

“HE HATH MINGLED WITH THE UNGODLY”:
THE LIFE OF SIMEON SOLOMON AFTER 1873,
WITH A SURVEY OF THE EXTANT WORKS

CAROLYN CONROY

TWO VOLUMES

VOLUME I

PH.D.

THE UNIVERSITY OF YORK

HISTORY OF ART

DECEMBER 2009

ABSTRACT

This thesis focuses on the life and work of the marginalized British Pre-Raphaelite and Aesthetic homosexual Jewish painter Simeon Solomon (1840-1905) after 1873. This year was fundamental in the artist's professional and personal life, because it is the year that he was arrested for attempted sodomy charges in London.

The popular view that has been disseminated by the early historiography of Solomon, since before and after his death in 1905, has been to claim that, after this date, the artist led a life that was worthless, both personally and artistically. It has also asserted that this situation was self-inflicted, and that, despite the consistent efforts of his family and friends to return him to the conventions of Victorian middle-class life, he resisted, and that, this resistant was evidence of his 'deviancy'.

Indeed, for over sixty years, the overall effect of this early historiography has been to defame the character of Solomon and reduce his importance within the Aesthetic movement and the second wave of Pre-Raphaelitism. It has also had the effect of relegating the work that he produced after 1873 to either virtual obscurity or critical censure. In fact, it is only recently that a revival of interest in the artist has gained momentum, although the latter part of his life from 1873 has still remained under-researched and unrecorded.

Therefore, the function of this thesis is to re-evaluate Solomon's life after his arrest in 1873 and reveal what actually happened to the artist during the final thirty-three years of his life. It does this primarily through a unique study and examination of newly identified archival documents and information. By examining, in particular, the original nineteenth-century records that relate to his arrest in London, and those that record a virtually unknown arrest in Paris in 1874, and putting this in the context of nineteenth-century sodomy law and male homosexual society, it is possible to re-consider Solomon's previously misunderstood resistance to sexual and societal rehabilitation. It makes use of a new critical understanding, which now suggests the non-repentance of the previously seen tragic figure of the homosexual male in Victorian society, which was promoted in part by the Oscar Wilde trials of 1895. The study of the detail of Solomon's later life within this thesis will support these new ideas by promoting the suggestion of the artist as self-consciously queer and unapologetic.

In addition, this thesis includes, for the first time, a survey of Solomon's works produced after 1873, which help to provide an approximation of how active Solomon was artistically; suggest what kind of media he was using during certain periods; record who was continuing to buy Solomon's work at this time, and to make the images of Solomon's extant work available to future researchers. These extant images appear in Volume II of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<u>Volume I</u>	
Abstract	02
List of Illustrations	04
Acknowledgements	23
Introduction	24
I	52
1873: The London Arrest, the Question of the Asylum, and Gossip	
II	87
1873: Solomon's Whereabouts and the Trip to Devon	
III	105
1874 – 1878: The Arrest in Paris, <i>Cleopatra's Needle</i> , (1877), Hollyer, and Hardship	
IV	136
1879 – 1883: First Admission to the Workhouse, Dalziel Brothers' <i>Bible Gallery</i> (1881), and the Burglary	
V	164
1884 – 1887: The Workhouse, <i>Sins of the Cities of the Plain</i> (1881), and Count Stenbock	
VI	197
1888 – 1896: Johnson, Horne and Hollyer	
VII	231
1897 – 1905: The Casual Ward and Death	
Postscript	245
Conclusion	250
Appendix 1: Work in Exhibitions Post-1873	253
Appendix II: Work by Solomon Post-1873 without Images	262
Appendix III: Solomon Prints by Frederick Hollyer	267
Bibliography:	
i.	268
Primary Sources: Unpublished	
ii.	270
Primary Sources: Published	
iii.	285
Secondary Sources.	
<u>Volume II</u>	
Illustrations	

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Simeon Solomon, 1873, from a letter to Mrs Tong dated 30 January 1873, University of Rochester, Manuscript Collection.
2. David Wilkie Wynfield, *Simeon Solomon in Fancy Dress*, circa 1870, Photograph, Royal Academy, London.
3. Simeon Solomon, *A Jewish King and his Page (The Acolyte)*, 1873, Dublin City Art Gallery, watercolour, 216x216mm. (www.hughlane.ie).
4. Simeon Solomon, *Greeks Going to a Festival*, 1873, Dublin City Art Gallery, watercolour, 216x216mm. (www.hughlane.ie).
5. Simeon Solomon, *The Bride*, 1873, Dublin City Art Gallery, watercolour, 381x168mm. (www.hughlane.ie).
6. Simeon Solomon, *The Bridegroom*, 1872, Dublin City Art Gallery, watercolour, 381x168mm. (www.hughlane.ie).
7. Simeon Solomon, *The Voice of my Beloved that Knocketh*, 1873, Location Unknown, watercolour, 497x343mm. (Reynolds, 1985, Pl 66).
8. Simeon Solomon, *Allegorical Self Portrait*, 1873, Minneapolis Institute of Arts, watercolour, gouache and gum Arabic over red chalk, heavy watercolour paper, 355x227mm. (www.artsmia.org).
9. Simeon Solomon, *Night*, 1873, Priv Coll, drawing on paper, 298x445mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
10. Simeon Solomon, *Study, Female Figure*, 1873, City of Manchester Art Galleries, watercolour and oil on paper, 250x151mm. (www.manchestergalleries.org).
11. Simeon Solomon, *Study of a Woman with Red Hair*, 1873, Priv Coll, watercolour/paper, 170x170mm. (www.bloomsburyauctions.com).
12. Six-Place Urinal, Place de le Bourse, Paris, about 1875-78. (Sibalis, 1999, p20).
13. Simeon Solomon, *King Solomon*, 1874, The National Gallery, Washington, egg tempera on paper mounted on board, 495x295mm. (www.nga.gov).
14. Simeon Solomon, *A Bishop of the Eastern Church*, 1874, private collection, watercolour and bodycolour on paper, 305x220mm. (Cruise, 2005, p138).
15. Simeon Solomon, *Pomona*, 1874, Barry Friedman Ltd, New York, drawing, 445x305mm. (Reynolds, 1985, Pl 67).
16. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Love Confronted by Death*, 1874, Birmingham Museums & Art Gallery, platinotype, 232x357mm. (Cruise, 2005, p174).

17. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Until the Day Break and the Shadows Flee Away*, 1874, Birmingham Museums and Art Galleries, platinotype print, 325x253mm. (www.preraaphaelites.org).
18. Simeon Solomon, *Until the Day Break and the Shadows Flee Away*, 1869, British Museum, Graphite and black chalk, with bodycolour and red chalk, 129x154mm. (www.britishmuseum.org).
19. Simeon Solomon, *Aaron with the Scroll of Law*, 1875, Southampton City Art Gallery, oil on canvas, 290x140mm. (Cruise, 2005, p140).
20. Simeon Solomon, *David Mourning Absalom*, 1875, Private Collection, 241x114mm. (Werner, 1966, p50).
21. Simeon Solomon, *Seven Cherubs Dancing*, 1875, The Jewish Museum, red chalk, size unknown. (Burman, 2001, p48).
22. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Spartan Boys about to be Scourged at the Altar of Diana*, 1865, Priv Coll, platinotype, dimensions unknown. (Reynolds, 1985, Pl. 40).
23. Simeon Solomon, *Amor*, 1877, Priv Coll, black chalk, 229x178mm. (Sotheby's, 1996a, p186).
24. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Consecration of the King* from the *Song of Songs*, 1878, Jewish Museum, London, platinotype, 278x184mm. (www.jewishmuseum.org.uk),
25. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Captivity of the Bride* from the *Song of Songs*, 1878, Jewish Museum, London, platinotype, 278x184mm. (www.jewishmuseum.org.uk).
26. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *The Calling of the Bride* from the *Song of Songs*, 1878, Jewish Museum, London, platinotype, 278x184mm. (www.jewishmuseum.org.uk)
27. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *The Invitation of the Bride* from the *Song of Songs*, 1878, Jewish Museum, London, platinotype, 278x184mm. (www.jewishmuseum.org.uk),
28. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Desire of the Bride* from the *Song of Songs*, 1878, Jewish Museum, London, platinotype, 278x184mm. (www.jewishmuseum.org.uk).
29. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *The Nuptials of the King* from the *Song of Songs*, 1878, Jewish Museum, London, platinotype, 278x184mm. (www.jewishmuseum.org.uk).
30. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *The Night of the Nuptials* from the *Song of Songs*, 1878, Jewish Museum, London, platinotype, 278x184mm. (www.jewishmuseum.org.uk).

31. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *The Blessing from the Song of Songs*, 1878, Jewish Museum, London, platinotype, 278x184mm. (www.jewishmuseum.org.uk).
32. Simeon Solomon, *The Magic Crystal*, 1878, City of Manchester Art Galleries, oil on paper, 320x181mm. (www.manchestergalleries.org).
33. Frederick Hollyer, *The Book of Ruth*, 1879, Jewish Museum, London, six prints with illustrated cover by Simeon Solomon, 278x184mm. (www.jewishmuseum.org.uk).
34. Frederick Hollyer, *The Book of Ruth – Then Said Boaz*, 1879, Jewish Museum, London, platinotype, after drawing by Simeon Solomon, 278x184mm. (www.jewishmuseum.org.uk).
35. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Call me not Naomi from The Book of Ruth*, 1879, Jewish Museum, London, platinotype, 278x184mm. (www.jewishmuseum.org.uk).
36. Frederick Hollyer, *The Book of Ruth – But Ruth Clave onto her*, 1879, Jewish Museum, London, platinotype, after drawing by Simeon Solomon, 278x184mm. (www.jewishmuseum.org.uk).
37. Frederick Hollyer, *The Book of Ruth – So Boaz Took Ruth*, 1879, Jewish Museum, London, platinotype, after drawing by Simeon Solomon, 278x184mm. (www.jewishmuseum.org.uk).
38. Frederick Hollyer, *The Book of Ruth – And Naomi took the Child*, 1879, Jewish Museum, London, platinotype, after drawing by Simeon Solomon, 278x184mm. (www.jewishmuseum.org.uk).
39. Frederick Hollyer, *The Book of Ruth – Blessed be he*, 1879, Jewish Museum, London, platinotype, after drawing by Simeon Solomon, 278x184mm. (www.jewishmuseum.org.uk).
40. Simeon Solomon, *Divine Charity and Sleep*, 1879, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, pencil, dimensions unknown. (Kolsteren, 1985, p55).
41. Simeon Solomon, *Head of a Girl*, 1880, Fogg Museum of Art, Harvard University, blue, black, and red crayon with touches of white chalk, 349x247mm. (www.artmuseums.harvard.edu).
42. Simeon Solomon, *Head of a Woman*, 1880, Fogg Museum of Art, Harvard University, blue, black, and red crayon with touches of white chalk and graphite 352x250mm. (Reynolds, 1985, Pl 69).
43. Simeon Solomon, *Head*, c1880, The Art Institute of Chicago, red chalk on buff woven paper, 350x240mm. (www.artic.edu).

44. Dalziel Brothers after Simeon Solomon, *Melchisedek Blesses Abram*, c1863, published in *Dalziels' Bible Gallery* (1881), wood engraving. (Dalziels' Bible Gallery, 1881).
45. Dalziel Brothers after Simeon Solomon, *Hagar and Ishmael*, c1862, published in *Dalziels' Bible Gallery* (1881), wood engraving. (Dalziels' Bible Gallery, 1881).
46. Dalziel Brothers after Simeon Solomon, *Abraham and Isaac*, c1862, published in *Dalziels' Bible Gallery* (1881), wood engraving. (Dalziels' Bible Gallery, 1881).
47. Dalziel Brothers after Simeon Solomon, *The Infant Moses*, c1862, published in *Dalziels' Bible Gallery* (1881), wood engraving. (Dalziels' Bible Gallery, 1881).
48. Dalziel Brothers after Simeon Solomon, *Naomi and the Child Obed*, c1863, published in *Dalziels' Bible Gallery* (1881), wood engraving. (Dalziels' Bible Gallery, 1881).
49. Dalziel Brothers after Simeon Solomon, *Hosannah!*, c1862, published in *Dalziels' Bible Gallery* (1881), wood engraving. (Dalziels' Bible Gallery, 1881).
50. Simeon Solomon, *Study of a Woman*, 1881, Priv Coll, coloured chalk, watercolour and bodycolour over pencil, 430x195mm. (Bonhams, 2007a, lot 112).
51. Simeon Solomon, *Standing Figure with Peacock Feather*, 1881, Priv Coll, coloured chalk, watercolour and bodycolour over pencil, 430x195. (Sotheby's, New York, 1999).
52. Simeon Solomon, *Angel and Youth*, 1881, The John Hunov Art Collection, Copenhagen, Denmark, pencil, 360 x 540mm. (www.johnhunov.dk).
53. Simeon Solomon, *Nox*, 1882, Priv Coll, pencil and blue chalk, 406x305mm. (Christie's, 2007a, p150).
54. Simeon Solomon, *Cupid's Defeat*, 1883, Priv Coll, pencil and coloured chalks, 375x508mm. (Christie's, 2005a, p96).
55. Simeon Solomon, *Cupid and Amorini Targeting a Kneeling Woman*, 1883, Priv Coll, pencil and yellow, green and blue chalk, 381x520mm. (Christie's, 2007a, p150).
56. Simeon Solomon, *Seated Angel*, 1883, Minneapolis Institute of Arts, coloured chalks, 508x395mm. (www.artsmia.org).
57. Simeon Solomon, *Head of a Man*, 1884, Priv Coll, watercolour, dimensions unknown. (www.maasgallery.com).
58. Simeon Solomon, *How Beautiful is Death*, 1884, Priv Coll, red and blue chalk and pencil, 437x317mm. (Christie's, 1992b, p13).
59. Simeon Solomon, *O. Pot. O. Pot.*, 1884, Priv Coll, pencil and blue and pink chalks, 197x146mm. (Christie's, 2007b, p167).

