso Baring 1917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2270</td>
<td><strong>REP/4</strong> Reproduction of portrait of Cecil Baring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2271</td>
<td><strong>REP/5/1917</strong> Reproduction of portrait of Helen Morris in London Pride, 1917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2272</td>
<td><strong>REP/6</strong> Reproduction of portrait of David Lloyd George</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2273</td>
<td><strong>REP/7/1917</strong> Reproduction of portrait of Lady Gwendoline Churchill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2274</td>
<td><strong>REP/7/1917A</strong> Reproduction of portrait of Lady Gwendoline Churchill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2275</td>
<td><strong>REP/7/1917B</strong> Reproduction of portrait of Lady Gwendoline Churchill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2276</td>
<td><strong>REP/8</strong> Reproduction of portrait of Mr Horace Priestly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2277</td>
<td><strong>REP/8A</strong> Reproduction of portrait of Mr Horace Priestly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2278</td>
<td><strong>LET/745/1961</strong> Letter to Mrs Bazell (Anna McEvoy) from Frank Gill, 11 Cheltenham Avenue, Liverpool 17, 22nd June 1961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2279</td>
<td><strong>LET/746</strong> Letter to Mary McEvoy from Beatrice Malevlin?, 12th December no year, 30 Sussex Place, Queen's Gate, London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td><strong>LET/747/1934</strong> Letter to Mary McEvoy from W.A. Burton, 9th November 1934, Reform Club, Pall Mall, London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2281</td>
<td><strong>NOT/58</strong> Note on how to clean a canvas and varnish it, Albert Armor? 31 &amp; 32 Sv. Farmes Street, London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>File Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2282</td>
<td>LET/748/1935</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Charles Cheston, RWS, 2 Trafalgar Studios, SW3, 16th February 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2283</td>
<td>LET/749</td>
<td>Letter to May from Cynthia, 15 Bolton Gardens London, 16th Dec, no year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2284</td>
<td>LET/750</td>
<td>Empty envelope to La Comtesse de Limur, 17 Rue Berton, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2285</td>
<td>LET/751/1953</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell (Anna McEvoy) from Judith Cloake, Deputy Keeper and Publications Manager, Tate Gallery, 20th March 1953, with copyright form attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2286</td>
<td>LET/752</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Phillis de Jauze, Sunday, no date, 25 Rue de L'Arcade, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2287</td>
<td>LET/753/1930</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Lillah Keeble (nee McCarthy), Hammels, Boars Hill Oxford, 29th August 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2288</td>
<td>LET/754/1930</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Lillah Keeble (nee McCarthy), Hammels, Boars Hill Oxford, 2nd September 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2290</td>
<td>REP/9</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of The Countess of Latham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2291</td>
<td>REP/10</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of The Yellow Cushion, Mrs Claude Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2292</td>
<td>REP/11</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Mrs Radcliffe 1918 Watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2293</td>
<td>REP/12</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of The Little Model Watercolour belonging to Sir Cyril Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2294</td>
<td>REP/13/1917</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Mrs Francis McLaren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2295</td>
<td>REP/14/1918</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lady Tredegar 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2296</td>
<td>REP/14/1918A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lady Tredegar 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2297</td>
<td>REP/14/1918B</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lady Tredegar 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2298</td>
<td>REP/14/1918C</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lady Tredegar 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2299</td>
<td>REP/14/1918D</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lady Tredegar 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>REP/15</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Mrs Lawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301</td>
<td>REP/16</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lady Wodehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2302</td>
<td>REP/16A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lady Wodehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2303</td>
<td>REP/17/1915</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of The Ballet Girls 1915, belonging to Hon Evan Charteris watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2304</td>
<td>REP/18/1918</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lady Diana Manners 1918, N.P. Feb-Mar 1918 no known owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2305</td>
<td>REP/19/1917</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Mrs Francis Howard 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2306</td>
<td>REP/20/1917</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Mrs Aubrey Smith 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2307</td>
<td>REP/21/1914</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of The Net Menders 1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2308</td>
<td>REP/22</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lillah McCarthy (Lady Keeble) going to be exhibited at Glasgow during his exhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2309</td>
<td>REP/23</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of The Gypsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2310</td>
<td>REP/24</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of The Gypsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311</td>
<td>REP/25/1917</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lady Devina Lytton 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2312</td>
<td>REP/26/1915</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Miss Eva Albanesi 1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2313</td>
<td>REP/27/1917</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Princess Bibesco, Elizabeth Asquith, 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2314</td>
<td>REP/28</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Mrs Eileen Paull, Mrs Claude Johnson's collection, watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2315</td>
<td>REP/29/1918</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Mrs Gilbert Russell, owned by Gilbert Russell watercolour, 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2316</td>
<td>REP/29/1918A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Mrs Gilbert Russell, owned by Gilbert Russell watercolour, 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2317</td>
<td>REP/29/1918B</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Mrs Gilbert Russell, owned by Gilbert Russell watercolour, 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2318</td>
<td>REP/30/1918</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Mrs W.A. Jowitt 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2319</td>
<td>REP/31</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Study for the Gypsy owned by Mr E.J. Hesslein, 65 West 49 Street New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>REP/32/1917</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Miss Julia James 1917 Actress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2321</td>
<td>REP/33</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Meraud Guinness, Mrs Benjamin Guinness 11 Carton House Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2322</td>
<td>REP/34</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Mrs Lydia Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2323</td>
<td>REP/35/1919</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Dancers Resting 1919 Owned by the artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2325</td>
<td>REP/37</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lady Gwendoline Churchill Watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2326</td>
<td>REP/38/1919</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Evan Morgan, 2nd Viscount Tredegar (1893-1949) 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2327</td>
<td>REP/39</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lydia Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2328</td>
<td>REP/40/1917</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Sir James Taggart, KBE, Lord Provost of Aberdeen (1914-1919), 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2329</td>
<td>REP/41</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2330</td>
<td>REP/41A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2331</td>
<td>REP/42</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2332</td>
<td>REP/43</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of woman, Lois Sturt?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2333</td>
<td>PHO/5</td>
<td>Photograph of Ambrose McEvoy in profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2334</td>
<td>REP/44</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2335</td>
<td>REP/45</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a man in a hat (self-portrait?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2336</td>
<td>REP/46</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2337</td>
<td>REP/47</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2338</td>
<td>REP/48</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Rosalind and Helen Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2339</td>
<td>REP/49</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2340</td>
<td>REP/50</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of man in regimentals with garter star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2341</td>
<td>REP/50A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of man in regimentals with garter star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2342</td>
<td>PHO/6</td>
<td>Photograph of Ambrose McEvoy in profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2343</td>
<td>REP/51</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of woman in profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2344</td>
<td>REP/52</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Helen Morris in London Pride, 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2345</td>
<td>REP/53</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of woman standing holding cigarette? Diana Manners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2346</td>
<td>REP/54</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2347</td>
<td>REP/55</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Miss Mary Clare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2348</td>
<td>REP/56</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of girl standing, hand to heart, profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2349</td>
<td>REP/57</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of woman standing, striped dress, cradling arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2350</td>
<td>REP/58</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Ramsay Macdonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2351</td>
<td>REP/59</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2352</td>
<td>REP/60</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of La Reprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2353</td>
<td>REP/61</td>
<td>Reproduction of Bessborough Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2354</td>
<td>REP/61A</td>
<td>Reproduction of Bessborough Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2355</td>
<td>REP/62</td>
<td>Reproduction of woman seated in interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2356</td>
<td>REP/63</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of woman standing, striped dress, cradling arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2357</td>
<td>REP/64</td>
<td>Reproduction of pencil sketch of a harbour, Dieppe?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2358</td>
<td>REP/65</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of woman seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2359</td>
<td>REP/66</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Mellon bankers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2360</td>
<td>REP/66A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Mellon bankers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2361</td>
<td>REP/67</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2362</td>
<td>REP/68</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lord Ivor Spencer Churchill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2363</td>
<td>REP/69</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Claude Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2364</td>
<td>DOC/51</td>
<td>A Notable Series of Bronze Portrait Sculptures by Jacob Epstein. 115. Mrs Ambrose McEvoy. Sold at Sotheby's Nov 1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2365</td>
<td>REP/70</td>
<td>Reproduction of The Earring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2366</td>
<td>REP/71</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a young child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2367</td>
<td>REP/72</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of woman standing at a mirror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2368</td>
<td>REP/73</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of woman in hat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2369</td>
<td>REP/74</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of woman in hat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2370</td>
<td>REP/75</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of The Governess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2371</td>
<td>REP/76</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Dorothy Una Radcliffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2372</td>
<td>REP/77</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of girl seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2373</td>
<td>REP/78</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of woman in headscarf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2374</td>
<td>REP/78A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of woman in headscarf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2375</td>
<td>REP/79</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Captain M E Nasmith, VC, RN, Imperial War Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2376</td>
<td>REP/80</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of woman seated and turned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2377</td>
<td>REP/81</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of woman standing with greyhound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2378</td>
<td>REP/81A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of woman standing with greyhound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2379</td>
<td>REP/82</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Artist's mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2380</td>
<td>REP/83</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of The Right Hon. Augustine Birrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2381</td>
<td>Red Victoria Box File #5</td>
<td>REP/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2382</td>
<td>REP/84A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lieutenant H. Strachan, the Victoria Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2383</td>
<td>REP/84B</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lieutenant H. Strachan, the Victoria Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2384</td>
<td>REP/84C</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lieutenant H. Strachan, the Victoria Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2385</td>
<td>REP/85</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Brigadier-General B C Freyberg, VC, DSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2386</td>
<td>REP/85A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Brigadier-General B C Freyberg, VC, DSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2387</td>
<td>REP/86</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Sergeant Filip Konowal, the Victoria Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2388</td>
<td>REP/86A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Sergeant Filip Konowal, the Victoria Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2389</td>
<td>REP/86B</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Sergeant Filip Konowal, the Victoria Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2390</td>
<td>REP/86C</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Sergeant Filip Konowal, the Victoria Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2391</td>
<td>REP/87</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Commander Egerton, 1918, Imperial War Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2392</td>
<td>REP/88</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lieutenant Sandford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2393</td>
<td>REP/89</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Commander Beak 1918, Imperial War Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2394</td>
<td>REP/89A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Commander Beak 1918, Imperial War Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2395</td>
<td>REP/90</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2396</td>
<td>REP/91</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2397</td>
<td>REP/92</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Major W S Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2398</td>
<td>REP/93</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Alcock in flying dress, 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2399</td>
<td>REP/94</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Sergeant N A Finch, 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>REP/94A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Sergeant N A Finch, 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2401</td>
<td>REP/94B</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Sergeant N A Finch, 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2402</td>
<td>REP/94C</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Sergeant N A Finch, 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2403</td>
<td>REP/94D</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Sergeant N A Finch, 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2404</td>
<td>REP/95</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Major W S Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2405</td>
<td>REP/96</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a nurse, WW1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2406</td>
<td>REP/97</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Commander Kenneth Mackenzie Grieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2407</td>
<td>REP/97A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Commander Kenneth Mackenzie Grieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2408</td>
<td>REP/98</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Harry George Hawker (1889-1921)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2409</td>
<td>REP/99</td>
<td>Reproduction of standing portrait sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2410</td>
<td>REP/99A</td>
<td>Reproduction of standing portrait sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2411</td>
<td>REP/100</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2412</td>
<td>REP/100A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2413</td>
<td>REP/100B</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2414</td>
<td>REP/100C</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2415</td>
<td>REP/100D</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2419</td>
<td>REP/102</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of soldiers in interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2420</td>
<td>REP/102A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of soldiers in interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2421</td>
<td>REP/102B</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of soldiers in interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2422</td>
<td>REP/103</td>
<td>Reproduction of landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2423</td>
<td>REP/104</td>
<td>Reproduction of landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2424</td>
<td>REP/105</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Sergeant Filip Konowal, the Victoria Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2425</td>
<td>REP/106</td>
<td>Reproduction of landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2426</td>
<td>REP/107</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Sir James Taggart, KBE, Lord Provost of Aberdeen (1914-1919)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2427</td>
<td>REP/108</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Captain M E Nasmith, VC, RN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2428</td>
<td>REP/108A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Captain M E Nasmith, VC, RN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2429</td>
<td>REP/109</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Major E Bamford, VC, DSO, RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2430</td>
<td>REP/109A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Major E Bamford, VC, DSO, RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2431</td>
<td>REP/109B</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Major E Bamford, VC, DSO, RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2432</td>
<td>REP/110</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a soldier, Major Anderson 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2433</td>
<td>REP/111</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a girl seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2434</td>
<td>REP/112</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman, black and white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2435</td>
<td>REP/113</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Margot Molina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2436</td>
<td>REP/114</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mary Anna Sturt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2437</td>
<td>REP/114A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mary Anna Sturt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2438</td>
<td>REP/115</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mary Feery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2439</td>
<td>REP/115A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mary Feery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2440</td>
<td>REP/116</td>
<td>Reproduction of a religious painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2441</td>
<td>REP/117</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Nell Mrs Romer Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2442</td>
<td>REP/118</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Norris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2443</td>
<td>REP/119</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lesley Jowitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2444</td>
<td>REP/120</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Susan Hornby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2445</td>
<td>REP/121</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lady O'Neil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2446</td>
<td>REP/122</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of The Hon Mrs Alexander Hardinge by Mary McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2447</td>
<td>REP/123</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Ranoleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2448</td>
<td>REP/124</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mary Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2449</td>
<td>REP/125</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lady Jowitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2450</td>
<td>REP/126</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Anna McEvoy by Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Rep/No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2451</td>
<td>REP/127</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman, black and white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2452</td>
<td>REP/128</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of The Lady Mary Cambridge by Mary McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2453</td>
<td>REP/129</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of V. Rev Father Stuart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2454</td>
<td>REP/129A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of V. Rev Father Stuart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2455</td>
<td>REP/130</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Diana Hornby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2456</td>
<td>REP/130A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Diana Hornby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2457</td>
<td>REP/131</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of The Marchioness of Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2458</td>
<td>REP/132</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Everard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2459</td>
<td>REP/133</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Margaret Vickers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2460</td>
<td>REP/134</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Stella Patrick Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2461</td>
<td>REP/135</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Madmoiselle Mary de Limur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2462</td>
<td>REP/136</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Marie Stevenson Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2463</td>
<td>REP/137</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Miss Marii Mitchell by Mary McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2464</td>
<td>REP/138</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Madame Margarita Molina by Mary McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2465</td>
<td>REP/139</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Miss Patricia Ravenhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2466</td>
<td>REP/140</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Julaya daughter of Last Minister of Siam? Now Gonebek?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2467</td>
<td>REP/141</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mary Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2468</td>
<td>REP/141A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mary Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2469</td>
<td>REP/141B</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mary Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2470</td>
<td>REP/142</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Winifred Hardinge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2471</td>
<td>REP/143</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of The Lady Cynthia Asquith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2472</td>
<td>REP/144</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Duke of Leinster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2473</td>
<td>REP/145</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Miss Susan Hornby by Mary McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2474</td>
<td>REP/146</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Romer Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2475</td>
<td>REP/147</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Norris by Mary McEvoy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2476</td>
<td>REP/148</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Pershouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2477</td>
<td>REP/149</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Professor Neville ....maint? by Mary McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2478</td>
<td>EXH/16</td>
<td>Exhibition catalogue, Three Women Artists, Corporation Art Gallery, Rochdale, 21st January-18th February 1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2479</td>
<td>REP/150</td>
<td>Print of a country house on a lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2480</td>
<td>REP/151</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Elizabeth Hardinge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2481</td>
<td>REP/152</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Emily Dutton by Mary McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2482</td>
<td>REP/153</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Marchioness of Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2483</td>
<td>REP/154</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a seated child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2484</td>
<td>REP/155</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Rev Father Stuart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2485</td>
<td>REP/156</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lady Currie Hilda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2486</td>
<td>REP/157</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Baba Melisande Brockhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2487</td>
<td>REP/158</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Audrey Cooper RA Sold to Southampton Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2488</td>
<td>REP/159</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Bradley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2489</td>
<td>REP/160</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Miss Marie Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2490</td>
<td>REP/161</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Joannie, The Hon Lady Greiss?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2491</td>
<td>REP/162</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Richard (Grandson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2492</td>
<td>REP/163</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Marchioness of Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2493</td>
<td>REP/164</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a seated woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2494</td>
<td>REP/165</td>
<td>Reproduction of a Rembrandt Sketch British Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2495</td>
<td>PHO/7</td>
<td>Photograph of Mary McEvoy with painting of Mrs Frank Pershouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2496</td>
<td>PHO/7A</td>
<td>Photograph of Mary McEvoy with painting of Mrs Frank Pershouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2497</td>
<td>REP/166</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman reading from National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2498</td>
<td>ART/13/1936</td>
<td>Collection of articles reviewing Mary McEvoy's work all from 1936. Exhibition at the Knoedler Galleries, Old Bond Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2499</td>
<td>REP/167</td>
<td>Reproduction of a painting of a bridge, black and white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>DRA/729</td>
<td>Drawing of lilies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2501</td>
<td>ART/14/1936</td>
<td>Collection of articles reviewing Mary McEvoy's work all from 1936. Exhibition at the Knoedler Galleries, Old Bond Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2502</td>
<td>ART/15/1936</td>
<td>Beauty and Character by Mary McEvoy 'The Sketch, 11th March 1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2503</td>
<td>REP/168</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Miss Alexander by Whistler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2504</td>
<td>RED/V7</td>
<td>Red Victoria Box File #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2505</td>
<td>PHO/8</td>
<td>Army &amp; Navy Film &amp; Print Wallet with several photographs inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2505</td>
<td>LET/756</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Benjamin Evans, Sunday, no year, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2506</td>
<td>LET/757</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Benjamin Evans, no date, 11 Canfield Gardens, Hampstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2507</td>
<td>LET/758</td>
<td>Letter to Mary and Bo (Ambrose) McEvoy from Charlie McEvoy, from 'somewhere in Italy', no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2508</td>
<td>NOT/59</td>
<td>Description of outside on a midsummer morning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2509</td>
<td>DOC/52/1961</td>
<td>Receipt, fee for Granada TV network using Charles McEvoy's 'David Ballard' £112.10, 29th June 1961 Addressed to Mrs Bazell (Anna McEvoy), Joseph Williams Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2510</td>
<td>LET/759/1930</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Lillah Keeble (nee McCarthy) 11th July 1930, Hammels, Boar's Hill, Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2511</td>
<td>LET/760/1930</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Lillah Keeble (nee McCarthy) 12th September 1930, Hammels, Boar's Hill, Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2512</td>
<td>DRA/730</td>
<td>Sketches of heads/faces in ink, pencil writing/poem about love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2514</td>
<td>DOC/54/1927</td>
<td>Royal Academy of Arts, List of the Academicians as they have served in council from 1769, printed in 1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2516</td>
<td>LET/762/1918</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Christie Manson &amp; Woods, 20th April 1918, 8 King Street, St James's Square, London, Red Cross Sale, Lot 842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2517</td>
<td>LET/763/1918</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Williams Winslow 1918 The Shooting House? Heacham, Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2518</td>
<td>LET/764</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Howard de Walden, Seaford House, Belgrave Square, London, Friday, no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2519</td>
<td>NOT/60</td>
<td>Business card and note in French from Ernest May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2520</td>
<td>LET/765</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Mrs/Lady Howard de Walden, Seaford House, Belgrave Square, London, no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2521</td>
<td>LET/766</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Mary Hutchinson, 3 Albert Road, Regents Park, London, no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2522</td>
<td>LET/767/1925</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Louise Eikius? Sw.... Mrs Wharton Sw.... Philadelphia, 11th April 1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2523</td>
<td>NOT/61</td>
<td>Note on Asa Lingard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2524</td>
<td>LET/768/1916</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from unknown sender, 30th April 1916, 26A Bryanston Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2525</td>
<td>LET/769/1917</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from unknown sender (incomplete letter) 5th January 1917, Knebworth House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2526</td>
<td>LET/770</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Stella Gwynne, 47 Catherine Street London, no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2527</td>
<td>LET/771/1916</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Elizabeth Asquith, 14th June 1916, 10 Downing Street, Whitehall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2528</td>
<td>LET/772/1927</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Guinevere Dunsford, 3rd August 1927, Waldershare Park, Dover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2529</td>
<td>NOT/62</td>
<td>Note on European 16th and 17th century painters, looks like Mary McEvoy's hand but not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2530</td>
<td>In envelope titled 'models addresses' in same red Victoria box</td>
<td>Business card of William Rothenstein, on the reverse an introduction: Miss Lois Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document ID</td>
<td>Folder Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2531</td>
<td>NOT/64</td>
<td>Business card for Miss E.K. Taylor, 17 Bolingbroke Road, West Kensington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2532</td>
<td>NOT/65</td>
<td>Note of address: Mademoiselle Arlette Gallet Au Louvre, 4 New Bond Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2533</td>
<td>NOT/66</td>
<td>Note of address: Kitty Bolotine? Maisonnette, Eskdale Avenue, Chesham, Buckinghamshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2534</td>
<td>NOT/67</td>
<td>Note of address: Dorothy Tidman, 195B, Munster Road, Fulham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2535</td>
<td>NOT/68</td>
<td>Business card Mr W. J. Sheppherd introduced by Mr Augustus John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2536</td>
<td>LET/773</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mr McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2537</td>
<td>NOT/69</td>
<td>Business card Miss Florence E. Mayer Costume Model, 2 Margravine Gardens, Baron's Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2538</td>
<td>LET/774</td>
<td>Christmas card from Christian Brinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2539</td>
<td>NOT/70</td>
<td>Addresses of three models: Kitty Dale, Lily Ryan and Miss Tempest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2540</td>
<td>NOT/71</td>
<td>Miss Witthager, le Cope Place, Earl's Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2541</td>
<td>NOT/72</td>
<td>Henry Tonks, Chateau arc-en-Barrois, Pres Chaumont, Haut Marne, France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2542</td>
<td>NOT/73</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Olga Sangorski, 19 Howland Street, Fitzroy Square, London, 14th May 1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2543</td>
<td>NOT/74</td>
<td>Addresses of Mademoiselle J Baude, 16 Harley Street, and Martha Hubert 67 Charlotte Street, Fitzroy Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2544</td>
<td>NOT/75</td>
<td>Miss Olga Sangorski, Miss Laurie Caruthers? 31 Allestree Road, Fulham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2545</td>
<td>NOT/76</td>
<td>Addresses: Lily Ryan and Miss B. Morrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2546</td>
<td>NOT/77</td>
<td>Business card Miss Peggy Lines, South Africa and London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2547</td>
<td>NOT/78</td>
<td>Crossed out hand written notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2548</td>
<td>LET/775</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Blanche Somerset, Monday, no date, 11 Portman Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2549</td>
<td>NOT/79</td>
<td>Crossed out hand written notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2550</td>
<td>NOT/80</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2551</td>
<td>LET/776/1933</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from R.H. Wilenski, 12th May 1933, 50 Blenheim Terrace, St John's Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2552</td>
<td>LET/777/1928</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Ethel Desborough, 25th January 1928, Taplow Court, Taplow, Buckinghamshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Date/ID</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2553</td>
<td>LET/778</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvoy from Benjamin Evans, no date or address. Rembrandt print on reverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2554</td>
<td>ART/16</td>
<td>Orpen the Jesting Painter' by Marita Ross, date and publication unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2555</td>
<td>NOT/81</td>
<td>Handwritten table 'Four Centuries of Italian Painters'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2556</td>
<td>NOT/82</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Balsay, Charles Floquet, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2557</td>
<td>NOT/83</td>
<td>Business card Lady and Miss Coghlan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2558</td>
<td>NOT/84</td>
<td>Col R.M Calmont, Aldestrop House, Kingham, Exon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2560</td>
<td>DOC/55/1925</td>
<td>Receipt of payment for Portrait of Miss Sheila Byrne £500, Knoedler &amp; Co. 1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2561</td>
<td>DRA/731</td>
<td>Sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2562</td>
<td>LET/780</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from unknown sender, 25th February, 4 Cornwall Terrace, Regents Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2563</td>
<td>LET/781</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Monday, no date or address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2564</td>
<td>LET/782</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from unknown sender (Granard?), no date, Forbes House, Halkin Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2565</td>
<td>LET/783</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Nin? Nina? Villa Nandermot, Montana Vermala Suisse, no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2566</td>
<td>NOT/85</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2567</td>
<td>NOT/86</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2568</td>
<td>LET/784</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Frances Radney, Battle Hall, Leeds, Maidstone, no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2569</td>
<td>LET/785</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Helen H. Saturday, no date, Winchester Tower, Windsor Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2570</td>
<td>LET/786</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from ..... W Lewis, 20th April, The Court, Crondall, Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2571</td>
<td>LET/787</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Beatrice Granard, Castle Forbes, Newtown Forbes, Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2574</td>
<td>LET/789</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Leslie M. Howland, 3rd May no year (1917? Corresponds to dates in letter), Ritz Hotel, Piccadilly, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2575</td>
<td>LET/790</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Ethel Verney Cave, 25th Saturday, Stanford on Avon, Rugby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2576</td>
<td>LET/791/1925</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Dennis Gwynn, 8th April 1925, 47 Halsey Street, Cadogan Gardens, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2577</td>
<td>PHO/9</td>
<td>Photograph of stamp for McEvoy's works in envelope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2578</td>
<td>LET/792/1929</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Elinor Kinloch, 1st September 1929, 20 Eaton Place, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2579</td>
<td>NOT/87</td>
<td>Pencil notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2580</td>
<td>LET/793/1917</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Katharine Cromer, 7th April 1917, Ardgowan Greenock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2581</td>
<td>LET/794/1913</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from James Ward, 4th October 1913, 6 Selwyn Gardens, Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2582</td>
<td>EXH/17</td>
<td>Exhibition catalogue, Three Women Artists, Corporation Art Gallery, Rochdale, 21st January-18th February 1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2583</td>
<td>LET/795</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy/Mary McEvoy? From Betty Leggett, Halls Croft, Stratford-on-Avon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2584</td>
<td>LET/796</td>
<td>Letter to Madam de Jaucourt from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Monday morning, Hotel Meurice, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2585</td>
<td>PHO/10</td>
<td>Photograph of four people seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2586</td>
<td>LET/797</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Selina Luisson? No date, Princess hotel, Avenue de Bois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2587</td>
<td>DOC/57</td>
<td>Chantrey Recommending Committee, purchasing works from the New English Art Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2588</td>
<td>DOC/58</td>
<td>Mary McEvoy's passport 10th November 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2589</td>
