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Abstract

Simeon Solomon (9 October 1840 – 14 August 1905) was a Jewish pre-Raphaelite artist whose life and works demonstrated the supposed difficulties of replicating symbolic patterns between cultures as a Jew. The reception of Simeon Solomon’s symbolic project between the 1850s and 1870s thereby illustrates the ambivalent and contested nature of British Jewish assimilation during and after Jewish emancipation, when Solomon was expected, and failed, to portray a specific Jewish image for his audience. My unique contribution will be to investigate stereotype parameters by analysing the fringes of Solomon’s depictions of Hebraism, through rabbis holding scrolls of the law, Jewish domestic scenes, biblical patriarchs, prophets, and furious sovereigns, to test the assumptions of the British Hebrew stereotype placed upon the artist.

Solomon’s reception varied within that short period as the forces governing the national Hebrew image changed rapidly, especially towards the rise of Disraeli’s second premiership, and following the dissemination of Matthew Arnold’s theories of culture. However, Solomon’s British romantic symbolism has been seen to constitute a hidden homosexuality that was not neatly framed within the expected terms of the Hebrew national image. The rejection of his symbolic project marks the definition of perceived Jewish self-hatred by Sander Gilman: Solomon was seen to be “unable to command the language, discourse, or both, of the world that [he] inhabits”, to articulate the expected symbolism according to his Hebrew stereotype. The ambivalent reaction to Solomon’s romantic symbolism creates boundaries over the image of Hebrew nationhood and demonstrates how he interiorised and represented the contested Christian supersession and conversion fantasies placed upon him. This thesis will therefore look at the fringes of Solomon’s supposed unified Jewish Hebraism to question gendered assumptions of symbolic assimilation.
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Preface

I was taught how philosophical aesthetics laid the grounds for the history of the category art by Andrew Hemingway at UCL. The primary reason why I am studying at the University of York is because it is the field of my beloved supervisor, Liz Prettejohn. She has already demonstrated that Simeon Solomon engaged with aesthetics, and as such, he is one of the founding chapters in her book of a British ‘Art for Art’s Sake’ movement. She has, that is, written about how Solomon was attempting to engage with the Kantian Critique of Judgment as well as Schiller’s aesthetics.¹ My principal decision to pursue Solomon studies at York, then, is that these philosophical uses of late- enlightenment British aesthetic provided laudable subject oriented moral legitimations and calls for tolerance of both faith, and sexuality.

However, within a few months study of Solomon’s case it fast became clear that the potential understanding of his modes of engagement with late enlightenment philosophies ran into trouble; particularly in the 1860s as there was a distinct change in what the Jew had to represent across the British political and social spectrum in what becomes known as the ‘culture and society’ school of aesthetic criticism. The problem with reception of the Jewish image, occurs both in the domestic literature that was distributed, and cultural theories that developed within the circles of academic scholars and critics that Solomon attempted to engage, specifically ones who were also engaged with the scholarship of classical antiquity.

What was troubling in Solomon’s narrative is that I saw a conscription of Jewish stereotype by those who established claims to aesthetics, specifically by people who also

laid their own theoretical grounding in Kant’s *Critique of Judgement*, to establish their cultural theory: from Matthew Arnold, T.S. Palgrave, and even Solomon’s closest allies such as A.C. Swinburne, Walter Pater, and others. They laid out boundaries for what the Jew could represent within their civilizing cultural systems.

I found that conscription leading up to 1870, and Solomon’s resulting aggression towards his critical apparatus, colleagues, and friends, unsatisfying for my own personal agenda in ‘queer theory’ and ‘the Jewish question’; but it was nonetheless ‘there’ in the extant literature. As Solomon tried to move into dissenting modes of romanticism through the mid to late 1860s, forms that were common to other Jews from a prior era of liberal tolerance towards dissenting faiths in the 1830s, the Hebrew image was galvanized in relation to culture and Puritan boundaries of nationhood; and Solomon’s romantic vision, a common mode in English literature since the English Reformation, was an impossibility to his art world of friends and critics. The art world simply refused to allow his romantic vision as a ‘sincere’ mode of ‘Hebraism’ distinct from other cultural modalities. Solomon dropped out from these circles in the art world, whose synchronous Hebraism was too brackish for their studies of culture, and classical antiquity.

What is fascinating in Solomon’s case study, in any event, is precisely his snap with the paradigms of reception in the ‘art world’ due to these stereotypes, and what that says about how the Jewish individual responds to constraints (to use terms from my Jewish community), as both a situated self in the community, and a sovereign, or individuated self. I see the failures of Solomon’s philosophical reception as if it were Solomon’s failure to represent his ‘type’ aligned to Sander Gilman’s linguistic mode of self-hatred, within his historic linguistic understanding of the term.

Resonant with stereotype conscription in social studies for developments in art history, is something Friedrich Nietzsche writes in *Twilight of the Idols*. Nietzsche’s
characterizable dour tone about man’s very uses of aesthetics, is to do with arts’ purpose to combat the forces of humanity, to combat negative affects to ugliness which he defines as the disintegration of type. It seems very instructive for the establishment of a concrete Hebrew type:

What is it that man hates? Without a doubt it is the decline of his type. In this regard his hatred springs from the deepest instincts of the race: there is horror, caution, profundity and far-reaching vision in this hatred, —it is the most profound hatred that exists. On its account alone Art is profound.\(^2\)

Solomon’s contemporary critics in the art world (1860-1871) who saw his later works as a failed exemplar of his ‘Hebrew’ type, led to what were projections of self-hatred. On the one hand the ceremonial images he produced in the earlier years of the 1860s were ‘unimportant’ to those who derided ceremonies within their puritan confession (the designation ‘unimportant’ in the Anglican confession specifically refers to the adoration of the Host, and by extension ritualism); and on the other his romantic uses of syncretic vision were ultimately rejected for being ‘insincere’ to his supposed Jewish exemplar in the later parts of the decade: these were just other forms of self-hatred of his Hebrew type. Despite his perceived failures of type, Solomon continued to draw and paint, even through that rejection of his interior romantic vision.

The subsequent question is: if an artist chooses to marginalize himself from the critical apparatus of the ‘art world’, can he still call himself an ‘artist’? I argue, as T.J. Clark in his *Image of the People*, that there is a distinction between an artist’s ideal audience, and an actual public.\(^3\) Clark argues that the tension causes a snap in the artist to make an outstanding work that startles his public. However, Solomon’s rebellions from his expected type no longer represents a sincere artistic engagement in the national symbolic

---


sense, as his Jewish stereotype ought to, that he could not engage with his intended vision for his audience. As a result of that failure to engage with his actual public based on their expectations, he severs with his friends and critics beyond the elastic limit of symbolic acceptability of his type. It is only in the years immediately after that time that he finally criminalizes himself to genital exposure to passersby on the streets of Stratford Place Mews in February 1873, close to a police station.

Rather than presenting the assumptions of Solomon’s dismissal by his colleagues after his criminalization due to homophobia, I have re-read sources which imply that his rejection was for other reasons, particularly the suspicion over Solomon’s involvement in the Fleshy School of Poetry controversy of October 1871.\(^4\) The fallout with his network was due to what his closest colleagues saw as a betrayal: it seemed to Algernon Charles Swinburne, Dante Gabriel Rossetti, and William Michael Rossetti, that Solomon intended to be listed in the excoriating criticism. Solomon’s critical acts tried to repair the apparent damage caused to Solomon’s attempts at a romantic ‘vision’ after Swinburne’s critical article for the *Dark Blue*, of July 1871, just three months prior, which distanced the Jewish artist from romantic modes. Swinburne’s rejection in July followed F.T. Palgrave’s limiting Hebrew allocentrism which Solomon shared with Swinburne immediately before he asked Swinburne to write the review. Therefore, it is through the allocentrism of Solomon’s Hebrew stereotype in which I managed to find a purpose for Solomon’s critical failure in the time leading up to the early 1870s.

In looking at the ambivalences of Jewish assimilation – particularly in the rise of national Hebraism, I am not afraid of my alignment with the copious Jewish ‘placing the blame’ literatures since Hannah Arendt, in addition to the modes of psychosocial

\(^4\) Historians of the Pre-Raphaelites will know that the Fleshy school controversy marked D.G. Rossetti’s beginning of his decline in health, and paranoia.
literatures immediately after the Holocaust. These ‘self-hating’ discussions involve describing how gay men, or Jews, are implicated in perpetuating negative mythologies. In my case study I draw attention to how British gay men and Jews assimilating symbolic power in the nineteenth century perpetuate gestures of authority, such as abusive acts of sexual impunity, hedonism, or displays of extreme wealth. These might be critiqued for seeing the ‘done-to’ victim as sliding into ‘the do-er’, or ‘villain’ category, confusing the symbolic processes of a minority group’s claims to social justice through historical claims to victimhood.

As a member of the élite cousinhood of Jews in London, Solomon was engaged with modes of assimilation that relied on the production of symbolic power. With regards to Solomon’s history then, I knew that I could not shy away from the conflicting mental investments by scholars of certain Jewish or queer paradigms calling for social justice. In this work investigating competing Jewish stereotypes leading up to 1870, national uses of Hebraism conflict with élite hedonisms which signified impunity. With Solomon’s fantasies, that assimilation also included the sexual abuses of power and pornographies involving corporal punishment of minors in élite institutions; ones that were reined in by the Jewish community in his own time. As it happened, these apparent abuses had to be suppressed for Liberal agenda in the early 1870s, based on Hebrew moralism.

After submission of this thesis in January 2022, I needed to find help in how I should understand engagements with traumatised receptions that use Solomon for their own calls for social justice. My alternative findings were responses to how I perceived accounts of child sexual abuse, in both sadism, and processes known as ‘favouritism’ in the élite education systems; hedonism, and élite exceptionalism; public genital exposure without consent to passers-by; critical betrayal; and to the other extreme, to engagements with Hebrew nationalism. These findings might affect those with differing claims for
social justice – but I am confident that my communities can take them. However, findings such as these caused violence, or projections of other paradigms of self-hatred.

Understanding possible violent reception to my project when alternative paradigms of testimony were provided, was given to me by Stephen Frosh in psychosocial studies. In his beautiful book, *Those who come After: Postmemory, Acknowledgment and Forgiveness*. The primary concern was to ask how we might approach accounts of memories of historic injustice that might implicate descendants of perpetrators who come many generations after.

Frosh cites Yosef Haim Yerushalmi’s *Zachor* which approaches historic versus religious Jewish memory (also useful also for queer hagiography), Judith Butler on the vulnerability of accusations of self-hatred, Jessica Benjamin on existential contest for acknowledgment, Thomas Tresize on platforms for witnessing trauma in holocaust testimony where he points out that, *ultimately, the way testimony of lost community is given space to be articulated, or alternatively, silenced, gives an example of how either the listener or teller relates to community itself*. I learned that the delivery of traumatic testimony can only be delivered – in say, abuse of power in education systems – if the witness is given a safe platform to do so. If an alternate paradigm of a response to the *listener’s* personal trauma is offered to historic facts, the listener will feel that his relationship to community is being overlooked; he may try to silence the witness, or, at worst the reception gives way to a feeling of existential threat so that a primal feeling of competition occurs in which ‘only one can live’. I want to circumvent such chains of violence. I do not want the original contributions of this thesis to lay conscription on how historical memory is to be conceived, and what relationships are allowed to be grieved.\(^5\)

---

\(^5\) In 2017, Judith Butler gave a memorial lecture for José Esteban Muñoz at Lisa Baraister’s book launch on grief, time, and care. Lisa Baraister, *Enduring time* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2017). I asked Judith Butler herself whether public sex can be grieved without the constitutive nature of *polis* to cosmopolitan public sex – knowing that ‘giving an account of oneself’ is the main function of her early work. The question
For the purposes of AIDs activism in the 1980s, and the generations of scholars who faced violence and homophobic oppression, that is where Solomon’s existing paradigm among non-Jews has fit. I point out that through the 1980s, Jews’ paradigms of witnessing suffering have readily been appropriated to provide witness to queer neglect. The Jewish historian, when brought into these environments, might have to give witness these traumas, and responses to them. I do not want to turn away from these paradigms of relatedness to lost community, and therefore I produce lengthy ‘paradigms’ of Solomon reception within my introduction; so that I am not seen to be looking away from witnessing AIDs memory and violence against gay men in those times. As a member of both of these communities I cannot look away from how Solomon is used by such appropriations, but equally, I also look at the engagements of romantic agony that depict Solomon’s uses of child sexual abuse, child pain, and abuses of power, as one of the subjects of his work.

*Those Who Come After* also had passages that responded to some of the other Jewish issues such as Yosef Haim Yerushalmi’s idealization of religious memory (contra historical fact), and it also includes a theology that uses ‘myths of return’ made popular through Martin Buber. I also engage with religious systems of ‘revelation’ and ‘myths of return’, in my readings of Solomon’s images, but they relate to the sexuality of British romanticism in the British mode of elegiac poetry. Specifically, my own specific uses of a ‘myth of return’ involves analyzing Solomon’s uses of a poet’s homosexual phaseology, to a state of homosexuality before the hymnal pact between students is broken. It relates to the before-times between brethren prior to reaching the fleshy metaphor of the celestial

---

is, if you introduce the shadow of police as a constitutive part of public sex to Jose Estaban Munoz’s Chapter 2, ‘Cruising the Toilet’, in *Cruising Utopia*, then her desire to eliminate police as a mental barrier collapses. Butler ‘preferred not to’ answer the question. I assumed that preference represents a stumbling block of queer theory. The psychosocial students present legitimised my question.
city in the nuptial bed. The place of return, the celestial city, or Beulah, is the genital fleshy place of marriage. Phaseology might be anathema to identity testimonies of ‘coming out’ that one ‘always was’ ‘born this way’. ‘Return’ to the homosexual state does not delegitimate such claims. However, as we shall see, chronologists of homosexual art such as James Saslow’s *Pictures and Passions*, use Solomon’s nuptial depictions to interpret the drama of lost loves in the friends of the bridegroom regrettably leaving his homosexual past.

That approach is quite simply normative English literature that used to be well known. As people do not read Milton as they used to (or other fleshy quest literatures), it is a metaphor that is quite forgotten and needs to be revived to understand British romanticism in Solomon’s work. The inclusion of the hymnal break with homosexual before-times also gives the *Fleshy School* controversy the valence it deserves – as I shall discuss in the thesis.

I am especially thankful for the listening and understanding that Nadia Valman offered in my examination; and the thorough reading of my repressed, or ‘traumatized speech’ through the years I have been working on this project. Her engagement was a relief. I now know that I can always find a safe place to articulate myself, despite the disagreements that takes the form of antagonism in the receptions of Solomon’s case study. It shows that I can relate to the paradigms of Jewish and-or queer trauma narrations.

---


7 The parallel account of ‘coming out’ as a Jew in Racine’s *Esther* springs particularly to mind. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick. *Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 2008), 76. However, contrary to secular French ‘dejudaisations’ that Racine’s use of the Biblical narrative would point to, I would argue that Solomon’s identity was never concealed either as a Jew, or homosexual in British society.

that are recalled or denied by Solomon’s case study; and moreover, how the paradigmatic responses to the recollection of his mythologies and works also relates to how the reviewer responds to their own relationship to their own lost loves, to their prior abuses, to elitist impunity, or to their relationship to community itself.
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**Introduction**

In the broadest literary sense, Simeon Solomon’s work concatenated symbols from various cultures, which expressed the oppositional tensions of a Jew within a form of British romanticism, and Hebraism, in the era of Jewish emancipation. The receptions to his project was illustrative in that a Jew might express a sort of tension between presenting his Jewish image to a national audience, either relaying a total revelation of sovereignty in Britain, where the expected image of Hebraism is that of inherited law; against an opposing type of law in the imagination of the individual dissenter against the British divinity schools, creating a revelation through their own interior vision. The Jew between these two types, according to the receptions of his audience, comes to either to express the supposed totalizing awareness of national sovereignty (Hebraism); or supposed subjectivity (romanticism). There are ahistoric philosophical and theological implications surrounding the paradox, but luckily Solomon was situated in a particular time and place leading up to 1871, when Numa Hartog won the Wrangler Prize through his mathematical genius, surpassing the need to swear an oath of abjuration at Oxford ‘according to the true faith of a Christian’; and so the importance of individual dissent as a romantic non-confessional poet became less apparent.

**Outline Biography of Simeon Solomon**

The life, works, and places inhabited by Simeon Solomon are well known and documented in the numerous catalogues and existing scholarship devoted to the artist.

---

9 A posthumously awarded thesis written by Peter Gross ז״ל, represents a valiant attempt in the British Jewish Studies that tries to incorporate “post-colonial discourse, the concept of nationhood and the consequent assimilation; colonisation or exclusion of others and the concepts of alterity and of ambivalence” in "Representations of Jews and Jewishness in English painting, 1887-1914." PhD dissertation, (University of Leeds, 2004), 4. The discourse of postcoloniality and alterity are vast, but it does seem that Solomon’s case upset some queer gendered paradigms for Jewish scholars.
Here I will include a basic outline biography of the artist, followed by a supplementary comment on the Solomon family ethos and religious practice; and how it might bridge problematic paradigms of Solomon scholarship.\textsuperscript{10} Simeon Solomon was born in Bishopsgate, London, on the 9th October, 1840, and his birth was registered at the New Synagogue.\textsuperscript{11} He was the last one of the eight children to Michael Solomon (Hebrew name, Meyer son of Aaron), and Catherine Levy. Simeon’s father Michael had three brothers, Reuben, Isaac, and Abraham. Aaron, the patriarch, established their business in Léghorn hats, with international connections to the Italian merchant towns. In the year of Simeon’s birth Michael and his brothers sold their father Aaron’s business – continuing trade in the family by establishing a paper embossing factory.

The Solomons have become known as a “family of painters”:\textsuperscript{12} Simeon Solomon’s mother was a miniaturist, and two of Simeon’s older siblings, Abraham (1823-1862) and Rebecca (1832-1886), were artists trained through privately established art preparatory schools. Solomon’s eldest brother Abraham was trained at Henry Sass’s school of Art in Bloomsbury from 1836, and he enrolled at the Royal Academy school in 1839 with Sass’s nomination. Rebecca was trained at Spitalfields School of Design and became an historically notable artist in her own right, specializing in genre scenes.\textsuperscript{13} The three siblings exhibited at the Royal Academy together in 1858. Simeon and Abraham Solomon enlisted with to the Artist’s Rifles Corps on 19th January 1861.\textsuperscript{14} Simeon’s resignation could be

\textsuperscript{10} Colin Cruise’s amalgamation of credible sources is reliable, in “Simeon Solomon: A Chronology”, in Cruise (ed.), \textit{Love Revealed, Simeon Solomon and the Pre-Raphaelites}, (London and New York: Merrell, 2005), 184-185. I have provided further sources when they differ.

\textsuperscript{11} As provided by the Jewish Genealogical Society of Great Britain database, https://www.jewishgen.org/databases/UK/ 12/06/2022.

\textsuperscript{12} The term is taken from \textit{Solomon: A Family of Painters}, ed. Jeffrey Daniels (London: Geffrey Museum, 1985)

\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{14} My thanks to Patrick Baty for access to the Muster Roll of the Artists’ Rifles.
dated through the enrolment register under Abraham’s incorrectly entered death, “December 1863”.  

In outline of Simeon’s artistic training, Simeon trained at Francis Stephen Cary’s school of design in April 1856 and was nominated to enroll at the Royal Academy school by Augustus Egg, R.A., a member of the St. John’s Wood clique of artists. As fellow probationers in the Royal Academy Schools, Simeon made a sketching club with Henry Holiday, Marcus Stone, and Albert Moore. They studied objects at the British Museum when bible depictions were rendered in Assyrian styles. At the Academy school he also became friends with William Blake Richmond, son of the British ‘Idealist’ painter George Richmond.

As a lively household during the 1850s, the Solomons had gatherings with many notable visitors. Rebecca and Abraham visited other salons of literary and fine artists, and the young Simeon was introduced to these circles through an album of sketches. It is in response to these drawings that the term ‘genius’ was applied to Simeon, and I will discuss how he developed the identity through his life in relation to his romantic mythology.

Simeon met George Price Boyce via his siblings in 1857; and it was through Boyce that Simeon was introduced to William Burges and to decorate the famous cabinet with thirteen other artists, now at the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. Simeon also developed his friendship with Edward Burne Jones through his sister’s relationship to the MacDonald sisters; and it was via Burne Jones that he developed an intimate friendship with the poet and critic, Charles Algernon Swinburne, and William Michael, and Dante Gabriel Rossetti.

Simeon continued to exhibit at the Royal Academy and other prominent galleries throughout the 1860s, including the newly established Dudley picture gallery, from 1865.

---

15 As shown on the Artist’s Rifle’s muster Roll, Ibid.
He traveled internationally, marking a revival in the interest in anachronistic renaissance styles. He visited France with Rebecca in 1858 or 1859, visited Florence in 1865, followed with a longer sojourn in Rome in 1866 and 1867, befriending Elihu Vedder, and there was joined by Holiday, to go on a trip to Naples.  

Solomon made an impression in at least one of these gatherings by attending in costume in 1863 at Fryston Hall, the stately home of Richard Monkton Milnes (Lord Haughton). At Fryston, Solomon was likely to have met Alexander Strahan, the Sabbatarian publishing mogul of Christian domestic literature. Strahan was the editor of *Once a Week*, with the stewardship of Samuel Lucas, and *Good Words* with Norman MacLeod as editor, the latter an influential Scottish preacher. Strahan also made use of prominent authors, including Pre-Raphaelite artists such as John Everett Millais among others to illustrate serialized novels, so that *Good words* had the quality cache of authors and illustrators to rival Dickens’s *Household Words*. As I shall discuss in the chapter, Solomon published photographs of his drawings of a Jewish lifecycle in 1862 from a gallery that was exhibiting William Holman Hunt’s work, *Finding the Saviour in the Temple*. As we shall see, two of these photographs of Jewish life (related as ‘his’ people) were published as wood engravings in *Once a Week* under the Sabbatarian editor’s papers. The set of ten images were also published in *The Leisure Hour* during 1866. In December of 1862, Solomon illustrated a poem in *Good Words*, by his friend and minor dramatist Robert Smithson, depicting *Isaac and Rebekah*.  

Regarding Solomon’s friendship with William De Morgan, his sister in law A.M.W. Stirling cites a letter from Isabel, the wife of the Jewish ‘amateur’ engraver

---

17 Cruise, op. cit.  
18 This drawing was probably rescued from the delayed Dalziel Bible Gallery project that Simeon produced at least 20 drawings for in 1862 among other prominent artists such as William Holman Hunt, and Frederic Leighton. Sadly this project was shelved until the 1880s. Only six of Solomon’s images were published in the first printing in 1881; and a round twenty in the subsequent re-publication by Aly Fox in 1900.
Horatio J. Lucas. She includes Solomon in a list of friends, as she talks of the Lucas’s close friendship with the de Morgans in 1863, “one evening, William De Morgan, Henry Holiday, Simeon Solomon, and one or two others besides the master of the house, left specimen of their skill on the walls”. William De Morgan knew that they would be home on Friday nights, probably because of the Sabbath. They spend these nights jovially, with “vulgar” newspapers: “we sat around the hearth, with its mantelpiece of beautiful Burne-Jones tiles, laughing as only young people can laugh.” As a fellow graduate of UCL, Horatio Lucas was a close friend of the de Morgans. Isabel was the niece of famous Jewish lawyer, Francis Goldsmid, son of Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, who co-established UCL.

We can infer from this that Solomon was close to the wealthier Jewish cousinhood, the élites, as well as the late pre-Raphaelite, Evelyn de Morgan, and potter and novelist, William de Morgan.

In 1868 Solomon starts a close friendship with the Eton master Oscar Browning, and according to extant scholarship, his friendship with Walter Pater also starts at Oxford in this year; just as he moved to his studio at 12 Fitzroy Square. He had been interested in themes and popular stories referring to classical antiquity in prior years, with his exhibition of Habet! in 1865 from the scene in Melvyn White’s The Gladiator, to renowned acclaim, and Daemon and Aglae that took the same pattern as his dyadic biblical works in 1866,
and Bacchus in 1867 accompanying a William Morris excerpt. In my interpretation, this Bacchus references the Biblical story of Moses’s spies carrying the giant grapes of Givon, making the pattern and substance of these ‘non-Hebrew’ works adhere to romantic dialogues between cultures.

Through 1868 onwards Solomon sought legitimacy of his romantic visionary project through networks of scholars at Oxford and Eton. He attended student events in Balliol societies. He exhibited Sacramentum Amoris, whose title he confirmed with Browning, but was harshly criticized, and The Bride, the Bridegroom, and Friend of the Bridegroom, that was savagely criticized in the Saturday Review for its quotation from John 3.28, by F.T. Palgrave, the editor, and himself son of a Jewish convert to Christianity.23

In 1870 and 1871, Solomon visits Italy twice. Colin Cruise gives the implication that the latter trip with Oscar Browning might “have been for legal reasons, possibly related to his homosexuality”.24 There he writes his romantic prose poem that has been connected to his work, Mystery of Love in Sleep: An Allegory, and it finally published in 1871 as A Vision of Love Revealed in Sleep. Solomon sent a copy of his prose poem to Swinburne to review in The Dark Blue, an Oxford student journal. Solomon intended Swinburne to promote his poem, as he organized the review through Solomon’s own connections to the journal. Within the letter to Swinburne Solomon also relates how he is following the trial details of the concurrent infamous transvestites in London. When Swinburne’s review was finally published Solomon reacts badly to it with indignant

24 Cruise, op cit. I have decided not to study the abuses of power too closely for personal reasons, but in the interests of social justice, someone may find articulation and redress for historic child abuse, and sexual abuses of power against students. I am dismayed that I failed to do so. It may nonetheless be an important factor in what Conroy describes as what she perceives as ‘prejudice’, so I argue that his friends were aware of his ‘homosexuality’ throughout the 1860s, so this reference is a reasonable cause for prejudicial social abjuration.
letters. Soon after, another paper owned by Alexander Strahan, *The Contemporary Review*, publishes Robert Buchanan’s anonymous attack on the Pre-Raphaelite poets, titled ‘The fleshy school of Poetry’ in 1871. I argue through implications in the Solomon biography by Julia Ellsworth Ford, and from letters from Swinburne to their mutual friend, George Powell, and W.M. Rossetti, that this Fleshy critique was discovered in part to be enabled by Solomon. At the very least it linked Solomon in Strahan’s cover up of the author’s identity, and it provides the true reason for Rossetti’s invective against Solomon.

As mentioned, Solomon’s interested knowledge of the Boulton case was evidence that he was aware of the legal specifications of public sex prohibitions which was a feature of their trial, and it implies he knowingly invested in his criminalization. On the 11th February 1873, Solomon exposes himself to passersby on Stratford Place Mews, and thereafter caught attempting buggary with George Roberts, a sixty year old stableman, inside the toilet located there. He was thereafter taken to a police station on the corner of the same small street and on the following day they both were remanded in custody. Simeon’s cut Jewish penis – contrary to queer-Jewish interiorized theories of sexual alterity – was considered “natural in appearance”, and his rectum was considered “perfectly natural in appearance”; and was given surety by his cousin Myer Salaman, so that his sentence was commuted to two weeks.25 Roberts, who was examined and had evidence of “rectal” soreness, is sentenced to eighteen months of hard labour.26 Solomon was again arrested again on the 3rd March in Paris with Henry Lefranc in a public latrine,

---

25 Conroy’s relates these details, Conroy, 65.
26 *Ibid.* For most of the details of this trial see Conroy’s dissertation, Chapter 1. I accept much of her rich and detailed scholarship on the trial, although I interpret “passing and re-passing” and “open and public space” to mean exposing his erect penis to passers-by for fifteen minutes on the street, before entering the toilet with Roberts. In my view, it would thereby interpret the language of the indictment like Wendy Stacey Johnson did. MJ/SR/S405, LMA, 1873. Wendell Stacy Johnson, *Living In Sin: The Victorian Sexual Revolution* (Chicago: Nelson Hall, 1979), 167 ff.
and put on trial French charges of pederasty, and was sentenced to three months in prison, and given a 16 Franc fine.

Solomon continued to publish reproductions of his images, for instance he continued his professional relationship with Frederic Hollyer, appearing with many images in the photographer’s various catalogues of platinotypes and reproductions. Despite instances of private artistic engagements, he supplies legends of his genius and vagrancy, with visits to St Giles workhouse and hospital “in broken down circumstances”, Endell street, 1885. Solomon also creates a myth of conversion to Catholicism, which is salient to both Christian fetishes of Jewish conversion, and to the Christian narratives about Jewish ‘insincerity’ in the era of Jewish emancipation and reform, which I will discuss. On the 14th August 1905 Solomon finally collapsed on High Holborn, and is taken to St Giles’ Hospital, where he dies of heart failure. He was buried in Willesden Jewish Cemetery.

I include some of these post 1873 images aside from the issues of chronology because they refer to the same tension between the newly specified Hebraism, and ‘quotational strategies’ of Solomon’s visionary romanticism in the 1860s to 1870s. Rather than point to it as evidence that Solomon maintained a ‘career’ as an ‘artist’ as an active self-identity, my thesis will contain its scope to the difficulty of a British Jew’s artistic identification between romantic forms of subjective revelation leading up to 1870 – with all the aristocratic mythologies of genius exceptionalism; and the faultline this artistic attempt at romanticism enacts with a newly galvanized national image of cultural Hebraism for the newly enfranchised working classes towards the late 1860s. Solomon’s retrospective themes in his art after 1873 also represents the cultural tensions in the changes between senses of the ‘national image’ leading up to that year.

27 Conroy, 187.
The Solomon Family Ethos and Religious Practice

The Solomon family were active members of the London Jewish community. One paradigm in the study and presentation of Simeon Solomon’s work is what I will summarize as a perceived severance or cleavage represented in Solomon’s morality between an assumed piety of a ‘practicing’ Jewish background, and as he moves towards his attempted artistic vision, associated with his insincere hedonism. There is therefore a perceived paradox between the Solomon ‘conversaziones’ which was described by Lambourne as “undoubtedly tremendous fun” laced with the probability that for the upper middling class Jews, displays of “tremendous wealth”, freedoms of drink, as described directly about the Solomons by George du Maurier; with salon wit, gossip, and enlightened secular thought, seem incongruous against the pieties of community support, amiability, knowledge of Sabbath observance, prayers, and knowledge of kashrut laws.28

DuMaurier’s more obvious motives in the use of the Solomons is to prove his non antisemitic credentials of an earlier era after the excoriating antisemitism of Trilby in 1894, which seems to come in handy by the publication of his diary and letters. The motive here seems to be that Daphne Du Maurier published George’s letters where he recalls his trip to the Solomons’ parties; and, against the prejudices of his friends, to say that Jews were “the very kindest people of my acquaintance...”. Du Maurier includes small portions of information about the conversaziones, which are used by Lambourne’s depiction of the Solomons’ salons of this period; and used Du Maurier’s recollection of the Solomon guest list of important leading artists and well-connected impresarios of their era, from Frederic Leighton to Millais, and the MacDonald Sisters. With the “tremendous wealth”, and

“tremendous fun”, the apparent hedonism afforded the Solomon’s a tremendous symbolic social cache in the ‘art world’.29

In a catalogue entry devoted to Rebecca Solomon, Pamela Gerrish-Nunn describes how in the mid 1860s, an incongruous schism between an assumed background is painted about her ‘hedonism’ and alcoholism, by a “disturbing” picture of her parties in the mid 1860s as a “cause of gossip and anxiety” by her friend, Aggie MacDonald.30 Gerrish-Nunn also perceives an incongruity in the ‘evidence’ from the recollections of MacDonald, that Rebecca was responsible for Simeon’s Jewish education, and observing of “the Jewish calendar and orthodox eating habits at a time when most writers allege she was leading a wild and unruly life”.31

Solomon’s “observance” of orthodox dietary laws is not strictly correct; as Solomon’s friends mention on multiple occasions. Henry Holiday notes that on a vacation in Wales in 1869,

I remember that one morning at breakfast when carving a large cold ham I asked Simeon if I might give him some more. (He did not observe the Jewish restrictions.) [sic] 'Thank you, no," he said, "I have perhaps taken too much already, for I much fear it has not chewed its cud this morning."32

As Holiday describes within the passage itself, this Jewish joke is a reference to the current Colenso affair, where there was “an episcopal fight over the hare’s cud”.33 It is apparent from this matter that Solomon is knowledgeable and made light of his place as Jewish example in episcopal affairs, but that he did not keep kashrut.

Another example of Solomon’s nonobservant consumption is listed by Elihu Vedder, the American artist in Rome, in 1866. In this section he devoted to his recollection

29 Ibid. 6-7.
30 Pamela Gerrish-Nunn, ‘Rebecca Solomon’ 22, footnote 19
31 Ibid. n.19
32 Holiday, 159 - 160
33 Ibid.
of community between young and old artists, writing about seeing the old ascetic
Nazarene, Overbeck, “wandering about”, and how he would have liked to have learned
about the days of “Shelley, Keats, and Byron” from another artist, Joseph Severn.34 He
immediately relates that in the 1866 his company including Solomon would take hikes
around the Campagna: “We had to take what we could get – bread, wine, ham and eggs.
We drank and ate voraciously, Simmit [Solomon] keeping up with the rest”. On
commenting on the dismal thunderstorm, where “all hell seemed to break loose”, Solomon
“sat down, and quietly remarked as if to himself, “By Jove, what a fearful pother[sic]
about a little pork!” It was such a funny witticism, that his remark became famous as
“household words”. 35

It is reasonable to think that this joke about Solomon’s non-Kosher consumption
had more serious Jewish biblical overtones, as they would also conscious of the recent
painting of Hannah and her Sons, by Antonio Ciseri, with its theme about their martyrdom
from the Book of Maccabees. The joke that Solomon made was to represent the
extraordinary ‘pother’ that Jewish sons underwent in the form of dismemberment, as
witnessed by their mother, to avoid desecrating God’s name in front of the wicked
Seleucid king Antiochus. What may also be deduced from this joke is that this reference to
the divine redress against the eating of pork relates to his future interests by Solomon and
Walter Pater, in their morbid fascination towards Greek tortures and dismemberment of
children.

With regards to the Solomon ethos, comments about eating non-Kosher is
nonetheless a reference to Solomon’s Jewish index, and his relationship as a Jew to the
idea of kosher laws, in the orthodox traditional sense, without being practicing. Gayle

34 Elihu Vedder, “Rome”, The Digressions of V.: Written for His Own Fun and that of His Friends.
(Houghton Mifflin Company, 1910), 334
35 Ibid. 337.
Seymour brings a humorous account of an acculturated practice in the family, in interview with Harry Solomon where he related, "Michael Solomon would have probably gotten up on a Saturday morning, enjoyed a full English breakfast — including bacon — and then gone to the Synagogue.” Even if the narrative is made in humour, this account of synagogue formality, and traditional laxity in the home is congruent with discussions of Jewish acculturation, when pitched against an ideal practice within the community’s sense of higher theology, or ideology. It goes without saying regarding religious depictions, regardless of these communal paradoxes and hypocrisies, that according to the aesthetic narratives that are deployed, sovereignty is derived from sexual charisma in its various agonistic guises in the agony of Solomon’s religious youths – a theme I will develop.

Another example of how Solomon was conscious of his Jewish image in connection to and the unity of purpose within the British Jewish élite community, is from the Artist’s Rifles regiment, where Holiday related how he was catching Solomon up on the drills he had missed,

of course we all have to take the oath of allegiance, and a day was appointed when we were all to go and swear. I went with Simeon and he asked me gravely if I thought the sergeant would be satisfied if he said, “Drat it”, as he had a conscientious objection to using stronger language.

This joke relates Solomon and Holiday’s knowledge of the constitutional issues over Jews taking the oath of abjuration, which after a long constitutional tussle was recently changed

---

38 Holiday, op. cit.
to allow Jews to take their seats in parliament, as well as other offices of state. I show later that even as late as 1871, Solomon is following the case of Numa Hartog, the Mathematical Wrangler at Oxford, from the perspective of his own community, where they change the last obstruction to Jewish entry into élite society; indeed in Solomon’s many drawings we can see the two oath fingers in countless Solomon drawings referencing Oxford graduation procedures. With interest in the Oaths thus related, and the naughtiness over his polluted eating, I have here shown that there is a family ‘ethos’ which firmly aligns Solomons’ ethos, among the Jewish London élite. His family alignment goes further than this, however.

Solomon’s uncle and cousins were active members of the New Synagogue. It is Simeon Solomon’s cousin, Aaron Abraham Solomon (Son of Abraham, brother of their father, Michael), who comments on their father Abraham’s friendship with Nathaniel Rothschild, “the first Rothschild, Baron Nathan Mayor Rothschild [sic] and my father were very intimate and he used to go over most Saturdays to have a chat with him.” which given the father’s relationship to the synagogue, and his concern for the poor relief in the Laws, could certainly have taken a hebdomadal quality (a term primarily used to describe weekly financial meeting in a university college).39 It also informs the fact that the Synagogues became an important part akin to the parish infrastructure for the Jewish community taking its role in the Poor Laws during reform.40 Sabbath would have been important for community gathering, where news of needs for alms would have been made known. The Solomon family were therefore demonstrably close to the social issues aligned with élite interests in Jewish emancipation, which required Jewish attainment of social prosperity and avoidance of vagrancy. It is certain that the family were attached to social.

---

justice causes in the portrayals of social realism and class issues from within the salons, whether Rebecca Solomon’s various portrayals of governesses, social justice, *A Friend in Need*, and in her international exhibitions the nation *A Visit to Triplet*, selected by Solomon Alexander Hart to represent the nation in Paris. There is therefore a dialectic of the Jew in ‘hedonistic’ salon culture which seems to become a voice for social reform (and *the Laws of the New Synagogue* by their uncle, Abraham Solomon); as well as define contrary contexts of gentility that is between class, and exception.

For Solomon studies that is interested in Jewish community interests, the investiture of Jews as lawmakers is fraught with anxieties about economic worth to the nation with the Jewish community who already seem assimilated, and whose security lies in property. 41

Jewish historians have noted the feeling of being on trial among British Jews during this period. 42 As a result of being at the foreground of a national constitutional discourse, the post emancipation British Jewish community around 1858 felt “scars” that plagued their conscience, as Alderman summarizes,

The immediate post emancipation generations felt that they were on trial, that they had to prove, and to continue to prove, that they were worthy of the rights and freedoms Anglo-Christian society had extended to them, and that they must somehow conform to what they felt were Gentile expectations of acceptable Jewish behaviour. (my emphasis) 43

---


42 Victorian scholars have discussed the mid-Victorian moment of equipoise, meaning there was a difference in the economic developments between secular town and “cottager” countryside. For “equipoise” see a summary of Dennis Smith, *Conflict and Compromise: Class Formation in English Society 1830-1914*. (Boston and London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982), 89.

The Jewish community was anxious about being seen in the era of reform as being a burden to the state with its increased visibility of Jewish poverty and public vice, and that they had to manage the poor provisions for the community as a state institution. It was a matter that the Solomons and their cousins, had intimate knowledge as Abraham Solomon was a warden of the synagogue, and wrote about the Synagogue’s provisions for the Jewish poor. From their art, Simeon Solomon’s older siblings, Rebecca and Abraham Solomon, created genre depictions of financial issues indicative of one’s status as either worthy or unworthy of belonging. Even with their titles, Abraham Solomon’s *Waiting for the Verdict*, and its companion, *Not Guilty*, are good examples illustrating how the impoverished *pater familias* is liable for his status, just as *A Friend in Need*, by Rebecca Solomon becomes a social critique of the literal worthiness and “guilt” of the impoverished as the embodiment of the ambiguities of financial status on the severance of social pact.

As a result of the turmoil of post emancipation there is a probationary period where the perceptions of vice, poverty, and rationalism are sensitively weighed and guarded with an infrastructure protecting a counter image of prosperity and propriety (that counters an image of superstitious ritualism). Simeon Solomon navigates the community expectations surrounding the Jewish image, and the ambiguous qualities in his young...

---

4. Bryan Cheyette, “From Apology to Revolt: Benjamin Farjeon, Amy Levy and the Post-Emancipation Anglo-Jewish Novel, 1880-1900.” *Jewish Historical Studies* 29 (1982), 253-265. According to Israel Feinstein, Jews carried a “sedate view as to the civic and political aspirations of individual Jews,” after the violence which occurred after the Naturalization Act of 1753, where radicalism was on the “backfoot”; I argue that there is a period a century later, where terms of sovereign exceptionalism was to be contested. Feinstein, *Jewish Society in Victorian England*, (London: Valentine Mitchell, 1993), 229.

subjects seem to radically question religious law and the regime of the masculine lawgivers by which they are interpellated.

I have summarised a distinction between an assumed ‘ethos’ between ‘practicing’ orthodoxy, and a unification of Jewish ideology within the community. However, a discussion of ‘ethos’ is yet to develop the context of a tussle of values between ‘practicing’ Jews, and ‘hedonist’ strategies of elitist distinctions. Here, I look at seemingly divergent values in the Solomon family ethos as exemplary of post-enlightenment emancipation strategies, to test how the severance is laid out as a chronological movement in a sort of cleavage between an assumed religious piety with its associations of practicing Jewish life on the one hand, assimilation with artists, and its requisite ‘hedonism’ on the other. In a section on the historical uses of Hebraism, I demonstrate how this image of puritan Hebraism is formulated in opposition to the cultural modalities that were held onto from a prior era in the late 1860s, as opposed to the post enlightenment principals of tolerance between religious practices in the 1830s and 1840s.

Hannah Arendt’s notion of the Salon Jew, that developed out of the Court Jew, concurs with a former enlightenment quality, that despite an inherent precarity of social life in gossip, ensured Jewish freedom from a recent era, especially given the precarity of recent German élite exception. For purposes of illustration, I bring the example of Isaac D’Avigdor of Nice (Isabel’s grandfather). In 1822 the Jews who were recently given their rights by Napoleon were commanded to return to the ghetto by the government, and were degraded through the decades by appalling conditions. According to Bermant, Isaac “simply refused” to go back to the ghetto because he was able to “assert himself”. I argue therefore that the parties are notable forms of exception which indicate an alignment with the tussles for emancipation, among the élites. The well documented salons and lively

45 Bermant, op. cit.
parties that the Solomon household held aligned to an extremely precarious social strategy. With regards to their vibrant life in the salon parties through the 1860s, Aaron Solomon, writing with retrospection close to his death, perceived that they were “a wild bunch”, and secular, as if “atheists”.46

Alongside this seeming rejection of salon hedonism, Aaron made sure to relay that he was an athlete, oarsman, and practiced fighter, which was important signifier as “it was an age when the hatred of Jews was wild.”47 Fists certainly became a necessary in the years following waves of immigration after the eastern European pogroms of 1872. However, boxing, and athletics was of course an increasingly important class signifier, as the significant works of Michael Berkowics and the Jewish image have demonstrated; and huge sums were paid for lessons with prize fighters among the wealthy élites.48

There was, however, due to the context of mentioned ‘nation on trial’, a unification strategy under-way between piety, and elitist modes of assimilation towards the end of the 1860s. Arendt argues that the earlier German and British model of the Salon Jew from the era Abraham Solomon depicts, develops from the Court Jew – the Jewish monied financier developed by the court out of Christian usuary law, and her description can offer them a different notion of symbolic currency through entertaining gossip among exceptional social groups, distinctly the Jews, performing a similar function of their exceptionalism to the invert among courtiers. She points out that Benjamin Disraeli’s investments in the worst of antisemitic calumnies as part of the salon and club world – was that Jewish wealth is evidence of its racial election – embarrassed the tiny, mostly Whiggish, Jewish

46 Solomon, op. cit.
47 Solomon, op. cit.
community itself, one that needed to demonstrate it was a faith like any other.\textsuperscript{49} I will discuss historical context of Benjamin Disraeli at the beginning of chapter one, in addition to historiographic material in the introduction, after accounting for four paradigms of Solomon scholarship, and defining the theoretical terms I deploy.