60. Simeon Solomon, *Head of Medusa*, 1884, Priv Coll, chalk on paper, 400x314mm. (Christie's, 1997a, Lot 44).
61. Simeon Solomon, *The Spirit of Shelley*, 1885, Priv Coll, pencil and coloured chalks, 325x253. (Christie's, 2003a, p104).
62. Simeon Solomon, *Woman's Head in Profile with Drapery*, 1885, Priv Coll, pencil and crayon on paper, 324x305mm. (Christie's, New York, 2007c, p222).
63. Simeon Solomon, *Angel of Light*, 1885, Priv Coll, coloured chalks, 425x325mm. (Sotheby's, 2001, p6).
64. Simeon Solomon, *Love*, 1885, William Morris Gallery, pencil, dimensions unknown. (Kolstern, 1985, p57).
65. Simeon Solomon, *Cupid Carried in Triumph by Two Cherubs*, 1885, Priv Coll, pencil & coloured crayon, 310x250. (Bonhams, 2008, p5).
66. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Somnium*, 1885, Collection of Dr Michael Richard Barclay, platinotype, 330x260mm. (Cruise, 2005, p174).
67. Simeon Solomon, *Oval Portrait of an Androgyne*, 1885, Private Collection, conté crayon, 250x220mm.
68. Simeon Solomon, *Amor Militans Spes Invidia*, 1886, Priv Coll, pencil, 325x495. (Champin, Lombrail & Gautier, 1987, Lot 24).
69. Simeon Solomon, *Head of a Young Man, in Profile to the Left*, 1886, Priv Coll, red chalk, paper, 390x330mm. (Christie's, 1998, p103).
70. Simeon Solomon, *Vision of Love, the Angel and the Patriarch*, 1886, Priv Coll, pencil, brown and blue crayon, 325x410mm. (Sotheby's, 1998b, p7).
71. Simeon Solomon, *Doubt*, 1886, Priv Coll, pencil on paper, dimensions unknown. (www.maasgallery.com).
72. Simeon Solomon, *Head Study of a Woman*, 1886, Priv Coll, pastel, 404x336mm. (Christie's, 2009, p70).
73. Simeon Solomon, *The Sleep of Remorse*, 1886, Fogg Museum of Art, Harvard University, drawing, 436x315mm. (www.artmuseums.harvard.edu).
74. Simeon Solomon, *From W. Blakes's 'Songs of Innocence'*, 1886, Priv Coll, pencil, 180x260mm. (Sotheby's, 2008, Lot 11).
75. Simeon Solomon, *Panthea. Prometheus Unbound*, 1886, Priv Coll, pencil, 385x318mm. (Sotheby's, 1998a, p19).
76. Simeon Solomon, *Man in a Turban Holding Lulav and Etrog*, 1886, Jewish Museum, London, crayon on paper, 385x280mm. (www.jewishmuseum.org.uk).

77. Simeon Solomon, *The Vision of the Doubter*, 1886, P Coll, graphite and coloured pencil on paper, 172x242mm. (Phillips, 1999, p26).
78. Simeon Solomon, *Cupid*, 1886, Birmingham Museums & Art Gallery, pencil on paper, 412x310mm. (www.preraphaelites.org).
79. Simeon Solomon, *Head of a Woman*, 1886, Birmingham Museums & Art Galleries, pastel and chalk, 385x318mm. (www.preraphaelites.org).
80. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Many Waters Cannot Quench Love*, 1886, location unknown, platinotype, original in pencil, dimensions unknown. (Ford, 1908, facing page 53).
81. Simeon Solomon, *Erinna of Lesbos*, 1886, Priv Coll, chalk on paper, 166x130mm. (Sotheby's, 1988, Lot 411).
82. Simeon Solomon, *Perseus a Type of Temptation*, 1886, Priv Coll, coloured chalks, 320x260mm. (Sotheby's, 1995b, Lot 245).
83. Simeon Solomon, *Zephyr*, 1887, Priv Coll, Blue Crayon and Pencil on Paper, 389x285mm. (Phillips, 1989, Lot 97).
84. Simeon Solomon, *An Angel, (Love)*, 1887, Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery, drawing/coloured chalks, 451x277mm. (www.preraphaelites.org).
85. Simeon Solomon, *The Sleeping Endymion*, 1887, Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery, blue, red and other crayons, 297x492mm. (www.preraphaelites.org).
86. Simeon Solomon, *The Virgin Knight*, 1887, Priv Coll, crayon and pencil on paper, size unknown. (www.leicestergalleries.com)
87. Simeon Solomon, *Young Nude Girl Standing*, 1887, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, crayon, 281x127mm. (www.mga.org).
88. Simeon Solomon, *Figure Study in Profile*, 1887, Priv Coll, coloured chalks, 394x330mm. (Christies, 2007a, p130).
89. Simeon Solomon, *The Rebuking Conscience*, 1887, Priv Coll, pencil, 265x325mm. (Bonhams, 2007b, p85).
90. Simeon Solomon, *An Angel*, 1887, Priv Coll, coloured chalks, 330x254mm. (Sotheby's, 1994, lot 209).
91. Simeon Solomon, *I Pensieri Del Tempo Passato*, 1887, Priv Coll, drawing, 381x279mm. (www.maasgallery.com).
92. Simeon Solomon, *Night and Sleep*, 1888, Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery, blue and red chalk on paper, 357x295mm. (Cruise, 2005, p170).
93. Simeon Solomon, *Head of a Young Man*, 1888, Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery, blue, red and brown crayon, 290x245mm. (Cruise, 2005, p172).

94. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Ave Maria Gratia Plena*, 1888, Collection of Dr Michael Richard Barclay, platinotype, 390x320mm. (Cruise, 2005, p174).
95. Simeon Solomon, *Love Wounded*, 1888, Beinecke Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Yale University, photographic reprint, dimensions unknown. (www.simeonsolomon.org).
96. Simeon Solomon, *The Tormented Conscience*, 1889, Priv Coll, red chalk on paper, 406x305mm. (Cruise, 2005, p166).
97. Simeon Solomon, *The Winged and Poppied Sleep*, 1889, Aberdeen Art Gallery & Museums Collections, red chalk on paper, 553x400mm. (Cruise, 2005, p168).
98. Simeon Solomon, *Head of a Girl*, 1889, Priv Coll, watercolour on paper, 235x190mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
99. Simeon Solomon, *Medusa Erotica*, 1889, Priv Coll, pencil and coloured chalks, 514x318mm. (Christie's, 1999, p40).
100. Solomon, *Good and Evil*, 1889, Priv Coll, brown and white chalk on grey paper, 170x400. (Christie's, Sydney, 2004, p112).
101. Simeon Solomon, *Head of Christ*, 1889, Fogg Museum of Art, Harvard University, drawing, 317x269mm. (www.artmuseums.harvard.edu).
102. Simeon Solomon, *Angel of Sorrow and Redemption (Doloris Et Redemptionis Angelus)*, 1889, Priv Coll, brown chalk, 442x292mm. (Christie's, 1998, p104).
103. Simeon Solomon, *Twilight, Pity and Death*, 1889, Birmingham Museums and Art Galleries, pencil, blue and red chalk on paper, 358x396mm. (www.preraphaelites.org).
104. Simeon Solomon, *Head of a Girl*, 1889, Priv Coll, red chalk, 295x250mm. (Sotheby's, 1995a, p123).
105. Simeon Solomon, *Head of Hypnos or Dawn*, 189?, Metropolitan Museum of Art, blue, red, brown and black chalks, 328x271mm. (www.metmuseum.org).
106. Simeon Solomon, *Tannhäuser*, c1890, The John Hunov Art Collection, Copenhagen, Denmark, oil on board, 425x370mm. (www.johnhunov.dk).
107. Simeon Solomon, *Head of a Young Girl*, 1890, Priv Coll, red chalk, 300x265. (Sotheby's, 2008, p24).
108. Simeon Solomon, *A Rabbi*, 1890, Priv Coll, watercolour, 228x177mm. (Sotheby's 1993a, Lot 197).
109. Simeon Solomon, *Profile Head*, 1890, Art Gallery of Ontario, Canada, watercolour and gouache on wove paper, 272x215mm. (www.collectionx.museum)

110. Simeon Solomon, *Head of a Woman*, 1890, Priv Coll, red chalk, 355x290mm. (Sotheby's, 2008, p25).
111. Simeon Solomon, *Head of a Young Beauty*, 1890, Priv Coll, pencil/paper, 330x243mm. (New Orleans Galleries, 2007, p319).
112. Simeon Solomon, *Ophelia*, 1890, Priv Coll, red chalk, 355x285mm. (Sotheby's, 1996b, p100).
113. Simeon Solomon, *Let not Thine Eyes See Aught Evil Itself, but be its Shadow Upon Life Enough for Thee*, 1890, Priv Coll, coloured chalks on paper, 325x263mm. (Cruise, 2005, p166).
114. Simeon Solomon, *Love, Joy, Peace, Longsuffering, Gentleness, Goodness, Faith, Meekness, Temperance*, 1890, Priv Coll, oil on canvas, 460x170mm. (Sotheby's, 2006a, p22/23).
115. Simeon Solomon, *Night*, 1890, Priv Coll, oil on board, 520x420mm. (Sotheby's, 2004a, p43).
116. Simeon Solomon, *Creation*, c1890, Victoria & Albert Museum, watercolour on paper, 228x279mm. (Cruise, 2005, p168).
117. Simeon Solomon, *Solis Osculum Daphnia Mors Felix*, 1891, Priv Coll, chalk drawing, 330x495mm. (Reynolds, 1985, Pl 73).
118. Simeon Solomon, *Head of Christ*, 1891, Priv Coll, Oil on Board, 460 x 355 mm. (Image courtesy of owner).
119. Simeon Solomon, *The Village Wit*, 1891, Priv Coll, red chalk on paper, 355x245mm. (Cruise, 2005, p173).
120. Simeon Solomon, *Love at the Waters of Oblivion*, 1891, The Albert Dawson Collection, red chalk on paper, 610x305mm. (Cruise, 2005, p173).
121. Simeon Solomon, *Portrait of an Angel*, 1891, Private Collection, medium unknown, 230x220mm. (www.durtro.com).
122. Simeon Solomon, *Eros the God of Love*, 1892, Priv Coll, red chalk, 510x340mm. (Sotheby's, 2007, Lot 12).
123. Simeon Solomon, *Christ and Youth*, 1892, Private Collection, watercolour on paper, dimensions unknown. (Image courtesy of owner).
124. Simeon Solomon, *Quia Multum Amauit*, 1892, Priv Coll, red chalk, 358x407mm. (Christie's, 1997b, p25).
125. Simeon Solomon, *Winged and Poppied Sleep*, 1892, Priv Coll, red chalk, 575x485mm. (Sotheby's, 1997, p35).
126. Simeon Solomon, *Hypnos the god of Sleep*, 1892, Priv Coll, red chalk, 350x300mm. (Sotheby's, 2006b, p34).

127. Simeon Solomon, *Cherub with Roses*, 1892, Priv Coll, oil on board, 310x200mm. (Bonhams, 2005, p84).
128. Simeon Solomon, *Cherub with Fruit*, 1892, Priv Coll, oil on board, 310x200mm. (Bonhams, 2005, p84).
129. Simeon Solomon, *Christ and St John*, 1892, Priv Coll, red chalk on board, 330x370mm. (Sotheby's, New York, 2003a, Lot 137).
130. Simeon Solomon, *Night and her Child Sleep*, 1892, Priv Coll, Red Chalk on Paper, Size Unknown. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
131. Simeon Solomon, *A Venetian Study*, 1892, Georgetown University Library, Washington, chalk drawing in sepia, dimensions unknown. (www.georgetown.edu).
132. Simeon Solomon, *Head of a Girl*, 1892, Priv Coll, red chalk on paper, 380x265mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
133. Simeon Solomon, *Night Bidding the Dream to Descend to Earth*, 1892, Louvre, Paris, red chalk, 405x365mm. (www.louvre.fr)
134. Simeon Solomon, *A Vision of Wounded Love*, 1893, Priv Coll, pencil on paper, 381x476mm. (Christie's, 1992a, p67).
135. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Spiritual Wife of Michelangelo*, c1893, location unknown, platinotype, dimensions unknown. (Ford, 1908, facing page 34).
136. Simeon Solomon, *Night Looking Upon Sleep, her Beloved Child*, 1893, Ben Uri Gallery, London, red chalk, 585x508mm. (Lambourne, L, and G. M Seymour, 1985, p79).
137. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Nirvana*, 1893, Location Unknown, platinotype, size unknown. (Reynolds, 1985, Pl 76).
138. Simeon Solomon, *Esoteric Buddhism*, c1893, Private Collection, medium unknown, size unknown. (Image courtesy of owner).
139. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Love Singing to Memory*, 1893, The Mansell Collection, platinotype print, 190x240mm. (Lambourne, L, and G. M Seymour, 1985, p81).
140. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Vision in the Crystal Globe*, 1893, Location Unknown, platinotype, dimensions unknown. (Ford, 1908, facing page 60).
141. Simeon Solomon, *The Healing Night and Wounded Love*, 1893, Fogg Museum of Art, Harvard University, drawing, 387x520mm. (www.artmuseums.harvard.edu).
142. Simeon Solomon, *The Rabbi*, 1893, Ben Uri Gallery, charcoal, size unknown. (www.ort.org).

143. Simeon Solomon, *Corruptio Optimi Pessima*, 1893, Birmingham Libraries, Process Reproduction, 196x124mm. (Cruise, 2005, p167).
144. Simeon Solomon, *For the Night Must Pass Before the Coming Day*, 1893, Priv Coll, black chalk on paper, 349x540mm. (Lambourne, L, and G. M Seymour, 1985, p79).
145. Charles C. Pierce after Simeon Solomon, *Jesus Before Pilate*, c1893, University of Southern California Library, photographic print, 260x210mm. (www.usc.edu).
146. Simeon Solomon, *The Spirit of Womanhood*, 1894, Priv Coll, red chalk, 290x230mm. (Sotheby's, 2007, p34).
147. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Until the Day Break*, 1894, location unknown, platinotype, dimensions unknown. (Ford, 1908, facing page 70).
148. Simeon Solomon, *Three Heads*, 1894, Priv Coll, red chalk, paper, 370x605mm. (Sotheby's, 1998, p100).
149. Simeon Solomon, *The Generation of Charity*, 1894, Victor Arwas Gallery, pencil drawing, 300x460mm. (www.victorarwas.com).
150. Simeon Solomon, *Study of a Female Head*, 1894, Priv Coll, red chalk, 405x315mm. (Bonhams, 2007c, p79).
151. Simeon Solomon, *The Moon and Sleep*, 1894, Tate Britain, London, Oil on Canvas, 514x762mm. (Cruise, 2005, p172).
152. Simeon Solomon, *The Annunciation*, 1894, Tate Britain, London, oil on canvas, 375x622mm. (Cruise, 2005, p164).
153. Simeon Solomon, *Hero at Abydos*, 1894, Priv Coll, oil on canvas, 380x510mm. (Lambourne, L, and G. M Seymour, 1985, p80).
154. Simeon Solomon, *The Tormented Soul*, 1894, Piccadilly Gallery, London, black chalk, 395x300mm. (Reynolds, 1985, Pl 77).
155. Simeon Solomon, *Flight*, 1894, Barry Friedman Ltd, New York, chalk drawing, 330x533mm. (Reynolds, 1985, Pl 78).
156. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *The Crucifixion*, c1894, Location Unknown, platinotype, 235x150mm. (Lambourne, L, and G. M Seymour, 1985, p81).
157. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *One Watching in the Night*, 1894, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x115mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
158. Simeon Solomon, *Helen of Troy*, 1894, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University, pencil, dimensions unknown. (www.simeonsolomon.org).

159. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *My Soul and I*, 1894, Location Unknown, platinotype, unknown dimensions. (Ford, 1908, facing page 43).
160. Simeon Solomon, *Sleep*, 1894, Priv Coll, watercolour on paper laid on board, 243x242mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
161. Simeon Solomon, *A Design for a Motif from Parsifal*, 1894, Priv Coll, blue chalk on paper, 610x450mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
162. Simeon Solomon, *Future Thoughts*, 1894, Priv Coll, coloured chalk on white paper, 520x350mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
163. Simeon Solomon, *Head of a Young Man*, 1894, Priv Coll, watercolour on paper, 263x218mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
164. Simeon Solomon, *Study of a Woman*, 1894, Priv Coll, watercolour, 335x267mm. (Christie's, 2003a, p104).
165. Simeon Solomon, *Leonora D'Este*, 1894, Delaware Art Museum, USA, red and white chalk on paper, 20x14in. (www.preraph.org).
166. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Sleep*, 1894, Leicester Galleries, taken from an album of 43 photographic prints by Hollyer, approx 200x115mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
167. Simeon Solomon, *Night and Day*, 1894, Priv Coll, red chalk on paper, 345x505mm. (Christie's, 2000).
168. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Dante in Esilio (Dante in Exile)*, 1895, location unknown, platinotype, dimensions unknown. (Ford, 1908, facing page 38).
169. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Immaculate Conception*, 1895, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x115mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
170. Simeon Solomon, *Angel of Children*, 1895, Priv Coll, red and white chalk on grey paper, 400x275mm. (Sotheby's, 2003b, p144-45).
171. Simeon Solomon, *Renewal of the Vows on the Scroll of Law*, 1895, The Ben Uri Gallery, watercolour and charcoal, size unknown. (www.ort.org).
172. Simeon Solomon, *Annunziata*, 1895, Private Collection, pastel/paper, 395x255mm. (Sotheby's, 2005, p74).
173. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *La Pia del Tolomei Imprigionata*, 1895, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x115mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
174. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *I Sleep that Ye Shall Wake*, 1895, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).

175. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *The Box of Pandora*, 1895, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
176. Simeon Solomon, *Summer*, 1895, Priv Coll, watercolour on board, 305x223mm. (Sotheby's, 2006c, p58).
177. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Winter*, 1895, The Mansell Collection, platinotype, 230x165mm. (Lambourne, L, and G. M Seymour, 1985, p82).
178. Simeon Solomon, *Night Looking Upon her Beloved Child*, 1895, Ben Uri Gallery, London, watercolour and charcoal on paper, 285x390mm. (Cruise, 2005, p171).
179. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Filius Hominis Traditurus Est*, 1895, platinotype, 220x180mm. (Lambourne, L, and G. M Seymour, 1985, p81).
180. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Il Sogno di Dante Esiliato di Firenze*, 1895, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
181. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Il Sogno di Dante a Ravenna di Firenze*, 1895, The Mansell Collection, platinotype, 170x230mm. (Lambourne, L, and G. M Seymour, 1985, p82).
182. Simeon Solomon, *Angel Boy*, 1895, Priv Coll, watercolour on paper, 180x130mm. (www.theleicestergalleries.com).
183. Simeon Solomon, *The Child of Hermes and Aphrodite*, 1895. Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University, photographic reproduction, dimensions unknown. (www.simeonsolomon.org).
184. Simeon Solomon, *The Angel of Death*, 1895, Priv Coll, pastel and ink on paper, 310x460mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
185. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Will o' the Wisp*, 1895, location unknown, platinotype, dimensions unknown. (Ford, 1908, facing page 24).
186. Simeon Solomon, *Caritas*, c1895, Priv Coll, sepia and wash, dimensions unknown. (Kolsteren, 1985, p56).
187. Simeon Solomon, *Head*, 1895, Museum of New Zealand, watercolour, 419x292mm. (www.collectionsx.tepapa.govt.nz)
188. Simeon Solomon, *Delphike*, 1896, Priv Coll, watercolour, 350x240mm. (Sotheby's, 1993b, p71).
189. Simeon Solomon, *Potens*, 1896, Priv Coll, black chalk, 431x279mm. (Christie's, 1979, Lot 7).
190. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Within the Veil*, 1896, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).

191. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *The Veil of the Temple*, 1896, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
192. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Miserikordiae Angelus*, 1896, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
193. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Angelus Coronae Spinarum*, 1896, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
194. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Sleep at the Antechamber of Death*, 1896, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
195. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Ritratto di Laura*, 1896, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
196. Simeon Solomon, *L'Angelo Della Morte*, 1896, Dr Dennis T. Lanigan Collection, Canada, watercolour on paper, 248x172mm. (Cruise, 2005, p165).
197. Simeon Solomon, *Mysterium Fidei*, 1896, Private Collection, bodycolour, 1206x501mm. (Christie's, 2006a, p112).
198. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Maria Foederis Arca*, 1896, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
199. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Ecce Ancilla Domini*, 1896, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
200. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Hope*, 1896, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
201. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Maria Madalena: At the House of the Pharisee*, 1896, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
202. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *David and Saul*, 1896, Location Unknown, platinotype print, 265x281mm. (Reynolds, 1985, Pl 79).
203. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Within the Sacramental Veils*, 1896, Location Unknown, platinotype print, size unknown. (Reynolds, 1985, Pl 80).
204. Simeon Solomon, *Christ and Peter*, 1896, Priv Coll, watercolour, size unknown. (www.simeonsolomon.org).

205. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Death Awakening Sleep*, 1896, Location Unknown, platinotype, size unknown. (Ford, 1908, facing page 20).
206. Simeon Solomon, *Youth*, 1896, The Maas Gallery, pencil on paper, 220x290mm. (www.maasgallery.com).
207. Simeon Solomon, *Perseus with the Head of Medusa*, 1896, Priv Coll, pencil on paper, 410x200mm. (Galerie Auktion Burkard, 1998, p18).
208. Simeon Solomon, *Greek Ships*, 1896, Priv Coll, pencil on paper, 350x190mm. (Galerie Auktion Burkard, 1998, p18).
209. Simeon Solomon, *Andromeda*, 1896, Priv Coll, pencil, 410x190mm. (Galerie Auktion Burkard, 1998, p18).
210. Simeon Solomon, *Profile of a Young Woman*, 1896, Priv Coll, conte crayon on grey paperboard, 394x374mm. (Skinner, 1996, p51)
211. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Ariadne Deserted by Theseus*, 1896, Leicester Galleries, taken from an album of 43 Solomon images by Hollyer, approx 200x115mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
212. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Twilight and Sleep*, 1897, The Mansell Collection, platinotype print, 240x180mm. (Lambourne, L, and G. M Seymour, 1985, p82).
213. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *The Angel Gabriel Waiting for the Annunciation*, 1897, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
214. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Lead Pencil Drawing*, c1890s, location unknown, platinotype, size unknown. (*The Art Amateur*, 1899, p75).
215. Simeon Solomon, *Saint John the Baptist*, 1898, Priv Coll, watercolour on paper, 240x335mm. (Christie's, 1996, p30).
216. Charles C. Pierce after Simeon Solomon, *Jesus (Esto Fedelis Ad Mortem Et Tibi Dabo Coronam Vitae)*, c1899, University of Southern California Library, photographic print, 260x210mm. (www.usc.edu).
217. Simeon Solomon, *Head of a Woman with Red Hair*, 1899, Priv Coll, watercolour, 227x228mm. (Christie's, 2007d, p131).
218. Simeon Solomon, *A Waker, A Nocturne, A Sleeper*, 1900, Priv Coll, Coloured Chalks on Paper, 305x405mm. (Image courtesy of owner).
219. Simeon Solomon, *Head Study*, 1900, Priv Coll, oil on canvas, 584x487mm. (Image courtesy of owner).
220. Simeon Solomon, *Angel Giving a Blessing*, 1900, Wichita Art Museum, USA, conte crayon on woven paper, 29 1/2 x 22 1/2 in. (www.wichitaartmuseum.org).

221. Simeon Solomon, *Allegorical Head*, 1900, The Maas Gallery, pencil on paper, 130x180mm. (www.maasgallery.com).
222. Simeon Solomon, *L'Amour Ambigieux*, 1901, Priv Coll, pencil, 356x241mm. (Christie's, 2007d, p130).
223. Simeon Solomon, *Dante Alghieri Divino Poeta Firenze Ravenna*, 1905, Priv Coll, graphite and black chalk on paper, 518x318mm. (Sotheby's, 2003c, p113).
224. Simeon Solomon, *Untitled*, 1905, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University, pencil, size unknown. (www.simeonsolomon.org).
225. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Orpheus and Eurydice*, 1905, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
226. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Speak Lord*, 1903, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
227. Simeon Solomon, *Retrospection*, 1905, location unknown, chalk, size unknown. (Wilson, 1911, p166).
228. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Night and her Child Sleep*, date unknown, location unknown, platinotype, dimensions unknown. (Ford, 1908, facing page 16).
229. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Ignis (Fire)*, date unknown, location unknown, platinotype, dimensions unknown. (Ford, 1908, facing page 27).
230. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Diana*, date unknown, location unknown, platinotype, dimensions unknown. (Ford, 1908, facing page 30).
231. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Paulo e Francesca da Rimini*, date unknown, location unknown, platinotype, dimensions unknown. (Ford, 1908, facing page 36).
232. Simeon Solomon, *Glastonbury*, Date Unknown, Priv Coll, watercolour on paper, 210x290mm. (Sotheby's, 1993).
233. Simeon Solomon, *Night*, Date Unknown, Royal Albert Memorial Museum, Exeter, watercolour, 310x170mm. (Reynolds, Pl 75).
234. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *At the Gate*, Date Unknown, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
235. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Morning*, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, Leicester Galleries, 200x115mm (approx). (www.leicestergalleries.com).

236. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Evening*, Date Unknown, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
237. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Design for a Sonnet of D. G. Rossetti*, Date Unknown, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
238. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Gethsemane The Blood of the Righteous Shall Not be Shed in Vain, I am the Lord Thy God*, Date Unknown, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
239. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Head of Christ (detail)*, Date Unknown, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
240. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Head of Christ*, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, 200x115mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
241. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Love Bound*, Date Unknown, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
242. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Mary Magdalene (Head)*, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer. Leicester Galleries, 200x115mm (approx). (www.leicestergalleries.com).
243. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Orestes*, Date Unknown, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, Leicester Galleries, 200x115mm (approx). (www.leicestergalleries.com).
244. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *The Doubt of Eurydice*, Date Unknown, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
245. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Ritratto de Maria Beatrice Depona per Dante Poeta Aivino per Giotto di Bondone*, Date Unknown, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
246. Simeon Solomon, *Female Head Study/Head of a Young Man*, Date Unknown, Priv Coll, pencil, 275x255mm. (Bonhams, 2007d, p35).
247. Simeon Solomon, *Hypnos the god of Sleep*, Date Unknown, Priv Coll, medium unknown, dimensions unknown. (Sotheby's, 2003b, p143).
248. Simeon Solomon, *David*, Date Unknown, Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, watercolour on paper, 270x216mm. (Cruise, 2005, p164).

249. Simeon Solomon, *Head*, Date Unknown, British Museum, graphite, 242x190mm. (Seymour, 1986, p434).
250. Simeon Solomon, *Head of a Girl*, Date Unknown, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, graphite pencil on paper, 152x203. (www.mfa.org).
251. Simeon Solomon, *Hymen with a Flaming Torch*, Date Unknown, Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery, chalk drawing, 535x290mm. (www.preraphaelites.org).
252. Simeon Solomon, *Illustration for Canto VII of Dante's Inferno*, Date Unknown, Priv Coll, pencil on paper, 430x550mm. (Bonhams, 1995, p14).
253. Simeon Solomon, *Love and Hate*, Date Unknown, Priv Coll, red chalk, 305x415mm. (Sotheby's, 1992, p106).
254. Simeon Solomon, *Love and Lust*, Date Unknown, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University, Photographic Reproduction, dimensions unknown. (www.simeonsolomon.org).
255. Simeon Solomon, *Mary Magdalene*, Date Unknown, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University, photographic reproduction, dimensions unknown. (www.simeonsolomon.org).
256. Simeon Solomon, *One Watching in the Night*, Date Unknown, Priv Coll, watercolour, dimensions unknown. (www.simeonsolomon.org).
257. Simeon Solomon, *Mercury*, Date Unknown, Priv Coll, watercolour, 280x206mm. (Christie's, 2001, p37).
258. Simeon Solomon, *Mercury*, Date Unknown, Priv Coll, watercolour, dimensions unknown. (www.simeonsolomon.org).
259. Simeon Solomon, *Perseus with the Head of Medusa*, Date Unknown, Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery, pencil on toned paper, 272x281. (www.preraphaelites.org).
260. Simeon Solomon, *Profile Study of a Woman's Head*, Date Unknown, Priv Coll, watercolour, 235x180mm. (Bonhams, 2007e, p14).
261. Simeon Solomon, *Study of a Head in Profile*, Date Unknown, Priv Coll, pencil, 158x177mm. (Christie's, 2007e, Lot 722).
262. Simeon Solomon, *Study of a Youth Holding a Torch*, Date Unknown, Priv Coll, pencil, 230x140mm. (Bonhams, 2007e, Lot 57).
263. Simeon Solomon, *Sin Gazing Upon Eternal Death*, Date Unknown, Priv Coll, black chalk, 343x412mm. (Christie's, 2007a, p149).
264. Simeon Solomon, *Fiat Voluntas Tua*, Date Unknown, Priv Coll, watercolour, 381x279mm. (Phillips, 1987, Lot 143).

265. Simeon Solomon, *Head of a Young Man*, Priv Coll, watercolour, 340x248mm. (Christie's, 2002, p83).
266. Simeon Solomon, *Head of a Youth*, Date Unknown, Priv Coll, pencil, watercolour and bodycolour, 180x230mm. (Christie's, 2006b, p176),
267. Simeon Solomon, *Andromache*, Date Unknown, Priv Coll, black chalk, 438x317mm. (Christie's, 2005b, p48).
268. Simeon Solomon, *Sanctus Sanctus Sanctus*, Date Unknown, Priv Coll, pencil and blue crayon, 382x280. (Christie's, 2003b, p115).
269. Simeon Solomon, *An Hour Before Dawn*, Priv Coll, pencil, 381x324mm. (Christie's, 2003b, p115).
270. Simeon Solomon, *S. Aloysius de Gonzaga*, undated, Priv Coll, black chalk, 248x178. (Christie's, 2003b, p115).
271. Simeon Solomon, *Head of a Youth*, Date Unknown, Priv Coll, watercolour and gouache on paper, 223x145mm. (Sotheby's, 2003c, p16).
272. Simeon Solomon, *Ophelia*, Date Unknown, Priv Coll, ink and wash, 410x460mm. (Sotheby's, 2004b, p90).
273. Charles C. Pierce after Simeon Solomon, *Jesus Before Pilate*, Date Unknown, University of Southern California Library, photographic print, 260x210mm. (www.usc.edu).
274. Charles C. Pierce after Simeon Solomon, *Jesus*, Date Unknown, University of Southern California Library, photographic print, 260x210mm. (www.usc.edu).
275. Simeon Solomon, *Silentium*, Date Unknown, Priv Coll, drawing, 12x9in. (www.maasgallery.com).
276. Simeon Solomon, *Perseus*, Date Unknown, Priv Coll, pastel on paper, dimensions unknown. (www.maasgallery.com).
277. Simeon Solomon, *Mercury and Persephone*, Priv Coll, watercolour on paper, dimensions unknown. (www.maasgallery.com).
278. Simeon Solomon, *Head of a Girl*, Date Unknown, Priv Coll, pencil, 355x265mm. (Sotheby's, 2003d, p60).
279. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Title Unknown*, Date Unknown, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
280. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Title Unknown*, Date Unknown, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).

281. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Title Unknown*, Date Unknown, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
282. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *Title Unknown*, Date Unknown, Leicester Galleries, from an album of 43 Solomon images photographed by Hollyer, approx 200x215mm. (www.leicestergalleries.com).
283. Frederick Hollyer after Simeon Solomon, *The Veil of the Temple was Rent in Twain*, date unknown, location unknown, medium unknown, size unknown. (Lenox, 1898, p395).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the Arts and Humanities Research Council for supporting my doctoral research.

I would also like to thank my supervisor Jason Edwards for his constant encouragement, enthusiasm for the project, patience and friendship, and to David Peters Corbett for his advice and guidance.

This thesis would also not have been possible without the help of the following people. I would like to thank, in particular, Roberto C. Ferrari for the generosity he has shown in sharing his own unpublished Solomon research with me, for his constant support, kindness, reassurance, Solomon chats, research trips together, and friendship. In addition, Donato Esposito has also shared valuable research with me and provided much needed enthusiasm, laughter and friendship when it has been greatly needed. I would also like to thank Pam Solomon for allowing me to use the information contained in her personal family tree, and for her constant interest and passion for everything Solomon. Colin Cruise, Gayle Seymour, and Simon Reynolds have also shown me great kindness and generosity. William Peniston kindly pointed me in the right direction during my Paris research and Natalie Ford was a tirelessly supportive companion in the Paris archives. I would also like to thank Johan Bergström-Allen of the Carmelite Friary in York for his time and generosity, and Patricia A. Ruddle for her infectious enthusiasm, support, friendship and for sharing her vast knowledge of nineteenth-century photography.

I am also grateful to everyone who made my research visits productive. I would like to thank Alison Brisby at Castle Howard for allowing me to share her notes on George Howard's visits to Solomon, and for her friendship and encouragement. I would also like to thank the staff at the following archives: the London Metropolitan Archive; the Henry Moore Institute; the Brotherton Library, Leeds; Archives of the King's College Hospital, London; the National Archives, Kew; the British Library; Archive de Paris, Paris; Les Archives du Musee de la Prefecture de Police, Paris; the Borthwick Archives, University of York; and the J. B. Morrell Library, University of York.

Thanks also go to Jane Cowan and Rosemarie Cynthia Aagaard for allowing me to reproduce Solomon images from their private collections.

Finally, I would like to thank the following family and friends who have made writing and researching this thesis possible. My good friends Rose Pringle and Gifty Burrows have been constantly supportive and provided cups of tea and cake when needed. My brothers Alan and Peter have both supplied much needed practical and emotional support, and my sister Susan, my dad Stan and step-mum Barbara have kept me going with their abundant enthusiasm. Lastly, but most importantly, I would like to thank my husband Ray and my children Stephen and Sarah for their love, support, patience and belief in me.

This thesis is dedicated to Sylvia Dirkje (1944-2008).

INTRODUCTION

On the 24th February 1905, the *Jewish Chronicle* reported in error that the Pre-Raphaelite and Aesthetic Jewish artist Simeon Solomon had died.¹ The *Chronicle* reported that the “distinguished art-critic”, M. H. Spielmann, had delivered a speech to the “Maccabeans’ Art Dinner” on the 18th February, during which, the critic had described Solomon as an “unhappy, misguided genius”, although the *Chronicle* suggested that Spielmann had been unaware of Solomon’s ‘death’.² The *Chronicle* also reported that Solomon had given way to “debauchery, suffered from mental illness, and became a charge on the benevolence of his family”.³ On the 26th August 1905, twelve days after Solomon actually died, the *Illustrated London News* printed a small obituary for the artist that claimed that had Solomon “been of normal temperament and reasonable habits”, he would have had a better life.⁴ The report concluded with the assertion that Solomon’s “overstrained emotional capacity” had been the signs of someone who had not possessed “the art of living”.⁵ Writing for the same newspaper some five months later, ‘M.W.’ berated the Royal Academy’s exhibition of 1906 for allowing Solomon’s “inferior drawings” to be exhibited beside those of Dante Gabriel Rossetti. He described Solomon’s work as “eminently erratic”, created by someone whose “inspiration was infrequent”, and derided the Academy’s decision to include Solomon’s work in an exhibition dedicated to deceased ‘masters’.⁶

¹ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 24 February 1905: 20.

² Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 24 February 1905: 11. The Ancient Order of Maccabeans was a friendly benefit society founded in 1896 by Herman Cohen whose members of “professional men” adhered themselves to the Zionist movement. Solomon J Solomon was, for ten years, the first president of the organisation. www.jewishencyclopedia.com (accessed 6 Feb 2007). The date of the speech appears to suggest that the *Chronicle* had assumed that Solomon had died some days before the 18th February.

³ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 24 February 1905: 20.

⁴ M.W., *The Illustrated London News*, 26 August 1905: 312 col 1-2.

⁵ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 18 August 1905: 22.

⁶ M.W., *The Illustrated London News*, 6 January 1906: 34 col 3. Sixteen of Solomon’s works were included in the thirty-seventh annual *Exhibition of Works by the Old Masters and Deceased Masters of the British School* at the Royal Academy in 1906: see Appendix I.

These evaluations of Solomon's character are early examples of the disapproval that was felt by critics at the time of his death, when Solomon's British reputation appears to have been at its lowest point. The journalists' suggestions that Solomon was 'misguided' and that his life gave way to 'debauchery', refer to Solomon's earlier arrest and conviction for attempted buggery in 1873, at the age of thirty-two. According to contemporary critics, such as Robert Ross and Bernard Falk, this conviction had the effect of directly altering the course of Solomon's life. They claim that Solomon was subsequently shunned as a pariah, would produce work that was worthless and technically deficient, and would spend the next thirty-three years as an alcoholic vagrant, sleeping alternately on the streets or in the local workhouse.⁷

This early depiction of Solomon, as a pathological, tragic, Aesthetic 'sodomite' provided by newspaper obituaries and unreliable, sensationalist journalists such as Ross and Falk, is likely to have been influenced by the public condemnation of Oscar Wilde, after his arrest and imprisonment for 'gross indecency' in 1895, tainting Solomon's reputation by association. Indeed, in his influential *Degeneration* (1895), Max Nordau had famously condemned Wilde, even before he was tried, as the chief "deranged ego-maniac" of the 'degenerate' Aesthetic movement.⁸

Unfortunately, until recently, this early historiography had the effect of vilifying Solomon's character and reputation and reducing or eliminating his importance as a queer, Jewish artist in the second half of the nineteenth century. In addition, the general climate of homophobia and the continued criminalisation of homosexual acts between men until 1967 had a considerable effect upon the scholarly attention that was subsequently given to Solomon's life and work, which in the main was limited, full of biographical inaccuracies and tainted with scandalizing anecdotal tales and homophobic references, as I shall go on to demonstrate.

⁷ Ross, 1909. Falk, 1937.

⁸ Nordau, 1993: 317.

However, despite the revival of interest in Solomon's work in the 1960s, provided by the art historian Lionel Lambourne, which accompanied a new interest in the British Pre-Raphaelite movement as a whole, and the work done by scholars such as Elizabeth Prettejohn, Richard Dellamora, Thais E. Morgan, Gayle Seymour, Colin Cruise, and Roberto C. Ferrari over the last three decades, little detailed biographical research on Solomon's life after 1873 has been attempted. This has had the effect of leaving significant gaps in the history of Solomon's life, particularly in relation to the trial and the years after, and scholars have had a tendency to rely on both prejudiced presupposition and limited extant information which is more often than not unevaluated, inaccurate, taken from unreliable sources, and sometimes fabricated.

At the beginning of the 1990s, Dellamora suggested that it is only within recent times that Solomon's historiography has begun to demythologise the damning Victorian recollection of the artist's life as ending in self-induced 'tragedy'.⁹ This biographical omission and inaccuracy has tended to cause scholars to continue to link the artist with the perceived notion of the Wildean 'tragic' homosexual male, suggesting that, like Wilde, Solomon's trial "left him vulnerable to the execration and punishment of a society that could neither understand nor ultimately tolerate him".¹⁰ Solomon's withdrawal from 'respectable' society, his alcoholism and his apparent unwillingness to cooperate with any kind of rehabilitation, either physical or psychological, is still seen as a sign of his 'vulnerability' caused by a reaction to the similar situation that was presented to the very different Wilde twenty years later.

I challenge the notion of Solomon's 'vulnerability' and suggest that Solomon's subsequent reaction to his conviction for attempted sodomy was distinctly different to Wilde's. I propose that the way that Solomon conducted his life after 1873 epitomises the potential non-repentant homosexual, as identified by more recent scholars including

⁹ Dellamora, 1990: 170.

¹⁰ Cohen, 1993: 3.

Dellamora.¹¹ I take, as a model that was exemplified by Solomon, Dellamora's belief that homosexual men at this time "responded to their situations not simply in panic", "self ignorance, or confusion", but in "resourceful and creative" ways that were at times inevitably circumscribed and painful.¹² Indeed, Harry Cocks suggests that Wilde has too long been seen as the originator of the homosexual identity and that his encounter with Victorian justice has "provided historians with the paradigm of the persecuted homosexual".¹³ While not seeking to downplay the persecution Solomon suffered, this dissertation concurs with the new critical perception of the self-aware homosexual male in Victorian society, by demonstrating the unconventionality of Solomon's response as the convicted 'sodomite', which has previously been seen by early critics as a sign of mental illness and later as a symptom of alcoholism.

I come to these conclusions by using for the first time in any substantial way extensively-researched biographical material and newly discovered archival documents, which include Solomon's 1873 London arrest documents, material that relates directly to his arrest in Paris the following year, and arrest documents that relate to Solomon's involvement in a burglary in 1883. I also make a point of correcting the many errors, omissions and presumptions made by scholars, which to date, continue to misinform.

Researching Solomon's life after 1873 is particularly challenging because a Solomon archive does not exist, and there are few records still in existence. Of these records, this thesis makes use of the extant letters to and from Solomon, but also relies on the second-hand correspondence of Solomon's contemporaries, who were writing about him after 1873, in correspondence and published and unpublished memoirs and journals. I also make use of newly discovered articles, advertisements and notices about Solomon, that appear in contemporary newspapers and journals.

¹¹ Dellamora, 1990: 22.

¹² Dellamora, 1990: 22.

¹³ Cocks, 2003a: 159.

Together with the extant Board of Guardians documentation for St Giles' workhouse, I also draw upon the newly available and searchable census and trades directory material for the period to assist me in the identification of Solomon's whereabouts after 1873. In addition, I make use of the work of nineteenth-century social reformer Charles Booth, social researcher Henry Mayhew, and founder of the Salvation Army, William Booth, to help contextualise Solomon's life during this period, in order for it to be possible, for the first time, to get a better sense of Solomon's actual experience in nineteenth-century London.

This thesis also makes a survey of the extant work produced by Solomon between 1873 and his death in 1905, and includes, in a second volume, images of these works that have been brought together for the first time. By doing this, I am able to make an approximation of how active Solomon was artistically after 1873, to suggest what kind of media he was using during certain periods, to record who was continuing to buy Solomon's work at this time, and to make the images of Solomon's extant work available to future researchers. It is useful to note, however, that because Solomon's later work remains, largely, in the hands of private collectors, and much of it only exists as Frederick Hollyer reproductions, this thesis cannot provide an exhaustive survey of the extant works after 1873. Nonetheless, I use exhibition and auction catalogues, the records of national and international art galleries, and the assistance of some private collectors to make a survey of Solomon's later work that is as detailed as it can be given the difficulties suggested.

This project also includes three appendices which record Solomon's work that is not accompanied by images; the titles of Solomon's work that were reproduced by Hollyer as prints and published in the Boston *Complete Art Record Catalogue* of 1902, and a full list of the exhibitions of Solomon's work after 1873.

Before continuing, it is also important to discuss how the terminology used to describe Solomon's sexuality can be problematic, because his life spanned the different legal, medical and moral definition of what we now call homosexuality. Indeed, the concept of the 'homosexual' as a 'type' of person was only mentioned for the first time in England in 1892 in Richard von Krafft-Ebing's medical book on sexual 'deviancy', *Psychopathia Sexualis*, in which he concluded that most 'homosexuals' had a mental illness caused by degenerate heredity.¹⁴ In 1873, when Solomon was arrested for attempted sodomy, his crime was not related to any notion of a type of sexuality, but simply to the act of 'buggery' which was considered a 'moral' crime; a Biblical 'sin against nature' and one that any sinful person could be convicted of. It is unlikely, then, that Solomon would have thought of himself as being a 'type' of person at this time, but he would undoubtedly have been aware that legally and socially he was considered a 'sodomite' with all the 'unnatural' connotations that that implied.

By the time of Solomon's death in 1905, the practice of 'sodomy' was inextricably linked with the identity of the medically defined 'homosexual'. The *Labouchere Amendment* of the 1885 Criminal Law Amendment Act sought to criminalise *all* male homosexual acts, whether committed in public or private, and thirteen years later, the 1898 *Vagrancy Act* clamped down on homosexual 'soliciting'. These often-cited legal acts, in addition to some equally infamous 'homosexual' scandals of the time, such as the Wilde trials, the Cleveland Street Scandal of 1889, and the earlier Boulton and Park trials, helped to sharpen public hostility towards homosexuality.¹⁵ However, in opposition, the promotion of the term 'invert', rather than homosexual, coined by psychologist Henry Havelock Ellis, and John Addington Symonds, promoted a more liberal approach to

¹⁴ Krafft-Ebing, 1892.

¹⁵ See chapter five for more information on the Cleveland Street Scandal, and chapters one and five for more information on the Boulton and Park trials.

homosexuality, based on the idea that it was a recurrent part of human sexuality and therefore should not be criminalised.¹⁶

The Early Historiography

In the same way that Wilde largely disappeared from public view after his trial, at least in the short term, Solomon too, albeit twenty-two years earlier, almost ceased to exist within the pages of contemporary newspapers, and particularly the *Jewish Chronicle*, which had been a distinct long-term exponent of his “Jewish talent”.¹⁷ The last positive mention of Solomon in the *Chronicle* appeared on the 8th November 1872, three months before the artist’s arrest, in which his painting *Autumn Love (Love in Autumn)* (1866) was praised as “the best of his productions”, when it was exhibited at the Dudley Gallery’s ‘Winter Exhibition of Cabinet Pictures in Oil’ that year.¹⁸ After that date, the *Chronicle* made no more mention of Solomon or his work until 1891, despite the artist’s work being exhibited at another thirteen exhibitions in the intervening twenty years, of which one, the Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition of 1887, held at the Royal Albert Hall, was devoted exclusively to Jewish work.¹⁹ Indeed, the *Chronicle*’s brief mention of Solomon in 1891, by Stuart M. Samuel, anticipated Spielmann’s aforementioned opinion of Solomon in the *Chronicle* in 1905, suggesting that Solomon had been an artist of “great promise”, but that “he never achieved anything greater than sketches and drawings of an unimportant character”.²⁰ In 1901, the *Chronicle* briefly reported that Solomon’s paintings had been exhibited at the Whitechapel Art Gallery, but gave no other information, and, as already

¹⁶ Ellis and Symonds, 1897. See chapter one for a more detailed explanation of the legal definition of sodomy and a description of the *Labouchere Amendment* and the 1898 Vagrancy Act and the subsequent consequences of these Acts.