<td>LET/798</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Ambrose McEvoy from unknown sender, 20th December no year, Pixton Park, Dulverton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2591</td>
<td>LET/800</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvo from Stella Gwynne, 47 Catherine Street, Buckingham Gate, Bladon, Cramlington, Northumberland, Wootton Polegate, Sussex. 5th, no year or month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2592</td>
<td>LET/801</td>
<td>Empty envelope to Mrs Burghes, 54B Redcliffe Square, Earl's Court, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2593</td>
<td>POS/527</td>
<td>Postcard to Ambrose McEvo from Hazel L? 22nd October no clear year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2594</td>
<td>LET/802</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvo from Granard, 1st July no year, Forbes House, Halkin Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2595</td>
<td>LET/803/1939</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvo from Hilda Currie, 8th July 1939, Upham House, Aldbourne, Wiltshire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2597</td>
<td>LET/805</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvo from Berna? Brett, no date, Tuesday, 19 Thurloe Square, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2598</td>
<td>PHO/11</td>
<td>Negative of house in woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2599</td>
<td>NOT/88</td>
<td>Notes on Great Western Royal Hotel, Paddington notepaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2600</td>
<td>LET/806/1921</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvo from illegible sender, Mark? 24th September 1921, Hotel in Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2601</td>
<td>NOT/89</td>
<td>Notes for a story or play?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2602</td>
<td>NOT/90</td>
<td>Pencil notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2603</td>
<td>NOT/91</td>
<td>Notes for a play?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2604</td>
<td>NOT/92</td>
<td>Notes for a story or play?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2605</td>
<td>LET/807</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvo from Ambrose McEvo, no date or address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2607</td>
<td>NOT/93</td>
<td>Business card of Gabriel Grovlez with note in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2608</td>
<td>NOT/94</td>
<td>Business card of Lieut Seymour de Ricci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2609</td>
<td>NOT/95</td>
<td>Business card La Comtesse Hermann de Pourtales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2610</td>
<td>NOT/96</td>
<td>Handwritten story, not sure who by, called A.D. 3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611</td>
<td>NOT/97</td>
<td>Pencil written story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Box File</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2612</td>
<td>LET/809</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Granard, Saturday, no date, Forbes House, Halkin Street London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2613</td>
<td>LET/810/1913</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from J.P. Strachey, 11th May 1913, Newham College, Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2614</td>
<td>LET/811/1917</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from C.J. Myers, Great Shelford, Cambridge, 19th August 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2615</td>
<td>LET/812/1928</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Marchioness of Cambridge, Shotton Hall, Shrewsbury, 18th May 1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2616</td>
<td>NOT/98</td>
<td>Business card for Marquise de Polignac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2617</td>
<td>NOT/99</td>
<td>Business card for Mrs Henry Phipps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2618</td>
<td>NOT/100</td>
<td>Business card for La Comtesse Hermann de Pourtales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2619</td>
<td>NOT/101</td>
<td>Business card for Serge de Diaghilew with note in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2620</td>
<td>LET/813</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Odette Thornhill, North Audley House, 40 North Audley Street, Mayfair, no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2621</td>
<td>Red Victoria Box File #7</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Miss Erica Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2622</td>
<td>REP/169</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lord Crewe, London County Council 30 x 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2623</td>
<td>REP/170</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Mrs Fitzgerald Marsden Manor Cirencester 30 x 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2624</td>
<td>REP/171</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Hon Mrs Cecil Baring, owned by Hon Cecil Baring 85 x 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2625</td>
<td>REP/172</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lady Helen Whitaker 57 1/2 x 43. Belonging to Hugh Whitaker, Elmers Court, Lymington, Hauts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2626</td>
<td>REP/173</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Mrs Sampson 50 x 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2627</td>
<td>REP/174</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lady Gwendoline Churchill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628</td>
<td>REP/175A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lady Gwendoline Churchill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2629</td>
<td>REP/175</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lady Duveen 50 x 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2630</td>
<td>REP/177</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Daphne Baring 40 x 30 belonging to Cecil Baring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2631</td>
<td>REP/178</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Viscountess Chilton 40 x 30 Johnson Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2632</td>
<td>REP/179</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Tink (in green) 30 x 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2633</td>
<td>REP/180</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of the Hon Mrs Akers Douglas, return to Dr Christian Brinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2634</td>
<td>REP/181</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lady Gwendoline Churchill, watercolour, Mrs Claude Johnson Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2635</td>
<td>REP/181A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lady Gwendoline Churchill, watercolour, Mrs Claude Johnson Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2636</td>
<td>REP/182</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait &quot;The Inverness Café&quot; Johnson Collection 40x30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2637</td>
<td>REP/183</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Michael McEvoy Christmas 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2638</td>
<td>REP/184</td>
<td>Reproduction of religious scene, birth of Christ and three kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2639</td>
<td>REP/184A</td>
<td>Reproduction of religious scene, birth of Christ and three kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2640</td>
<td>REP/184B</td>
<td>Reproduction of religious scene, birth of Christ and three kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2641</td>
<td>REP/184C</td>
<td>Reproduction of religious scene, birth of Christ and three kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2642</td>
<td>REP/184D</td>
<td>Reproduction of religious scene, birth of Christ and three kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2643</td>
<td>REP/185</td>
<td>Reproduction of The Seasons 18 x 16 1/2 C. K. Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2644</td>
<td>REP/186</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Mr St John Hutchinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2645</td>
<td>REP/187</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Helen and Rosalind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2646</td>
<td>REP/188</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of The Book owned by H. E. J. Hesslein V.F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2647</td>
<td>REP/189</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Master John Martin, Catalogue RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2648</td>
<td>REP/190</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of an older woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2649</td>
<td>PHO/12</td>
<td>Sepia photograph of boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2650</td>
<td>PHO/13</td>
<td>Photograph of woman next to portrait XVII 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2651</td>
<td>PHO/13A</td>
<td>Photograph of woman next to portrait XVII 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2652</td>
<td>REP/191</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a man standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2653</td>
<td>REP/191A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a man standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2654</td>
<td>REP/191B</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a man standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2655</td>
<td>REP/191C</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a man standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2656</td>
<td>REP/191D</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a man standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2657</td>
<td>REP/192</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a woman in pearl earrings and necklace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2658</td>
<td>REP/193</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of an older man seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2659</td>
<td>REP/193A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of an older man seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2660</td>
<td>REP/193B</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of an older man seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2661</td>
<td>REP/194</td>
<td>Reproduction of self-portrait of Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2662</td>
<td>REP/194A</td>
<td>Reproduction of self-portrait of Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2663</td>
<td>REP/195</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Lady Duveen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2664</td>
<td>REP/196</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a woman in fur-trimmed shawl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2665</td>
<td>REP/197</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2666</td>
<td>REP/198</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of man seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2667</td>
<td>REP/199</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a woman standing/walking in long pearls and flapper style dress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2668</td>
<td>REP/200</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a woman standing hand on hip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2669</td>
<td>REP/200A</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a woman standing hand on hip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2670</td>
<td>REP/200B</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a woman standing hand on hip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2671</td>
<td>REP/200C</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a woman standing hand on hip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2672</td>
<td>REP/201</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of an older woman in glasses seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2673</td>
<td>REP/202</td>
<td>Reproduction of a watercolour portrait of a woman in profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2674</td>
<td>REP/203</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2675</td>
<td>REP/204</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2676</td>
<td>REP/205</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman standing, half-length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2677</td>
<td>REP/206</td>
<td>Reproduction of a preliminary portrait sketch of Daphne Baring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2678</td>
<td>REP/206A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a preliminary portrait sketch of Daphne Baring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2679</td>
<td>REP/207</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man in a bow tie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2680</td>
<td>REP/208</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman seated in a black evening dress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2681</td>
<td>REP/209</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2682</td>
<td>Rep/210</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Gwendoline Churchill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2683</td>
<td>Rep/211</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Akers-Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2684</td>
<td>Rep/212</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait sketch of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2685</td>
<td>Rep/213</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait sketch of a man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2686</td>
<td>Rep/214</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait sketch of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2687</td>
<td>Rep/215</td>
<td>Reproduction of a pencil sketch of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2688</td>
<td>Rep/216</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a girl seated in circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2689</td>
<td>Rep/217</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man (tennis player?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2690</td>
<td>Rep/218</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a mother and child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2691</td>
<td>Rep/219</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait sketch of a boy and a parrot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2692</td>
<td>Rep/220</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man standing half-length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2693</td>
<td>Rep/221</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait sketch of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2694</td>
<td>Rep/222</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man half profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2695</td>
<td>Rep/222A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man half profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2696</td>
<td>Rep/223</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2697</td>
<td>Rep/223A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2698</td>
<td>Rep/224</td>
<td>Reproduction of a watercolour portrait of a man in a suit and overcoat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2699</td>
<td>Rep/225</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Akers-Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700</td>
<td>Rep/226</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in a hat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2701</td>
<td>Rep/227</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man in a suit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2702</td>
<td>Rep/228</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2703</td>
<td>Rep/228A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2704</td>
<td>Rep/229</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Tink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2705</td>
<td>Rep/230</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2706</td>
<td>Rep/231</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Master John Martin?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2707</td>
<td>Rep/232</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman seated arms folded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2708</td>
<td>Rep/233</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman standing in black head scarf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2709</td>
<td>REP/234</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2710</td>
<td>REP/235</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of James Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2711</td>
<td>REP/236</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a girl seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2712</td>
<td>REP/236A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a girl seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2713</td>
<td>REP/237</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman with a fan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2714</td>
<td>REP/237A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman with a fan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2715</td>
<td>REP/238</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of two sisters in an interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2716</td>
<td>REP/238A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of two sisters in an interior on easel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2717</td>
<td>REP/239</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man in a bow tie standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2718</td>
<td>REP/239A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man in a bow tie standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2719</td>
<td>REP/239B</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man in a bow tie standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2720</td>
<td>REP/240</td>
<td>Reproduction of a woman and child in a wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2721</td>
<td>REP/240A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a woman and child in a wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2722</td>
<td>REP/241</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in an interior holding a lute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2723</td>
<td>REP/241A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in an interior holding a lute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2724</td>
<td>REP/241B</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in an interior holding a lute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2725</td>
<td>REP/242</td>
<td>Reproduction of a sepia sketch of a woman in a hat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2726</td>
<td>REP/243</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2727</td>
<td>REP/244</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman standing in a hat with a flower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2728</td>
<td>REP/245</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2729</td>
<td>REP/246</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2730</td>
<td>REP/247</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of an Edwardian lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2731</td>
<td>REP/248</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a mother and child reading a book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2732</td>
<td>SKE/36</td>
<td>Small Sketchbook with notes and anatomical drawings inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2733</td>
<td>REP/249</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Board of Directors Barings Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2734</td>
<td>REP/250</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Stevenson Scott 30 x 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2735</td>
<td>REP/251</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lady Ridley oil 8 1/4 x 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2736</td>
<td>REP/252</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of an older man seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2737</td>
<td>REP/252A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of an older man seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2738</td>
<td>REP/253</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man with a bow tie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2739</td>
<td>REP/254</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Duchess of Marlborough, to be exhibited at Duveen's beginning Mar? 2nd? 1920?, 90 x 44 1/2 return to Christian Brinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2740</td>
<td>REP/255</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Miss Daphne Crampton Woods 50 x 40 catalogue RA 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2741</td>
<td>REP/256</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the children of the earl of Sandwich catalogue RA 482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2742</td>
<td>REP/257</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Arkwright NYE 10 1/2 x 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2743</td>
<td>REP/258</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mother and Child (reading a book) in the exhibition of the New English Art Club, the Case for Modern Painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2744</td>
<td>REP/259</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Hon Mrs Aubrey Herbert, Return to Dr Christian Brinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2745</td>
<td>REP/260</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Claude Johnson painted 1925 Johnson collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2746</td>
<td>REP/261</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of The children of Mr J.A.C. Tilly C.B. 64 x 48 painted 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2747</td>
<td>REP/262</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a gentleman seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2748</td>
<td>REP/263</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Miss Elizabeth Asquith 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2749</td>
<td>REP/264</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Honourable Mrs Montagu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2750</td>
<td>REP/265</td>
<td>Reproduction of a watercolour portrait of the Lady Devina Lytton belonging to Stevenson Scott america? 6 1/2 x 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2751</td>
<td>REP/266</td>
<td>Reproduction of The Tattoo Tate Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2752</td>
<td>REP/267</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Meraud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2753</td>
<td>REP/268</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Duchess of Marlborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reproduction</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2754</td>
<td>REP/269</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man. On the reverse: 'Please do the photographs for Mr Coward like this one which Mr McEvoy says is the best. Submit similar copy to Mr Noel Coward, 111 Ebury St. and return this here.' Is this a portrait of Coward?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2755</td>
<td>REP/270</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of In the Doorway 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2756</td>
<td>REP/271</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Violet the Duchess of Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2757</td>
<td>REP/272</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Viola Tree and Alan Parsons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2758</td>
<td>REP/273</td>
<td>Reproduction of a self-portrait of Ambrose McEvoy Johnson Collection 40 x 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2759</td>
<td>REP/274</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Ramsay Macdonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2760</td>
<td>REP/275</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Rt Hon Viscount D'Abernon belonging to him 30 x 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2761</td>
<td>ART/17/1927</td>
<td>Obituaries 1927 for Ambrose McEvoy The Times and Daily Chronicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2762</td>
<td>REP/276</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of David Lloyd George, return to Christian Brinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2763</td>
<td>REP/277</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lieut Sandford R.N. V.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2764</td>
<td>REP/278</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Sir C. Shute painted Hindenburg Trench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2765</td>
<td>REP/279</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Williams 40 x 30 belongs to Mr Williams Wilmslow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2766</td>
<td>REP/280</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Hon Mrs Cecil Baring return to Christian Brinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2767</td>
<td>REP/281</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait sketch of the artist's wife (418 at RA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2768</td>
<td>REP/282</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lady Kendal Butler and her two daughters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2769</td>
<td>REP/283</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of The Gypsy 1909 New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2770</td>
<td>REP/284</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lady Cranbourne 40 x 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2771</td>
<td>REP/285</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Autumn 19 x 17 Mrs B Salaman Cohen 13 Eton Avenue Hampstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2772</td>
<td>REP/286</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Sir John Alcock first man to fly across the Atlantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2773</td>
<td>REP/287</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repro No.</td>
<td>Repro Cat.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/288</td>
<td>2774</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Viscountess Dunsford and Children RA Catalogue 455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/289</td>
<td>2775</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Claude Johnson in black 52 x 40 Johnson collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/290</td>
<td>2776</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in black seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/291</td>
<td>2777</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/292</td>
<td>2778</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Duchess of Marlborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/293</td>
<td>2779</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/294</td>
<td>2780</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Michael McEvoy 30 x 25 belonging to Mrs McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/294A</td>
<td>2781</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Michael McEvoy 30 x 25 belonging to Mrs McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/294B</td>
<td>2782</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Michael McEvoy 30 x 25 belonging to Mrs McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/295</td>
<td>2783</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of The Lark 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/296</td>
<td>2784</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Daphne II 30 x 25 belonging to Cecil Baring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/297</td>
<td>2785</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Evan Morgan, Viscount Tredegar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/298</td>
<td>2786</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Nancy Cunard watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/299</td>
<td>2787</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Derwent Wood watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/300</td>
<td>2788</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mary McEvoy watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/301</td>
<td>2789</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Helen Morris in London Pride watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/302</td>
<td>2790</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of model watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/303</td>
<td>2791</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Barbara daughter of Mr Frederick Goodenough 40 x 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/304</td>
<td>2792</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mary McEvoy watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/305</td>
<td>2793</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in fur coat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/306</td>
<td>2794</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of The Dancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/307</td>
<td>2795</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman next to a mirror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/307A</td>
<td>2796</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman next to a mirror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP/308</td>
<td>2797</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Reproduction ID</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2798</td>
<td>REP/309</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of woman standing in profile holding a fan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2799</td>
<td>REP/309A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of woman standing in profile holding a fan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2800</td>
<td>REP/310</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of woman in a hat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2801</td>
<td>REP/311</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of woman, Lady Elcho?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2802</td>
<td>REP/312</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2803</td>
<td>REP/313</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2804</td>
<td>REP/314</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of woman seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2805</td>
<td>REP/315</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of man with a bow tie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2806</td>
<td>REP/316</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2807</td>
<td>REP/317</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Howard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2808</td>
<td>REP/318</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman arm on mantelpiece and mirror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2809</td>
<td>REP/319</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman with fur collar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2810</td>
<td>REP/320</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2811</td>
<td>REP/321</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Calypso Baring, return to Christian Brinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2812</td>
<td>REP/322</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Cecil Baring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2813</td>
<td>REP/322A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Cecil Baring, return to Christian Brinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2814</td>
<td>REP/323</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Princess Bibesco, return to Christian Brinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2815</td>
<td>REP/324</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Calypso Baring, return to Christian Brinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2816</td>
<td>REP/325</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Viscountess Wimbourne, return to Christian Brinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2817</td>
<td>REP/326</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Viscountess Wimbourne, in colour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2818</td>
<td>REP/327</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of The Earring (Girl at her Mirror) in Colour magazine, May-June 1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2819</td>
<td>REP/328</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Calypso Baring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2820</td>
<td>REP/328A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Calypso Baring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2821</td>
<td>REP/329</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Blue and Gold Johnson Collection 50 x 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2822</td>
<td>REP/330</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Study for Selina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2823</td>
<td>REP/330A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Study for Selina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2824</td>
<td>REP/330B</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Study for Selina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2825</td>
<td>REP/331</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lady Violet Benson 50 x 40 107 Grosvenor Road SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2826</td>
<td>REP/332</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a Study of a Head watercolour, Mrs Claude Johnson Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2827</td>
<td>REP/333</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Denise 30 x 25 532 in RA catalogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2828</td>
<td>REP/334</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of The Green Hat Johnson Collection 30 x 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2829</td>
<td>REP/335</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Euphemia, Madame Errazuris 30 x 25 owned by Mrs McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2830</td>
<td>REP/336</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Calypso and article on child portraiture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2831</td>
<td>REP/337</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2832</td>
<td>REP/338</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Goosenough 40 x 30 belonging to F Goodenough, Filkius Hall, Lechlade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2833</td>
<td>REP/339</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Princess Bibesco 30 x 25 belonging to Mrs Asquith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2834</td>
<td>REP/340</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lady Alington belonging to Lord Alington Michel Wimbourne 40 x 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2835</td>
<td>REP/341</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Madame Edwards 50 x 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2836</td>
<td>REP/342</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of an older woman in glasses seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2837</td>
<td>REP/342A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of an older woman in glasses seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2838</td>
<td>REP/342B</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of an older woman in glasses seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2839</td>
<td>REP/343</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Madame Groulitz, Madeleine, Pianist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2840</td>
<td>REP/344</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2841</td>
<td>ART/18</td>
<td>Article from Apollo: A Journal of the Arts, 'The Late Ambrose McEvoy' by Carroll Carstairs, pages 421 and 422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2842</td>
<td>REP/345</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of The Artist's Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2843</td>
<td>REP/346</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Cecil Baring, return to Christian Brinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2844</td>
<td>REP/347</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Elizabeth Asquith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2845</td>
<td>REP/348</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Vicomtesse Henri de Jauze in the possession of the Carnegie Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2846</td>
<td>REP/349</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lucie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2847</td>
<td>REP/350</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lady Gwendoline Churchill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2848</td>
<td>REP/350A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lady Gwendoline Churchill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2849</td>
<td>REP/351</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of 'Madame' at the Luxemburg Gallery, in Colour magazine May-June 1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2850</td>
<td>REP/352</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of The Hon Mrs Aubrey Herbert, 50 x 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2851</td>
<td>REP/353</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of The Countess of Lytton, return to Dr Christian Brinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2852</td>
<td>REP/354</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Hon Mrs Spender Clay 48 x 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2853</td>
<td>REP/355</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of The Gipsy page 30 of a book or magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2854</td>
<td>REP/356</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Radcliffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2855</td>
<td>REP/357</td>
<td>Reproduction of a watercolour portrait of a woman, nude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2856</td>
<td>REP/357A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a watercolour portrait of a woman, nude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2857</td>
<td>REP/358</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Derwent Wood watercolour, 1915, owned by Mrs Derwent Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2858</td>
<td>REP/359</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Study for Selina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2859</td>
<td>REP/360</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Ralli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2860</td>
<td>REP/361</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Elaine, after 1923, Return to Ms A McEvoy 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2861</td>
<td>REP/362</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Radcliffe, belonging to Brotherton?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2862</td>
<td>REP/363</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Francis McLaren return to Christian Brinton, The Players, 16 Gramercy Park, New York City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2863</td>
<td>REP/363A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Francis McLaren return to Christian Brinton, The Players, 16 Gramercy Park, New York City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2864</td>
<td>REP/363B</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Francis McLaren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2865</td>
<td>REP/363C</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Francis McLaren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2866</td>
<td>REP/363D</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Francis McLaren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2867</td>
<td>REP/363E</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Francis McLaren return to Christian Brinton, The Players, 16 Gramercy Park, New York City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2868</td>
<td>REP/363F</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Francis McLaren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2869</td>
<td>REP/363G</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Francis McLaren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2870</td>
<td>REP/363H</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Francis McLaren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2871</td>
<td>REP/364</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Pauls? Prauls? Lent by Mr Claude Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2872</td>
<td>REP/365</td>
<td>Reproduction of Silver and Grey (Mrs Charles McEvoy) 40 x 30 Manchester Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2873</td>
<td>REP/366</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Madame Groulitz, Madeleine, Pianist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2874</td>
<td>REP/367</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Honourable Mrs Edwin Montagu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2875</td>
<td>REP/368</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lydia, Johnson Collection, 30 x 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2876</td>
<td>REP/369</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Cecil Baring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2877</td>
<td>REP/370</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of The Countess of Lytton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2878</td>
<td>REP/371</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman with a fur collar and cuffs almost in profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2879</td>
<td>REP/372</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lady Gwendoline Churchill, return to Christian Brinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2880</td>
<td>REP/373</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Duchess of Marlborough, return to Christian Brinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2881</td>
<td>REP/374</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman and two children in interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2882</td>
<td>REP/374A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman and two children in interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2883</td>
<td>REP/374B</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman and two children in interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2884</td>
<td>Green book box #3 photos</td>
<td>REP/375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2885</td>
<td>REP/376</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs McCormick? McCormack? and her daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2886</td>
<td>REP/376A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs McCormick? McCormack? and her daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2887</td>
<td>REP/376B</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs McCormick? McCormack? and her daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2888</td>
<td>REP/377</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2889</td>
<td>REP/378</td>
<td>Reproduction of 'Madame'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2890</td>
<td>REP/379</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2891</td>
<td>REP/379A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2892</td>
<td>REP/380</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2893</td>
<td>REP/380A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2894</td>
<td>REP/381</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman pearl necklace and earrings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2895</td>
<td>REP/381A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman pearl necklace and earrings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2896</td>
<td>REP/382</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2897</td>
<td>REP/383</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2898</td>
<td>REP/384</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man seated in colour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2899</td>
<td>REP/385</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2900</td>
<td>REP/386</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman seated, in frame on a wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2901</td>
<td>REP/387</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in a hat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2902</td>
<td>REP/388</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in a fur coat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2903</td>
<td>REP/388A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in a fur coat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2904</td>
<td>REP/389</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2905</td>
<td>REP/389A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2906</td>
<td>REP/389B</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2907</td>