**Further Historiographic Material:**

The C. A. Swinburne and Oscar Browning letters demonstrate that Solomon did in fact engage with many aristocrats intimately, and participated in their vices by using gossip and recalling sexual activity as a form of social currency.\textsuperscript{50} In their relationships, he attempted to mobilize critical forces to establish his work in the art world, while integrating himself into the classes educated in Greek and Latin, which was at the site of a struggle within pedagogic reform by restless parents who doubted that it was “sufficient intellectual equipment for an English gentleman”.\textsuperscript{51} To Browning’s party at Eton reformers, “the classics were the bedrock of morality, citizenship, culture”.\textsuperscript{52} Browning courted the great “artists and men of letters, actors and musicians, Ruskin and Solomon, George Eliot and Walter Pater…”\textsuperscript{53} in order to “educate a governing class that would owe its position not only to wealth and privilege but also to its Platonic virtues of wisdom and goodness.”\textsuperscript{54} Solomon had reciprocal uses of Browning in that respect, to exchange knowledge.


\textsuperscript{52} *Ibid.* 50.

\textsuperscript{53} *Ibid.* 62.

\textsuperscript{54} *Ibid.* 44.
In the years leading up to 1872, there is always a hardy-like chip on his shoulder, “I always feel that you will despise me for my ignorance and very limited forms of conversation”\(^{55}\), he writes, just after 27 November, 1868. Elsewhere Solomon chides Browning with one of his speeches, that as Solomon quotes Browning specifically, “the “common basis of a classical education” precludes all probability of intellectual equality.” Solomon makes an eproctophilia reference, “'It does not banish us wholly from your presence’, my friends and I have much enjoyed your little trumpet blast of superiority”.

Although Solomon signs off the letter with “love to yourself”, as he often does in these letters, with love, expressing a romantic relationship between them. \(^{56}\)

Perhaps this period of autodidacticism is where the assumption of his chronology “away from” Hebraism occurs. \(^{57}\) Solomon’s prescription against the quotation of cultures that are not his own, is that the provision of an education in classical antiquity became a class battle; which both Swinburne and Browning sought to remove by encouraging its use in those who do not have access to its instruction. \(^ {58}\)

However, with regards to the more nuanced approach to Solomon’s quotational strategy rather than a clear severance from Hebraism, I describe Jew as witness prototype in common with romantic dissenters that make quotations from classical antiquity. As a Jew excluded from Oxford and public schools interested in creating good Christian men, he in turn aligned with a British literary genre of romantic artist that is evoked in the form of the conscientious religious dissenter, formed against the strictures British élite university’s demands to sign up to the Thirty-

\(^{55}\) OB-1-1532-032, marked by the mention of Alice Mary Egerton’s death (Mrs Reginald Cholmeley).

\(^{56}\) OB-1-1531-025

\(^{57}\) Falk refers to the use of his “newly developed literary touch…shown by the painter’s note-paper. Above the word Pax and a laurel wreath design were the letters S.S. interlocked in pale gold.”, Falk, “Trajedy of Simeon Solomon”, 326.

nine Articles of Religion. It is therefore a more nuanced approach to the chronology of a neat cleavage between Hebrew and Hellenism.

A British romantic poet, by definition, is one who configures the Law on his own terms, with an interior revelation of forms, rather than expressing a collective spirit of received revelation. That is definitively not the a Mosaic form of revelation. The romantic poet therefore creates an independent vision of revelation, like Arnold or Pater, whose “necessity of free criticism was also part of the system”, in turn, reflecting the free element of individuality for the establishment. Either the poet is a dissenter (like Bunyan), the British romantic resists being made into a Lawmaker; and, like Milton through to Arnold, the unmarried and therefore asexual male might use elegiac poetry to articulate the fears of his lost homosexual bond as a single virginal poet, or grieve over his lost dissenting friend. Solomon even quotes Arnold’s 1865 poem on a visit to Oxford to visit the medical scholar librarian and curator of the Bodleian, Henry Wentworth Ackland (or one of his sons), “I want to take a long walk with him through all the places M. Arnold speaks of in Thyrsis, but I daresay I told you all of this before.”

The refusal of Solomon’s romantic intent here by Solomon’s late critics is similar to those other Jews attempting romantic forms, they are traditionally seen apart from the bucolic struggles of the landed gentry as they resist becoming men. The English backpacker, progress myth, or gypsy boy, presents a deeper paradoxes for Jewish art history in relation to British cultures, such as whether the Dissenting British Wanderer, is

---

59 Ibid. 90 ff.
60 Graham Hough. The Last Romantics, (University Paperbacks: London, 1961), xiii. We might reflect that Hough’s theory of free critique was part of a post war triumphalism, and an argument against totalitarianism when first published his work in 1947.
61 OB-1-1531-008
the Wandering Jew. We will note that Solomon is also called the Wondering Jew by Swinburne, but I argue that the common slur is part of Solomon’s self-mythology in that he was attempting to align with the romantic vision.

It would be generous to speak of Solomon’s own intention to facture of this stereotype in his late chronology. Percy Bate, known for his historiography that came to define who constituted the Pre-Raphaelites, emphasises the romantic element of Solomon’s work in his chapter “The Romantic Influence: Frederick Sandys; Simeon Solomon; George Wilson”, that took the elements “akin to that of Rossetti”, specifically, the “lands of dreams and visions”, and the influence of Shelley. In that chapter, he writes a generous summary of the artist, and he comments on what is exemplary of the artists typical output in allegory, “which dealt more with abstractions, with symbols… akin to the master Blake”. In another place where Solomon’s works were sold in platinotype reproductions, Bate mentions that Solomon, was “dowered with real romantic power”, including the romantic characteristic, “genius”. He was, he says, possessed of “much individuality and real poetic power”. As the artist was still alive during the publication of Bate’s genre defining catalogue, and was in dialogue with Frederic Hollyer over the sale and reproductions of his artwork over decades, Solomon would have had influence over Bate’s assessment, and would therefore have emphasized his romantic intentions. Solomon’s reference to Shelley is emphasized in his only known interview with the

---

63 Citing Felsenstein, Richard I. Cohen references the significance of its lack in British visual culture. The paper is significant in the use of Gordon’s assumption of the Wondering Jew. Aside from Shapiro’s assessment of the wandering magician in Jacobean mythology appropriate to Shakespeare from the 1990s, I am making a unique claim which explains the Wanderer with the dissenters need for sincerity, romantic dissidence, and in his similar struggle to the Jewish type in relationship to Oxford’s Oaths. “The “Wandering Jew” from Medieval Legend to Modern Metaphor.” In The Art of Being Jewish in Modern Times, pp. 147-175. (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 153.
65 Ibid. 64
American writer, and biographer, Julia Ellsworth Ford, in 1901, later published in 1909, where she takes three pages devoted to Solomon’s “genius”, and love of Shelley.\textsuperscript{67}

I find this romantic mode the more compelling form of his literary artistic intention, which developed out of Jewish assimilation struggles with Oxford through the 1860s, where he was in close relationship with Browning, Pater, and Swinburne. It displays in literary and visual terms, the symbolic ambivalence of cultural assimilation which is common to romantic literature, and is directly quoted in his prose poem, \textit{A Vision of Love Revealed in Sleep}, of 1871. While this form of romantic Jewish type shows Solomon aligning himself with the bucolic elegies from Milton to early poems by Matthew Arnold, his other intimate friend and critic, Charles Algernon Swinburne, he felt, ultimately rejected the poem on theoretical grounds, that of Schlegel’s fragment theory, in direct opposition to Solomon’s delineated Hebraism. Swinburne writes:

> Read by itself as a fragment of spiritual allegory, this written ‘Vision of Love revealed in Sleep’ seems to want even that much coherence which is requisite to keep symbolic or allegoric art from absolute dissolution and collapse; that unity of outline and connection of purpose, that gradation of correlative parts and significance of corresponsive details, without which the whole aerial and tremulous fabric of symbolism must decompose into mere confusion of formless and fruitless chaos.\textsuperscript{68}

From my reading of Solomon’s letters to Swinburne, and Swinburne’s letters to George Powell and William Michael Rossetti, it implied that Solomon’s angry response to the review was the cause of great schism; both in relation to angry letters back to Swinburne, after his review, as well as the immanent \textit{Fleshy School of Poetry} affair that followed the review within a matter of months.


\textsuperscript{68} Swinburne, A. "Simeon Solomon: Notes on His ‘Vision of Love’ and Other Studies." \textit{The Dark blue} 1, no. 5 (1871): 569-570
There is analysis British hypocrisy in Swinburne’s statements of in Swinburne’s separation from Solomon after his conviction, of becoming above the law while creating it, there are discussions of statements made by Swinburne on June 6 1873, that Solomon, “out of his mind and done, things amenable to law such as done by any sane man would make it impossible for any one to keep up a relationship.” Without realizing the Disraeli quotation applied to Solomon, both Alfred Werner, the Jewish art historian, and Bernard Falk, suggests this statement is evidence of Swinburne’s British hypocrisy, but not that Solomon was imitating Disraeli’s image of British hypocrisy. Solomon, according to Swinburne, had taken Disraeli’s British Hebrew mode of carefree masculinity too literally; that is, in his criminality, Solomon had had gone too far, and both rightly acknowledge Swinburne’s hypocrisy, and very near misses from a similar fate to that of Solomon.

Conroy’s thesis positions Falk as prejudice (I assume she means, against Solomon’s homosexuality), however, unlike Conroy’s outright dismissal I believe that Falk’s assessment of Solomon deserves to be taken account of, as his alignment of Solomon to Menken’s timeline gives some vital clues as to Solomon’s intent with Swinburne. It also gives some of the vital features of the *Fleshy School of Poetry* affair, which implicates Solomon in the wrong literary camp, despite being attacked in the article itself.

Falk’s ire against Swinburne comes from his interest in Swinburne’s form with describing Jewish fallen spirits, such as the fleshy (suited) Jewish actress, Adah Isaacs.

69 Swinburne to George Powell, Holmwood, June 6 1873, Lane 484, 253. Lane’s emphasis.
71 Dominic Janes recently recapitulated the argument in an essay about Solomon’s “brightly coloured ecclesiastical vestments and cross-dressing.” Which added to Buchanan’s hatred of the school, but there had to be a bigger signifier for that word “Fleshy” which would come to hurt Swinburne that knew of the (not secret) signifier of his public mistress. citing Morgan. Dominic Janes, "“Religion, cross-dressing and sexual desire in the art of Simeon Solomon” *PRS Review* Pre-Raphaelite Society, 28, no. 3, (Autumn, 2020), 55.
Menken. Menken was made famous for her international performance of Byron’s Mazeppa, tied in a flesh suit to a horse; and as Swinburne’s mistress, that he called, Delores.

According to Falk, Swinburne helps Menken write her poetry, and they perform their public dalliance with various notorious displays: Swinburne was a weaker, ersatz shadow of her greater public affair with Dumas, but is likewise photographed in a similar pose with the actress for widespread publication. Falk illustrates other tales, designed to give them notoriety: Menken brings a horse whip to a theatre box to goad Swinburne; Dante Gabriel Rossetti and Richard Burton make a wager with Menken about Swinburne’s sexuality; and Swinburne tells Julian Field, one of his Oxford friends, that Menken was visiting to “sleep with him”. Edward Burne Jones makes cartoons of Menken and Swinburne in chaste irony for general publication, sitting at opposite ends of a couch.

Thus, Falk writes Menkin’s legend in a large, dramatic biography illustrated with photographs and drawings by Frank Papé, as a tragic Traviata figure. Swinburne is cast as the wicked and foolish Alfredo Germond; who, like the Verdi opera, is rescued by his parents intervention, while Menkin dies alone and consumptive in a room in Paris while a festival occurs in the streets. In the final scene, rather than come to visit her in remorse, Swinburne gets blind drunk, and tries to kill himself in the sea; but bathetically fails. It seems to me that Falk assesses Solomon as the next Jewish victim Swinburne’s bad influence, that Solomon was anticipating Swinburne’s literary support in the same way that Swinburne had supported Menkin.


To emphasize the strength of Menken’s legend, Stephen Sondheim, in one of his few Jewish references, names a burlesque stripper Mazeppah, in Gypsy, “Once I was a schlepper, now I’m Miss Mazeppah”, in, “You Gotta Get a Gimmick”, Gypsy.

Ibid. 228
Swinburne’s review in the *Dark Blue* caused Solomon dismay, despite the seemingly positive review of Solomon’s artwork. Solomon’s dismay has a twofold reason: First, that he too, was not similarly given Swinburne’s assistance for his literary ambition, specifically, in appraisal of his fragmentary symbolic project.\(^{75}\) Second, that Swinburne outed Solomon’s sadistic tendencies in his review for the *Dark Blue*: In an apology letter, Solomon described that he was in a vulnerable position, “my designs and pictures executed during the last three or four years have been looked upon with suspicion, and, as I have been a false friend to myself, I have not sought to remove the impression.”\(^ {76}\) That birching fetish, as Swinburne directly relates, “*des branches de la sensibilité*” is made most obvious in the review,

> the seal of this sensitive cruelty is set; made beautiful beyond the beauty of serpent or of tiger by the sensible infusion of a soul which refines to a more delicate delight the mere nervous lust after blood, the mere physical appetite and ravenous relish for *fleshly* torture; which finds out the very ‘spirit of sense’ and fine root of utmost feeling alike in the patient and the agent of the pain.\(^ {77}\) (my emphasis)

What then occurs after Swinburne’s review is a violent relay of letters towards Swinburne (currently missing), but angry enough for Swinburne to describe Solomon’s “imbecile impertinence” to their mutual friend George Powell, a lover who Solomon had “dinner and fun” with in the past.

Rikky Rookesby’s exceptional biography of Swinburne claims that the title of Robert Buchanan’s “The Fleshy School of Poetry” came from “Swinburne’s half-dozen uses of ‘fleshly’ in his review of Gabriel Rossetti’s poems”.\(^ {78}\) I would like to connect how, in 1866 Rossetti had “criticized Swinburne for publishing ‘Delores’ and the sadistic overtones in ‘Anactoria’”, and that Swinburne was therefore making a private jest in his


\(^{76}\) Letter from Simeon Solomon to Swinburne, Lang (400), 159.

\(^{77}\) Swinburne, *Ibid.* 576

use of the word, fleshy, back towards Rossetti.  
It was commonly known that Delores was one of Swinburne’s nicknames for Adah Menken. I want to argue that the “Fleshy school of poetry” which comments on those acts made direct comment on the affair he was having with the flesh suited actress that Swinburne had grieved over. It was meant to have a direct sting.

But if Solomon was also critiqued mentioned by the anonymous author, Thomas Maitland, for what is now well known, for his “pretty pieces of morality”, and lending “actual genius to worthless subjects, and thereby produce veritable monsters — like the lovely devils that danced round Saint Anthony,” and that Solomon had apparently patched up their friendship over his impertinence, there is the matter which is significant.

Letters from Swinburne seem to suggest that Solomon was involved in the Buchanan affair, “with a good deal of guile”, even though he was also named in the “Fleshy school” article itself. That comment to Powell, seemed to imply Solomon’s duplicity, not about his sexual offenses (Swinburne knew about Solomon’s cruising – or zigzagging the dolomites), but about another matter: as Solomon knew the publisher of The Contemporary Review, Alexander Strahan, who was the editor for Good Words. Solomon confirmed from directly from Strahan that Buchanan was the author of Strahan’s publication in Contemporary Review; but then Solomon retracted his information in a similar way to Strahan’s fumble over the affair. In a letter to William Michael Rossetti, in

79 Ibid. 144.
80 The appellation holds even if Rookesby points out that Delores was written before Swinburne met Menken. Ibid. Menken was also a form who fit Swinburne’s interest in finding a character in the Traviata pattern, so too I point out Menken fits the templates of Swinburne’s desire (as Falk describes).
82 Ibid.
83 Letter to George Powell, Holmwood, March 11, 1873, Lang (470), 233.
84 Letter from Simeon Solomon to Swinburne Lang (386), 142.
85 Letter from Simeon Solomon to Swinburne, Lang (404), 162; From Swinburne to William Michael Rossetti, Lang (405), 163.
October 19 (Lang assumed the year was 1871), Swinburne writes in a verbose language that

I perceive that, à propos of Gabriel’s poems’ a son of Sodom, hitherto unknown except (I suppose to Whitman’s bedfellows the cleaners of privies, has lately ‘del cul fatto trombetta’ in a Malebolgian periodical called the Contemporary Review, conducted by C.P.s and other spiritual nightmen, of the autocoprophagous persuasion.  

What is demonstrative from this section is that rather than referring to Buchanan or than Strahan, the publisher of Buchanan’s poem, it was more likely that Swinburne referred to Solomon as the Son of Sodom character.; both because of the reference to sodomy, or the rear trumpets (already referenced by Solomon about Browning); Solomon’s interest in Walt Whitman “as an angel”; but also as there needed to be duplicity of Solomon’s behaviour, at this stage from the “Malacodia”-like trickery. When Julia Ellsworth Ford visited Solomon, she relays that he said, “it was through Swinburne that I first read Walt Whitman’s ‘leaves of grass’”, immediately after relaying her story that Solomon would not sign his name on the same page as quotation of Shelley’s “Adonais”,

“Life, like a dome of many-colored glass, stains the white radiance of eternity.”

My friend told me later that he had asked Solomon to write his name upon this photograph [of the quotation], but he had refused upon the ground that he was not worthy to set his name beside that of Shelley.

It is well known from various places, including the Swinburne letters, that Solomon had attempted to sell incriminating Swinburne’s letters later, but Solomon’s severance from Swinburne and Rossetti was at least as a result of his similar fumble over naming Buchanan as Strahan; but, moreover that Solomon may even have assisted in the fleshy publication, in order that his name be mentioned alongside Rossetti’s, “like Mr. Simeon

87 Solomon writes to Dante Gabriel Rossetti, “for my part I have always looked upon the man who wrote the Leaves of Grass as an angel.” Quoted by Roberto Ferrari: “To the Rossettis, from the Solomons: Five Unpublished Letters.” Notes and Queries 52, no. 1 (2005): 70.
88 Ellsworth Ford, Simeon Solomon: An Appreciation, 23
Solomon, however, with whom he seems to have many points in common”. 89 While Solomon was unwilling to put his name next to Shelley’s, he was in 1873, willing to have his name placed next to Rossetti’s: and Ellsworth Ford had even included a “Facsimile of S. Solomon’s handwriting”, “From Shelley, September 8th 1896” beneath the very same quotation, with Solomon’s own signature. 90 That is a distinct exposure of having ones name next to the great poet, and feeling “not worthy to”. The following page, Ellsworth Ford brings the famous piece of autobiographic evidence perhaps sent by the same friend, that proves that “Solomon was conscious of his own failure”. 91 

Before I bring the “History of Simeon Solomon: From his Cradle to the Grave”, written by the artist, which was omitted from Conroy’s doctorate (perhaps because it indicated a form of worthlessness, counter to her argument), It is worth pointing out that Ellsworth Ford had marked off pages from her letters to and from W. M. Rossetti, and was granted permission to quote from them by the man, implying her fastidious attention to editorial accuracy and was trustworthy source: Ellsworth Ford was also publishing a children’s book Snickerty Nick, and was looking for a children’s book illustrator, and settled for the very expensive Arthur Rackham (according to his defensive letters to Ford). Ford had a large array of writing on homosexual literature, and writings by gay theosophist poets, in her bequest to the Beinecke library, at Yale (my emphasis, in the citation below).

As an infant he was very fractious. He developed a tendency toward designing. He had a horrid temper. He was hampered. He illustrated the Bible before he was sixteen.

He was hated by all of his family before he was eighteen. He was eighteen at the time he was sent to Paris. His behavior there was so disgraceful that his family – the Nathans, Solomon’s, Moses, Cohens, etc., et hoc genus homo [sic] – would have nothing to do with him. He returned to London to pursue his

89 Buchanan, ibid.
90 Ellsworth Ford, Simeon Solomon: An Appreciation, 22.
91 Ibid. 24
disgraceful course of Art, wherein he displayed such marvelously exquisite effects of coleography that the world wondered. He then turned his headlong course into another channel – that of illustrating books for youths. His “vision of Love Revealed in Sleep” is too well known. After the publication of this his family repudiated him forever.

“His appearance is as follows:

Very slender, dark, a scar on one or two eyebrows, a slouching way with him, a certain nose, one under lip.

That is

S. S.

There are many interesting significant covert details here, given the fact he was attempting to offer his services to Ellsworth Ford, who did provide another work of illustration for the artist; her publication of the Song of Solomon: for a start the triple rejection of family, first in the use of Et hoc genus homo – is an interesting reference to the vegetable concept of genius in romantic literature; four families of the Jewish cousinhood are directly mentioned; the Nathans, as Olga Somech Philips points out, were the largest costumiers in London, and may have assisted in the artist’s needs for his episodes of Salon dress. The last, third, mention of family, was important, “after the publication of this his family repudiated him forever.” I am emphasizing that after mentioning a first family which I interpret as nuclear; and a second, which described the cousinhood – and introducing the vegetable terms of romantic gunius; Solomon was making a third, precursive use of the word family to mean his close colleagues or critical art apparatus; that rather than rejecting him after his conviction for attempted buggery, according to Solomon’s own statement, rejected him after the publication of his prose poem, “repudiating him forever”. Of all the causes of his dismay, Solomon himself establishes that it is the poem’s rejection that most dismayed him, and in this section I gave a series of events which led to this moment; that demonstrated that Solomon made furious efforts to “cut up” his critical apparatus, and I
will discuss how he describes how his community, “the Jews” are “cut up” by the death of their community.

It is convenient that the term “cut up” was used by Valerie Solanas, referencing that if when the regime of men do not admit the success of women they should “cut up men”. Solanas shot Andy Warhol herself. It is to be acknowledged as Halberstam points out that “Shadow feminisms take the form not of becoming, being, and doing but of shady, murky modes of undoing, unbecoming, and violating.” I provided new reasoning for the dismay that Solomon’s involvement in the Fleshy school of poetry caused, as by definition, Solomon’s poem was too fragmentary to provide a masculine vision. Solomon was not admitted on his interior romantic terms into strong masculine articulation, in Pater’s definition of masculine style; but rather into the regime of Lawgivers on Hebrew terms. I do see his alterity as a point of violent refusal, and it pre-empts his more violent return to the Law; but its origins come from the fact that in 1871, he wanted to articulate a new category in a romantic form into which he was not admitted. In his anger of his Swinburne review for The Dark Blue, Solomon cut up his network of supporters including himself, by aligning with Alexander Strahan, who published Buchanan’s Fleshy School article.

**Historiography of Simeon Solomon Scholarship**

There are four paradigms within Solomon scholarship that I engage with. The first, as mentioned, contends with the notion of family ethos and religious practice. It shows that within thematic chronological exhibition practice Solomon is depicted thematically with a clear severance in his work from Jewish themes; and that this is explained by a notion that Solomon broke from, or moved away from, his Jewish upbringing. The second paradigm within Solomon historiography takes note of Jewish exhibition practice even within his

---

own later life and demonstrates how Solomon is used to represent Jewish cultural achievement within the very terms of genius or transgression, particularly at times of British Jewish national crisis. The third historiographic paradigm looks at the terms of romantic agony, and forms of suffering that Solomon represents; and within these romantic historiographies, the troubling recollections of Solomon’s fantasies of sadism and child abuse. The fourth historiographic paradigm of Solomon scholarship relates to the galvanization within the arts of gay rights interests since the 1980s, which ennobles Solomon into a queer icon; and makes claims to Solomon being both a martyred and a ‘forgotten’ artist, rejected by his friends and subsequent historiographic literature, to legitimate calls for social justice, and gay tolerance.

**Historical Paradigm One: ‘Severance’ from ‘Jewish background’**

I have just laid out the binarism between ‘hedonism’ and ‘piety’ of the Jewish community. However, it remains an example of how Solomon studies is affected by conventions of art history; and it is registered in a number of catalogue articles and papers devoted to the artist that use language such as “breaks” or “departures” from his Jewish faith in his movement towards ‘Hellenism’. A common exhibition practice in both Jewish, and homophile exhibition of Solomon’s work separates his themes between Hebrew subjects and classical antiquity. That practice constructs a false chronology of Solomon’s Biblical and ceremonial artworks from his non-Hebrew works as a sort of cleavage: specifically, that Solomon moved away from his orthodox Jewish background as he explored his homosexuality through Hellenism. Solomon found out the constraints of his dual Jewish stereotype as both exemplar of post-Emancipation Jewish capability, and national Hebraism, and knew when his syncretic project failed due to the intractable rise in the philosemitic Hebrew stereotypes. The latter saw the Jewish contribution to civilization as a Mosaic revelation of the Law. However, Jewish art history has not developed a
credible sexually informed explanation as to the religious subjects evoked by the artist; and by the same token, queer art history goes silent when it comes to the religious subjects evoked by the artist.\textsuperscript{93} That ends up with the narrative falling into an either/or bifurcation, with a seemingly blind thematic chronology in Solomon’s work.

To explain what might be occurring in these instances which describe the artist is “moving away”, or “breaking” from his Jewish background, Norman Kleeblatt, the director of the Jewish Museum, Manhattan, and who has made some genre defining queer exhibitions there, wrote a compelling paper about the influence of early renaissance art on Solomon’s early work, as early as 1995.\textsuperscript{94} He directly points out this habit in Solomon critics during and after his life, that they “bemoaned the break with his earlier program of Hebrew iconography” and related “this break to his being confused about his faith, and they associated the change of his subjects with his departure from conventional sexual mores.”\textsuperscript{95}

As we shall see, the authors that Kleeblatt is referring to are developing a Hebraist narrative of the artist unknowingly based on national Hebraism, and conflate his artistic change with the idea of a decline in his work – the idea being that the product of an artist’s mind represent internal morals and beliefs “as if both the relative decline in the quality and the subjects demonstrating his possible religious apostacy could be read as a just retribution of a sinful lifestyle.”\textsuperscript{96} My work on Jewish art history and Simeon Solomon’s stereotypes, aims to build on Kleeblatt’s corrective.

\textsuperscript{93} The exception is Dominic Janes, “Seeing and tasting the divine: Simeon Solomon’s homoerotic sacrament,” in \textit{Art, History and the Senses: 1830 to the present}, ed. Patrizia di Bello and Gabriel Koureas (Surrey: Ashgate, 2010).
\textsuperscript{95} \textit{Ibid}.
\textsuperscript{96} \textit{Ibid}.
Even within more reductive gender queer art histories that I come to in the fourth paradigm of Solomon scholarship, a similar corrective about a ‘break’ needs to occur: Henry Sandberg’s thesis makes a similar moralising claim, that investigating how Solomon might disturb gender norms is a chronological turn. In his thesis, *The Androgynous Vision of a Victorian Outsider: The Life and Work of Simeon Solomon*, Sandberg discusses how “By the late 1860s Solomon had *turned away* from Old Testament themes and explored gender roles and androgyny in completely different ways.”97 (My emphasis). It appears that Sandberg was straining to paint a picture of British Jewish life observance, with a rather simple assessment that “it seems naive to assume that Solomon did not drink alcohol before meeting Swinburne. Solomon had attended many parties and as an Orthodox Jew he must have certainly drunk several glasses of wine at Friday night Shabbas [sic] dinners and at Passover Seders.”98 (lest we think that British Jewry had similar strictures as Mormons or Muslim prohibition) or, “Solomon’s sacrilegious reinterpretation must have shocked and horrified many of his relatives, who already faced the difficulties of observing their minority religion in an overwhelmingly Christian country.”99 He also made the common embarrassing assumption for Jewish art historians,

“As a person coming from an Orthodox Jewish background, Solomon’s fascination with mysterious Christian rituals was very unusual and in some ways demonstrated his *early rejection of Judaism* and his attempts at assimilation. In deciding to become an artist it was imminent that he would have to *break with* some of the Orthodox traditions which frowned on all forms of iconography.” (my emphasis).

97 Sandberg, 247, Surprisingly Gayle Seymour’s assessment of the British Jewry’s lax observances were more likely, and I might add to her assessment that traditional British Jewry delegates in their Yiddish, “froome” (or, frum) figureheads as ideal performers of faith. In short, I apply Mary Douglas’s theory of hypocrisy on this complex issue. However, she uses this fact to stumble into an error in applying Christian concepts of the second commandment without knowledge of the blind Jewish stereotype, just like Sandberg in his assessment of the Jewish community.

98 Sandberg, 114.

Neither of two other important theses on Solomon made by Carolyn Conroy, or Gayle Seymour (not Jewish scholars either) – make the assertion that there is a movement away from Hebraism, or of a break from a religious background that was never performed as an orthodox practice other than the laxity of the British Jewish community; although Seymour has made similar, second commandment, assertions against making art in relation to traditional Jewish orthodoxy. I make this critique of Solomon’s historiography by the above mentioned writers, about the cleavage from personal belief, by promoting a new argument that makes use of Jewish studies: about the stereotypes involved between the enlightenment Jew of the salon, and national Hebrew Jew, and how Solomon was caught between the two Jewish stereotypes.

I want to be generous here. Contemporary Jewish writers and their exhibition practices tend to be on board with tolerant agendas, or else they wouldn’t be writing about, or exhibiting Solomon’s work. It may just be that delegating sexuality to chapters by queer scholars is part of scholarly etiquette; for instance, to delegate chapters devoted to “Jewish background” and “Classical antiquity” or “androgyny”. However, to re-emphasize a problem with Kleeblatt’s critique, characters undergoing “just retribution[s] of a sinful lifestyle” seems part of the religious themes in Solomon’s work itself. We are forced to return to a problem in Solomon studies with the conflation of iconographies between the Hebrew, and the apparently non-Hebrew iconography. Instead, I emphasize my argument, that the cleavage is only between the receptions of the Jewish types in the artwork he

---

pursues, and it reflects the British assimilation strategies during and after the Jewish emancipation. He was caught between two different but overlapping Jewish stereotypes, a strong Hebraism, bringing Jewish antecedents for national notions of election, sin, and sovereignty; and the more syncretic romantic progress mythologies closely aligned to wandering Jewish stereotypes; interior visions, and elegiac lament.

With regards to the rupture with the assumed Jewish background, a similar occurrence happens with Jewish historians. In her essay *The Jewish Background*, in the 1984 exhibition catalogue for the Geffrye Museum’s exhibition about the Solomon family of painters, Monica Bohm-Duchen writes that “it is perhaps no accident that Simeon’s growing *departure* from religious orthodoxy ran parallel - indeed was closely tied up with – his *departure* from conventional sexual mores: both represented a *rupture* with his Jewishness.”\(^{102}\) At this point Bohm-Duchen remarks that our tradition of Solomon many decades later converts to Catholicism, while also embodying a supra-denominational religious fervour, with anecdotes about Solomon that were not “unmixed with mockery”.\(^{103}\) That mockery of conversion “sincerity”, has important national implications to do with the common discussions of Jewish conversion during the rise of Disraeli’s second premiership which are yet to be discussed here in the national image, but these are traditions about the life of the artist which tend to be in line with the kind of bifurcations

---

103 The question of whether an artist is supposed to keep these lives separate is something Ross demonstrates in the obituary cited above, “Any one curious enough to study his pictures will regret that he was lost to art by allowing an ill-regulated life to prey upon his genius. He had not sufficient strength to keep the two things separate, as Shakespeare, Verlaine, and Leonardo succeeded in doing.” These were historical sodomites who were able to produce work uninhibited by their sexuality, and that Solomon himself developed a personal affinity. Ross, "A Note on Simeon Solomon," 142. Shakespeare, Verlaine, and Leonardo, are grand exemplars of homoerotic love used in a similar way to Oscar Wilde in his trial, alongside David and Jonathan.

The main source material for Bohm-Duchan, as it is for many who want to portray the cleavage from a Jewish background is from William Blake Richmond, illustrating anxieties surrounding renewed racial sentiments in the national image, as well as expressing his personal anxieties about the ambitions of his cohort at the royal academy schools which is worth the long quotation:

Simeon Solomon was a fair little Hebrew, a Jew of the Jews, who seemed to have inherited a great spirit, an Eastern of the Easterns, facile and spasmodically intense, sensitive to extreme touchiness, conscious of his great abilities, proud of his race but with something of the mystic about him which was Pagan, not Christian…

When I first knew Simeon Solomon in 1858 his art was at its zenith. It was about this time that he made a noble series of designs wholly inspired by the Hebrew Bible, which were indescribably ancient-looking and strangely imbued with the semi-barbaric life it tells of in the Book of Kings and in the Psalter of David. So strongly was this the case that they seemed to be written in Hebrew characters; no one but a Jew could have conceived or expressed the depth of national feeling which lay under the strange, remote forms of the archaic people whom he depicted and whose passions he told with a genius entirely unique…

Unfortunately Solomon departed from his simple genius to accept an artificial and neurotic vein of late and debased Roman Art; the result was, \textit{he was no longer sincere}, whereas when he consented to be a Jew, to think out designs and dream as a Jew, no more highly interesting personal work has ever been done.\footnote{My emphasis. Stirling, A. M. W. The Richmond Papers from the Correspondence and Manuscripts of George Richmond ... And His Son, Sir William Richmond. London: W. Heinemann, Ltd., 1926, 161.}

Before we examine this comment in detail which seems to exist on the borderline between antisemitism and philosemitism, I want to point out some context of the timeline. In 1858 Sassoon David Sassoon, one of David Sassoon’s sons had made his way to London, during the cooling of the Indian mutiny, and the rise of the Lancashire cotton
famine – which becomes important in a discussion of the hopeful nature of the poem that Isaac and Rebekah illustrates for *Good Words* in 1862. The son’s appearance, and his father’s appearance as Patriarch in all senses of the word in 1862, of what is seen as the Prince of Exile (if Roth’s Nazi-Era hagiography of Jewish nobility is to be taken as writ), is as close as a Jew could get to actual royalty, and would have had extraordinary effect on the Jewish image, in extraordinary wealth, virile masculinity, and noble self-image, as “Eastern of Easterns.” Thomas Woolner was to make posthumous a sculpture of him. There is indeed a period in 1862 where turbans are more prevalent among Solomon – and everyone else’s – biblical depictions: and certainly retrospective works from the 1880s such as the *Prince in Israel* (fig. 1.3., renamed for sale at Christies as *King Solomon sitting in Judgment*) with an enthroned Indo-Arab turban, has direct resemblance to earlier studies of a model in this period (I wonder how much interest it would have gathered if it was re-named, *Prince in Israel, [after Sassoon]*). The Court Jew again returns to the salon, and salon invites court as an interpretation of Eastern courtly sincerity. In our discussion about emancipation over the next two chapters – as oaths are made available to the élites as lawmakers, the retrospective drawing of a turbaned Jewish patriarch and his youth reading from a parchment is called, *Renewal of Vows on the Scrolls of the Law* (1.4), and there are many examples of swearing of vows in Solomon’s works with the two finger reference to swearing oaths or vows in Oxford graduations, for example, the later story of *Ruth and Naomi.*

However, William Blake Richmond’s motive for finding racial-religious “sincerity” in his friend’s work was attributable to his own family’s millenarian Christian background, as well as the later racial theory I mention by Disraeli – and during a period

---

107 I devote a definition on the sincerity of *Oaths.*
of unprecedented depression in around 1866. His philosemitism was also grounded in firmer antsemitism: it was expressed in the causes of dismay for his Portsmouth professor at the Royal Academy school, Solomon Alexander Hart. Richmond remarked on his “pompous” dialect, that he “delivered [lectures] in a mumble as if his mouth had been full of pudding,” while his “pretentions” were belied by the shuffle of “his fat Semitic feet”. 108

This antisemitic comment about his dialect and feet, which would give context for Richmond’s approach to Solomon’s Hebraism, was not included in either of Simon Reynold’s biographies, either to Simeon Solomon, or to Blake Richmond. 109 The rather ludicrous caricature of Hart’s mumbling indicates that in his imitation of academism, he was trying to imitate the aristocracy, was in fact belied by the “Semitic feet” and decrepit shuffle. William Blake Richmond is identifying his own privilege as the son of an academician, as well as deriding the aspiration of certain Jewish social mores; this was probably more to do with Hart’s regionalism - he was a Portsmouth Jew from a poor background, not a wealthy mercantile London Jew like the Solomons, or one of its élite. Solomon’s development into neuroticism is something to can be defined as a displacement from true self, and was more attributable to the allusion to the vice within “late and debased Roman art”, after his exhibition of Habet in 1864, when he was two years into his friendship with Swinburne.

There are class elements in his statement, as Richmond remembered the respect he was given by the staff and porters as a son of a full academician by the caretaker staff at the academy. Richmond was third generation artist: his father, George Richmond, was a lifelong friend of Samuel Palmer, forming the “Idealist” school of painting who produced

108 My emphasis Ibid, 161-162. Stirling cites “George Richmond inherited three things [from Sara] – his good looks, his wit, and his stern and rather gloomy views on religion”. According to the family tradition, it was due to her that George was drawn to a circle called the “idealists” who, in becoming lifelong friends with the circle of religious artists around Samuel Palmer Ibid., 5.

an earnest William Blake-inspired English style of Christian and Pagan works. Richmond junior was therefore named after the romantic artist. However, if you are Jewish, one had to restrict oneself to speaking and dreaming “like a Jew” and be true to your form, whether you are from Portsmouth, like Hart, from Mumbai like Sassoon, but it seems like a non sequitur for Solomon, who is born in London, and he wants to make true to his type.\footnote{My thanks to Keith Kahn-Harris, who introduced me to anti-Semitism during recent national political debates. Keith. Strange Hate: Antisemitism, Racism and the Limits of Diversity. (Watkins Media Limited, 2019) passim.}

There may be an element of hypocrisy here: Richmond’s. His own paternal grandmother, Sara Oram, was Jewish, which according to the biographer, Stirling, was the cause for the family’s serious non-conformist, stern “Puritan earnestness” even “thirty years after the death of Westley”.\footnote{Stirling} Therefore, in his racial theory, Richmond is also describing a Christian millenarian vision for Solomon is part of what they might see as a safe and authentic national purpose for the Jews.

The students tended to be left to their own teaching by their professors, Hart and his co-professor, Edwin Landseer, “performing their duties to the letter of the law”. During life classes they came round once, commenting on their accuracy of the bicep or patella, respectively. The closeness brotherliness in the Royal Academy schools which formed out of their neglect, and it seems that Blake Richmond was upset at the splitting of the ways, which he had anticipated would have been like his father’s romantic Blake inspired, Idealist clique. In reading Stirling’s collection of papers, I detect in William Blake Richmond fear about the loss of his entire cohort which reflected his fears about his personal ambition as his friends moved up, and away, to wealthier parvenu circles. The “late and debased Roman art” aligns Solomon with educated classes in classical antiquity – which I read in a similar way to his critique of his other friends for their associations to narcissistic “cliques”, like the “quiet” Yorkshireman, Albert Moore, and to the “little
godhead”, the narcissism of James McNeill Whistler, making their movements towards the new generation of outrageously rich Holland Park circle of artists.112 Like these, Richmond sees Solomon as alien from cultures that were not his own. What I am associating for the first time in connection to Solomon’s Jewish mythologies, is the close triumvirate style friendships typified in George Du Maurier’s *Trilby*, which seems to use the salon mythologies of covert Jewishness, with recognizable characteristics of the close circles of friendships which cast the fully blown Jewish genius in parallel, but that is unrecognizable until after the close friendships are long removed.113 Richmond (with the relation to the early reference in *Trilby* to a vital part of Jewish breeding in the nation) makes direct reference to the idyllic life of the characterization of Little Bilee’s and his friends– in which the students, including a strong Yorkshireman, like Moore, also went to the British museum to study objects from around the world, including Assyrian reliefs, such as the Black Obilisk. It is now well known through Donato Esposito’s superb work, was exciting for being the a reference to the Bible in Layard’s popular discoveries.114 The Assyrian reliefs, as Esposito points out in his thesis, thereafter became an index for Biblical styles, which Solomon copies, and is described by Richmond as “barbaric” and “ancient-looking”, and in “Hebrew characters”.115

113 An example of implied antisemitism when wider social incrimination is present can be seen in a study by Daniel Pick, who discusses the “most widely read of all antisemitic representations in the Victorian era”, the character of Svengali in *Trilby*. Danel Pick, “Powers of Suggestion: Svengali and the Fin-de-Siecle”, in Cheyette, Marcus, Cheyette, Bryan, and Marcus, Laura [eds]. Modernity, Culture and ‘the Jew’. (Oxford: Polity, 1998). 106
114 Donato Esposito has described them to me affectionately as “triumvirates”.
What is important to note for our purposes in an assumption of Solomon’s cleavage among Jewish art histories, however, is that this quotation was the source material which created the traditions about the life of the artist which Bohm Duchen applies the kind of mental bifurcation about religion and sexuality.\textsuperscript{116} Bohm-Duchen’s comment on Blake Richmond’s quotation was apparently curtailed by page 11 and the next essay on Solomon’s brother, Abraham. She would appear to agree with William Blake Richmond’s assessment because it was the final word on Bohm-Duchen’s short essay. The essay itself laid out a certain common art historical shorthand for the emergence of Jewish artist nineteenth century;\textsuperscript{117} that is, the genealogy of Anglo-Jewish resettlement, rejecting the projected theology of the second commandment, and comparing Solomon to other European Jewish artists benefitting from an apparent international emancipation.\textsuperscript{118} Her paper emphasizes her restricted scope in writing about Solomon’s religious ideology when there are many essays in a single catalogue. It seems that the issues of sexuality in the exhibition is left to Emmanuel Cooper, a writer of gay art history, with his essay two chapters later titled, “A Vision of Love: Homosexual and Androgynous Themes in Simeon Solomon’s Work after 1873”.\textsuperscript{119} The use of androgynous subjects, he argues, relates to a

\textsuperscript{116} The question of whether an artist is supposed to keep these lives separate is something Ross demonstrates in the obituary cited above, “Any one curious enough to study his pictures will regret that he was lost to art by allowing an ill-regulated life to prey upon his genius. He had not sufficient strength to keep the two things separate, as Shakespeare, Verlaine, and Leonardo succeeded in doing.” These were historical sodomites who were able to produce work uninhibited by their sexuality, and that Solomon himself developed a personal affinity. Ross, “A Note on Simeon Solomon,” 142.