¹⁷ For more information about how contemporary newspapers reported the aftermath of Wilde’s trials see: Cohen, 1993. My research appears to suggest that the *Jewish Chronicle*’s first mention of Solomon was on the 4th June 1858, when “la famille Solomon”, as the *Chronicle* dubbed Solomon, his sister Rebecca and elder brother Abraham, exhibited at the Royal Academy together for the first time. However, the *Chronicle* suggested in error that they believed that Solomon was Abraham’s son. Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 4 June 1858: 197.

¹⁸ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 8 November 1872: 433.

¹⁹ See Appendix I for a full list of Solomon’s work exhibited after 1873.

²⁰ Samuel, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 13 November 1891: 33.

suggested, this was followed, in February 1905, by the incorrect reporting of the artist's death.²¹

As well as acknowledging Spielmann's opinion of Solomon in the February 1905 report, the *Chronicle* also described a fictitious scene, in which an anonymous "visitor" to Solomon's "lodgings", had provided the newspaper with the most 'current' information.²² The 'visitor' described how, in a "poorly furnished" apartment, Rossetti, William Holman-Hunt, Edward Burne-Jones and Algernon Swinburne had gathered to declaim "perfect verses" with Solomon, after "much discussion and daring talk". It is unlikely that this 'visitor' existed, and perhaps this fabricated event was printed as a consequence of the *Chronicle* having little information on Solomon, or because the newspaper was unwilling, or unable to find a more reliable source. Instead, I would suggest, that the newspaper, perhaps, decided to invent a scene which implied Solomon's earlier important position in artistic circles, whilst also, more or less, acknowledging his 'downfall'.²³ This enabled the *Chronicle* to advocate the significant status that the artist, as a Jew, had attained amongst gentile society, despite his resultant demise, for the benefit of its Jewish readers. In addition, around this time, Pre-Raphaelite painting had become a national style, which suggests that the *Chronicle* may also have been placing Solomon at the heart of that nationalising project.²⁴

As already suggested, Solomon actually died six months after this report was published, on the morning of the 14th August 1905, in the dining room of St Giles' workhouse, and the *Chronicle* acknowledged four days later that an "erroneous rumour"

²¹ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 15 March 1901: 14. See Appendix I. Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 24 February 1905: 20.

²² Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 24 February 1905: 20.

²³ It is interesting to note that the *Jewish Chronicle* interviewed a "personal friend", when reporting the death of Abraham Solomon in 1863, who gave a long glowing report of the artist's "manly virtues and simple worth". See Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 16 January 1863: 5.

²⁴ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 24 February 1905: 20. It is possible that the wealthy and influential side of Solomon's family, the orthodox Salamans, may not have been keen on publicly acknowledging their connection with the artist, especially within the Jewish community, if they had been approached by the *Chronicle*.

had caused them to report Solomon's earlier 'death'.²⁵ The *Manchester Guardian* reported Solomon's inquest a day after it was held, on the 17th August, and suggested that "to many people" who had read about Solomon's death in London that night, the artist's name would have sounded "strange yet familiar", like "something one had heard of long ago".²⁶ The *Guardian* doubted that "there were more than a dozen people who knew" that Solomon "was alive". However, contrary to this, the newspaper confirmed that "shops used to show in their windows photographs of his paintings and – a more unusual honour – even his drawings", and suggested that this was while he was "living the life of squalid Bohemianism among the dregs of the town". This tends to suggest that Solomon's work was popular, and that, perhaps, the artist was not as forgotten as the inconsistent report suggested; a possibility that this thesis seeks, with archival evidence, to flesh out in full.

The *Daily Mirror* report into the inquest, which was also published on the 18th and titled "Blighted Genius", was similarly brief and inaccurate.²⁷ It suggested that "Simon [sic] Solomon" had died "suddenly" and that his "brother" had given statements at the inquest.²⁸ Errors abound even here, since it seems likely that the *Mirror* was referring to Solomon's cousin, George Nathan, and not Solomon's only surviving brother, Isaac, because Nathan appeared in the *Times* reporting of Solomon's inquest on the same day.²⁹ On the following day, however, the *Mirror* published a long obituary to Solomon that suggested that the artist was "dowered by the Gods, but utterly ruined by drink".³⁰ The report acknowledged that Solomon's early work was exhibited at the Academy, and suggested that "American collectors vied with one another in obtaining his works". It is possible that the *Mirror* had confused this idea with the much later American interest in the artist's work in the form of Frederick Hollyer's reproductions, although it is also possible,

²⁵ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 18 August 1905: 22.

²⁶ Anon, *The Manchester Guardian*, 18 August 1905: 6.

²⁷ Anon, *Daily Mirror*, 18 August 1905: 4.

²⁸ For more on George Nathan, Solomon's inquest, and its reporting by the *Times* see chapter seven.

²⁹ Anon, *The Times*, 18 August 1905: 9.

³⁰ Anon, *Daily Mirror*, 19 August 1905: 4.

given the nature of this tabloid newspaper, that this information was simply fabricated. The *Mirror*'s melodramatic and overstated style can be seen in the concluding paragraphs of the report which described, how, after hearing news of a "family episode" which "seemed to take all the energy, enthusiasm and self-reliance out of him", Solomon "gave up everything to drink", and suggested that Solomon's "everlasting response" was "drink, give me drink".³¹

Another example of the confusion surrounding the reporting of the artist's life appeared in the *Times* on the 19th August, who published an obituary for Solomon. The report suggested that the inquest had closed "one of the most miserably tragic stories in the whole chronicles of art".³² However, despite suggesting that "seven and thirty years ago" there were "few men" of Solomon's "age so much in evidence, or on whom greater hopes were built", the report suggested that Solomon's career had been successful only "for a brief time", and that the artist's "greatest success" were his "chalk drawings of symbolic figures". It seems possible that the anonymous *Times* reporter had confused the artist's often undated later and earlier work, and was unclear about the fifteen years of fame and success that Solomon had achieved with his paintings before the arrest in 1873.

Notices of Solomon's death and reputation were not, however, confined to the UK, again suggesting that Solomon was not as forgotten after 1873 as some critics would have us believe. For example, on the 27th September, the Australian *Advertiser*, published in Adelaide, recorded a lengthy obituary of the artist, which ended with the suggestion that Solomon should be remembered "by the work of his early manhood" and that a 'veil' should be dropped "over the rest of the story".³³ Similarly, on the 7th October, the *Piqua Daily Call*, published in Ohio, also recorded Solomon's "wasted life", which the

³¹ Anon, *Daily Mirror*, 19 August 1905: 4.

³² Anon, *The Times*, 19 August 1905: 5.

³³ Anon, *The Advertiser*, 27 September 1905: 9.

newspaper considered was due to Solomon's "own deficiency of character" and not to "any want of public appreciation".³⁴

In addition to these lesser-known obituaries, Ross wrote his own, detailed, obituary. This initially appeared in the *Westminster Gazette* in August 1905, and became the standard source for subsequent writers.³⁵ In particular, Ross's vividly constructed anecdotal and unsubstantiated tales, which were used to describe Solomon's later life, and which were subsequently re-published with additions and changes by Ross in different publications, were used by Falk, whose endorsement of them seems to have been partially responsible for a future caricaturing of Solomon's personality.³⁶

In the *Gazette* article, Ross suggested that Solomon had become a "social pariah" as early as the "seventies"; had cast aside "reality", and had "no place in life".³⁷ He also condemned the artist's later work as "repulsive and ill-drawn", and suggested that it had the "added horror of being the shadows of once splendid achievements", having been "poured out", at a "guinea apiece".³⁸ However, Ross did not condemn all of Solomon's post-1873 work, and instead considered that the artist "entirely ceased to produce work of any value" by 1887, although, in the *Academy* published four months later, Ross changed this date to 1890.³⁹ This suggests that despite Ross's initial criticism of the work, he approved of at least fourteen years of Solomon's artistic production after the arrest.

Ross also described various events in Solomon's later life, such as the artist's admission into an asylum by friends, and Solomon's breaking into and entering a house owned by a "former friend" and "well-known artist" whilst in a drunken state for the

³⁴ Anon, *The Piqua Daily Call*, 7 Oct 1905: 6.

³⁵ Ross, *The Westminster Gazette*, 24 August 1905a: 1-2.

³⁶ Falk, 1937. Ross reproduced this small obituary in *The Academy*, four months later, and again with editorial changes in *Masques and Phases* in 1909, and lastly with more changes in *The Bibelot*, dated April 1911. See Ross, *Academy*, 23 December 1905b: 1336-37, Ross, 1909, Ross, *The Bibelot*, April 1911: 139-151.

³⁷ Ross, *The Westminster Gazette*, 24 August 1905a: 1-2.

³⁸ Ross, *The Westminster Gazette*, 24 August 1905a: 1-2.

³⁹ Ross, *Academy*, 23 December 1905b: 1336.

purposes of stealing from the occupant.⁴⁰ It is unclear where Ross might have come across this information, although his second article, published in the *Academy* in December 1905, suggests that the information may have come directly from Solomon, because Ross revealed that he had had “the pleasure of seeing” Solomon as late as 1893.⁴¹ Nevertheless, as I will demonstrate, my thorough research of these events determines that much of this information is, simply, either incorrect or unlikely.

Despite the “pleasure” that Ross felt upon his meeting with Solomon in 1893, when he had found the artist “cheerful and not aggressively alcoholic”, Ross considered that Solomon’s life belonged to “the history of morbid psychology”, which is, perhaps, interesting considering that Ross had been a constant and loyal friend of Wilde, before and after Wilde’s imprisonment, and was homosexual himself.⁴² It is also notable that the language Ross used in relation to Solomon was very reminiscent of the public reaction to Wilde. For example, as suggested, Solomon, according to Ross, had become a “social pariah”, whose name was now only mentioned “in whispers”.⁴³ This is interesting considering that this article was written while Ross was continuing his service to the memory of Wilde by remaining Wilde’s literary executor, pursuing the purchase of Wilde’s copyrighted work, and having Wilde’s letter to Lord Alfred Douglas published as *De Profundis*.⁴⁴ Indeed, Ross’s reaction to Solomon appears contradictory, especially when, as Maureen Borland suggested in her 1990 biography of Ross, “it was as if Robbie could understand and appreciate Wilde’s terrible suffering, which others could not begin to comprehend”.⁴⁵ This would perhaps suggest that Ross could sympathise with the contrite

⁴⁰ Ross, *The Westminster Gazette*, 24 August 1905a: 1-2.

⁴¹ Ross, *Academy*, 23 December 1905b: 1337.

⁴² Ross, *The Bibelot*, April 1911: 146.

⁴³ Ross, *Academy*, 23 December 1905b: 1336.

⁴⁴ Wilde, 1905. For more information on Ross’s involvement with *De Profundis* and his on-going legal dispute with Lord Alfred Douglas: see Borland, 1990.

⁴⁵ Borland, 1990: 96.

Wilde, who had revealed his regret in *De Profundis*, but not the un-contrite Solomon, who, as Ross suggested, “enjoyed himself in his own sordid way”.⁴⁶

Borland also suggested that “Ross discouraged discussion of his sex-life and maintained a life-long silence about the exact nature of his relationship with Wilde”, although it seems likely that this silence was deliberately designed as a way of protecting Ross’s liberty and reputation, because he had witnessed first hand the devastating effect that Wilde’s conviction and imprisonment had had.⁴⁷ This might further explain Ross’s public disapproval of Solomon’s life, because, unlike Ross, the artist had not kept his sexuality away from public and legal scrutiny. Certainly, unlike Solomon, Wilde and other homosexual men who were famously ‘ruined’ and convicted as ‘sodomites’ in his lifetime, Ross secretly and successfully maintained two long-term relationships with other men and sustained an almost untiring devotion to the legacy of Wilde, without losing his ‘respectability’ or more importantly his liberty, and this appears, perhaps, to have been partly achieved by his contradictory public response to other homosexual men such as Solomon.⁴⁸

Undeniably, and perhaps understandably, Ross was keen to reassure the readers of the article that he associated himself with them and not with Solomon’s “sordid existence”, because he suggested that his readers, like him, had “no need to frighten” themselves by searching “too curiously for hidden meanings” in Solomon’s “unwholesome and morbid” paintings.⁴⁹ In this way, Ross was also able to reassure the owners of Solomon’s work that the images that they possessed, and, indeed, they themselves, would not be interpreted by viewers as possessing possible sexual deviant subtexts. But Ross betrayed something of his own sexuality at the end of the article, when he made a plea for Solomon’s homoerotic

⁴⁶ Ross, *The Bibelot*, April 1911: 146.

⁴⁷ Borland, ‘Ross, Robert Baldwin (1869-1918)’, www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/37915, 2004. (accessed 12th September, 2005).

⁴⁸ Borland’s biography of Ross provides the most current information on his life. However, there is no mention of Solomon in Borland’s publication, either direct or indirect.

⁴⁹ Ross, *The Bibelot*, April 1911: 148.

prose poem, *A Vision of Love Revealed in Sleep* (1871) to be re-published, and perhaps Ross also hinted at his respect and admiration for Solomon's distinctive and unrepentant individuality by quoting Swinburne's description of the artist: "he is himself alone, and one whose place no man can take", leaving this as his last word on the subject.⁵⁰

Arthur Symons' response to Solomon also accompanied Ross's as a re-print in the *Bibelot* of 1911 but had originally been published in Symons's *Studies in Seven Arts* (1906).⁵¹ Symons, a poet, literary scholar and author who became a leading figure in London's literary circles during the 1890s, was a friend of W. B. Yeats and a member of the Rhymers' Club, and knew Solomon personally during this time.⁵² Indeed, according to Symons' recent biographer, Karl Beckson, in September 1888 Symons was hoping "to meet Herbert Horne, to whom he had been directing queries about the Pre-Raphaelite artist, Simeon Solomon".⁵³ At the same time, Symons was also intending to meet up with the sexologist Havelock Ellis after corresponding with him since 1886 and indeed subsequently became a close friend.⁵⁴

As already suggested, Havelock Ellis published *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* between 1897 and 1910, with a collaborative volume titled *Sexual Inversion*, written with John Addington Symonds, which, unlike many of the studies published around the same time, sought to promote a more tolerant climate towards homosexuality.⁵⁵ Symons would also sympathise with Wilde after 1895, visiting him during his two-year prison sentence in

⁵⁰ Ross, *The Bibelot*, April 1911: 148. This quotation is taken from Swinburne's review of *A Vision of Love Revealed in Sleep*, published in the *Dark Blue* in 1871. See Swinburne, *Dark Blue*, July 1871: 568-78. Ross re-printed this article in his book *Masques and Phases* in 1909, with some editorial changes, but he removed Swinburne's quote and his request for Solomon's prose poem to be re-printed. It is unclear why this happened, because interest in the poet did not begin to decline until the 1930s, although Ross's decision may have had something to do with Swinburne's death of the same year. For more on Swinburne and his relationship with Solomon see Thais E Morgan's study 'Perverse Male Bodies: Simeon Solomon and Algernon Charles Swinburne', Morgan, 1996a.

⁵¹ Symons, *The Bibelot*, 1911: 152-158. Symons, 1906.

⁵² See chapter six for more on Solomon and the members of the Rhymers' Club.