<td>REP/390</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in pearl earrings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2908</td>
<td>REP/390A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in pearl earrings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2909</td>
<td>REP/391</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in pearl earrings, slight variation of REP/390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2910</td>
<td>REP/391A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in pearl earrings, slight variation of REP/390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2911</td>
<td>REP/391B</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in pearl earrings, slight variation of REP/390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2912</td>
<td>REP/391C</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in pearl earrings, slight variation of REP/390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2913</td>
<td>REP/391D</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in pearl earrings, slight variation of REP/390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2914</td>
<td>REP/392</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman modern, low cut dress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2915</td>
<td>REP/392A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman modern, low cut dress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2916</td>
<td>REP/393</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman with a greyhound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2917</td>
<td>REP/394</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Duchess of Marlborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2918</td>
<td>REP/394A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Duchess of Marlborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2919</td>
<td>REP/395</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman pearl necklace and earrings hand to neck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2920</td>
<td>REP/396</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2921</td>
<td>REP/397</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in a fur collared coat and hat with feather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2922</td>
<td>REP/398</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of Mrs Francis McLaren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2923</td>
<td>REP/399</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in a hat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2924</td>
<td>REP/400</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2925</td>
<td>REP/401</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2926</td>
<td>REP/402</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of an older woman in a checked jacket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2927</td>
<td>REP/402A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of an older woman in a checked jacket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2928</td>
<td>REP/402B</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of an older woman in a checked jacket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2929</td>
<td>REP/403</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in a hat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2930</td>
<td>REP/404</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2931</td>
<td>REP/405</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman, half length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2932</td>
<td>REP/406</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman standing in a frilly dress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2933</td>
<td>REP/407</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman standing in an embroidered coat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2934</td>
<td>REP/408</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of an older lady half length in a choker necklace. Mrs Rankin?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2935</td>
<td>REP/409</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of an older lady half length in a choker necklace. Mrs Rankin?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2936</td>
<td>REP/410</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Towers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2937</td>
<td>REP/410A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Towers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2938</td>
<td>REP/411</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in a pearl necklace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2939</td>
<td>REP/412</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman with shawl on one shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2940</td>
<td>REP/413</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Alice Astor by McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2941</td>
<td>REP/414</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2942</td>
<td>REP/415</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2943</td>
<td>REP/416</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2944</td>
<td>REP/417</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2945</td>
<td>REP/418</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2946</td>
<td>REP/419</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of woman standing with greyhound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2947</td>
<td>REP/420</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman. Mrs Cecil Baring. Thought to have been painted posthumously from full-length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2948</td>
<td>REP/421</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2949</td>
<td>REP/422</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Miss Jeanne Courtauld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2950</td>
<td>REP/422A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Miss Jeanne Courtauld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2951</td>
<td>REP/423</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a girl, dress slightly off shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2952</td>
<td>REP/423A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a girl, dress slightly off shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2953</td>
<td>REP/423B</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a girl, dress slightly off shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2954</td>
<td>REP/424</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Major Spencer Edwards (Miss F Spencer Edwards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2955</td>
<td>REP/425</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2956</td>
<td>REP/426</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Violet Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2957</td>
<td>REP/427</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman lent by Mrs Asquith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2958</td>
<td>REP/428</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Beatrice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2959</td>
<td>REP/429</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Akers-Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2960</td>
<td>REP/429A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Akers-Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2961</td>
<td>REP/430</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a Girl in Riding Clothes 40 x 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/431</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Honourable Mrs Aubrey Herbert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/431A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Honourable Mrs Aubrey Herbert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/431B</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Honourable Mrs Aubrey Herbert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/432</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Viscountess Wimborne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/433</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in a fur coat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/434</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Siana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/435</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Countess of Lytton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/436</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait sketch of a man in pencil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/437</td>
<td>Reproduction of a print of Elizabeth Asquith 1916 by John Singer Sargent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/438</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Akers-Douglas in Colour magazine April 1921 page 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/439</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lady Wimborne in Harper's Bazaar January 1931 page 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/440</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Major Spencer Edwards watercolour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/441</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Robert McCalmont in The Ladies' Field, Saturday 31st May 1919 Vol LXXXV no. 1107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LET/814/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs A Bazell from Richard Seddan director. Graves Art Gallery Sheffield, 14th July 1948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/442</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a girl seated, short hair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/443</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of two children seated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/444</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/445</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a little boy with a parrot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/445A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a little boy with a parrot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/445B</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a little boy with a parrot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/445C</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a little boy with a parrot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Library No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2983</td>
<td>REP/446</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man in a fur hat, watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2984</td>
<td>REP/446A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man in a fur hat, watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2985</td>
<td>REP/446B</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man in a fur hat, watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2986</td>
<td>REP/446C</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man in a fur hat, watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2987</td>
<td>REP/446D</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man in a fur hat, watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2988</td>
<td>REP/447</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man in a suit and tie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2989</td>
<td>REP/448</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man with a book and column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2990</td>
<td>REP/448A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man with a book and column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2991</td>
<td>REP/449</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Alfred Mildmay belonging to Baring Bros and Bishopgate 30 x 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2992</td>
<td>REP/450</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lord D'Abernon return to Christian Brinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2993</td>
<td>REP/451</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Evan Morgan, Viscount Tredegar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2994</td>
<td>REP/451A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Evan Morgan, Viscount Tredegar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2995</td>
<td>REP/452</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of The Hon Cecil Baring lent by the Hon Cecil Baring 1929 now Lord Revelstoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2996</td>
<td>REP/453</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Frederick Goodenough Filkius Hall, Lechlade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2997</td>
<td>REP/453A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Frederick Goodenough Filkius Hall, Lechlade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2998</td>
<td>REP/454</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of an older man in profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2999</td>
<td>REP/455</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man in a suit and tie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>REP/455A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man in a suit and tie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001</td>
<td>REP/455B</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man in a suit and tie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3002</td>
<td>REP/456</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Cecil Baring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3003</td>
<td>REP/457</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man with a book and column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3004</td>
<td>REP/458</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lord Alington 1923 oil 30 x 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3005</td>
<td>REP/459</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man seated with hot air balloon in picture behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3006</td>
<td>REP/460</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man holding bowler hat, crop and gloves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3007</td>
<td>REP/461</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a nude watercolour, Bought by Cardiff Museum from McEvoy exhibition there 1968-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3008</td>
<td>REP/462</td>
<td>Reproduction of portraits of Lord Revelstoke and James Ramsay McDonald, taken from unknown magazine page 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3009</td>
<td>REP/463</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lord Revelstoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3010</td>
<td>REP/464</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man holding bowler hat, crop and gloves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3011</td>
<td>REP/464A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man holding bowler hat, crop and gloves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3012</td>
<td>REP/465</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man in a bow tie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3013</td>
<td>REP/466</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Sir Johnston Forbes Robertson, sent in by T. Martin Wood March 1917, 30 x 25, belonging to the Viscouness Cowdray, 16 Carlton House Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3014</td>
<td>REP/466A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Sir Johnston Forbes Robertson, sent in by T. Martin Wood March 1917, 30 x 25, belonging to the Viscouness Cowdray, 16 Carlton House Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3015</td>
<td>REP/467</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Commander A W Buckle, DSO, RNVR, 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3016</td>
<td>REP/468</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3017</td>
<td>REP/469</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3018</td>
<td>REP/470</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man seated, pencil drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3019</td>
<td>REP/471</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of 'The Engraving'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020</td>
<td>REP/472</td>
<td>Reproduction of 'On a Balcony'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021</td>
<td>REP/472A</td>
<td>Reproduction of 'On a Balcony'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3022</td>
<td>REP/472B</td>
<td>Reproduction of 'On a Balcony'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3023</td>
<td>REP/473</td>
<td>Reproduction of 'Waterloo Bridge from the Adelphi'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3024</td>
<td>REP/473A</td>
<td>Reproduction of 'Waterloo Bridge from the Adelphi'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3025</td>
<td>REP/474</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of James Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3026</td>
<td>REP/475</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a boy profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>REP/475A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a boy profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3028</td>
<td>REP/475B</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a boy profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3029</td>
<td>REP/476</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lord Ivor Churchill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030</td>
<td>REP/477</td>
<td>Reproduction of Aldbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031</td>
<td>REP/478</td>
<td>Reproduction of Pillbox 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3032</td>
<td>REP/479</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man decorated with medals including star of the garter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3033</td>
<td>REP/479A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man decorated with medals including star of the garter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3034</td>
<td>REP/479B</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man decorated with medals including star of the garter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3035</td>
<td>REP/480</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3036</td>
<td>REP/481</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Major Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3037</td>
<td>REP/482</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Captain Nasmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3038</td>
<td>REP/483</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Sir James Taggart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3039</td>
<td>REP/484</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Brigadier-General B C Freyberg, VC, DSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3040</td>
<td>REP/485</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Commander Buckle V.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3041</td>
<td>REP/486</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a soldier seated, watercolour, painted at the front 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3042</td>
<td>REP/487</td>
<td>Reproduction of portraits by Augustus John and Ambrose McEvoy unknown magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3043</td>
<td>REP/488</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3044</td>
<td>REP/488A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3045</td>
<td>REP/489</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man. On reverse: William C. Moog 21 Sherman Place, Jersey City, NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3046</td>
<td>REP/490</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait by John Carrall New York 1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3047</td>
<td>REP/491</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lady Wimborne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3048</td>
<td>REP/492</td>
<td>Reproduction of The Tattoo Tate Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3049</td>
<td>PHO/14</td>
<td>Sepia photograph of boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3050</td>
<td>REP/493</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lady Sybil Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3051</td>
<td>REP/494</td>
<td>Reproduction of Aldbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3052</td>
<td>REP/495</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Sampson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3053</td>
<td>REP/496</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Noel Coward?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3054</td>
<td>REP/497</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Miss Tanis Guinness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3055</td>
<td>REP/498</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man in white with golf club?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3056</td>
<td>REP/498A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man in white with golf club?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3057</td>
<td>REP/498B</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man in white with golf club?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3058</td>
<td>REP/498C</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man in white with golf club?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3059</td>
<td>REP/499</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of two children in dungarees with a fishing rod, 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3060</td>
<td>REP/499A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of two children in dungarees with a fishing rod, 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061</td>
<td>REP/500</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Mrs Hermann Lebus and children, 6 Kensington Palace Gardens, large life size, 100 x 78, catalogue RA 464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3062</td>
<td>REP/501</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man, tennis player?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3063</td>
<td>REP/502</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Fifi Schuster daughter of Captain Schuster Jan 1919, belonging to Captain Schuster, watercolour, catalogue RA 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3064</td>
<td>REP/503</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of mother and daughter sitting outside by a river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3065</td>
<td>REP/504</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of The Children of the Earl of Granard, Lady Moira and Lady Eileen Forbed 30 x 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3066</td>
<td>NOT/102</td>
<td>Project for a &quot;Life and Times of Ambrose McEvoy A.R.A. (1878-1927)&quot; by Viscount Chilston 3 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3067</td>
<td>NOT/103</td>
<td>Project for a &quot;Life and Times of Ambrose McEvoy A.R.A. (1878-1927)&quot; by Viscount Chilston 3 pages, with corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3068</td>
<td>LET/815/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna Bazell (McEvoy) from Anthony B. Lousada, 16th May 1972, Saddlers' Hall, Gutter Lane, Cheapside, EC2V 6BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3069</td>
<td>LET/816</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy's mother from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3070</td>
<td>LET/817</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy's mother from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3071</td>
<td>LET/818/1925</td>
<td>Letter to Charlie McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 18th November 1925, Charlie at 8 Darlington Place, Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3072</td>
<td>LET/819</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Tuesday 18th April, Hinchingbrooke, Huntingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3073</td>
<td>LET/820</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date or address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3074</td>
<td>LET/821</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy's mother from Ambrose McEvoy, no date or address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3075</td>
<td>LET/822</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Enid Lawson, 29th June, no year, The Biltmore New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3076</td>
<td>LET/823/1918</td>
<td>Transcript of a letter to Captain Campbell from Walcott Comm. R.N. Admiralty Rep., 16th October 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3077</td>
<td>LET/824/1919</td>
<td>Transcript of a letter to Yockney from Ambrose McEvoy, 17th March 1919, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3078</td>
<td>LET/825/1919</td>
<td>Transcript of a letter to Yockney from Ambrose McEvoy, 12th October 1919, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3079</td>
<td>LET/826</td>
<td>Transcript of a letter to Comm. Walcott from Ambrose McEvoy, no date or address. Also notes on dates of his attachment to the Marines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3080</td>
<td>LET/827</td>
<td>Transcript of a letter to Commander Walcot from Ambrose McEvoy, no date no address.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3081</td>
<td>LET/828/1918</td>
<td>Transcript of a letter to Mr Yockney from Ambrose McEvoy, 4th August 1918, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3082</td>
<td>LET/829</td>
<td>Transcript of two letters: To Commander Walcot from Ambrose McEvoy undated, no address and To Commander Walcot from Nasmith, 15th October 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3083</td>
<td>NOT/104/1971</td>
<td>Note by Anna, 21st July 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3085</td>
<td>ART/19/1927</td>
<td>Obituary of Ambrose McEvoy, An Appreciation by D'A, The Times, Wednesday 19th January 1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3086</td>
<td>LET/830/1973</td>
<td>Letter to Eric Chilston from Anna McEvoy (Mrs Bazell), Chilston Park, Sandway, nr Maidstone, Kent, 15th June 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3087</td>
<td>NOT/105</td>
<td>Note on papers of William Rothenstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3088</td>
<td>LET/831</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (possibly 1911) or address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3089</td>
<td>LET/832</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (possibly 1911) or address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3090</td>
<td>LET/833</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date (possibly 1911) or address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3091</td>
<td>LET/834</td>
<td>Envelope Mrs McEvoy, Abbotsleigh, Freshford, Bath 1911?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3092</td>
<td>LET/835</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 22nd February 1913, 42 South Street Torrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3093</td>
<td>LET/836</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Johnson from Ambrose McEvoy, Tuesday, no date, possibly 1922, 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3094</td>
<td>LET/837</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Johnson from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, possibly 1922, 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3095</td>
<td>LET/838</td>
<td>Letter to Wigs (Claude Johnson) from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, possibly 1920, 222 West 59th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3096</td>
<td>LET/839/1922</td>
<td>Envelope addressed to Mrs Claude Johnson, Villa Vita, Kingsdown, Near Deal, England, 14th August? 1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3098</td>
<td>PHO/15</td>
<td>Photograph of an old man seated in a garden taking tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3099</td>
<td>BOO/1</td>
<td>Ambrose McEvoy extract taken from “Modern English Painters: Sickert to Smith” by John Rothenstein pages 203-211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Shelfmark</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3100</td>
<td>LET/841</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to The Viscount Chilston, Chilston Park, Sandway, Maidstone, Kent, apparently contained McEvoy's letters from War front 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3101</td>
<td>LET/842/1975</td>
<td>Letter to Lord Chilston from Mary Taubman, 18th April 1975, 10 The Polygon, Clifton, Bristol 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3103</td>
<td>DOC/59</td>
<td>Invoice Electroprints: A. Ambrose McEvoy, 12 letters to Sir Wm. Rothenstein, 10th January 1974, $3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3104</td>
<td>LET/844</td>
<td>Letter to Eric Chilston from unknown sender, 5th September no year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3105</td>
<td>NOT/106</td>
<td>Notes in French Ambrose McEvoy and Luxembourg Gallery. Reproduction of Madame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3106</td>
<td>LET/845/1971</td>
<td>Transcript of a letter to Mrs Pollen (Daphne Baring) from R.H. Wilenski, Maldah, Institute Road, Marlow-on-Thames, Bucks. 16th July 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3107</td>
<td>LET/846/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from R.H. Wilenski, Maldah, Institute Road, Marlow-on-Thames, Bucks. 16th July 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3108</td>
<td>NOT/107</td>
<td>Chapter 3 - 3 pages of biography on McEvoy written by Anna McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3109</td>
<td>LET/847</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell (Anna McEvoy) from Diana Cooper, no date, Chateau de St Firmin, Vineuil, Oise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3110</td>
<td>ART/20</td>
<td>Obituary of Ambrose McEvoy, 'Death of Mr A. McEvoy. Famous Portrait Painter. Pneumonia’ unknown newspaper, day after McEvoy's death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3111</td>
<td>DRA/732</td>
<td>Sketches on Chelsfield House, Chelsfield, Kent headed paper of 5 children's head portraits. Francis (girl) the eldest 13, Isabel 10, Susan, 9, Nicholas 4, Edward 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3112</td>
<td>ART/21</td>
<td>Death announcement, Birmingham Gazette, Birmingham, 5th January 1927, Mr A McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3113</td>
<td>LET/848</td>
<td>Letter to Anna Bazell (McEvoy) from Daisy Legge, with recollections of Ambrose McEvoy painting her portrait. 10th February, no date, The Alexander Hotel, Harrington Gardens, SW7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3114</td>
<td>NOT/108</td>
<td>Notes about the wedding of McEvoy and Mary Spencer Edwards. Unknown writer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3115</td>
<td>NOT/109</td>
<td>Notes on Naked Truth by Clare Sheridan, 1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3116</td>
<td>POS/528</td>
<td>Postcard of a photograph of a man painting a girl on a horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3117</td>
<td>LET/849/1971</td>
<td>Letter to The Viscount Chilston from Paul Laib photographer. 6th October 1971, 3 Thistle Grove, Fulham Road, South Kensington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3118</td>
<td>ART/22/1971</td>
<td>Article of exhibition of Edna Clarke Hall's work at d'Offay Couper Gallery. 2nd October 1971, Daily Telegraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3120</td>
<td>LET/851/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Sybil, La Tourelle, Sheath Lane, Oxshott surrey, 9th August 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3121</td>
<td>ART/23</td>
<td>Article on Claiming Exemption, unknown newspaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3122</td>
<td>LET/852/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Monica L. Cree, Little Chowne, Croft Road, Crowborough, Sussex, 26th June 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3123</td>
<td>LET/853/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Eric Chilston from Anna McEvoy (Mrs Bazell) 7 Elm Park Road, Chelsea, 17th June 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3124</td>
<td>NOT/110</td>
<td>List of works by Ambrose McEvoy possibly to be used for biography Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3125</td>
<td>NOT/111</td>
<td>List of sittings for 2nd January, Ambrose McEvoy's handwriting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3126</td>
<td>LET/854/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Eric Chilston from Anna McEvoy, 9th September 1971, 7 Elm Park Road Chelsea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3127</td>
<td>DOC/60/1971</td>
<td>Permission to reproduce image of Alcock by Ambrose McEvoy, National Portrait Gallery, 21st December 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3128</td>
<td>NOT/112</td>
<td>Note Reggie Cockburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3129</td>
<td>NOT/113</td>
<td>Handwritten notes on works by McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3130</td>
<td>LET/855/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Eric Chilston from Basil Jennings (uncle), 25th October 1971, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3131</td>
<td>LET/856/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Eric Chilston from Basil Jennings (uncle), 27th October 1971, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3133</td>
<td>NOT/115</td>
<td>Notes on 'Augustus John' Vol I The Years of Innocence, Michael Holroyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3134</td>
<td>LET/857/1946</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Hett (Anna McEvoy) from Charles Cheston, 3rd December 1946, Hillside Cottage, Polstead, Colchester. With recollections of McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3135</td>
<td>NOT/116</td>
<td>Excerpt of writing of 'Wigs' on 5th January 1921, a letter mainly about Marcel Dupre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3136</td>
<td>NOT/117</td>
<td>List of works by Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3137</td>
<td>NOT/118/1971</td>
<td>Reminiscences of Edna Clarke Hall (Edna Waugh) now aged 92, given to Anna when she asked her on 7th November 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3142</td>
<td>LET/861/1973</td>
<td>Letter to Lord Chilston from Belinda Loftus, Department of Art, Imperial War Museum, 30th April 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3143</td>
<td>LET/862/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from R.H. Wilenski, Maldah, Institute Road, Marlow-on-Thames, Bucks. 6th May 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3144</td>
<td>NOT/120</td>
<td>Extract taken from R.H. Wilenski's book 'English Painting'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3146</td>
<td>ART/24/1908</td>
<td>Article from the Confederate Veteran, (Charles) Ambrose McEvoy, inventor, vol 16, 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3147</td>
<td>LET/863/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Viscount Chilston from Donald Lammers, Department of History, University of Waterloo, Ontario Canada, 1st June 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DocID</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3148</td>
<td>LET/864</td>
<td>Letter to Charles McEvoy from Bo (Ambrose McEvoy) no date, 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3149</td>
<td>LET/865</td>
<td>Letter to Charles McEvoy from Bo (Ambrose McEvoy) no date, 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3150</td>
<td>LET/866</td>
<td>Letter to Charlie McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3151</td>
<td>LET/867</td>
<td>Letter to Charlie McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3152</td>
<td>ART/25/1973</td>
<td>To the Life' by Marina Veasey, article about Sickert in the Sunday Telegraph, 3rd June 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3153</td>
<td>ART/26</td>
<td>&quot;Genius' from a slum' by H.D. Ziman unknown newspaper. Article about Mark Gertler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3155</td>
<td>ART/28</td>
<td>Obituary of Captain Charles Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3156</td>
<td>ART/29</td>
<td>Obituary of Captain Charles Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3157</td>
<td>ART/30</td>
<td>Obituary of Captain Charles Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3158</td>
<td>NOT/122</td>
<td>Notes on obituary of Captain Charles Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3159</td>
<td>NOT/123</td>
<td>Typed notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3160</td>
<td>ART/31</td>
<td>R. H. Wilenski on Ambrose McEvoy - A Painter of Romantic Visions, Woman's Journal, September, Chip Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3161</td>
<td>ART/32</td>
<td>Gladys Cooper' by Sheridan Morley, unknown newspaper, no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3162</td>
<td>LET/868/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell (Anna McEvoy) from I.E. Tregarthen Jenkin, Secretary at the Slade School of Fine Art, UCL, Gower Street, London, 26th April 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3163</td>
<td>LET/869/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Eric Chilston from Anna McEvoy, 14th June 1971, 7 Elm Park Road Chelsea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3164</td>
<td>NOT/124</td>
<td>Handwritten quote, probably written by Eric Chilston, quote from Ambrose McEvoy's letter?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3165</td>
<td>NOT/125</td>
<td>Chilston notes on McEvoy and his portraits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3166</td>
<td>LET/870/1973</td>
<td>Draft letter to Basil Dean, 17th July 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3167</td>
<td>NOT/126</td>
<td>List of oil paintings by Ambrose McEvoy selected as being possibly for use as illustrations to biography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3168</td>
<td>REP/505</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Charles McEvoy by Augustus John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3169</td>
<td>ART/33</td>
<td>Mr Snowden as the Hero of a German. Gracie Fields in a Talkie' The Evening News, 10th July 1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3170</td>
<td>PHO/16</td>
<td>Photograph of Ambrose McEvoy painting a portrait of a woman in profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3171</td>
<td>LET/871</td>
<td>Letter to Eric Chilston from Anna McEvoy, Tuesday, no date, 7 Elm Park Road Chelsea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3172</td>
<td>LET/872/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Eric Chilston from Anna McEvoy, 24th August 1971, 7 Elm Park Road Chelsea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3173</td>
<td>LET/873</td>
<td>Letter to Charlie McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3174</td>
<td>LET/874/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Eric Chilston from Anna McEvoy, 4th August 1971, 7 Elm Park Road London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3175</td>
<td>LET/875</td>
<td>Letter to Eric Chilston from Anna McEvoy, Sunday no date, 7 Elm Park Road London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3176</td>
<td>LET/876/1913</td>
<td>Copy of a letter from Ambrose McEvoy to Basil Jennings-Bramly (brother of Amy, Lady Chilston) 10th August 1913, 54 Trumpington Street, Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3177</td>
<td>LET/877</td>
<td>Letter to Eric Chilston from Anna McEvoy, Sunday no date, 7 Elm Park Road London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3178</td>
<td>LET/878/1974</td>
<td>Letter to Lord Chilston from Mary Taubman, 21st May 1974, 10 The Polygon, Clifton, Bristol 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3179</td>
<td>LET/879/1974</td>
<td>Letter to Viscount Chilston from Cathrow Martin 22nd April 1974, Flat 17 Baronsmede, 17 Branksome Wood Road, Bournemouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3180</td>
<td>NOT/127</td>
<td>Pages 5-10 handwritten notes. Chilston?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3181</td>
<td>NOT/128/1923</td>
<td>Notebook on artists, Ambrose MCEvoy 20th January 1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3183</td>
<td>BOO/2</td>
<td>The Great Stepping-Stones in Europe of Sculpture and Painting from the Fifth Century before Christ, Until the Middle of the Nineteenth Century after Christ, Compiled and Annotated by Ambrose McEvoy published by The Medici Society, Ltd. London, 1922. Unpublished, handwritten book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3184</td>
<td>NOT/129</td>
<td>Notes for Preface, book by McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3185</td>
<td>NOT/130</td>
<td>Typed notes on different artworks from 2500BC, Assyrian Basreliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3186</td>
<td>NOT/131</td>
<td>Typed notes on different artworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3187</td>
<td>NOT/132</td>
<td>Typed notes on different artworks from 2500BC, Assyrian Basreliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3188</td>
<td>NOT/133</td>
<td>Book notes McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3189</td>
<td>NOT/134</td>
<td>Notes B-M for McEvoy book. Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3190</td>
<td>NOT/135</td>
<td>Book notes McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3191</td>
<td>NOT/136</td>
<td>Notes for Preface, book by McEvoy, earlier version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3192</td>
<td>NOT/137</td>
<td>Notes for Preface, book by McEvoy, earlier version, handwritten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3193</td>
<td>Large grey archive box - Exhibition catalogues and misc notes. Folder: Chilston</td>
<td>Double sided sketch: watercolour of a woman against a window in interior, reverse pencil landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3194</td>
<td>DRA/733</td>
<td>Double sided sketch: watercolour of women, one seated one standing, castle landscape in background, reverse pencil study of child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document No.</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3200</td>
<td>LET/885/1974</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell (Anna McEvoy) from Cathrow Martin 30th April 1974, Flat 17 Baronsmede, 17 Branksome Wood Road, Bournemouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3201</td>
<td>LET/886/1975</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell (Anna McEvoy) from Devonshire, Chatsworth, Bakewell, Derbyshire, 19th July 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3202</td>
<td>LET/887/1975</td>
<td>Letter to Duke of Devonshire from Anna Bazell (McEvoy), 22nd July 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3203</td>
<td>LET/888/1964</td>
<td>Letter to Anna Bazell (McEvoy) from Sothebys, 7th October 1964, 34 and 35 New Bond Street, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3204</td>
<td>EXH/19/1964</td>
<td>Sales catalogue, Modern British Drawings Paintings and Sculpture, Wednesday 22nd July 1964, Sotheby &amp; Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3205</td>
<td>EXH/20/1964</td>
<td>Sales catalogue Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Paintings and Drawings, Wednesday 10th June 1964, Sotheby &amp; Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3207</td>
<td>EXH/22/1933</td>
<td>Works by Orpen, McEvoy, Ricketts, 4th April-13th May 1933, City of Manchester Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3208</td>
<td>EXH/23/1964</td>
<td>Sales catalogue, English and Continental Prints and Drawings Paintings and Sculpture c.1850-c.1950, 13th July 1964, Christie's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3209</td>
<td>EXH/24</td>
<td>Some British Women Painters, The Art Exhibitions Bureau, 23 Albemarle Street, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3210</td>
<td>EXH/25/1946</td>
<td>A Collection of Contemporary English Painting, Tate Gallery 1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Docket</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3213</td>
<td>EXH/28/1957</td>
<td>The Rhodes National Gallery, Souvenir Catalogue, Panorama of European Painting, Inaugural Exhibition 16th July-1st September 1957, Rembrandt to Picasso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3216</td>
<td>EXH/30/1954</td>
<td>The Observer presents The Diaghilev Exhibition from the Edinburgh Festival 1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3219</td>
<td>NOT/138</td>
<td>List of works by Ambrose McEvoy at Manchester Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3220</td>
<td>Large grey archive box - Exhibition catalogues and misc notes. Folder: Knoedler Gallery</td>
<td>EXH/32/1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3221</td>
<td>EXH/33/1936</td>
<td>Exhibition of Portraits by Mary McEvoy 12th March-4th April 1936, Knoedler &amp; Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3222</td>
<td>Large grey archive box - Exhibition catalogues and misc notes. Folder: Jackson Art Gallery Manchester</td>
<td>EXH/34/1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3223</td>
<td>EXH/35/1927</td>
<td>Chas. A. Jackson's Galleries, Manchester, An Exhibition of Watercolor Drawings by Ambrose McEvoy, Tuesday 18th October 1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3224</td>
<td>NOT/139</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3225</td>
<td>DOC/61/1933</td>
<td>Credit receipt, Dr to Chas. A. Jackson, Dealer in Works of Art, Manchester, Mrs Ambrose McEvoy. 19th October 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3226</td>