\textsuperscript{118} There were, however, always Jewish artists in England, as these functions in British antisemitic folklore as witnesses of Christ, to revive Franz Landsberger’s excellent holocaust era study, Franz Landsberger, “The Jewish Artist before the Time of Emancipation.” \textit{Hebrew Union College Annual} 16 (1941): 321-414. I would argue that one problem is trying to appropriate the definition of the heroic status of the renaissance Artist in the eighteenth century, from France and Italy, and the more modest claims of what an artist is prior to the seventeenth century in England. There were plenty of Jewish limners, and artisans prior to \textit{The Emergence of the French gods} after they replaced their Cathedrals with Galleries, priests for painters: in England however, the matter of the cottage industry and use of artisans in the dissemination of visual imagery is worth more scrutiny.

post arrest style for, “The androgyne’s sexuality is not physical but one which is concerned only with pure emotional love. It was neither sordid nor illegal.”\textsuperscript{120} He vaguely hints at its religious influence, “During the nineteenth century one of the most important religious sources for the idea of the androgyne included the mystical philosophies associated with the Judaeo-Christian tradition [sic]. These for example are described in the Kabbala, the book of Jewish mystical philosophy.” Cooper doesn’t sound learned in Jewish cultures, nor of Christian Kabbalistic indices uses in British romanticism, although he was right to point it out as the field develops.\textsuperscript{121} Cooper’s small hint at an explanation of religious background amongst “the androgyne” at least indicates that Solomon is to be read in the syncretic unification of patterns across religious concepts of sexuality.\textsuperscript{122} We might then, reflect on Richmond’s idea that Solomon’s work was Pagan, not Christian, in terms of his family’s millenarianism, and relationship to Blake, which creates a particular Pagan-Christian mode of romanticism that supposedly excludes Hebraism.\textsuperscript{123}

Later in 2001 the Jewish Museum, London, put on an exhibition devoted to Simeon Solomon, \textit{From Prodigy to Outcast: Simeon Solomon – Pre-Raphaelite Artist}. The in-house curator Alisa Jaffe gave similar surprising assessments about internal morals being reflected in the movement away from Jewish material in the section of her essay subtitled, “From Jewish Themes to Symbolism” with my emphasis,

Following the aestheticism of the Pre-Raphaelites, Solomon moved away from his ‘Hebrew’ themes. His Jewish beliefs were weakening when he came under the influence of

\textsuperscript{120} Cooper, “A Vision of Love: Homosexual and Androgynous Themes in Simeon Solomon’s Work after 1873,” 33.
\textsuperscript{122} There are difficulties in the approach to the term “the Androgyne” to currents of Platonism in Victorian culture, as Prettejohn comments, that as a term, “there is no such thing”. See Prettejohn, “Simeon Solomon”, \textit{Art for Art’s Sake}, 82. For a more extensive description of Victorian neo-platonism, alas that I wish to study more of, see Liz Prettejohn, “Solomon, Swinburne, Sappho.” \textit{Victorian Review} 34, no. 2 (2008): 103-28.
\textsuperscript{123} See Spector, \textit{ibid}. 
the then fashionable Oxford movement with its strong attachment to Catholicism. The pomp and ceremony of Catholic ritual appealed to his aesthetic sensibilities.\textsuperscript{124}

Jaffe equivocates at this point in the text, where she acknowledges, “…However, Solomon never entirely abandoned Judaism, and continued to produce a number of portraits of rabbis.” She could do no less, for within the body of her essay is Solomon’s \textit{Man in turban holding lulav and etrog}, 1886, from the Jewish Museum’s collection, at least fifteen years after this apparent lapse in personal morality – his “weakening Jewish beliefs”. Indeed, the exhibition cover is the now infamous \textit{Rabbi Holding the Scrolls of the Law, or Synagogue in Genoa} which was executed in 1871, at a very late stage of his friendship with Algernon Swinburne since early 1860s, who is said to be one of the reasons behind his movement away from simple Hebraism.

As we can see described in Jaffe’s writing, the artist allegedly moved away from depicting Hebrew iconography and it marked a break with supposed personal beliefs (if there are such things to present outwards, of Hebraism, in a unified Jewish community). However, this departure from Hebrew iconography is plainly not true if you look at even the titles of Solomon’s later works included in the exhibition! That a respected curator for the Jewish Museum can miss basic chronological facts in her own essay goes to prove how strong this concept of unified symbol of ‘Hebraism’ in Jewish culture can be.\textsuperscript{125}

Alisa Jaffe’s exhibition was an important milestone in Solomon studies, where Solomon is once again foregrounded as a pre-Raphaelite artist important in Jewish British art. Jaffe opens the introductory essay, “we have deliberately limited works from his later allegorical period, inspired by Greek mythology, as these are already familiar from previous exposure.” It is unclear to me why this “later” allegorical period excludes Jewish


\textsuperscript{125} Jaffe’s scare quotes, to her credit.
images, but I argue here that they should not – as Solomon’s allegorical program, indexing the pre-Raphaelites’ use of allegory, was the foundation of his artistic identity from the very beginning of his artistic status, as he produces art to include patterns across civilizations, including Jewish ones. Thus, whether it is “late and debased roman art” which Richmond alludes to, or “symbolism” or “Greek” art that Jaffe does, I don’t believe that the image in Solomon’s production changes from the patterns involving the sexualised relationship between a youth and his elder religious patriarch. By doing so I am also producing an argument that sidesteps the concept of the androgyne that has become popular when discussing Solomon’s work.

An individual departing from an expected stereotype is called, self-hatred. What occurs in Solomon’s reception is an understanding between two Jewish types, where sincerity of both is questioned: The two Jewish stereotypes in the national image – either in moralizing Hebraism, and romantic mythology, are the ones are contested. The first type – the depiction of moralizing Hebraism, represents a revelation of covenant with a figure of the Law, newly defined in the national image. The second contrasting type is definitively a complex symbolic order, in that the Jew, like the romantic visionary, concatenates symbols across civilizations. It contains an ever shifting symbolic project of individual revelation; but that ambivalence invites the charge of self-hatred. That problem

---

126 The pre-Raphaelites, of course, had as many definitions of allegory and symbol which was applied to their in Woolner, Hunt, Rossetti, constitutional writings in the Germ, as well as a wider association with writers, each with their own definitions of symbol and allegory: from their Heroes, Carlyle, Poe, and Dante, through to the so called, “New Aesthetics”, Whistler, Swinburne, Ruskin, Pater, and to the more reflective Symons, and Bosanquet. The list of definitions for Allegory and Symbol at this time, is endless, not least because the romantic allegory they refer to is constitutive in the uses of literary pictorialism within British literature itself. Symbolism, in the broadest possible sense, is a characteristic of the literary stage of Victorian art and its relationship to illustration, for example, Lucien Pissarro writes of British art in his popular monograph of Dante Gabriel Rossetti. Rossetti: Masterpieces in Colour. (London: T.C. & E.C. Jack., 1908). For more on the relationships of symbolism (or none) and the New Aesthetes, see the anthologies by Eric Warner, and Graham Hough, eds. Strangeness and Beauty: Volume 1, Ruskin to Swinburne: An Anthology of Aesthetic Criticism 1840-1910. (Cambridge University Press, 1983).

127 Prettejohn, op. cit.

gets brought out in the pressures to assimilate in salons after Jewish enlightenment in Western Europe since the eighteenth century, against the imaginary community of Hebrew nationhood in Britain in the nineteenth century.

**Historical Paradigm Two: Early Jewish Exhibition**

*Jewish afterlives: (Kunst) Wissenschaft des Judentums – why non Hebrew art is still Jewish art*

*Jewish Contributions to Civilization*, is an anxious, holocaust era apologia written by Cecil Roth, re-printed many times during the second world war, to fight an allegation that “the Jew is essentially a middleman, who has produced nothing”. After citing many names of Jewish artists, “If Solomon Alexander Hart, professor and librarian of the Royal Academy, was a noteworthy exponent of what may be termed the pontifical school in British painting, that wayward genius, Simeon Solomon, was not the least remarkable member of the pre-Raphaelite group.” The Viennese art historian, Alfred Werner, writes about Solomon in glowing terms for Cecil Roth’s opus on Jewish Art. He merits a full two pages in Roth’s book, adapted from a more developed study on the artist for the Kenyon Review. Werner unites the queer and Jewish narratives. He does talk of Solomon in terms of a “self-destructive pattern of his contemporaries Baudelaire, Rimbaud and Oscar Wilde”. Werner at least does not conflate moral with stylistic departures, and does not cast a repressive gaze on his sexuality (like his editor Roth does with, say, with Phillip Sassoon’s depressions of his “bachelorhood”). Werner was married to a psychoanalyst,

---


130 Ibid. 130


and used Freudian terms to describe the artist’s self-mythology. However, there are clear culprits of “bad influence” that would be contrary to the values of queer scholars who are interested in the artists’ agency:

Swinburne apparently introduced him to homosexual and sadistic practices. The Victorian world was shocked by tales of orgies celebrated by the poet and his friends; handsome and unstable, Solomon participated in the exciting fare of art, sex, drink and drugs.

However, if we look at exhibition practices in the Jewish community since his death, homophilia seemed to have been indications of assimilation triumph especially as positive expressions of elitism. Solomon’s inclusion in two shows during Jewish crisis in England: first, in 1887, a year before the first Commons Select Committee on Alien Committee, where Solomon’s works were placed (discussed here in chapter 2). These documented Jewish life were displayed in direct comparison with Bernard Picard’s famous Ceremonies, thereby, as Batsheva Goldman-Ida quotes the centenary catalogue, they “present[ed] Jews as a cultured people, worthy of acceptance into English society and of potential benefit to it”. The second, at the “Jewish Art and Antiquities” exhibition, at the Whitechapel Art Gallery, as both Goldman-Ida and Juliet Steyn notes that exhibition is a year following the Anti-Aliens Bill. Steyn notes that Solomon, “was of infinitely greater merit as an artist [to the other exhibitors of] ‘history’, and ‘popular’ genres”… “whose work it was claimed, had he lived longer, would have surpassed that of Burne Jones and

---

134 Werner, "Jewish Artists of the Age of Emancipation," 570.
136 Batsheva Ida, Fragmented Mirror: Exhibition of Jewish Artists, Berlin, 1907. (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv Museum of Art, 2009), 159-158.
While it is a remarkable claim for the exhibition (and certainly with regards to Rosetti and Burne Jones’ earlier technique, is to my mind true of their early works), to Steyn, the exhibition served a dichotomous purpose, demonstrating the category of the English Jew, on the one hand, to “represent the Jew resisting assimilation”, and on the other, “it was Jews proclaiming the virtue and achievement of assimilation.” The exhibition is triumphalist, even if it does perform a pathetic “contributions to civilization” agenda. The selection committee included Solomon J. Solomon RA, and the Chief Rabbi Hermann Adler, indicating the unity of the Jewish community in time of crisis, and its use of Solomon’s exceptional artistic status, at least according to mythology, indicative of the heightened Jewish assimilation into the most elevated of cliques.

What is more evocative of the elitist use of homophilia within the Jewish community is that Solomon was also among the first and thus most important that were substantially collected by one of the first Jewish arts and cultural centres in England, the Ben Uri Art Society, in 1919. Works were collected by Moyshe Oyved, the registrar, Yiddish poet, antiques dealer, and friend of Jacob Epstein. Oyved’s queer self-mythology was intriguing, as his autobiographies show that he is open minded enough to describe his homosexual attraction: to body builders, secretly kissing his hand after he privately poses for Oyved in a room above his shop – totally naked, – and a deep spiritual attention of Epstein to his face, when posing for a bust by the sculptor; and his prose poem, The Book of Affinity, is a theosophist elegy which seems to be heavily inspired by Solomon’s prose poem, A Vision of Love Revealed in Sleep. Oyved recalled the names

---

138 Cited by Steyn, ibid.
139 Ibid. 79.
of his élite clientele to give him status, so I can infer that Oyved is merely posing as a sodomite to grant him status. Finally, The Ben Uri Gallery, “The festival of Britain, Anglo-Jewish Exhibition, 1851-1951” 9th July – 3rd August, uses Solomon’s painting of Abraham and Isaac lent by his nephew, and community leader, Dr. Redcliffe Salaman, as the cover image. I am bringing home the point that the aspirational elements of the Jewish community, display and imitate inversion as evidence of élite assimilation, despite (rather than because of) the vagrancy associated with his life. As far as his works represents the objects which marks the course of British assimilation into his majority state, his Jewish intentions; both directly in national Hebraism, and romantic concatenations of symbols that expresses a form of religious allegory among élites, requires some reflection. I will hint towards the latter romantic intent, and Solomon’s dismay that it was misunderstood, here.

**Historical Paradigm Three: Romantic Agony.**

Jaffe’s section is titled, “From Jewish Themes to Symbolism”[sic], although her claims for the romantic concatenation of symbols, in relation to the Symbolist movement were broadly instinctive, as any retrospective claims for the French movements have been since 1969. If Symbolism is allegedly brought into being in the year 1886, and that is the year that Solomon is creating Hebrew works again, a new working misunderstanding around the elements of the “symbolic” as a subcategory of the more British sense of “romanticism”, can be explored in relation to Solomon’s tortured subjects.

These inclusions of Solomon in a rudimentary and instinctive collection of French Symbolists however, did not make any grand definition of the ‘symbolist’ movement’s

---

142 to reclaim the Mauqess of Queensbury’s term to deprecate Wilde’s Irish plebeian class pretensions towards the hallowed vice, rather than truly embodying the full engagement in its practice among the élites.
143 Carolyn Conroy brings the names of the myriad works that were exhibited in Solomon’s later career Conroy, *He Hath Mingled*, Appendix I, 259.
French origins of the term in the 1880s: I have found that the first exhibition to self-consciously gather “Symbolist” works together, that also includes Solomon is a fascinating exhibition in Ontario, 1969. Collecting Solomon’s work as “Symbolism”, as it fully acknowledged in 1969, came with some element of blind “intuition”, or serendipity as they are assembled.\textsuperscript{145} Later the Barbican gallery in London, 1989, included Solomon’s work in an exhibition that seems obsequious in its aim to fit late British romanticism, including Solomon into the British origins of the general French art historical narrative. Solomon’s late Medusa heads, \textit{The Tormented Soul}, 1894, is a frontispiece, in connection to Walter Pater’s analysis of “Leonardo’s” Medusa [sic].\textsuperscript{146} There it references Solomon’s child sadism as part of popular romantic associations to the aesthetics of pain, and cites Mario Praz’s work from 1933.

Regarding child abuse in Solomon’s work, Simon Goldhill points out that Solomon puts “the less salubrious teacher/pupil relation on display”, especially in Solomon’s expressions of sadomasochism, and the terms of religious sexual violence is made evident from Solomon’s letters to Charles Swinburne and Oscar Browning with fantasies of beating them.\textsuperscript{147} Solomon paid attention to pedagogic abuse, in both violence and seduction (favouritism). Harry Sandberg has discussed the issue, although he does see it as a movement away from his “Jewish background”. However, I note that Swinburne depicts Solomon’s sadism also in his depictions of Hebraism, and the national image. In my

\textsuperscript{146} Christian, John, ed. The Last Romantics: The Romantic Tradition in British Art, Burne Jones to Stanley Spencer. Lund Humphries, 1989. Perhaps the Medusa’s use here, and the reference to sadism in the catalogue entry, is inspired by the 1933 work by Mario Praz, \textit{The Romantic agony}, that mentions Solomon in relation to Swinburne’s exposure of Solomon’s sadism in the \textit{Dark Blue}, in Praz’s notes on pages, 424, 426, and 480. The British exhibition thereby concatenates a subconscious relationship between Pater’s agony, as is brought in the infamous inter-war publication about the pain of romanticism, thus combining British agony of the previous century, Chapter 1, “The Beauty of the Medusa” to Solomon’s relationship with Pater’s clericy. See Mario Praz, Mario. \textit{The Romantic Agony. Birkenhead: The Fontana Library}, 1960 (1933).
argument however, I make the case against separating Solomon in that chronology away from his faith to explore sexuality. However, morbid depictions of trauma and abuse within sexuality can be part of religious charisma abuse. I bring a method from feminist discourses of pornography and bible studies in the porno-prophetic school of biblical criticism. It mirrors the homosexual nature of the abuses within the tutor pupil relationship, and in relation to religious youths, especially in abusive practices in fantasies of religious pain depicted by Solomon.  

Another Tate exhibition devoted to making British art precursive to French Symbolism in the following decade, 1997, with Solomon’s *Love in Autumn* as its frontispiece – with an entry which more directly references his sadism. While cross channel narratives are important for those who want to construct genealogies of art history leading to the primitive flatness of modernism (or to court money from Europhiles that believe in the Supremacy of French to American “canon”, while eliminating British imperialism), I find my uses of romanticism align with other distinct definitions of the aristocratic portrayals of law, and of genius, and of relation to interior faith. A fundamental element of this project is the British-Jewish emancipation and the constitutive biblical elements that are distinctly different to the Secular French revolutionaries. While the Anti-Theism of Swinburne in the Solomon household’s Salon, was distinctly shocking, and perverse to George Du Maurier, and Swinburne also had its connection to the French romantic positions, and understandings of totemic sacrifice, I position Solomon and Swinburne’s romanticism in
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148 Sandberg, ibid. Does a good job of describing those violences but kept them to his depictions of Classical Antiquity. See also, Dowling, Linda C. *Hellenism and homosexuality in Victorian Oxford* (Cornell University Press, 2014), which, like many queer theorists, attempts to separate “homo sociality” from the forms of male relationship Solomon sexually fantasized about.

149 Wilton, Andrew, and Gallery Tate. *The Age of Rossetti, Burne-Jones and Watts: Symbolism in Britain, 1860-1910*. Edited by Robert Upstone (London: Tate Gallery, 1997). The essay by Christopher Newell (pp.35-46) is explicit about Solomon’s homoeroticism, (p.43), and makes a point about Solomon’s drunken expression of a sadism fantasy to Browning in the catalogue entry, *Love in Autumn* (pp.111-113, also depicted as the frontispiece). The sadism evoked by the of previous exhibition, was perhaps also informed by Praz. But that he was outed by Swinburne’s article in the *Dark Blue Op. cit.*
national British ways. As I shall show with evidence to Julia Ellsworth Ford’s biography, Solomon align himself with Shelley’s work, and I relate Solomon’s romanticism in relation to the interpretations of the English literary ‘visionary company’, and interior revelations that are common to English dissenting literature.  

Historical Paradigm Four: Queer ‘Revivals’ and Assumptions of Homophobic Neglect

During the gay liberation activist years of the 1980s and 1990s, certain modalities of Jewish suffering was appropriated in the American Jewish writer’s toolbox – tropes of Jewish anxiety were made mainstream as American Jews reflect on the traumas of the holocaust that were being reproduced in their mass loss of community, and in their agitation for the same American civil rights as straight people: In desperation of entire community loss, the whole gamut of Jewish victim stereotypes was rightly deployed by Jewish writers in American theatre and other art activism (such as Larry Kramer, Tony Kushner, and William Finn etcetera). The use of holocaust imagery during the AIDs crisis to describe the loss of whole communities included Pride marches, vigils of collective grief, gender formation or none, the depiction of genitals or none, and what one is invited to do with them, or not, while describing partiality for forms (subjectivity and authority of
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150 George Du Maurier, and Daphne Du Maurier and Derek Peypes Whitley [eds.]. The Young George Du Maurier: A Selection of His Letters, 1860-1867. (London: Peter Davies, 1951), 235. It is dismaying that Thaïs Morgan misappropriates the language of "perversion" and the context of what was actually "perversion" at this conversazione in 1864, by characterizing it as a sexual rather than religious adjective, and misattributed to Solomon rather than Swinburne by. The anti-theist perversion was said, at Solomon’s house, by Swinburne. It was an otherwise very good essay, Thaïs Morgan. "Perverse Male Bodies: Simeon Solomon and Algernon Charles Swinburne." In Outlooks: Lesbian and Gay Sexualities and Visual Cultures, edited by Peter Horne and Reina Lewis, 61–85. (London and New York: Routledge, 1996). Harry Sandberg makes a similar mistaken attribution of what is said of Solomon’s effeminate figures, by misquoting Robert Browning’s irritation with the cliques’ allegories, and also unmasculine writing style; especially the superfluity of Swinburne and Rossetti’s writings, in a moment of envy at Rossetti’s success. By attributing envious irritations with Swinburne and Rossetti, and shock of their anti-theisms as currents of homophobia or transphobia against Solomon across queer discourses, the objectives of their art history are weakened. letter 128, June 19, 1870, 19 Warwick Crescent, London, W. in Browning, Robert, and Edward C. MacAleer. Dearest Isa Robert Browning's letters to Isabella Blagden. Austin, (Texas: University of Texas Press, 1951), 335-227.
ekphrasis narration). These tendencies are agreeable to homophile, Jewish, or non-Jewish, art historian, while talking about alignments and hyphenations of Jewish alterity and Jewish-queerness after Freudian castration models because of male circumcision. With relation to appropriations of holocaust imagery – I would even go so far as to say that Jewish scholars were probably more in tune to the cultural loss because of third generation holocaust survivor’s capacity to reflect and create activist theatre in the nineteen eighties.

The non-Jewish scholar or activist absorbing media from this era as part of their identity’s antecedents, might miss what actual Jewish culture, indeed, what Judaism is, without these queer associations to our history, and when it comes to their description in the Hebrew nation. For instance, Solomon’s Jewishness was only marginally depicted in the late nineteen eighties for Neil Bartlett’s play about homophobic violence during the Aids crisis, *A Vision of Love Revealed in Sleep*, that was named after Solomon’s prose poem, and based on Simon Reynold’s Biography of Solomon, which was a groundbreaking and an invaluable resource.

Bartlett’s original work was briefly underscored by the melancholy tune of Bruch’s Kol Nidre, to indicate Jewish melancholia and suffering (rather than its legal content), and opened his monologue by repeating the unsettling words, “help me”. The fully naked Bartlett demonstrated ultimate vulnerability to the elements, moving only in a sheet. Bartlett underscored his revival with musical phrases that sound like they are gleaned from Elgar’s Elegies: thereby representing an aligned concepts he meant to portray through the romantic understanding of that elegiac theme - of dissenter’s remorse, of exclusion, and dismay. In the first use of Kol Nidre, and the Biblical Song of Songs referenced by
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151 I tend to endorse these noble uses of Jewish victim narratives, but only by non-Jews in dense populated areas, who live and work with Jews intimately in field where there is a large Jewish community, In England, for instance, Shirley Bassey’s producers (for her revival of *The Performance* by the Pet Shop Boys), or Neil Bartlett.

152 Bartlett studied English literature with Alan Hollinghurst, so he knows that the form, elegy, means – that is, having the qualities of remorse.
Solomon’s vision of Love, Bartlett thereby used one Jewish tropes common to American activist theatre; but also used his literary education to understand the purposes of Hebrew elegy in British elegy. In short he was able to portray the savage rape and beating of the vulnerable Shulamite that represents Israel, and align it to the fear of homophobic attacks due to the AIDS pandemic.

There are further important queer cultural resonances at the time of Solomon’s revival at the end of the 1980s. The Gay Newspaper, *Gay Times* for March, 1989, featured Neil Bartlett on the cover between two drag queens, Betty Borne, and Regina Fong, posing as Solomon’s drawing *Sad Love*, for the revival of ‘A Vision of Love’. It was the third revival of the show he described as a two year “climax” of his historiography, *Who Was That Man? A Present for Mr. Oscar Wilde*. Bartlett describes the work as “a recreation of the life of a gay man from the historical past but functions at another as a consideration of the lives of contemporary gay men.”

There were stories inside the paper on the editorial page, the ‘News Round up’. Particularly notable was the headline, “Police under fire after public toilet patrols: Man commits suicide after cottage arrest”. It describes “police mismanagement over their overstretched resources”, tantamount to police over-reach in their staking out of public toilets; the information was shared by the police to the man’s home town newspaper where the details of the 50 year old man were made known, despite “warning the police that he would have to commit suicide if there was any publicity about the case”. From the above case, and cases of public sex of this era, to the generous and copious queer theories of public sex of this era (Jeffrey Weeks and H.G. Cocks to name but two heroes in gay liberation theory), were quite unapplicable Solomon's case, where, as mentioned, he was

154 David Smith ‘News Round-Up’ *Gay Times* (March 1989), 5. It is sadly a common story around this time.
well aware of the legal ramifications from recent court knowledge, and aware of the likelihood of police address given the area he was in. I am left with the ethical concern, how to hold this paradigm with care, as one’s relationship to community is predicated on relationships to narrations of lost community.\textsuperscript{155}

Within the queer revival literature, both Emmanuel Cooper and James Saslow, contribute to the placement of Solomon within a homosexual historical narrative.\textsuperscript{156} Cooper devotes over six pages to the artist, in his section, “Sexual Aesthetes”; and under \textit{Bridegroom and Sad Love} relating Solomon’s apologetic comment to Swinburne, “I have had to suffer for [how his pictures were looked upon with suspicion], and will probably have to suffer still” and Cooper commented with a flourish, “and suffer he did”, thereafter relating his arrest, and how he was cut off by Swinburne with assumptions of the immediate reason for his distance was his public sex conviction.\textsuperscript{157} Saslow likewise brings \textit{Sad love}, in the same way that Cooper did, and relates the farewell of the bridegroom to former homosexual friends.\textsuperscript{158} Saslow’s motives are more directly related to the paradigms of holocaust narration and the traumas of lost community, invoking the paradigm “never again”, as he references in his preface,\textsuperscript{159} and in the introduction, the purpose of his work is to mark that we were “simply and eloquently, there”.\textsuperscript{160}

One of the regrets of Solomon studies is the idea that he was forgotten, something that in the earlier historical paradigms I have shown was not the case. From the springs of these powerful AIDS era trauma narrations of victimhood, comes another wave of queer

\textsuperscript{155} Thomas Trezise, "Witnessing witnessing." In \textit{Witnessing Witnessing} (Fordham University Press, 2014).
\textsuperscript{157} Cooper, \textit{op. cit.} 68.
\textsuperscript{158} See \textit{Preface}
\textsuperscript{159} Saslow, \textit{Pictures and Passions}, preface, vii. This parallel to the holocaust narration paradigms I grew up with is personally affecting, as it intends to be.
\textsuperscript{160} \textit{Ibid.} 3.
Solomon scholarship. Harry Sandberg, for instance talks of Solomon being forgotten in the first page of his PhD thesis. But despite my examples in the earlier paradigms of Solomon scholarship, there is some truth to this narrative – that goes beyond American distaste of British art since the 1960s in favour of French art collected by state museums. Within my research I believe that it has to do with a mistake in a Pre-Raphaelite exhibition at the Tate Gallery, *Pre-Raphaelite Painters By Robin Ironside, with a Descriptive Catalogue by John Gere*, London, 1948. It included only one drawing by Simeon Solomon, *Dante’s first meeting with Beatrice*, as Solomon was less important that the first generation, and described how after 1870 “his friends made various attempts to reform him, with no success: he continued to live a jovial and unrepentant life in the London underworld…” (my emphasis)

This drawing by Solomon was the only one included in a grand landmark pre-Raphaelite revival exhibition at Tate, in 1984 – a case of replicating the earlier exhibition’s use of the artist. However, Liz Prettejohn in her important work, *The Art of the Pre-Raphaelites*, again at Tate, in 2007, did much to fix this neglect, with many inclusions of Rebecca and Simeon. Rather than assume the former case in 1984 was a case of homophobic prejudice, I rather deduce that it was a result of the replication of the exhibition object from 1848, in 1984. I engage with Prettejohn, my beloved supervisor, many times in the forthcoming thesis.

All the same, there are other elements in the fourth historical paradigm that will need to be addressed, particularly as gay art history gave way to pride agenda since the year 2000. I point particularly in psychosocial testimony studies to the so-called “prohibition” language against using anything but paradigmatic narratives that effect
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narrations and discussion of trauma between ‘historian’ and objects that serve as ‘witness’. Particularly exemplary in this discourse is the idea of a shame of shame. It made me question my motives whether self-hatred in the Jewish sense, was consonant with queer agenda, and through this, my own relationship with community as I discussed in the preface.

Clearly, there is an ethical concern with the 1848 use of the terms that in his 1870s alcoholism he was “resistant to reform”, that he was, unrepentant, and that was the discussion most relevant in the work of Carolyn Conroy with her important thesis about Solomon’s whereabouts, trial, and post 1873 works. Conroy was particularly keen to reflect on the ‘negative critical appraisal’ of Solomon’s later works, on the terms of his ‘unrepentant lifestyle’ and that he still kept his ‘career’ as an ‘artist’. These however, are post-year-2000 ethical judgments (particularly about whether one chooses a ‘career’ for life) rather than descriptions by his contemporaries, or indeed the sadness or remorse engaged by the AIDs era. Nevertheless, in Simeon Solomon’s case study surrounding his post Dark Blue fractions with his clique, what is there is there; and I argue that constructions of The Law in the national imagination, whether through interior vision, or exterior Hebrew power, is the very crux of the tension that he is exploring. I argue my case that the tension is indicative of the changing Jewish image during his active years since the 1850s, and climaxing with the tensions of a newly defined, and very specific cultural Hebraism around 1870, that radically opposed it.

To spell out the parameters of certain frictions within preoccupations which have been popular in existing Solomon scholarship: homophilic publications have illustrated the
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partiality of subjective desire present Solomon as an un-repentant, remorse, or shame free artist, ‘true’ to “his nature”, and that is because we are “born this way”; which through acceptable givens in queer scholarship, such as the fleeting privilege of gender norms (without acknowledging its genealogy in genre studies and aesthetics), and evidence such things in Solomon’s ephebic youths, and the androgynous figures he depicts is evidence of pre-gender realizations. Second, that the importance of Simeon Solomon’s work to queer scholarship since the 1980s is his dramatic mythology (the arrest and conviction for “attempted buggery” in February 1873). I agree that the mythology of that instant, returned to in sacred narrative, becomes a part of queer corporeal martyrdom. It becomes akin to that moment of Sartre’s biopic, Saint Genet, a moment before and after the “sacred drama” which those that study the artist return to, “repeating the original drama of the lost paradise”, as if a religious Myth of Eternal Return, in circular time described by Mircea Eliade. So too, Solomon’s works are seen within this archetypal event, “in the same symbolic and ritual form”, of our interested religious swooning over the repeated profiles and gestures of his later works, as if reviving our sympathy for criminalizing the homosexual for being himself – like the Jewish victim of the holocaust. Perhaps it is nothing more than an unfortunate accident that the pre-Raphaelites worked in circular projects, rather than in linear time; perhaps it is the point of Solomon’s later self-mythology; and I shall return to this notion of circular time over linear time in the thesis; I made clear when Solomon realized his vision could not hold in 1871.


Carolyn Conroy’s invaluable PhD, is ambivalent towards mythologization, in that it goes some way in trying to argue against the mythology that as Wilde’s publisher, Robbie Ross claimed, he was worthless after the event (as Solomon’s works were literally worthy of money), and his later life affectations as related to the French bohemians (rather than the British romantics of the previous century); on the other hand, as I brought out above, Conroy goes into great detail about Solomon’s supposed ‘humiliation’ of the police investigation – as much as her argument was devoted to de-mythologise with facts of his whereabouts.

One cannot have it both ways, and nor can one claim that Ross was prejudiced towards some contemporary concept of the origins. Solomon becomes part of the lives of the queer saintly victims; a brilliant antecedent, and is placed into the catalogue of queer art, next to Oscar Wilde, *due to the efforts* of Ross. In the words of his friend, and former lover, Oscar Browning on behalf of those who knew him, Solomon’s behaviours did in fact indicate a loss of morale, and I want to investigate what that behaviour was in terms of the Jewish community ‘on trial’ for its newly invested rights, and how it prompted an assimilation of Jews into the Hebrew national image; and therefore relations to the reception of that project as national pre-occupations in relation to the romantic artist, changed.

I prefer to see this sacred episode in February 1873 as Solomon’s useful alibi for the purposes of self-mythology, and as a containment strategy for the marginalization, and
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self-marginalization that occurred three years before when receptions to his symbolic project started to collapse as a purposive Hebrew philosemitism.\textsuperscript{168}

In summary of these paradigms as an overview of Simeon Solomon Scholarship; particularly regarding public sex, I recognize this moment of his biography as a \textit{return} to authority to the sovereign structure, rather a “moving away” from a perceived background.\textsuperscript{169} I see Solomon performing an altruistic removal against the interiorized needs for British Jewry in his asceticism, because the Jew in post emancipation, a Jew cannot afford to be impoverished, or criminalized, and has to reject the conversion fetish placed upon him, as the Jewish nation is on trial for its newly invested rights. Public exhibitionism, in Solomon’s case, cruising to passersby outside a toilet next to a police station, is a sure way of acknowledging that one is a subject of the Law; and confuses the Butlerian genre studies that relies on “giving an account of oneself”.\textsuperscript{170} But I want to remind my readers, as to appropriate Diotima, great ideas are not borne out of deposits of semen; or their absence, in Solomon’s case. I argue, even like Conroy who devotes so much of her thesis to the moment, that the mythology of the artist between two types of Jew (the Hebrew and the romantic vision), should not start here.

Key Terms

Here is a list of key terms I deploy, which refer to large disciplinary frameworks or concepts. In explaining terms that each discipline takes for granted, and how the terms overlap between disciplines, I help prevent the need for my audience to ‘read in’ while I deploy them. I try to avoid assuming prior discourses surrounding nineteenth century scholarship, in the interdisciplinary contributions that I make, for British history, English literature, gender studies, and social-political sciences in the study of historical Jewish subjects such as Simeon Solomon. They are not newly coined terms, nor are they neologisms.

I appropriate Benedict Anderson’s term, **National Image** and deploy it for art history from his work *Imagined Communities*. I summarize Benedict Anderson’s terms for constructing what is common to the image of nationhood, giving a commonality sensed between similar minds, motivating its individual members with the image of that community to make personal sacrifices for its sake, what he calls, *brotherliness*, or *fraternity*. Anderson also points out that part of community building is its necessity for boundaries, or who they come to exclude from the community, and I have decided to describe the discourse of Jewish alterity using the linguistic frameworks of stereotype studies to describe them. In other words, I take the terms of the imagined national ‘community’ from the publishing platforms, and how it aligns or spars with the image of ‘the Jew’ either as other, or a member of, the national community as it is deployed in the British national image towards the 1860s.

**Assimilation** indicates the ease at which the classificatory boundaries between groups and cultures are symbiotic, porous, semi-permeable, and therefore, as Zygmunt Bauman presses, ‘ambivalent’ between the prominent and the minority group. Just as a plant assimilates nutrients from the soil, so too the dominant group takes on characteristics
of the minority group as its own. In Anglo-Jewish histories, Jews might be seen to be assimilated into British culture, depending on what the boundaries that British identity and participation in high office is placed. British state apparatus enables or prevents the Jews from engaging in society through statement of belief according to the national confession, swearing according to the true faith of a Christian. In an application of our definition, when Thomas Arnold, headmaster of Rugby, argues against Jewish relief from oaths that restrict their participation, he uses a geographic metaphor of the city boundary. He may wish to include Catholics and non-confessional faiths as Christians, but he called the Jews mere ‘sojourners’ that, in Roman law, are on the margins of the city, which are not part of, and therefore not representatives of, the *polis*.

**Stereotype**, and social antagonism: The patterns of the minority group’s supposed characteristics form the group’s *stereotype*. It conscripts the minority to replicate what is presupposed by the pattern of their image. Stereotype studies looks at how ‘impressions’ are formed of a subject, and how a new subject, accords to the impression. To use a leaden metaphor of a glyph in press printing, the characteristics conform to a prior ‘impression’ of the type. That conscription, or boundaried stereotype has lasting effects on the new subject which tries to assimilate into a group, as the subject may offer varying behaviours in relation to a prior impression of its preceding type. The relation to antagonism that occurs when the subject does not conform to the prior impression are succinctly summarized by Irving Goffman, in *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*: because the audience for a new individual applies “their previous experience with individuals roughly similar to the one before them or, more important, to apply untested stereotypes to him” both parties control the stereotype by “influencing the definition of a situation” (such as this list) so that they may assimilate into a majority group. From the perspective of others looking upon the individual, a harmonious relationship can be sustained for as long as the
successful impression of the former category of the individual (such as the candidate) can be adhered to. As Goffman points out, harmony is assured when the parties are not suspected of attempts to “defraud, get rid of, confuse, mislead, antagonize or insult” each other. We shall see that Solomon was able to discern ‘family’ as type, alluding to the term, ‘genus’, as a form of scientific hierarchy in relation to scientific taxonomy of characteristics.

**Sincerity: Conversion sincerity, Oaths sincerity, and Institution.**

Sincerity in its simplest definition means to be from a single source: in its literal sense, without-impurity. I make the connection between the discourses about Jewish conversion in the early 1840s; where Jews that wanted entry into society simply had to convert to the Church of England, and whose conversion was seen to be questionable. Their conversion was seen to be insincere. This insincerity is parallel to arguments to abolish the oaths that tied students to the Church of England’s Acts of Faith, upon graduation, where they have to swear that they are “agreeable” to **Institution**; where Institution, in the Tudor sense, means an entire Church doctrine, or confession. There were arguments for abolition that this pre-requisite graduates to swear oaths insincerely, breaking a few of the ten commandments.

As we shall see from the scholarship on the Jewish reverend, Aaron Levy Green, part of the arguments against attack against abolishing the oath of abjuration in the 1840s and 1850s, to allow those to swear according to one’s faith, was that Jewish oaths were seen to be insincere. Thereafter I associate the assimilation of Jewish Hebraism towards the end of the 1860s parallel to a collected ‘allocentrism’, which has a galvanizing effect on what the Hebrew represents. The discourse after emancipation becomes how the Hebrew image becomes part of catholic abjuration, and in a broad narrative among the
newly enfranchised dissenters, the Hebrew represents a pure, and concretely identifiable traditional origin – a sincere symbol of biblical authority.\footnote{It has been noted by additional scholarship that philosemitism can be nuanced and does not merely act as a form of antisemitism in the nineteenth century, as can be seen in Jonathan Carp, and Adam Sutcliffe, eds. \textit{Philosemitism in History}. (Cambridge University Press, 2011).}

**Allocentrism:** Social studies has developed categories for the discussion of ‘the Jew’ particularly with Bauman’s definition of **allocentrism**, that sets Jews apart as a distinct group, but that is first non-committed and ambivalent, with the Jew being neither an object of immediate strong feeling, and loosens the assumptions of alterity that creates a constraining assumption of two other terms in relation to the Jew: ‘heterophobia’ – that the group is flatly rejected as a whole, and rather, casts the various origins of these assumptions with the Jew as an object of ‘proteophobia’, which rather “lays the seeds” for future strong feelings.

Regarding the terms of **allocentrism** in England during the time of Solomon’s difficulties in the late 1860s, there is a group of papers by Brian Cheyette. In a most collegiate compliment Bauman praises Brian Cheyette’s understanding of ‘the Jew’ in society and English literature, as the gold standard; “a shining example of the cognitively revealing and illuminating use to which the selection of allo- rather than antisemitism as a field of study may be put”.\footnote{Zygmunt Bauman,. “Allosemitism: Premodern, Modern, Postmodern.” In \textit{Modernity, Culture and ‘the Jew’}, edited by Bryan Cheyette and Laura Marcus, 143-56. (Stanford, CA and Cambridge: Stanford University Press; Polity Press, 1998) 155.} My study takes Cheyette’s basis, that deploys a double construction in eighteenth century Britain, when the galvanization of ‘the Jew’ takes place in the national image between Benjamin Disraeli’s presentations of the Jew based on race and aristocracy, and Matthew Arnold’s presentations of Hebrew ‘culture’, as it aligns chronologically to the dates of Solomon’s critical difficulties towards the end of the 1860s and beginning of the 1870s. In future study I would also add the assessment of thinkers, and the influence of historians and British law reform, such as James Anthony Froude, and
Thomas Babington Macauley to the discussion of Jewish emancipation, to Disraeli and
Arnold’s uses of Hebraism. These historians add to the national allocentrism and its
political function, rather than a total abjection of elitism, and definitions of aristocracy. I
therefore use the term Hebrew, to distinguish between ‘the Jew’ in the study of
antisemitism, and the new allocentric modes galvanized by discourses leading up to the
culture and society discourse within the national community as the decade of the 1860s
draws to its close, and claims to national character use the Jew to define parameters of
anti-Catholic alterity.

Reformation: The historical term for the National Image, is Victorian ‘Reformations’, is
revived in book title by Dominic Janes from a specific tract.\textsuperscript{173} It is a concatenation of
events that were objects of study during the Victorian era of legal constitutional reform
(for instance Poor Laws, and Corn Laws). Boundaryed national images in this puritan
regard arise as a result of Tractarianism, and Anglo-Catholicism following the Oxford
movement in the 1830s and 40s; and a reference to the religious tensions which arose due
to the re-introduction of Catholicism and how they may be applied in anti-Catholicism to
this day. Dominic Janes’ starts his assessment of the religious tensions of that era which
are perpetuated in the anti-Catholic sentiment within the hostile practices of ‘Guy Fawkes
Night’ among English towns such as Lewes. I should warn that the ascription of hostilities
towards non puritan dissenters in visual representations in art, however, must be presented
with nuance, particularly in the 1830s and 1840s, as the liberal quality of large history
paintings in the prior era to the pre-Raphaelite movement, demonstrates common
ceremonial practices between faiths, and they might also appeal to sympathies towards
non-confessional dissenters in their struggle for relief and representation, and alignments

\textsuperscript{173} Dominic Janes, Victorian reformation: the fight over idolatry in the Church of England, 1840-1860.
among dissenting confessions. In art history, both the gallery space, and the illustrated encyclopedia, draws forth comparison between ceremonies in the 1830s. History paintings with special interest in, for example, the fall of Cardinal Wolsey, or the persecution of Catholics during reign of Elizabeth, draw sympathy, and for liberal purposes, promoted tolerance. However, the recall of historical events can, in the boundaried spirit of national community hostility towards Catholicism brings other symbolic impressions in the national conscience in the allocentric engagements towards Disraeli’s second premiership in 1870.

**Symbolic power, distinction, transgression, and Salon culture.** These terms are widely deployed in reference to the scholarship of Pierre Bourdieu, particularly his chapter ‘Orthodoxy and Heresy’ in *The Field of Cultural Production*, and the terms of cultural power (the symbolic), pitched against economic power in his earlier work, *Language and Symbolic Power*.\(^{174}\) I also use the term ‘Distinction’ from Pierre Bourdieu’s material cultural analysis of that title, to represent the social interests in attaching oneself to material objects as exemplars of trends and alignment of individual classification with class intentions; and what it means to go beyond that class alignment in renunciation of these trends.\(^{175}\)

I apply these texts to the seeds laid by Hannah Arendt’s earlier work on Benjamin Disraeli’s uses of the Jewish image, and the integration of *élite* power, in a chapter devoted to the British Premier in *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. The Symbolic, within radical literature, refers to the structure of authority; including religious leaders, lawmakers, patriarchs, professors’ etcetera, which radicals try to resist, and usually fail in their
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attempt; they themselves becoming culturally **Symbolic**. Martin Jay uses the term symbolic as the manifestation of over what is seen to be the hypocrisy of the Frankfurt school, and the regress of hypocrisy of their academic detractors, themselves part of the elastic ‘symbolic’ nature of culture.\(^{176}\) The symbolic can also relate to transgression, hedonism of the private salon, where behavioral and material excesses demonstrate that power is demonstrable *because of*, rather than despite, their vulnerability to authority. I use the term in Hannah Arendt’s paradigm as she talks of derided and embarrassing myths of exception, of concepts of Jewish election, because of Disraeli’s use of the myths of excessive financial power among the Jewish *élite* as evidence of racial and British election.

However, in my first chapter I demonstrate how this model of excess is reversed towards the mid-eighteen fifties, due to the spread of domestic literature, and enfranchisement of the dissenting Puritan electorate in the late 1860s. It is then where alternative uses of the Jews as exemplars of morality; that is to say, the image of the Jew is valued in terms of Biblical Hebraism for the domestic paradigm in drives towards Sabbatarianism in the labouring classes. For the Jewish community after emancipation, as I have discussed, it means that the Jewish community are said to feel on ‘probation’, for the rights they had just been granted. In Arendt’s model from the 1950s, the former Symbolic currency for both the homosexual, ‘invert’, and the hedonisms of the *élite*, are vulnerable in this model where Symbolic power is no longer achieved in the salon, especially when criminality is involved. To Arendt, what comes to protect the Jew in England is their cultural status within the domestic literature, called the cottage classes.