⁵³ Beckson, 1987: 42.

⁵⁴ Beckson, 1987: 42. Also see Beckson for more information on Symons and Ellis's relationship. For more on Ellis and sex-reform see Weeks, 2000: 16-52.

⁵⁵ Ellis and Symonds, 1897. For more on Symonds see Pemble, 2000. Weeks, 2004.

Reading Gaol.⁵⁶ Consequently, Symons' article on Solomon reflected his benevolence towards the artist when he compared him favourably with Burne-Jones, suggesting that Solomon could have been a "formidable rival" if "circumstances" had been "kinder", but he did criticise Solomon's "hate" of "reality" and suggested that he turned "deliberately backwards".⁵⁷ This, perhaps, echoes Havelock Ellis's warning to 'inverts', "not [to] set" themselves "in violent opposition" to their "society".⁵⁸ Nevertheless, Symons did concur with Ross that Solomon "as lately as ten years ago" was still producing work of worth, but that his most recent drawings were the "splintering wreck of a painter's technique".⁵⁹ Interestingly, though, Symons was possibly the first person after 1873 to make note that Solomon's work was androgynous, or as Symons put it, "without sex", and that "the lips" were "scarcely roughened to indicate a man, the throats scarcely lengthened to indicate a woman".⁶⁰

As already suggested, some of the information provided by Ross was re-used by Falk in 1937, although, interestingly, despite this, Falk suggested that upon meeting Solomon, Ross "fell into" the artist's "trap" because of Solomon's "romancings", and "forgot that he was listening to a "sly rascal" and "consummate hoaxer".⁶¹ Nevertheless, Falk was in agreement with Ross that if Solomon had occasion to meet anybody who had known him "in his better days", then he "showed no traces of embarrassment", and "in his cloudy soul remained some saving grace of humour that reconciled him to the sorriest pass".⁶² However, to Falk, Solomon was more importantly a man who had "lost all sense of restraint", was "tainted with perverse inclination" and "turned into a creature at war with respectable society".⁶³ This interpretation was more than likely influenced by early

⁵⁶ Beckson, 1987: 42.

⁵⁷ Symons, *The Bibelot*, 1911: 152.

⁵⁸ Weeks, 1994: 104.

⁵⁹ Symons, *The Bibelot*, 1911: 157.

⁶⁰ Symons, *The Bibelot*, 1911: 158.

⁶¹ Falk, 1937: 316. Falk suggested that some months before Solomon's death in 1905, he had, himself, met with the artist in a "tavern hard by Seven Dials" where he interviewed Solomon for the article.

⁶² Falk, 1937: 315.

⁶³ Falk, 1937: 312.

twentieth-century scientific thought about ‘sexual deviance’, which pronounced that “sexual perversions usually develop in those who are unhappily born with taint, such as lack of control, or who have their willpower and self-respect weakened by another vice”.⁶⁴

Falk also believed that despite Solomon’s “sorrowing friends” striving hard “to restore him to respectable society”, they were to find that “in the end” he was “incapable of being reclaimed from a vagabond life”.⁶⁵ Falk’s suggestion about Solomon’s life, lived away from the “moral decency” of the home and instead spent in a public workhouse and on the streets, is, as Jeffrey Weeks expresses, indicative of a Victorian attitude which based its decency and morality on the dichotomy between the “naturalness of the home” and the “pollution of the public sphere”.⁶⁶ Weeks also suggests that “the double standard of morality” which “relied upon this separation between the public and the private” was, “by the end of the nineteenth-century, at the heart of moral discourse”.⁶⁷ Solomon’s ‘public’ life, which would have been spent amongst Weeks’ “artificiality of the streets”, which were “badly lit, unhygienic, dangerous and immoral”, was clearly at odds with the versions of morality provided by Falk.

In addition, Falk’s article has to be put into the context of his former career as a writer of sensational journalism for the *London Evening News* around 1909.⁶⁸ This perhaps explains his melodramatic style of prose and particularly his suggestion that Ross had been ‘conned’ by Solomon. Unfortunately, this type of sensationalism only helped to promote Solomon’s damaged reputation, and as late as 1965, the influential American writer William E. Fredeman hailed Falk’s writing on Solomon as “the best, and almost the only analysis” of the artist’s work.⁶⁹ Similarly, in 1968, Lambourne was suggesting that Falk’s

⁶⁴ Weeks, 1990: 29. This quote was taken from Patrick Geddes’ and J. A. Thompson’s *A Home University Library Book* (1914), found in many middle-class homes at the beginning of the twentieth century.

⁶⁵ Falk, 1937: 311.

⁶⁶ Weeks, 1994: 81.

⁶⁷ Weeks, 1994: 81.

⁶⁸ Ferrari, *The Journal of Pre-Raphaelite Studies*, Spring 1999: 78.

⁶⁹ Fredeman, 1965: 214. Fredeman wrote more than fifty articles and reviews on Rossetti and the Pre-Raphaelites in his lifetime, including two volumes of D. G. Rossetti’s letters and W. M. Rossetti’s *Pre-Raphaelite Journal*. For more on Fredeman see: *The University of British Columbia Archives*, at

account of Solomon's life was "by far the fullest account of the artist's life" and a "work to which all subsequent writers on Solomon will always be indebted".⁷⁰

In 1908, Julia Ellsworth Ford produced the first Solomon monograph, which recorded a meeting with the artist "while visiting a studio in London".⁷¹ Ford was primarily a writer of children's fiction, but she was also a well-known New York socialite, who had entertained many famous artistic visitors to her home, including Yeats and the American dancer Isadora Duncan.⁷²

Ford described a different version of Solomon to the one described by Ross and Falk, and portrayed Solomon as an energetic, articulate man, preoccupied with his work and almost too busy to talk. She described Solomon's hasty arrival and his "visible annoyance" at having to "break away" from his work "just as the spirit" was with him.⁷³ Ford recorded that Solomon quickly recovered from his initial irritation, presenting himself as an "interesting and ready talker", who was "bright and alert" and up-to-date with current ideas and debate, and able to talk knowledgably about topics as diverse as "women in athletics", "socialism", and "the modern spirit in English literature".⁷⁴ Ford recalled that Solomon told her many "very humorous stories" and spoke with "enthusiasm" about poetry and poets, especially Shelley and Walt Whitman. Solomon also appeared to be willing to answer her questions about his work and spent some time explaining the idea behind one of his later paintings, *One Watching in the Night* (1894) (Fig. 157).⁷⁵

www.library.ubc.ca/archives/u_arch/fredeman.html. In 1963, the *Jewish Chronicle* also used Falk's work as a biographical reference in an article titled *Solomon's Strange Return*. The article described the "uncanny" coincidence of the artist's work being exhibited in the same building one hundred years apart, when the *Ben Uri Gallery* bought 14 Berners Street, in London, which unbeknown to them had belonged to another fine arts gallery in 1863. Levy, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 1 February 1963: 30.

⁷⁰ Lambourne, *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, 1968: 286, n7.

⁷¹ Ford, 1908a: 21.

⁷² The Beinecke Rare Book Library, at Yale University houses the complete Julia Ellsworth Ford Archive, including letters from WM Rossetti answering her queries about Solomon.

⁷³ Ford, 1908a: 22.

⁷⁴ Ford, 1908a: 22.

⁷⁵ Ford, 1908a: 23. Solomon explained that this painting had been created for a "celebrated surgeon" who desired to give it to a "brother worker who had assisted him through a long and serious operation", This could possibly have been Solomon's nephew Redcliffe Nathan Salaman, who qualified in medicine at the London Hospital in 1900, and became a noted geneticist. For more biographical information on Salaman see

In one respect, however, Ford's record of this meeting does correspond with Ross's statement that Solomon demonstrated a "lack of grievances",⁷⁶ for whilst in her company, Ford suggested that Solomon showed neither the slightest resentment of former friends, or concern for his present condition.⁷⁷ Nonetheless, as suggested, Ford's first-hand account of a buoyant, busy and light-hearted Solomon appears to contradict Ross's earlier pessimistic account of Solomon's condition and mental state, when, according to Ross, "he was sunk in the lowest depths of drink and misery".⁷⁸ It is possible that Ford's more sympathetic view of Solomon was possible because she was an American writer. As I show in chapter six, Solomon's work had become popular in America from the 1890s due to Hollyer's export of photographic reproductions of the artist's work, and American articles published during that time appear, similarly, either to be sympathetic towards or ignorant of Solomon's earlier arrest for sodomy.

Certainly, American law at this time maintained the British common law practice that sodomy was illegal and associated it similarly as a crime against nature.⁷⁹ It would, therefore, follow that the American public perception of homosexuality, particularly after the Wilde trials, would be similar to the British response; but, according to Jonathan Katz, it is difficult to ascertain how the American public reacted after the Wilde trials because, literally, there are so few references to the event.⁸⁰ He suggests, however, that from those that are still extant, it is evident that there was some sympathy to Wilde's plight, but that, generally, little was known.⁸¹

Palladino, 'Salaman, Redcliffe Nathan (1874-1955)', www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/35911, 2004. (accessed 23rd March 2006). The Salaman family were collectors and patrons of Solomon's work.

Note: The figure number for this work appears as 152 because I have ordered the images of Solomon's work chronologically in Volume II.

⁷⁶ Ross, *Academy*, 23 December 1905b: 1336.

⁷⁷ Ford, 1908a: 23.

⁷⁸ Ricketts, *The Burlington Magazine* July 1908: 198.

⁷⁹ See *American Sodomy Laws*, Sodomylaws.org, www.sodomylaws.org/history/history.htm (accessed 15 August, 2005).

⁸⁰ Katz, 1992: 577.

⁸¹ Katz, 1992: 577.

Katz cites the autobiography of Emma Goldman, a major figure in the history of American radicalism and feminism, in which Goldman revealed how she publicly defended Wilde in her speaking engagement before the American public. However, on his visit to the USA in 1896, the British philosopher and social critic, Bertrand Russell, recalled that “no one seemed to know about Wilde’s trouble”.⁸² It could be said that Goldman is not a particularly good example of the general American reaction to Wilde because, as a radical, she would only represent a minority view. But despite the lack of tangible evidence regarding the American response to Wilde, the American public attitude to homosexuality probably would have been similar to that in Britain, because the legal, moral and medical assumptions were comparable.⁸³ It seems likely then that Ford was either ignorant of Solomon’s arrest, or had chosen to ignore it in order to share Goldman’s ‘new woman’ credentials.

After Ford’s publication, there were a few more positive references to Solomon’s early work, but any response to his character remained negative, and unpleasant stories about his sister Rebecca, who was also a painter, began to appear. In 1928, Forrest Reid claimed that “something went amiss with her too, and in the end she came to disaster”.⁸⁴ Rebecca died, accidentally, in 1886, when she was knocked over by a hansom cab on Euston Road, but tales of her life mirroring that of her brother appear to have been started by Murray Marks’ biographer, D. G. Williamson in 1919. Williamson stated that Rebecca was “merry at times and deep in depression at others” and that she was “high spirited” and “resented constraint of any sort”, despite “all the efforts of her friends”.⁸⁵ This presumption, that Rebecca had the same disruptive nature as Solomon, developed into more sinister accusations of sexual ‘deviancy’, which Welby T. Earle expressed, in 1929,

⁸² Katz, 1992. For more on Emma Goldman see *The Emma Goldman Papers*, online at www.sunsite.berkeley.edu/Goldman/ (accessed 12th Feb 2006). For more on Bertrand Russell see *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* at www.plato.stanford.edu/entries/russell/ (accessed 12th Feb 2006).

⁸³ For more on the American reaction to the Wilde trials and a comprehensive history of homosexuality in the USA see Katz, 1992.

⁸⁴ Reid, 1928: 103.

⁸⁵ Williamson, 1919: 157.

as her “disastrous impulses”.⁸⁶ By 1933, Frances Winwar suggested that Rebecca and Solomon had gained their “disregard for conventions” from “some obscure seed”, “where morals existed only to be ignored and laws to be broken”, and in 1985 Pamela Gerrish-Nunn suggested that Rebecca “was eventually a drunkard”.⁸⁷

These suggestions of Rebecca and Solomon’s inherited ‘immorality’, may have been encouraged by the new ‘scientific’ thinking on the origin of sexuality, which had begun as early as 1913, with the proposal by Thomas Hunt Morgan that a person’s sexual identity was inherited;⁸⁸ a view flying in the face of Sigmund Freud’s more often-cited 1905 *Three Essays on Sexuality* which had made the alternative suggestion that personality was developed in terms of ‘psychosexual’ stages, which were recorded as oral, anal, phallic, latent, and genital.⁸⁹ However, in 1944, J. Bauer, writing in a journal on criminality, expressed the opinion that homosexuality was “the result of an inborn constitutional anomaly, probably connected with some malfunction of the sex glands, and possibly hereditary”.⁹⁰

Because of the close identification between Solomon and Rebecca’s inherited ‘immorality’ in the later scholarship, I also make a point of discussing Rebecca’s life after 1873 in addition to Solomon’s in this thesis. This new research into Rebecca’s life after 1873 demonstrates, for the first time, her continued activity as a commissioned artist in the late 1870s, and the effect that the early negative response to Solomon’s arrest eventually had on her life. By doing this, I propose that despite scholarly assumptions that Rebecca’s perceived ‘dissolute’ character and her life after 1873 closely mirrored Solomon’s, there is no archival evidence to support this suggestion. In addition, my study of the details of Rebecca’s life during this time is useful in establishing Solomon’s possible whereabouts during the 1870s and 1880s.

⁸⁶ Earle, 1929: 58.

⁸⁷ Winwar, 1933: 183.

⁸⁸ Morgan, 1913.

⁸⁹ Translated from the German by J. Strachey. See Strachey, 1959.

⁹⁰ Quoted in West, 1960: 93.

In the 1940s, three pieces of writing about Solomon appeared, two of them authored by Thomas Burke. The first, written in 1944, appeared in the *Lilliput Magazine*, a periodical designed for easy reading and the general public.⁹¹ Burke titled his article on the artist ‘The Strange Case of Simeon Solomon’, which, in its reminiscence of Robert Louis Stevenson’s ‘Strange Case of Jekyll and Hyde’, is suggestive of Burke’s general work as a fictional horror writer. His story followed the, by now, fairly familiar tale of Solomon’s ‘downfall’, which was described by Burke as “the wreckage of bright hopes”.⁹² He saw Solomon as a promising artist who “didn’t want his gifts or his personal beauty” and, instead, “threw them to the dogs” when “the rot set in”.⁹³ Burke’s second piece on Solomon appeared in his 1948 book *Son of London*, whose tone was significantly more disparaging of Solomon, whom he described as “a blotchy, unkempt screever”.⁹⁴ Burke also elaborated significantly on the details of Solomon’s life, which he had originally provided in the first article, and suggested that there were stories about Solomon “not only of drink, but of drugs and sexual aberrations and abominations”, and that the artist had “deliberately lived the rest of his life as an exile among the lower outcasts”.⁹⁵

In 1945 William Gaunt included Solomon in his publication on Aestheticism, where he claimed that the artist was the “first casualty” of “art for art’s sake” and was “a warning to others who might take aestheticism too seriously”.⁹⁶ He derided the Aesthetic movement for its “gutter-crazy” participants, of whom Solomon was particularly singled out as one of the worst, who were unable to take part in “a middle-class world” because of their “craving for abjection” and “romanticisation of sin”.⁹⁷ Gaunt’s inferred connection between Aestheticism and homosexuality is also suggested by his mention of London

⁹¹ Burke, *Lilliput Magazine*, July 1844: 38-40.