<td>LET/890/1933</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy (Mary) from Charles A. Jackson, 24th October 1933, Art Dealer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3227</td>
<td>Large grey archive box - Exhibition catalogues and misc notes. Folder: Carlisle</td>
<td>EXH/36/1928 Corporation Art Gallery, Tullie House, Carlisle, Annual Exhibition of Pictures, 2nd August-1st September 1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3230</td>
<td></td>
<td>INV/7 Invitation to Exhibition of Watercolours by Ambrose McEvoy private view, The Leicester Galleries, 13th April 1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3231</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/891/1928 Letter to Mrs McEvoy (Mary) from Encyclopaedia Britannica, 7th November 1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3232</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXH/38/1930 Exhibition of Paintings and Watercolours by Charles Conder and Ambrose McEvoy, Beaux Arts Gallery, 10th November-6th December 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3233</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXH/39/1922 Ambrose McEvoy, Portraits, 18th May 1922, Duveen Brothers, 20 Place Vendome, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3234</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXH/40/1927 Chas. A. Jackson's Galleries, Manchester, An Exhibition of Watercolor Drawings by Ambrose McEvoy, Tuesday 18th October 1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3235</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT/140 Ambrose McEvoy, list of works, when painted and exhibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>Large grey archive box - Exhibition catalogues and misc notes. Folder: Misc. a) persons for PV cards,b) ideas, c)facts v prices of some pictures</td>
<td>NOT/141/1974 List of Paintings by Ambrose McEvoy requested by Morley Gallery, to be loaned for an exhibition of the artist's works to be opened on Thursday 21st February 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3237</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT/142 List of works, dates, exhibitions, owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3239</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/893 Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Melita Hely-Hutchinson, 26th August, no year, Rockley Manor, Marlborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LET/894</td>
<td>3240</td>
<td>Letter to Mr/Mrs? McEvoy from Jack, no date, 18 Hyde Park Gardens, Paddington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LET/895</td>
<td>3241</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from Moyra Heywartt, 15th June, no year, 57 Seymour Street, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LET/896</td>
<td>3242</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Arthur Crossland, Bradford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LET/897/1936</td>
<td>3243</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from George Humphreys-Davies, Freshwater, Clevedon, New Zealand, 15th December 1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/143</td>
<td>3245</td>
<td>Floor plan Department of Prints and Drawings, The British Museum, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/144</td>
<td>3246</td>
<td>Notes and sketch on the back of a blank postcard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LET/899/1939</td>
<td>3247</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from A. Willey, 23 Carlisle Place, Bradford, 11th January 1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/145</td>
<td>3248</td>
<td>Notes with prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LET/900</td>
<td>3249</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from unknown sender, 28th June no year, 35 Upper Brook Street, Mayfair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LET/901/1934</td>
<td>3250</td>
<td>Letter to unknown recipient from Mary McEvoy, January 1934, 107 Grosvenor Road, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LET/902/1936</td>
<td>3251</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from the Private Secretary to H.H. The Maharani Sahiba of Cooch Behar, 11th February 1936, Woodlands, Alipore, Calcutta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/146</td>
<td>3252</td>
<td>List of works with prices 6 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/147</td>
<td>3253</td>
<td>List of works with prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/148</td>
<td>3254</td>
<td>List of addresses 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/149</td>
<td>3255</td>
<td>List of Art Galleries and Museums where the pictures of Ambrose McEvoy have been shown at Loan Exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/150</td>
<td>3256</td>
<td>List of works, Carlton House Terrace Studio, Miss Pacell 1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/151</td>
<td>3257</td>
<td>List of works, watercolours and drawings, dates, owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LET/903/1971</td>
<td>3258</td>
<td>Letter to Eric Chilston from Anna McEvoy, Monday 9th August 1971, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LET/904</td>
<td>3259</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from ....? Mary de Limur, 11th December, no year, 17 Rue Berton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Folder</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3260</td>
<td>NOT/152</td>
<td>List of works, dates, exhibitions, owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3261</td>
<td>NOT/153</td>
<td>Notes on works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3262</td>
<td>NOT/154</td>
<td>Notes on works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3263</td>
<td>NOT/155</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3264</td>
<td>NOT/156</td>
<td>Notes on works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3266</td>
<td>NOT/157</td>
<td>Typed Lists of McEvoy's Oil Paintings and Watercolours. 7 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3267</td>
<td>NOT/157A</td>
<td>Typed Lists of McEvoy's Oil Paintings and Watercolours. 17 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3268</td>
<td>NOT/157B</td>
<td>Typed Lists of McEvoy's Oil Paintings and Watercolours. 4 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3269</td>
<td>NOT/158</td>
<td>List of Paintings by Ambrose McEvoy requested by Morley Gallery, to be loaned for an exhibition of the artist's works to be opened on Thursday 21st February 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3270</td>
<td>ART/35/1922</td>
<td>British Art in Paris, Mr Ambrose McEvoy's fine work, The Daily Mail Thursday 18th May 1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3271</td>
<td>ART/35A/1922</td>
<td>British Art in Paris, Mr Ambrose McEvoy's fine work, The Daily Mail Thursday 18th May 1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3272</td>
<td>Large grey archive box - Exhibition catalogues and misc notes. Folder: Leamington Art Gallery</td>
<td>List of paintings by Ambrose McEvoy available for exhibition - quoting sizes of canvases and (in case of watercolours) mounts, and also insurance = sales values. (Frame values for oil paintings separate, as see below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3273</td>
<td>LET/905/1949</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from A. Yockney, Art Exhibitions Bureau, 8 Clarges Street, Piccadilly, London, 28th June 1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3274</td>
<td>LET/906/1949</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from A. Yockney, Art Exhibitions Bureau, 8 Clarges Street, Piccadilly, London, 17th June 1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3275</td>
<td>LET/907/1949</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from A. Yockney, Art Exhibitions Bureau, 8 Clarges Street, Piccadilly, London, 5th August 1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3276</td>
<td>LET/908/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from H.G. Fletcher, Borough Librarian and Curator, Borough of Royal Leamington Spa, Public Library Art Gallery and Museum, 7th April 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3277</td>
<td>DOC/62</td>
<td>2 frame receipts and a list of frames on paintings of McEvoy, pinned together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3278</td>
<td>LET/909/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mr Fletcher from Anna McEvoy (Bazell), 17th March 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3279</td>
<td>LET/910/1949</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from H.G. Fletcher, Borough Librarian and Curator, Borough of Royal Leamington Spa, Public Library Art Gallery and Museum, 22nd August 1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3280</td>
<td>LET/911/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mr Fletcher from Anna McEvoy (Bazell), 12th April 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3281</td>
<td>LET/912/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from H.G. Fletcher, Borough Librarian and Curator, Borough of Royal Leamington Spa, Public Library Art Gallery and Museum, 15th March 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3282</td>
<td>LET/913</td>
<td>Letter to Mr Fletcher from Anna McEvoy (Bazell), no date or address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3283</td>
<td>LET/914/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from H.G. Fletcher, Borough Librarian and Curator, Borough of Royal Leamington Spa, Public Library Art Gallery and Museum, 4th March 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3284</td>
<td>LET/915</td>
<td>Letter to Mr Fletcher from Anna McEvoy (Bazell), no date or address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3285</td>
<td>LET/916/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mr Fletcher from Anna McEvoy (Bazell), 27th February 1948, 107A Grosvenor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3286</td>
<td>LET/917/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from H.G. Fletcher, Borough Librarian and Curator, Borough of Royal Leamington Spa, Public Library Art Gallery and Museum, 27th February 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3287</td>
<td>LET/918/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from H.G. Fletcher, Borough Librarian and Curator, Borough of Royal Leamington Spa, Public Library Art Gallery and Museum, 21st February 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3288</td>
<td>EXH/42/1948</td>
<td>Royal Leamington Spa Art Gallery, Paintings by Ambrose McEvoy, on exhibition until April 3rd 1948, 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3289</td>
<td>EXH/42A/1948</td>
<td>Royal Leamington Spa Art Gallery, Paintings by Ambrose McEvoy, on exhibition until April 3rd 1948, 265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3290</td>
<td>LET/919/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Miss E Tonks, 11th April 1948, The Red House, Offchurch, Leamington Spa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3291</td>
<td>LET/920/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Miss Tonks from Mrs Bazell, 12th April 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3292</td>
<td>LET/921/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Miss E Tonks, 19th April 1948, The Red House, Offchurch, Leamington Spa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3293</td>
<td>LET/922/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Miss Tonks from Mrs Bazell, 20th April 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3294</td>
<td>LET/923/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Miss E Tonks, 21st April 1948, The Red House, Offchurch, Leamington Spa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3295</td>
<td>LET/924/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Miss E Tonks, 26th April 1948, The Red House, Offchurch, Leamington Spa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3296</td>
<td>DOC/63</td>
<td>2 receipts from Borough of Royal Leamington Spa 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3297</td>
<td>LET/925/1948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Miss E Tonks, 15th June 1948, The Red House, Offchurch, Leamington Spa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3298</td>
<td>Small grey archive box: Diaries</td>
<td>DIA/3/1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3299</td>
<td>PHO/17</td>
<td>11 small photographs and negatives in envelope. No year, Mrs Hett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3300</td>
<td>DIA/4/1923</td>
<td>Miniature diary 1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301</td>
<td>DIA/5/1911</td>
<td>Small diary 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3302</td>
<td>DIA/6/1912</td>
<td>Small diary 1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3303</td>
<td>NOT/160</td>
<td>Small notebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3304</td>
<td>NOT/161</td>
<td>Address book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3305</td>
<td>NOT/162</td>
<td>Small notebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3306</td>
<td>DIA/7/1910</td>
<td>GEM' Pocket Book and Diary for 1910, one penny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3307</td>
<td>DIA/8/1926</td>
<td>Miniature diary 1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3308</td>
<td>DIA/9/1925</td>
<td>Miniature diary 1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3309</td>
<td>NOT/163</td>
<td>Notebook with daily expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310</td>
<td>DIA/10/1919</td>
<td>A5 hardback diary 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3311</td>
<td>DIA/11/1920</td>
<td>A5 hardback diary 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3312</td>
<td>DIA/12</td>
<td>Daily Engagements starting with Sunday 21st. Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3313</td>
<td>Redwood Empire Mountain Pears cardboard box. Folder: Undated A McEvoy</td>
<td>LET/926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3314</td>
<td>LET/927/1917</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy, Abbotsleigh, Freshford, 23rd July 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3315</td>
<td>LET/928</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3316</td>
<td>LET/929/1910</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 9th August 1910, writing to Abbotsleigh, Freshford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3317</td>
<td>LET/930</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Grosvenor Hotel, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3318</td>
<td>LET/931</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Chelsea Arts Club, Church Street, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3319</td>
<td>LET/932</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Honeywood House, Oakwood Hill, Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3320</td>
<td>LET/933</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3321</td>
<td>LET/934</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date or address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3322</td>
<td>LET/935</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Monday no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3323</td>
<td>LET/936</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Monday no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3324</td>
<td>LET/937</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Monday no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3325</td>
<td>LET/938</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Sunday no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3326</td>
<td>LET/939</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Tuesday no date, Midland Adelphi Hotel Liverpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3327</td>
<td>LET/940</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy, Abbotsleigh, Freshford, 26th August no year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3328</td>
<td>LET/941</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Chelsea Arts Club, Church Street, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3329</td>
<td>LET/942</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 11 Carlton House Terrace, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3330</td>
<td>LET/943</td>
<td>Letter/postcard to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy from Paris, 1911?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3331</td>
<td>LET/944</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Chelsea Arts Club, Church Street, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3332</td>
<td>LET/945</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 27th October 1919, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3333</td>
<td>LET/946</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 18th May, no year, The New English Art Club, 6 1/2 Suffolk Street, Pall Mall. Writing to c/o Mrs Dyer, 79 Baker Street, Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3334</td>
<td>NOT/164</td>
<td>List of works with dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3335</td>
<td>DIA/13</td>
<td>Daily Engagements page starting with Sunday. Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3336</td>
<td>LET/947</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Sunday no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3337</td>
<td>LET/948</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Davis from Mary McEvoy, 3rd December no year, Bourton Shivenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3338</td>
<td>LET/949</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Sunday no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3339</td>
<td>LET/950</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from D (dad?), 107 Grosvenor Road, 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3340</td>
<td>LET/951</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Tuesday no date, no address Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3341</td>
<td>LET/952</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3342</td>
<td>LET/953</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 30th October 1915, The Mouse, Bourton, Shrivenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3343</td>
<td>LET/954</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3344</td>
<td>LET/955</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3345</td>
<td>LET/956</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Chelsea Arts Club, Church Street, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3346</td>
<td>LET/957</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ursula Tyrwhitt, 19 the Glebe Blackheath, no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3347</td>
<td>LET/958</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3348</td>
<td>LET/959</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Howard Pimi?, Johannesburg Gallery, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3349</td>
<td>LET/960</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3350</td>
<td>LET/961</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Catalogue No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3351</td>
<td>LET/962</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3352</td>
<td>LET/963</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3353</td>
<td>NOT/165</td>
<td>Notes, ripped in half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3354</td>
<td>LET/964</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Westfield, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3355</td>
<td>LET/965</td>
<td>Unfinished letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3356</td>
<td>LET/966</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 19th September, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3357</td>
<td>LET/967</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3358</td>
<td>LET/968</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3359</td>
<td>LET/969</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3360</td>
<td>LET/970</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3361</td>
<td>NOT/166</td>
<td>List of works, on 107 Grosvenor Road headed paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3362</td>
<td>NOT/167</td>
<td>List of works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3363</td>
<td>LET/971</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3364</td>
<td>LET/972</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy, Freshford, Bath, 29th September 1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3365</td>
<td>LET/973</td>
<td>Letter to unknown recipient from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3366</td>
<td>LET/974</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3367</td>
<td>LET/975</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, from Hungerford, 30th September 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3368</td>
<td>LET/976</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Chelsea Arts Club, Church Street, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3369</td>
<td>LET/977</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3371</td>
<td>LET/979</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3372</td>
<td>NOT/168</td>
<td>Note, 'Bo says his pic faced south'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3373</td>
<td>LET/980</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Sunday, Aldbourne, 1910?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3374</td>
<td>LET/981</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3375</td>
<td>LET/982</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3376</td>
<td>LET/983</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy, Abbotsleigh, Freshford, 11th September 1920 from Deal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3377</td>
<td>LET/984</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3378</td>
<td>DOC/64</td>
<td>The Goupil Gallery Salon 1913, List of Works forwarded to the above Exhibition, empty form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3379</td>
<td>LET/985</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 1917, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3380</td>
<td>LET/986</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3381</td>
<td>LET/987</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3382</td>
<td>LET/988</td>
<td>Letter to unknown recipient, Madam, from unknown sender (probably Mary McEvoy), 11th September, no year, 107 Grosvenor Road, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3383</td>
<td>LET/989</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3384</td>
<td>LET/990</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Midland Adelphi Hotel Liverpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3385</td>
<td>LET/991</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3386</td>
<td>BOO/3</td>
<td>'Divine people'' (Life of Ambrose McEvoy ARA)(2nd copy) by Eric Chilston, introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3387</td>
<td>BOO/3A</td>
<td>'Divine people'' (Life of Ambrose McEvoy ARA)(2nd copy) by Eric Chilston, chapter I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3388</td>
<td>BOO/3B</td>
<td>'Divine people'' (Life of Ambrose McEvoy ARA)(2nd copy) by Eric Chilston, chapter II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3389</td>
<td>BOO/3C</td>
<td>'Divine people'' (Life of Ambrose McEvoy ARA)(2nd copy) by Eric Chilston, chapter III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3390</td>
<td>BOO/3D</td>
<td>'Divine people' (Life of Ambrose McEvoy ARA)(2nd copy) by Eric Chilston, chapter IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3391</td>
<td>BOO/3E</td>
<td>'Divine people' (Life of Ambrose McEvoy ARA)(2nd copy) by Eric Chilston, chapter V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3392</td>
<td>BOO/3F</td>
<td>'Divine people' (Life of Ambrose McEvoy ARA)(2nd copy) by Eric Chilston, chapter VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3393</td>
<td>BOO/3G</td>
<td>'Divine people' (Life of Ambrose McEvoy ARA)(2nd copy) by Eric Chilston, chapter VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3394</td>
<td>BOO/3H</td>
<td>'Divine people' (Life of Ambrose McEvoy ARA)(2nd copy) by Eric Chilston, chapter VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3395</td>
<td>BOO/3I</td>
<td>'Divine people' (Life of Ambrose McEvoy ARA)(2nd copy) by Eric Chilston, chapter IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3396</td>
<td>BOO/3J</td>
<td>'Divine people' (Life of Ambrose McEvoy ARA)(2nd copy) by Eric Chilston, chapter X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3397</td>
<td>BOO/3K</td>
<td>'Divine people' (Life of Ambrose McEvoy ARA)(2nd copy) by Eric Chilston, chapter XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3398</td>
<td>BOO/3L</td>
<td>'Divine people' (Life of Ambrose McEvoy ARA)(2nd copy) by Eric Chilston, chapter XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3399</td>
<td>BOO/3M</td>
<td>'Divine people' (Life of Ambrose McEvoy ARA)(2nd copy) by Eric Chilston, chapter XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3400</td>
<td>DOC/65</td>
<td>Lease Sir Luke Fildes KCVO, RA and others to Ambrose McEvoy. 14th February 1919. Studio on the ground floor of no. 17 Gerald Road, Eaton Square in the County of Middlesex. Term commences 25th December 1918. Four years less three days, expired 26th September 1923. Rent £110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3401</td>
<td>LET/992</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3402</td>
<td>LET/993</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3403</td>
<td>LET/994</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3404</td>
<td>LET/995</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3405</td>
<td>LET/996</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3406</td>
<td>LET/997</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3407</td>
<td>LET/998</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3408</strong></td>
<td>LET/999</td>
<td>Envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy, Abbottsleigh, Freshford, 16th August 1919 posted from Deal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3409</strong></td>
<td>LET/1000/1926</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy (Ambrose's mother) from Mary McEvoy, sent to Mrs McEvoy, 8 Darlington Street, Bath, 13th December 1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3410</strong></td>
<td>DOC/66</td>
<td>September 1923, Mrs H.M.A. Ward and A.A. McEvoy esq, Schedule of Repairs required in respect of the covenants of the lease dated 14th February 1919 of the premises described as Ground Floor Studio Nos 17 and 17A Gerald Road, Chelsea to A.A. McEvoy esq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3411</strong></td>
<td>LET/1001/1919</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Lord Sandwich, Hinchingbrooke, Huntington, 24th September 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3412</strong></td>
<td>LET/1002/1919</td>
<td>Letter of introduction to Mrs Phipps from Alice Wimbourne, December 1919, Wimbourne House, Arlington Street St James's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3413</strong></td>
<td>LET/1003/1923</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from G de G Griffith, Solicitor, Eaton Chambers, 60 Buckingham Palace Road, 11th October 1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3414</strong></td>
<td>LET/1004/1919</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from L.E. Beaufort, 12th October 1919, Badminton Gloucestershire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3415</strong></td>
<td>LET/1005/1919</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from John Alcock, 25th September 1919, Weybridge Works, Byfleet Road, Weybridge, Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3416</strong></td>
<td>LET/1006/1923</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from G de G Griffith, Solicitor, Eaton Chambers, 60 Buckingham Palace Road, 4th October 1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3417</strong></td>
<td>LET/1007/1923</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from G de G Griffith, Solicitor, Eaton Chambers, 60 Buckingham Palace Road, 28th September 1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3418</strong></td>
<td>LET/1008/1919</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Robinson Smith from P.G. Konody, 13th December 1919, 13 The Albany, Piccadilly. Letter introducing McEvoy for USA visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3419</strong></td>
<td>LET/1009/1919</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Lord Islington, 15th August 1919, 3 Portman Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3421</td>
<td>LET/1011/1919</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from ….Howard de Walden, 19th March 1919, 47 Portland Place, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3422</td>
<td>LET/1012/1919</td>
<td>Letter to Solon from P.G. Konody, 13th December 1919, 13 The Albany, Piccadilly. Letter introducing McEvoy for USA visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3423</td>
<td>Redwood Empire Mountain Pears cardboard box. All contained loose in scrapbook ART/59</td>
<td>Article from unknown newspaper, Artist's Artist Wife, 1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3424</td>
<td>ART/37</td>
<td>Art Exhibitions, Portraits and Landscapes, by our art critic, Morning Post London, 13th March 1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3425</td>
<td>ART/38</td>
<td>The Women's International Art Club, no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3426</td>
<td>ART/39</td>
<td>Evening Ltd, Looking at the Portraits, 1st November 1933?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3427</td>
<td>ART/40</td>
<td>The Tatler, With Silent Friends, continued. 11th March 1936, no. 1811, page 472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3429</td>
<td>ART/42</td>
<td>The Baby' from one of Mary McEvoy’s Paintings exhibited at the Chenil Galery, unknown newspaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3430</td>
<td>ART/43</td>
<td>Evening News, Tallis Street, EC4, 6th November 1941, Woman Painter Dies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3431</td>
<td>ART/44</td>
<td>Art Exhibitions, Portraits and Landscapes, by our art critic, Morning Post London, 13th March 1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3432</td>
<td>ART/45</td>
<td>Daily Telegraph August 1933, A Gifted Woman Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3433</td>
<td>ART/46</td>
<td>Portraiture of Mary McEvoy, unknown magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3434</td>
<td>ART/47</td>
<td>Mrs Mary McEvoy's Portraits, the Times, 17th March, no year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3435</td>
<td>ART/48</td>
<td>Claude Monet Exhibition, Best Work of Great Impressionist, 30 Superb Pictures, by T.W. Earp, Child Portraits, unknown newspaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3436</td>
<td>ART/49</td>
<td>The Times, 17th March 1936, Mrs Mary McEvoy's Portraits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3437</td>
<td>ART/50</td>
<td>Birmingham Post, 17th March 193?, Portraits of Women and Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3438</td>
<td>ART/51</td>
<td>Yorkshire Observer, Braford, 12th March, 1936, Delicate Technique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3439</td>
<td>ART/52</td>
<td>Morning Post, 15 Tudor Street, London, 9th November 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3440</td>
<td>ART/53</td>
<td>Portrait Painter Dies, 6th November 1941, the Star, Bouverie Street, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3441</td>
<td>ART/54</td>
<td>Mrs Frank Pershouse: A Portrait by Mrs McEvoy, The Tatler, With Silent Friends, continued. 11th March 1936, no. 1811, page 472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3442</td>
<td>ART/55</td>
<td>Morning Post, 12 Wellington Street, London, Mrs McEvoy’s Pictures, 6th November 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3443</td>
<td>ART/56</td>
<td>Evening Standard, London, 10th March 1936, Portrait Painter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3444</td>
<td>ART/57</td>
<td>The Chenil Gallery, Tribune, 8th November 1936?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3445</td>
<td>ART/58</td>
<td>Evening Standard London, 10th March 1936, Portrait Painter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3446</td>
<td>ART/59</td>
<td>Scrapbook containing articles on Mary McEvoy and her work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3447</td>
<td>ART/60</td>
<td>The Sketch, 11th March 1936, page 490. Beauty and Character by Mary McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3448</td>
<td>ART/61</td>
<td>Evening Standard, London, 6th November 1941, Mrs McEvoy, Portrait Painter, dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3449</td>
<td>DOC/67</td>
<td>Charles Ambrose McEvoy, no.2786. Victoria by the Grace of God, Charles Ambrose McEvoy of the London Ordnance Works Bear Lane Southwark in the County of Surrey hath by his petition humbly represented unto Us that he is in possession of an Invention for Improvements in firing and in giving motion to torpedoes, part of which invention, is also applicable to propelling other floating bodies, 1st August 1878. Patent on vellum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3450</td>
<td>DRA/735</td>
<td>Technical drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3451</td>
<td>DOC/68</td>
<td>Captain McEvoy, Electrician and Torpedo Engineer, 18 Adam Street, Adelphi, London. Letter of advertisement. No date. Sketch on the reverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document ID</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3452</td>
<td>LET/1013/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Charles McEvoy from JWB Ellis, Secretary for The Royal Commission on Awards to Inventors, Martlett House, Bow Street, London, 29th May 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3453</td>
<td>ESS/20/1903</td>
<td>Typed essay 'The Submarine, are our harbours safe?' by Charles Ambrose McEvoy, Daily Mail, Thursday 19th February 1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3454</td>
<td>DOC/69</td>
<td>No.12,122 A.D. 1892, Provisional Specification, Improvements in Microphone Mechanism. Captain Charles Ambrose McEvoy. Date of Application 29th June 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3455</td>
<td></td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy, 107 Grosvenor Road, London, from Orange Vaucluse, 2nd December 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3456</td>
<td>LET/1015</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3457</td>
<td>LET/1016</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Grand Café, Hotel Restaurant Colombel, Claverie, Maussane, 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3458</td>
<td>LET/1017</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Grand Café, Hotel Restaurant Colombel, Claverie, Maussane, 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3459</td>
<td>LET/1018</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Orange, Hotels de la Poste et des Princes, 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3460</td>
<td>LET/1019</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3461</td>
<td>LET/1020</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road, 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3462</td>
<td>LET/1021</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no address, 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3463</td>
<td>LET/1022</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3464</td>
<td>LET/1023</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3465</td>
<td>LET/1024</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3466</td>
<td>LET/1025</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 1917, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3467</td>
<td>LET/1026</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3468</td>
<td>LET/1027</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3469</td>
<td>LET/1028</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3470</td>
<td>LET/1029</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3471</td>
<td>LET/1030</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3472</td>
<td>LET/1031</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3473</td>
<td>LET/1032</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3474</td>
<td>LET/1033</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Bourton House, Shrivenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3475</td>
<td>LET/1034</td>
<td>Letter unknown, 34 Albert Road, Regents Park, Hamstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3476</td>
<td>LET/1035</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from ... Lousada, 16th July 1912, 10 Craven Hill Gardens, Hyde Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3477</td>
<td>NOT/169</td>
<td>Handwritten pencil notes on submarines and patents, reverse side: Chapter One, by Anna McEvoy on Life of Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3478</td>
<td>NOT/170</td>
<td>Brief outline of the Life of Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3479</td>
<td>NOT/171</td>
<td>Excerpts from &quot;The Techniques of Portrait Painting&quot; by Harrington Mann, relative to the work of Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3480</td>
<td>NOT/172</td>
<td>Quotation from British Water Colour Painting by Adrian Bury. P. 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3481</td>
<td>NOT/173</td>
<td>Suggested title: 'McEvoy, the Searcher', Outline of preface, if John agrees....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3482</td>
<td>NOT/174</td>
<td>Ambrose McEvoy by Carroll Carstairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3483</td>
<td>NOT/175</td>
<td>Typed notes for The Life of Ambrose McEvoy by Anna McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3484</td>
<td>NOT/176</td>
<td>Brief outline of the Life of Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3485</td>
<td>NOT/177</td>
<td>Chapter One, Brief outline of the Life of Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3486</td>
<td>NOT/178</td>
<td>Suggested Outline by Anna McEvoy, typed and hand written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3487</td>
<td>NOT/179</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3488</td>
<td>NOT/180</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3489</td>
<td>NOT/181</td>
<td>Suggested title: 'McEvoy, the Searcher', Outline of preface, if John agrees....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3490</td>
<td>NOT/182</td>
<td>Chapter One, Brief outline of the Life of Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3491</td>
<td>PHO/18</td>
<td>Photograph of Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3492</td>
<td>PHO/19</td>
<td>Photograph of portrait on easel in studio, woman standing, 9841 (255)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3493</td>
<td>PHO/20</td>
<td>Photograph of portrait on easel of Captain Nasmith, 9799 (122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3494</td>
<td>PHO/21</td>
<td>Photograph of portrait on easel in studio, woman standing half length, 9780 (122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3495</td>
<td>PHO/22</td>
<td>Photograph of Silver and Grey on easel, 8178 (935)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3496</td>
<td>PHO/23</td>
<td>Photograph of portrait of woman seated, hand raised 9793 (122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3497</td>
<td>PHO/24</td>
<td>Photograph of portrait of woman in toga ish dress with hair up, on easel 8458 (847)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3498</td>
<td>DOC/70</td>
<td>Ambrose McEvoy and Claude Johnson Esq, Agreement for hire of picture 'Lydia'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3499</td>
<td>LET/1036/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Claude Johnson, 7th January 1920, 15 Conduit Street, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500</td>
<td>LET/1037/1919</td>
<td>Letter to Aldred from Claude Johnson, 10th December 1919, 15 Conduit Street, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3501</td>
<td>LET/1038</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Claude Johnson, 16th June no year, 15 Conduit Street, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3502</td>
<td>LET/1039</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Claude Johnson, 19th October no year, 15 Conduit Street, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3503</td>
<td>REP/506</td>
<td>Reproduction of a painting of Chilston Park by Felix Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3504</td>
<td>LET/1040</td>
<td>Letter to Marie-Carmen Hett from Simon, no date, 9 Mill Road, Henham, Nr. Bishop's Stortford, Hertfordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3505</td>
<td>PHO/25</td>
<td>Black and white photograph/x-ray? Of painting. Made by the Courtauld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3506</td>
<td>PHO/26</td>
<td>Black and white photograph/x-ray? Of painting. Made by the Courtauld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3507</td>
<td>PHO/27</td>
<td>Black and white photograph/x-ray? Of painting. Made by the Courtauld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3508</td>
<td>PHO/28</td>
<td>Black and white photograph/x-ray? Of painting. Made by the Courtauld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3509</td>
<td>PHO/29</td>
<td>Black and white photograph/x-ray? Of painting. Made by the Courtauld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3510</td>
<td>PHO/30</td>
<td>Black and white photograph/x-ray? Of painting. Made by the Courtauld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3511</td>
<td>PHO/31</td>
<td>Black and white photograph/x-ray? Of painting. Made by the Courtauld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3512</td>
<td>LET/1041/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 15th June 1972, Chilston Park, Sandway, Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3513</td>
<td>LET/1042/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 3rd July 1972, Chilston Park, Sandway, Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3514</td>
<td>LET/1043/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 12th July 1972, Chilston Park, Sandway, Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3515</td>
<td>LET/1044/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 18th August 1972, Chilston Park, Sandway, Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3516</td>
<td>LET/1045/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 5th July 1972, Chilston Park, Sandway, Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3517</td>
<td>LET/1046/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 22nd June 1972, Chilston Park, Sandway, Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3518</td>
<td>DOC/71</td>
<td>Courtauld Institute Galleries, Conservation Record, Technical Examination, Ambrose McEvoy, 'Bridge at Le Puy'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3519</td>
<td>LET/1047</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 24th September 1917?, Addressed to Abbotsleigh, Freshford, Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3520</td>
<td>LET/1048</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address, possibly 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3521</td>
<td>LET/1049/1907</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 9th September 1907, addressed to 107 Grosvenor Road, written from Wentcote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3522</td>
<td>LET/1050</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Myles Jenson? Juinen?, no date, Cedar Corner, Elberon, New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3523</td>
<td>ART/62/1913</td>
<td>Something New', Saturday Review, 7th June 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3524</td>
<td>ART/63/1913</td>
<td>The Picture Galleries, The New English Art Club', Field, 31st May 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3525</td>
<td>ART/64/1913</td>
<td>The New English Art Club', Architect, 6th June 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3526</td>
<td>ART/65/1913</td>
<td>New English Art Club', Queen, Breams Buildings, 7th June 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3527</td>
<td>ART/66/1913</td>
<td>Art and Artists, The New English Art Club' by A.J. Finberg, 3rd June 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3528</td>
<td>ART/67/1913</td>
<td>The New English Art Club', World, 1 York Street, Covent Garden, 28th May 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3529</td>
<td>LET/1051/1918</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from A. Yockney, War Memorials, 22nd March 1918, Ministry of Information, Norfolk Street, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3530</td>
<td>LET/1052/1912</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy, c/o Mrs Merrick, 1 Princes Bdgs, Weston-Super-Mare, 3rd September 1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3531</td>
<td>LET/1053/1907</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 21st September 1907, sent to Abbotsleigh, Freshford, Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3532</td>
<td>LET/1054</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Sunday morning, no date, no address, sketch of tent on a hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3533</td>
<td>LET/1055</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Sunday morning, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3534</td>
<td>LET/1056</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Sunday morning, Westcote, Spansholt, 7th September 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3535</td>
<td>LET/1057/1907</td>
<td>Envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy, 107 Grosvenor Road, London, 6th September 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3536</td>