Here, emancipation and enfranchisement has knock on effects in the role of the romantic genius. I tie together the relationship between revelation, dissent, and *élite*

transgression, for tensions they deliver to romantic concepts from English literature. For
the purposes of definition, I classify three objects of thought: the romantic genius; the
romantic vision quest (or elegy); and its relation to fleshy sexuality, particularly
masculinity. I assert, congruent with Raymond Williams, that the construction of the
romantic genius is particularly relevant to the aesthetic modes of ‘culture and civilization’
schools of social criticism, as it develops into Arnold’s theories of culture in the Cornhill
Magazines.

**The Romantic genius**, as exemplar of his time, demonstrates what is most
individual about the individual, as he has to function both in relation to his own rules apart
from Institution, creating a myth of what is most ‘peculiar’ about his personality; but also
an ultimate, ideal view of the world that he concatenates from fragments of perception.
The vision quest, which can take the form of pastoral elegy, is a mode by which a young
knight, scholar, virgin, or even elderly dissenting wanderer; seeks the celestial city, a
Jerusalem, and ultimate Beulah. Once delivered to the end of his journey, he traditionally
expires of exhaustion. It can therefore be in the third person to discuss a loving friend’s
journey, or with retrospection to think nostalgically about the before-times when love
between them was possible. In my reading of the pre-Raphaelites uses of ‘quest’ and
‘elegy’ forms, the ‘celestial city’ as a mythic place of return, Jerusalem, takes on a sexual
reference to the place of self-knowledge. That place, as both Beulah, and as Hymen, the
god of Marriage, is united in the fleshy sexual act. Harold Bloom, in the ‘Visionary
Company’ (strangely devoted to his Jewish teacher of English literature, M.H. Abrams),
must certainly have known that his second chapter named after Blake’s reference to Isiah,
Beulah is Talmudic Hebrew for the base vulgarity of the moment of penile penetration.
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177 These concepts are staples of English literary studies in this regard, from Northhope Frye’s *Anatomy of
Criticism*, (Princeton, 1957); M. H. Abraham’s *The Mirror And the Lamp* (Oxford University Press, 1971);
and of course, Harold Bloom’s *Bloom, Harold. The visionary company: A reading of English romantic
poetry* (Cornell University Press, 1971).
Queer and feminist readings of the hymnal break, particularly Lauren Berlant on Miltonic nuptials in Virginia Woolf, write of this nuptial moment between husband and wife as the break of the homosexual pact from the wife’s female homosexual lovers. So too does Simeon Solomon refer to the groom’s break of the nuptial hymen (in for instance, his *Bride, Bridgroom, and Sad Love or Bride, Bridgroom, and Friend of the Bridgroom*), as a hymnal break from the groom’s past homosexual friendships. It is, strangely enough for queer studies, a fairly normative, and phaseological association of ‘progress’ of the feminized homosexual towards development into manhood and grown-up responsibilities, moving on from being a childish poet among his homosexual friends. **Interiority**, and **Absorption**. With regards to the concept of lost-love, therefore, it makes sense that Solomon’s passive faces are associated with the art historical term, absorption, in relation to the nuptial subjects homosexual remembrances from childhood. This term in art history was popularized by Michael Freid’s work, *Absorption and Theatricality: Painting and Beholder in the Age of Diderot*, with particular examples Jean Baptiste Greuze’s girls with dead birds, representing their lost virginity. It is kind of hostility towards well-known Miltonic romantic concept by critics. Specifically, it evokes a phase in romantic progress mythologies, as examples of the vision of lost homosexual love through the sexual act, that in Solomon uses in his ‘vision’. It marks the effeminacy of passive subjects’ depiction, in a binary with an active, theatrical gaze; and, notably, a strong, masculine delineation.

---


179 Prettejohn, *Art for Art’s Sake*, 80-85.

180 *Ibid* 82. Liz Prettejohn also gives the portrayal of men with this device, imbuing resonances of “effeminacy” by critics in her assessment of Frederic Leighton’s *Golden Hours*, from 1864, where a bearded man sits at a keyboard, lost in reverie.
With other regards to the broken nuptial pact, I explore a kind of tension depicted in Solomon’s works between Christianity and Judaisim, as he makes works for a Christian audience, involving a modality of Biblical exegesis in ideas of **Typology**, and **supersession**. Questions surrounding the broken covenant imply that the Jews lose love of God because of their sins, and this is foreshadowed in the Old Testament. Northrop Frye argues that the idea is summarized by the Augustinian axiom “the Old Testament is revealed in the New and the New conceal in the Old: that the two testaments are not so much allegories of one another as metaphorical identifications of one another”, and thus, as Frye directs, this tradition thereby maintains a *mythos* of a messiah, in the sense of a romantic quest, as we spoke about.\footnote{Frye Anatomy of Criticism, 315 – 316.} We will see how the Jewish community, however, had obvious antipathies to Solomon’s formulation of these ideas; and Christian cultural theorists also looked upon it with suspicion.

It is the last chapter of this thesis which I explore how the concept of **porno-prophetic** feminist modalities of biblical criticism within the prophets, relate to how Solomons depicts the abusive relationship between God, and his people. Porno-prophetic schools of biblical criticism appropriate on a feminist discourse from the 1980s about pornography as abuse; particularly that the male mind seeks to own and abuse women, and as victim, she thereafter yearns for her abuser. Solomon’s depictions as the raped prophet, as Jeremiah, or King David as psalmist at the hands of King Saul, enact this concept.

Therefore, I shall wrap up the terms in my title in relation to Solomon which is, “Between Types: A Symbolic analysis of Simeon Solomon’s Hebrew image”. According to Sander Gilman, and projections of **Self-Hatred** therefore, aligns with the linguistic problem of stereotype to a Jewish artist with romantic intentions, that may concatenate laws according to his interior vision. When a Jew such as Solomon had to be seen as
sincere to his allocentric Hebrew image in relation to his oaths, and subsequently to his renewed Symbolic role in nationhood, he can no longer rely on the romantic genius’s claims to extraordinariness. It simply means that there is hostility towards those who are unable to present their expected stereotype in the rapid assimilation of the Jew’s national Hebrew image.
Chapter 1. Salon Jew, between Syncretism, and Allocentrism.

A historical account of the passage of Jewish emancipation across the span of Simeon Solomon's first half of life, can be seen in parallel to the passage between liberal reforms: in the varying tussles of the Jew Bill; where Jews were seeking their rights to hold offices alongside other non-confessional faiths such as Catholics and dissenters, and subsequently, when these were finally granted after 1862; the rise of a forceful Toryism since 1868’s enactment of the Representation of the people act (the Second Reform Act) which galvanised a Puritan electorate, resulting in Benjamin Disraeli’s second premiership 1874.

As it happened, Benjamin Disraeli also had parallel modal strategies in his novels, between romanticism of the vision quest, and Hebraism, by mentioning two alternative mythological strategies employed in two of Benjamin Disraeli’s novels: *Tancred, or the New Crusade* (1847), and *Lothair* (1870). While Tancred tells the story of the romantic visionary, who travels to the East, and takes his cues from a curious religious syncretism from the Muslims and Jews as the source and origin of a Sinaitic revelation to its protagonist; *Lothair*, as a new sort of Tancred character, seems to have epitomized an allocentric image, rejecting the bells and smells of an unpatriotic, perverse, and effete Catholicism pushed upon him by his Romish wards. While Tancred represents an eastern form of inter-religious concatenation congruent with the late enlightenment; it also represents a romantic vision of revelation centered in the subject himself. *Lothair*, on the other hand, seems to be an anti-Catholic wolf whistle in the guise of a dissenting clarion.

Introducing the timeframe of Solomon studies with regards to the national politics, the latter novel’s allocentrism would seem to make sense. The Great Reform Act was to be put into motion by 1868 inviting swathes of new voters across the country; Habeas corpus was suspended because of Fenian terrorism the previous year; and Irish Land and Church
questions were being debated in parliament. Disraeli was biding his time, responding equivocally to the Irish questions, while the Liberal cabinet ran out of steam – “exhausted volcanoes”, was the simile that stuck in his infamous Manchester speech of 1872. This last long speech, and another at Crystal Palace, set a Tory manifesto that is still cited to this day.

To appropriate another opening line from popular art history about the shame of abundance, who exactly, did Britain think it was?182 God’s elect from the East? Of course, as mentioned, every nation needs to think it’s bound by a covenant of some shape to form community, but there were important national differences which shaped Britain’s Biblical identity between 1860, and 1870; just as Solomon’s romantic image was moving in the opposing Jewish salon model for his public. This thesis hereafter marks how the Jewish Pre-Raphaelite, is placed between competing Jewish stereotypes in the national images leading up to 1871: the Hebrew, and the Jew as romantic visionary who concatenates cultural symbols through morality. I will prove the hypothesis by analysing the fringes of Solomon’s depictions of Hebraism, through discussions of rabbis holding scrolls of the law, Jewish domestic scenes, biblical patriarchs, prophets, and furious sovereigns. If we take a materialist approach to the British national image, and the importance of the parish as state infrastructure, whether you were God’s elect all depends on where you live, who you are publishing for, that is, your approach to the parish and cottage, and how recently you were granted your suffrage during the age of reform; or on the other hand your approach to enlightenment values, such as tolerance.183

183 I have revisited an “equipoise” approach to the study of the national image, See Burn, Chapter 1, William Laurence Burn, The age of equipoise: a study of the mid-Victorian generation. (London: Routledge, 2019). I recognize that it is a controversial choice in historical study, but when a split between points of ecumenicalism that is the point of contention, and it is appropriate to revive the theory.
We shall re-wind, back to where Simeon Solomon’s life begins, using the European model of salon Jews, and the currencies of wealth and gossip to push the Jewish cousinhood towards the contrary modes of symbolic power.

I also reframing Solomon’s critical dismissal in terms of temporal relations to the Jewish image. National Hebraism of the 1840s through to the late 1860s has a secular backlash, and Solomon’s fall from critical appreciation mirrors it between 1869 and 1873, leading up to his arrest and assumed fall from social favour. Michael Wohl has noted in Disraeli studies, towards the end of the 1860s and early 1870s, a new hostile tenor to the inclusive Hebraic constitutional image occurs due to Disraeli’s populist, Hebraist second rise to power. The result for Solomon was the similarly critical rejection of his work as racially insincere – the word literally meaning, not from one source, or adulterated with impurities. For Jewish studies, his symbolic project is therefore aligned to the masculine, national socio-cultural negotiation of the Hebrew and non-Hebrew image.

I locate Solomon’s work within the movement that saw biblical subjects in public settings as part of the assimilation of religious communal imaginary as a negotiation with the earlier nationally allocentric – that is to say, limiting – Hebrew mode around 1860.


186 Michaela Giebelhausen. Painting the Bible : Representation and Belief in Mid-Victorian Britain (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).
However, Solomon’s work concerning the national image depicts various modes of synchronous revelation to subjects that occurs after a time when the removal of Catholic disabilities was extending to Jews.

A consequence of the rise of queer narratives that position Solomon as the “queer icon” means that Solomon’s ceremonial works have been framed by the ritualist cameries of unmanly, Catholic decadence. Solomon’s young, worshiping Catholics could be read in the context of anxieties and the fraught renewal of Catholic investiture. Elementary separations from Romish and rabbinic practices are mocked in mainstream literature as feminine or camp, which for the scholars of this movement are examples the national anxieties over a Roman Catholic revival. Dismissal of rituals and unmasculine decadence indicates a negotiation of religious power rather than the familiar theory of dismissal of Jewish circumcision. The anti-ritualism and panic associated with Popery are demonstrative of the anxieties surrounding the expanded bounds of an Anglican identity. However, in the 1830s to 1860s the entire religious national infrastructure was giving power to Catholics and Jews, and the expanded communal imagination is here made evident in certain synchronous public murals responds to that expanded covenant.

---


Solomons’ Paintings, inverts, and Salon Jews

As mentioned in the introduction, Hannah Arendt’s *Origins of Totalitarianism* marked how the Disraelis followed a pattern that used the salon, and private club world, to engage with the most embarrassing myths of Jewish exception and election, applying it to his notions of nationhood. It saves British Jews from the kinds of French anti-dreyfusard antisemitism, and German Nazism. Arendt distinguishes Disraeli’s uses of Jewish mythology, distinct from the French, in this early point in Jewish historiography with counter examples of the “camouflage” of Marcel Proust’s types in his novels, *In search of Lost Time,* : depicting French (and therefore secular), “déjudaised Jews”, and “inverts” as particularly vulnerable to the salon door being firmly shut.\(^{190}\) However in the case of Hebraised Jews, this law of the salon does not fully apply to the symbolic regimes of power; and her case in point is when Disraeli constructs contrasting Jewish self-mythologies in the emergent Hebrew nation, where the shape of Jewish assimilation takes more symbolically overt biblical forms. As we shall see, Solomon’s elder brother Abraham Solomon, depicted salon scenes including camouflaged invert types.

Pursuing romanticism, therefore, seems like the anticipation of the common, traditional slurs that are associated with Jewishness, what Will Self writes succinctly in his Jewish shame of Woody Allen, the “androgynty, thanatos, sexual obsession, febrile

\(^{190}\)The associations of camouflage between inverts and Jews is discussed in J. E. van Praag, “Marcel Proust, Temoin du Judaïsme dejudaize” in *La Revue Juive de Geneve,* vol. 48, (1937), 1 ff. For the importance of *La Revue* publication as the prototype of Jewish studies itself, see, Goodman, Martin, and Jeremy Cohen, eds. *The Oxford handbook of Jewish studies.* (Oxford University Press on Demand, 2002). What is important about Proust in these comparison is the camouflage of Jewishness, as the camouflage of what is then called, inversion. Myths of national Hebraism reverses that “dejudaisation” only apparent through codes of Dreyfusard and Antidreyfusard affiliation, in favour of overt, nationalist Hebraisation. See discussion of Arendt and Disraeli, below. It is interesting that this relay between camouflaged queerness and secularised Jewishness is made at the very beginning of Jewish studies. I use the word ‘relays’ from Boyarin, Daniel, Daniel Itzkovitz, and Ann Pellegrini. “Strange bedfellows: An introduction.” *Queer theory and the Jewish Question* (2003): 1-18.
Put another way, what seems counterintuitive in my discussions of Solomon to the later Jewish stereotype of androgyny, thanatos, sexual obsession, is that that these slurs of Jewishness which seem so relevant to the depictions of unmasculine adolescence in his works, are conscious attempts of assimilation into British elitist signifiers: The élite represents a morality and sexuality above the Law. As Arendt confirms through Disraeli’s British character in Tancred, “what is a crime among the multitude is only a vice among the few.” For Arendt this is a further example of the exception Jew, imitating élites, with both the Jewish community at the time, and the Tory party, shuddering, and claiming that, like the adjective Burton used for Disraeli, this “Hebrew of Hebrew” was being insincere. Was Solomon performing a similar self-mythology? Either way, there seems to be two types within the exception, either above, or through, the Law. Solomon’s most famous works leading up to the severance with his friends, the smooth faces, and downy lips of adolescent acolytes, have wrestled against the Christian theology’s Jewish signifiers – the blind, extremely decrepit, bearded male Jew, once being the epitome of, but now meekly attached to, the Law.

In Solomon’s time the type of common motif of febrile genius of romanticism was yet to be associated with the Jew. The struggle that I have in engaging ‘queer-Jewish’ scholarship in the presentation of feminized masculinity of Solomon’s community, then, is that the male Jewish stereotype in the Britain the 1850s to 1870s is not particularly queer. The British Jew is not smart, he is unenlightened, uncreative, and obstructed from the academy, stupid. Perhaps Solomon’s associations with the élites constructed the very

192 What Jack Halberstam tries to remove from the parameters of queer agitation, what she calls, “aristocratic eccentricity”, in Queer British Art.
193 Disraeli’s Tancred, quoted by Arendt, Origins of Totalitarianism, 69.
prototype of acolytish femininity. The infamous Labouchère amendment, so important in both Jewish and homosexual communities, had liberal intent against infecting the poor with upper class vice. In other words, there is room to suggest that class pre-occupations and particular moralizing restrictions against homosexuality shift as a liberal agenda 1873.\textsuperscript{195}

With regards to Hebrew masculinity, those that require a strong delineation of Hebraism in the late 1860s as the origin of national identity, would not admit Solomon’s Jewish projects either, seeing it as insincere to his newly created Hebrew type in the national image. I described that it became the drama that occurs after he publishes his romantic prose poem, \textit{A Vision of Love Revealed in Sleep}, in 1871, rather than his arrest and conviction for attempted buggary.

\textbf{A Freed Institution}

What is apparent from my investigation of Solomon’s intimate letters to the Eton master, Oscar Browning, and the repeated fear that the Jews were not intelligent or educated enough due to their limited impact in the arts, that he had not the classical education of the Etonians or Oxbridge scholars.\textsuperscript{196} Solomon says that “his people” specifically, “(the Jews)” are “cut up” over the death of the young Jewish mathematician, Numa Hartog. Hartog’s death of smallpox was just days after the Repeal of Tests Act, June 16, 1871. Hartog had a vital historic importance in the final stage of Jewish emancipation in the Removal of Tests due to his mathematical brilliance, was awarded Wrangler which necessitated the removal of the final barrier to Jewish academic achievement. Hartog was mentioned immediately after complaining of being

\textsuperscript{195} The stereotype of the \textit{élite} British colonizers, as described as Irvine Walsh’s character in Trainspotting complains, is that they are “effete arseholes” https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f1CB-D11T1Xc
\textsuperscript{196} Cantor, Geoffrey. Quakers, Jews, and science: religious responses to modernity and the sciences in Britain, 1650-1900 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005). 86
misunderstood by Swinburne’s review, and that Solomon had refused three invitations by Pater, and was inclined to refuse a fourth.\textsuperscript{197} We can see that accomplishment weighed heavily on Solomon’s shoulders, and that there was a cause for dismay in the relationships of the circle of friends.\textsuperscript{198} The new philologies of Hebraism had something to do with this dismay, as well as his resistance to seeing Pater (It seems that they patched up the relationship with Pater, as the famous portrait of him is signed 1872, and it has been noted, was happy to hear of Solomon in later years). The publication of Solomon’s Vision is synchronous with the Removal of Tests Act, allowing full participation in Oxford – the vitality of romantic dissent among non-Anglicans, and privileged Jews in the Cousinhood of two hundred wealthy families at least, is removed during this year, 1871.\textsuperscript{199} The very terms of difference and exclusion which created the terms of romantic elegy, were invalid.

The events in the Jewish community, directly following Solomon’s conviction in February 1873 had an important new connection for our purposes in describing the Jews’ Hebrew image: that of moralizing force in Oxford. The young Leonard Montefiore, who is about as close as one could get to the core of the Jewish cousinhood, becomes another protagonist of the Solomon – Pater timeline. He is the very young co-whistleblower in the now infamous Hardinge affair, which gets the student sent down by Benjamin Jowett to cool off from his infatuation before any actual abomination might occur; and Pater, closely after his publication of History of the Renaissance, was severely reprimanded by Jowett, apparently under threat.\textsuperscript{200} Inman, in her excellent scholarship, summarized, “one can say that only seven months after Simeon Solomon was arrested for deviant behavior, Pater was involved in a homosexual romance with a nineteen-year-old student who had a tendency,
before faced with consequences, to advertise his homosexuality.” Inman thereby implies the direct effects of the Solomon narrative on the Hardinge affair and its effects on Pater’s career, as he was chastened by Jowett.

I want to add, however, that Leonard Montefiore, although characterized as having great feeling for the mood of his company, and would have felt pressure to fit in with his friends; must have found the pressure to report the affair before Pater’s abuse of power occurred because of the known dire straits that Solomon was in. Indeed, Leonard Montefiore is told by Benjamin Disraeli, “you and I belong to a race which can do anything but fail”. To my British Jewish reading what appears like simple exceptionalism comes as a threat: you cannot afford to fail, and, in retrospect, a strong attempt to manage Jews in the national image, results. After Oxford, Leonard was firm socialist, and died on an American mission, age 26. His famous elder brother Claude, that under Jowett’s close tutelage, became the co-founder of Liberal Judaism, and worked closely with the Chief Rabbi, Joseph Herman Hertz to construct the authorized prayer book.; In Herz’s tiny, Book of Jewish thoughts, sent to servicemen in many re-prints and publications, Claude Montefiore is cited on page 6:

We Jews have a more pressing responsibility for our lives and beliefs than perhaps any other religious community. Don’t shelter yourself in any course of action by the idea that ‘it is my affair.’ It is your affair, but it is also mine and the community’s. Nor can we neglect the world beyond. A fierce light beats upon the Jew. It is a grave responsibility, this – to be a Jew; and you can’t escape from it, even if you choose to ignore it. Ethically or religiously, we Jews can be and do nothing light-heartedly. Ten bad Jews may help to damn us; ten good Jews may help to save us. Which minyan will you join.”

---

201 Ibid. 13.
In 1896, I wonder which minyan C.J. Montefiore put Solomon in, but as a value of assimilation British Jewry celebrates him as their own. Solomon had a fragmentary symbolic vision, a form of Jewish romanticism, that was ultimately dashed by a fumble in his critical apparatus and personal relationships. The modes of symbolic assimilation were not compatible with the sciences of religion that emerged in the late 1860s, and the moral panic that resulted from the Repeal of Tests Act in the early 1871, which also affected the close circle around the pre-Raphaelites. But I established as I began this thesis, that Solomon’s loss of morale was in 1871 when he knew that his program was seen to be incompatible with his type.

Salon Inverts

Lionel Lambournre points out that Solomon’s family until 1864, held conversationes, was well aware of these contrasting forms of Jewish integration within the salon world.204 It would good to point out, that Simeon Solomon’s eldest brother, Abraham Solomon, demonstrates that invert’s place in court and salon (imitating aristocratic macaroni) in his painting, *Academy for instruction in the discipline of the fan, 1711* (fig. 1.1), in 1849 – when Simeon was nine. He presents naif women seeking social refinement, going to an apparent invert assumed from his pose, and earring, and posture presenting his rear to the viewer – knows the courtly ways of their superior classes. His gender-defying pose as a sodomite with a fan (a more modern term is fabulous), might instruct those who are, in their unrefined plebian dress, in reality simply naff. The joke is that the man is merely posing as a courtier, and perhaps even posing as an invert, as he is learning these social mores from a book. The concealment of the in-vert’s status is exposed even as late as the famous 1985 catalogue, where the cataloguist and curator of the entire exhibition,

Jeffrey Daniels, in demonstrating a mild xenophobia of those years points out the macaroni master “is probably meant to be French or Italian”, and, despite pointing out that from the numerous studies of the painting the “principal figures [were] immediately established”. Daniels comments on how the figural establishment makes an extreme effort to set up a punchline between the catalogue entries, “the artist obviously gave considerable thought to the pose… the risibility of the result is merely coincidental.”

There would be no reason to hide reference to this sexualized risibility in his catalogue devoted to the Solomons with four catalogue entries with explicit references devoted to Simeon Solomon, including one by a famous canonizer of homosexual art, Emmanuel Cooper. Daniel’s contraction of “merely coincidental” mirrors the camouflaged jest of the invert.

To relate the form of gossip and scandal of the artist’s currency in the salon, as the catalogue established, Abraham Solomon’s, First Class – the meeting (as I will discuss in relation to Solomon’s early self-portrait in the subsequent chapter), freely attracted scandal, enough to be revised. I have even found a demonstrably filthy albumen print from Paris photographers in both the physical and metaphorical sense, shown here for the first time (fig. 1.2.), that may have been close to Abraham Solomon’s original pornographic intent, with an extra arm emerging between the carousing lovers with a gesture of folded index finger, which seems to be an important signifier (one of Solomon’s Fleshy, Sad Marriage depictions that he sent a copy of to Walter Pater, contained such an extra arm), and another arm folding up beneath the woman’s crinolin. It occurs to me that the French albumen print of the First Class carriage, may even be close to the intent of the original painting.

---

206 Ibid. cat. 10, 11.
Jan Marsh also made a recent discovery about the Solomons’ uses courtly supremacy in relation to salon gossip in her discovery of a piece of Simeon Solomon’s juvenilia, called *The Order of the Garter*, which contains the letters in backwards writing, *Honi soit qui mal y pense!* Which loosely translates as, *shame on those who think* [this behaviour by a courtier can even be considered a rude act]. Simeon Solomon is not only knowledgeable in Abraham Solomon’s depictions of courtly gossip, inversion, and salon culture, from childhood; and its uses as social currency.

In dialogue with Disraeli’s constructions of Eastern racial elitism, Matthew Arnold’s British educational theory, inventing “culture”, means that patriarchal British Hebraism of the expanded electorate can often spar with queer suppositions of Jewish feeble gender stereotypes, because Hebraism has thereafter a unified constitutional valence. It is to be contrasted with the worse shame of the Jewish community’s idiocy, its blind, uncreative Legal attachments, its artlessness, its historical, supersession in its historic national stereotype. This study to a certain extent, also expresses an approach to Solomon in the spirit of the Enlightenment responses to the issue: those (*Kunst Wissenschaft Des Judentums*), that respond to Europe-wide deprecations of Jewish culture in the Enlightenment. The history of the Hebrew Jewish type, would thereby force our

---

210 Margaret Olin, *The nation without art: examining modern discourses on Jewish art*. (University of Nebraska Press, 2001). The scarcity of scholars that are reflexive about their attempting to re-construct a Jewish art history has made me try harder: despite my weaknesses, and academic forces that do not recognise the needs of the British Jewish community to depict the uses of Jewish art historiography during times of crisis. See also Soussloff, Catherine M. "Introducing Jewish Identity to Art History." In *Jewish Identity in Modern Art history*, pp. 1-16. (University of California Press, 1999). And Emily J. Levine, *Dreamland of humanists: Warburg, Cassirer, Panofsky, and the Hamburg school*. (University of Chicago Press, 2013). I can also argue that the librarian’s vision, from that of S.A. Hart in the Royal Academy, and the symbolic concatenations of Solomon, replicates in the romantic Jewish form as a type of cultural witness to civilization, and that they interiorize the wandering Jewish mythology as the materialist witness to the history of civilization. My thanks to Anoushka Alexander-Rose in our discussions about wondering Jew mythologies. I would like to add that in popular culture, the Jewish art historian stereotype and its queer...
lens on Solomon’s relationships to nineteenth century British Hebraism. That latter form, Hebrew parochialism (while he made sure to make the most of Jewish iconography across his life and works throughout his career) was not Solomon’s romantic intent, although he took benefit from its earlier uses in print media – as I will demonstrate. To position myself in relation to Pride agenda, as much as queer Jewish studies may will Simeon Solomon’s ephebic youths as examples of queer agitation against the privilege of gender norms, Solomon knew of this poseur position, calculated that it was better to be a romantic artist-poet (and the assumed analogues of queer studies presented activist analogues with victimhood), while meaning to penetrate assumed elitist pedagogic indexes from court and salon. These pedagogic indexes take the form of British romantic self-mythologies, and has had effects on an understanding of Solomon’s chronology and iconography.

analogue – not least in its relationships to its Proustian narratives of dejudaised Judaism, philology, memory, and witness, and disruptions with complex relays and tensions with the inclusion of non-Jewish philosophy that aims to destroy it, such as the struggles with Heiddegerian Metaphysics, and Italian fascism, to Greek sculpture – was beautifully depicted in the André Aciman’s novel Call Me by Your Name, and the film of that title. Solomon’s work in the concatenations of cultures, places him as exemplar of the Judaising form of that depiction of the gay Jewish witness, despite (or because of) his sadomasochism. 211 There is a debate between two scholars over whether there was a British Haskalah, between Endelman and Ruderman, the former discusses how the Jews of England, unlike Moses Mendelson of Prussia, were not living in an “economic backwater”, and therefore did not need to pursue the feats of enlightenment to secure freedoms, whereas Ruderman takes a more materialist approach, by looking at the shape of Jewish contributions where they occurred. Todd M Endelman, “The Englishness of Jewish Modernity in England,” in Toward Modernity: The European Jewish Model. ed. J. Katz, (London: Routledge, 2017), 225-246.; David B. Jewish Enlightenment in an English Key: Anglo-Jewry’s Construction of Modern Jewish Thought. Princeton University Press, 2000. Trusted voices, invested in Jewish studies, have written up feelings of dismay. I do not wholly disagree with the self critical state of affairs within Jewish studies. Mitchell B. Hart, ”The unbearable lightness of Britain”: Anglo-Jewish historiography and the anxiety of success.” Journal of Modern Jewish Studies 6, no. 2 (2007): 145-165. Todd Endelman, “Anglo-Jewish Historiography and the Jewish Historiographical Mainstream.” Jewish Culture and History 12, no. 1-2 (2010): 28-40.
Chapter 2. Jews with the Law

I would like to place the Law as the focus of the next few chapters, as Solomon struggled to place himself between dual symbolic interests in both Hebrew mode (the single source of symbolic Law) and Enlightenment modes (comparative, eclectic symbolism) as contrasting and competing languages. The current chapter will engage with Solomon’s now popular images of young Jews with the Law to depict the tension that Solomon is framed between two Jewish types, British romantic depiction of an individual revelation; and a unified depiction of a subject in relation to an assumed apriori Law in the unified Mosaic image of Hebraism. Attempts have been made to negotiate Solomon’s work through the context of Jewish emancipation across Europe, but not by using the image of the Jew with the Law for the specifically British national purposes in the same way that the discourses were established around a parish economic support structure. While contextualising the Jewish Emancipation, they do not talk of the impact the covenental purposes of a particular British Hebraism have on Solomon’s work.212

The national image as a whole would be running parallel to enlightenment discourses in ritualism and aesthetics. However, in England the Christian sciences of religion navigate the cultural symbols between self and other as a form of Christian self-

212 See for example, Gayle Seymour, "The Old Testament Paintings and Drawings: The Search for Identity in the Post-Emancipation Era."

legitimacy; and in the last chapter we introduced the dissenter’s romantic form against the Institution; and demonstrate that in common with romantic elegy, Jews are excluded in universities, yet become subjects of scrutiny; and there is a tussle of autonomy in the religious press which I will describe in the next chapter. On the other hand, the national constitutional pact undergoes a reciprocal process of image assimilation between aligned cultures to form communal identity in what is called the national image. Within social sciences, Benedict Anderson described how images are assimilated into the nation through community boundaries. Zygmunt Bauman was able to apply similar terms for Jewish assimilation to describe a fraught and anxious slippage through the barrier between self and other: the anxiety is encompassed by the adjective, ambiguous.

I have questioned how that ambiguity is delineated in Solomon’s symbols and forms as a reflection of Jews in modernity and how it was rejected as assimilation occurred. The remaining thesis re-engages Solomon’s symbols within a boundary flux at the edges of the Hebraic order of pact, patriarch, and Sovereignty as a Jewish artist.

As Sander Gilman’s intervention in Jewish studies demonstrates, the perceived lack of symbolic coherence within the subject is defined as Jewish self-hatred: Gilman’s
definition of self-hatred is to work within the mythologised stereotype of the Jew, whereby if they do not conform to their image within the nation, they are perceived as being “unable to command the language, discourse, or both, of the world that they inhabit”.\textsuperscript{216} As we have seen in the introduction, the critique of Solomon’s recherche eclecticism has been seen an a linguistic ambiguity surrounding the racialised affiliation to unified symbolic terms, so the critique surrounding his symbolic eclecticism will eventually be discussed. Here however, I will deal with the gendered challenge that comes out of a specifically unified Hebraic order displayed in Solomon’s figures of Rabbis holding Scrolls of the Law.

During the emancipatory period between 1828 and the 1870s, the national Biblical image is indicative of identity in flux, reflecting how Catholics, Dissenters and Jews gain rights to be invested as members of parliament without swearing the Anglican formula, “according to the true faith of a Christian”.\textsuperscript{217} It demonstrates that entry into the world of secular law-making and into the male order of knowledge at universities, revolves around a religious covenantal discourse, and that British Enlightenment, among the other European nations, is not a secular one but in the nation as a whole, it is a discordant and complex Anglo-Christian one.\textsuperscript{218}

\textsuperscript{217} Even though they are still absent from university infrastructure until 1872. The word “Emancipation” is taken from abolitionist rhetoric as we shall see in the chapter on Solomon’s figures of Jewish exile.

As for the constitutional image in relation to Jews with the Law we can only compare and contrast to Jewish French art history, See Batsheva Goldman-Ida, “A Synagogue Interior by Édouard Brandon,” In Tel Aviv Museum of Art Annual Review No. 6, ed. Doron J. Lurie, (Tel Aviv Museum of Art, 1997), 62 – 73. The art genre of Moses, or Jews with the Law fits into such religious Anglo-Emancipationist movements quite distinct from the Rousseau “pact” of French enlightenment that claims that the social covenant is more mutable, comparing the polis to a child coming of age, tied to the family only by consent. A good example of the distinction between British biblical covenant and French can be seen in fig 1 comparing the group of brothers in David’s Oath of the Horatii, which invokes the spirit of mutual fraternity, to a risible figure of revelation, presented with the hard left socialist’s covenant in the figure of Louis Blanc delivering a
The expansion of the national biblical imaginary in town and cottage becomes indicative of the relationship to an expanded religious electorate. I revived equipoisal historical approaches where the disparity in economic realities between the metropolis and rural areas through 1850 and 1870 undermines an Enlightened and inclusive comparison of faiths in Britain to include at times anti-Catholic, national Hebraism, and at others a broad sweeping anti-ritualist approach of both Popery and Rabbinism. The reason for this was that the economic pastoral support for the nation was split between an old religious infrastructure and government as the Corn and Poor Laws take effect. Roman Catholics, Dissenters and finally Jews gained economic power at the expense of the pastoral security that utilised Hebraic symbols. It occurs to me that as government took over religious social responsibilities such as the managing of the poor, the national symbolic depictions of lawmaking became incorporated into the national pact, and the symbol of Mosaic lawgivers is unified by the country.  

All of the above separates Solomon’s Anglo-Jewish ambivalences of assimilation and emancipation from the established Pan-European discourse about Jewish and non-Jewish engagements in a non-Hebraic culture. Moreover, understanding the gendered element of the national Hebraism re-addresses a problem within wider Solomon studies surrounding the masculinity of the Hebrew painter in relation to his supra-sexual subjects.

“sermon” to the oath takers, depicted as Moses bringing down the immutable Law – with the word “constitution” inscribed upon it. “Study after the Masters by Gill: Sermon of Horace (David)”, La Lane, (8 July 1877), (fig. 1). The “sermon” seemingly mocks Brandon’s prize winning depiction of Rabbi Cordozo delivering a sermon at a Portuguese Synagogue in Amsterdam (fig 1.2). Normally, Brandon’s studies of Jewish synagogue art in France at this era considers the Jewish subjecthood would have a distinct and ennobling style while performing prayers for the Secular state, reflecting French Jewry’s secular constitutive position.

Solomon’s whereabouts in the few months after his trial for attempted Sodomy was a matter for Conroy. However, Swinburne’s passing reference to Solomon being in Devon giving public reading of Dickens, seems to be a literary joke about Solomon’s politics. A full examination of Solomon’s social economic politics and the literary reason for Trollope inspired jest invoking Dickens will have to remain for another study from the discipline of English related literature. Conroy, Carolyn. “He Hath Mingled with the Ungodly”. For an interesting account of tensions between country and town, Dickens and Trollope (particularly his novel, The Warden), see M. A. Goldberg, “Trollope’s The Warden: A Commentary on the "Age of Equipoise".” Nineteenth-Century Fiction 17, no. 4 (1963): 381-90, re-invoking my methods.
New interventions on Jewish queer studies of gender and sexuality, the so called “queer Jewish question”, therefore necessitate a re-reading of Solomon’s work in the face of the national Hebraism.

Masculine Hebrew Self vs. Queer Jewish other

It would have been a facile project, and incorrect, to place Solomon’s figures of “melting beauty” within theories such as the context of the imagined “feminised other” of secular Jewish emancipation across wider European nations.\(^{220}\) However, I will move through two Jewish studies problems surrounding blind Jews with the Law, which transforms into a problem as Jews become a substantiated metonym of the Law. In this chapter devoted to Solomon’s images of Jews with the Law, I will reflect on the trouble with Jews as a metonym of the Law. Solomon exhibits Christian anxieties surrounding the monstrous sexual alterity within Jewish rites such as circumcision. They reflect on how Solomon in 1858 plays with more personal anxieties about the Jewish convert, and fears over circumcised sexuality.

If I am equating the synchronous entrance of Jewish lawmakers to Solomon’s depictions of the Law, depictions of male Jewish genitality becomes an significant subject, as both the (later) British Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment uses of the patriarchal Hebrew tropes tests easy assumptions about a simple reading of queer Jews

\(^{220}\) For the stereotype of feminised, or cuckolded Jews in the British popular visual imagination in the period leading up to the 1830s, see Frank Felsenstein, *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes: a Paradigm of Otherness in English Popular Culture, 1660-1830* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1999). In Jewish studies following Sander Gilman, Jay Geller, and Daniel Boyarin’s queer intervention, it has become popular to discuss the Jew as “feminised other” across Europe as if Europe has a similar process of assimilation and enlightenment resulting in the Viennese *fin-de-siècle* and the subsequent rise of Nazism. Sander Gilman, *Jewish Self-Hatred: Anti-Semitism and the Hidden Language of the Jews*. (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990. And within Art History, see an application of Sander’s concept of homosexual feminization used in Michael White, “The Grosz Case: Paranoia, Self-hatred and Anti-Semitism.” *Oxford Art Journal* 30, no. 3 (2007): 431-453. However, as I mention, Solomon’s work after queer art history is now conceived of as being connected to a symbolic search for an allocentric community language among homosexuals through the application of precedents from antiquity but severed from the national Hebraic Jewishness.
between 1850-70 if they are included and assimilated as the depiction of the masculine Law.

By doing so I am using an important intervention on the question of queer Jewish studies and the sexuality of circumcision written by Eric Santner. Santner re-examined the journals of Sigmund Freud’s Schreber case, which in Jewish studies forms a major reference point to the assumptions of the feminised or queer Jew.\textsuperscript{221} By looking through his journals, Santner found that Daniel Schreber, a non-Jew, associated with the Jew just as he was becoming invested as a Judge. Santner reasons that Freud was unwilling to write up Schreber’s relation to anything associated with his own Jewishness for fears that revealing the Mosaic qualities of the case would taint his work as a Jewish science.\textsuperscript{222}

According to Santner’s discovered evidence, Schreber fantasised that he was the subject in relation to the furious emasculating image of the Divine Law, and his feminisation became a resistance to a “traumatic interpellation” that was \textit{becoming} the Law. Santner deployed a theory by Elaine Scarry that circumcision becomes a mode of “analogical substantiation”, and that its “inscription” onto the body “promis[es] both symbolic power and progeny” in a process of exteriorising pain.\textsuperscript{223} Through circumcision, the Jew \textit{becomes} the phallic symbol of Legal authority.

Like Santner’s discovery, I assert that Solomon’s super-sexual works (Swinburne’s word in the \textit{Dark Blue} for neither man nor woman) are representative of the Jewish

\textsuperscript{221} See above.

\textsuperscript{222} Santner, Eric L. “My own private Germany: Daniel Paul Schreber's secret history of modernity.” in Cheyette, Marcus, Cheyette, Bryan, and Marcus, Laura [eds]. Modernity, Culture and 'the Jew'. (Oxford: Polity, 1998). 43, 46. By reading over Schreber’s journals, Santner imagines Jewish feminisation as response to the “traumatic interpellation” of becoming a judge and undergoes a gendered disruption to the symbolic order. By invoking the male godhead in his process of feminisation, Schreber reacts to his “crisis of [masculine] investiture” as a lawmaker. Research that incorporates notions of the bisexual bonds towards national pact, forms a notable challenge to both queer Jewish studies that simply see the subject as (circumcised and therefore) feminised other to a male norm, when they are in fact in crisis while entering the phallocentric sphere of lawmakers.

subjects’ resistance to or “crisis of investiture”, mirroring how the disinvested Catholics and Jews are granted entry into the arena of the masculine lawmakers. To do so reframes the sexually ambiguous quality of Solomon’s work, within what Colin Cruise defines as the Pre-Raphaelite fantasy of a feminine subjectal element against a masculine “fixity” through their “fever of exhaustion”. Instead I speak of these un-male elements as subjects subject to fantasies of a Mosaic, active, male delineation which mirrors our understanding of the Pre-Raphaelite fantasy of masculinity.\textsuperscript{224} In summary, I am sparring with the potential queer readings of Solomon’s so called “Jewish androgyny” in light of the new and corrected queer Jewish studies that see the Divine law of Moses as a heightened form of masculine legislature, a phallic lawgiver that castrates the child interlocutor who resists his primordially ordained investiture.\textsuperscript{225}

The male’s “crisis of investiture” is made visually palpable through the religious national context of Victorian reform during national constitutional development. I would like to make the comparable assessment as Jews are granted entry into the arena of the masculine lawgivers as a similarly gendered “traumatic interpellation” into the patriarchal lawgivers among a certain wealthy, \textit{élite} class.\textsuperscript{226} It weighs into the above problem of same sex desire among Solomon’s childhood subjects on the cusp of adulthood, as they question whether they are invested or interpellated as a man with phallic power (as opposed to a


\textsuperscript{226} I use Santner’s terms in quotation marks, \textit{Ibid}. Before I read Santner’s theoretically streamlined paper I had to relied on Althusserian theory of interpellation which I struggled to align with Lacanian concepts of the Law, which will be used in the next chapter in terms of the pre-ordination of the Jewish career, or lifecycle.
child or woman without it), and will therefore forgo a passive homoerotic role in society in favour of a bisexualy desired, active masculine lawgiver.

Moses with the Law

The rise in biblical images of the Law is materially manifested in the most important areas of juridical infrastructure. For example, in the Lord’s robing room at the Palace of Westminster in 1850 (fig. 2.3., fig 2.4.), a fresco was commissioned by parliament depicting Moses coming down from Mount Sinai later known as Moses Bringing Down the Second Tables of the Law by John Robert Herbert (a Roman Catholic), and it was completed as a water glass painting in 1864.227 The image of in the revelation at Sinai, (Moses descent of the Mount with the Covenant) serves both to be inclusive towards the Mosaic faiths, and also limits those in the covenant to those of communal national imaginaries by indicating the Lords are bestowed with seemingly immutable and primordial power on its subjects.

A more difficult imagination of the Mosaic Law is aligned to the comparative secular European terms of a universalist and comparative enlightenment in another vast fresco (fig. 2.5, fig. 2.6). A commission from Lincoln’s Inn in 1852 to be executed by G.F. Watts in the Grand Hall, was entitled, Justice, A Hemicycle of Lawgivers – depicting a historical timeline of lawgiving characters from Moses to Edward I. It depicted Moses as the most corporeal, as he is the first polychrome human beneath the monochrome sculptural values Truth, Justice, and Mercy. By invoking Greek sculpture in a kind of pantheon of values, the latter group gives the constitutional sense of Roman idealism in a paragone dialogue: the school of lawgivers in dialogue that has the real authority, in colour. The mural was

likewise completed after great delay, but with much celebration, for the barristers in 1859.²²⁸

Both these images, in their public distribution in the Illustrated London News, indicate Hebraic symbols in the place where they are depicted in the time leading up to the early 1860s. The Hebrew depictions of primordial Lawgiving, both in the discussion of legislature in the House of Lords, and for the advocates at Lincoln’s Inn, are placed in juridical environments representing the expansion of the (make clear the community to which you refer) community within the national imaginary. Both paintings invigorate the audience with the sense of Moses as primordial lawgiver, but they invoke a contradictory sense of the changing primordial covenant in connection with the national myth to include subjects that were once excluded.