⁹² Burke, 1944: 38, 39.

⁹³ Burke, *Lilliput Magazine*, July 1844: 37.

⁹⁴ Burke, 1948: 222. Screever was slang for a pavement artist.

⁹⁵ Burke, 1948: 222.

⁹⁶ Gaunt, 1945: 48, 128.

⁹⁷ Gaunt, 1945: 128.

being full of flourishing “Verlaines”, all eager to seek out their “sordid destiny”.⁹⁸ This was a reference to Paul Verlaine, the bisexual French poet and leader of the Symbolist Movement in France, who, in 1873, the same year that Solomon was convicted, was sentenced to two years in jail after shooting his lover, the poet Arthur Rimbaud, in the wrist.⁹⁹

Like Falk before him, Gaunt also reproduced Ross’s alleged tales of Solomon’s antics and embellished them with his own, slightly comical, moralising treatise on the artist, whom he thought had a “lurking anger” which was aggrieved at society and showed itself as a “kind of obstructive helplessness” which caused “people to lie down in the street in front of moving vehicles”.¹⁰⁰

The Later Scholarship

During the 1950s, interest in the artist waned, but a revival of interest in the Pre-Raphaelite movement as a whole, towards the end of the 1960s, encouraged some new Solomon research. This resurgence of interest appeared around the same time as the 1967 Sexual Offences Act, which decriminalised male homosexual activities for adults over the age of twenty-one.¹⁰¹ However, despite this ruling, and a more sympathetic reading of Solomon, the writing of this period is still notable for its continued use of homophobic language. In 1967, Rupert Croft-Cooke spoke of Solomon’s propensity for humour as “the natural campness of his kind”, but that he wasn’t as funny as the usual “Cockney queer”.¹⁰² Two years later, William Pearsall wrote that Solomon was the most “raffish of Victorian perverts”, whose “naughty ways” were “unashamedly homosexual and perverse”.¹⁰³

Weeks suggests that the propensity for writers to use such language in the 1960s reinforced

⁹⁸ Gaunt, 1945: 128.

⁹⁹ Robb, 2003: 27. See chapter one for more information on Verlaine.

¹⁰⁰ Gaunt, 1945: 127.

¹⁰¹ Weeks, 1990: 176.

¹⁰² Croft-Cooke, 1967: 40.

¹⁰³ Pearsall, 1969: 451.

the negative stereotype of the homosexual male and was fuelled mostly by the popular press.¹⁰⁴

Nevertheless, there were signs of authors looking beyond Solomon's 'scandalous behaviour'. The first of these writers was Lambourne, who would become head of paintings at the V & A from 1986 to 1993. Lambourne wrote his first article about Solomon in *Apollo* in 1967, which for the first time sourced information about the artist's life directly from descendants of the Solomon family.¹⁰⁵ Unfortunately, articles still appeared in the 1970s which, despite Lambourne's new research, produced imprecise accounts of Solomon's life and, in particular, mention of the details of his arrest remained confused. Alfred Werner, tellingly, supposed in 1975 that Solomon was "careless enough to be caught in the act of molesting a boy", and appeared untroubled that his information was incorrect.¹⁰⁶ Four years later, Wendell Stacy Johnson included Solomon in a chapter of his book entitled *Sexual Deviants*, and, like Werner, made significant mistakes about the artist's trial and its aftermath:¹⁰⁷ for example Werner described a fictitious account of how the Victorian general public had expressed their horror and disgust when Solomon's trial became 'public'; however, as I demonstrate in chapter one, Solomon's trial was not reported in any of the main newspapers, and there was confusion even among Solomon's close friends regarding his fate.¹⁰⁸

In the 1980s Lambourne's previously executed biographical work and less morally judgmental consideration of Solomon's life and works inspired the attempted writing of new biographies of the artist. It has been suggested that Lambourne had been in the process of writing a full biography of Solomon, but to date it has never appeared.¹⁰⁹ Indeed, in 1985, the first publication devoted entirely to the chronicling of Solomon's life emerged,

¹⁰⁴ Weeks, 1990: 163.

¹⁰⁵ Lambourne, *Apollo*, January 1967: 59-61.

¹⁰⁶ Werner, *Art and Artists*, January 1975: 9.

¹⁰⁷ See chapter one for more information on Johnson's article.

¹⁰⁸ Johnson, 1979: 167.

¹⁰⁹ Croft-Cooke, 1967: 38. Croft-Cooke also proposed that Lambourne was about to publish a full-length biography.

written and researched by Simon Reynolds, and illustrated with many previously unseen and unpublished paintings and drawings. In his preface, Reynolds concurred that Lambourne had a Solomon biography “well in hand” and acknowledged his assistance and guidance as invaluable.¹¹⁰ However, despite the inclusion of many new illustrations and a re-printing of Solomon’s prose poem of 1871, *A Vision of Love Revealed in Sleep*, Reynolds’ modest biography remains frustrating for its lack of rigour, particularly when citing primary research, and its casual observations regarding Solomon’s character are unnecessarily subjective.¹¹¹ However, this work remains the only major published monograph of the artist’s life, and its influence on the current general perception of Solomon is considerable.

A year after Reynolds’ book was published, the American scholar Gayle Seymour produced a far more meticulously researched, but still unpublished, PhD thesis that documented Solomon’s early life and work in detail. She also acknowledged that Lambourne’s help had been invaluable, particularly with respect to her research, to the extent that she supposed she could not have written her thesis without him.¹¹² However, Seymour only devotes twenty pages of her two-hundred-and-twenty-three-page thesis to Solomon’s life and work after his arrest in 1873, and, despite making reference to the availability of the arrest documents, she makes only a cursory consideration of the subject.

Accompanying this biographical work, a new interest in Solomon’s imagery began to appear, suggested by such writers as Steven Kolsteren and Emmanuel Cooper.¹¹³ They continued to develop ideas that had been proposed in the late 1970s by writers such as John Christian. Christian wrote a brief analysis of the artist’s paintings that described Solomon’s

¹¹⁰ Reynolds, 1985: i.

¹¹¹ When commenting on Abraham Solomon’s painting of his brother Simeon as a baby, Reynolds asks the question; “are the seeds of alcoholism already apparent in baby Simeon’s facial expression?” Reynolds, 1985: description of plate 7.

¹¹² Seymour, 1986: iv.

¹¹³ For Kolsteren on Solomon see the following: Kolsteren, *The Journal of Pre-Raphaelite Studies*, May 1982: 35-48, Kolsteren, *The Journal of Pre-Raphaelite Studies*, May 1984: 62-69, Kolsteren, *Dreamworks: An Interdisciplinary Quarterly*, 1986-87: 113-22, Kolsteren, www.ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/skolsteren, (July 27, 2005). For Cooper on Solomon see: Cooper, 1985 and Cooper, 1994.

fascination with Symbolism, directly influenced by Rossetti and Burne-Jones.¹¹⁴ He described Solomon's work as "a vision that was at once mystical and sensuous" and made mention of the artist's androgynous imagery, which he believed was "taken up by Burne-Jones".¹¹⁵ In 1982, Kolsteren also discussed the influence that Rossetti's iconography had on Solomon's work and particularly that which was influenced by *A Vision of Love Revealed in Sleep*.¹¹⁶ He was also interested in Solomon's often-repeated biblical theme *The Song of Songs*, which, along with the artist's poem, is suggestive of a private mythology.¹¹⁷

At the end of 1985, the Geffrye Museum in London hosted an exhibition of work by Solomon and siblings Abraham and Rebecca. In the exhibition catalogue, Cooper wrote an article about Solomon's androgynous themes after his 1873 arrest, which he described as 'homosexual', less complex in composition, and in which the theme of androgyny had become prominent.¹¹⁸ In this article, Cooper also made a new determination of Solomon as a person who chose to reject offers of help from friends and family in order that he could "be free to pursue his own ideas" and also "because he did not want to be beholden to them".¹¹⁹

Despite this positive new consideration of Solomon's life and work, a review of the exhibition, which had transferred to Birmingham after the London showing, determined that the three Solomon painters would make a better "one-family case for the most lurid of soaps".¹²⁰ The reviewer, Rosemary Treble, who suggested, cryptically, that she had read the exhibition catalogue, continued to adopt the early, negative attitude and ideas about Solomon and Rebecca that were clearly not evident in the exhibition's publication. She suggested that Solomon "courted disaster throughout his life with determination and lack

¹¹⁴ Christian, 1977: 4.

¹¹⁵ Christian, 1977: 26.

¹¹⁶ Kolsteren, *The Journal of Pre-Raphaelite Studies*, May 1982: 35-48.

¹¹⁷ Kolsteren, *The Journal of Pre-Raphaelite Studies*, May 1982: 47.

¹¹⁸ Cooper, 1985: 31.

¹¹⁹ Cooper, 1985: 33.

¹²⁰ Treble, *The Burlington Magazine*, 1986: 53.

of any instinct for self-preservation” and pronounced Abraham as “certainly the best” artist of the family.¹²¹ Her opinion that Rebecca “declined latterly into alcohol, dragged down” by “dependence on and support for her brother Simeon” is surely taken from Earle and Winwar’s opinions of Rebecca, related in the early 1930s. Treble’s evident favouritism for the ‘obedient’ Solomon, Abraham, is clear, for she devoted nearly the entire article to his work, ignoring that of his brother and sister.

Unfortunately it was still the case that some writers were continuing to rely on out-dated sources of information and ideas, although it is likely that the exhibition encouraged a revival of interest in the artist. This is suggested by the attention shown to Solomon from members of the gay community, who produced some interesting interpretations of his life. In 1988 the gay theatre director and playwright Neil Bartlett was wondering, “why can I find no books about a man named Simeon Solomon?”¹²² He voiced this question in his personal meditation on Wilde’s life, which used miscellaneous information, such as police reports and clues from Wilde’s literary texts to re-imagine gay lives in the nineteenth-century and to link them with the homosexual male in the 1980s. Bartlett succinctly made a suggestion about Solomon that concurs with this thesis, that the “fall of the artist” was an “unapologetic survival of ‘disgrace’” and that his life was an “instructive contrast to the moral neatness of the fable of Oscar Wilde”.¹²³ Bartlett continued to explore Solomon’s life in his 1989 play *A Vision of Love Revealed in Sleep*, which dramatised the massive downturn in attitude to the homosexual male in the latter part of the twentieth century with the onset of AIDS. He portrayed Solomon as a gay ‘hero’, who could provide moral and spiritual support because of his ‘courage’ and ‘defiance’.¹²⁴

The 1990s brought about an increased acknowledgement of Solomon as a major force in the Pre-Raphaelite movement and a re-evaluation of his later ‘downfall’ was being

¹²¹ Treble, *The Burlington Magazine*, 1986: 53.

¹²² Bartlett, 1988: 30.

¹²³ Bartlett, 1988: 30.

¹²⁴ Bartlett, 1990: 84.

expressed. This was encouraged by the new queer theoretical writing of scholars such as Dellamora, who emphasised the possibility of sexual self-definition during the mid-nineteenth century.¹²⁵ Indeed, Dellamora suggested that Solomon's homoerotic work signalled a "sexual interest recognizable to those in the know"¹²⁶ and that he "made deliberate choices against respectability and against becoming an object of charity".¹²⁷ In 1996, Thais E. Morgan furthered this suggestion by focusing on Solomon's friendship with Swinburne, and their shared homoerotic imagery, which she described as "some of the most aesthetically innovative and morally daring work of the 1860s and early 1870s".¹²⁸

Twenty-first-century interest in Solomon began in 2000, with Henry Sandberg's unpublished Ph.D. thesis, which concentrated mainly on the artist's androgynous imagery, and could be considered important work, but unfortunately Sandberg's inability to correctly quote important dates and events, as well as some of his notions of homosexuality, makes the work appear sloppy, both conceptually and archivally.¹²⁹

More recently, scholars such as Cruise, Prettejohn and Ferrari have done much to continue promoting Solomon as an important member of the Pre-Raphaelite and Aesthetic movements. On the 1st October 2005, a major retrospective of the artist's work took place at the Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery, which was billed at the time as "the first full-scale survey of Solomon's career in a hundred years".¹³⁰ It was curated by Cruise, who also edited the exhibition catalogue titled *Love Revealed*, which gave many new insights into the artist's life and work.¹³¹ The essays in the catalogue primarily cover Solomon's life before 1873, and include Prettejohn's study of the classicism in Solomon's work, Seymour's study of Solomon's Old Testament imagery, Debra N. Mancoff's work on the artist's Pre-Raphaelite identity and Ferrari's study into Solomon's letters and

¹²⁵ Sedgwick, 1990.

¹²⁶ Dellamora, 1990: 46.

¹²⁷ Dellamora, 1990: 171.

¹²⁸ Morgan, 1996a: 62.

¹²⁹ Sandberg, 2000: 169. Sandberg suggests that Solomon's arrest in London was in 1872 and not 1873, which completely negates his ideas about certain paintings that he feels were executed at this time.

¹³⁰ www.bmag.org.uk/exhibitions/love_revealed/ (accessed 19th July, 2005).

¹³¹ Cruise, 2005.

correspondence, particularly in relation to the artist's early patrons James Leathart and Frederick Layland. Ferrari has also done much to promote awareness of Solomon through the creation of a website dedicated to Solomon research, which contains a comprehensive bibliography, timeline and many illustrations of the artist's work.¹³²

As I have shown, Solomon's early historiography was heavily influenced by writers such as Ross and Falk, and this writing has had a significant impact on the subsequent negative critical appraisal of Solomon. However, it is also clear that this early writing was prejudiced by the concurrent illegality of homosexual acts and by prejudiced pseudo-scientific and theoretical conjecture about homosexuality. Fortunately, because of work formulated by queer theorists in recent years, and a more liberal attitude to homosexuality, Solomon's life and work is beginning to be re-evaluated and appreciated, as suggested by the exhibition of his work in 2005. Nevertheless, there are still vast gaps in our understanding of the detail of Solomon's life, particularly in the under-studied area after 1873, and it is this detail that the present thesis addresses especially.

¹³² This can be accessed at www.simeonsolomon.org. (accessed 1st Nov 2009).

CHAPTER I

1873: THE LONDON ARREST, THE QUESTION OF THE ASYLUM, AND GOSSIP

In *Living in Sin: the Victorian Sexual Revolution* (1979), Wendell Stacy Johnson published the jury's 1873 Indictment of Solomon and Roberts in full, and made some attempt at deciphering the contents.¹³³ The indictment is reproduced in a chapter, titled without irony, 'Victorian Deviants'. As reproduced, it contains at least twelve word errors and three completely missing sentences. It cannot, therefore, be described as a reliable source. In *The Vision of Simeon Solomon* (1985), Simon Reynolds published some of the facts of the arrest in his monograph. In the same year, Gayle Seymour also provided similar documentary evidence in the catalogue for the *Solomon: a Family of Painters* exhibition, which was held at the Geffrye Museum in London that year.¹³⁴ In 1986, Seymour reiterated these facts in her PhD thesis, suggesting that an "account of the trial" had "never been published", even though "the documents pertaining to it" were still available for consultation, and, to date, this situation has remained.¹³⁵ Therefore, all of Solomon's arrest documents are discussed in this chapter for the first time.