<td>ART/68/1911</td>
<td>The New English Art Club', The Athenaeum, 8th June 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3537</td>
<td>ART/69/1933</td>
<td>Mrs McEvoy', 7th November 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3538</td>
<td>ART/70/1912</td>
<td>Sculptors, Painters, and Gravers', 28th June 1912, The Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3539</td>
<td>POS/529</td>
<td>Postcard, blank, Labrador Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3540</td>
<td>ART/71/1912</td>
<td>Contemporary Arts Society's Purchases', 28th June 1912, Nottingham Guardian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3541</td>
<td>ART/72/1912</td>
<td>Morning Post, Strand, London, 28th June 1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3542</td>
<td>ART/73/1913</td>
<td>The New English Art Club, The Fiftieth Exhibition', 1st December 1913, The Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3543</td>
<td>PHO/32</td>
<td>Photo of a man by A.G. Tod, North Parade, Cheltenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3544</td>
<td>LET/1058/1907</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 20th August 1907, addressed to 107 Grosvenor Road, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3545</td>
<td>LET/1059</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3546</td>
<td>LET/1060</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, Bourton House, Shrivenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3547</td>
<td>LET/1061/1900</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to A.A. McEvoy, Citi Titland, Le Puy en Velay, Hte Loire, France, 6th October 1900, posted from Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3548</td>
<td>POS/530/1907</td>
<td>Postcard to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 16th March 1907, posted from France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3549</td>
<td>Redwood Empire Mountain Pears cardboard box. Folder: Chilston Book File</td>
<td>Letter to Susan Campbell from Anna Bazell (McEvoy), Reproductions, Rights and Sales, National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa, 19th October 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3550</td>
<td>LET/1062/1979</td>
<td>Letter to Anna Bazell (McEvoy) from Susan Campbell, Reproductions, Rights and Sales, National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa, 27th September 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3551</td>
<td>LET/1064/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell (Anna McEvoy) from W.G. Lees, Museum Assistant, 12th April 1972, Tate Gallery, Millbank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3552</td>
<td>NOT/183</td>
<td>R.F. Wodehouse address Canadian War Museum, Ottawa, notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3553</td>
<td>LET/1065/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna Bazell (McEvoy) from Eric Chilston, 17th February 1972, Hotel Santa Isabel, Fanchal, Madeira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3554</td>
<td>LET/1066/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna Bazell (McEvoy) from Eric Chilston, 9th February 1972, Hotel Santa Isabel, Fanchal, Madeira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3555</td>
<td>LET/1067/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna Bazell (McEvoy) from Eric Chilston, 3rd February 1972, Hotel Santa Isabel, Fanchal, Madeira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3556</td>
<td>NOT/184</td>
<td>Notes handwritten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3557</td>
<td>LET/1068/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna Bazell (McEvoy) from Eric Chilston, 20th March 1972, Chilston Park, Sandway, Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3558</td>
<td>LET/1069/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna Bazell (McEvoy) from Eric Chilston, 24th February 1972, Hotel Santa Isabel, Funchal, Madeira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3559</td>
<td>PHO/33</td>
<td>Photograph of a portrait of Girl in a Red Coat, The National Gallery, Ottawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3560</td>
<td>LET/1070/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna Bazell (McEvoy) from Eric Chilston, 2nd August 1972, Chilston Park, Sandway, Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3561</td>
<td>LET/1071/1941</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 1st September 1941, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3562</td>
<td>NOT/185</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3563</td>
<td>LET/1072/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 13th January 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3564</td>
<td>PHO/34</td>
<td>Photograph of an unfinished portrait, black and white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3565</td>
<td>NOT/186</td>
<td>List of present whereabouts of important paintings shown in the Ambrose McEvoy Exhibition at the Ulster Museum, Belfast, on May, 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3566</td>
<td>NOT/186A</td>
<td>List of present whereabouts of important paintings shown in the Ambrose McEvoy Exhibition at the Ulster Museum, Belfast, on May, 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3567</td>
<td>PHO/35</td>
<td>Photograph of a portrait of a woman, hands on hips, black and white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3568</td>
<td>PHO/35A</td>
<td>Photograph of a portrait of a woman, hands on hips, black and white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3569</td>
<td>PHO/36</td>
<td>Photograph of a portrait of a woman, hand to face, watercolour, black and white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3570</td>
<td>NOT/187</td>
<td>Note on Lord Beaverbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3571</td>
<td>LET/1073/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 15th January 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3572</td>
<td>LET/1074/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Roy Strong from Anna McEvoy, 9th December 1971, NPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3573</td>
<td>LET/1075/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 20th January 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3574</td>
<td>LET/1076/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 18th December 1971, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3575</td>
<td>LET/1077/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 9th January 1971, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3576</td>
<td>LET/1078/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 23rd December 1971, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3577</td>
<td>LET/1079/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Anna Bazell from J. Marcel Dupre, 19th December 1971, 40 Boulevard Anatole-France, 92-Meudon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3578</td>
<td>LET/1080/1971</td>
<td>Letter to The Director of the Photographic Department, Royal Academy, Burlington House, Piccadilly, London from Anna McEvoy, 19th December 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3579</td>
<td>LET/1081/1971</td>
<td>Letter to The Director of the Photographic Department, Royal Academy, Burlington House, Piccadilly, London from Anna McEvoy, 9th December 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3580</td>
<td>LET/1082/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 8th December 1971, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3581</td>
<td>LET/1083/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell (Anna McEvoy) from Roy Strong, Director, National Portrait Gallery, London, 14th December 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3582</td>
<td>LET/1084/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 7th August 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3583</td>
<td>LET/1085/1972</td>
<td>Letter to the Director of Luxembourg Gallery, Paris from Anna Bazell (McEvoy), 29th June 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3584</td>
<td>LET/1086/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Mr Ronald Tree from Anna Bazell, 29th June 1972, 123 East 79th Street, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3585</td>
<td>NOT/188</td>
<td>Typed notes in French and English, Luxembourg Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3587</td>
<td>LET/1088/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 9th June 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3588</td>
<td>LET/1089/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 5th June 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3589</td>
<td>LET/1090/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 1st June 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3590</td>
<td>LET/1091/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell (Anna McEvoy) from Julian Treuherz, 26th May 1972, City Art Gallery, Mosley Street, Manchester, M2 3JL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3591</td>
<td>LET/1092/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Mr R.F. Wodehouse from Anna Bazell (McEvoy), 1st May 1972, Curator Art Collections, Canadian War Museum, 330 Sussex Drive, Ottawa, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3592</td>
<td>LET/1093/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Anna Bazell from Mr R.F. Wodehouse, 20th April 1972, Department of Paintings, City Art Gallery, Mosley Street, Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3593</td>
<td>LET/1094/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Mr Treuherz from Anna Bazell (McEvoy), 1st June 1972, Department of Paintings, City Art Gallery, Mosley Street, Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3594</td>
<td>LET/1095/1972</td>
<td>Receipt for 5 black and white photographs, 26th May 1972, City Treasurer's Department, Town Hall, Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3595</td>
<td>LET/1096/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna Bazell (McEvoy) from Anthony B. Lousada, 16th May 1972, Saddlers' Hall, Gutter Lane, Cheapside, EC2V 6BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3597</td>
<td>LET/1098/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 27th May 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3598</td>
<td>LET/1099/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 10th May 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3599</td>
<td>LET/1100/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 20th May 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3600</td>
<td>NOT/189</td>
<td>Receipt of photograph order from City of Manchester Art Galleries, 18th May 1972?, from Julian Treuherz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3601</td>
<td>LET/1101/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna Bazell (McEvoy) from Julian Treuherz, 15th May 1972, City Art Gallery, Mosley Street, Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3603</td>
<td>LET/1103/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 27th April 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3604</td>
<td>LET/1104/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 14th April 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3605</td>
<td>LET/1105/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 3rd May 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3606</td>
<td>LET/1106/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 17th April 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3607</td>
<td>PHO/37</td>
<td>Photograph of a portrait in black and white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3608</td>
<td>PHO/37A</td>
<td>Photograph of a portrait in black and white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3609</td>
<td>PHO/38</td>
<td>Photograph of an unfinished portrait in black and white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3610</td>
<td>PHO/39</td>
<td>Photograph of an unfinished portrait of a woman in a headdress in black and white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3611</td>
<td>PHO/40</td>
<td>Photograph of a portrait of Tink Johnson, in black and white, 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3612</td>
<td>PHO/41</td>
<td>Photograph of a portrait of Madame Grovelz, 1920, in black and white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3613</td>
<td>PHO/42</td>
<td>Photograph of a portrait in black and white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3614</td>
<td>PHO/43</td>
<td>Photograph of a portrait of The Midinette 1917, property of Mrs Hugh Riddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3615</td>
<td>PHO/44</td>
<td>Photograph of a portrait of a mother and child in a window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3616</td>
<td>PHO/44A</td>
<td>Photograph of a portrait of a mother and child in a window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3617</td>
<td>PHO/45</td>
<td>Photograph of an unfinished watercolour sketch of Madame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3618</td>
<td>PHO/46</td>
<td>Photograph of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3619</td>
<td>PHO/47</td>
<td>Photograph of a portrait of a woman with her hand to her face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3620</td>
<td>LET/1107</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Daphne Baring, 20th August no date, Cray Cottage, Harpsden Wood, Henley-on-Thames, Oxen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3621</td>
<td>NOT/190</td>
<td>Crossed out notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3622</td>
<td>LET/1108/1973</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 29th November 1973, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3623</td>
<td>LET/1109/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna Bazell (McEvoy) from Donald Lammers, 24th July 1972, 248 Westcourt Place, Waterloo, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3624</td>
<td>LET/1110/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 6th September 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3625</td>
<td>LET/1111/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 22nd August 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3626</td>
<td>LET/1112/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 18th December 1971, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3628</td>
<td>LET/1114/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 12th August 1971, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3629</td>
<td>LET/1115/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 21st August 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3631</td>
<td>LET/1117/1973</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 20th February 1973, Hotel Santa Isabel, Fanchal, Madeira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3632</td>
<td>LET/1118/1973</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 12th June 1973, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3633</td>
<td>LET/1119/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 5th November 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3634</td>
<td>LET/1120/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 10th November 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3635</td>
<td>LET/1121/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 24th October 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3636</td>
<td>LET/1122/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 30th October 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3637</td>
<td>LET/1123/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 7th October 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3638</td>
<td>LET/1124/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 20th November 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3639</td>
<td>LET/1125/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 29th November 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3640</td>
<td>LET/1126/1973</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 10th February 1973, Hotel Santa Isabel, Fanchal, Madeira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3642</td>
<td>LET/1128/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell from Ciril B..., 9th July 1972, 8 Pelham Place, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3644</td>
<td>PHO/48</td>
<td>Photograph of a man in profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3645</td>
<td>LET/1130/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 25th September 1972, Chilston Park, Maidstone, Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3646</td>
<td>LET/1131</td>
<td>Letter to Eric Chilston from Basil Jennings, 22nd September, no year, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3647</td>
<td>REP/507</td>
<td>Reproduction of drawing of heads - study for etching c.1926-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3648</td>
<td>REP/508</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Viscountesse Henri de Janze (nee Phyllis Boyd) owned by Carnegie Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3649</td>
<td>REP/509</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Duchess of Marlborough 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3650</td>
<td>REP/510</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of The Hon Lois Sturt (Later Viscountess Tredegar) 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3651</td>
<td>REP/511</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of 'Miss Helen Morris' in 'London Pride' Lady Lathom, 1917, watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3652</td>
<td>REP/512</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Julia James, Madame Maurice Dollfus, Head of Fords? 40 x 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3653</td>
<td>ART/74/1919</td>
<td>Much Discussed: Some of the New 'McEvoys', The Sketch, 29th October 1919, page 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3654</td>
<td>ART/75</td>
<td>Reproduction of 'Tink', full-length, by Ambrose McEvoy, in Colour magazine, page 21, no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3655</td>
<td>REP/513</td>
<td>Reproduction of a painting/drawing of a harbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3656</td>
<td>REP/514</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a soldier, Canadian War Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3657</td>
<td>REP/515</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Madame Balsain, Duchess of Marlborough, 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3658</td>
<td>REP/516</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lady Cynthia Asquith, 1918, for Lady Howard de Walden, Watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3659</td>
<td></td>
<td>Redwood Empire Mountain Pears cardboard box. Folder: McEvoy Letters or Interviews for Attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3660</td>
<td>NOT/191</td>
<td>Note: Douglas Jerrold: The Royal Naval Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3661</td>
<td>ART/76</td>
<td>Bea Lillie loses her island claim', newspaper unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3662</td>
<td>LET/1133</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from unknown sender, Stone Cottage, Alvescot, Oxfordshire, 21st February no year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3663</td>
<td>LET/1134</td>
<td>Half a torn letter, presumably to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, date unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3664</td>
<td>LET/1135/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 26th June 1972, Chilston Park, Sandway, Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3665</td>
<td>NOT/192</td>
<td>Note Basil Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3666</td>
<td>LET/1136/1974</td>
<td>Letter to Anna Bazell (McEvoy) from Faith Culme?-Seymour, 9th April 1974, Wytherston Powerstock Bridport, Dorset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3667</td>
<td>LET/1137/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Winn from Anna Bazell (McEvoy), 13th September 1972, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3668</td>
<td>LET/1138/1972</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Anna Bazell from Alice Winn, 7th September 1972, 13 Burton Court, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3669</td>
<td>NOT/193</td>
<td>Note Mrs Mary J. McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3670</td>
<td>LET/1139/1974</td>
<td>Letter to Lord Eric Chilston from Mary Taubman, 4th June 1974, 10 The Polygon, Clifton, Bristol 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3671</td>
<td>Redwood Empire Mountain Pears cardboard box. Folder: unmarked brown folder</td>
<td>REP/517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3672</td>
<td>REP/518</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a soldier, Canadian War Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3673</td>
<td>REP/519</td>
<td>Reproduction of The Searchlight Tattoo, Wembley, Tate Gallery, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3674</td>
<td>REP/520</td>
<td>Reproduction of a self-portrait of Ambrose McEvoy with a sketchbook in glasses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3675</td>
<td>LET/1140/1919</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Irene Laurley, 26th August 1919, Villa Medici, Fiesole, Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3676</td>
<td>NOT/194</td>
<td>List of present whereabouts of important paintings shown in the Ambrose McEvoy Exhibition at the Ulster Museum, Belfast, on May, 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3678</td>
<td>LET/1142/1975</td>
<td>Letter to Anna Bazell (McEvoy) from Mr Ford Smith, 21st January 1975, Ulster Museum, Botanic Gardens, Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3680</td>
<td>LET/1144/1974</td>
<td>Letter to Anna Bazell (McEvoy) from Mr Ford Smith, 23rd July 1974, Ulster Museum, Botanic Gardens, Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3681</td>
<td>LET/1145</td>
<td>Envelope addressed to J. Ford Smith, Ulster Museum, Botanic Gardens, Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3682</td>
<td>LET/1146/1975</td>
<td>Letter to Anna Bazell (McEvoy) from Mr Ford Smith, 6th February 1975, Ulster Museum, Botanic Gardens, Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3683</td>
<td>Redwood Empire Mountain Pears cardboard box. Folder: McEvoy 1926 Approx</td>
<td>REP/521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3684</td>
<td>REP/522</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3685</td>
<td>DOC/72</td>
<td>Receipt of payment 45 shillings, for dilapidation of the ground floor studio of 17 &amp; 17A Gerald Road, Chester Square, 13th October 1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3686</td>
<td>LET/1147/1923</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from G de G Griffith Solicitors, 15th October 1923, re. 17 &amp; 17A Gerald Road, 60 Buckingham Palace Road, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3687</td>
<td>REP/523</td>
<td>Reproduction of religious scene, birth of Christ and three kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3688</td>
<td>REP/523A</td>
<td>Reproduction of religious scene, birth of Christ and three kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3689</td>
<td>LET/1148/1926</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Harold Speed, 18th October 1926, Royal Society of Portrait Painters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3690</td>
<td>LET/1149</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Ambrose McEvoy's mother from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3691</td>
<td>LET/1150/1926</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Mary H. Runnsey?, 6th June 1926, Wheatley Hills, Westbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3692</td>
<td>LET/1151/1926</td>
<td>Damaged letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Dorothy Una Ratcliffe, 19th July 1926, Laverton Grange, Kirby Malzeard, Ripon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3693</td>
<td>LET/1152</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Lord? Sandwich, 26th April, no year, Hinchinbrooke, Huntingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3694</td>
<td>LET/1153/1926</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from L.G. Duke, Director of Establishments, 16th June 1926, Board of Education, Whitehall, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3695</td>
<td>LET/1154/1926</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Reginald Hunt, Secretary, 15th March 1926, Royal Society of Painters in Watercolours, Galelry SA Pall Mall East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3696</td>
<td>LET/1155</td>
<td>Letter to Rij from Ambrose McEvoy, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road, London, probably 1926 just before McEvoy's death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3697</td>
<td>LET/1156/1975</td>
<td>Letter to Mr Ford Smith from Anna Bazell (McEvoy), 19th February 1975, Ulster Museum, Botanic Gardens, Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3698</td>
<td>Redwood Empire Mountain Pears cardboard box. Folder: yellow, marked A</td>
<td>LET/1157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3699</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/1158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3700</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT/195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3701</td>
<td></td>
<td>ESS/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3702</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT/196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3703</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/1159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3705</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/1161/1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3706</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT/197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3707</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT/198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3708</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/1162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3709</td>
<td></td>
<td>DOC/73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3710</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT/199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3711</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT/200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3712</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT/201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3713</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT/202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3714</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT/203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3715</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT/204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3716</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT/205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3717</td>
<td></td>
<td>ART/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3718</td>
<td></td>
<td>ART/78/1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3721</td>
<td></td>
<td>REP/524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry No.</td>
<td>Accession Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3722</td>
<td>NOT/206</td>
<td>Exercise book and sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3723</td>
<td>DRA/736</td>
<td>Pen and wash sketch of a soldier on a horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3725</td>
<td>LET/1164/1961</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Anna Bazell from J. Dierden, Lloyds Bank Ltd, 22nd February 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3726</td>
<td>NOT/207</td>
<td>Selected works for the piano by classical composers, Stewart Macpherson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3727</td>
<td>DOC/74</td>
<td>Probate/interitence of Charles McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3728</td>
<td>DOC/75</td>
<td>National Registration Act 1915, Arthur Ambrose McEvoy, attested, medical board 25th May 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3729</td>
<td>LET/1165/1927</td>
<td>Letter torn in half to Charlie from Douglas? Lilroy, 80 … Road, West Norwood, London, 8th June 1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3730</td>
<td>LET/1166/1929</td>
<td>Letter to the Health Department, Bath, England from Mrs C.F. McEvoy, 21st February 1929, 221-223 West Pratt Street, Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3731</td>
<td>LET/1167</td>
<td>Letter to unknown recipient from Viola G. McAvoy, Mrs William F. McEvoy, 2906 North Calvert Street, Baltimore 18 Maryland, no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3732</td>
<td>LET/1168/1939</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Ambrose McEvoy (Mary) from G.L. Lewin, 13th July 1939, c/o The Standard Bank of South Africa, 10 Clement Lane, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3733</td>
<td>LET/1169/1946</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Gibson from Anna Seccombe Hett (McEvoy), 22nd October 1946, 107A Grosvenor Road, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3734</td>
<td>LET/1170/1927</td>
<td>Letter to unknown recipient (aunt) from Sarah H. Bigsby, 6th January 1927, Kingsgate Clacton-on-sea, Essex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3735</td>
<td>PHO/49</td>
<td>Photograph of Ambrose McEvoy painting David Lloyd George? Walter Benington, 39 Brook Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3736</td>
<td>PHO/50</td>
<td>Photograph of Ambrose McEvoy in military uniform, Walter Benington, 39 Brook Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3737</td>
<td>PHO/50A</td>
<td>Photograph of Ambrose McEvoy in military uniform, Walter Benington, 39 Brook Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3738</td>
<td>PHO/50B</td>
<td>Photograph of Ambrose McEvoy in military uniform, Walter Benington, 39 Brook Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3739</td>
<td>PHO/50C</td>
<td>Photograph of Ambrose McEvoy in military uniform, Walter Benington, 39 Brook Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3740</td>
<td>Photograph of Ambrose McEvoy in military uniform, Walter Benington, 39 Brook Street</td>
<td>PHO/50D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3741</td>
<td>Redwood Empire Mountain Pears cardboard box. Folder: Beaux Arts Gallery</td>
<td>LET/1171/1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3742</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/1172/1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3743</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/1173/1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3744</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/1174/1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3745</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/1175/1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3746</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/1176/1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3747</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/1177/1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3748</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXH/43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3749</td>
<td>Redwood Empire Mountain Pears cardboard box. Folder: Letters written to various people regarding past sitters, etc.</td>
<td>LET/1178/1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3751</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/1180/1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Accession No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3752</td>
<td>Redwood Empire Mountain Pears cardboard box. Folder: Epstein, Jacob</td>
<td>ART/80/1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3753</td>
<td>Redwood Empire Mountain Pears cardboard box. Folder: Epstein, Jacob</td>
<td>LET/1181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3754</td>
<td>Redwood Empire Mountain Pears cardboard box. Folder: Epstein, Jacob</td>
<td>LET/1181A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3755</td>
<td>Note on Epstein, 1913</td>
<td>NOT/208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3756</td>
<td>Note on Epstein, 1911</td>
<td>NOT/209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3757</td>
<td>Redwood Empire Mountain Pears cardboard box. Folder: Brockhurst, Gerald L.</td>
<td>LET/1182/1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3758</td>
<td>Redwood Empire Mountain Pears cardboard box. Folder: Exhibitions - records</td>
<td>LET/1183/1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3760</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/1185/1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3761</td>
<td></td>
<td>LET/1186/1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3762</td>
<td>Redwood Empire Mountain Pears cardboard box. Folder: Preface and also notes</td>
<td>NOT/210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3763</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT/211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3764</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT/212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3765</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT/213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3766</td>
<td>NOT/214</td>
<td>Typed Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3767</td>
<td>NOT/215</td>
<td>Typed notes on art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3768</td>
<td>NOT/216</td>
<td>Numbered list of statements about art and beauty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3769</td>
<td>NOT/217</td>
<td>Typed notes on art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3770</td>
<td>NOT/218</td>
<td>Typed notes on art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3771</td>
<td>NOT/219</td>
<td>Typed notes on art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3772</td>
<td>NOT/220</td>
<td>Typed notes on art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3773</td>
<td>NOT/221</td>
<td>Appendix, original notes by Ambrose McEvoy jotted in his notebooks between 1898 and 1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3774</td>
<td>NOT/222</td>
<td>Discoveries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3775</td>
<td>NOT/223</td>
<td>Typed notes on art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3776</td>
<td>NOT/224</td>
<td>Typed notes on art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3777</td>
<td>NOT/225</td>
<td>Typed notes on art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3778</td>
<td>NOT/226</td>
<td>Typed notes on art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3779</td>
<td>NOT/227</td>
<td>Typed notes on art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3780</td>
<td>NOT/228</td>
<td>Typed notes on art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3781</td>
<td>NOT/229</td>
<td>The meaning of imitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3782</td>
<td>NOT/230</td>
<td>Typed notes on art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3783</td>
<td>NOT/231</td>
<td>Typed notes on art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3784</td>
<td>NOT/232</td>
<td>Typed notes on art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3785</td>
<td>NOT/233</td>
<td>Typed notes on art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3786</td>
<td>NOT/234</td>
<td>Typed notes on art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3787</td>
<td>NOT/235</td>
<td>Typed notes on art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3788</td>
<td>NOT/236</td>
<td>Typed notes on art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3789</td>
<td>NOT/237</td>
<td>Typed notes on art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3790</td>
<td>NOT/238</td>
<td>Typed notes on art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3791</td>
<td>NOT/239</td>
<td>Outline of Through an Artist's Eyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3792</td>
<td>Redwood Empire Mountain Pears cardboard box. Folder: Publicity File Ambrose McEvoy</td>
<td>NOT/240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3794</td>
<td>EXH/45/1935</td>
<td>City of Lincoln Corporation, Usher Art Gallery, Paintings and Drawings by Ambrose McEvoy, 27th October 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3795</td>
<td>REP/525</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Anna McEvoy by Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3796</td>
<td>NOT/241</td>
<td>Abbreviations and list of works by Ambrose McEvoy, pencil handwritten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3797</td>
<td>REP/526/1918</td>
<td>Reproduction of a sketch, Diana sitting to Mr McEvoy 1918. Original by Violet Manners, Diana’s mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3798</td>
<td>NOT/242</td>
<td>Notes on works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3799</td>
<td>LET/1187/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Eric Chilston, 5th August 1971, Chilston Park, Sandway, Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3800</td>
<td>LET/1188/1977</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Anna Bazell from Robert J. Lamb, Research Assistant, Beaverbrook Art Gallery, 25th May 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3802</td>
<td>NOT/243</td>
<td>A. McEvoy Mon, Tues, Thursday Mr Craine in basement of 19 Portman Square. (Items listed at Witt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3803</td>
<td>NOT/244</td>
<td>List of photographs of works by Ambrose McEvoy which were all taken by Laib. Sen or Laib Jun. and which it is hoped to reproduce in a biography of the artist which has just been completed by Viscount Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3804</td>
<td>NOT/245</td>
<td>Handwritten notes, draft letter 26th July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3805</td>
<td>NOT/246</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3806</td>
<td>NOT/247</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3809</td>
<td>LET/1192/1976</td>
<td>Copy of a letter to Herbert van Thal from Lord Chilston, 24th July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3811</td>
<td>ART/81/1975</td>
<td>Professor Arnold Toynbee, A great historian, The Times, 23rd October 1975, page 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3818</td>
<td>LET/1200</td>
<td>Letter to Sally Bruce-Lockhart from Eric Chilston, pencil draft, 3rd September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3819</td>
<td>LET/1201/1975</td>
<td>Letter to Sally Bruce-Lockhart from Eric Chilston, pencil draft, 26th September 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3820</td>
<td>LET/1202</td>
<td>Letter to Sally Bruce-Lockhart from Eric Chilston, no date, pen draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3822</td>
<td>NOT/248</td>
<td>The George Eliot Fellowship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3823</td>
<td>LET/1204</td>
<td>Letter to Herbert van Thal from Eric Chilston, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3827</td>
<td>LET/1208</td>
<td>Draft letter to Mr Faulkus, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3828</td>
<td>LET/1209/1976</td>
<td>Draft letter to Herbert Van Thal from Eric Chilston, 25th January 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3830</td>
<td>NOT/249</td>
<td>Telephoned van Thal, 28th June, notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3833</td>
<td>LET/1213/1976</td>
<td>Copy of a letter to Mr Falkus from Eric Chilston, 29th June 1976, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3834</td>
<td>LET/1214/1982</td>
<td>Draft letter to Mr Reinhardt, January 1982, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3839</td>
<td>LET/1219/1977</td>
<td>Letter to Mr Underwood from Harbottle &amp; Lewis solicitors, 12th July 1977, 34 South Molton Street, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3840</td>
<td>LET/1220/1977</td>
<td>Letter to Mr Stutter of Harbottle &amp; Lewis solicitors from Mr Underwood of Winckworth and Pemberton solicitors, 5th July 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3844</td>
<td>LET/1224/1977</td>
<td>Letter to Harbottle &amp; Lewis from Winckworth and Pemberton, 26th August 1977, Lord Chilston's Manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3845</td>
<td>LET/1225/1977</td>
<td>Payment to Winckworth and Pemberton for legal fees, August 1977, Lost Manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3848</td>
<td>LET/1228/1977</td>
<td>Letter to Winckworth and Pemberton from Harbottle &amp; Lewis solicitors, 13th April 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3850</td>
<td>LET/1230/1977</td>
<td>Letter to Harbottle &amp; Lewis from Winckworth and Pemberton, 14th March 1977, Lord Chilston's Manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3852</td>
<td>LET/1232/1977</td>
<td>Letter to Winckworth and Pemberton from Harbottle &amp; Lewis solicitors, Without Prejudice, 18th February 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3856</td>
<td>LET/1236/1977</td>
<td>Letter to Winckworth and Pemberton from Harbottle &amp; Lewis solicitors, Lord Chilston's manuscript, 10th January 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3857</td>
<td>LET/1237/1977</td>
<td>Letter to Lord Chilston from Winckworth and Pemberton, no date, Winckworth and Pemberton, solicitors, 41/43 Great Peter Street, Westminster, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3859</td>
<td>LET/1239</td>
<td>Letter to Mr Russell from Sally Bruce-Lockhart, 20th October, 9 Pembroke Place, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3860</td>
<td>LET/1240</td>
<td>Letter to Mr Russell from Herbert van Thal, no date, London Management, 235/241 Regent Street, London, W1A 2JT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3863</td>
<td>LET/1243/1976</td>
<td>Letter to Winckworth and Pemberton from Harbottle &amp; Lewis solicitors, Lord Chilston's manuscript, 29th October 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3864</td>
<td>LET/1244</td>
<td>Draft letter to Messrs. Harbottle &amp; Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3866</td>
<td>LET/1246/1976</td>
<td>Letter to Harbottle &amp; Lewis from Winckworth and Pemberton, 15th November 1976, Lord Chilston's Manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3868</td>
<td>LET/1248</td>
<td>Letter to Eric Chilston from Sally Bruce-Lockhart, 8th December, 9 Pembroke Place, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3869</td>
<td>LET/1249</td>
<td>Draft letter to Sally Bruce-Lockhart, 9th December 1976, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3871</td>
<td>LET/1251</td>
<td>Van Thal, notes on manuscript lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3872</td>
<td>LET/1252</td>
<td>Van Thal, notes on manuscript lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3873</td>
<td>LET/1253</td>
<td>Draft letter to Van Thal 25th June 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3874</td>
<td>ART/82/1936</td>
<td>Beauty and Character by Mary McEvoy' The Sketch, 11th March 1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3876</td>
<td>NOT/250</td>
<td>List of pictures by Mary McEvoy on 107 Grosvenor Road headed paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3877</td>
<td>NOT/251</td>
<td>Notes on Flower painting in the London Galleries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3878</td>
<td>DRA/737</td>
<td>Sketch of Emma Hamilton with dog, possibly by Mary McEvoy rather than Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3879</td>
<td>PHO/51</td>
<td>Photograph of a woman, possibly Mary McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3880</td>
<td>LET/1255/1935</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Secretary to the Editor of La Reve Moderne, 16th May 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3881</td>
<td>LET/1256/1940</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Mary McEvoy from Fred S. Field, 7th February 1940, 1 Lane Close, Dollis Hill Avenue, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3882</td>
<td>ART/83</td>
<td>Claude Monet Exhibition, Best Work of Great Impressionist, 30 Superb Pictures' by T. Earp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3883</td>
<td>LET/1257/1901</td>
<td>Letter to Miss Spencer Edwards from William Rothenstein, 7th November 1901, 1 Pembroke Cottages, Edwardes Square, Kensington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3884</td>
<td>LET/1258</td>
<td>Letter to Miss Spencer Edwards from Frederick Brown, Thursday (1901?), Thursday, 9 Netherton? Grove, Fulham Road, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3885</td>
<td>NOT/252</td>
<td>Notes on NEAC, Miss Spencer Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3886</td>
<td>ART/84</td>
<td>Several articles from 1901 NEAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3887</td>
<td>NOT/253</td>
<td>A. McEvoy 107 Grosvenor Road, Record of Pictures, notebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3888</td>
<td>NOT/254</td>
<td>Handwritten note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3889</td>
<td>REP/527</td>
<td>Portrait of Anna and baby Richard, property of Tannis Hett, by Mary McEvoy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3890</td>
<td>REP/527A</td>
<td>Portrait of Anna and baby Richard, property of Tannis Hett, by Mary McEvoy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3891</td>
<td>LET/1259</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy, incomplete, from Sam D. Bles, no date, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3892</td>
<td>REP/528</td>
<td>Portrait of a vicar, presumably by Mary McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3893</td>
<td>REP/529</td>
<td>Portrait of Michael McEvoy by Mary McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3894</td>