Watts’s work in Lincoln’s Inn has a more challenging Enlightenment eclecticism that could be seen as agnostic. There is a national symbolism as a result of the inclusive investiture, with eclectic depictions that form a genealogy of law makers, including the Prophet Mohamed and the Pharaoh Ptolemy invoking Semitic mythologies of genealogical descent. Even within the eclecticism of the “school” of lawgivers brought in conversation with each other, both these artists were using Mosaic depictions from the Hebrew Bible as signifiers of divine revelation and covenant for the national imaginary - so even though the latter negotiated those elements of archaeologically inspired doubt, both placed reassuring limits on the expanded community. Having discussed the use of Old Testament images in public murals denoting the constitutive symbol of the Law, I can speak about Solomon’s images of young Jews with the Law.

Scrolls of the Law

In Sotheby’s sale of 2016, the auction catalogue asserted that Lot 95, Simeon Solomon’s oil painting called *Carrying Scrolls of the Law*, 1871 (fig. 2.7), “stand[s] at the pinnacle of the history of Jewish art of the Nineteenth Century”.229 To justify the grandiose statement they point to the use of a similar earlier gouache and watercolour in Whitworth Art Gallery (fig. 2.8), that was used as the cover of the Manhattan Jewish museum exhibition catalogue from 2001, *The Emergence of Jewish Artists in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (fig. 2.9). They mention that the painting for sale was also used as the cover image for the 2001 London Jewish Museum exhibition devoted to the artist, *From Prodigy to Outcast* (fig. 2.10).230 It captures some ideas within Jewish art, although until now it might be called religious “devotion” or “fervour”.231

---


The result of this claim was that it sold for half a million dollars as part of a Sotheby’s Judaica sale, far exceeding Solomon’s normal sale prices.


231 While it might be contested in face of abstract modernism or some misplaced argument about Jewish aniconism, there is something iconic about the kind of image involving a close depiction of a rabbi holding scrolls of the Law that might seem to exclude outside interest. It would seem that the apogee of Jewish art is also its most derided for displaying “derivative” Jewish iconography. The literary scholar Anthony Julius tries to galvanise a sort of second commandment Jewish aesthetics with a certain occlusion – a sort of “fetishization” of the Jew in Jewish iconism – which is worth quoting in full: “While there is a paucity of Jewish aniconic art, there is a surfeit of Jewish iconic works. There are far too many, and few of them have any value. Pictures of Rabbis, or of Jews at prayer, landscapes of Israel, figurations of scriptural characters: Jewish homes and public places are stuffed with such works. They are mostly timid, derivative items. It is as if their negotiation of the second prohibition, or their efforts to circumvent it (for example, by the invention of freakish creatures, or the depiction of incompletely limbed human beings), exhausted their makers’ capacity for inventiveness or originality.” Anthony Julius, *Idolizing Pictures: Idolatry, Iconoclasm and Jewish Art*, vol. 44 (Thames & Hudson New York, 2001), 49. Julius, in overt symbols of Jewish art has been embarrassing to modernist art historians; perhaps in1996, a rather beautiful exhibition at the Jewish Museum, Manhattan, *Too Jewish?, Challenging Traditional Identities* (Jewish Museum, 1996), ix. The catalogue collects essays by heavyweight historians and cultural writers (Margaret Olin, Sander Gilman, Tony Kushner) to look at those overt engagements in Jewish culture with the public sphere.
Like the earlier watercolour of 1867, the oil painting of 1871 depicts the profile of a young man dressed in prayer shawl (tallis) over his canonicals of office, with a round French cantorial mitre, and a Torah scroll, decorated in the central Italian style. The scroll is dressed in a long red and gold embroidered mantel in western Sephardi style that covers its handles called trees of life (atzei chayim), and one therefore held with one hand beneath. The Italian silver Judaica ornaments indicate the setting, as does the earlier 1867 lower right signage: “Rome”, as the artist was taking studio that year in a Roman apartment (5 Via Degli Avignonesi) after spending time in Florence.\(^\text{232}\) In the later work, instead of a fecund Botticelli-esque orange tree he may have seen in Florence, here the setting seems to be at the front of synagogue, beneath the latticed gallery where a young woman in blue shawl looks down.\(^\text{233}\) The combination of finials with their silver and multi storied rimonim proudly protrude with bells on, beyond the larger Italian crown, and there is a small badgelike breastplate from a chain that proclaims its separated sanctity for God with the words Kodesh – Ladonai (KDSH YY) under the figure of an embossed crown – the small badge is similar to Torah ornaments in the Jewish Museum of Venice (fig. 2.11).\(^\text{234}\)

To a synagogue attendee, this image will bring to mind the sounds of the contemporary service on the return of the Law to the Ark. The Royal academy exhibition label gave it the title, “The Law is a Tree of Life to those who Lay Hold upon it. The Supporters thereof are Happy” marking moment and the liturgy in the service that the picture illustrates. The figure is facing left with downcast gaze as he approaches steps at the front of the synagogue, to return the scroll to the ark after being read.

---

\(^\text{232}\) Seymour, *The Life and Work of Simeon Solomon*, 133. Trees adorn the synagogue during the festival of Shavuot according to the Jewish tradition. It recalls that Mount Sinai blossomed during the giving of the Law. A symbolic connection would therefore be made between the Law given to Moses at Sinai, and that Law held by the Rabbis is from the same authority. This will be described later in this chapter when I introduce an image of Moses holding Scrolls of the Law.

\(^\text{233}\) For Solomon’s pioneering interest in Botticelli see Jeremy Melius, *Art History and the Invention of Botticelli* (Berkeley: University of California, 2010) 14 – 19.

\(^\text{234}\) The double yud is a shortening of the tetragrammaton.
He is beneath a choir screen at the front of the synagogue, which extends out to the ladies’ gallery as he mounts the ark steps. The mitre on the youthful face is reminiscent to that of the cantor and Composer, Samuel Naumbourg (fig. 2.12), who writes a continental rendition of *Eitz Chayim Hi* (“it is a tree of life”) – the prayer for returning the scrolls to the ark in tribute to Rossini. (fig. 2.13), and here the soloist breaks free from the chorus for a call and response: “[The Law… is a tree of Life]: her path, her path, are paths of pleasantness”. It is a fraught, possibly ironic ambiguity about the “pleasantness” of the law’s path, with the tension of the descending minor scale, before exploding into a resolution from the relative major via the dominant degree: “and its gates are peaceful… return us to days of old”.235 The music, gallery label, and liturgy therefore reflects the unfolding of an operatic scene, a revelation of narrative in something like a theatre play set to music. What Prettejohn within the faces of Solomon’s subjects, describes as having an ambiguous “tangible sense of remoteness or unfathomability”, but with the subject’s relation to the Law itself and its dramatic future.236

We also can hear the flirtatious, light tinkle of the bells in the grand multi-storied finials, the metallic clatter of the indexical *Yad* against the silver plate. The blue ladies shawl makes the woman a type of Marian figure, and the gold embroidery on the red mantle of 1871 has an additional covert crucifix made from the brocade beneath the pointer – indicating either a kind of comparative mode between faiths, or a covert question

---

235 (fig 13. bar 16), a useful if fast recent performance by Kolot Halev Choir will give a sense of the religioso minor for “the way” into the dominant and major scale for “peace” at 00.20 – 00.55 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5XW0B9KOU3c 08.04.2020 I am interpreting Naumbourg’s mitre as a musical quotation, marking a symbolic aesthetic question towards Solomon’s friend Walter Pater ascribed as the “visible deeds in music.” Pater, *Renaissance*, 128. For Solomon’s Tannhauser references see Colin Cruise, “Critical Connections and Quotational Strategies: Allegory and Aestheticism in Pater and Simeon Solomon.” In *Victorian Aesthetic Conditions: Pater across the Arts*, edited by Elicia Clements, (Springer, 2010), 68-82. Liz Prettejohn’s, sees the blossoming rod in *The Saint of The Eastern Church* as a comparable referent to Aaron’s election using Paterian terms. It therefore becomes a Paterian “philosophy of the unseen” as the “Love which is forever ardent but can have no end or consummation”. Prettejohn, *Art for Art’s Sake*, 86-87 236 *Ibid.* 78.
of supersession for Christian audiences. What is important for these depictions is the artist’s cropping of the subject, giving an intense focus on the face of the subject holding the Law. The Manhattan catalogue even crops the Manchester image further, and in so doing, adds import to the subject’s face as the place of cerebral psychological confrontation for the viewer – conceiving the ambiguous “path” of “The Law” in Rome.237

The Jewish Histories of Art discusses Simeon Solomon’s works that include rapt figures of young Jews with the Law containing “as much intensity as the current imagery of the lovelorn romantics in the art of Dante Gabriel Rossetti”.238 The purpose in Solomon’s connection in style to the Pre-Raphaelites, as the Solomon scholar, Colin Cruises, writes for the Jewish Quarterly, imbues the psychological impact in a “move away from genre or history painting” towards an “idea centred” purpose.239 Samantha Baskind and Larry Silver’s summary in the survey book, Jewish Art, conforms to the traditional, established “romantic” quality in the circles surrounding Rossetti, particularly “the self-expression of the individual [in] conveying a personal sense of the world”.240 The individuality of subjective experience marks the challenges of the Art for Art’s sake, or Aesthetic, movement, of which Solomon’s work and personality was a key early chapter in association with his close circle of friends Walter Pater and Charles Algernon Swinburne.241

---

237 Kleeblatt wrote about the closing in on the face as a psychological confrontation in Kleeblatt, “Jewish Stereotype and Christian Prototype” 117. He also was the Jewish Museum’s director, placing Solomon’s work on the cover indicates his affiliation to the artist, and prior work.
238 See Samantha Baskind and Larry Silver, Jewish Art: A Modern History (London: Reaktion Books, 2011) 49. See also Prettejohn’s use of the image in connection to Rossetti’s in, Prettejohn, Art and Beauty, 119, as noted above.
Rapt devotion with closed eyes, however, is considered passive and effete. As Liz Prettejohn convincingly argues, the absorption of the downcast eyes in rapt devotion, or subjects intoxicated by fervour is a problem for critics who prefer an energetic approach.242

According to Prettejohn, Solomon demonstrates figures of super-sexual “melting beauty” with philosophical intention - contrasting subjective aesthetics of the energetic beauty mentioned in Schiller’s *Aesthetic Letters*. Prettejohn reflects that Solomon’s youthful characters, their un-bearded, unmanly forms, become a challenge to conventional artistic values among critics for a more “active” rather than passive beauty, but they cannot be dismissed due to the quality of their execution.243 Given the artist’s homosexuality, Prettejohn considers that they are about to enter a more permissive psychological domain that allows for homoerotic confidence – a confidence, I assume in the tenor of Prettejohn’s chapter, outside the assumed faith “strictures” against sodomy.244

Whitney Davis makes a rival, considered assessment of Solomon’s homosexuality within these works, through the reception of John Addington Symonds’ passing interest in the artist. Davis writes about the youths’ flirtation with the male viewer while paradoxically perceiving in them the “mournful image of a lost homoeroticism might be the partial condition of its future reconstitution”.245 David contrasts Solomon’s “oscillating” portrayals of potentially lost desire to Symonds frustrated friendship with the artist and theologian Edward Clifford. Davis argues that Symonds is comparing with Solomon’s...

---

242 Prettejohn, *Art for Art’s Sake*, 76
243 The similar super-sexual quality to the Rossetti’s depiction of females, was noted specifically in relation to the figures’ lack of facial hair. *Ibid.*, 76.
244 Liz Prettejohn argues that Solomon’s androgynous Hellenist subjects seem to mark “a pause, tentative enough but also strangely lucid, between the security of a religious faith no longer certain and the assertion of a homoerotic confidence yet to come.” Prettejohn, *Art for Art’s Sake*, 77 - 78.
works, his negotiation of a “transcendental” Greek tradition of a chaste homoerotic yearning for Clifford.

Davis points to homoerotic yearning “justified, if at all, in virtue of universal, intrinsic human cognitive and moral characteristics”.246 Girded with “transcending” medieval armour and chivalric avoidance of sin (a metaphor for Clifford’s fierce faith), his recoil from the pederastic yearning placed upon him is evident and Clifford is duly protected from Symonds yearning in the armour of denial.247 Davis contrasts the chaste chivalric purity of Symonds relationship to Clifford to Solomon’s awareness of lost homoerotic possibilities.

Perhaps Davis is working on an assumption that the Teutonic symbols are separable from Jewish symbols, and I mentioned an antisemitic critique of the artist following Arnold’s discussion in the late 1860s that tried to separate Solomon from Christian culture: “Mr Solomon may possibly claim Semitic privileges, and certainly his colour almost Eastern in splendour, his rhythm of line truly lyrical, his sensuous beauty distinctly musical, are foreign to our Western art and Teutonic schools.”248 As I will show, ten years prior to this antisemitic critique in the Saturday Review, Solomon was invoking popular Teutonic stories within his most popular Hebrew work to play with gendered concepts of conversion and investiture. According to the family tradition, Solomon’s cousin and guarantor, Myer Salaman, also encouraged the Sir Walter Scott’s reading of Ivanhoe among his children and grandchildren for moral instruction.249

Davis’s “visual intelligibility” of a “lost homoeroticism”, stands counter to Prettejohn’s argument of the approach to a future homoerotic confidence.250 Between

246 Davis, 191.
247 Ibid.
249 My thanks to Peter Hamburger for providing me with the excerpt from the unpublished memoirs of Redcliffe Salaman.
250 Davis, 201.
Prettejohn and Davis, they mark a question the artist seems to address: is desire in the male subjects lost, or is the object of their desire yet to come? Or, for Jewish Art History, the homoerotic terms of desire are reframed in terms of investiture - is the young man rapt with devotion grieving the lost Law of his Judaism as he converts, or is he reconstituting the Law for a renewed future investiture as a lawgiver in an era when he no longer has to? There is no question of the knights transcending purity and cleanliness of sin, until he reaches the object of his quest, throwing him violently into the presence of a corpse, which indicates a love lost. Alternatively, as so amply illustrated by the Pre-Raphaelites, the knight comes to the end of the quest, finds the grail, and takes Holy Communion, and upon eating the body of Christ, and having completed his mission, expires.²⁵¹

Solomon’s depiction of young rabbis with the Law contains some elements of the knights that inspired Davis’s reading of Symonds as they enter the regime of male lawgiver. Solomon imitates the form of a few chivalric pre-Raphaelite depictions of chaste male virgins in profile, inspired by William Morris’s medievalism which evokes dual purposes (William Morris’s The Defense of Guenevere and Other Poems, was published by Bell and Daldy in 1858).²⁵² In the poems, the chaste knight will come to a realisation (or revelation) and death of his past world. For instance, the figure is in the same format as Rossetti’s depiction of Sir Gallahad... in a wood at night, complete with reference to the fecund orange tree (fig. 2.14) Most importantly, it was created to illustrate Tennyson’s description of the pure knight’s “virgin heart” in the Moxon publication.²⁵³ Rossetti’s later

²⁵³ Ibid.
work, How Sir Galahad, Sir Bors and Sir Percival Were Fed with the Sanct Grael; but Sir Percival’s Sister Died by the Way (fig. 2.15).\textsuperscript{254} Similarly contains a stooping figure of Sir Percival stooping with lowered face in grief.

We might even contrast the chivalric purity displayed in Solomon’s Rabbi with the Scrolls of the Law to G.F. Watts’s famous composition of Sir Gallahad, first executed in 1858, and exhibited in 1862, and later collected among Etonians who had a copy of the paintings in their school in the platinotype photograph by Frederick Hollyer (fig. 2.16).\textsuperscript{255} The painting in the school indicates the didactic quality of the image to represent a young man’s pure destiny and of his quest. The Solomon painting seems to connect to the image of purity within the body of a youth’s, chaste journey.

Solomon even made a drawing of this format in 1862, catalogued as, Knight and Woman in a Horse on a Landscape (fig 17), giving an uncertain relation between of a man and his dead lover in a forest. That subject also has affinity to Rossetti’s illustration for Mallory’s poetic description of Arthur’s Tomb (fig 18), where Queen Guinevere, now a chaste nun, meets her former adulterer, Sir Lancelot, over Arthur’s Tomb and refuses his advances. Rossetti’s Arthurian image also has a tomb with a bandaged funeral shroud, and an orange tree. There seems to be a pattern that Solomon was following in his depiction of the young Rabbi holding scrolls of the Law of chaste medievalism.

In line with Davis, I prefer to read Solomon’s figure in a landscape with a tomb to represent lost past homoerotic relationships as they enter the bisexually desired sphere of masculine lawgiver, rather than in Prettejohn’s terms of a future hope of homosexual confidence, or a Jewish art histories’ assumptions about the lost Law in exchange for

\textsuperscript{254} See Rossetti archive, http://www.rossettiarchive.org/docs/s115.raw.html 18.05.20
\textsuperscript{255} A copy of the painting is displayed in Eton college, and I use a famous platinotype reproduction here acquired from an old boy that culturally indicates its identification with the school.
establishing the pleasures of its subjection. In the medieval depictions, it either ends with the grail and death, or with a dead body of a loved object.

As I mention above, Solomon’s rabbis holding scrolls of the Law, and his other works in relation to the Law, are produced towards the end of a time of Anglo-Jewish emancipation – and contribute to the discourse on Jewish sexuality. The “dutiful” knight, or perceptions of the or “reverential” young man with the Law, is a gendered phallic symbol that possesses ambivalence in relation to his place as a masculine legal representative. I started my assessment by describing the similarities between the Rabbi and contemporary depictions of knights in the same pattern to represent either a duty fulfilled, or a sexuality lost and a new reality thereby reconstituted.

“The Dread Burden”, Ulalume

A much earlier form than the forlorn knights by the young artist is in the Ein Harod sketchbook, presumably executed in 1856 in Solomon’s illustration, Ulalume (fig. 2.19).256 A stooped young man in profile is holding a shrouded object which, on closer inspection, forms the body of a naked woman through the cloth. The artist captions the image with sections of a Poe poem in his own hand. Ulalume is a poem about a man trying to work out what is pressing on his mind as he heads into a wood, and the image of his mind is externalised as a female Psyche. The poem ends with the narrator recognising that he has lost his lover on the anniversary of her death, as he has stumbled on her tomb in a complex psychological oscillation between conscience and unknown conscience. Poe’s poem is about the revelation of the subconscious symbol, the “dread burden” that Psyche made the narrator realise was the motive for his procession to the forest. Solomon’s sketch of the

256 I am working from a reproduction copied in Lionel Lambourne, as Ein Harod Museum is unable to locate the sketchbook. "A Simeon Solomon Sketchbook." Apollo 85 (1967): 60.
dread burden that is revealed in *Ulalume*, unifies the symbol of a beloved’s corpse with the scrolls of the Law.

The paradigm for a Pre-Raphaelite “dread burden” of Ulalume is not depicted as the actual corpse, but for Dante Gabriel Rossetti, a winged Psyche as a voice in the narrator’s head (fig. 2.20). As we can see, Rossetti deciphers the thought of his loss as a pleading psyche, rather than the physical object is the “dread burden” of a corpse. Rossetti depicted the path to realisation as a series of externalised, winged and feminine images of his Psyche, preventing the narrator from achieving his dread burden through the darkness. Rossetti’s sketch of the form demonstrates her accompaniment through two stages, as the narrator strolls through the woods with the winged figure protecting him from the oppressing thought in a procession of two repeated figures. In Solomon’s sketch, the burden is shrouded and becomes both the Psyche, as well as the corpse of his lost love itself. The form of the dread burden, in Solomon’s case Ulalume’s corpse rather than the animated Psyche, becomes the form of the Law. We might also compare Rossetti’s idea of a procession of winged figures illustrating another of Poe’s poems, *The Raven* (fig. 2.21), about the narrator’s loss of “Lenore” to those of Solomon’s later processions of the Law so prominently discussed here and in the next chapter. The *Raven* describes an “unseen censer Swung by Seraphim whose foot-falls tinkled on the tufted floor” and so we can see that Rossetti gives the angels procession a votive element by giving the angel at the front carries a thurible so prominent in Solomon’s Coptic and Roman Catholic ceremonial depictions. It therefore also depicts a realisation of love lost, perhaps as they approach a regime of sexual knowledge.

---

Seeing the sounds (Exodus 20: 15)

I would briefly like to apply an aesthetic theory of visual recall to the forms of aural recall that Solomon refers to in Poe. Solomon’s friend the Eton school master, Oscar Browning, described Walter Pater as being a “very intimate friend” of the artist alongside Browning’s discovery of Pater’s writing on Winkelman for the Westminster Review.258 After a brief paragraph on Pater, relating his gentility, and his sexual privacy (that “the sacred flame which burnt within him was concealed”) Browning then discussed Solomon’s synaesthetic relationship to colour, “appealing to him as music appeals to a musical ear.”259 He was referring to a grisaille of a thrashing, so it was a camouflaged sexual joke. Given the juxtaposition of the two “very intimate” friendships (just before describing Solomon’s “very intimate friendship” with Swinburne), it seems that Browning was also relating Pater’s aesthetics in the Westminster (republished in 1873 as The Renaissance) to Solomon’s musical perceptions of fine art, and of the musical connection to his essay on “The School of Giorgione”.260 In it Pater describes the aspiration of fine art, “continually struggling after the law, or principle of music”.261 Solomon’s scenes depicting musical performance have been discussed by scholars elsewhere, particularly the quotational strategies inspired by Pater to relate divine revelation, but here I would like to relate the concept of synaesthesia, to the Jewish biblical myth of “seeing” the sounds of Lawgiving, to Solomon’s reference to Edgar Allan Poe.262

259 Ibid. 108.
261 I have found Simon Shaw Miller’s Visible Deeds of Music, a significantly inspiring read, relating the Kantian links to Walter Pater’s conception of the Law, as being “somewhere between sensation and intellect”. Shaw-Miller, Simon. Visible Deeds of Music. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008), 31. Shaw Miller also discusses the forms of Paragonia discourses of Horace and Poetry, which is related to my discussion of the relationship between the Muses and Lawgiving above. Miller, Chapter 1, n. 1.
There is a Jewish tradition that at the revelation at Sinai, the Israelites “saw the sounds” (Exodus 20: 5), and I am here making the connection between the depiction of Rabbis carrying the scrolls of the Law, to a remembered sound of the revelation of the Law. Like the figures of divine revelation, Ulalume also has dramatic musical importance, which scholars Kevin Hayes and Richard Kopley describes as “combining music, story, and verse”. Earlier I discussed Carrying the Scrolls of the Law in relation to the Rossini sounds that are composed by Naumburg’s setting of the liturgy, of the return to the feminine “path” of the Law. Hayes and Kopley describe mental landscaping as coverings in artistic devices using a theatre proscenium or in the gradual revelation of a sketch, in reference to opera, and drawing, respective to each Were and Auber’s craft. In doing so, they point out that Poe creates what he calls an “aural” frame in the landscape “that makes a connection between the poem and the world external only to sever the connection.” So too, Solomon’s figure holding the Law seems to perceive the Law through its dramatic musicality, and its ways (halacha) seem musically resist presence until it finds at the end of the path, peace. That peace in the song label, “the tree of life” to the end of the knight’s quest, is an epiphany revelation in the major scale as a form of after-life, or death. In the centre of the Rabbi’s breastplate are the words, KDSH YY, Holy for God, and we will see that the locative Lamedh, L, meaning for or to is missing from the plate. I wonder why the locative Lamedh is missing, particularly as he seems familiar with the wording,

---

263 Op cit.
265 Ibid.
266 A similar form of musical revelation occurs in Tannhauser, as discussed above. For a discussion of the origins of Wagner’s phrase, Deeds Made Visable, from 1872, see Shaw-Miller, n.1, 249. Solomon also referred to Tannhauser in another Acolyte image, see Cruise, “Critical Connections and Quotational Strategies: Allegory and Aestheticism in Pater and Simeon Solomon.” In Victorian Aesthetic Conditions (Palgrave Macmillan, London, 2010), 68.
**KDSH L’Adonai**, is an element of the mitre for high priest’s costume. It takes the familiar designation for God from Saul’s mitre similar to the form of a contemporary sculpture described in chapter 4, drawn by the artist in a sketch for Saul.

Solomon missed Poe’s favourite L-letter in his alliteration, “The name of the lost love, like so many of Poe’s female characters – Annabel Lee, Eulalie, Helen, Lenore, Ligeia, Morella”. I find it too coincidental that the locative letter L in the breastplate of the Law is missing as the youth walks or processes down a path during the most tense musical moment of the Rossini inspired setting to the liturgy about the *paths* of the *Law*. That coincidence deserves an explanation.

The apogee of the unclean in Jewish law is a naked corpse. What Solomon does is take the holy and transplant it with the polluted (the corpse of Ulalume). Alternatively, the corpse becomes the Real Presence of the Holy Sacrament. In conversion the external world in the depiction of the Law is both destroyed and brought into a new reality and at the same time. What is certain is that the Law changes from female Psyche, with one hand beneath representing interiority, to phallic male signifier. The state of the knowing past is willingly ambiguous.

In this study about Solomon’s subjects in relation to Law, I have been emphasizing the subject’s crisis of investiture as the law. I have noted that that the youthful figures are rendered in an ambiguous oscillating state between past and future knowledge in an era when conversion to Christianity is no longer required. Within a biblical society of male lawgivers also, the subject is invested with status within a culture which is dependent on inverting their bonds towards patriarchal lawgivers. The sexuality lost, as Davis and Cruise put it, symbolises their crisis of investiture, as one confronts the genitality of rabbinic

---

267 Kopley and Hayes, 200.
268 I have describe Solomon’s use of a hymenal allegory within nuptualism and its later deployment as a metaphor for assimilation in Bauman and Derrida.
masculinity, depicted by entering the covenant of the fully bearded, masculine Rabbis holding scrolls of the Law.

For instance, Solomon’s sepia and crayon Procession with the Scrolls of the Law (fig. 2.22), depicts a cantor or rabbi followed by two top hatted gentlemen holding scrolls of their own before the front pew. They allow a man to reach down and kiss the Law’s mantel (fig. 2.22, detail). In the centre of the mantel is a depiction of an embroidered menorah, and the central branch has been rendered with a phallus. Procession was assumed to have been constructed with The First Jewish Ceremony. The Circumcision (discussed later), a third lost companion piece at The Jewish Museum, London called The Bar Mitzvah.269 However, the Law is solemnly being carried past the front of worshipping congregants including what could be a bar mitzvah boy. The boy is next in line to kiss the Law with the phallic menorah, and through his rite, is interpellated by the Law into his responsibilities towards it, while entering the regime of male lawgivers as a man. A covert menorah is also present in The Death of Sir Galahad While Taking a Potion of the Holy Grail Administered by Joseph of Arimathea (fig 23.), in the latter’s cope, also drawn in that year by the artist. Therefore, the kiss of the phallic menorah becomes a homoerotic slippage into the Real Presence, with an ambivalence in the infant’s quest between living and dead worlds, or between youthful innocence and masculine knowledge.

As for the phallic menorah as the symbol of patriarchal investiture, Solomon later depicts youths around a menorah in two works in 1862. The Dalziel Bible Gallery Project, He Shall Order the Lamps (fig. 2.24), where the Sons of Aaron are given their birth right and temple duties. Aaron holds out his cup to be filled with oil by one of his descendants, and another fills one of his branches. They gather round him with classical and inviting,

hip swaggering contrapposto, their mouths open in song. The un-male boys displaying their receptive anality are being invested into the divinely ordained male priesthood as sons of Aaron.

By comparison in 1862, the crayon-like sepia photograph, *Feast of Dedication* (fig. 2.25), illustrates Hannukah (from the series of photographs I will discuss in the next chapter). It is created at the tail end of a controversial time in Anglo-Jewry that split over the terms of its faith practices that constitute religious assimilation strategies.  

The lamp lighting is done through an outstretched phallic taper by the Rabbi, where the contemporary male choristers in varying states of maturity are illuminated by his Rabbinic authority. The festival proclaims the victory of Rabbinic Judaism over the decadent Seleucids that would have decimated the Law. Lucky then for the “Orthodox” choristers of Dukes Place synagogue, who are un-Hellenised. They are able to maintain their submissive covenant with the male symbolic order without recourse to decadent Greece (symbolising modern Anglican assimilation). Like the sons of Aaron, the choristers are brought into male space by participating in their rites in the synagogue for the dedication of the legal rabbinic order, and will through contradictory temporality, light the lights: blessing “God” Himself for the “commandment” to do so. The blessing implies a temporal contradiction from the liturgy, as if the rabbinic order is invested with primordial divinity. The Hannukah service is a significant and pressingly current distinction between Orthodox and the Reform movements, the latter did not include the blessing at the time as they saw it as a ceremony that is charged with rabbinism, preferring to study a more Karaïtic approach to the liturgy.  


271 My thanks to Rabbi Shalom Morris of Bevis Marks, London, for his reference to the particular interest in Hannukah blessings as representative of the schism between reform and orthodoxy’s approach to the Oral Law at this time. See Michael A. Meyer, *Response to Modernity: A History of the Reform Movement in*
orthodox ritualism that establishes a sense of the Jewish Law that is distinctly rabbinic, patriarchal, and seemingly primordial in feeling. Solomon creates an image whereby subjects elect to be subordinate and reconstitute the law.

Like Aaron’s sons, and the choristers, Solomon’s early ceremonial depictions from the late 1850s demonstrate a tension between awareness of interpellation and investiture, or whether rites of investiture are there merely to acknowledge ones supposed primordial destiny. The former quality, the rites acknowledging a primordial interpellation that precedes the subject, is an acknowledgment that one was always elected as a consequence of birth.

Thus far, I have discussed how Carrying the Scrolls of the Law invokes ambivalent futures brought about by Solomon’s depictions of medievalist quests, and how Horror genres inspired by Edgar Allan Poe navigate the oscillation between old regimes and new as a response to the Jewish emancipation anxieties surrounding conversion. I will continue to look at the question of investiture into the Law and the queer Jewish question in Solomon’s images, and whether the Jewish child is interpellated as a sovereign by rite or by primordial descent.

The infant and his primordial investiture

This chapter has emphasized Solomon’s phallic depictions that respond to a national Christian “crisis of investiture”. As a result of the Jews Relief Act of 1858, Jews become lawmakers without converting to Christianity, swearing their oath of office “according to the true faith of a Christian”. Domestic assemblages represent enlightened eclecticism as opposed to a Christian allocentric national covenantal mode. Norman Kleeblatt notes that Solomon’s interest in medieval (or primitive) Christian art in earlier

Judaism. (Wayne State University Press, 1995). 172 - 173. Abraham Solomon painted a portrait of the Reform Movement’s lay leader, David Woolf Marks (now lost). Marks with published the siddur, Seder Ha-Tefilot – Forms of Prayer significantly omitted mention in the “rites that “god has commanded us” [for] regarding them [thus] ran counter to the belief that only the Written Law was divinely revealed”. Ibid, 174
years is devised by his interest in the exhibition at Manchester, and would have what we now associate with his medieval Christian “spiky” style of his early work as an example of stylistic assimilation as part of a secular intellectual Enlightenment that is defined by eclectic assemblage of cultures.\textsuperscript{272} However, understanding of Solomon’s interest in votive Christian styles requires a recognition of two factors: the influence of comparative Enlightenment versus the integration of images within national Christian pacts. I would like to underscore the anxiety towards Jews among Christian lawmakers implicit in later primitive Christian depictions regarding the conversion fantasy.\textsuperscript{273}

Art collections on the walls of Simeon Solomon’s other ceremonial images also hint towards the use of material culture in Jewish households in the mid to late 1850s to represent the Child’s investiture, through circumcision, that directly engage with Christian terms of Jewish genitality within the domestic sphere. Before we get to an understanding of those depictions, I want to demonstrate Solomon’s pictorial engagement with the anxieties surrounding Jewish Christian conversion, and how he flirts with the Christian fantasy of Jewish conversion.\textsuperscript{274}

A famous depiction of \textit{Simeon Solomon as a Baby} by his brother, Abraham Solomon (fig. 2.26), asks the above question of interpellation, whether a male lawmaker is born or made. Emphasising election as a consequence of birth, Abraham depicts Solomon in a popular genre of the time depicting royal babies in their cribs. It bears striking similarities to the subject in Edwin Landseer’s \textit{Victoria Princess Royal, with Aos} (fig.


\textsuperscript{274} Michael Ragussis, Figures of Conversion : "The Jewish Question” and English National Identity. passim. See introduction.
Both depict babies in skirts, and both have ribbons attaching them to jewels of office. Both depict an infant with a dog, symbolising that the sovereign can command loyalty, or can naturally have dominion over lower creatures, and can tame their subjects without the need for physical strength.

The Solomon’s rattle attached with blue ribbon, replicates the accoutrements of the Torah scroll: the bells of the silver *rimonim*, for instance, or the *yad*, the pointer, made in some instances with red coral like the teething end. Abraham Solomon was commenting, through use of this royal genre that the infant need only be invested and interpellated into his Law through birth. Future rites of passage, therefore merely let the subject know their primordial status. The pure infant Simeon in his body is depicted as the Law, and interpellated as a Jew by the pointing *yad* (hand) of the Law. Then, as now, the painting has stayed in the family collection, which portrays an element of lived material culture in the Jewish family, and how they see Simeon Solomon as an innocent and elected child of Israel and *ben Torah*.

**Reflection, Inversion, and the Self Portrait**

A well discussed self-portrait contains the 17-year-old artist’s face, drawn in 1859 (fig. 2.28). Solomon’s smooth, round face looks towards the viewer. We know the viewer himself, as his glassy right eye has a single figure reflected, represented by a singular dot. He has blocked out a dark curtain, to make the face come forward. The hatching of the shadow contrasts to the curved lines of his long, luscious, wavy hair, giving him the air of his bohemian Pre-Raphaelite seniors he was so keen to know, and the Rossetti “clique” he

---

275 Landseer’s brother was Simeon Solomon’s teacher at the Royal Academy Schools, see Stirling ed. *The Richmond Papers*, 162.
Each eyebrow and lash has been delicately picked out by his pencil, and his nose contains a carefully smooth hatching, like on his forehead. A tender erasure of a barely registered graphite finger smudge indicates shine to the tip of his nose and the whites of his eyes, giving additional shape. There is no smoke from the chimney beyond the window: it is a mild day in Bloomsbury. There is a tassel behind him in front of an elegant Edwardian sash window, fastened with a sharp rendering of a brass, straight arm locking sash fastener, a tiny apparatus so recognisable in the small drawing. The tassel indicates that there is a blind behind his eyes, that is has been pulled long, to reveal a votive stained-glass panel. The figure in the panel is not as finely rendered as the other details, meaning that the lock, the sash, and the face are the solid qualities Solomon outwardly presents.

I interpret the tassel as a reference to a similar to the one on his brother, Abraham Solomon’s work, about a flirtation in front of a sleeping chaperone, First Class: the Meeting… and at First Meeting Loved (fig. 2.29.) The free tassel of the window sprightly invigorated by the springing motion of the carriage, contrasts with the limp tassel that shelters the sleeping chaperone from the light. The tassels therefore compare the qualities of illumination connected to knowledge, together with kinetic priapic arousal, to the old chaperone’s literal darkness in his limp, emasculated or cuckolded blind-ness. The shortened blind tassel therefore represents a shelter from confronting realities that are kept

---

277 An assessment of his keen associations with the Pre-Raphaelitism was drawn by Seymour from a letter to Munro, 1857, in Seymour, The Life and Work, 29.

278 The tassel has recently been compared to 'tzitzis' by Jasmine Allen – although it does not appear to be like ones I am familiar with or have personally worn. However, the projection is a good one – and it goes along the lines of my above argument about the uses of religious costume on the body. Applying the argument to Allen’s idea, the home itself becomes an extension of the flesh. Jasmine Allen, “Simeon Solomon and Stained Glass”, PRS Review Pre-Raphaelite Society, 28, no. 3, (Autumn, 2020), 18. Mancoff, Debra N. “As Others Saw Him: A Self-Portrait by Simeon Solomon.” Art Institute of Chicago Museum Studies 18, no. 2 (1992): 147-88. The ‘self portrait’ she brings is rather a copy of the model for one of Rossetti’s Knights in the foreground of Fig. 2.15 How Sir Gallahad, etc. – evidence contrary to W.M. Rossetti’s vehement assertion to Ford that Solomon did not work in D.G.’s studio. Solomon at least lingered long enough to copy the model for the painting, or even had a hand in its production.
unseen through elderly irresponsibility, and in Solomon’s depiction I make the association that the long (therefore virile) tassel in the *self portrait* evoke the fresh sight of a converted individual, and recovers age old anxieties surrounding Jewish conversion to see the young Christian Church. Put another way, Solomon is engaging with old *blind* Jewish synagogue, until he undergoes Revelation.

Until now the figure in the window of Solomon’s *Self portrait* is seen to be too undeveloped to be fully registered or deciphered. Perhaps it is a form of William Morris inspired Guenevere (fig. 2.30), which would have the correct dimensions for a Bloomsbury window (126 x 55cm), and she has similar blocks on its head as a veiled wimple headdress.²⁷⁹ She also carries a long and thin rod which is understood to imply sovereignty.²⁸⁰ I would like to suggest from Solomon’s eclectic symbolic strategy that was also referencing his other medievalist work from 1858. During this year, on one of Solomon’s panels of the Burges cabinet, *John and the New Jerusalem* (fig 31. and detail), depicts telling symbols in the *Self Portrait*. I am arguing that Solomon is depicting a similar symbol in the stained votive glass of his *Self Portrait*, in the style of his medieval work on the Burges cabinet– a piece of functional, yet certainly decorative, furniture. The young angel in the panel is showing a wizened and elderly John the plans for the Church, or the *New Jerusalem* with a gate of precious stone. On the gate there are three Hebrew letters, “MIN” which like the self portrait of that year is in mirror writing.²⁸¹ Because of the letters MIN, the panel therefore depicts the gate of the tribe of Benjamin from the book of Revelations (a decimated tribe in the Old Testament, descended from the youngest of


²⁸⁰ Allen invites us to perceive the image as king Solomon, *Op. Cit.* I have also heard theories that it could also be Moses. Given the length of the rod, both attributions seem unlikely.

Joseph’s brothers), and the staff is the measuring rod of an angel of the plagues in chapter 21 is an allegory demonstrating a utopian vision of ideal architecture for the New Jerusalem. The angel of the plagues inverts our assumptions about investiture between young and old figures, which is a further sign of end times.

I would like to suggest for the first time that the rod carried by the robed subject in the window, and the blocks on its head as a form of New Jerusalem – as opposed to Blind Synagogue carries eschatological symbols from the Burges panel, thus invoking Jewish conversion in the book of Revelation and in the end of days. It carries contrasted meanings from the ambivalent and contested relationship during the emancipation about the unconverted status of the Jew, as it represents a relationship between the future Church (New Jerusalem) and its old, succeeded Synagogue. In the Self Portrait therefore, the Christian votive image behind the blind, represents upon the subject an anxiety surrounding old qualities that Christian project towards Blind Synagogue, and for his fantasised future in the young seeing Christian, a future Revelation represented by the blocks of the Church as its headdress.

When it comes to Christian projections of the New Jerusalem, Solomon’s Self Portrait seems to have retained similar formal qualities the William Holman Hunt’s Study of he Heads of Mary and Jesus for ‘The Finding of the Temple’ executed a year earlier, 1858 (fig. 2.32). In that graphite, ink and wash sketch by Hunt, the young round Jewish face of the future Christ also has long uncovered hair which is parted in the centre, the boy’s lips are rounded, his eyebrows are thin, his ears, eyes and nose are similar dimensions to the Solomon self-portrait. Jesus’s medium length wild hair that reaches the ears is also offset by dark cross hatching in the background. If Solomon wasn’t the model for Hunt in the previous year, then the resemblance to the Jewish model in the study is

indicative of his own associations with the Christ type of the sketch: a sketch rendered with familiar drawing technique as if he was depicting himself as a young Jesus in Hunt’s hand. Solomon was thereby exploring conceptions of the Jewish boy confronting the Law of his ancestors, and coming into a world of his own creation.

Gayle Seymour notes the historical synchronicity and association with *Finding the Saviour in the Temple* (fig. 2.33), an extant letter from Hunt to Abraham Solomon in the Victoria and Albert Museum implies that Hunt knew Abraham Solomon well enough locally to request his help finding a Torah mantel. 283 The very purpose of their interaction around 1857 was surrounding the depiction of Jews with the Law with so called “archaeological” accuracy of carrying the Law. 284 Solomon’s *Self Portrait* in reference to the Hunt study therefore makes a reference to a boy who is in the threshold of the study hall, as a representation of the liminal state of becoming outside of the parameters of the Law.

For this section, the ancient tensions between Judaism and Christianity - particularly the latter faith’s fantasy to convert the former - is represented by the gendered decoration of interior spaces. In summary, what we see through Solomon’s mirror is a house with Christian art beyond the sash window, and a tassel evoking his interior domestic environment, as opposed to the window, an anglo-Christian environment, “out there” beyond the blind to be assimilated into. I am reading Solomon’s balancing of the presentation of Christian sources as mere artistic inspiration and material culture (as Kleeblatt maintains), and for the fetish of a Christian audience that is anxious about Jewish investiture into the national pact, with or without conversion.

---

284 We shall see how the gallery ties the output of the two artists together in the next chapter.
Put in terms of the symbolic parameters of this thesis, Solomon’s self-portrait is one that symbolises domestic ambivalences of assimilation with the non-Jewish world. The symbolism of the subject matter, *The Finding of the Saviour in the Temple* even locates Christ on the threshold of the interior order of blind Rabbis with head coverings, holding their Law with their blind cataracts, while the world of Christ’s “becoming” is on a threshold to a Christian civilisation in a world outside of the Rabbinate, a world out there. The *Self Portrait* is therefore a gesture of a Jewish boy who understands his Jewishness in relation to Christian supercessionist fantasy of his young and developing, clear and sparkly eyed world of the New Jerusalem, a world where the phallic law of the pharisee is left inside the frame that he is either within or without.

**Mosaic genitality and the Covenant of Abraham**

However, reasserting the patriarchal masculinity of lawgivers might have affected our conception of the genderless youth in the *Saviour* form. Solomon’s self-portrait demonstrates the oscillation of between Jewish and Christian gendered projections by depicting male investiture within a domestic sphere that is subversively masculine. He does so through a specifically genital scenes of investiture: circumcision.

Solomon’s 1857 depiction of a Jewish circumcision (fig. 2.34), provides a telling example of the oscillation between Christian and Jewish life by depicting images representing the Old and the New on the wall of the living room interior. We can see that Jewish Old Testament subjects such as Moses holding the Tables of the Law, is hung adjacent to a Christian Holy Family in an earlier drawing of the circumcision ceremony.\(^{285}\)

---

\(^{285}\) Freud also famously had a Rembrandt engraving of Moses with the tables in the family home. So important is this material culture that a famous biographer of his Jewishness put the original oil painting on the front cover. See Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi. *Freud's Moses: Judaism terminable and interminable*. (Yale University Press, 1993). Cover.
An Old Testament depiction in the family walls might have reminded us of the Felsenstein assessment of British depictions of Jewish sexuality. 286 Felsenstein demonstrated the cuckolded Jewish man’s interiors such as on the walls in Hogarth’s Rake’s progress, as an example of his curtailed, diminished and feminised sexuality due to his circumcision, and a joke at his expense. However, with Solomon’s depiction, a century later, the depiction of Moses on the walls has a more terrific intention: most of the frame is taken over by the large phallic Tables of the Law, together with lines indicating the brazen serpent, a type of Crucifix, and Solomon’s monogram. The Law is the condition of masculinity within which the infant enters through the rites of circumcision. Moses becomes a challenge to the conception of the cuckolded and thus feminised Jew from the previous century, as the infant is passed into the covenant of Abraham among the top hatted brotherhood of the male community, and forms the phallic brazen serpent that becomes his monogram.