<td>LET/1260</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from D.M, no date, Branksome Tower Hotel, Branksome Park, Bournemouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3896</td>
<td>LET/1262/1946</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Hett (Anna McEvoy) from Hugh? Conway ....? 23rd December 1946, St Colombus Church, Long Tower, Derry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3897</td>
<td>NOT/255</td>
<td>List of names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3898</td>
<td>NOT/256</td>
<td>List of names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3899</td>
<td>REP/530</td>
<td>Sketch of an infant's head, Richard Hett, Anna's son, by Mary McEvoy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3900</td>
<td>NOT/257</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3901</td>
<td>ART/85/1913</td>
<td>Art notes', The Illustrated London News, 7th June 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3902</td>
<td>REP/531</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of John Hampson, presumably by Mary McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3903</td>
<td>LET/1263/1913</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from G.L. Joynson Hicks, 11th February 1913, no address, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3904</td>
<td>REP/S32</td>
<td>Mounted reproductions of McEvoy's 'Dieppe' and Sickert's 'Old Royal Hotel, Dieppe'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3905</td>
<td>REP/S33</td>
<td>Mounted reproductions of McEvoy's 'Madame' Musee de Luxembourg, 1914, 'La Basquaise', Mrs McFadden, Philadelphia 1913 and 'Lord Jowett' Tate 1914. Reverse: reproduction of Mrs Akers-Douglas 1916, Mrs Archibald Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3906</td>
<td>LET/1264</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Monsieur Leroudelle, 76 Rue Blanche, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3908</td>
<td>ART/86/1931</td>
<td>Article from the South Wales Echo, 23rd June 1931, 'Head of a Man' Romance of Tate Gallery Picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3909</td>
<td>REP/S33</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman in a white dress standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3910</td>
<td>REP/S34</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Viscountess Wimbourne, return to Christian Brinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3911</td>
<td>REP/S35</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lady Gwendoline Churchill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3912</td>
<td>REP/S36</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Calypso Baring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3913</td>
<td>REP/S37</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of an old man in profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3914</td>
<td>REP/S38</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Miss Daphne Crompton-Wood, belongs to Mr Crompton-Wood, Badgers Rake, Ledsham, Near Chester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3915</td>
<td>REP/S39</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man sleeping/dead, watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3916</td>
<td>REP/S40</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man, Baring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3917</td>
<td>REP/S41</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the head of the Virgin Mary?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3918</td>
<td>REP/S42</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a young woman standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3919</td>
<td>REP/S43</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3920</td>
<td>REP/S44</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Duchess of Westminster 50 x 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3921</td>
<td>REP/S45</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of the Viscountess Wimbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3922</td>
<td>REP/546</td>
<td>Reproduction of a self-portrait of McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3923</td>
<td>REP/547</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Michael McEvoy, the artist’s son, owned by the Tate Gallery, 30 x 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3924</td>
<td>REP/548</td>
<td>Small reproduction of a portrait of an old man in profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3925</td>
<td>LET/1265</td>
<td>Empty envelope Born Crudwell Wilts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3926</td>
<td>REP/549</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of an old man in profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3927</td>
<td>REP/550</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of an old man in profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3928</td>
<td>REP/551</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a young woman seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3929</td>
<td>REP/552</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Daphne Baring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3930</td>
<td>REP/553</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of The Honourable Mrs Spender Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3931</td>
<td>REP/554</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3932</td>
<td>REP/555</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lady Diana Duff-Cooper (nee Manners), painted by Ambrose McEvoy, to be exhibited at Duveen’s beginning March 2nd 1920, Famous English portrait painter, son of the inventor Charles Ambrose McEvoy and pupil of Whistler. About 50 pictures to be shown. Return to Christian Brinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3933</td>
<td>REP/556</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3934</td>
<td>REP/557</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a girl with her hands on her hips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3935</td>
<td>REP/558</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman, unfinished, watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3936</td>
<td>REP/559</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman's head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3937</td>
<td>REP/559A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman's head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3938</td>
<td>REP/560</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a young woman seated, study 1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3939</td>
<td>REP/561</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Major Spencer Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3940</td>
<td>REP/562</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Eva, daughter of Le Chevalier Carlo Albanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3941</td>
<td>REP/563</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3942</td>
<td>REP/564</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman, unfinished, watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3943</td>
<td>REP/565</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a young woman seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3944</td>
<td>REP/566</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman seated, hand to chest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3945</td>
<td>REP/567</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3946</td>
<td>REP/568</td>
<td>Unfinished portrait of a mother and child seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3947</td>
<td>REP/569</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a young woman seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3948</td>
<td>REP/570</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a young woman seated, unfinished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3949</td>
<td>REP/571</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a young woman seated and turned, watercolour sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3950</td>
<td>NOT/259</td>
<td>Chapter IX of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3951</td>
<td>NOT/260</td>
<td>Chapter XII of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3952</td>
<td>NOT/261</td>
<td>Extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston? Letters from Alice Wimbourne, typed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3953</td>
<td>NOT/262</td>
<td>Extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3954</td>
<td>NOT/263</td>
<td>Extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3955</td>
<td>NOT/264</td>
<td>Chapter II of Divine People by Eric Chilston, 2 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3956</td>
<td>NOT/265</td>
<td>Extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3957</td>
<td>NOT/266</td>
<td>Extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3958</td>
<td>NOT/267</td>
<td>Extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3959</td>
<td>NOT/268</td>
<td>Extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3960</td>
<td>NOT/269</td>
<td>Extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3961</td>
<td>NOT/270</td>
<td>Chapter VI of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3962</td>
<td>NOT/271</td>
<td>Chapter VI of Divine People by Eric Chilston, just page 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3963</td>
<td>NOT/272</td>
<td>Chapter XII of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3964</td>
<td>NOT/273</td>
<td>Chapter VII of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3965</td>
<td>NOT/274</td>
<td>Extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3966</td>
<td>NOT/275</td>
<td>Extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3967</td>
<td>NOT/276</td>
<td>Handwritten Chapter IX, Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3968</td>
<td>NOT/277</td>
<td>Chapter VII of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3969</td>
<td>NOT/278</td>
<td>Handwritten Chapter VIII, Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3970</td>
<td>NOT/279</td>
<td>Handwritten extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3971</td>
<td>NOT/280</td>
<td>Handwritten Chapter VI, Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3972</td>
<td>NOT/281</td>
<td>Handwritten Chapter VII, Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3973</td>
<td>NOT/282</td>
<td>Handwritten extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3974</td>
<td>NOT/283</td>
<td>Extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3975</td>
<td>NOT/284</td>
<td>Chapter IV of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3976</td>
<td>NOT/285</td>
<td>Handwritten Chapter XI, Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3977</td>
<td>NOT/286</td>
<td>Chapter IX of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3978</td>
<td>NOT/287</td>
<td>Chapter V of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3979</td>
<td>LET/1266</td>
<td>Empty envelope Carbon Copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3980</td>
<td></td>
<td>Redwood Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain Pears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cardboard box.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Folder: Chapter IV top copy and 1 copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOT/288</td>
<td>Author's Foreword, Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3981</td>
<td>NOT/289</td>
<td>Chapter VI of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3982</td>
<td>NOT/290</td>
<td>Handwritten Author's Foreword, Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3983</td>
<td>NOT/291</td>
<td>Handwritten Chapter VII, Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3984</td>
<td>NOT/292</td>
<td>Handwritten Chapter V, Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3985</td>
<td>NOT/293</td>
<td>Handwritten extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3986</td>
<td>NOT/294</td>
<td>Handwritten Chapter VIII, Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3987</td>
<td>NOT/295</td>
<td>Handwritten Chapter X, Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3988</td>
<td>NOT/296</td>
<td>Handwritten extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3989</td>
<td>NOT/297</td>
<td>Handwritten Chapter XI, Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3990</td>
<td>NOT/298</td>
<td>Handwritten extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3991</td>
<td>NOT/299</td>
<td>Handwritten extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3992</td>
<td>NOT/300</td>
<td>Chapter I of Divine People by Eric Chilston, page 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3993</td>
<td>NOT/301</td>
<td>Handwritten Chapter I, Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3994</td>
<td>NOT/302</td>
<td>Chapter X of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3995</td>
<td>NOT/303</td>
<td>Handwritten extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/304</td>
<td>Handwritten Chapter IX, Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/305</td>
<td>Handwritten extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/306</td>
<td>Author's Foreword, Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/307</td>
<td>Chapter IX of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/308</td>
<td>Chapter III of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/309</td>
<td>Project for a &quot;Life and Times of Ambrose McEvoy&quot; by Viscount Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/310</td>
<td>Handwritten Chapter II, &quot;Life and Times of Ambrose McEvoy&quot; by Viscount Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/311</td>
<td>Handwritten Chapter III, &quot;Life and Times of Ambrose McEvoy&quot; by Viscount Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/312</td>
<td>Handwritten Chapter IV, &quot;Life and Times of Ambrose McEvoy&quot; by Viscount Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/313</td>
<td>Handwritten Chapter V, &quot;Life and Times of Ambrose McEvoy&quot; by Viscount Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/314</td>
<td>Extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston, pages 10-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/315</td>
<td>Chapter IX of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/316</td>
<td>Extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/317</td>
<td>Handwritten extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/318</td>
<td>Chapter X of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/319</td>
<td>Chapter VI of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/320</td>
<td>Chapter V of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/321</td>
<td>Handwritten extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/322</td>
<td>Extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/323</td>
<td>Chapter VI of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/324</td>
<td>Handwritten notes on final chapter XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/325</td>
<td>Author's Foreword, Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/326</td>
<td>Chapter XIII of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/327</td>
<td>Chapter XIII of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/328</td>
<td>Note on blank business card</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/329</td>
<td>Note on blank business card</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/330</td>
<td>Ambrose McEvoy's business card</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT/331</td>
<td>Chapter IV of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4024</td>
<td>NOT/332</td>
<td>Extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4025</td>
<td>NOT/333</td>
<td>Chapter XI of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4026</td>
<td>NOT/334</td>
<td>Extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4027</td>
<td>NOT/335</td>
<td>Chapter VI of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4028</td>
<td>NOT/336</td>
<td>Handwritten chapter XIII of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4029</td>
<td>NOT/337</td>
<td>Chapter XIII of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4030</td>
<td>NOT/338</td>
<td>Handwritten chapter X of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4031</td>
<td>NOT/339</td>
<td>Handwritten notes, XII, Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4032</td>
<td>NOT/340</td>
<td>Extract from Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4033</td>
<td>NOT/341</td>
<td>Chapter XI of Divine People by Eric Chilston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4034</td>
<td>REP/572</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait, woman at a piano and a girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4035</td>
<td>ART/87</td>
<td>&quot;New Masters&quot; for Old, Gift of Seven Pictures to Tate Gallery, Daily Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4036</td>
<td>ART/88</td>
<td>The Times, Mr Ambrose McEvoy's Portraits, 1922?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4037</td>
<td>DRA/738</td>
<td>Ink drawing of figures labelled Andalusia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4038</td>
<td>ART/89</td>
<td>Professor Makaroff, with picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4039</td>
<td>ART/90</td>
<td>Article from the Manchester Disp, 3rd June, can't read year 1913? 'Private Affairs by Charles McEvoy'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040</td>
<td>PHO/52</td>
<td>Photograph of man and child outside large house, Abbotsleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4041</td>
<td>ART/91/1927</td>
<td>American Critic on British Art, Technique Not at Its Ease', Morning Post, 25th January 1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4042</td>
<td>POS/531</td>
<td>Postcard of the Kremlin, Moscow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4043</td>
<td>PHO/53</td>
<td>Photograph of a woman's head, half profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4044</td>
<td>REP/573</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a mother and child reading a book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4045</td>
<td>NOT/342</td>
<td>Speech to open Widcombe exhibition in Bath, Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4046</td>
<td>BOO/4</td>
<td>The Slade School Record 1893-1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4047</td>
<td>NOT/343</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4048</td>
<td>BOO/5</td>
<td>The Watercolours of Ambrose McEvoy' pages 55-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4049</td>
<td>NOT/344</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4050</td>
<td>LET/1267/1935</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Maurice Villain, 31st December 1935, 82 Boulevard Yourdan, Paris, 14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4051</td>
<td>DRA/739</td>
<td>Sketch of a boy with a parrot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4052</td>
<td>LET/1268/1899</td>
<td>Letter to Auntie (Ambrose McEvoy's mother?) from David Jessom, 5th July 1899, Vincent Lane, Off Vincent St., Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4053</td>
<td>NOT/345</td>
<td>Address List, Invitations sent for exhibition at Knoedler Galleries, Old Bond Street, November 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4054</td>
<td>NOT/346</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4055</td>
<td>NOT/347</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4056</td>
<td>SKE/37</td>
<td>Exercise book, sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4057</td>
<td>Redwood Empire Mountain Pears cardboard box. Thick card folder taped together: Ambrose McEvoy An Appreciation by his wife</td>
<td>NOT/348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4058</td>
<td>NOT/349</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4059</td>
<td>NOT/350</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4060</td>
<td>NOT/351</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4061</td>
<td>NOT/352</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4062</td>
<td>NOT/353</td>
<td>Typed notes, McEvoy's biography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4063</td>
<td>NOT/354</td>
<td>The Life of Ambrose McEvoy, handwritten notes on 107A Grosvenor Road headed paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4064</td>
<td>NOT/355</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4065</td>
<td>NOT/356</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4066</td>
<td>NOT/357</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4067</td>
<td>NOT/358</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4068</td>
<td>NOT/359</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4069</td>
<td>NOT/360</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4070</td>
<td>NOT/361</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4071</td>
<td>NOT/362</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4072</td>
<td>NOT/363</td>
<td>Handwritten notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4073</td>
<td>LET/1269</td>
<td>Envelope containing above, Ambrose McEvoy An Appreciation by his Wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4074</td>
<td>NOT/364</td>
<td>Notebook, Summary of McEvoy's activities 1893-1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Object Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4075</td>
<td>LET/1270/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Claude Johnson (Wigs), 30th August 1920, 18 Conduit Street, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4077</td>
<td>ESS/22</td>
<td>The meaning of Imitation, handwritten essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4078</td>
<td>NOT/366</td>
<td>The Ideal Note and Envelopes, empty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4079</td>
<td>SKE/38</td>
<td>Sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4080</td>
<td>NOT/367</td>
<td>Notebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4081</td>
<td>DRA/740</td>
<td>Ink figure sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4082</td>
<td>NOT/368</td>
<td>Note Jan 1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4083</td>
<td>ESS/23</td>
<td>Handwritten notes Constable essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4084</td>
<td>NOT/369</td>
<td>The Art of Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4085</td>
<td>NOT/370</td>
<td>Bibliography, note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4086</td>
<td>REP/574</td>
<td>Mounted postcards: Augustus John Dorelia in a landscape, Auguste Renoir By the Seashore, Gainsborough Madame Baccelli; reverse, Daphne Baring sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4087</td>
<td>LET/1271/1953</td>
<td>Letter to Anna McEvoy from Lord Sandwich, 20th November 1953, The Cottage, Hinchingbrooke, Huntingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4088</td>
<td>REP/575</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Calypso Baring, Hon Cecil Baring collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4089</td>
<td>REP/576</td>
<td>Reproduction of Watercolour (1925) reverse Watercolour (c.1925)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4090</td>
<td>NOT/371</td>
<td>Notes imitation and beauty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4091</td>
<td>PHO/54</td>
<td>Photograph of Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4092</td>
<td>LET/1272/1907</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 6th August 1907, no address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4093</td>
<td>NOT/372</td>
<td>Handwritten miscellaneous notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4094</td>
<td>NOT/373</td>
<td>Handwritten miscellaneous notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4095</td>
<td>NOT/374</td>
<td>Handwritten miscellaneous notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4096</td>
<td>BOO/6</td>
<td>Large Green Box Folder: Works of Ambrose McEvoy 1900-1919, Vol. I Oil Paintings, by C.J (Claude Johnson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4097</td>
<td>BOO/7</td>
<td>Large Green Box Folder: Works of Ambrose McEvoy 1900-1919, Vol. II Watercolours, by C.J (Claude Johnson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Catalogue No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4098</td>
<td>Cream/Brown box file large: Mary McEvo, S. Box number 9</td>
<td>DRA/741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4099</td>
<td>DRA/742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4100</td>
<td>DRA/743</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4101</td>
<td>DRA/744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4102</td>
<td>DRA/745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4103</td>
<td>DRA/746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4104</td>
<td>DRA/747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4105</td>
<td>DRA/748</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4106</td>
<td>DRA/749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4107</td>
<td>DRA/750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4108</td>
<td>DRA/751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4109</td>
<td>DRA/752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110</td>
<td>DRA/753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4111</td>
<td>DRA/754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4112</td>
<td>DRA/755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4113</td>
<td>DRA/756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4114</td>
<td>DRA/757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4115</td>
<td>DRA/758</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4116</td>
<td>DRA/759</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4117</td>
<td>DRA/760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4118</td>
<td>DRA/761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4119</td>
<td>DRA/762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4120</td>
<td>DRA/763</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4121</td>
<td>DRA/764</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: dog asleep, scene, MM118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4122</td>
<td>DRA/765</td>
<td>Sketches of chickens, M117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4123</td>
<td>DRA/766</td>
<td>Crossed out pencil sketch, M116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4124</td>
<td>DRA/767</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: chalk drawings of hands, crossed out sketch of a man, M115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4125</td>
<td>DRA/768</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a woman, M114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4126</td>
<td>DRA/769</td>
<td>Sketch of woman's hands and arms, M113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4127</td>
<td>DRA/770</td>
<td>Pencil and watercolour sketch of woman's head, M112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4128</td>
<td>DRA/771</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a woman, M98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4129</td>
<td>DRA/772</td>
<td>Sketch Sewing Lesson, M100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4130</td>
<td>DRA/773</td>
<td>Sketch The Kiss, M99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4131</td>
<td>DRA/774</td>
<td>Anatomical drawing M101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4132</td>
<td>DRA/775</td>
<td>Anatomical drawings M102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4133</td>
<td>DRA/776</td>
<td>Anatomical drawings M103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4134</td>
<td>DRA/777</td>
<td>Pencil sketch landscape, M104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4135</td>
<td>DRA/778</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a woman's head, Virgin Mary? M105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4136</td>
<td>DRA/779</td>
<td>Sketch of woman and child, M106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4137</td>
<td>DRA/780</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of European villa, M107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4138</td>
<td>DRA/781</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: woman's hands playing piano, sketch of old master? M109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4140</td>
<td>DRA/783</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a child's head, M111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4141</td>
<td>DRA/784</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a boy (Michael?) with a teddy, M129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4142</td>
<td>DRA/785</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: watercolour sketch of a woman at a piano?, woman reading by a fire, M128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4143</td>
<td>DRA/786</td>
<td>Pencil and chalk sketch of Christ being crucified M127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4144</td>
<td>DRA/787</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a head of a woman, M126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4145</td>
<td>DRA/788</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a house and landscape, MM124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4146</td>
<td>DRA/789</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a woman from behind in an interior MM123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4147</td>
<td>DRA/790</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: watercolour of two women, reverse watercolour of woman, MM122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4148</td>
<td>DRA/791</td>
<td>Sketch of an older woman's head, M130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4149</td>
<td>DRA/792</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman, MM121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4150</td>
<td>DRA/793</td>
<td>Sketch of a man and woman, M131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4151</td>
<td>DRA/794</td>
<td>Sketch of an infant's head, M132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Number</td>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4152</td>
<td>DRA/795</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman holding a necklace, M133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4153</td>
<td>DRA/796</td>
<td>Sketch of figures around a piano, M134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4154</td>
<td>DRA/797</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of a head of a woman, M135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4155</td>
<td>DRA/798</td>
<td>Sketch of a hand holding an apple, M136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4156</td>
<td>DRA/799</td>
<td>Watercolour and pencil sketch of a woman and a dog, M137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4157</td>
<td>DRA/800</td>
<td>Sketch of a hand on an instrument, M139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4158</td>
<td>DRA/801</td>
<td>Sketch of a hand, M141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4159</td>
<td>DRA/802</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: sketch of a young girl, hand holding a ball, M142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4160</td>
<td>DRA/803</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman from behind, MM149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4161</td>
<td>DRA/804</td>
<td>Sketch of a figure on steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4162</td>
<td>DRA/805</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch, M151 thought to be by Mary of Augustus John but no text to confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4163</td>
<td>DRA/806</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman seated on the floor, M143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4164</td>
<td>DRA/807</td>
<td>Several pencil sketches of figures, M148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4165</td>
<td>DRA/808</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: figures gathered around, reverse factory in a landscape, MM155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4166</td>
<td>DRA/809</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a landscape, MM154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4167</td>
<td>DRA/810</td>
<td>Sketch of a dress, MM153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4168</td>
<td>DRA/811</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman seated, tuning a violin, M144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4169</td>
<td>DRA/812</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman ironing, MM145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4170</td>
<td>DRA/813</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of a person seated on the grass, M146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4171</td>
<td>DRA/814</td>
<td>Sketch of a hand, MM160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4172</td>
<td>DRA/815</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: The crucifixion, Head of a statue, MM157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4173</td>
<td>DRA/816</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: head of a girl, reverse hands, M147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4174</td>
<td>DRA/817</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman, MM159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4175</td>
<td>DRA/818</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch head of a woman, MM158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4176</td>
<td>DRA/819</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of a landscape with horses and cart, MM156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4177</td>
<td>DRA/820</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a child, M168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4178</td>
<td>DRA/821</td>
<td>Sketch of hands, M167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4179</td>
<td>DRA/822</td>
<td>Sketch of child praying, MM166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4180</td>
<td>DRA/823</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: pencil and chalk sketch of a woman playing the piano, sketch of figure playing the cello, MM165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4181</td>
<td>DRA/824</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman playing the harp, MM163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4182</td>
<td>DRA/825</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a woman in a doorway with a plate of food, MM162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4183</td>
<td>DRA/826</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: Woman seated at a table, reverse child praying, MM161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4184</td>
<td>DRA/827</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch of figures, M181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4185</td>
<td>DRA/828</td>
<td>Pen sketch of figures gathered around, M182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4186</td>
<td>DRA/829</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman at a piano on a songsheet, M183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4187</td>
<td>DRA/830</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch, people gathered around, human skull, M185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4188</td>
<td>DRA/831</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of an old man, M187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4189</td>
<td>DRA/832</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: pencil sketch of an old man, reverse watercolour of a woman seated reading, M186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4190</td>
<td>DRA/833</td>
<td>Sketch of people gathered, M188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4191</td>
<td>DRA/834</td>
<td>Sketch of a hand playing a cello, M189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4192</td>
<td>DRA/835</td>
<td>Double sided pencil sketch: interior, head of a baby, M190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4193</td>
<td>DRA/836</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman seated in a veil, M172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4194</td>
<td>DRA/837</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: male figures, M184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4195</td>
<td>DRA/838</td>
<td>Sketch, M192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4196</td>
<td>DRA/839</td>
<td>Sketch of hands, M193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4197</td>
<td>DRA/840</td>
<td>Sketch of columns, M191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4198</td>
<td>DRA/841</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman's head, M174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4199</td>
<td>DRA/842</td>
<td>Sketch of figures, M194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4200</td>
<td>DRA/843</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman seated, M195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4201</td>
<td>DRA/844</td>
<td>Woman and child seated at a table with a bird cage, M196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4202</td>
<td>DRA/845</td>
<td>Woman seated playing a lute looking at a bird cage, M197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4203</td>
<td>DRA/846</td>
<td>Sketch, MM164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4204</td>
<td>DRA/847</td>
<td>Sketch of a baby sleeping, MM152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4205</td>
<td>DRA/848</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of flowers, M140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4206</td>
<td>DRA/849</td>
<td>Sketch Renaissance/classical scene, M198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4207</td>
<td>DRA/850</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman standing, after Reynolds, copied B.M. June 26 1893, M199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4208</td>
<td>Cream/Brown box file large: Mary McEvoy 2 of 2, S. Box 7, Genre Drawings</td>
<td>Drawing of figures in a boat, 418ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4209</td>
<td>DRA/852</td>
<td>Oil sketch? Of two women overlooking a landscape 472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>DRA/No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4210</td>
<td>DRA/853</td>
<td>Oil sketch? Of three figures seated in a landscape 417ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4211</td>
<td>DRA/854</td>
<td>Sketch of figures in an interior 424ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4212</td>
<td>DRA/855</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch head of a child, M76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4213</td>
<td>DRA/856</td>
<td>Chair in a window, 'Endimion', 'Senior Divi' M78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4214</td>
<td>DRA/857</td>
<td>Sketch of a figure, M79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4215</td>
<td>DRA/858</td>
<td>Sketch of a house in a landscape, John Constable, copied B.M.Jun 26 1893 M73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4216</td>
<td>DRA/859</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of a city scape M 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4217</td>
<td>DRA/860</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch of man reading (Ambrose?) March 1900 and hand, M71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4218</td>
<td>DRA/861</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of small bay or harbour, I.C. October 29 1825, copied B.M. June 24 1893, M70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4219</td>
<td>DRA/862</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of mountain scape, M69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4220</td>
<td>DRA/863</td>
<td>Watercolour twilight street view, M68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4221</td>
<td>DRA/864</td>
<td>Sketch of Venice, M67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4222</td>
<td>DRA/865</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of a city scape M66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4223</td>
<td>DRA/866</td>
<td>Pencil sketch, Thomas Gainsborough, copied B.M. Jun 28 1893, M65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4224</td>
<td>DRA/867</td>
<td>Watercolour flowers M74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4225</td>
<td>DRA/868</td>
<td>Monochrome watercolour of mother and child in interior M56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4226</td>
<td>DRA/869</td>
<td>Sketch of a young woman, M57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4227</td>
<td>DRA/870</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of a figure M59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4228</td>
<td>DRA/871</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch of figures, M60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4229</td>
<td>DRA/872</td>
<td>Sketch of church interior, M62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4230</td>
<td>DRA/873</td>
<td>Sketch of landscape M63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4231</td>
<td>DRA/874</td>
<td>Pen and wash sketch of Arab scene, M64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4232</td>
<td>DRA/875</td>
<td>Sketch of large house, M61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4233</td>
<td>DRA/876</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch in sepia: young Ambrose McEvoy and hands, M58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4234</td>
<td>DRA/877</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman in a large entrance hall M53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4235</td>
<td>DRA/878</td>
<td>Double-sided colour sketches: trees and horizon scene, M54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Catalogue No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4236</td>
<td>DRA/879</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman in a large entrance hall M55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4237</td>
<td>DRA/880</td>
<td>Coloured sketch of woman at a piano M48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4238</td>
<td>DRA/881</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman seated, M49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4239</td>
<td>DRA/882</td>
<td>Pencil and chalk sketch of a woman seated, M50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4240</td>
<td>DRA/883</td>
<td>Pen and wash sketch of man and woman in interior, M51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4241</td>
<td>DRA/884</td>
<td>Double sided sketch: man on a horse in sepia pastel, pencil figures on a hillside M47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4242</td>
<td>DRA/885</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman playing a lute looking at a bird cage M52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4243</td>
<td>DRA/886</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a tree, M43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4244</td>
<td>DRA/887</td>
<td>Monochrome watercolour landscape M44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4245</td>
<td>DRA/888</td>
<td>Sketch of landscape M45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4246</td>
<td>DRA/889</td>
<td>Sketch of landscape M46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4247</td>
<td>DRA/890</td>
<td>Sketch of animals and figure M31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4248</td>
<td>DRA/891</td>
<td>Double sided pencil sketch: dog and curtain M32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4249</td>
<td>DRA/892</td>
<td>Double sided sketch of woman in bonnet, M50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4250</td>
<td>DRA/893</td>
<td>Sketch of figure M22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4251</td>
<td>DRA/894</td>
<td>Woman breastfeeding baby, M27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4252</td>
<td>DRA/895</td>
<td>Sketch M28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4253</td>
<td>DRA/896</td>
<td>Portrait of a figure weeping in a shawl, M29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4254</td>
<td>DRA/897</td>
<td>Pencil of a woman at a piano M26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4255</td>
<td>DRA/898</td>
<td>Sketch of figures, classical scene, M35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4256</td>
<td>DRA/899</td>
<td>Double sided sketch, nude girl seated, Japanese cartoon, M36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4257</td>
<td>DRA/900</td>
<td>Double sided sketch: Fragment of bold red and blue M, reverse pencil sketch of urns and beehive, M37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4258</td>
<td>DRA/901</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a woman in a hat, M38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4259</td>
<td>DRA/902</td>
<td>Fragment of a sketch of a landscape, M39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4260</td>
<td>DRA/903</td>
<td>Sketch of a man's head, M40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4261</td>
<td>DRA/904</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of woman and child in an interior M41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4262</td>
<td>DRA/905</td>
<td>Monochrome sketch of woman and child in oval M42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4263</td>
<td>DRA/906</td>
<td>Double sided sketch woman in landscape, tree in landscape M34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4264</td>
<td>DRA/907</td>
<td>Double sided sketch of figures M25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4265</td>
<td>DRA/908</td>
<td>Sketch of street with trees M23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4266</td>
<td>DRA/909</td>
<td>Monochrome sketch of shore scene M33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4267</td>
<td>DRA/910</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch of woman reading and woman in shawl, M16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4268</td>
<td>DRA/911</td>
<td>Sketch of woman seated, M18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4269</td>
<td>DRA/912</td>
<td>Coloured sketch of woman and child seated at table, M19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4270</td>
<td>DRA/913</td>
<td>Sketch of figure M20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4271</td>
<td>DRA/914</td>
<td>Sketch of figures in interior, M12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4272</td>
<td>DRA/915</td>
<td>Highly finished sketch of a house in grounds with couple walking, M9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4273</td>
<td>DRA/916</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman's head, M24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4274</td>
<td>DRA/917</td>
<td>Sketch of a head of a child, Listening to his Gramaphone by Mary McEvoy, Catalogue 1946, M15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4275</td>
<td>DRA/918</td>
<td>Head of a woman, M17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4276</td>
<td>DRA/919</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch, girl in an interior, head of an older woman, M11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4277</td>
<td>DRA/920</td>
<td>Sketch of a man, M21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4278</td>
<td>DRA/921</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman M13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4279</td>
<td>DRA/922</td>
<td>Pen and wash sketch of a straw hut, figure and landscape M14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4280</td>
<td>DRA/923</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch of women, M10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4281</td>
<td>DRA/924</td>
<td>Sketch of basement? M8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4282</td>
<td>DRA/925</td>
<td>Sketch of woman in interior M7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4283</td>
<td>DRA/926</td>
<td>Coloured sketch of woman seated, sewing M6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4284</td>
<td>DRA/927</td>
<td>Sketch head of a woman M5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4285</td>
<td>DRA/928</td>
<td>Pastel sketch of man's head, M4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4286</td>
<td>DRA/929</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of head of man, M3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4287</td>
<td>DRA/930</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman M2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4288</td>
<td>DRA/931</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman seated with bird cage, M1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4289</td>
<td>DRA/932</td>
<td>Sketch of figures in interior 228ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4290</td>
<td>DRA/933</td>
<td>Sketch of figures in interior 122ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4291</td>
<td>DRA/934</td>
<td>Sketch of figures in interior 121ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4292</td>
<td>DRA/935</td>
<td>Sketch of two women on a terrace 120ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4293</td>
<td>DRA/936</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: woman, street view with a man rolling a barrel 119ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4294</td>
<td>DRA/937</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman in a rowing boat 128ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4295</td>
<td>DRA/938</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch 129ch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4296</td>
<td>DRA/939</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch 130ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4297</td>
<td>DRA/940</td>
<td>Sketch of figure in interior 124ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4298</td>
<td>DRA/941</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of populated street view, 126ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4299</td>
<td>DRA/942</td>
<td>Double-sided figure sketches 125ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4300</td>
<td>DRA/943</td>
<td>Double-sided figure sketch of woman with arms up, embankment landscape 492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4301</td>
<td>DRA/944</td>
<td>Pastel sketch of figures. Backstage of a play? 132ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4302</td>
<td>DRA/945</td>
<td>Pen and chalk drawing of a couple watching the sunset 134ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4303</td>
<td>DRA/946</td>
<td>Sketch of mother and child outside 469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4304</td>
<td>DRA/947</td>
<td>Pen sketch of figures 133ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4305</td>
<td>DRA/948</td>
<td>Sketches of figures, 131ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4306</td>
<td>DRA/949</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a woman leaning over a railing 127ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4307</td>
<td>DRA/950</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a woman rowing, 135ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4308</td>
<td>DRA/951</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch watercolour and pencil 137ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4309</td>
<td>DRA/952</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman with a basket on her head, reverse woman carrying a basket, 136ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4310</td>
<td>DRA/953</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch: figure with staff, two figures leaning over a railing 474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4311</td>
<td>DRA/954</td>
<td>Double-sided street sketches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4312</td>
<td>DRA/955</td>
<td>Figures seated at a table 138ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4313</td>
<td>DRA/956</td>
<td>Double-sided figure sketches 139ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4314</td>
<td>DRA/957</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman seated in a landscape feeding a dove 147ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4315</td>
<td>DRA/958</td>
<td>Sketch of two women kissing 146ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4316</td>
<td>DRA/959</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: woman seated with girl at the piano, classical scene, 145ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4317</td>
<td>DRA/960</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch of figures 470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4318</td>
<td>DRA/961</td>
<td>Figure sketch 142ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4319</td>
<td>DRA/962</td>
<td>Figure sketch man and woman 141ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4320</td>
<td>DRA/963</td>
<td>Watercolour figures lying in a landscape 143ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4321</td>
<td>DRA/964</td>
<td>Pen sketch, dancers resting 144ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4322</td>
<td>DRA/965</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch 234ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4323</td>
<td>DRA/966</td>
<td>Double-sided monochrome sketch 232ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4324</td>
<td>DRA/967</td>
<td>Figure sketch 230ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4325</td>
<td>DRA/968</td>
<td>Figures at a bar? 233ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4326</td>
<td>DRA/969</td>
<td>Man and child on a beach pen sketch, pencil sketch of a woman 227ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4327</td>
<td>DRA/970</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 231ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4328</td>
<td>DRA/971</td>
<td>Pencil figures 229ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4329</td>
<td>DRA/972</td>
<td>Watercolour figures 238ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4330</td>
<td>DRA/973</td>
<td>Figure in an interior 235ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4331</td>
<td>DRA/974</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of an interior 236ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4332</td>
<td>DRA/975</td>
<td>Pencil figure sketches, 237ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4333</td>
<td>DRA/976</td>
<td>Sketch of figures 240ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4334</td>
<td>DRA/977</td>
<td>Sketch of classical scene 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4335</td>
<td>DRA/978</td>
<td>Figures in an interior 241ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4336</td>
<td>DRA/979</td>
<td>Sketch 244ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4337</td>
<td>DRA/980</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch 243ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4338</td>
<td>DRA/981</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch 242ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4339</td>
<td>DRA/982</td>
<td>Watercolour figures 253ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4340</td>
<td>DRA/983</td>
<td>Sketch of woman reaching up to mantelpiece 246ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4341</td>
<td>DRA/984</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a street view 245ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4342</td>
<td>DRA/985</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch 250ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4343</td>
<td>DRA/986</td>
<td>Figures in interior 249ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4344</td>
<td>DRA/987</td>
<td>Figure on a horse 248ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4345</td>
<td>DRA/988</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch 247ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4346</td>
<td>DRA/989</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of a figure 252ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4347</td>
<td>DRA/990</td>
<td>Double-sided sketches 251ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4348</td>
<td>DRA/991</td>
<td>Sketch of classical columns in a landscape 958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4349</td>
<td>DRA/992</td>
<td>Double-sided watercolour and pencil sketch 925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4350</td>
<td>DRA/993</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch, interior scene with figure and figure in landscape 255ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4351</td>
<td>DRA/994</td>
<td>Monochrome figures 257ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4352</td>
<td>DRA/995</td>
<td>Double-sided figure sketches 258ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4353</td>
<td>DRA/996</td>
<td>Figures sketch 259ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4354</td>
<td>DRA/997</td>
<td>Sketch figures with bridge 261ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4355</td>
<td>DRA/998</td>
<td>Sketch 260ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4356</td>
<td>DRA/999</td>
<td>Double sided pencil sketch 254ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4357</td>
<td>DRA/1000</td>
<td>Sketch of figures in interior 262ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4358</td>
<td>DRA/1001</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of a woman seated at a table 256ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4359</td>
<td>DRA/1002</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch 263ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4360</td>
<td>DRA/1003</td>
<td>Sketch 264ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4361</td>
<td>DRA/1004</td>
<td>Classical scene sketch, figure sketch 265ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4362</td>
<td>DRA/1005</td>
<td>Figure sketch 266ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4363</td>
<td>DRA/1006</td>
<td>Sketch 267ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4364</td>
<td>DRA/1007</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch 268ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4365</td>
<td>DRA/1008</td>
<td>Watercolour figure sketch 269ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4366</td>
<td>DRA/1009</td>
<td>Figure sketches 280ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4367</td>
<td>DRA/1010</td>
<td>Sketch of a house 272ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4368</td>
<td>DRA/1011</td>
<td>Sketch 271ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4369</td>
<td>DRA/1012</td>
<td>Abstract sketch 273ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4370</td>
<td>DRA/1013</td>
<td>Sketch 274ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4371</td>
<td>DRA/1014</td>
<td>Sketch 275ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4372</td>
<td>DRA/1015</td>
<td>Sketch of a figure 276ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4373</td>
<td>DRA/1016</td>
<td>Sketch of two figures outside 277ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4374</td>
<td>DRA/1017</td>
<td>Sketch of two figures outside 278ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4375</td>
<td>DRA/1018</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch, woman sitting at a desk, sketch of a figure 279ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4376</td>
<td>DRA/1019</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch of classical scenes 280ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4377</td>
<td>DRA/1020</td>
<td>Sketch of two women in a landscape 282ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4378</td>
<td>DRA/1021</td>
<td>Sketch of three figures in a landscape, one catching a ball, 281ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4379</td>
<td>DRA/1022</td>
<td>Watercolour and pencil sketch of figures in a boat, 291ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4380</td>
<td>DRA/1023</td>
<td>Sketch 289ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4381</td>
<td>DRA/1024</td>
<td>Sketch of a classical scene 290ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4382</td>
<td>DRA/1025</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of figures 288ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4383</td>
<td>DRA/1026</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch watercolour woman standing, pencil woman standing, 287ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4384</td>
<td>DRA/1027</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 285ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4385</td>
<td>DRA/1028</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: figures and Penelope awaits the return of Odysseus, 286ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4386</td>
<td>DRA/1029</td>
<td>Sketch of figure with watercolour 283ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4387</td>
<td>DRA/1030</td>
<td>Sketch 284ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4388</td>
<td>DRA/1031</td>
<td>Sketch of figures outside 414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4389</td>
<td>DRA/1032</td>
<td>Sketch of figures 302ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4390</td>
<td>DRA/1033</td>
<td>Sketch of interior 301ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4391</td>
<td>DRA/1034</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of figure, 300ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4392</td>
<td>DRA/1035</td>
<td>Sketch of figures pencil, 298ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4393</td>
<td>DRA/1036</td>
<td>Double sided sketch: charcoal man and woman, pencil man seated 299ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4394</td>
<td>DRA/1037</td>
<td>Sketch of figure, 296ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4395</td>
<td>DRA/1038</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: watercolour and pencil, 297ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4396</td>
<td>DRA/1039</td>
<td>Sketch 295ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4397</td>
<td>DRA/1040</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch, 294ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4398</td>
<td>DRA/1041</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of figures 293ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4399</td>
<td>DRA/1042</td>
<td>Double-sided charcoal sketch, 292ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4400</td>
<td>DRA/1043</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of figures 303ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4401</td>
<td>DRA/1044</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch 313ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4402</td>
<td>DRA/1045</td>
<td>Figure sketches 312ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4403</td>
<td>DRA/1046</td>
<td>Figure sketches 311ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4404</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1047</td>
<td>Figure sketches 310ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4405</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1048</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch 309ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4406</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1049</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of figures 308ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4407</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1050</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch 307ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4408</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1051</td>
<td>Sketch of figures 306ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4409</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1052</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch 305ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4410</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1053</td>
<td>Watercolour rubbed out sketch 304ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4411</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1054</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch 322ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4412</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1055</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch 321ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4413</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1056</td>
<td>Sketch 320ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4414</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1057</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch 319ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4415</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1058</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: figures labelled aeschylus and people at a table (last supper?) 318ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4416</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1059</td>
<td>Sketch of figures 317ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4417</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1060</td>
<td>Sketch 316ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4418</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1061</td>
<td>Sketch of figure in walled garden 315ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4419</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1062</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch 314ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4420</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1063</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch 933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4421</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1064</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: figure in a landscape, landscape, 932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4422</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1065</td>
<td>Oil sketch on board 333ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4423</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1066</td>
<td>Sketch of figures, 324ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4424</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1067</td>
<td>Sketch of figures, 325ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4425</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1068</td>
<td>Mixed media sketch of figures outside 323ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4426</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1069</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch, 326ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4427</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1070</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch 327ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4428</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1071</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch 328ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4429</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1072</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch, man and woman kissing, man and woman walking 329ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4430</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1073</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a woman by a mantlepiece and mirror 330ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4431</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1074</td>
<td>Sketch of two women on a terrace 331ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4432</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1075</td>
<td>Sketch of figures 332ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4433</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1076</td>
<td>Monochrome sketches of figures 123ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4434</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1077</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: pencil landscape sketch, reverse horse studies 460ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4435</strong></td>
<td>DRA/1078</td>
<td>Watercolour interior 459ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Number</td>
<td>DRA/1079</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4436</td>
<td>DRA/1079</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: study of an arm, landscape 481ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4437</td>
<td>DRA/1080</td>
<td>Pencil landscape 467ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4438</td>
<td>DRA/1081</td>
<td>Pen sketch of a wooden bridge over water 465ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4439</td>
<td>DRA/1082</td>
<td>Sketch of figures carrying figure 464ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4440</td>
<td>DRA/1083</td>
<td>Sketch of roofline 462ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4441</td>
<td>DRA/1084</td>
<td>Sketch Chilston Park landscape 461ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4442</td>
<td>DRA/1085</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of horses, 486ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4443</td>
<td>DRA/1086</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch, group of people gathering 463ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4444</td>
<td>DRA/1087</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape mounted on board M91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4445</td>
<td>DRA/1088</td>
<td>Double-sided figure sketches, sepia chalk M85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4446</td>
<td>DRA/1089</td>
<td>Woman sat by a fire mounted on board M92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4447</td>
<td>DRA/1090</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman's head mounted on board M93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4448</td>
<td>DRA/1091</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of a woman in a landscape, mounted, M88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4449</td>
<td>DRA/1092</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: watercolour of flowers, pencil sketch of a woman playing a harp M89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4450</td>
<td>DRA/1093</td>
<td>Watercolour of flowers M90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4451</td>
<td>DRA/1094</td>
<td>Pen and wash sketch of a woman at a piano M86, mounted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4452</td>
<td>DRA/1095</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of a woman's head mounted M87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4453</td>
<td>DRA/1096</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketches of women seated M83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4454</td>
<td>DRA/1097</td>
<td>Pen and wash sketch of a woman seated at a piano reading M84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4455</td>
<td>DRA/1098</td>
<td>Sepia sketch of a woman's head M80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4456</td>
<td>DRA/1099</td>
<td>Certificate for Miss Mary Spencer Edwards, First certificate the prize of £2.10 for head painting from life. 1896-7. M95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4457</td>
<td>DRA/1100</td>
<td>Sketch of a dog, M81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4458</td>
<td>DRA/1101</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman M82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4459</td>
<td>DRA/1102</td>
<td>Sketch 441ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4460</td>
<td>DRA/1103</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch, market scene on street, head of a woman in pencil 398ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4461</td>
<td>DRA/1104</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of a line of trees 399ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4462</td>
<td>DRA/1105</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch 851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4463</td>
<td>DRA/1106</td>
<td>Sketch 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4464</td>
<td>DRA/1107</td>
<td>Double-sided watercolour sketch 400ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4465</td>
<td>DRA/1108</td>
<td>Sketch of street 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4466</td>
<td>DRA/1109</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch 401ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4467</td>
<td>DRA/1110</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch 978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4468</td>
<td>DRA/1111</td>
<td>Sketch 436ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4469</td>
<td>DRA/1112</td>
<td>Sketch 440ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4470</td>
<td>DRA/1113</td>
<td>Sketch 458ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4471</td>
<td>DRA/1114</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of cliffs and sea 48ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4472</td>
<td>DRA/1115</td>
<td>Cottages at Aldbourne, carriage paid 5th April 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4473</td>
<td>DRA/1116</td>
<td>Half finished harbour sketch 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4474</td>
<td>DRA/1117</td>
<td>Sketch of a French Street 128 909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4475</td>
<td>DRA/1118</td>
<td>Pencil street view from a window 921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4476</td>
<td>DRA/1119</td>
<td>Pen sketch 873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4477</td>
<td>DRA/1120</td>
<td>Landscape watercolour sketch 881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4478</td>
<td>DRA/1121</td>
<td>Sketch 972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4479</td>
<td>DRA/1122</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of a landscape 1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4480</td>
<td>DRA/1123</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of line of trees 852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4481</td>
<td>DRA/1124</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of line of trees 955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4482</td>
<td>DRA/1125</td>
<td>Sketch Bridge at Arignon, mounted 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4483</td>
<td>DRA/1126</td>
<td>Sketch watercolour French Coast 19 936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4484</td>
<td>DRA/1127</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape 898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4485</td>
<td>DRA/1128</td>
<td>Pencil sketch harbour scene, mounted, 960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4486</td>
<td>DRA/1129</td>
<td>Sketch, looking through an archway. Arcade scene 1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4487</td>
<td>DRA/1130</td>
<td>Study of St Jacques church Dieppe 18, 977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4488</td>
<td>DRA/1131</td>
<td>Study of a church 904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4489</td>
<td>DRA/1132</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4490</td>
<td>DRA/1133</td>
<td>The Downs by Ambrose McEvoy, 1928, Royal Academy Winter Exhibition 1928, mounted, 853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4491</td>
<td>DRA/1134</td>
<td>Sketch 939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4492</td>
<td>DRA/1135</td>
<td>Sketch of 20 Thames Embankment Grosvenor Road 855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4493</td>
<td>Cream/Brown box file extra large: Portraits 1/2 box 3</td>
<td>Tracing of St Jacques church Dieppe 428ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4494</td>
<td>DRA/1137</td>
<td>Tracing of landscape 969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4495</td>
<td>DRA/1138</td>
<td>Tracing of landscape 427ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Number</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4496</td>
<td>DRA/1139</td>
<td>Tracing of harbour landscape 434ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4497</td>
<td>DRA/1140</td>
<td>Tracing of harbour landscape 1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4498</td>
<td>DRA/1141</td>
<td>Tracing of harbour landscape 431ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4499</td>
<td>DRA/1142</td>
<td>Tracing of café scene 433ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4500</td>
<td>DRA/1143</td>
<td>Tracing of embankment 432ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4501</td>
<td>DRA/1144</td>
<td>Tracing of trees and houses 430ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4502</td>
<td>DRA/1145</td>
<td>Tracing of street scene 429ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4503</td>
<td>DRA/1146</td>
<td>Portrait of a girl, Olga, chalk and wash drawing by Ambrose McEvoy, mounted, Beaux Arts Gallery label on reverse 393ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4504</td>
<td>DRA/1147</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a woman's head 392ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4505</td>
<td>DRA/1148</td>
<td>Watercolour and pencil sketch of a girl 397ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4506</td>
<td>DRA/1149</td>
<td>Watercolour and pencil sketch of a child 390ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4507</td>
<td>DRA/1150</td>
<td>Pencil sketch mounted of a woman named Pricilla 391ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4508</td>
<td>DRA/1151</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch 395ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4509</td>
<td>DRA/1152</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman half profile 394ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4510</td>
<td>DRA/1153</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of a woman seated 396ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4511</td>
<td>DRA/1154</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman seated 45ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4512</td>
<td>DRA/1155</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman seated 391ch, mounted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4513</td>
<td>DRA/1156</td>
<td>Sketch of a child seated 41ch mounted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4514</td>
<td>DRA/1157</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman seated 42ch mounted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4515</td>
<td>DRA/1158</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman 47ch, mounted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4516</td>
<td>DRA/1159</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch 708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4517</td>
<td>DRA/1160</td>
<td>Double-sided watercolour sketch of two women, one red composition one blue, 113, 62 study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4518</td>
<td>DRA/1161</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch 758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4519</td>
<td>DRA/1162</td>
<td>Sketch of woman standing 1184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4520</td>
<td>DRA/1163</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a woman 754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4521</td>
<td>DRA/1164</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a woman standing 753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4522</td>
<td>DRA/1165</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch 1178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4523</td>
<td>DRA/1166</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch, watercolour and ink 627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4524</td>
<td>DRA/1167</td>
<td>Double-sided watercolour sketch 720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4525</td>
<td>DRA/1168</td>
<td>Double-sided watercolour sketch 701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4526</td>
<td>DRA/1169</td>
<td>Monochrome sketch of woman 735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4527</td>
<td>DRA/1170</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch 741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4528</td>
<td>DRA/1171</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch 463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4529</td>
<td>DRA/1172</td>
<td>Sketch of head 743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4530</td>
<td>DRA/1173</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of woman seated 611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4531</td>
<td>DRA/1174</td>
<td>Sketch of woman 712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>DRA/No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4532</td>
<td>DRA/1175</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch of women 742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4533</td>
<td>DRA/1176</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of woman 630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4534</td>
<td>DRA/1177</td>
<td>Sketch of woman's head 40ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4535</td>
<td>DRA/1178</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of woman standing with arm up, 33, 2659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4536</td>
<td>DRA/1179</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of woman 740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4537</td>
<td>DRA/1180</td>
<td>Monochrome sketch of woman standing 734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4538</td>
<td>DRA/1181</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of boy standing 603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4539</td>
<td>DRA/1182</td>
<td>Monochrome sketch 731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4540</td>
<td>DRA/1183</td>
<td>Pencil sketch smaller, same as composition DRA/1156 &amp; DRA/1157, 495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4541</td>
<td>DRA/1184</td>
<td>Ink sketch smaller, same as composition DRA/1156, DRA/1157, DRA/1183, 496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4542</td>
<td>DRA/1185</td>
<td>Sketch of woman 703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4543</td>
<td>DRA/1186</td>
<td>Sketch of Marcel Dupre at the organ, Notre Dame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4544</td>
<td>DRA/1187</td>
<td>Double-sided watercolour sketch 633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4545</td>
<td>DRA/1188</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch, Wimbledon set 1043, 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4546</td>
<td>DRA/1189</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: 27 F.L. Figure Prudence?, woman on reverse in watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4547</td>
<td>DRA/1190</td>
<td>Watercolour woman seated in a window AE 1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4548</td>
<td>DRA/1191</td>
<td>Pencil figure sketches, 1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4549</td>
<td>DRA/1192</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman 727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4550</td>
<td>DRA/1193</td>
<td>Sketch of a family scene (McEvoys?) AE 1891 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4551</td>
<td>Cream/Brown box file extra large: Figure studies 1/2, interiors, Centre 1/2, Irish Church, box 1; cream folder Irish Church</td>
<td>DRA/1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4552</td>
<td>DRA/1195</td>
<td>Badly damaged watercolour sketch of woman standing 427ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4553</td>
<td>DRA/1196</td>
<td>Double-sided religious pencil sketches 425ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4554</td>
<td>DRA/1197</td>
<td>Double-sided religious pencil sketches 428ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4555</td>
<td>DRA/1198</td>
<td>Pencil figure kneeling praying 506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>DRA/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4556</td>
<td>Cream/Brown box file extra large: Figure studies 1/2, interiors, Centre 1/2, Irish Church, box 1; cream folder Figure Studies</td>
<td>DRA/1199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4557</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4558</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4559</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4560</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4561</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4562</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4563</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4564</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4565</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4566</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4567</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4568</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4569</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4570</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4571</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4572</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4573</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4574</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4575</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4576</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4577</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4578</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4579</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4580</td>
<td>DRA/1223</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: watercolour woman standing by mantlepiece and mirror, ink sketch of hands 458A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4581</td>
<td>DRA/1224</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of nude seated, mounted Ch 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4582</td>
<td>Cream/Brown box file extra large: Figure studies 1/2, interiors, Centre 1/2, Irish Church, box 1; cream folder Irish Church?</td>
<td>DRA/1225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4583</td>
<td>DRA/1226</td>
<td>Charcoal and chalk sketch of man with beard LT5 CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4584</td>
<td>DRA/1227</td>
<td>Pastel sketch of man with beard LT4 CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4585</td>
<td>DRA/1228</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of figures LT3ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4586</td>
<td>DRA/1229</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch LT2ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4587</td>
<td>Cream/Brown box file extra large: Figure studies 1/2, interiors, Centre 1/2, Irish Church, box 1; cream folder Interiors</td>
<td>DRA/1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4588</td>
<td>DRA/1231</td>
<td>Pencil sketch 409ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4589</td>
<td>DRA/1232</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of woman standing by mantlepiece, watercolour sketch on reverse 604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4590</td>
<td>DRA/1233</td>
<td>Pencil sketch woman and child in interior 409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4591</td>
<td>DRA/1234</td>
<td>Sketch of domed church (St Paul's?) from a window 1045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4592</td>
<td>DRA/1235</td>
<td>Blue watercolour sketch of woman seated reading 813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4593</td>
<td>DRA/1236</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch: pencil of nude bending over, wash of woman's head 1179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4594</td>
<td>DRA/1237</td>
<td>Pen and wash sketch of woman seated in interior with birdcage and letter 15ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4595</td>
<td>Cream/Brown box file extra large: Figure studies 1/2, interiors, Cenre 1/2, Irish Church, box 1; cream folder Figure Studies 1/2</td>
<td>DRA/1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4596</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4597</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4598</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4599</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4600</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4601</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4602</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4603</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4604</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4605</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4606</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4607</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4608</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4609</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4610</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4611</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4612</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4613</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4614</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRA/1257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4615</td>
<td>Large old archival box: Drawings by Ambrose McEvoy, property of Mrs A G Bazell unfinished. Etchings, Irish</td>
<td>PAI/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Accession No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4616</td>
<td>PAI/2</td>
<td>Double-sided landscape scenes, oil on board 701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4617</td>
<td>DRA/1258</td>
<td>Sketch on blue paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4618</td>
<td>PAI/3</td>
<td>Harbour scene, oil on board, 1, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4619</td>
<td>PAI/4</td>
<td>An English Village by Ambrose McEvoy, oil on board, 3, 103B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4620</td>
<td>DRA/1259</td>
<td>Mounted pencil drawing of a child writing, Michael? 378ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4621</td>
<td>DRA/1260</td>
<td>Pencil sketch boat in a harbour, 51ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4622</td>
<td>DRA/1261</td>
<td>Pencil sketch boats in a harbour, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4623</td>
<td>DRA/1262</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape sketch 1026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4624</td>
<td>DRA/1263</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape sketch 52ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4625</td>
<td>DRA/1264</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape sketch 1043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4626</td>
<td>DRA/1265</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of village scene, Abbotsleigh? 879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4627</td>
<td>DRA/1266</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch Sand-Dunes 103, watercolour and graphite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4628</td>
<td>DRA/1267</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape sketch 929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4629</td>
<td>DRA/1268</td>
<td>Pencil sketch, canal/river with bridge and buildings, 1013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4630</td>
<td>DRA/1269</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch, watercolour and pencil sketch of harbour and boats 1039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4631</td>
<td>DRA/1270</td>