In order to make the idea of male investiture apparent through circumcision (as opposed to his feminisation), compare the 1857 depiction to a later photograph of Simeon Solomon’s drawing, *The Presentation of the Child for Circumcision on the Eighth day* (fig. 2.35), later known simply as *Circumcision*. The scene is also set in a contemporary wealthy upper-middle class home, where in the series, the female domesticated space is being handed over to the males for the rite. The woman’s shadow rests on a tall panelled Georgian door.

The rear wall is covered in large half portraits of busty women and a convex mirror above a mantel piece adorned an elongated, ornately handled vase. A baby’s potato-like head is seen while a woman with a striped shawl and modest hair covering tenderly hands him to the profile of a bearded man in a housecoat and traditional round cap. He is being

---

handed into the regime of the patriarchs for his rite of inclusion. There is a group of men behind the man accepting the baby into the male covenant from left to right: there is a group behind candles indicating and a wine jug for the sacrificial event which is similar to a Christian altar. One bearded man in a cap next to a top hatted bearded man. A taller man in a three quarter-length coat and cap has his back towards us with one hand behind his back, the other on the table – reversing the courtly manner. Perhaps he is the surgeon, the Mohel. His fingers are long and practical. Two young men in top hats, one holding a box (perhaps the circumcision kit) and the other folding his hands nonchalantly, and another shorter bearded man in a cap folding his arms. In the middle of the picture, a familiar, tall, turbaned man with a flowing beard and a long coat tied around the upper waist places his hand on the back of a simple chair with a cushion. Without the later hyper-patriarchal Indio-Arab depictions of the Sassoons by the artist, we would assume that this the legendary biblical character Elijah, visiting the scene to comfort the child in his suffering. He, along with the child’s head, casts a theatrical and castrative gaze out to us. The later wood engraving published in 1866 has the young man looking out at us, and Elijah looking towards the handover, but faithfully and crisply renders the other details from the drawing.

However, back in the 1857 image, among the top hatted figures there are eclectic costumes that seem more primitive and macabre: the Mohel is also on his knees and at work with a headscarf, and a similar portly figure wears round spectacles perhaps evoking blindness. Instead having a group of top hatted and bearded men standing back, separating themselves from the man holding the child undergoing the rite. Another top hatted man is holding a long pointed knife with a castrative glare out at the viewer (see detail).

Through all the associations of the cut, there are however, phallic imaginings of authority. The table legs are phallic, just like the Moses with his horned shafts of light and holding his massive tablets, overlooks the scene. The later drawing eliminates the
violence, the phallic symbolism including Moses with his tables of the Law, and the nervous standing group overlooking the scene at a distance.

It is my novel contention that in the 1857 circumcision image, the kneeling, turbaned man has a more horrific reference to Christian depictions of the Jewish *Mohel* in the medieval Tucher altar piece (fig. 2.36). The reference makes the scene of Jewish priests circumcising Christ a macabre Christian fantasy of Jews. The earlier drawing by Solomon from 1857 does not have the tender tragedy that we would understand as a rite of passage where the mother hands over the infant into the male company of Abraham’s covenant, like the Etonians going off to school. Instead, Solomon is associating the covenant with a macabre Christian representation of blind Jews sacrificing a type of Christ.

On the one hand (if we use Kleeblatt’s assessment), the representation of the Holy Family represents the materiality of the Jewish home that collects Christian art as enlightened Jews, alongside the expected Old Testament depictions of Moses with the Law. The picture of the frame that roughly depicts the Holy Family reflects the ambiguities surrounding New Testament images among Enlightenment households that I discussed in relation to the self-portrait. However, we know that the circumcision image contains macabre antisemitic depictions that contain specific medieval Christian anxieties about Jewish sexuality invoking Christian fetishes of Jewish genitality and ritual murder.

Through the inclusion of Tucher altar piece references, Solomon seemed to be engaging with antisemitic blood ritual myths alongside his contemporary associates. During the year 1858 he made a new acquaintance among the second generation Pre-

---

287 Kleeblatt, “Jewish Stereotype and Christian prototype” *passim.*
Raphaelites, Edward Burne Jones. Roberto Ferrari notes that Solomon’s portrait of him has, with its stiffness, a medievalising character, yet he sees within it a homoerotic longing (fig. 2.37). In 1859, Burne Jones was creating the most ancient of British antisemitic folklore on furniture for the Hogarth club (fig. 2.38). Chaucer’s Prioress’s Tale, based on the story of Hugh of Lincoln, who was circumcised, his blood drained, and thrown in a cesspit by Jews, all as imagined by the poet as a projected inversion of Christ’s cannibalism in a “demonic parody” of the Eucharist.

What is important here is that Solomon was investing a medieval approach to his Jewish home that conferred with horrific tropes of a contemporary genre, a genre that was definitively, in its pre-Raphaelitism, a “primitive” Christian one. The Solomon family’s material culture is being depicted that includes votive and horrific medieval styles for lived environment, and that he was familiar with violent antisemitic tropes that engaged with sexualised and bloody myths about primitive rituals that were distanced by scientific understanding of origin myths.
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290 Dominic Janes has credibly taken the cannibal elements of the Eucharist as evidence for Solomon’s “Homoerotic Sacrement” in the more Romish, The Mystery of Faith. “Seeing and Tasting the Divine: Simeon Solomon’s Homoerotic Sacrament.” In Art, History and the Senses: 1830 to the Present, ed. Patrizia di Bello and Gabriel Koureas, (Surrey: Ashgate, 2010) 35 - 50. I thank Carolyne Arscott for a reassuring conversation where she supposed that the piece merely imitates votive conceptions of faith, not to portray its belief – that would be outrageous indictment of a tendency among recent Catholic art historians who project Burne Jones’s Catholicism in earnest (I would not assume that they share the antisemitic depictions as Catholicism too), rather it was intended as an eclectic piece work for the Hogarth gentleman’s club, inspired by the passion for Edgar Allen Poe and the new horror genre. Further work on the purpose of the cabinet’s antisemitic folklore needs to be done, although it falls outside of the scope of this thesis. For projective inversion, see Alan Dundes, The Blood Libel Legend: A Casebook in Anti-Semitic Folklore. Univ of Wisconsin Press, 1991; Dundes, Alan. "Projective Inversion in the Ancient Egyptian" Tale of Two Brothers". Journal of American folklore 115, no. 457 (2002): 378-94. Solomon’s friend, Charles Algernon Swinburne was to write the Cannibal Catechism (the same title of Bentham’s anti-Papist tract against the true Host). Swinburne was member of the Cannibal Club with his friend and explorer, Sir Robert Burns. A recent exhibition wrote an entry for the text as follows, “It is the spirit of anti-theism and associations with the While cannibalism was, in all likelihood, not practiced, the club’s official symbol was a mace in the shape of an African head gnawing on a thighbone inscribed with the words “Ecce Homo.” “The Cannibal Catechism,” which was recited by all at the beginning of each dinner, subjects the Eucharist to “demonic parody,” reifying the spiritual cannibalism that is inherent in the ritual.” Kathryn L Beam and Seymon Khokhlov, Swinburne: A Radical Victorian. Ex cat. University of Michigan, 2008, 13.
However, the difference I am asserting regarding Felsenstein’s antisemitic feminization of the Jew, as well as the genital otherness from Daniel Boyarin’s conception of the castrated burden, is that Solomon presents within the circumcision a depiction of investiture, where through the circumcision, the infant becomes male, rather than female, and rather than a dreaded castration seen in the mirror, Solomon sees a dreaded burden. My argument is expanded by reflecting on the Old and New Testament art on the walls, reflecting the Christian Jewish ambivalences surrounding the crisis of investiture during 1858, and that sexuality during a season of Poe-inspired horror tales was inspired by the contemporary macabre medieval folkloristic interests.

The argument leaves us with the debate between Prettejohn and Davis surrounding whether those absorbed by rapt devotion constitute a lost homoerotic past or a future homoerotic reconstitution. Within the context of the phallic law, I believe that the youth is entering into a thrilling and macabre patriarchal environment whose extreme depictions of altered genitality creates an anxiety surrounding a state of manhood to come: the future association with the patriarchal regime is not confidently marched into, rather it is an anxious and cruel confrontation.

Madness and the Phallic Law

Citing Freud’s “Moses and Monotheism”, Daniel Boyarin writes an article recalling Freud’s perception of his circumcision in the mirror, and recalling the “dreaded castration”, “the apparent dislike of his own circumcised penis”. In Solomon’s much later depiction of Rabbi holding Scrolls of the Law (Moses) from 1881 (fig. 2.39), we can easily associate figure of a bearded man holding a Torah scroll as a kind of Moses with an uncircumcised phallus, which like Watt’s Moses in the Hemicycle of Lawgivers, is inspired
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291 Boyarin “Homophobia and the Postcoloniality of the “Jewish Science””, 166, Freud, Moses and Monotheism, 91.
by Michaelangelo’s sculpture (that veined hand pulling his beard to the right, while it mingling with long wavy hair is a definitive Michaelangelo influence). Like the rough rendering of Moses on the wall of the circumcision image, he looks out in semi-profile, as if he is copied from the remembered domestic depiction from 1857.

But there are key differences to the circumcision scene, Solomon’s 1881 Moses doesn’t have Pan-like horns of light; rather, he has a shimmer of an aura bouncing through the darkness above his head. The light has no source, seemingly acting like a mist emanating from within, like the glow of perspiration brought on after a great exertion of heroic energy with a Rembrandtesque chiaroscuro. The light within implies the inherent status as a lawgiver. The misty light indicates that the figure is moving forward as there is a gap in the linear hatch on the tables behind him. Solomon, with fluid wrist motions and basket hatching, has created a foreground that, unlike the seated Michelangelo, has the face floating forward into a swirling tempestuous space. He has softened the hatching lines with graphite smudges that saturate the grain of the paper. As an afterthought, heavier lines are added on the lower left framing the scrolls by following the scrolls’ form and curving round with swift arm motions to unify the foreground into a darker sky. The swift action of the artist on the large paper, and the dark lines that are contrasted by the lighter ones in the foreground makes us imagine Moses is moving from the fierce exacting and rational clarity of gaze, and the delineated tables of law towards a world *tohu va bohu*, of unregulated lawlessness that he will purposefully conquer. The drawing of the scroll is most phallic of all, and continuing the metaphor the covering at the top of the law forms an uncircumcised glans: the foreskin loose and uncircumcised. Looking closely, a single red crayon line lightly passes down the zig zag decorated length of its shaft with potent energy, rendered with the random stumbling like veins ready to enlarge and conquer, like a
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292 Freud’s earlier iconographic paper on “The Moses of Michaelangelo” will be discussed.
Heraclitan club. The bearded lawgiver demonstrates the genital and terrific epitome of masculinity, as the Tables of the Law stand as a mountain behind his head with impenetrable anality. If we are to include Freud’s paper on the iconographic difference of the Michelangelo sculpture to precedents of Moses holding the tables aloft, Freud thereby view as dropping the Tables of the Law by accident, or disregard. Watts’s Moses, is passing his law down to the school of lawgivers through the muses of Truth, Justice and Mercy. It serves to emphasize the contrary difference in the importance of the phallic Hebrew relevance of Moses as Lawgiver between British image of the nation. Solomon, assimilated yet invested as a Jewish representative of the Hebrew nation through the investiture crises, as I argued for Santner’s reading that the Jewish phallus becomes is a signifier of legal substantiation.

This chapter has introduced Solomon’s male/non-male binary in relation to the figure of the Law. I have discussed the phallic genitality of a culturally unified symbol of Hebraism, and have updated the Jewish imagination of the Law in terms of the Jewish national anxieties of investiture as male lawmakers without the need to convert according to the true faith of a Christian. Questions surrounding the queer feminised Jew are called into question as the phallic order Law is fully embodied by the figure of Moses, and their female and childhood infant interlocutors are passed into the Mosaic symbolic order. I have considered Solomon’s images of Rabbis holding scrolls of the Law as Jews positioning themselves to the exterior Christian world, and have shown that Solomon flirts with symbols of the Real Presence within the body of the scrolls of the Law. I have
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294 Unlike Boyarin’s supposed accepted reading of Freud’s Jewish “post-coloniality”, feminized, assimilated and unrepresentative of the Viennese nation.
imagined the cerebral slippage of old worlds and worlds to come as a metaphor for the Law holder who faces a crisis of investiture, where the fully invested male leaves a homoerotic world left behind as they enter the body of lawmakers. The next chapter will look at the Jewish response to Solomon’s ceremonial depictions from 1862 and 1866 that problematise their motives within the parameters of British interfaith, Enlightenment discourses.
Chapter 3. Jewish Ceremonies and Customs

My thesis has so far looked at Simeon Solomon’s young figures with the Law in nineteenth century British Hebrew culture. Solomon’s varied receptions become a representation of the ambiguous and contested place of Jews within British society during their investiture as lawgivers. I demonstrated within Solomon’s rabbinic and Mosaic depictions that the genital symbols of the Law become a patriarchal challenge to Boyarin’s terms of the “queer Jewish question” between the late 1850s and early 1860s. I did so by discussing the phallic Hebraism in what Benedict Anderson called the national imaginary.

In doing this I negotiated a path between Liz Prettejohn and Whitney Davis’s debates about the ambivalence of adolescent homosexual subjectivity that amounted to the queer aesthetic question of Solomon’s depictions associated with the Pre-Raphaelites, and negotiated the terms of lost symbolic worlds. In Prettejohn, Solomon’s adolescent males were “melting” in contrast to “energetic” beauty, depicting hope that adolescent love will reconstitute itself in confident adulthood after overcoming presumed religious subjection to sodomy prohibitions; and in Davis, the subjects’ anxiety reflects a knowing loss of the innocent homosexual bonds of childhood.

By bringing a more updated queer Jewish studies by Eric Santner, I demonstrated Solomon’s sexually ambivalent subjects appeared in relation to a delineated phallic Law, which served to describe the ambiguities of assimilation, and Hebraic cultural representation within the Christian world. I interpreted the feminized, un-male subjects as a metaphor for Jewish assimilation because Solomon imagined the reciprocal bisexual crisis of investiture and interpellation in society as sexually potent male lawmakers.

This chapter will engage with the ambivalent and contested style of what has been seen to be a different form of Solomon’s lost worlds. Here, associations of genre depictions in Solomon’s series of Jewish Ceremonies (figs 3.1 – 3.22) negotiate between
the temporal elements within an anachronistic style, against the value of an ambivalent and contested lived realist ritualism. Paradoxically, their longevity as important art comes from their stylistic similarities to anachronistic Dutch genre scenes, that in the late 1850s London also had an ambivalent and contested popularity. 295

The first three photographs are part of a lifecycle, from the circumcision a week after birth (3.1), to marriage (3.2), and mourning the subject’s death (3.3).

The *Marriage Ceremony* portrays the domestic domain in the poles and *chuppah* canopy, with negotiations between interiority and exteriority becoming a metaphor of the image’s aperture itself. The canopy forms the top border, with later wood engraving iterations including the pelmet (fig. 3.12, fig. 3.16). It seems the same block is adapted to fit the later journal. In the 1862 wood engraving, there are two millimetres distance from the top of the block, leaving blank space which gives the canopy an extra border. The later wood engravings are based on the photographs, with *The Marriage* (fig. 3.2), reversed for its depiction in *Once A Week* (fig 3.12). In the Journal article, the bridesmaids and groomsmen become an important feature as it describes “two men” and “two female friends” they summon the bride and groom from their homes for the “awful” ceremony. 296

William Buckler has noted the aesthetic categories of illustration within Samuel Lucas’s publishing ideology for the leisure journal *Once A Week*, that illustrations must accurately depict the text (as the separatist competition of Samuel Lucas to the Charles
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295 By art world, I again discuss their value as art through a discursive set of relationships between the communities of critics. T.J. Clark, *Image of the People*, 4 - 6. "Jewish Ceremonies, by Mr. S. Solomon.". *The Jewish Chronicle and Hebrew Observer* (1 August 1862): 8.

This chapter responds to an extremely well researched article by my former colleague Julia Weiner, who writes about the importance given in Jewish receptions to them based on their attention to ritual, “that Solomon’s *Jewish Ceremonies*, must have been alarmed that they would present an erroneous picture to non-Jews, and indeed, they do seem to have been intended primarily for a non-Jewish market”, in Julia Weiner, ““An Artist of Strong Jewish Feeling”: Simeon Solomon’s Depictions of Jewish Ceremonies”, in Burman, Rickie [ed.]. *From Prodigy to Outcast : Simeon Solomon : Pre-Raphaelite Artist*. (London: Jewish Museum, London. 2001), 16

Dickens rival, *Household Words*).\(^{297}\) In this case *Once a Week* wanted to portray living religious worlds based on the oscillations between a biblical and contemporary Jewish world. Therefore the “real” interpretation of the text through image was therefore doubly important. As we can see in the two edited images (fig. 3.11 and 3.12), a few edits to Solomon’s depictions were made – particularly the description of the wedding scene, where two friends of the bridegroom mentioned in the text are added behind the canopy. In print making the photographs are applied to blocks for carving, so these elements would have been redrawn.

I identify the author for the first time as the Jewish community insider and theological defender, Aaron Levy Green. He informs the reader “These same persons place the two principal performers facing each other”. The two pairs of friends assembled in the chuppah behind the couple are therefore depicted with greater definition, simply by repeating the pole bearers features – in line with Samuel Lucas’s editorial preference to have the image accurately serve the text.\(^{298}\)

In the first wood engraving, the bride holds out her hand, to accept her ring from a near silhouetted top hatted groom, whereas in the original photograph the bride’s mother draws back the bride’s veil to accept the minister’s cup. The bridesmaid imitates the mother’s gesture, as if seeing her own future veil removed. Thankfully the child does not perform this saccharine gesture in the 1866 engraving, where she instead holds a posy and looks into the scene – drawing the viewer into the center where the bride’s full length becomes visible. The child has been eliminated entirely from the 1862 engraving to make room for these friends of the bride and groom, and so as not to distract the reader from the identification with the textual description of the scene. The Jewish head scarf of the

\(^{297}\) Ibid.
mother in the 1866 engraving changes to a bonnet, and the bride is turned towards us, and
the small girl faces her.

Unlike the temptation so many might have, I prefer not to read the figures holding
the poles as a homoerotic subtext, as those outside the ideological frame of heterosexuality
desiring each other, because the figure on the left of the 1866 engraving seems to emulate
a familiar type complaining about the boredom of the labour of men and boys bearing
canopy poles at lengthy Jewish weddings. They have been landed with a laborious role.
For example, see how the pole bearing boy looks at the viewer in a *chuppah* study by S.A
Hart, shown here for the first time (fig. 3.25), and faces towards the opposite the older pole
bearer in (fig 3.26). The female feinting in the first is the only evidence of a lost love.²⁹⁹

*The Week of Mourning* (fig. 3.3) depicts a Jewish Shiva, with the bearded minister
comforting the mourning female relatives in a semi-circle. Another male bearded mourner
consoles on the far end. A serving woman in a pinafore redundantly consoles by serving
cake, and placing one hand on the weeping woman that holds her face. Two embracing
girls in the centre stare out with harrowing eyes, rendered in stark and minimal dots from
Solomon’s early spikey style. The same top hatted figure from the *Marriage* appears
behind the window in gloomy shadow, now as a ghost. Solomon once again references
Rossetti’s Edgar Allan Poe illustrations, *The Sleeper* (fig. 3.27), where the figure imagines
the lost ghosts of the lover out of the window while she is absorbed in a dream. In Poe’s
poem, the “canopy” is a metaphor for waving curtains that hide the loved object in a veil.
³⁰⁰ The previous photograph is a marriage sheltered by a canopy, where the veil on the
bride is also waived by her mother. The veiled bride is a religious type of Christian

²⁹⁹ This may disappoint, sometimes a pole bearer is just a pole bearer. One is more likely to read a sexual
subtext in the albumen printing process.
allegory which Solomon depicts in this year for another journal for Alexander Strahan, *Good Words*.

In *The Feast of Tabernacles* (fig. 3.9), the albumen process allows for the interior to have bolder pigment reaction, and so making the silhouette sharper, yet less detailed than the sunny outside. It draws us in to the interior of the *Sukka*. The silhouette effect of interior presences is inverted from the *Feast of Mourning* because the viewer looks inside with the exterior shadows of the past in biblical costume, temporally looking into the future world of the festival. The biblical costume reminds the viewer of the Jewish tradition that the *Sukka* is visited by the Jewish ancestors, the *Ushpizin*, on each of the seven feast days, through the sanctity of the ritual act. The aperture reverses the meaning of a biblical lived reality and the psychic connotations of the Poe lost worlds are reversed, as the real present is perceived from the outside past.

*The Week of Mourning* (fig. 3.3), is posed like an 1853 pattern of Othello relating his tales of his adventures to Desdemona by Charles West Cope (fig. 3.27) – in this case the minister relates the adventures of another spiritual realm. emphasises the bisexual seduction between minister and congregants through tale-telling (a form Solomon repeats in his *Love relating tales to Boys*, and *Love relating tales to Girls*; based on a form of Socrates).

The reference to Cope’s work is also relevant for the medium Solomon is emulating, as Cope is president of the Etching Club. Back in 1858 Solomon illustrates another ghost tale by Thomas Hood for the Junior etching club, *The Haunted House* (fig. 3.29), in which two girls peer round a door, a man leans over a dead body in a casket in a room beyond. Both the references to Poe and the etching for the Thomas Hood horror poem gives the depiction a morbid ghostly theme of a lost world within the home. Cope’s 1857 etching, *Milton’s Dream for his Deceased Wife – Sonnet 18* (fig. 3.39), carries
within immediate Blake and Rossetti references to spirits moved from this realm hovering above a sleeping man (I presume that it may even have inspired Rossetti).  

I mentioned that *Once a Week* portrays these images to illustrate its narrative of the Jewish “Career”, within a description of the lives of the Jews in England and their affairs, educationally, domestically, politically. “To begin at an early period in the *career* of the English Jew”; the circumcision, and then after describing the Bar Mitzvah, the author, Aaron Levy Green, introduces “the next important step in his *career*… his betrothal, which usually takes place at an early age, in accordance with the recommendation of the Jewish *law*.”  

We should consider how the word ‘career’ is a kind of predetermination alongside the word, *law*. In the English language at that time, a career is not chosen but according to the Johnson dictionary definition, it is affecting a course through one’s existence to the grave. We career from life to death, we are on a course to goodness, or wickedness. It is little wonder that the next article in Good Words for 1862 is aptly juxtaposed next to ours: Brief, by Astley H. Baldwin. The Stanzas describe the lifecycle, -- Infancy, Boyhood, Manhood and Age, -- as certain as the grave.  

Lucas ensured the depictions in both text and image are legal, timeless descriptions of Jewish circle of life by a plan that precedes the subject, a seemingly a priori course of birth, marriage, fertility, (sometimes divorce), aging, death, and even refusal to marry one’s dead brother’s widow – of popular constitutional import to the British nation. The long ending of the article talks about the Jewish question of emancipation, criticizing the notion that Britishness is in any way to do with anything other than a matter of birthright, “Has the Israelite a fatherland besides Jerusalem? Yes; the country wherein he is bred and
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born…”. I believe the images are carefully selected and omit the fasts of Jerusalem (fig. 3.7). 303

Questions about Solomon’s relationship between his personal “career” and the “Jewish career” is engaged by the Jewish lifecycle series partly published three times between 1862 and 1866. Attention on the word “career” reflects upon the tensions between the artist’s sexual agency and social construction as a Jewish artist within the community, and therefore, the new focus here is on the history of Simeon Solomon and his pictures as an inter- and post-emancipation Jewish artist in England. The publications of these images as woodengravings alongside texts about the Jewish lifecycle enable us to read these pictures as part of a discourse which Solomon responds to. They are repetitions of Solomon’s religious symbolism as nuanced moral reflections in the artist’s “career”.

Marcia Pointon’s essay on Millais and marriage presents us with a similar socio-political structural model to analyse ceremonial images. 304 In her essay, “Histories of Matrimony: J. E. Millais”, Pointon writes of the idea that “paintings…” are not merely reflexive, but “are themselves a discursive practice”, that they participate in “the ideology of marriage” and thus can be a form of engagement on behalf of the artist in either protest of this ideological, artistically produced, “allegorical matrix”, or on the contrary, establish it.

Here, in a similar way to Pointon I will be asking how these images function as discourse, and whether Solomon in his assimilation of self within the structure, was establishing the very social values he was transgressing: Pointon makes the connection between church, state, law, and intimate ceremonies and ritual. She is using Althusserian and post-structuralist language to do so combining rituals with concepts of ideological state

303 Ibid.
apparatus. In the summary and critique of Stuart Hall, Ideology “appears in practices located within the rituals or social institutions or organisations” which delineate an idea of what the subject “ought to do” by optional “nurturing” apparatuses. Pointon’s example is Millais depiction of church weddings. Insofar as Solomon is representing the Jewish ideological apparatuses, rituals, customs, depictions of domestic interiors alongside the synagogue alike, he places himself inside the religious ideological matrix as these images are for domestic consumption in family Journals. Their original publication as photographs a week before the two wood-engravings appear in Once a Week do not necessarily mean they were intended to be published as photographs, but there was clearly a commercial value in doing so, and their photographic mediation provide a documentary weight about the rituals of Jewish life.

While those first three photographs depict the devotional elements inside the home and under a wedding canopy, photographs four and five introduce us to the kinds of religious gendered space, where Carrying the Procession of the Scrolls of the Law (fig. 3.4) occurs in a male only synagogue space with the women out of sight; the Lighting of the Lamps (3.5) is a domestic female activity performed by the matriarch in a room with an old man and group of singing children she is caring for. The Fast for the Destruction of Jerusalem (fig. 3.7), The Day of Atonement (fig. 3.8), and The Feast of Dedication of the Temple [Hannuka lighting] (fig. 3.10) are performed in synagogue, depicted with dramatic chiaroscuro with a fine latticed line, and the figures are likewise male patriarchal performers.

The Eve of the Passover (fig. 3.6), and Tabernacles (3.9), also include women, within the former tending the children around a table, and the ancient family for Tabernacles that I mentioned earlier, remain outside the room.306

Dutch realism

Because they associate themselves to anachronistic styles and genres, their value as art in the Jewish world contends with not only those connoisseur discourses at the time, but also of religious assimilation of Jewish orthodox ritual life in the nation. The perceived lack of symbolic coherence is defined as Jewish self-hatred, but its opposite is to “conform to their [stereotype] image within the nation”.307 If after an initial ambivalence from the Jewish community, these depictions were then seen to be among Solomon’s most authentic works, as if “written in Hebrew characters”, then perhaps according to stereotype, they were reasoned to be the least self-hating of them all.308 That understanding however, would have to be balanced if invoking Rembrandt’s etching styles which are for this time seen to be unimportant. There is no doubt that these works become unique in Solomon’s output.

Forrest Reid’s famous work about 1860s illustration perceived that their iterations in wood engravings had “Rembrandteque” features that were “completely unlike the sensuous idealism of Rossetti”.309 For Reid, unlike the Rossetti-like association we mentioned above and in the previous chapter, the style of these wood engravings were

306 I described both Circumcision and Feast of Dedication in the previous chapter.

Although it can be assumed from the later wood engravings that women would not be included in the Sukkah not being obligated to participate, the more tonally sympathetic photograph of the drawing contains a woman inside the Sukkah, at the left of the table.


308 Richmond’s quotation, see Stirling, op. cit.

The reasons why Jewish artists are readily compared to Rembrandt’s work is curious. For Example, Larry Silver “Jewish Identity in Art and History Maurycc Gottlieb as Early Jewish Artist.” In Jewish Identity in Modern Art History, ed. Catharine Soussloff (University of California Press, 1999), 101-102.

apparently completely separate from the Pre-Raphaelite project and marked a unique series in Solomon’s oeuvre. To Reid, they “brimmed with atmosphere – an atmosphere strange, sad, exotic, alien… Its emotion is a kind of nostalgia, a homesickness, a sickness of the soul”.310 On the other hand, Algernon Swinburne’s 1871 assessment of the “series of seasons and festivals of the Jewish year” had “singular force and refinement”.311 That “singularity” of delineation marks them out as unique within his works of less “present” adolescent subjects, with their “force” having that lauded energetic quality. I would argue that its delineation was qualified by the facture in the style of Dutch realism: The works oscillated between drawing in an etching style and photography, and into wood engraving (and finally in one case, into paint), the series of Jewish Ceremonies are thereby depictions of forceful energetic realism.

I argue that their primary status as photographs is important here in that they emulate copper plate etching. Copper plate etching involves intaglio process whereby ink is sucked out of the plate grooves by wet paper on a press. The lines are created by drawing out the coating on a primed plate, where the primer protects the plate from the acid and the lines drawn into the plate remove the protection from the acid bath. The acid creating grooves (etching) where ink will be rubbed in for transfer to the paper. The grooves for ink could be fine if the plate is not left in the acid long, or the lines could be thicker if the plate is left in the bath for a longer time. Texture could be added as the lines could contain a slight burr from the acid bites etches into lines on a mask if left too long. The texture can also be affected by the wiped marks from the scrim cloth, which gives the engraving a painterly effect and tonal contrast. There can also be multiple iterations or

310 Ibid. That Reid is commonly part-cited indicates that this is a familiar accepted response by Weiner, op cit., and Simon Reynolds, Reynolds, Simon. The Vision of Simeon Solomon. (Gloucestershire: Catalpa Press, 1985), 10.

stages of the plate etching, as details could be added by masking the plate. The etching process between cross hatching and the scrim marks and stages of plate etching, can therefore evoke strong chiaroscuro capabilities. They can emulate the drawings of lost and haunted pasts, as the multi-stage process iterates temporal elements of process. For the reproduction of Solomon’s drawings, albumen photography seems to be a process that albumen photography emulates, as there is the possibility of stronger reaction of the silver to different areas of the plate (like a contemporary dodge and burn edit), and the tiny bubbles within the egg solution can leave a burr like smudge of a longer etching bath. Therefore certain figures can be brought to prominence, or to foreground depending on the solidity of the lines with a higher titration of the reactant, brought into shadow, or brought into a lighter and obscurest fade.

Authors have tended to miss this depiction because they use the wood engravings from *The Leisure Hour* to describe the pictures. However, when looking at the only known photographs extant at the Jewish Museum, London, it is clear that the tonal quality is assisted by the photographic process. The duplicate of *Tabernacles* (Figs 3.9 and 3.9a, the only duplicate photograph in existence) indicates that there was additional exposure given to certain sections of the negative in a process called burning and dodging. The effect means that there was sharpening and darkening of the interior of the tabernacle, which contributed to a darkening tone beyond the normal tonal spectrum of a drawing. Through the photographic masking process method, the figures in the foreground of *The Eve of Passover* (fig. 3.6) are darker, the mother of the bride’s dress in *The Marriage* (fig. 3.2), is sharper, the knee area of the comforting Rabbi’s coat *Mourning* (fig 3.3.), is highlighted and foregrounded, and the top hatted silhouette of a figure in the back window denigrated to a mere haze. As such the photographs recreate the camera lens’ focus over
particular areas of a field of vision. When it comes to the later wood engravings, these features are lost because the wood cutting process is not tonal.

In his earlier book, *Jewish Icons*, Richard Cohen described how Solomon’s works took on the aura of an old ghetto world that was fossilised and remembered vanished world, and, in common with Reid, were wistfully nostalgic (particularly in comparison to the ennobling nature of Isaac Kaufman’s work of handsome rabbis that were from a vanished past). Cohen’s Jewish art historical readings of the ceremonial wood engravings are based on an areligious Eurocentric view of the Jewish emancipation narrative. That may be a true account of the emancipation of European Jews, but as I demonstrated using Anglo-Jewish history, it was not the case for their particular symbolic assimilation within the nation – Anglo-Jewry’s ambiguous image was sometimes fetishized as religious legitimation.

Cohen thereby argues that Solomon is distancing himself from a joyless (perhaps that is to say, unerotic), past. As we shall see, perhaps Cohen was responding to the critique in the Jewish community organ, *The Jewish Chronicle*, that commented on the original photographs. Cohen describes the works in terms of an assumed misery and decrepitude, and does not make the association with its genre or techniques of its reproduction as explanations for their darkness. In portraying an association with Dutch genre, Solomon was producing drawing that imitates etching, and both that genre association, and the prior photography that disseminated those drawings imbued them with
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315 Cohen, particularly, compares depictions of circumcision through the ages. I already discussed how Solomon’s later version was depicted as a less macabre affair, but can imagine how the depictions, with their imitative chiaroscuro, could seem darker than wood engravings would ordinarily admit (and we shall see why).
a sense of a past lived reality. Only thereafter do journals disseminated wood engraving that Reid and Cohen discusses.

In the modes of dissemination, the consumers of these works are expanded, and the images serve as an example of the expanded critical engagement between new discursive platforms. In the new age of mechanical reproduction and distribution, genre hierarchies are negotiated across new media in the rise of a new consumer class from within and from without the London gallery art world. In relation to Cohen and Reid’s argument therefore, European models of secular Enlightenment did not necessarily apply to how the images fit in to the national Anglo-Christian dissemination, rather than in university, or the London gallery, or national pastoral infrastructure, early in 1862.316

The critique over its initial publication in photography passes in 1862, and paradoxically, its familiar Dutch style of Jewish ceremonies and customs has a lasting benefit for the works in museums: they appear alongside Bernard Picart’s infamous Ceremonies in the grand Jewish bicentenary exhibition as early as 1887 (fig. 3.23).317 The style for the series of Solomon’s Ceremonies is imbued with the features of the lionized and canonical works of Bernard Picart’s within Jewish art history.318 Picart’s works are

316 Discussions of the cheaper journalism have been classed as “subjugated knowledge” by the young discipline of Journalism Studies. I have been inspired by conversations had with Laurel Brake. See Laurel Brake, Subjugated Knowledges: Journalism, Gender and Literature in the Nineteenth Century. (Springer, 1994). Josef Lewis Altholz, The Religious Press in Britain, 1760-1900. (Praeger Pub Text, 1989).


famous landmarks for Jewish art history because they represent Jewish life in the historic free and prosperous community of Amsterdam. They were even familiar in 1862 as depictions of historic Jews from 1723, as they were reproduced in Cassell’s cheap Imperial Family bible in 1862 (fig. 3.24).\textsuperscript{319} Even in the same book where Cohen discussed Solomon’s Ceremonies, Cohen himself described Bernard Picart’s infamous illustrations of Jewish life in Amsterdam, as “one of the most impressive publishing enterprises of the eighteenth century”.\textsuperscript{320} Solomon’s genre enables their return to a material cultural approach to Jewish history, just like that of the more European mode of Jewish Enlightenment through their display as artifacts in 1887. Such a proximity in the 1887 exhibition display seems to give the works stylistic intention historical importance. The similarity of style assimilates these images into an historicising Jewish wissenschaft in works of genre that the Jewish community values in histories of art, rather than derides.

Through their association with Bernard Picart’s now canonical works, Solomon’s works oscillate between an anachronistic but important style for Jewish art history, but struggle in their early years with the anxieties over depicting ideal Jewish domestic realities for a broad church Christian audience.\textsuperscript{321}

\textsuperscript{319}Rachel Teukolsky unwittingly used what she assumed was an illustration depicting foreign, impoverished and decrepit Jewish life from Cassell’s Family Bible. (fig. 2.23, author’s collection). Sadly for her thesis on “current” depictions of Jews, as we know the scene is in fact a reproduction from Picart’s infamous genre picture from 1723, as I discuss, not 1862. The figures are extremely wealthy rather than what she describes as “German peasants”. It occurs to me that Cassell’s reuse of the “German” (that is to say, Ashkenazi) Jews from over one hundred years before makes it an anachronistic depiction in the Dutch realist style. I can glean from Teukolsky’s error (and use of my cropped depictions) that there was precedent for Solomon to imitate famous historic works of Jewish genre scenes as biblical legitimation. Reproduction of vintage images, not least the frontispiece from the instantly recognisable King James Bible, is indicative that there is a bank of historic images that are reused many times by Cassell and Co. and Solomon’s photographs are likewise republished many times as “old fashioned” images. Rachel Teukolsky, “Orients of the Self: Bible illustration and the Victorian world picture” Picture World: Image, Aesthetics, and Victorian New Media, 199. She might have consulted my second draft, where she might have found that Senate house library has a separate library full of print and journalism studies, including a guide to understanding Cassell’s project by the house themselves, in Simon Nowell-Smith, The House of Cassell: 1848-1958. (London: Cassell & Co. Ltd), 1958. Wilson Carpenter’s work is however, excellent, and is worth citation, particularly on the domesticated objecthood of the family Bible. Carpenter, M. W. Imperial Bibles, Domestic Bodies: Women, Sexuality, and Religion in the Victorian Market. (Ohio University Press, 2003).

\textsuperscript{320}Richard I. Cohen, Jewish Icons, 43.

\textsuperscript{321}Karen Levitov and Richard Cohen, in The Emergence of the Jewish Artist in Nineteenth Century Europe, discusses Solomon’s depiction of an assumed lost Jewish world through a pan-European notion of
Photography and realism

The question we are left with for art history: is Dutch genre an anachronistic style indicating a world lost, or is it a present form of documentary "realism", like photography? Parallel to our Jewish historical methodologies that struggle with the ambivalence of national assimilation, Ruth Yeazell’s argued that the inclusion of descriptions of Dutch realism within the text of bourgeois novels from the 1850s is defined by process of “assimilation”, for, “the very idea of genre painting depends on our capacity to recognize enlightenment secularization. Cohen and Levitov imply that the ceremonial and religious depictions are reflections of domestic and religious life which are at odds with Solomon as a homosexual subject who would not be legitimised in the images he produces. Therefore the “struggle” that they discuss in relation to these images is one about ceremonial and religious life is inherently supposed by the authors in the status of the Law holder as a sexual outsider. Solomon thereby becomes a metaphor for Jewish alienation in assimilated society for the strictures of his past worlds. They would presume to favour Prettejohn’s approach. However, these worlds are not necessarily lost, but may merely depict an unpopular and uncanny genre in the current art world. Susan Tumarkin Goodman, and Richard Cohen. The Emergence of Jewish Artists in Nineteenth-Century Europe (New York: Merrell, 2001). A major flaw in the exhibition is that in England there were Jewish artists before the nineteenth century, and that is, I assume, because of the British artists’ artisanal status. S. A. Hart’s started as an illustrator for Knight’s Encyclopaedias, and the Britishness of the art is also relevant to a chapter devoted to Solomon’s wood engravings. See Rubens, Alfred. "Early Anglo-Jewish Artists." Transactions (Jewish Historical Society of England) 14 (1935): 91-129. However this is not the only function of the ceremonial depictions, nor is it an inherent characteristic within the subjects of the works. A convincing argument about the hiddenness of same sex desire in the Ceremonials can be seen in writing by the author and sexual activist, Neil Bartlett. Bartlett uses figures from Solomon’s religious genre scene of “The Jewish Marriage” as the very proof that “inversion” is most often hidden, and non-detectable in artist’s portrayals. Bartlett, Neil. Who Was That Man?: A Present for Mr Oscar Wilde (London: Penguin, 1988), 73. Bartlett uses these images of the Jewish lifecycle which establish in the depiction of marriage, an ideal and sexually normative religious setting, to question whether homosexual desire can be detected in its male figures.

He cropped thumbnails from the third reprinting of Solomon’s serialised Jewish life series in the Leisure Hour cut by Butterworth and Heath, of a Jewish Wedding. These cropped faces from Solomon’s Jewish Wedding, are amongst other portraits of and by homosexual authors. “Is there anything at all in these pictures can tell you that they are homosexuals?” Bartlett asks. These are the sexologist, Dr Magnus Hirschfeld’s questions from “A Categoric Personal Analysis for the Reader” questionnaire, 1899, are placed amongst the images. Herschfeld in this questionnaire is classifying inversion. Through mocking these questions, and placing them against a heterosexual scene drawn by Solomon, Bartlett is arguing that there is no formal way of telling how a “gay man” should look. Ibid. In avoiding the substantive context of ritual discourse as divine revelation, Cohen with Levitov wisely re-attributed the qualities of reflexive secularised Jewish pessimism from Cohen’s early work into Solomon’s sexual biography. However, as I have demonstrated in the introduction, the particularly Hebraic forms of an English identity celebrated the very qualities in Solomon’s works which promoted Old Testament depictions for nationalist reasons. The expectations that the then editor of the Jewish Chronicle had in this respect were specifically aimed at the religious nuances of Anglo-Jewish self-image discussed in the previous chapter. Solomon would have to transgress the Jewish self-image because of Neil Bartlett’s argument: that Solomon’s sexuality can be hidden within an ordinary, non-elevated come naturalist forms of religious domestic structure.

anonymous persons as somehow like ourselves”.

Such an assessment invoking assimilation is truer for the ambivalence of the works within an ambivalent and contested Jewish modernity.

Solomon’s 1862 drawings of Jewish ceremonials and the subsequent interest in the photographs follows a discourse within recent ecclesiastic history. The Jewish artist depicted ceremonials in his own faith background, which had various functions of anglo-Jewish Emancipation. It also serves to validate Christian culture by depicting modern Jews practicing “biblical” rites in seemingly real spaces, the medium of photography giving the transcendental rites a current, empirical quality.

In mid to late June 1862, the portfolio of ten photographs after illustrations of Jewish ceremonials by Simeon Solomon was advertised for sale in a variety of newspapers and journals regionally and in London’s Jewish community. The week before their release, the Atheneum’s “Weekly Gossip” column on June 21 complimented the wise choice of subject matter, that the Jewish artist had “given himself to the representation of incidents in the history of his people”. The point in using the word “incidents” being that although the works in contemporary dress (excepting Tabernacles), yet the ceremonies are seen as having historic, that is to say, ancient biblical valence. The Fine Art-Gossip’s review with a description of the technical elements of these photographs of the drawings. F.G. Stephens comments on the “rough but effective” pen and ink drawings, which imply a bold line useful for the photographic process. The article also complimented their subtlety of tone with attention given to the tonal values of The Week of Mourning as I described above (fig. 3.3).


323 For example: Bradford Observer 26 June 1862, 3; Durham County Advertiser, 4 July 1862, 6; The Jewish Chronicle and Hebrew Observer, 16 July 1862, 8; The Jewish Chronicle and Hebrew Observer, 1 August 1862, 1; The Jewish Chronicle and Hebrew Observer, 8 August 1862, 1.

Here for the first time it is important to mention that the “Weekly Gossip” column of that date also informed us that the gallery space was shared by an artist from the last chapter:

HOLMAN HUNT’S great picture, THE FINDING OF THE SAVIOUR IN THE TEMPLE, commenced in Jerusalem in 1854, is NOW ON VIEW at the GERMAN GALLERY, 168, New Bond Street – admission, 1s.

We described Solomon’s stylistic and artistic similarities to William Holman Hunt’s in relation to the Christian fetishization of Jews. Here I bring the June 21 advertisement in the *Atheneum* which means that Hunt’s biblical picture on display at the German Gallery (whose address was also 168 New Bond Street) was the same location from which Cundall, Downes and Co. were selling a portfolio of photographs of Solomon’s of Jewish customs to subscribers.

The publication of contemporary incidents of “[Solomon’s] people” therefore likened those ancient Jews of Hunt’s picture by 168 New Bond Street, linking Hart’s biblical Jews to those illustrated by Solomon for subscribers to the gallery space.

We discussed how Solomon’s Jews with the Law related to Hunt’s works in that they were involved in dialogue with the theological fetishes of a biblical medievalism in the last chapter. Here too, Solomon’s photographic prints were on sale close to Hunts works, and seem to respond to the archaeological terms to Hunt’s conceptions of the pharisee holding the Law through a lived experience.

The photographic medium of Solomon’s depictions connects to Hunt’s spirituality. Lindsay Smith argued effectively that the influence of photography for Pre-Raphaelite artists using biblical iconography such as Hunt, “radically re-defined the relationship of the visible to the invisible, the empirical to the transcendental”.325 For instance, the

scapegoat from Leviticus, due to the contemporary optical influence of the medium of photography, can be portrayed as an ordinary goat. Solomon’s ceremonial depictions from Jewish life were likewise mass produced through methods in albumen photography, to become realist depictions of a modern modes of revelation of biblical customs (figs 3.1-3.10).

**Jews in eclectic Costume**

The *Weekly Art Gossip* column in the *Athenaeum* the following week whose column is traditionally assumed to be written by F. G. Stephens, summarised the “modern costumes in the home occasions, and the traditional garments of the priests in those which are strictly ecclesiastical.” Women are exclusively depicted in contemporary dress free from the trappings of religious life, except for simple headscarves for the married women, who were described as “matriarchs” above, in respect of Jewish law (figs. 3.2, 3.5, and 3.6).

The *tallis* is indeed only portrayed in the synagogue space and under the canopy, the *chuppah*. However, apart from the one child that the Jewish Chronicle picks out (see below), male head-coverings are ubiquitous implying the home is also ritual space but they are also eclectic, giving a sense of unity of exiles, and the messianic end of times.

*The Presentation of the Child for Circumcision and Carrying the Scrolls of the Law*, (figs. 3.1 and 3.4) are good examples of the types of religious and secular head-covering worn at this time in both settings of home and synagogue, ranging from top hat to cantor’s mitre, from indo-Arabic turban, to fur *streimels*, and flat *yarmulkes* worn indoors. These head coverings not only distinguish foreign traditions with the fur *streimel* of polish origin for instance, but also distinguish social integration, or “modernity” in the rendering

---

326 For Hunt’s lived biblical experience, see also Colin Cruise, Pre-Raphaelite Drawing (Thames & Hudson, 2011), 140.
of top hats.\textsuperscript{328} The eclecticism of headwear is indicative of Jewish traffic, either in trade hubs such as Leghorn where Solomon’s family had trade, or in Jerusalem. Solomon Alexander Hart’s \textit{Feast of Rejoicing of the Law in the Synagogue at Leghorn} from 1850 (fig. 3.31) depicts a variety of Jewish costume in a synagogue that serves both east and west, and according to one Jewish art historian, “includes open ground to negotiate a would be participant in this joyful parade”.\textsuperscript{329} Hart’s inclusive options for the viewer is starkly compared to the William Holman Hunt illustration of a Jerusalem \textit{Synagogue} in 1854 (3.32), where the quickly dispatched figures seem to create a fence to includes some but exclude others – symbolized by the Anglican cleric on the right, angrily gazed at by the boy who instinctively knows his exterior status. It is symbolic for the Christian outsider such as Hunt, who sees his fate aligned to that of the Jewish people in Palestine. However, even the most eclectic male Jewish costume creates boundaries between alien self and the interior space of the Jew – something that Solomon’s self-depiction relates to on the liminal cusp of a Christian space, as I described in the last chapter. While Yeazell described genre as “our capacity to recognize anonymous persons as somehow like ourselves”, in Hunt’s case that would depend on a sense of ground and inclusion the 1854 drawing indicates that he lacks as a Christian wanting to assimilate with the Jewish Law holders. The Atheneum, in describing Solomon’s depictions as incidents of “his people” thereby imbues the photographic depictions with what Christians sees as an interior authority of ones community, by someone who associates as one of his people.

\textbf{The Jewish Chronicle}

But what of the critique of Solomon’s own community that he was representing? The German scholar, and editor of the Jewish Chronicle, Dr. Abraham Benisch, adopted a


\textsuperscript{329} \textit{Ibid.} 271.
distinct photographic simile for the preface of his English translation of the Hebrew Bible, “it is not the production of a portrait, but rather that of a daguerreotype of the original at which the translator of the Bible should aim”.\textsuperscript{330} Benisch explains that his translation was to rid the bible of its Christian Jacobean falsehoods and lack of nuance influenced by the team of Bishops. It is the artisanal haze of the bishopric that an accurate photographic depiction of “the word of God” should be rendered.

The following section about the critique of Solomon’s \textit{Ceremonials} was introduced through the uses of photography in depicting a biblical realism. If Benisch was able to use photography to mobilise similes about the artistic modes of reproduction as a simile for translating biblical realism, he was nonetheless mobilising Smith’s photographic metaphor for the integrating the sense of ideal, or transcendental.

By 1862 Abraham Benisch had been the extremely successful editor of the \textit{Jewish Chronicle and Hebrew Observer} for six years, managing to bring the paper back into the red. He was a radical defender of orthodox (then, non-Reform) Jewish ceremonial practice as part of the Jewish emancipation. As Roth and other contributors to the first history of the Chronicle state, “According to Benisch's view of the function of the Anglo-Jewish press, it had to be not only informative and educational, but at the same time a weapon of defence and of offence in the recurrent polemics both inside and outside the community”\textsuperscript{331}

The case for and against ritualism was hotly contested, as I pointed out in the last chapter. The eminent Jewish historian, David Ceserani made the case that the \textit{Chronicle} under Benisch became a vital international Jewish news source, but also functioned in a dialogical way with Christian interlocutors through the era of Jewish emancipation,

\textsuperscript{330} Abraham Benisch, \textit{Jewish School and Family Bible} (London: Jewish Chronicle Office, 1851), ix.

reading at times like a theological paper.\footnote{David Cesarani, \textit{The Jewish Chronicle and Anglo-Jewry, 1841-1991} (Cambridge University Press, 1994), 32 ff.} “At the centre of his concern,” says Cesarani in his master chapter on Benisch’s editorship amongst English religious politics, “was the image of the Jew”, in that Jews are not associated with “the barrage of negative stereotypes” or linked with “criminality” and “venal behaviour”.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 40.}

Conversely the editorials celebrate the successful Jewish image. In response to the excellent review of Simeon Solomon’s exhibition of “The Child Jeremiah” at the Royal Academy in May 1862 the editorial writes, “A Jewish artist that draws his inspiration principally from Jewish subjects is a phenomenon so gratifying that we love to dwell upon it.”\footnote{“Royal Academy Exhibition,” \textit{The Jewish Chronicle and The Hebrew Observer}, 30 May 1862, 7.} The \textit{Chronicle} thereafter reprinted the \textit{Times} review of all three Solomons siblings’ works in the summer show of that year.\footnote{It should be noted that the \textit{Illustrated Times} reported that the ceremonials were in fact submitted for exhibition at the same time as \textit{The Child Jeremiah} in their report for sending in day at the Royal Academy, “Mr Simeon Solomon has also two of his usual pictures from scripture subjects, and a series of really wonderful drawings representing many interesting Jewish ceremonies.”. See “Royal Academy,” \textit{Illustrated Times}, 12 April 1862, 235. My sincere thanks to Carolyn Conroy for generously sharing this information with me.}

It is hard to understand how from the heights of such “gratification” in a Jewish artist drawing inspiration from Jewish subjects, could come up with such a negative review of the artist’s depictions of Jewish ceremonials it had advertised but a few months later.\footnote{“Jewish Ceremonies, by Mr. S. Solomon.,” \textit{The Jewish Chronicle and Hebrew Observer}, 1 August 1862, 8.} “They cannot approve of them as works of art” since, “they lack the idealisation which raises productions of this kind above the ordinary, and since they fail to call forth those holy feelings of awe and veneration from which they derive their chief value.”\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}}

While other contemporary historians such as Richard Cohen understand the \textit{Chronicle’s} comments to be a rejection of a kind of fossilising nostalgia, an example of idiosyncratic
Jewish decrepitude in Europe’s new emancipated age, I want to frame the Chronicle’s review of the photographs in relation to the debates of biblical realism I outlined above.\textsuperscript{338}

There are certainly connections to the blind Pharisees in Hunt’s picture, in that the photographs come out of the same building, and the elderly bearded men in photographs (figs. 32, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.7 and 3.10) resemble them. It is remarkable that \textit{Fast for the Destruction of Jerusalem} (fig. 3.7), the old man sits on the floor in light making everything hard-to-see, and the foremost figure \textit{Carrying the Scrolls of the Law} (fig 2.4) looks especially like a Hunt Pharisee from the previous chapter, with his white beard and own beloved Torah scrolls. This reference to Hunt’s blind old Jewish men (if Cohen was able to make it) involved with seemingly superfluous ritual law is justified critique, but apparently not the Chronicle’s objections to Solomon’s ceremonial photographs.

There are amongst the Chronicle’s objections three reasons: first, the objections to minor ceremonial errors which makes Solomon’s images less than ideal portrayal of Jewish ceremonies. For instance, Jews only momentarily kneel in distinction to Christian prayer, whereas \textit{The Day of Atonement} (fig. 3.8) has the cantor and congregation kneeling. We can surmise that the ritualist discourses that the Chronicle were involved with wanted to distinguish itself from Christian custom – and the prohibition to emulate non-Jewish worship. The Halachik ruling for distinction to rituals by non-Jews, Chukat Hagoy, are specific for the very matter of prostration in worship, and kneeling are Muslim and Christian acts of devotion. The act of prostration and kneeling is therefore limited to once or twice a year. The Chronicle’s second objection was the cropped style that was relevant in the first chapter’s Rossetti like attention to the face or head. Solomon seemed to sacrifice the grandeur of the of the whole synagogue’s worship to the depiction of the

\textsuperscript{338} Cohen, \textit{Op. Cit.}
individual worshiper, in both the Atonement image (fig. 3.7) and Fast for the Destruction of Jerusalem (fig. 3.7).

Although architectural elements of Duke’s Place great synagogue were included here, there is a problem with lending focus upon a single individual. “Nothing is here to impress us with the grand spectacle of an entire body of fellow-worshippers, standing to ask forgiveness on this day of judgment”. The Chronicle seems by this to say that the Jewish atonement image is a collective issue, rather than focus on psychological guilt states of individuals in Christian theology. Furthermore from this critique we also do not perceive in these images the grandiosity of the Jewish religious buildings, which reflect the position of Jews in the English Landscape. Depictions of the synagogue of Great St. Helens, and St. Albans Place in their expected grandeur existed in architectural pages (Fig. 3.33, 3.34, 3.35). In electing officials that represent the Jewish body for the Illustrated London News, as well as the prized architecture, is also depicted in wood engraving for the architectural pages to represent British-Jewry’s status. The eclectic costume represents the gathering of the Jews that representing a messianic quality of a people comfortable in their own land. Taking The Law out of the ark – beneath the Tables of the Law, maintains a divine presence as the individual is part of the national community. The Cathedral Synagogues give community presence within the city landscape.

The third critique, as I mentioned, the editorial was complaining about the lacking “idealisation…[that raises] the subjects out of the ordinary”. It would seem that a concept of Holiness was the Chronicle’s order of the day. An exception was made with Lighting the Lamps, Eve of the Sabbath”, where

---

340 Ibid.
“there is certainly something devotional, something truly elevating in the face…but would not the sanctification of the Sabbath Kodesh [Holy Sabbath], which, after all, is the ceremony of the Sabbath eve, have more appropriately represented what the artist wished to depict than the ceremony actually delineated?\textsuperscript{341}

It appears that the \textit{Chronicle} had missed Solomon’s reference to Picard’s \textit{Searching for Leaven} (fig. 3.36), the little girl on the left of Solomon’s image seems to imitate the matriarch of the house – over similarly carved table legs. The manic hustle and bustle in Jewish life in Picart prior to Passover is indeed a ritual, but one of domestic ordinariness nonetheless. In fact Solomon’s work before the Sabbath was more hallowed for its gender norms, as the Picart mocks the Jewish male in his pre-Pesach spring clean. By including the word \textit{Kodesh KDSH} to refer to the Sabbath the editor was making the point that he did not read biblical realism in the same way that Solomon or Hunt wished to depict a biblical realism in the ordinary sense, the rituals of everyday life.\textsuperscript{342} This reference to the sacrosanct nature of the Sabbath eve, is directly connected to a challenge by Sabbatarians who were campaigning to make \textit{Sunday} the Sabbath day, as a day of rest for labouring masses enshrined in law. The orthodox Jews would have to lose two days’ income. The sacredness of the Jewish Sabbath that the editor addresses in the \textit{Holy Sabbath}, marks his intent to mark off Saturday \textit{itself} as being Holy for the Jews.

We are left with the editor of the \textit{Chronicle’s} equivocal stance towards a Pre-Raphaelite biblical realism, and moreover, equivocations about celebrating the ordinary nature of Jewish ritual. Likening Benisch’s simile comparing the biblical translator to the daguerreotype portraitist does not effectively compare to Smith’s interest in the photographic influence over biblical realism. A work of art, to the \textit{Chronicle}, does more:

\textsuperscript{341} \textit{Jewish Chronical, ibid.}
\textsuperscript{342} I described in the last chapter, the equivalent to the German, \textit{heilig}, sanctified, elevated, and thus separated.
to qualify as a ceremony, it needs to be out of the ordinary. It’s a paradox, because the Jewish “career” seems pre-destined, an ordinary and assimilated into day to day lived existence – a Halachah, a path, or a system of rules.\footnote{The Chronicle complaint contains an essence of the Jewish Joke: waiter, the food is terrible, and the portion sizes are too small.} The terms of ritual life is likewise boundaried into the Kodesh, a holiness that in Cohen’s assumption of the critique, should be reflected in rituals of joy. Solomon could have responded by placing Kodesh in the very centre of Carrying the Scrolls of the Law, which was the subject of the last chapter. In it, I described how Solomon depicted the moment in liturgy about the path of the Law being pleasant. I also described the pointer hand (yad), which implied that the subject of the Law is interpellated from birth and goes on a pre-destined career.

There are however, two more reasons for the Jewish Chronicle’s specific critique. The fist comes from perceiving the high attention paid to the accuracy of the Hunt picture, The Finding of the Saviour in the Temple in a long letter to the editor.\footnote{Isaac Bernstein, “Finding of the Saviour in the Temple”, in Jewish Chronicle, (15 June, 1860), 7.} It gives a Talmudic exegesis in near excessive detail, of both Jesus of Nazareth, as well as minute halachik errors in the painting, from the concept of the colour blue in the tzitzis – techeles, to the number of threads it should contain. It also described male and female head coverings that were so important to the acknowledgment of Christ the last chapter.

Incredibly, “It is an undisputed rule derived from the Scriptures, that the “phylactery” on the forehead cannot be worn unless the other has been previously fastened on the arm. If the artist should have omitted this, it would constitute a gross mistake”, and I can see immediately that the head tephillin is being held by a principal rabbi with the cataract was in fact holding his head tephillin with his middle finger still strapped up.

There is a very particular order to the strap tying and untying that was omitted from the ritual object, but although the Jewish viewer would immediately detect the error, in
contemporary times this would just seem like a trifling thought. It is perhaps ironic that Chronicle contributor was falling into the very anti-ritual critique that Christ was making about the pharisees, or it could have been a laboured joke. The point however, is that the minutiae of the Jewish tradition had to be an insider language, and that the Chronicle held a high standard for its depictions of ritual accuracy.\textsuperscript{345}

Solomon’s famous drawing \textit{Babylon Hath Been A Golden Cup}, from 1859, melding the myths of Saul’s abuse of David (as I describe is associated with Robert Browning’s poem in the last chapter) with Bacchus, and the depravity of Exile. The image seems to snipe roundly at Hunt’s neglect of the strap binding and unbinding order, with the whole arm \textit{tephillin} loosening as the Jewish man falls into musical Dionysian absorption. It thereby depicts an insider’s Jewish artist’s knowing that the Law is being neglected in a non-\textit{halakhik} unbinding, which in that sense has a double neglect of the Law. To Solomon’s figures in exile, The Law’s ritual orders are neglected and lost, but not through Rabbinic mistake or intent, but through the metaphor of sexual abandon. My point as I mentioned, is that the Chronicle are engaged in debates of the time with Christian scholars, and that they felt a responsibility to point out any errors in the portrayal of Jewish ritual. That would associate with Yeazell’s argument that genre is fundamentally about empathy, where the self identifies with the real world depicted, and assimilates into it. The pursuit of Solomon’s minute ritual errors, paradoxically enough for the Jewish Chronicle in 1862, was an ambivalent and contested form of image assimilation \textit{into}, rather than out of, the ordinary. The ideal or holy world they want needs to be out of the ordinary, yet must contain accuracy of an ordinary life. As well as marking out Kodesh on the scrolls breastplate, Solomon responds in future by depicting other forms of revelation.

\textsuperscript{345} Weiner, op. cit.
Unimportant Genre

A more unknown reason behind the Chronicle’s distaste could have been a reflection of critical taste against genre. In 1862 Gambart’s International gallery in Pall Mall exhibited two pictures by the famous artist, Henri Leys.\footnote{“Fine Arts and French Exhibition”, Illustrated London News, 11 April 1862, 405.} They are written up by the London Illustrated News, “Leys is only represented by two small unimportant little Rembrandteque pictures of a “Synagogue in Prague” (fig. 3.37) and “Paul Potter in his Studio”.\footnote{It may be important for our discussion to compare Leys’s etching (fig. 3.38). Leys depicted Rembrandt in his Studio and attempted to popularise the medium. See Scullen below. For the influence of Leys on the Pre-Raphaelites, see Jan Dirk Baetens, “The Belgian Brand: Ernest Gambart and the British Market for Modern Belgian Art, c. 1850-1870.” Revue belge de Philologie et d’Histoire 92, no. 4 (2014): 1277-1310. I thank him for his discussion about the synagogue depictions.} The adjective, “small”, “unimportant”, and “Rembrandtesque”, are derivative at this time.

“Rembrantesque” apparently connotes a Jewish subject, written with pejorative derision towards its painting technique and methods by which the painter depicts its light. By comparison, the critic lavished Jean-Léon Gérôme’s, Socrates Seeking Alcibiades at the House of Aspasia (fig. 3.39), with a full description of the narrative scene and the moral within the social setting - of the Bearded Socrates trying to seduce the ruler away from Aspasia and back into the male space of the forum. The dog’s bushy tail in the foreground teasing us about the worst morality of Alcibiades, despite the vicious homoerotic overtones of Socrates.

As we saw with the influence of the Etching Club, and under the editorship of C.W. Cope, Solomon’s ceremonial depictions were responding to a more international approach to the etching revival. Gambart’s picture gallery and Royal Academy training infrastructure were doing the same. In some cases were experimenting with sixteenth century Dutch printing methods, particularly in the art and reproduction of of Frederic
Leys, and Solomon Hart’s friend, C.W Cope – both engaged with etching clubs. Alison McQueen discusses a French battle over the engraving needle in French art inspired by Rembrandt’s techniques from the early 1850s culminating in 1862.\footnote{348} To the high art critics such as the writer for the *Atheneum*, they were disengaged with hierarchies and critical fashions of the time.

They engaged in a less popular, and “Rembrandtesque” methods, emulating his style, which in the late 1850s and early 1860s that was dismissed in painting. These techniques made any similar synagogue depictions seem “unimportant”, and now at the end of the chapter we will see that by the end of the decade, even more so. McQueen also notes that in France towards the end of the 1880s the distance from Rembrandt grew in antisemitic tenor.\footnote{349}

There, the depictions of Jews in Synagogue doorways marked out the liminality of the Jewish presence, who had an ambivalent status within the domain of the nation. It may be difficult to associate the withdrawal from Rembrandt’s Jews by antisemitic French critics, on a London community, twenty years earlier. Yet, the point of the attack, that the Jew is depicted by Rembrandt, on the threshold of society in Ley’s image of the synagogue in Prague does contain some truth. The old rabbi is on the threshold at the entrance to the synagogue, there are notices on the board, mounted up without having been cleared away, the plaster of the walls of the grand synagogue is crumbling, and he is walking into the gloom. A neglected tallis is strewn on a pew. The Hannukah lamps are there, but so high up in the room that they seem to reference the Menorah of the Arch of Titus, and it thereby


\footnote{349} *Ibid.*
signifies the loss of proud Jewish nationhood, the people’s ancient and glorious days, which like the crumbling walls, is past its best.

As has recently been commented by an exhibition devoted to pre-Raphaelite art at the British Museum, we cannot ignore the very striking similarity between Rembrandt’s *Jeremiah* (fig. 2.40), and Solomon’s *Fast for the Destruction of Jerusalem* (fig. 2.4). The two figures loom out of the darkness, grieving the very same loss. Solomon’s *Fast* even depicts a candelabrum that Leys flashes in his earlier work, like a kind of *Menorah* on the Arch of Titus. If we were to judge Forrest Reid’s description from before, that the series possessed “a kind of nostalgia, a homesickness, a sickness of the soul”, then by the comparison of *The Fast of Jerusalem* to *Jeremiah*, we have to acknowledge that it is both correct in both associations with the Rembrandtesque elements, and of an ambivalence of Jewish assimilation in exile and their alien homesickness. What happens to the patriarchal bonds of sexuality when he sits, a figure of exile, on the floor? Perhaps he tells exciting tales like in the house of mourning. The ghosts of the noble past flicker on the curtain once more.

And yet, to the author of the Once a Week article, these are not feminised Jews. They are patriarchal attachments within the lived reality and entitled to be citizens and lawmakers. I asserted for the first time that the article written for *Once A Week* (fig. 3.11 and 3.12), was written by “Reb” Aaron Levy Green (fig 3.41). Reb Aaron (as he was affectionately known) was important as both a community minister, and given special dispensation to address the community. As Alex Jacob’s writes, his inclusion as a correspondent in the Samuel Lucas paper is important to British Jewish history, because in

---

350 The Chief Rabbi, Nathan Adler, ensured that were no official Rabbis in Anglo-Jewry, and thereby held the monopoly over orthodox rabbinic infrastructure. Alex Jacob’s essay is an excellent account of Reb Aaron, Alex Jacob, "Aaron Levy Green, 1821—1883." *Transactions & Miscellanies (Jewish Historical Society of England)* 25 (1973): 87-106.

351 Ibid.
the previous decade he wrote an defense against Christian anti-Jewish assumptions about the sincerity of their oathtaking. The essay that was written for *Once a Week*, once again seemed to attack the conversionist premise of Jewish inclusion through conversion.

Furthermore, looking at his portrait, it seems that his image with his flat skullcap and short beard, was depicted in the series as the *pater familias* in Solomon’s depiction of *Passover* (fig. 3.6). He was by this time the reader for the Great Synagogue at Dukes place, and the depictions match the architectural features of the depictions with the front pews in *Carrying the Scrolls of the Law in Synagogue* (fig. 3.4), as well as the large romanesque windows and columns in *The Day of Atonement* (fig 3.8). Both the actual depictions of Reb Aaron, and the Synagogue, would imply the importance of these depictions as documentary evidence of actual Jewish life, with the real Reb Aaron.

Also, as was important for the last chapter on establishing patriarchal attachment to Rabbinic Lawgivers, Levy Green emphasized the separation of Jewish life into male and female domains, with the blessing for men thanking God that they were not made a woman, and declaring “their presence in the gallery is, in theory, only tolerated on the hypothesis that it forms no part of the synagogue”. Levy Green continues to write that, “in everyday life the sexes are as much on an equality as among other civilized peoples”, while thereafter attempting to portraying a nuanced approach to female domesticity that has rabbinic import in separating from the Reform movement: he discusses the liturgical importance for women in their rabbinic command to perceive that the immutable God, “Who has sanctified us with thy commandments, and commanded us to light the lamp of the Sabbath”, while in matters of Challah separation “officers have been appointed to see that the dough is prepared by the baker in the orthodox way”. Through an acknowledgement of these particularities in the images and the text, it seems that the depictions therefore ennoble a safe and patriarchal, sincere orthodox Jewish life.
Synagogue at Genoa

In the bibliographic appendix to the Young George Du Maurier’s letters, the barrister, Derek Peypes Whitely, cited that to Edward Burne Jones, the wood engravings for *The Leisure Hour*, were described as “the most imaginative work he had ever seen”. Without talking about the queer public sexual martyrdom, Peypes Whitely described that Solomon’s career collapsed “owing partly to adverse press criticism of his later work” and that “he refused commissions and no longer painted.”

Solomon had risked dismissal in what T.J. Clark would term the “art world” through these unpopular styles inspired Dutch realism, both in 1862, and as we shall see from my archival discovery, again in 1871. The critical art world can be defined as both Solomon’s group of colleagues, and a wider group of writers he may or may not have known personally.

As I have discussed in the introduction and in the previous chapter, the latter year coincided with anti-Jewish hostilities in the nation as a whole. Both of these groups were overlapping, and reviewed his symbolic agenda with the tensions between an artist, his colleagues, and his public. As I have shown in the introduction, at this time his colleagues were facing tensions of their own: A.C. Swinburne and D.G. Rosetti, who were in the throes of the scandalous “Fleshy School of Poetry” critique in October where Solomon was also directly mentioned. I also show that the affair happened just after Solomon severed his relationship to Swinburne after he asked for a review of his prose poem of *A*

---

353 Ibid.
355 As I have laid out in the previous chapter, the latter year coincided with the critical problems Solomon was facing due to anti-Jewish prejudices the nation had as a whole in response to Disraeli’s election strategies, see Wohl, “Ben Juju”.
Vision of Love for the *The Dark Blue* but it didn’t turn out the way he wanted, and wrote back to Swinburne impertinently.\textsuperscript{356}

Solomon, by way of an obsequious apology, seems to describe his frustrating relationship to critics. He self-deprecatingly, or perhaps rudely explains to Swinburne that he is exhibiting a picture in the Dudley of “A Synagogue” (fig. 3.41), which he perhaps sarcastically tells his friend and critic, is “liked more than anything I have ever done”.\textsuperscript{357}

As we have seen, the interior critical relationship to his Jewish work was ambivalent in that it both celebrated his Jewish art, but was particular about its ritual accuracy, and to Swinburne, Solomon was being deliberately bitter towards his friend that had let him down.

Solomon admits that the image is a return to an earlier form that his public expects from him, that he “intend[s] now to go in for a different kind of work and cultivate that element that was more prominent some years ago…” although he does not talk of “that element” as a return to a Jewish theme specifically. Instead he specifies that “I mean the dramatic (on the intellectual side) and the effective (on the artistic side).”\textsuperscript{358}

The terms “dramatic”, “intellectual”, and “effective”, seem to mock the critical terms of his critical friends, merging those of Sidney Colvin’s value, “intellectual” with other contemporary critics.\textsuperscript{359}

However, one critic writing for the *Art Journal* notes that, “‘Carrying the Law in the Synagogue at Genoa’ is, except to Jews, an uninteresting, and, to all, an undramatic, subject”.\textsuperscript{360} In reading this letter in light of the future *Art Journal* critique of his work, we do not know if the intellectually dramatic, or the artistically effective, are mockeries of

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{356} That fury was written about in the introduction
\textsuperscript{357} Simeon Solomon To Swinburne ca. October 25, 1871 in Lang. 2, *Ibid*. 404
\textsuperscript{358} *Ibid*.
\end{footnotes}
those critical values, or are meant in earnest. The critic speaks of the frequency that Solomon depicts “the gloom of dark interiors; but, like Rembrandt, he also delights in the contrasting glory of strongly lighted surfaces.”

From the archival photograph we see the small window of the synagogue, and the familiar pews – occupied by the familiar types of people from 1862, Carrying the Scrolls of the Law in Synagogue (fig. 3.4) and 1866, The Rejoicing of the Law (fig. 3.21). The man with the thick glasses is present on the left, like the character in the Tucher Alter piece from the previous chapter, and the man with the fur streimel in earlier iterations has in 1871, been given a very large Indio-Arabic turban. The tallis in left, draped in the left seat just as previous iteration, but now it is clear that it is a quotation of the abandoned tallis strewn in Leys’s Synagogue entrance. There are hints at ghost stories from the Ceremonials, as the window is covered by a blowing curtain. Perhaps the lost biblical world of the past looks in like the first depiction of Tabernacles (fig. 3.9).

The realism of his synagogue depictions ten years later, based on your social distinctions of continental taste for or against Dutch styles, was quite an unimportant one “other than to Jews”. It is true that the liturgy at this point in the service is dramatic, with the final call, Save us! for the Hossanah Rabbah at the end of Tabernacles, is said in the most primal and sombre repetition. It is the final days of atonement. The critic is equivocal, noting “yellow surfaces worked over with gold thread is a favourite study with this artist, and one in which he excels” – and although we cannot see it in the small “cabinet piece”, the colour therefore refers back to the Young Rabbis holding the Law in Chapter two. Lulavim palms and Esrog citrus are imported from Genoa for Sukkos. However, so similar in type to the earlier photographs of Carrying the Scrolls of the Law
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361 Ibid, my emphasis.
362 Ibid.
in Synagogue, and The Rejoicing of the Law that they must be remembered pieces in this depiction. Adding the lulavim, and transferring the scene to a Safardi synagogue in Italy makes the concrete genre connection to Picart’s Procession du Palmes in the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue (3.23), ensuring that the depictions are indeed kept important for Jewish art historians as worlds of the past.

The critic seemed to miss the eclecticism, favoring instead to cite the dim interior, and the unimportance of the depiction to anyone but a Jew, just like the 1862 critic for the Leys’s unimportant Rembrandtesque synagogue at Gambart’s gallery in Pall Mall. As genre, it is ordinary, and the characters within Yeazell’s terms for genre, are either unassimilable or unimportant, that is to say in Jewish studies, ambiguous, or contested.

This chapter has described how critics are both favorable and dismissive of the artist at the same time. Solomon detects a pattern in this criticism. To cite Gilman, while he seems to belong in these ordinary genre depictions, their Rembrandteque and Poe like portrayals of a real world within a lost world seems definitively by Sander Gilman “unable to command the language, discourse, or both, of the world” that they inhabit.363

There are still hints at Solomon’s attempt at interesting forms of inter-cultural, cross temporal eclecticism. The group on the right seem to be wearing Greek Coptic caps, the boy is about to drop his prayer book from exhaustion. The processing Rabbi’s hair is long like a patriarch, and there is a distinct reference to fifteenth century portraits of young men in red caps by Botticelli in front of the central window, just behind the familiar staring face of Reb Aaron from the painting by Barnet Samuel Marks (fig. 3.41). Beyond the eclecticism is the original symbolic source. Reb Aaron holds his palm, and the esrog rests on the pew before him like a still life on a ledge.

363 Gilman, Op cit.
Perhaps finding hidden meanings in Dutch Genre might be appropriate at this stage in Solomon’s symbolic work. In the Jewish mystical tradition, while the palm represents the spine, the citrus represents the heart.

The rabbi confronts the viewer. He was made famous for fiercely defended the Jewish right not to convert and seeing us assimilated and perhaps converted, has dropped his heart. Who could know that the rabbi is staring out to invite the viewer to pick it up again?

This thesis has described the effects that a changing Hebrew stereotype has on Solomon’s reception between 1860 and 1870, and its effects on recent exhibition culture that tends to separate Hebrew and Hellenic themes; as if there is a chronological schism between the authenticity of his Jewish world and his desire that leaves the former behind. Solomon’s historical chronology was the events towards the end of the Jewish emancipation, and the racial and cultural implications for the Jewish image between Arnold’s and Disraeli’s national Hebraism that came to define constitutive parameters for the Jewish symbolic assimilation into the national image. These parameters filter into the art world’s new expectations for the delineated Hebraism, demonstrating that aesthetic expectations of delineated masculine Hebraism, and aesthetics of divine election, counters Solomon’s appropriation of romantic tropes in English literature, constituting British aesthetic tropes that would give him more canonical status in British Art History. The first two chapters wrestled with the problems of Solomon’s Hebrew delineation in philosemitic narratives, and how it spars with queer Freudian assumptions of the castrated Jewish stereotype in reference front of Mosaic and Rabbinic lawgivers among post holocaust
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Jewish studies. I tested those assumptions of European Jewish stereotype by looked at concurrent depictions of lawgiving in England, and depictions of embodying lawgivers through to resistances to male becoming by unmale youths.

In these alternative Hebrew terms to queer Jewish theory, Solomon’s romantic intentions to include feminising, fragmentary, inter-cultural syncretism seem insincere to the Hebrew delineation, and has challenging gendered implications on a new philosemitic Jewish stereotype. As I have shown in the second chapter, their national impact has an effect on the popular literature of gendered genre scenes, as the Hebrew comes to represent the Law and Mosaic Lawgiving. As I have shown in prior chapters, Lawgiving or strong masculine Hebrew delineation are also engaged by the artist, even when Solomon’s appropriates a contrary romantic Jewish image through his Vision of Love Revealed in Sleep, in 1870. Doing so is a notable lacuna in Jewish studies and social studies that interiorises antisemitic images of the effete Jews in post-colonial theory, and their celebrated “queer” stereotypes. The seeming maladjustment of effeminate, misty romanticism, with the renewed (and temporary) scientific grounds of masculine Jewish stereotype becomes brackish – even to his sympathetic allies, and Solomon’s work runs into the art world’s critique. I apply the word “self-hatred” by the Jewish scholar, Sander Gilman, to understand accusations of Solomon’s Jewish insincerity when he explores apparently non-Hebrew or rejected themes upon the newly accepted tropes in a renewed British interest in biblical art and its parameters.

365 See discussions of Kafka’s “Before the Law” through Derrida and Butler, op. cit.
366 I have given much space in the first few chapters into differentiating my thesis from popular American academic studies of Jewish feminization in non-British Jewish stereotypes in the castrated Jewish anxieties.
367 Boyarin, Gilman, Felsenstein, Geller, op. cit.
368 See Giebelhausen, op. cit. I note the omission of British jewry particularly his omission of Disraeli within Gilman’s linguistic project. What results is the logical implications if British-Hebraism on the Jewish subject who does not take his stereotype. It takes the pattern of Gilman’s Jewish stereotype, but is not a criticism of his work.
With regards to the aesthetic parameters of Hebraism in a wider dissemination in the art world, I discussed how the political uses of the Hebrew image varied widely across high and low platforms during the era of economic equipoise and reform, dividing the function of biblical images between the ancient universities and the dissemination of print among the cottager classes from the more broad-church organs, as well as the juridical environs of the houses of legislature. This thesis therefore looks through Solomon’s biblical symbolism that constitutes that contrary national engagement with Hebrew delineation in the 1860s and reiterations in his later projects, while acknowledging his intention to appropriate what becomes incongruous Jewish images of romanticism and gendered becoming in English literature in earlier publishing years prior to the thematic schisms of the 1870s I discussed.
Chapter 4. Sovereignty

This thesis has introduced the difficulties that Solomon faced between two types of Jew in national symbolic cultural apparatus between the interior visionary romantic; and the revelation of Hebrew Law. Solomon’s romantic project that produced concatenations of his images as he anticipated in one type of Jew congruent with romanticism, was bound to fail as a form of insincerity, or self-hatred, according to his Hebrew stereotype in the national image. This chapter will discuss the notion of Solomon’s depictions of sovereigns which traverses either notion of revelation, as interior or exterior Law. In political theory, the “body of the sovereign”, also called the crown, holds the subject accountable through its attachment; but the sovereign also embodies a state of impunity, or exception. This chapter is uses typological projections and revelations of the abuses of sovereign power, to navigate between the two types of Jewish image. Solomon’s seemingly “obvious” motive, in depicting David and Jonathan’s love (as Colin Cruise puts it), has led to a blind spot regarding Solomon’s fantasies of Saul’s relationship to David, and the projections of national apparatus through the romantic/Legal dialectic. The story of Saul in the


370 Discussions of David and Jonathan in Simeon Solomon’s work will be assessed below. Colin Cruise, “Truth, Nature and Intensity: Solomon and Schnorr Illustrating the Bible,” in PRS Review eds. Carolyn Conroy and R. Ferrari 28, no. 3 (Autumn 2020) 5-17. 6; a podcast from Minneapolis Museum of art talks about Solomon’s repeated use of David and Jonathan to mark a sexual identity assumption during puberty, “… Simeon, incredibly precocious and hitting puberty. He’s well aware of the story of Jonathan and David, so when he goes on to study at the Royal academy at age 15, he latches on to this story as a way of exploring this kind of love within the very acceptable bounds of the bible. He draws Jonathon and David, over, and over.” Tim Gihring hosts, “Unspeakable love: the rebel that went too far”, The Object Podcast (podcast), Minneapolis Institute of Art, June 2020 (from 5:00 min.) https://soundcloud.com/theobjectpodcast/unspeakable-love-the-rebel-who-went-too-far on 20/11/20. I helped Dr Noam Sienna with research for this project. It is interesting to note how the Tate website gave a now often discussed work in Solomon scholarship the title, Eight Scenes from the Story of David and Jonathan (discussion of fig 4.2). Jonathan is only present in one scene, and eliminates the references to Saul, who is depicted in three, so clearly a more important protagonist. See also discussions of Gayle Seymour’s work below where she writes about the integration of a
Books of Samuel questions the divine foundations of sovereign exception in the British nation.

Solomon’s renderings of Saul and David are framed by the national image which are important in Solomon’s wider image of patriarchal sovereignty and exceptionalism, which places us back into the framework between court and salon displays of gossip and impunity.\(^{371}\) The Books of Samuel have been invoked by political philosophers before republicanism to describe the vicissitudes of sovereignty and have been used to legitimate sovereignty in modern state power structures. We have seen how Solomon’s colleagues project insincerity from his fragmentary symbolic concatenations that were non-Hebrew; but also that Jewish self-abjuration is more obviously apparent in Solomon’s depiction of Christian supersession, particularly in exhibiting Jewish imperfection of Old Testament images within the typological pattern. As we saw from Blake Richmond’s statement, not only is a Jew assimilating these Christian symbolic structures seen to be “insincere” in an era when his conversion is no longer fantasized for national integration after 1871; but it also indicates a second form of ruin and Saul’s house is a typological metaphor.

Israel requests a sovereign (Saul) to the objection of Samuel, marking the end to the era of Judges.\(^{372}\) So too, these images by Solomon negotiate the sincerity of his
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\(^{371}\) It is here that I include the important note by Agamben of which described the Arendt’s uses of Carl Schmitt’s Theory of Partisan. In her work, On Revolution, which defines Sovereignty during civil wars as a questionable moral form by which Nazis threw off its moral duty; between real, and fictitious, “states of exception”. I however, describe the definitions of exception with regards to the mythologies of divine right through blessings of election above the Law. Georgio Agamben, *State of Exception*, translated by Kevin Attell (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press), 3.

converted Jewishness in an era of post-emancipation, with David representing a type of Christ, and Saul the superseded king of Israel, who loses the divine spirit. In traditional typological readings before this era, Saul represents a type of hostile superseded regime, whereas David represents election and a type of Christian sovereignty, and so David and Jonathan’s love might seem to be triumphant over the persecution, a quaint metaphor of triumph over the persecution faced by homophobic oppression made in the argument of Oscar Wilde’s first trial. In a couple of gay liberation platforms since the 1980s, queer readings of Solomon’s early illustrations to the Bible story of David and Jonathan also functioned as a mode of gay legitimation (probably because they are familiar with Oscar Wilde’s speech, rather than the Bible), invoking the passages from 1 Samuel 18, describing the souls of David and Jonathan knit together in covenant. David also

373 Abraham Benisch translated a Hebrew bible to avoid the typological translations that he found threatening from King James’s Old Testament. For Benisch’s political interests in this area, see chapter 2. Benisch, Abraham. Jewish School and Family Bible (London: Jewish Chronicle Office, 1851), “Introduction”, passim. I acknowledge that as a form of Bible studies that it is not from my own ideological construction, nor from his, and the changing approach to the hermeneutics between Judaism and Christianity is marked within poetry of Robert Browning. It is important to acknowledge the misuses of supersessionist thought by the academy, and as Bryan Cheyette has noted, even in popular political thinkers such as Agamben, Alain Badiou, and Slavoj Zizek. As the Bible scholar and Philologist, Hindy Najman, points out in an earnest and personal lecture, these topics in Bible studies are difficult to express because they are calling out forms of religious biases, and even racisms. Cheyette, Bryan. “Against Supersessionist Thinking: Old and New, Jews and Postcolonialism, the Ghetto and Diaspora.” The Cambridge Journal of Postcolonial Literary Inquiry 4, no. 3 (2017): 424–39. Najman, Hindy. “Philosemitism and Antisemitism in Biblical Criticism: Prof. Hindy Najman” paper delivered at The Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Antisemitism and Racism, Tel Aviv University 22.11.17 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tv_h4ILxypo&t=2600s Second, the Jew in exile represents his guilt and covenantal supersession, which flies in the face of the “shame-free” or “unrepentent” agenda. Contested faultlines with Judaism appears in the covenantal parameters of dispersal, or galus may come from the effects of sin (chet) – and the natural end of prophecy, but unlike certain Gospel narratives does not imply covenantal supersession and the loss of spirit.

374 Colin Cruise recently wrote about how David’s “character and ambivalent sexuality attracted Solomon, for reasons that are perhaps obvious to us now. For example, he depicted the loving relationship between David and Jonathan several times in his juvenile designs” (my emphasis). Colin Cruise, “Truth, Nature and Intensity: Solomon and Schnorr Illustrating the Bible,” in PRS Review eds. Carolyn Conroy and R. Ferrari 28, no. 3 (Autumn 2020) 5-17. 6; a podcast from Minneapolis Museum of art talks about Solomon’s repeated use of David and Jonathan to mark a sexual identity assumption during puberty, “and now: here’s Simeon, incredibly precocious and hitting puberty. He’s well aware of the story of Jonathan and David, so when he goes on to study at the Royal academy at age 15, he latches on to this story as a way of exploring this kind of love within the very acceptable bounds of the bible. He draws Jonathan and David, over, and over.” Tim Gihring hosts, “Unspeakable love: the rebel that went too far”, The Object Podcast (podcast), Minneapolis Institute of Art, June 2020 (from 5:00 min.) https://soundcloud.com/thefobjectpodcast/unspeakable-love-the-rebel-who-went-too-far on 20/11/20. I was delighted to have helped Dr Noam Sienna with research for this project.
laments how his love for Saul’s son, Jonathan, transcends the love of women (‘David’s Lament for Saul’, 2 Samuel 23 – 27). So expected is this argument of Solomon’s queer self-knowledge that one image of David and Jonathan is placed on the back of the Jewish Museum Catalogue in 2001 (fig. 4.1). It is yet another example of assumed chronological cleavage, Alisa Jaffe’s error in her introductory essay to the same exhibition as we discussed in chapter one, where she argued that Solomon’s movement towards homosexual themes was chronological, claiming that “The Bride, Bridegroom, and Sad Love of 1865, was one of the earliest of Solomon’s drawings to express a homoerotic quality”. 375 The Tate website gave a now often discussed work in Solomon scholarship the title, Eight Scenes from the Story of David and Jonathan (discussion of fig 4.2, below). Jonathan is only present in one scene, and eliminates the references to Saul, who is depicted in three, so clearly a more important protagonist. 376

The same logic by which attention to David and Jonathan images as celebrations of same sex desire, opens us up understanding of Solomon’s depictions to include the national image of Saul on the same terms of his wrath, sin, and envy, for Christians – and morbidity, and melancholy for Jews who see his pursuit of David as legitimate attempts to nullify a pretender. However, Solomon’s renderings of David from 1855-1862 also contain depictions of Saul, and therefore depictions of Saul should be understood in terms of the symbolic philosemitic national apparatus, as well as the violent sexuality that he represents in contemporary literature. 377 As I have laid out in my discussion about phallic

substantiation, the biblical sovereign narrative contests to the very idea of gender coming “before the law” in genre theory, when Jews are depicted as an analogic substantiation of Hebrew Law. The image of the sovereign therefore also becomes the very embodiment of the Law distinct to the romantic, fragmentary visionary of an interior law.