<td>Pencil sketch, heads of woman 88ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4632</td>
<td>DRA/1271</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch self-portraits McEvoy 39ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4633</td>
<td>DRA/1272</td>
<td>Double-sided landscape scene watercolour and pencil sketches of women/classical figures 971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4634</td>
<td>DRA/1273</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape scene, mounted and labelled 19th Feb 1987, 395/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4635</td>
<td>DRA/1274</td>
<td>Ink sketch outside scene, 501ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4636</td>
<td>DRA/1275</td>
<td>Ink sketch building 502ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4637</td>
<td>DRA/1276</td>
<td>Ink sketch street scene 495ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4638</td>
<td>DRA/1277</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch ink people May 99, pencil architecture 494ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4639</td>
<td>DRA/1278</td>
<td>Ink street scene 492ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Catalogue</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4640</td>
<td>DRA/1279</td>
<td>Double-sided ink and pencil sketches, harbour, heads, 507ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4641</td>
<td>DRA/1280</td>
<td>Ink street scene 504ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4642</td>
<td>DRA/1281</td>
<td>Ink sketch, street vendor and woman 503ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4643</td>
<td>DRA/1282</td>
<td>Ink and wash sketch river scene, 505ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4644</td>
<td>DRA/1283</td>
<td>Double-sided ink sketch, 493ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4645</td>
<td>DRA/1284</td>
<td>Double-sided ink sketch, 499ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4646</td>
<td>DRA/1285</td>
<td>Half head self-portrait sketch McEvoy 510ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4647</td>
<td>DRA/1286</td>
<td>Double-sided ink sketch 500ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4648</td>
<td>DRA/1287</td>
<td>Ink street scene 13th August 1900 491ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4649</td>
<td>DRA/1288</td>
<td>Ink outside scene 497ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4650</td>
<td>DRA/1289</td>
<td>Ink street scene 29th May 1899, 509ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4651</td>
<td>DRA/1290</td>
<td>Ink industrial scene 506ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4652</td>
<td>DRA/1291</td>
<td>Double-sided ink fishing embankment scene, watercolour sketch 496ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4653</td>
<td>DRA/1292</td>
<td>Ink street scene, 498ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4654</td>
<td>DRA/1293</td>
<td>Watercolour and charcoal embankment scene 439ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4655</td>
<td>DRA/1294</td>
<td>Badly damaged oil on paper, in two pieces, nude looking up, pencil sketch on reverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4656</td>
<td>DRA/1295</td>
<td>Pencil and watercolour flowers in vase M75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4657</td>
<td>DRA/1296</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of baby's head 15th Jan, M169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4658</td>
<td>DRA/1297</td>
<td>Pencil sketch woman sat at piano? M125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4659</td>
<td>DRA/1298</td>
<td>Pencil head of girl, same on reverse M138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4660</td>
<td>DRA/1299</td>
<td>Badly damaged landscape on board, in 3 pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4661</td>
<td>DRA/1300</td>
<td>Oil sketch landscape scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4662</td>
<td>PAI/5</td>
<td>Piece of painted canvas, Christ/classical figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4663</td>
<td>PAI/6</td>
<td>Unfinished by Ambrose McEvoy, sketch of woman's head, oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4664</td>
<td>PAI/7</td>
<td>Oil sketch of figures in black and white, one playing a guitar. After an unknown Dutch painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4665</td>
<td>PAI/8</td>
<td>Oil on canvas of hands in prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4666</td>
<td>PAI/9</td>
<td>Badly damaged oil on canvas sketch of woman in purple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4667</td>
<td>NOT/375</td>
<td>Notes on John Wateridge of Kentish Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4668</td>
<td>SKE/53?</td>
<td>Leather bound scrapbook containing drawings. This isn't marked on the sketchbook!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4669</td>
<td>DRA/1301</td>
<td>Loose sketch double-sided pencil figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4670</td>
<td>DRA/1302</td>
<td>Loose sketch McEvoy Self Portrait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4671</td>
<td>DRA/1303</td>
<td>Lookse sketch, double-sided pencil ballerina and figures walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4672</td>
<td>DRA/1304</td>
<td>Loose pencil sketch of woman playing with her hair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4673</td>
<td>DRA/1305</td>
<td>Loose double-sided ink sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4674</td>
<td>DRA/1306</td>
<td>Loose sketch soldiers standing ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4675</td>
<td>DRA/1307</td>
<td>Loose, cut-out ink sketch of figure standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4676</td>
<td>DRA/1308</td>
<td>Loose pencil sketch of woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4677</td>
<td>DRA/1309</td>
<td>Loose double-sided ink sketch of figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4678</td>
<td>DRA/1310</td>
<td>Loose sketch of head of soldier ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4679</td>
<td>DRA/1311</td>
<td>Loose sketch double-sided pencil figures 404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4680</td>
<td>DRA/1312</td>
<td>Loose pencil sketch of figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4681</td>
<td>DRA/1313</td>
<td>Loose sketch double-sided of women seated, ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4682</td>
<td>DRA/1314</td>
<td>Loose sketch, head of a man in profile 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4683</td>
<td>DRA/1315</td>
<td>Loose sketch, double-sided woman standing and figure kneeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4684</td>
<td>DRA/1316</td>
<td>Loose sketch of hand, 7th September 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4685</td>
<td>DRA/1317</td>
<td>Loose sketch, nude standing 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4686</td>
<td></td>
<td>Loose painting PAI/10 Painting of the birth of Christ, oil on card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4687</td>
<td>DRA/1318</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of Thames 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4688</td>
<td>PHO/55</td>
<td>Photograph of a gentleman, thought to be Charles McEvoy (Ambrose's father)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4689</td>
<td>PHO/56</td>
<td>Photograph of a gentleman in profile, thought to be Charles McEvoy (Ambrose's father)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4691</td>
<td>LET/1273/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Eric Chilston from Anna McEvoy, 27th June 1971, 7 Elm Park Road, Chelsea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4692</td>
<td>REP/577</td>
<td>Reproduction of The Music Room by Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4693</td>
<td>REP/578</td>
<td>Reproduction of The Autumn of their lives by Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4694</td>
<td>LET/1274/1951</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell (Anna) from Mary Chamot, Assistant Keeper at Tate Gallery, 25th June 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4695</td>
<td>LET/1275</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs Bazell (Anna) from Ronald Alley, The Institute of Contemporary Arts, 17-18 Dover Street, Piccadilly, London, 11th July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4696</td>
<td>ART/93/1929</td>
<td>Obituary of Charles McEvoy, 18th February 1929, Bath &amp; Wiltshire Chronicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4697</td>
<td>DRA/1319</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch, McEvoy At the National and Leaving the National, ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4698</td>
<td>LET/1276/1919</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Wednesday 24th December 1919, whilst crossing the Atlantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4699</td>
<td>REP/579</td>
<td>Reproduction of religious scene by Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4700</td>
<td>REP/580</td>
<td>Reproduction of religious scene by Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4701</td>
<td>LET/1277/1951</td>
<td>Letter to Anna Bazell from John R, Tate Gallery, London, 8th June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4702</td>
<td>NOT/376</td>
<td>Student’s ticket, Public Library Buckingham Palace Road, Ambrose McEvoy, 17th December 1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4703</td>
<td>LET/1278/1951</td>
<td>Letter from Ronald Alley from Tate Gallery, 'Ten Decades: A Review of British Taste, 1851-1951' to be shown at RBA Galleries, Suffolk Street, London. 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4704</td>
<td>NOT/377</td>
<td>Shipping receipt, Mr Hett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4705</td>
<td>SKE/39</td>
<td>Sketchbook, pocket size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4706</td>
<td>Cardboard box</td>
<td>LET/1279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4707</td>
<td>LET/1280</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from unknown sender, 38 Green Street, Park Lane, 16th July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4708</td>
<td>NOT/378</td>
<td>List of pictures not in the catalogue, October 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4709</td>
<td>NOT/379</td>
<td>List of pictures and prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4710</td>
<td>NOT/380</td>
<td>Paintings by the late Ambrose McEvoy to be collected by Messrs Dicksee &amp; Co., from Mrs McEvoy, 107 Grosvenor Road, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4711</td>
<td>LET/1281/1928</td>
<td>Letter from Royal Academy of Arts, Secretary, 25th January 1928. 'Julia' by Ambrose McEvoy, sold for £150 to Sir A. Cardew from owner Oliver Martin-Smith, torn in two pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4712</td>
<td>NOT/381</td>
<td>Watercolours by Ambrose McEvoy purchased by M. Knoedler and co., inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4713</td>
<td>LET/1282/1929</td>
<td>Letter to Miss Elias from Robert Schwitter? 26th September 1929, 123 Avenue Malakoff, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4715</td>
<td>REP/581</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Anna McEvoy by Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4716</td>
<td>REP/582</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a girl standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4717</td>
<td>REP/583</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Gwendoline Churchill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4718</td>
<td>REP/584</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Rachel (Mrs Howe-Browne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4719</td>
<td>REP/585</td>
<td>Reproduction of model in green dress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4720</td>
<td>REP/586</td>
<td>Reproduction of Louise Duchess of Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4721</td>
<td>REP/587</td>
<td>Reproduction of A.C.R. Carter 50x40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4722</td>
<td>REP/588</td>
<td>Reproduction of Lady at the Piano by Mrs McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4723</td>
<td>DRA/1320</td>
<td>Double-sided watercolour sketch, woman looking out of the window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4724</td>
<td>REP/589</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a man, Henry Connaught Hotel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4725</td>
<td>REP/590</td>
<td>Reproduction of Mrs Aubrey Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4726</td>
<td>REP/591</td>
<td>Reproduction of Dolores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4727</td>
<td>REP/592/A</td>
<td>Reproduction of the Duchess of Marlborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4728</td>
<td>REP/592/B</td>
<td>Reproduction of the Duchess of Marlborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4729</td>
<td>REP/593</td>
<td>Reproduction of the Thunderstorm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4730</td>
<td>REP/594</td>
<td>Reproduction of the Book (in America) Mrs G.J. Heslein, 65 West 49 St, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4731</td>
<td>REP/595</td>
<td>Reproduction of The Engraving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4732</td>
<td>REP/596</td>
<td>Reproduction of Mrs Gamble, Exeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4733</td>
<td>REP/597</td>
<td>Reproduction of Mrs Diana Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4734</td>
<td>REP/598</td>
<td>Reproduction of Rosamund Lady Ridley, owned by Lady Ridley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4735</td>
<td>REP/599</td>
<td>Reproduction of Cecil Baring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4736</td>
<td>REP/600</td>
<td>Reproduction of Lady Cranbourne 40 x 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4737</td>
<td>REP/601</td>
<td>Reproduction of Mrs Aubrey Herbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4738</td>
<td>PHO/57</td>
<td>Photograph of Mary McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4739</td>
<td>REP/602</td>
<td>Reproduction of 'Odette' Mrs Odette Thornhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4740</td>
<td>DRA/1321</td>
<td>Double-sided figure sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4741</td>
<td>REP/603A</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lois Sturt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4742</td>
<td>REP/603B</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lois Sturt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4743</td>
<td>REP/604</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of Lois Sturt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4744</td>
<td>REP/605</td>
<td>Reproduction of Dorothy II 30x25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4745</td>
<td>DRA/1322</td>
<td>Double-sided, watercolour of interior through a doorway, figure sketches on reverse, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4746</td>
<td>REP/606</td>
<td>Reproduction of Dancer Nude 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4747</td>
<td>REP/607</td>
<td>Reproduction of Odette Thornhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4748</td>
<td>REP/608</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4749</td>
<td>REP/609</td>
<td>Reproduction of the Green Hat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4750</td>
<td>REP/610</td>
<td>Reproduction of Marcel Dupre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4751</td>
<td>REP/611</td>
<td>Reproduction of a portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4752</td>
<td>REP/612</td>
<td>Reproduction of Anna McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4753</td>
<td>REP/613</td>
<td>Reproduction of Gwendoline Churchill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4754</td>
<td>REP/614</td>
<td>Reproduction of portrait of a man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4755</td>
<td>REP/615</td>
<td>Reproduction of Dancer Nude 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4756</td>
<td>SKE/40</td>
<td>Sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4757</td>
<td>SKE/41</td>
<td>Sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4758</td>
<td>DRA/1323</td>
<td>Double-sided ink sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4759</td>
<td>SKE/42</td>
<td>Sketchbook - watercolours mainly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4760</td>
<td>SKE/43</td>
<td>Sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4761</td>
<td>SKE/44</td>
<td>Sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4762</td>
<td>NOT/382</td>
<td>List of works, typed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4763</td>
<td>DRA/1324</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch, heads pencil, 30th July 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4764</td>
<td>LET/1284/1971</td>
<td>2 letters to Eric Chilston from Anna McEvoy (Bazell), 26th April 1971, 7 Elm Park Road, Chelsea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4765</td>
<td>LET/1285/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Eric Chilston from Anna McEvoy (Bazell), 26th May 1971, 7 Elm Park Road, Chelsea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4766</td>
<td>LET/1286/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Eric Chilston from Anna McEvoy (Bazell), 13th July 1971, 7 Elm Park Road, Chelsea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4767</td>
<td>NOT/383</td>
<td>List of Press Cuttings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4768</td>
<td>NOT/384</td>
<td>Sickert' Index Card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4769</td>
<td>NOT/385</td>
<td>Sickert' Index Card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4770</td>
<td>NOT/386</td>
<td>Gwen John' Inde Card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4771</td>
<td>LET/1287/1971</td>
<td>Letter to Eric Chilston from Anna McEvoy (Bazell), 12th September 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4772</td>
<td>LET/1288</td>
<td>Incomplete letter, presumably from Ambrose McEvoy to Mary McEvoy whilst in America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4773</td>
<td>NOT/387</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4774</td>
<td>LET/1289</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy 1916, no address or full date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4775</td>
<td>LET/1290/1936</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Marie Lawson, 218 Addison House, Grove End Road, 1st May 1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4776</td>
<td>LET/1291</td>
<td>Incomplete letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date or address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4777</td>
<td>LET/1292</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no address no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4778</td>
<td>LET/1293</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 107 Grosvenor Road, Christmas time, no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4779</td>
<td>LET/1294</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 1st March, no year, no address. Presumably written whilst in the US in 1920, just before Duveen Galleries exhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4780</td>
<td>LET/1295/1920</td>
<td>Copy of a letter to Wigs from Ambrose McEvoy, 15th March 1920, Gainsborough Studios, 222 West 59th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4781</td>
<td>LET/1296</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 8th March (1920)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4782</td>
<td>LET/1297</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date or address but written just after the Duveen exhibition in New York had opened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4783</td>
<td>LET/1298</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no date or address but written just after the Duveen exhibition in New York had opened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4784</td>
<td>LET/1299</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, no address, 27th February (1920)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4785</td>
<td>LET/1300/1920</td>
<td>Cable to 107 Grosvenor Road from McEvoy in New York 30th March 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4786</td>
<td>LET/1301</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4787</td>
<td>LET/1302/1920</td>
<td>Letter ripped in two to Ambrose McEvoy from M Sylvester secretary to Mr Guinness, 25 Broad Street, New York City to Gainsborough Studios, 222 West 59th Street, 26th February 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4788</td>
<td>LET/1303/1920</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy 15th March 1920, Gainsborough Studios, 222 West 59th Street, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4789</td>
<td>LET/1304</td>
<td>Envelope containing several letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4790</td>
<td>LET/1305</td>
<td>Empty envelope addressed to Mrs McEvoy 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4791</td>
<td>LET/1306</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, Saturday, no date, 107 Grosvenor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4792</td>
<td>NOT/388</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4793</td>
<td>SKE/45</td>
<td>Sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4794</td>
<td>SKE/46</td>
<td>Sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4795</td>
<td>DRA/1325</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4796</td>
<td>DRA/1326</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4797</td>
<td>PHO/58</td>
<td>3 photographs of a Sanctuary Lamp in envelope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4798</td>
<td>POS/532</td>
<td>Michael McEvoy album full of postcards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4799</td>
<td>SKE/47</td>
<td>Pocket sized sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4800</td>
<td>LET/1307</td>
<td>Letter presumably to Anna McEvoy from Mary McEvoy 11th September, no year, Freshford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4801</td>
<td>LET/1308</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Anna McEvoy whilst McEvoy in US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4802</td>
<td>ART/94</td>
<td>Article by John Rothenstein 'Great British Masters - 23 Ambrose McEvoy', Picture Post, 4th March 1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4803</td>
<td>REP/616</td>
<td>Reproduction of Julia James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4804</td>
<td>REP/617A</td>
<td>Reproduction of Major Spencer Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4805</td>
<td>REP/617B</td>
<td>Reproduction of Major Spencer Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4806</td>
<td>REP/618</td>
<td>Reproduction of Viscountesse Henrie de Jauze (nee Phyllis Boyd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4807</td>
<td>REP/619</td>
<td>Reproduction of Mrs Claude Johnson Tate Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4808</td>
<td>REP/620</td>
<td>Reproduction of Viscountess Chilston (Akers Douglas) 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4809</td>
<td>REP/621</td>
<td>Reproduction of Ballet Girls (Tate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4810</td>
<td>REP/622</td>
<td>Reproduction of Night-Flying (IWM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4811</td>
<td>SKE/48</td>
<td>Pocket sized sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4812</td>
<td>SKE/49</td>
<td>Small sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4813</td>
<td>SKE/50</td>
<td>Sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4814</td>
<td>SKE/51</td>
<td>Sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4816</td>
<td>DRA/1327</td>
<td>Watercolour scene of soldiers marching in the snow inscribed &quot;To my friend McEvoy Ed? Lurt...?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4817</td>
<td>DRA/1328</td>
<td>Pen and wash sketch, not Ambrose McEvoy according to folder, landscape, 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4818</td>
<td>DRA/1329</td>
<td>Pen and wash sketch, not Ambrose McEvoy according to folder, landscape, 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Shelfmark</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4819</td>
<td>DRA/1330</td>
<td>Sketch of Ambrose McEvoy by someone else? Nana? With note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4820</td>
<td>DRA/1331</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch, war torn landscape and soldier head and shoulders, not by McEvoy according to folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4821</td>
<td>DRA/1332</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman seated, not by McEvoy according to folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4822</td>
<td>DRA/1333</td>
<td>Sketch of a ballerina in frame without glass, pencil and wash, 30 a ballet dancer standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4823</td>
<td>DRA/1334</td>
<td>Pencil sketch woman seated, reverse heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4824</td>
<td>DRA/1335</td>
<td>Pencil sketch head of woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4825</td>
<td>DRA/1336</td>
<td>Landscape watercolour, horses in field 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4826</td>
<td>DRA/1337</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a woman seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4827</td>
<td>DRA/1338</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4828</td>
<td>DRA/1339</td>
<td>Watercolour head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4829</td>
<td>DRA/1340</td>
<td>Pencil sketch woman playing a cello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4830</td>
<td>DRA/1341</td>
<td>Double-sided pencil sketch, child writing, hands writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4831</td>
<td>DRA/1342</td>
<td>Double sided sketch woman's head turning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4832</td>
<td>DRA/1343</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch 'Over the Mediterranean' 24th March 92, Meuton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4833</td>
<td>DRA/1344</td>
<td>Sketch, hands holding picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4834</td>
<td>DRA/1345</td>
<td>Pencil sketch, man seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4835</td>
<td>DRA/1346</td>
<td>Pencil sketch, architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4836</td>
<td>DRA/1347</td>
<td>Sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4837</td>
<td>DRA/1348</td>
<td>Double-sided sketch, looking through door into interior, pencil woman sitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4838</td>
<td>DRA/1349</td>
<td>Large piece of paper, lots of different pencil sketches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4839</td>
<td>DRA/1350</td>
<td>Pencil sketch woman seated with sketchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4840</td>
<td>DRA/1351</td>
<td>Pencil sketch head of woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4841</td>
<td>DRA/1352</td>
<td>Ink sketch, woman seated at a piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4842</td>
<td>DRA/1353</td>
<td>Sketch outside scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4843</td>
<td>DRA/1354</td>
<td>Sketch woman looking out of open window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4844</td>
<td>BOO/8</td>
<td>The Times Atlas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4845</td>
<td>PAI/11</td>
<td>Crates of paintings: 9 or 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4846</td>
<td>PAI/12</td>
<td>Charles Hett, Fen Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4847</td>
<td>PAI/13</td>
<td>Framed watercolour of a woman, half-length, full face, c38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4848</td>
<td>PAI/14</td>
<td>Drawbridge over the Wilts and Dorset Canal by McEvoy, C36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4848</td>
<td>PAI/14</td>
<td>Sketch for Marcel Dupre playing organ, C27, glass on front broken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4849</td>
<td>PAI/15</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of a woman standing, C29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4850</td>
<td>PAI/16</td>
<td>Pencil Sketch of a woman head and shoulders C31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4851</td>
<td>PAI/17</td>
<td>Watercolour of Colonel Spencer Edwards? C25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4852</td>
<td>PAI/18</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of Odette Thornhill, 'Lady in Blue' C35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4853</td>
<td>PAI/19</td>
<td>Sketch of woman peeling potatoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4854</td>
<td>PAI/20</td>
<td>Watercolour landscape scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4855</td>
<td>PAI/21</td>
<td>Interior scene, family sitting together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4856</td>
<td>PAI/22</td>
<td>Ink sketch of woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4857</td>
<td>PAI/23</td>
<td>NOT MCEVOY FOLDER woman and children collecting firewood watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4858</td>
<td>PAI/24</td>
<td>NOT MCEVOY FOLDER Watercolour landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4859</td>
<td>PAI/25</td>
<td>NOT MCEVOY FOLDER Pencil sketch of woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4860</td>
<td>PAI/26</td>
<td>NOT MCEVOY FOLDER Pencil sketch of woman profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4861</td>
<td>Crates of paintings: 5</td>
<td>PAI/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4862</td>
<td>PAI/28</td>
<td>Portrait of Young Augustus John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4863</td>
<td>PAI/29</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4864</td>
<td>PAI/30</td>
<td>Woman in wooded scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4865</td>
<td>PAI/31</td>
<td>Portrait of a woman head and shoulders, copy of old master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4866</td>
<td>PAI/32</td>
<td>Copy of the Rape of Europa by Veronese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4867</td>
<td>PAI/33</td>
<td>Unfinished, landscape?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4868</td>
<td>PAI/34</td>
<td>Woman sitting reading a book by the fire by Mary McEvoy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4869</td>
<td>PAI/35</td>
<td>Distance - Bourton Downs 1904-5 by Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4870</td>
<td>PAI/36</td>
<td>Coast with Water by Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4871</td>
<td>PAI/37</td>
<td>Music, Evening by Mary McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4872</td>
<td>PAI/38</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4873</td>
<td>PAI/39</td>
<td>Woman in profile looking down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4874</td>
<td>Crates of paintings: 4</td>
<td>PAI/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4875</td>
<td>PAI/41</td>
<td>Portrait sketch of a young lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4876</td>
<td>PAI/42</td>
<td>Portrait of a woman seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4877</td>
<td>PAI/43</td>
<td>Portrait of a woman standing by mantlepiece with reflection in mirror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4878</td>
<td>PAI/44</td>
<td>Portrait sketch of a woman unfinished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4879</td>
<td>PAI/45</td>
<td>Portrait of a woman by Mary McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4880</td>
<td>PAI/46</td>
<td>Copy of Titian Noli me Tangere National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4881</td>
<td>PAI/47</td>
<td>Portrait of a woman in black wearing pearls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4882</td>
<td>PAI/48</td>
<td>Portrait of a woman seated in black with red scarf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4883</td>
<td>PAI/49</td>
<td>Portrait of a man seated in profile, Cecil Baring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4884</td>
<td>PAI/50</td>
<td>Portrait of an old lady in a black dress and hat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4885</td>
<td>PAI/51</td>
<td>Nude seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4886</td>
<td>PAI/52</td>
<td>Landscape unfinished, River Scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4887</td>
<td>PAI/53</td>
<td>Landscape, outside Grosvenor Road?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4888</td>
<td>PAI/54</td>
<td>The Garden at Grosvenor Road, Autumn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4889</td>
<td>PAI/55</td>
<td>Miss Margaret Gainsborough, after Gainsborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4890</td>
<td>PAI/56</td>
<td>Portrait of a woman by Charles Hett?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4891</td>
<td>PAI/57</td>
<td>Glass and Frond? Friend? Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4892</td>
<td>PAI/58</td>
<td>Unfinished landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4893</td>
<td>PAI/59</td>
<td>Study for La Reprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4894</td>
<td>PAI/60</td>
<td>Portrait of an officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4895</td>
<td>PAI/61</td>
<td>Wooded landscape small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4896</td>
<td>PAI/62</td>
<td>Ink sketch framed, people gathering round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4897</td>
<td>PAI/63</td>
<td>Ink line drawing, man and woman sat on a bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4898</td>
<td>PAI/64</td>
<td>Double sided sketch, woman sat in a window, man and woman kissing, ink and wash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4899</td>
<td>PAI/65</td>
<td>Townscape, ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4900</td>
<td>PAI/66</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of woman's head framed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4901</td>
<td>PAI/67</td>
<td>Etching, woman in a café? With large hat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4902</td>
<td>PAI/68</td>
<td>Etchings Pimlico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4903</td>
<td>PAI/69</td>
<td>Unfinished oil on panel, woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4904</td>
<td>PAI/70</td>
<td>Landscape, Charles Hett?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4905</td>
<td>PAI/71</td>
<td>Sketch of a woman in a bonnet, not by McEvoy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4906</td>
<td>PAI/72</td>
<td>Oil on board, nude standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4907</td>
<td>PAI/73</td>
<td>Soldiers playing cards by candle light, framed sketch pencil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4908</td>
<td>PAI/74</td>
<td>Watercolour framed sketch nudes seated C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4909</td>
<td>PAI/75</td>
<td>Park/street sketch framed C20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4910</td>
<td>PAI/76</td>
<td>Portrait head of a woman pencil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4911</td>
<td>PAI/77</td>
<td>Landscape sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4912</td>
<td>PAI/78</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4913</td>
<td>PAI/79</td>
<td>Chalk sketch of a woman framed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4914</td>
<td>PAI/80</td>
<td>Anna, sat at a piano, by Mary McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4915</td>
<td>PAI/81</td>
<td>Russian Music by Mary McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4916</td>
<td>PAI/82</td>
<td>Figures standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4917</td>
<td>PAI/83</td>
<td>Officer head and shoulders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4918</td>
<td>PAI/84</td>
<td>Study for Four Seasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4919</td>
<td>PAI/85</td>
<td>Drawing of Old Lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4920</td>
<td>PAI/86</td>
<td>Townscape C8, with broken glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4921</td>
<td>PAI/87</td>
<td>Pencil sketch, framed, two men sat reading C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4922</td>
<td>PAI/88</td>
<td>Pencil sketch Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4923</td>
<td>PAI/89</td>
<td>Watercolour framed, Spencer Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4924</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crates of paintings: 6 (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4925</td>
<td>PAI/90</td>
<td>Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4926</td>
<td>PAI/91</td>
<td>Two male nude sketches, pencil, framed C6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4927</td>
<td>PAI/92</td>
<td>Music Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4928</td>
<td>PAI/93</td>
<td>Landscape, oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4929</td>
<td>PAI/94</td>
<td>Study for Four Seasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4930</td>
<td>PAI/95</td>
<td>Woman standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4931</td>
<td>PAI/96</td>
<td>Girl at piano by Mary McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4932</td>
<td>PAI/97</td>
<td>Landscape, oil on panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4933</td>
<td>PAI/98</td>
<td>Landscape, oil on panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4934</td>
<td>PAI/99</td>
<td>Woman seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4935</td>
<td>PAI/100</td>
<td>Figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4936</td>
<td>PAI/101</td>
<td>Anna, sat at a piano, by Mary McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4937</td>
<td>PAI/102</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a woman framed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4938</td>
<td>PAI/103</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a woman framed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4939</td>
<td>PAI/104</td>
<td>Watercolour and pen landscape with figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4940</td>
<td>PAI/105</td>
<td>Sketch of figures gathered, small, framed C16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4941</td>
<td>PAI/106</td>
<td>Photograph Secccombe Hett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4942</td>
<td>PAI/107</td>
<td>Cows by Charlet Hett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4943</td>
<td>PAI/108</td>
<td>Landscape by Charles Hett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4944</td>
<td>PAI/109</td>
<td>Drawing by Shiugetsu, Grasshopper on Leaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4945</td>
<td>PAI/110</td>
<td>107 Child's Head by McEvoy C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4946</td>
<td>PAI/111</td>
<td>Pen and wash landscape C17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4947</td>
<td>PAI/112</td>
<td>Sketch of a harbour C14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4948</td>
<td>PAI/113</td>
<td>Woman's Head on board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>Accession Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4948</td>
<td>PAI/114</td>
<td>Double-sided board painting, landscape and figure standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4949</td>
<td>PAI/115</td>
<td>Pencil sketch baby breastfeeding, Mary McEvoy 1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4950</td>
<td>PAI/116</td>
<td>Street scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4951</td>
<td>PAI/117</td>
<td>Landscape on board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4952</td>
<td>PAI/118</td>
<td>Landscape on board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4953</td>
<td>PAI/119</td>
<td>Flowers in a vase by Mary McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4954</td>
<td>PAI/120</td>
<td>Unrecognisable painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4955</td>
<td>PAI/121</td>
<td>Unfinished buildings on board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4956</td>
<td>Cardboard box</td>
<td>Ambrose McEvoy sepia chalk sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4957</td>
<td>PAI/123</td>
<td>Pencil sketch head of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4958</td>
<td>PAI/124</td>
<td>Pencil sketch of a man with a beard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4959</td>
<td>PAI/125</td>
<td>Charcoal sketch of a woman reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4960</td>
<td>PAI/126</td>
<td>Woman seated, badly damaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4961</td>
<td>Loose to be put back with archival material</td>
<td>Loose sketch heads, pencil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4962</td>
<td>NOT/389</td>
<td>Admission to London art galleries as a member for 1919 Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4963</td>
<td>NOT/390</td>
<td>Admission to London art galleries as a member for 1919 Ambrose McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4964</td>
<td>LET/1310</td>
<td>Letter to Mrs McEvoy from C.W.H Johnson, 29th March 1931, National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4965</td>
<td>LET/1311</td>
<td>Letter to Ambrose McEvoy from Charles Houllses? Curator, National War Museum, 29th December 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4966</td>
<td>Crates of paintings: 2</td>
<td>PAI/127 Half-length portrait of Cecil Baring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4967</td>
<td>PAI/128</td>
<td>Girl in Yellow Blouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4968</td>
<td>PAI/129</td>
<td>Drawn for portrait of the Viscountess Chilston 1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4969</td>
<td>PAI/130</td>
<td>Portrait of a woman, half-length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4970</td>
<td>PAI/131</td>
<td>Portrait of the artist's mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4971</td>
<td>PAI/132</td>
<td>Portrait of a Soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4972</td>
<td>PAI/133</td>
<td>Copy of Hogarth's sister (Mrs Salter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4973</td>
<td>Crates of paintings: 1</td>
<td>PAI/134 Portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4974</td>
<td>PAI/135</td>
<td>Portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4975</td>
<td>PAI/136</td>
<td>Portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4976</td>
<td>PAI/137</td>
<td>Portrait of a little girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4977</td>
<td>PAI/138</td>
<td>Portrait of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4978</td>
<td>PAI/139</td>
<td>Winifred Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4979</td>
<td>PAI/140</td>
<td>Claude Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4980</td>
<td>PAI/141</td>
<td>Portrait of a young man, Jowitt?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4981</td>
<td>PAI/142</td>
<td>Portrait of a lady seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4982</td>
<td>PAI/143</td>
<td>Townscape through a window, London?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4983</td>
<td>Not marked with inventory marks on the paintings</td>
<td>PAI/144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4984</td>
<td>PAI/145</td>
<td>Ink sketch of soldier (general?) seated hands on lap, stamped with studio mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4985</td>
<td>PAI/146</td>
<td>The Thames at Night, watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4986</td>
<td>PAI/147</td>
<td>Figure with head leaning on hand, watercolour and ink, stamped with studio mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4987</td>
<td>PAI/148</td>
<td>Profile portrait of a girl, watercolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4988</td>
<td>PAI/149</td>
<td>Nude, seated leaning forward, watercolour and graphite, monochrome, stamped with studio mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4989</td>
<td>PAI/150</td>
<td>Seated woman, watercolour and india ink, monochrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4990</td>
<td>PAI/151</td>
<td>Two women talking, monochrome, watercolour, stamped with McEvoy studio stamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4991</td>
<td>PAI/152</td>
<td>Portrait of the Artist's Daughter, Anna, oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4992</td>
<td>PAI/153</td>
<td>Mary McEvoy sketch, view from Abbotsleigh, Freshford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4993</td>
<td>SKE/52</td>
<td>Sketchbook by Mary McEvoy, Vacation 1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4994</td>
<td>PAI/153</td>
<td>Watercolour sketch of a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4995</td>
<td>Letters that survived Charles Hett's garage fire</td>
<td>LET/1312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4996</td>
<td>LET/1313</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, date unknown, address unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4998</td>
<td>LET/1315/1914</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 9th August 1914, Hotel Restaurant Frappa, P.Berger, St. Etienne, France.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4999</td>
<td>LET/1316/1914</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 7th August 1914, Café Besset 35 Place du Peuple, St Etienne, France.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>LET/1317/1914</td>
<td>Letter to Mary McEvoy from Ambrose McEvoy, 12th August 1914, Café des Colonnnes, C.Chauve, St. Etienne, France.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>