In the Books of Samuel, King Saul is superseded by issue that is not his own – King David. Saul loses divine favour as a punishment for not decimating the Amalekites as commanded, and having killed off the priests, used necromancers prior to battle. He lost the ark of the covenant to the Philistines, the enemy of Israel. Saul conforms to the stereotype of Jewish self-hatred defined in my previous chapters, as using foreign divination becomes symbolic of his failure to command the language of the culture that was not his own. Furthermore, in Solomon’s works, King David takes the form of Saul in turn, and laments for the loss of that kingdom with equal dismay, and dances when the ark of the covenant is returned.

Studying Solomon’s depictions from the Books of Samuel has nuanced displacements over the sexuality discourses that would rather depict a triumphantal sexuality from these images, or a “shame-free” art, without recourse to actual discussions of the religious parameters of lament that are evident in those symbolic frameworks of Solomon’s oeuvre. An example of the tension between queer celebration of a supposed sovereign power of subjectivity, and the philosemitic ambivalence Christian symbolic sincerity, can be seen in the in the sales description of Solomon’s drawing, David Dancing before the Ark by Sotheby’s in May 2015 (fig 4.3). The drawing was sold with the story about the drawing’s provenance from a party of Richard Monkton Milnes (Lord Haughton), demonstrating Solomon’s “colourful personality” where “around this time

that *David Dancing Before the Ark* was given to his hosts". As we shall discuss, the image is seen to be a negotiation of self-exposure and unconscious self-exhibition of private parts, as the ark of the covenant is returned to Israel, and David Dances before the ark to Michal’s anger, who represents the hostility of the house of Saul. Bringing the story of Solomon’s personality in Milnes’s salon, with the depiction of sovereign exceptionalism among élites, seems to concatenate both types in my dialectic; interior revelation of one’s own rules; and the depiction of sovereign power.

However, rather than promoting a tale of self-actualization and celebration of the artist, they unwittingly connect the image of *David Dancing* to the story of the artist’s *insincerity* according to Hebrew type, by his old friend Murray Marks. It tells how Solomon came to the Monkton party in green toga, lyre, and laurel wreath, singing Hebrew songs learned from his childhood. The dialectic cannot stand with the projection of what he seems sincerely to be, Hebrew. While the mythology of his exhibition is an example of an expression of Solomon’s vivaciousness celebration for Sotheby’s and Reynolds, Murray Marks was to the contrary in that section of the biography, giving an example of Solomon’s conversion *insincerity* – expressed by the Hebrew song of his childhood that puts both his conversion, and his belonging to an exclusive and élite class indicators (toga, and laurels), in question. Reynolds connected the joy implied by the Songs of Solomon’s upbringing with Marks’s example of his cultural insincerity, merely to evoke joviality and a supposed sexual self-expression, without the complex ambivalent projections over Jewish symbolic assimilation.
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381 Solomon attended Fryston Hall much earlier than 1868, the year Reynolds ascribes by mistake, as Solomon.
As we explored in certain reception anxieties between Jews and Christian theologies in chapters two and three, according to those terms the old Jewish patriarch becomes a picturesque fossil, even though there are bonds of attachment towards him, rather than the young church that represent the future. This form of symbolism worked in dialogue with William Holman Hunt’s work as they were distributed from Bond Street in 1862. The discussion affects notions of Jewish sovereignty as Solomon interiorized their Christian image, and rendering them acceptable for a Christian audience.382

Northrop Frye’s discussion of typology to depict Romantic modalities enabled the Bible to be read as a kind of messianic quest story (as discussed in my introduction’s key terms). However, that typological symbolism is is expected to be abjured by Jews with their own biblical hermeneutic tradition – as discussed in my description of Abraham Benisch’s introduction to his translation of the Bible. Old fashioned art histories of Pre-Raphaelitism have studies the biblical work within these parameters. Defined again, it is a Christian device that marks premonitions from the Old Testament in the New Testament, but that marks a perception of Jews within a stereotype of supersession which implies Jewish imperfection.383 It also critiques the triumphant narrative of Solomon’s implied homosexuality in queer discourse by these images with biblical tropes of lament over the ruined Jewish house, the house of Saul. Solomon thereby invokes Christian supersessions stereotypes of Jews, representing the interiority of the projected imperfection to Solomon’s audience, while also navigating structures of succession in the Christian antitype – as David’s embodies the Christian type.

382 Naylor chooses to sever the relationship of “Christian perspectives” – that is, typological hermeneutics, with sexuality, seeming to foreclose homoerotic readings of David by Saul in wider culture. Because of the contemporary carnality of substantiation, typology does however, hypersexualize the work, undermining her attempts to separate homosexual readings. Aileen Elizabeth Naylor, “Simeon Solomon’s Work before 1873: Interpretation and Identity.” University of Birmingham, 2010.
383 I introduced the debates about how Solomon’s Christian types are imbued with Jewish insincerity, as Jewish conversions are no longer seen to be sincere during their emancipation, however, objections to the emancipation were grounded on the desire to convert the Jews See both Singer, and Feldman, with the particularly vivid example of Thomas Arnold’s ferocious argument. Op. cit.
I will now use the religious sadistic sexual violence fantasies of rape, and child abuse, within the Christian typological frameworks of porno-prophetic biblical reading manifested in Robert Browning’s poem, “Saul”, as the synthesis of the two competing types of Jewish image placed on Solomon. In the poem, and Solomon’s illustrations, the absorption of the raped prophet that becomes a type of Christ, facing the fury and sexual violence of the failed king, which manifests the dialectic between the two stereotypes: strong Hebrew delineation – thrusting sexual aggression; and romantic vision in the salon – the victim’s absorption and desire for the Sovereign abuser that gives power of pardon and exception (or in the euphemized term for pedagogic abuse in its day to this, favouritism). For Solomon studies, child sexual abuse and sovereign impunity is not merely to be associated with studies in classical antiquity: all cultures can be implicated. 384

In Browning’s poem through the voice of David, David is summoned by Abner to cure David of his melancholy. David plays the harp on the level between his strong oak legs, and the face of Saul comes close to him, while Saul runs his hands through his hair and the metaphor implies that Saul orally rapes him. Reading a Victorian image of David’s penetration at the hands of Saul denotes the very play of David before the thrust of the spear-like phallic law into his face. 385 David ends his narrative by emphasizing his love for Saul, and with the abused party’s fantasy (or foreknowledge) of the future repeat of this act of penetration with a spear into his (antitype’s) body. Thus, the failed sovereign’s exceptionalism (in the Spenglerian sense) and the favouritism (abuse), serves to endow the raped David, who fantasized about its repetition with a penetrating spear into his body, as

385 Much like the depiction of queen Victoria handing out batons intending to beat students to the servile school masters at Eton, drawn in a sketch by Solomon from Peter Spy in a letter to Swinburne in the Ashley collection, British Library. The image looks like Britannia in profile in a circle, similar to that of a shilling, with the sovereign handing out multiple batons which can represent a slewing motion. Solomon’s depiction of the Peter Spy cartoon takes a form of currency, where a sovereign’s biopolitical power is made manifest. Op. Cit.
a type of Christ. To non-Christians, and anti-theists such as Swinburne, it can be construed perversely; but David’s fluent description of nature is a romantic sense of revelation is a premonition of his antitype’s scourging: David’s feelings that the world can be expressed in its entirety, is an interior revelation as God’s elect from within the Christ Body itself because according to Christian theology his suffering redeems the world.

Robert Browning’s poetic monologue form questions the binary of good, and evil abusive kings, that embodies Jewish imperfection, doubt, and failure with philosemitic sympathy as early as 1845 and 1855, just as Solomon is creating his early depictions from Samuel beyond persecutor and persecuted types. Robert Browning’s interest in Jewish sovereign’s manifestation of the constitutional king that is desired by David would have been widely read. Given the interest that Solomon had in 1855 in the pre-Raphaelites, and Browning’s associations with them at the time, he would certainly have known of this work.

Typological symbolism was described as a key Pre-Raphaelite device by the literary scholar, George P. Landow. He describes how Ruskin’s writings, Modern Painters was indicative of the pre-Raphaelites symbolic systems. Ruskin uses typological symbols of supersession in the description of Tintoretto’s painting of The Annunciation. He describes “the ruined house” as “the Jewish dispensation”, against the Psalmist’s use of
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386 Morgan, mis-attributes Swinburne’s comment, in George Du Maurier’s descriptions of the event; it is Swinburne who claims that Lucrezia Borgia is like Christ., op. cit.


the “corner-stone” that becomes a type of Christ.\textsuperscript{389} It would be hard to omit the influence of Ruskin’s metaphor in Solomon’s depictions of the house of David as overcoming the “ruined Jewish house” (fig. 4.3, with Michal as the ruined House of Saul), One of Solomon’s depictions of \textit{David dancing before the Ark of the Covenant} portrays the jubilant figure in front of the very ruined house, with Saul’s excoriating daughter and chattel, and therefore represent the kinds of typological symbolism that, according to a Christian tradition, marks the terms of articulation of triumph coming out of the failed Jewish house (fig. 4.3 fig 4.4 fig 4.5) It even has the words from Isaiah; the verse is written in tiny Hebrew writing as if an engraver’s signature. It gives the weight of authorial intentionality despite (or because of) its size in a prayer book’s type-set. The verse from Isaiah Chapter 11 reads in hebrew, “and a branch will come from the stem of Jesse and a branch shall bear from his roots” – perhaps one reading is to describe the vegetable terms of a romantic, genealogical off-shoot from the main plant, a genius.\textsuperscript{390} The young lady in the far right frame is a recurrence of Solomon’s depiction of Ruth with the child Obed.

Solomon Scholar, Colin Cruise points out that Solomon’s concurrent drawing, \textit{Ruth, Naomi and the Child Obed} (fig. 4.6), is biblically significant because it represents the matriarchal lineage in the Jewish tradition, and importantly that according to the last verse in the book of Ruth, Obed is the ancestor of David, and the Madonna-like setting “is a deliberate reminder of the continuance of the house of David in Jesus.” \textsuperscript{391} The doves in the corner are the normal representation of the spirit of God, the trees represent the shoots from the house of Jesse, the infants represent his fruit, and the ark of the covenant


\textsuperscript{390} I thank Aryeh Grossman for identifying the verse.

represents his divine election. The only question is how much the Jewish artist was playing to a Jewish or Christian reading of the text and what this ambiguity serves.

I am also pointing out that Solomon uses the homoerotic narrative in the love triangle between David, Saul, and Jonathan, in a way that was common to recent Victorian popular poetry and art, without the need for women (in this case, the depiction of Michal - fig 4.4 verso) to reproduce the lineage. The homoeroticism of these bonds necessarily navigates a proto-structural elements of kinship patterns. In summary, Solomon’s depictions of David in triumph therefore dictate the negative logical binary surrounding Solomon’s renderings of Saul that have would not be necessarily associated. I point out three issues with typology exhibited in the story of David and Saul: first, that typological readings of superseded Jewish imperfection by modes of Christian biblical hermeneutics refer to an interior Jewish imperfection, which, according to Murray Marks represents a perceived insincerity of his conversion; second, that it is the relationship between Saul and David, that should be of interest rather than David and Jonathan; and that the violence of Saul represents a desired strong delineation, for the ‘porno-prophetic’ modes of attachments of victims to abusers, as represented in Browning’s poem, Saul. This mode concealed abuse by the religious and pedagogic subjects, a Biblical mode, and that, to repeat arguments about a breach between Solomon’s Jewish themes, and later lifestyle as he is attracted to Hellenism, I have shown that abuses of power, and sovereign impunity, therefore, is not exclusive symbolic domain of those that study classical antiquity.

**Saul’s face**

In this section I will include Solomon’s images of the failed king, raising the questions both for the purposes of Christian philosemitism (of depicting the “Jewish” and
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392 Despite the best efforts of Mieke Bal, I am yet to see bible-studies that can navigate the gendered and anti-gendered terms of biblical kinship of Samuel without recourse to structural patterns of sovereign succession – especially queer bible studies of the narrative of David and Jonathan.
therefore imperfect king, Saul). In a nuanced argument about depictions of Victorian same sex desire, Dominic Janes does observe the structural significance of Saul in Solomon’s drawing, but only in terms that the homosexual subject is revealed in the abjuration of women. In working on the Victorian sources of cross-generational, same-sex queerness in ecclesiastical art, Janes looks at the depiction of David and Jonathan as children as a strategy for “clerical sexual secrecy” in “a fantasy of youth as an Edenic space of pure love.” It functions as “spiritually idealised channel for energies which […] might otherwise lead to lives of sin”. In other words the depiction of same-sex love between children is purified of any ill intent. However, Janes notes, if this type of love was innocently perceived, the same paradox about desire calls this evidence into question as a strategy for sexual presentation, for if the love is uneroticized, then it no longer poses a threat to the established order. Janes therefore brings the Solomon image of Eight Scenes as discussed in Seymour’s essay to suggest imagining of overtly homoerotic love between David and Jonathan. It constructs an affirmative homosexual relationship between the youths through the following binary, and so Janes is able to position the sacred love in an overtly eroticised way: The eight scene story that Seymour discussed contrasts David and Jonathan’s love with what Janes sees as Saul’s abjuration of women: “the disgust at female nudity that may contain an element of misogyny” (fig 4.2, detail). Janes contrasts Solomon’s depiction of Saul’s reaction towards Jonathan’s love for David, and Saul’s “disgust” for the women. The binary (desire for men or disgust for women) is evidence that the youths can in fact be eroticised - and Janes’ argument concerning the eroticisation of youths is validated. The suppression of these tales is confirmed in wider nineteenth century British Christian contexts in the following decades among boarding schoolboys or

393 See previous footnote.
395 Ibid, 155.
396 Janes 157
monastic life.\textsuperscript{397} Even if I have already shown that the Christian narrative (at least for non Christians and anti-theists), can be construed in terms of sexual violence.

If seen in terms of the desire/abhorrence binary, Janes would make a compelling argument for a structural approach to understanding Solomon’s use of the lateral relations in the book of Samuel, and I will take it further here. I do not deny the sexualisation of David and Jonathan’s love by the artist, and through discussion of these images that will also be confirmed. There are other ways that women are important in the narrative other than in abhorrence, however. They are not eliminated, but as a group play a vital role in sovereign election. While I make an argument about Sovereign election by women here in coronation practices of proclamation and procession, I make the argument in David Dancing that Saul attempts to cement the future of his sovereignty by including David to the succession by marrying his daughter to the rival. Thus an alternative discourse about the inclusion of women in the biblical narrative itself develops: the topic is female exchange, in the exchange of Michal, Saul’s daughter. In the purely patriarchal narrative that eliminates women, therefore, the bonds he is trying to prove are homosexual to start with, as bonds of power are negotiated between them through the exchange of women.\textsuperscript{398} However, the biblical narrative goes further as depicted by Solomon.

**Elective Power of Women and Saul’s Envy**

To Seymour and Janes, Saul regards the half-naked women with assumed disgust as according to their constructionist paradigm, misogynistic abhorrence of women is a phase of homosexual integration. They are dancing with cymbals like in Bacchic festivals from classical friezes. Seymour and Janes argue that drawing Saul’s look of disgust implies Solomon’s sexual preference. That is all very well, however they do not focus on

\textsuperscript{397} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{398} See Gail Ruben, bibliography; See also Stephen Frosh’s superb analysis of the homoerotic negotiation of contracts between two male characters in *The Dybbuk,* in Stephen Frosh, *Hauntings: Psychoanalysis and ghostly transmissions* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).
the crown and raiment that Saul is wearing in the frame which are key props in the crown as sovereign’s body narrative, missing the structural purpose of the inversion itself.

Only in the previous scene, Jonathan gives David his raiment, and in the next frame, the ermine coat that represents his status is seen to be slipping from Saul’s shoulder. The crown appears to be dislodged from Saul’s head amid the tumult of the scene, and he tries to steady it with one hand. The dancing women accidentally tread on his foot. Saul therefore recoils as he is marched over by the women without thought in their excitement for David. The precarious position of the crown and raiment, therefore, symbolise the threat to Saul’s power, stability, and future by the elective power of the women, following the transfer of his son’s election to David in an oath. Procession is a form of proclamation in the ancient natural form of coronation, and the women’s song is a threat to Saul’s sovereignty thus: “and as the women danced they sang out Saul has slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands” (Saul Envies David 1 Samuel 18:7). It is at this moment that Saul wonders if David will take over his Kingdom. Saul’s look is of envy.

Solomon would know from 1856 plans for the memorial to William Henry Miller M.P., that the women’s dancing is a form of election, and indicates deselection. For example, the bas reliefs for the memorial by Alfred Gatley depicted Moses and Miriam Dancing in Song on the one side (fig. 4.7), and The Overthrow of Pharaoh in the Red Sea on the other. The song in the bible proclaims God as king, eliminating Pharaoh: “The Lord Reigns for ever and Ever… 20 Sing ye to the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously: The horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea.(Exodus 15.18-20). Gatley’s bas relief was depicted in a wood engraving for the London Illustrated News, 8 October, 1858, and it seems relevant that William Henry Miller was rumoured of being intersex, and was thus (if we took the Butler metaphor of genre), throwing off the sovereign yoke of gender. So too
was Solomon’s depiction of David dancing before the ark in the same pattern as the memorial (associated here with the pattern for the first time), throwing off the yoke, by revealing his nakedness. Alternatively, he was more likely making a risible public reference to Miller’s gender legend; entirely keeping with his later interest in transvestism. One can compare the pattern of Moses within the wood engraving, to Solomon’s later developed drawing, as if he adapted his design to make a direct comparison. Unlike his earlier sketch where Solomon depicted his revealed genitals, with arms in front of him to hold a harp, Solomon has given David a full skirt and practiced the pose in which he would, like the wood engraving, raise his arms either side. Like the mausoleum which is two sided, with the yoke of the Egyptian oppressors on the frieze on the other side, Michal (a female embodiment of Saul’s house), is on the verso of the David Sketch (fig. 4.4). David thereby turns away the Sovereignty of Law, for an interior revelation depicted by the ark of the covenant. So too, in Solomon’s famous Sacramentum Amoris, written about by so many as the typification of his project of interior revelation, the ark of the covenant is depicted as the pinnacle of their interior revelation, at the top of the monstrance, which I identify here (fig. 4.8). The revelation of Amoris Sacramentum, references that of a High Priest with the mercy seat in the Holy of Holies – the authority of the entire people contained in their singular vision of interior revelation through the concatenation of many symbols; thus the depiction of David in the much earlier drawing of 1860, combines an interior revelation of law with sovereign authority.

399 I have not yet seen this feature described, Davis quotes Solomon’s vision, “the dreamer sees a kind of quasi-homosexual or androgynous pollination taking place between the two male ‘Holy Ones’. ‘six winged and ardent, they bend towards and lightly couch one another ‘like two flower-laden branches’”; while he says “we cannot really tell who the Antinous-Dionysus of Amoris Sacramentum might be and exactly what his action and paraphernalia might mean”; it should be obvious from anyone who has seen the film, Raiders of the Lost Ark, that this particular symbol refers to the cherubic icon in the Holy of Holies. Whitney Davis, “Symonds and Homoerotic Art Criticism”, 207.
Conscience of the King

How does Solomon grant David authority through David and Jonathan narrative? How does Solomon get around the question of the (lack of) future issue, and the depiction of severance of the divine contract? Saul must be written into the love triangle between David, Jonathan and Saul. Remorse is represented in the figure’s knowledge of the loss of his future issue, is “immobilised”, and to use Aycock’s structuralist terms, “made out of the way” for the narrative to continue. Saul’s loss of sovereignty in Solomon’s case becomes more cerebral as Solomon focuses on the face as the site of understanding.

The word “immobilized” to describe that vehicle in pushing a character out of the way for the narrative to continue. Solomon depicts Saul where the immobilization occurs as a form of the shadow of the face that stretches between the two as a kind of anamorphosis (fig. 4.9, right), as if a face stretches as a result of their union, opposite the shadow of David’s erect oath finger. Their oath performs a petrifying succession of Jonathan’s father without the need of a woman. Later, in one of the many dyadic drawings, Solomon depicts the Love between Saul and David, without Jonathan as the intermediary (fig. 4.10); and that late image, with Saul’s spear and David’s harp, seems congruent with the Browning poem.

Concentrating on the melancholy face of the superseded monarch is important for Solomon studies; as it represents the depiction of superseded covenant through sin, which becomes the Arnoldian feature of cultural Hebraism. The activist and writer of a monologue about Solomon, Neil Bartlett, opened up the options for queer expression to include remorse or regret. His critique of the 2005 Solomon exhibition considered

Solomon’s “true subject - the introspective mind”.[^402] By an introspective mind, Bartlett meant the feature of Solomon’s faces that was similar in the faces of both Solomon’s late and early works, of an undefined “scrutiny; the inward gaze of conscience”, which for Saul becomes immobilized and petrified in a very early depiction (fig. 4.11). It seems to be a study for his later depiction of *David took an Harp* for the Dalziel Bible Gallery (4.12, and detail), but that was planned earlier, around 1856-7 (fig. 4.13). These re-emphasize the connection to Pater’s sense of decay in early writings on Solomon’s romantic agony, in Solomon’s heads of the Medusa described in the introduction.[^403] Solomon displays sympathy with Saul’s character’s recognition of his inability to carry the entire Law, and is immobilized to make way for his successor, for the narrative to continue. *Corruptio Optimi Pessima* (fig 4.14) is an example of Solomon’s later works that serve to demonstrate the “petrified” face of the subject whose time is congealed. It connects the theme of “loss of innocence” and the “conscience” of the loss of sovereignty within the Lament’s refrain by David, *oh how the mighty have fallen.*[^404]

In part of our discussion of sovereignty and subjecthood, this “conscience” is represented by the artist in depicting the biblical character of Saul, when the character had been conventionally represented with wrath towards David. Solomon’s depiction of Saul displays an interior wrath against the self. It is an “introspection”, and it is not aimed outwards towards an external object, the usurper David, and that recognizes that in his deselection, he has been removed for the narrative to continue.

To see this introspection, as opposed to extrospection, compare Solomon’s early study of Saul’s face to the American sculptor William Wetmore Story’s of 1865 (fig 5.15.

[^403]: Ibid.
[^404]: See below. It is no coincidence that Neil Bartlett, who expressed in the late faces that display of the “inward gaze of conscience” above, also owns a drawing of *Corruptio Optimi Pessima* in the Neil Bartlett and James Gardiner collection, expressing the lament.
and detail). The latter contains the traditional wrath in the face of Saul, who is crowned as the messiah, with “anointed of God” in Hebrew (detail). His thoughts are simmering against a pretender. Even in its day, the sculptor made reference to the fury of the stern face of Moses by Michaelangelo discussed in the first chapter. While Freud tried to emphasize the Lawgiver’s composure, here, like Solomon’s late depiction of Moses, the sculpture is in a state of Mosaic wrath, and can be seen in that Saul tugs the similarly long and curly tresses of his beard with a veiny arm, and his other hand has two fingers parted, seizing the arm of his throne in reference to Moses with the tables of the Law. As if to emphasize this analogy, his crown also contains the miniature shape of two rounded tablets at its peak, where the monde piece of a crown would be. If the Law is represented by a monde (also translated as world), the world is personified by Law. To ignore the Law would be to annihilate one’s known world. Saul, in his crown, becomes the lawgiver of an old regime, whose throne is the embodiment of the social covenant between God and the nation. The audience occupies the position of David beneath him, forced to address the Old Testament ideas of monarchy as if in the old regime, or chose to eliminate it from our Christian place in the New.

Pope Pius IX sent the sculpture to gaze sternly at queen Victoria at the Dublin International exhibition in 1865. Whig M.P., Sir Francis Isaac Goldsmid, and as we have seen, an uncle of Solomon’s friends, “a deeply devout Jew” may have purchased the sculpture for an enormous sum as a message towards the Vatican at a time of strain between them and the Jewish community over the Mortara affair, (1858). In an earlier chapter we mentioned how Goldsmid’s own niece, and personal friend of Simeon
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406 Ibid.
407 Bermant, The Cousinhood, 78.
Solomon, Isabel, was almost forcibly baptised. I mentioned the close personal connection between Simeon Solomon and Horatio Lucas, who married Isabel D’Avigdor; whose mother was Francis’s sister. The Goldsmids were also cousins with Leonard and Claude Goldsmid Montefiore; Leonard was the whistle-blower of the Hardinge-Pater affair. It is satisfying to know that all of these individuals, Isabel D’Avigdor and Horatio Lucas, Claude and Leonard Montefiore, grew up with this sculpture as part of their material cultural environment, and Simeon Solomon would certainly have been familiar with it.

If in sending the sculpture to gaze at the Queen is intended to intimidate the viewer by the firesome sight, owning the figure is in turn an act of subversion. Bermant comments on Rev. D. W. Marks’ obituary of Goldsmid, “A clue to his [religious national] feelings” could be found in “its references not to the Jew, but the Hebrew, not to Judaism, but Mosaism. Jews and Judaism were alien, rootless, in exile: Hebrews and Mosaism were established, at home, English.”

The sculpture therefore acts as a signifier of the British democratic monarchy.

Solomon’s face of Saul however is introspective (fig. 4.11), like his later works, denoting Saul’s anxieties about his place within the covenant, and the weakness of his democratic sovereignty. His Jewish sidelocks merge with the ties for his own tzitz - a religious tiara described in the bible for the High Priest, similarly evoking sacred selection (until this day used in orthodox Christian baptism). The strands of the tzitz’s ties are unfurling, as if the tzitz that represents his election is being neglected and undone. The elective tiara in the shiny and metallic band flashes brightly against the darkness of his curly hair. The tie on the left is unmarked, in contrast to the sidelock on the right, implying it is a continuation of the tzitz itself, and on the right where his Assyrian hair is bunched, another strand is loosely flying away like his thoughts. His jaw has dropped. His mouth is

---

open in shock, frozen in time, neither able to utter speech, nor breathe. His eyes look beyond the viewer as if his “conscience” has been “caught” in a moment of realisation that he has no place in the existing covenant.

“Petrified” is Arthur Symonds’s word to describe late Solomon’s dream state of his figures similar to Gustav Moreau’s depictions. The faces of Solomon as Symons put it, describe the “horror of [their] joy”, as “husks of desire”.\textsuperscript{409} I framed discussions of how Jewish myth-ritualism forms an ideal world of Jewish perception, but in this case, I discuss the biblical world where Saul is in a “world not made after [his] pattern”.\textsuperscript{410} As I look at a work by Solomon, where Saul is played the harp by David, \textit{And David Took an Harp}, Saul is rather in a future world that does not belong to him but ceding sovereignty to David. Grief “congeals” and “petrifies” the subject in time, and makes him unable to speak.\textsuperscript{411} This congealment allows the narrative of his people to continue without him.\textsuperscript{412}

\textsuperscript{409} Arthur Symons, \textit{From Toulouse-Lautrec to Rodin: with some personal impressions} (London: John Lane The Bodley Head Ltd, 1929), 149 and 151.
\textsuperscript{410} Symons, \textit{Ibid}.
\textsuperscript{411} Veena Das, \textit{Life and Words: Violence and the Descent into the Ordinary} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007).
\textsuperscript{412} Symons, 149. The “congealment” of time as a result of grief for the loss of children can be found in the opening pages of Lisa Baraitser, \textit{Enduring time} (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2017). After submission, I discovered Stephen Frosh discussed the ethical concern to look back into Sodom while fleeing it, to show concern to those under sulphurous attack, particularly in his discussion of the midrash of Irit, Lot’s wife. Frosh \textit{Those Who Come After}, 37-40. It feels like my examiner did so with me.
Conclusion

This thesis has discussed Simeon Solomon’s presentation of his image between two Jewish mythologies: on the one hand, Solomon is expected to conform to a type of strong Hebraism, which takes a supposed Mosaic revelation as the inherited Law, called delineation; and on the other hand, a type of established dissenting romantic form in English literature, granting the individual an interior form of revelation, by concatenating symbolic fragments. The interior qualities of revelation (subjective interior law), involves an independent fragmentary concatenation of cultural symbols, establishing of one’s exceptional mythology which is a common dissenter form that developed out of exclusion from the regime of Lawgivers. It marks an independent aesthetics of exterior revelation, and Solomon attempted to use European enlightenment frameworks of aesthetics. It treated the individual as a dissenting minority, mimicking the aesthetic principals of enlightenment through the acknowledgment of interior Judgment. The literary cultural currency of individual exception can be promoted in salon gossip, as the artist promotes a myth of interior laws according to his own system called genius. However, this form of independent revelation stands in direct opposition to a unified revelation of Law that occurs prior to the subject, called Hebraism, which places the subject in relation to his responsibilities as a subject of The Law, and its platform was expected in the wider expanded electorate. The thing that creates masculine Lawgivers (a strong delineation) gives the Jewish subject another, more unified Symbol, as his mosaic type.

The tension between the two Jewish types is a late British approach to the forces intrinsic to enlightenment in the nation; especially when cottage and town create differing expectations for the Jewish image. The Jewish inclusion both in Parliament, and as a moralizing force at Oxford represented the changing image of symbolic power. Simply, Solomon is caught between the two types for very specific social historical reasons. I have
tested a supposed unified Hebraism in Solomon’s fragmentary symbolism, as that strong delineation was expected in an inherited Hebraism, is diametrically opposed to a romantic, interior, dissenting vision. I related the parallel chronological example of Benjamin Disraeli’s two novels, the syncretic vision in *Tancred*, and the anti-Papist abjurations in *Lothair*, concurrent with his second rise to power. I also discussed Matthew Arnold’s concurrent cultural theories of Hebraism which gave the Jew a heightened moral status as divine Law-taker. These elements gives the Jew a nuanced frame to perceive typologies of sin and supersession; as well as frameworks of cultural assimilation.

The romantic vision of interior revelation was refused by his network at an important synchronous moment in the nation, when the terms for the Jew’s own dissidence was no longer valid in 1871 as its men from the Jewish community were allowed to participate at Oxford, and in debates around relationships to Hebraism in the national image took hold. I have laid out the social parameters of Solomon’s interests in constructing the artist’s mythology, that was grounded in his relationships to the pre-Raphaelite movement’s uses of romantic dissention, that contributed to the tension between the two types.

As well as one of the modes of Disraeli’s parallel rise to power, the introduction and first chapter described the Solomons in relation to the generation of salon cultures, their enlightenment objectives, and symbolic power, where intricate balance of gossip, wealth, community support apparatus, alongside myths of exception. Through the world of the salon, I repositioned Solomon among the incorrect historic presentation of Solomon’s assumed thematic cleavage, which tried to suggest that that Solomon broke away, or turned aside from his Jewish background towards forms of ‘Hellenism’, and brought attention to attempts during national Jewish crisis that use Solomon’s mythology to demonstrate genius, and claims for Jewish exception among dissenting élites.
The reception of Solomon’s project to concatenate symbolic fragments to represent interior dissenting revelation was hamstrung by the Repeal of Tests in 1871. British romanticism, especially the progress quests towards Beulah, had contingent need for romantic exception to Institution; something that was torn down by Numa Hartog’s achievement of the Wrangler prize. Furthermore, allocentric theories of Hebraism denied both the Jews place in typological elements of the Biblical quest; and the Jew’s supposed place within the puritan systems of morality against the elitist hedonisms within the study of classical antiquity.

The historical background to Solomon’s severance from the art world emphasized the impossible tension between the type of enlightenment exception that produced those forms of individual revelation, with the severance from those moral movements; as Solomon was refused access to its British literary category by his close friend A.C. Swinburne after Matthew Arnold and Benjamin Jowett’s intervention. According to Bernard Falk, Swinburne had just recovered from the affects of his scandalous relationship and death of the Jewess, Adah Menkin. The traumas of that relationship and desire to pull himself from the brink as a result, provided him with a motive to reject his association to his former Jewish partners in scandal such as Solomon. It was both a public example of his own relationship to romantic mythology, and his desire to reign his association with the Jewish artist back. By re-reading Julia Ellsworth Ford’s biography, I demonstrated that Solomon’s assistance with The Fleshly School of Poetry scandal, was an attempt to place himself on the same page as his contemporary romantic poets, but their era, and type of dissenting alterity, was over.

I described Solomon’s dismay of his rejection as the new type of Hebrew was being constructed, and his dramatic attempts to be placed in the category of romantic dissent was evoked in his involvement with the Fleshly School of Poetry controversy. I
showed how was seen to help orchestrate his alignment with the dissenter’s organs, including the *Contemporary Review*’s editor, Alexander Strahan, and was discovered in the fumble over naming *The Fleshy School*’s anonymous author, Robert Buchanan. What the controversy indicates is the tension over Solomon’s place between the Jewish types of strong delineation (Law and parish infrastructure) and fragmentary symbolism (romantic law of interior revelation), as the editor becomes an exemplar of publishing for the majority cottage and domestic periodicals that Solomon published for in the prior decade.

Solomon’s subsequent exhibitionism in 1873 after the Repeal of Tests in 1871, caused a fierce constriction of Jewish type as a moralizing force, represented by the outbreak of morality in Oxford: Solomon’s close friend, Walter Pater, was embroiled in two scandals, first over the initial publication of *The History of the Renaissance*, and second, the Hardinge affair where Leonard Montefiore bravely came forward to expose sexual abuses of power between tutor and student. Further examinations of the use of Jews as moralizing force in the nation after that moment would be useful, especially in the national Institution need to be engaged in the years between 1871, and following 1873; and the rise of the Montefiore brothers’ socialist morality encouraged by Benjamin Jowett’s mentorship. This relationship between Jowett and the Montefiores creates an opportunity for future research to understand alignments of progressive Judaism, to national moralizing forces. It also has the wider implication that Liberal politics in general constrained sexual license in the subsequent decades especially in the constraint of aristocratic exceptionalism as it developed in the mid to late 1880s.413

The second chapter looked at the fringes of a second Hebrew type depicted by Solomon, of a strong delineation that became a reflection of the new Jew as he became a
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413 One might reflect that this thesis passed examination on the same day as the Pincher affair caused mass resignation from Boris Johnson’s ministers. The fear of anti-intellectual associations of the non-Classically trained electorate between Eton-Oxford associated hedonism and the impunity connected to sexual abuse of power, has survived to this day.
representative of the Law in the national image. I use Eric Santner’s corrective to the recent Jewish studies analogues of queer Jewish femininity which attempt to interiorize both antisemitism, and homophobia to attempt assimilation into the queer American academy. The argument Santner constructs is in relation to famous queer-Jewish discussions of Freud’s Schreber case. The contrary narrative brought by Santner to the queer-Jewish question of Jewish alterity runs like so: In fear of becoming a man of status as a Judge, Schreber can no longer yearn for feminine submission to the Law, and subsequently resists his male becoming as a significant legal authority.

Solomon’s use of masculine becoming also relies on these resonances. Solomon’s depictions of youths have actual homoerotic yearning towards the sadism of such legalizing powers they responded to as they too becoming authorities. A similar exchange of roles between schoolboy, and their self-feminization occurs when they relate to the violence of a ‘strong delineation’ of a Mosaic Lawgiver, and as feminized youths, they refuse to abandon him by their resistance to becoming lawgiving patriarchs themselves. I examined Solomon’s depictions of men holding scrolls of the Law as relating their process of male becoming; and questioned the queer Jewish turn of the discourse as “castrated” feminized other in Freudian myth surrounding the reuses of the depictions of Moses by Michelangelo, as violent castrating patriarch. I demonstrated the movement between Solomon’s interiorizations of Jewish horror, and movement towards Hebrew delineation, as Solomon moved from an interiorization of medieval quest and American genre inspired by Edgar Allan Poe, to depict Jewish masculinity rites, towards their installation as Lawgivers in the national image. The chapter, in relaying unmasculine infant’s pain in becoming Lawgivers among the élite, is analogous to the dissenter’s romantic vision, in their resistance to breaking their homoerotic pact as they enter the regime of Lawgivers. It
is a presentation of male progress, of male becoming, that the romantic apparatus foreclosures the sense of male becoming through fierce resistance, or self-castration.

Therefore, the theory I presented regarding Solomon’s characters can be replicated in English romantic literature’s vision quest towards the celestial city – the movement of the subject who resists the construction of Law, as dreaded burden, rather becoming the knowing Patriarch. These youths leave their romantic bonds of brotherhood behind as they breach the hymnal veil to die as virgins and become men. The reception of Solomon’s depictions of Jewish progressions with the Law enacts the tension between the importance of Jewish masculinity of Rabbinic Lawgivers; and the desire for an alternative framework of continental enlightenment, built on representations of the of minority interests in the national pact.

The third chapter of this thesis builds on Solomon’s strong delineation of Hebraism in his depiction of Jewish Ceremonies and Customs as a depiction of “his people”, in contrast to William Holman Hunt’s depiction of the Jews of Palestine. It becomes an historic portrayal of Jewish life within (Kunst) wissenschaft des Judentums, as it is commonly portrayed in contrast to Bernard Picard’s infamous historic representations. I have shown how in contrast with the latter, Solomon’s scenes demonstrate normative gender roles of Jewish domesticity. That is to say, they are designed to resonate with British gender preoccupations within the domestic ideal in the cottage and parish infrastructure, and further emphasize the use of the Jewish image of masculinity for the nation. I discussed the paradox of enlightenment motives in the Jewish community, represented by the ambivalent critique by the Jewish chronicle, and in the review that took place in Once a Week, in that they use the Jewish image to represent analogous rites to Christianity where they were once again published.
I named Abraham Benisch’s agenda in the Jewish Chronicle, which according to David Cesarani took the form of a theological and political debate about Sabbatarianism, the nature of ritual, and Christian supersession. I discussed the extreme lengths that Benisch took in learned defense congruent with his agenda in translating the Bible, as the Jewish community faced irritation from conversion missions and the encroachment of contrary typology fetishes on the Jewish Biblical image. It was an area of concern for the Jewish community that was hounded by conversionists. On the other hand, I contextualized Reb Aaron Levy Green’s agenda in promoting the Jewish sincerity of their oaths in the prior decade, and how Solomon’s images depicted some analogies between the forms of ritual. I designate Aaron Levey Green as the author of the *Once a Week* article that Solomon illustrated and see him portrayed as the model in the images, indicating a sense of British Jewish unity.

The depiction of genre, or scenes of everyday life, had a contradictory importance for the pre-Raphaelites Solomon was associating with, in that the style was seen on the one hand, as unimportant, and on the other, promoted a sense of realism. I demonstrated that Solomon used one of these depictions in an act of self-marginalization towards the end of his association with Swinburne, as if a chastisement of his description of the images’ strong delineation; because the image of the synagogue of Genoa covertly concatenated symbols from various cultures; while still appealing to a form of genre that was considered unimportant, yet was an exemplar of, “strong Hebrew delineation” in the way Swinburne celebrated. The chapter invites further discussion of genre depictions in the national organs and wood engraving for the working masses in an era of equipoise, especially as a result of new work on the Idyllists, such Frederic Walker; that were celebrated by the late impressionists as exemplars of art for the wealthier and newly enfranchised working classes.
The fourth chapter returns to the image of exception and Sovereignty, through his assumptions of typology in the figure of Saul as failed sovereign to represent God’s favour of the British constitution from the Book of Samuel. It contrives a synthesis between the Hebrew depictions, between the Image of the Jew for the cottage, and exceptionalism of the Court Jew. Doing so relegates the importance of the depiction of homoerotic love between David and Jonathan after Oscar Wilde’s famous speech in homosexual canon, and calls attention to the aggressive sexual abuse of King David by Saul under the pretext of typological language by Robert Browning. It once again foregrounds a porno-prophetic reading of the thrilling sexual abuse of David, that, as the psalmist in eloquence of revelation and total awareness of the world, and a foreshadow of the abused Christ, thereafter falls in love with his sexual abuser. Saul’s failure and fetishized sexual violence, makes homoerotic forms of violent biblical aggression. It gives precedent for the depiction of prophet rape in Ezekiel for example, as it was exposed by Swinburne as the core element of child pain in Solomon’s strong Hebrew delineation. Solomon’s interest in child cruelty, his sadism, is exposed by Swinburne in his descriptions of his works of an earlier era; but discussing Robert Browning’s exemplar of Biblical abuse gives cultural precedent.

Solomon’s depictions of David and Saul precedes Pater’s renewed interest in dismemberment in his studies of Dionysus. Pater brings two images from Solomon to display Hebrew brackishness with Dionysian modes; he both uses the image of Melancholy Bacchus in the pattern of King David mourning Absalom of that year; while also discussing Solomon’s Bacchus which depicts one of the spies of Israel holding the grapes of Givon from the prior decade. While Solomon’s Hebrew themes – according to Pater, particularly the loss of sovereign power, becomes brackish in the Lesbian cup: Browning’s Saul demonstrates that there is not a little potential for Child abuse within Hebraism too.
Rather than acknowledging a so-called shame-free art, this thesis returned to the split between a violence of strong Hebrew delineation; and Solomon’s preference for symbolic concatenation as an exemplar of the interior visions of a romantic artist: the latter was a national trope of dissent among literary élites; and Solomon was rejected from its canon as he was attempting an alignment based on restrictions that were no longer in play by 1871; when their sincerity was called into question.

A ‘Simeon Solomon Part II’, a potential achievement of his vision without the critical dismissal by his art world, would indicate a romantic theology of Hope upon the tilled landscape of ethical decimation. That might include the British aesthetics he tried to assimilate, where an abstracted philosophy is aligned with his syncretic symbolic agenda. I argued that a British Jew such as Solomon was not believed to be sincere in this approach in the late 1860s, specifically in that his typological approach from the New Testament, and was not to be trusted by his critics as sincere to his Hebrew stereotype. I understood the typological approach in Northrop Frye, which argued that the New Testament of Bible re-writes the unity of the texts to be re-read as progress myth within the boundaries of the British romantic tradition. However, the first step I needed to do for finding that private aesthetics of revelation was to describe a reading between the more acceptable form of Solomon’s Jewish stereotypes, in his strong Hebrew delineation, with all that implies for exceptionalism in the nation; and to assess Solomon’s contrary depictions of romantic exceptionalism of the outsider genius. Doing so also has important implications on my future encounters with theology, morality, and ethics and the drive for the inclusion of aesthetics in these platforms of moral enquiry among my contemporaries; who would benefit from the enlightenment contexts of aesthetics, and their objectives for civic freedom, prior to an American genealogy grounded the American activism of the 1950s.
This work in revealing the sexuality of Solomon’s Hebraism and strong delineation has offered a corrective to sexual dogmas depicting the Jew as castrated or feminized other by offering alternatives for the Jewish subject in the national image, and has discussed élite assimilation strategies which develop a social context for different images of sovereign exception. The philosophies of symbolism that Solomon had intended were dashed by the critical apparatus, his élite salon strategies had changed according to the Symbolic national pressures towards the Jewish role, especially as Hebrew moralizers. However, the introduction to his tension between the two types of Jew in national image – a witness to symbolic concatenation common to élite dissenters in its romantic literary forms; and the renewed construction of British sovereignty within the Hebrew nation, grants a dialectical method by which Solomon attempted to achieve a kind of exceptional symbolic synthesis.
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