The *Calendar of Prisoners* recorded that at 7.10pm on Tuesday the 11th February 1873, Solomon was arrested with George Roberts, a sixty-year-old stableman who "could read but not write".¹³⁶ The men were arrested in a public urinal by police constable William Mitchell, around the corner from Marylebone Lane Police Station, in Stratford Place Mews, off Oxford Street.¹³⁷ They were taken to the police station and held overnight in the cells. On the following day, they were brought before the Magistrate, Lieutenant L. T. D'Eyncourt, at the Marylebone Police Court, at 2 Seymour Place, and read the charge "that they did unlawfully attempt feloniously to commit the abominable crime of

¹³³ Johnson, 1979: 166.

¹³⁴ Reynolds, 1985: 81. Seymour, 1986.

¹³⁵ Seymour, 1986: 205.

¹³⁶ Calendar of Prisoners, London Metropolitan Archive, X071/ 100, London Metropolitan Archive, 1873.

¹³⁷ This area is now called St Christopher's Place. There is still a gentleman's underground Victorian public toilet in the centre of this area but it unclear whether this is the same public urinal used by Solomon.

buggery”.¹³⁸ The arraignment recorded the response of the two men to the charge, both making a plea for their innocence. The stableman, Roberts, protested, “it’s a false charge” and, when prompted, Solomon acquiesced that it was “equally so” with him.¹³⁹

Although both men declared their innocence, they were indicted with having a “venereal affair with each other” and bound over for trial.¹⁴⁰ Reynolds incorrectly suggests that the men were charged with “gross indecency”, but this would have been a legal impossibility at this time.¹⁴¹ The *Labouchere Amendment* of the 1885 Criminal Law Amendment Act, sought to criminalise *all* male homosexual acts whether committed in public or private, and thirteen years later, the 1898 *Vagrancy Act* clamped down on homosexual ‘soliciting’.¹⁴² The charge of ‘gross indecency’ was created as a direct result of these acts, and was responsible for convicting Oscar Wilde in 1895, but did not exist in 1873. The Criminal Register for 1873 records that Solomon and Roberts were charged with an “attempt to commit buggery”, which will be discussed in more detail later, but essentially the crimes of buggery and sodomy were linked with other sexual crimes, such as bestiality, paedophilia and incest, and grouped together as ‘unnatural offences’, (‘unnatural’, because they were non-procreative) and were usually described as ‘indecent assault’, or in the case of buggery and sodomy, ‘assault with intent’.¹⁴³

It is likely that Solomon and Roberts would have been taken to the Clerkenwell House of Detention after they left court, where they would have been locked up pending their appearance at the Middlesex Sessions House, Clerkenwell on the 24th February. At this February session, Solomon was allowed to post bail of £200 with a surety of £200 paid by his cousin, Myer Salaman, of No 9 Euston Square, London.¹⁴⁴ Roberts was not released,

¹³⁸ Middlesex Sessions Roll: Adjourned Sessions, London Metropolitan Archive, MJ/SB/C/020, London Metropolitan Archive, 1873.

¹³⁹ MJ/SB/C/020 LMA, 1873.

¹⁴⁰ Sessions of the Peace, London Metropolitan Archive, MJ/SR/5405, L. M. A., 1873.

¹⁴¹ Reynolds, 1985: 81.

¹⁴² Jeffery-Poulter, 1991: 9-10.

¹⁴³ Cocks, 2003a: 17-18.

¹⁴⁴ X071/100 LMA, 1873.

presumably because he could not afford to post bail, and remained in prison.¹⁴⁵ The trial was then held over until the next session, on the 10th March, and subsequently held over again until the 24th March.¹⁴⁶ At this hearing, before the assistant judge, Sir W. H. Bodkin, and his deputy, Mr Sergeant Cox, both men were found guilty by the jury. Solomon was fortunate enough to escape a custodial prison sentence but was required to pay a surety of £100 on condition that he returned to court if necessary.¹⁴⁷ This verdict essentially allowed Solomon to walk free. The unfortunate Roberts, however, was sentenced to eighteen months hard labour in the House of Correction at Cold Bath Fields.

This verdict is, perhaps, unsurprising when considering the social divide between the two men. It is likely that Roberts, as a sixty-year-old, working-class man, had taken a bigger risk with his liberty than the middle-class bohemian artist. It is clear that a man of lower social status was in a considerably weaker position when caught and charged with this type of offence than a gentleman, because of the Victorian perception of equating morality with respectability.¹⁴⁸ Solomon was also in a superior position because of his connection with an extended wealthy family, the Salamans, and the likely assumption made by the court of his familial good character, which may have given him an early release from prison and afforded him only twelve days incarceration at the Clerkenwell House of Detention.

As suggested, it was probably fortunate for Solomon that his cousin Myer Salaman was one of the wealthiest Jewish men in London. Salaman's business selling ostrich feathers had offices all over the world, and, at the time of Solomon's arrest, Salaman was living in a prestigious, seven- bedroomed house in Bloomsbury.¹⁴⁹ It is probable that

¹⁴⁵ MJ/SR/5405, LMA, 1873.

¹⁴⁶ Calendar of Prisoners, LMA, X071/ 100

¹⁴⁷ Reynolds suggests that Solomon was given a sentence of six weeks in prison. This is incorrect. According to the documentation he received no extra time in prison. In fact Solomon spent only twelve days in total in the Clerkenwell House of Detention. Reynolds, 1985: 81.

¹⁴⁸ Cocks, 2003a: 121.

¹⁴⁹ Endelman, *Jewish Social Sciences*, Fall 2004: 54. Myer was the father of Redcliffe Nathan Salaman (1874-1955), a geneticist of considerable recognition, who before the rise of Nazism was the first scientist to propose that the Jewish people were a genetically unique race.

Myer's financial and social influence went some way to affording Solomon an extremely lenient punishment. It is also interesting to note that, in her monograph on Burne-Jones, Penelope Fitzgerald suggests that the artist "put in a good word" for Solomon upon his arrest, which, if it is true, may also suggest another reason for this clemency, although there is no evidence to suggest that this ever happened.¹⁵⁰

As a working-class man, Roberts was more than likely a casual sexual encounter for Solomon, and probably unknown to him before that night, for in his evidence Roberts suggests that he "had nothing to do with" Solomon.¹⁵¹ However, it could be argued that Solomon chose a sexual encounter with Roberts, because it would make the crime appear to be less premeditated. Nonetheless, it remains unclear whether the two men had met elsewhere and then used the urinal as a place to have sexual intercourse, although the indictment does suggest that both men "did meet together" at this place, but since neither man admitted to knowing the other, this could be unsubstantiated court rhetoric. However, historically, this type of location was one typical meeting place for men of all classes seeking sex with other men, simply because it was a private male area, located in an easily accessed public place, which a man could anonymously and legitimately enter without drawing attention to any 'undesirable' intent.¹⁵²

That said, the public urinal in the city location was heavily policed and it is likely that both men would have been aware of the serious risk of detection. The Metropolitan Police were alert to the 'cottaging' activities of local 'sodomites' and frequently traversed their meeting places.¹⁵³ It is evident from PC William Mitchell's statement, regarding his discovery of Solomon and Roberts, that he would have had to purposefully enter the urinal

¹⁵⁰ Fitzgerald, 1989: 151.

¹⁵¹ MJ/SB/C/020, LMA, 1873.

¹⁵² Houlbrook, *The London Journal*, 2000: 53, 62.

¹⁵³ Cocks, 2003a: 29.

from Oxford Street where he was on duty, which could suggest that he was checking it out on his round.¹⁵⁴

Despite Marylebone's particularly rife association with other places of same-sex desire, such as 'molly houses' and 'cruising' locations such as Regent's Park and Berkeley Square, public urinals in particular were a place where the police had problems procuring reliable accusations of sodomy.¹⁵⁵ This was because most incidents occurred at night and in badly lit locations, and because public urinals were a place where a man could acceptably expose his genitals in the presence of other men for the purposes of urination.¹⁵⁶ It is possible that suspects arrested by the police would have been fully aware of the difficulty that constables had in securing evidence, and it might be seen that by their complete denial of guilt, that Solomon and Roberts were aware of this possibility.

The arrest documents indicate that when the prisoners were brought into Marylebone police station and read the charge of attempted buggery, Roberts exclaimed to Inspector James Austin that the accusation was "all lies", and that his attendance in the urinal was purely for the purposes of "making water".¹⁵⁷ Roberts later gave evidence to the court that attempted to corroborate his innocence, suggesting that there were

three or four gentlemen there. The places were all occupied and I made water behind this gentleman here, (pointing to Solomon). He was standing in the corner and I made water just behind him. He had his trousers down. I did not learn what he was doing. I had got my back towards him. I had nothing to do with him. I never touched him and never spoke to him.¹⁵⁸

Unfortunately, despite Roberts' attempts to prove his innocence, his evidence is in direct contradiction to that of the arresting officer, Mitchell, who declared that "Roberts' back

¹⁵⁴ MJ/SB/C/020, LMA, 1873.

¹⁵⁵ Cocks, 2003a: 57. The 'molly house' was a brothel behind closed doors, for men of all classes seeking sex with other men. The infamous eighteenth-century Mother Clap's molly house was situated not far from Marylebone in Holborn.

¹⁵⁶ Houlbrook, *The London Journal*, 2000: 53.

¹⁵⁷ MJ/SB/C/020, LMA, 1873.

¹⁵⁸ MJ/SB/C/020, LMA, 1873.

was not to Solomon. His trousers were down below his knees. There was no one else in the urinal but the prisoners. They were both in one compartment.”¹⁵⁹

As a police constable, Mitchell’s evidence would be considered by the jury as more honest and reliable than that of a stableman in suspicious circumstances, although it is interesting to note that, at the beginning of Roberts’ testimony, he makes the claim that the constable is lying. It could be argued that a man in this unenviable position would inevitably make this type of accusation against an arresting officer in order to procure his freedom, although it also needs to be considered that many members of the Metropolitan Constabulary engaged in forms of entrapment and lying in order to deal with the pressure of securing arrests for the purposes of ridding the streets of the ‘immoral’ and ‘undesirable’.¹⁶⁰ This type of ‘ethical policing’ in the Metropolis, which came to prominence around the 1870s, was created by the direct influence of leading moral reformers who sought to suppress the activities of those members of society that they considered depraved.¹⁶¹ According to Harry Cocks’ recent research into nineteenth-century homosexual activity, Marylebone was the London parish in which most offences of buggery were recorded in the nineteenth century.¹⁶² Although generally these crimes were reported evenly throughout the parishes, it is possible that either the Marylebone division officers were particularly perseverant in their endeavours, or, as I have argued, that this was a particular Victorian hotspot.¹⁶³

Despite this diligence, the level of committal of prisoners charged with sodomy was low, compared to the high arrest rate at the time of Solomon’s apprehension and this appears to be related to the difficulty in prosecuting such acts because of the difficult burden of proof that the act of sodomy entailed.¹⁶⁴ This is apparent in Solomon and

¹⁵⁹ MJ/SB/C/020, LMA, 1873.

¹⁶⁰ Houlbrook, *The London Journal*, 2000: 56.

¹⁶¹ Petrow, 1994: 4.

¹⁶² Cocks, 2003a: 59.

¹⁶³ Cocks, 2003a: 59.

¹⁶⁴ Cocks, 2003a: 67.

Roberts' case, for both men were charged and found guilty of an 'attempt' rather than the actual commission of buggery.¹⁶⁵ It is also interesting to note the arresting officer's careful adherence to the allegation of attempted sodomy, despite a specific indication that he may have observed them in the act. He says "both (men) had their trousers down. They were standing up. Solomon has his coat and shirt turned up over his back. Roberts had hold of him by the front with his person exposed".¹⁶⁶ The fact that the two men were charged with the 'attempt' is more than likely the reason that they - and Roberts in particular - did not receive the maximum custodial sentence that contemporary law dictated.

The two men were convicted under the 1861 *Offences Against the Person Act-Unnatural Offences*, which implied life imprisonment and penal servitude for the crime of buggery. However, the attempted crime received a less serious custodial sentence, which can be seen in the following passage from this ruling:

61. Whosoever shall be convicted of the abominable crime of buggery, committed either with mankind or with an animal, shall be liable, at the discretion of the court, to be kept in penal servitude for life or for any term not less than ten years.
62. Whosoever shall attempt to commit the said abominable crime, or shall be guilty of any assault with intent to commit the same, or of any indecent assault upon any male person, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and being convicted thereof shall be liable, at the discretion of the court, to be kept in penal servitude for any term not exceeding ten years and not less than three years, or to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour.¹⁶⁷

This law superseded the three-hundred-and-thirty-year old ruling by Henry VIII that had decreed the death penalty to punish "the detestable and abominable vice of buggery committed with mankind or beast" which had no counterpart of this magnitude elsewhere in Europe.¹⁶⁸ However, these two laws were not concerned with the policing of homosexuality, which had yet to be given a name or an identity in law, but rather the enforcement of the act of sodomy which did not differentiate between man, woman or beast. As already suggested, sexual crimes such as sodomy, bestiality, and other

¹⁶⁵ MJ/SB/C/020, LMA, 1873.

¹⁶⁶ MJ/SB/C/020, LMA, 1873.

¹⁶⁷ White, 1999: 44.

¹⁶⁸ Davenport-Hines, 1991: 59.

‘unnatural’ non-procreative sexual acts, were usually described as indecent assault or in the case of sodomy ‘assault with intent’.¹⁶⁹

The etymological origin of the word sodomy comes from the Old Testament, and is specifically mentioned in Genesis 19 when “the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah sulphur and fire from heaven”.¹⁷⁰ The general suggestion is that the Bible dictated the act of sodomy as an abomination that manifested itself as adultery, fornication, incest, nakedness, paedophilia, and paganism, in which the people of Sodom (Sodomites) engaged. However, Michael Carden suggests that the terms sodomite and sodomy appear to be a patriarchal heterosexual interpretation of the city of Sodom and, historically, have been used to sustain the idea of ‘deviant’ sexual behaviour.¹⁷¹ The language used in the condemnation of Solomon and Roberts in their indictment documentation is taken straight from the wrath of the Old Testament, and the “detestable” and “abominable” accused are described as “wickedly” committing with each other “diverse, lewd and unnatural practices”.¹⁷²

Cocks suggests that it is unusual in British legal tradition to publically name the crime of sodomy, because it was considered such an abomination, and in Solomon’s arrest documentation, only the title page uses this word.¹⁷³ Cocks also suggests that sodomy cases are difficult to research because the documentation fails to use the word sodomy to describe the crime, and in many cases the crime is simply not recorded, or is so insufficiently recorded that is nearly impossible to find.¹⁷⁴ The main body of text in Solomon’s indictment chooses to substitute the word buggery for sodomy although this is used only once, and the crime is described otherwise as “a certain felony” and “a venereal affair”.¹⁷⁵ In 1891, John Addington Symonds complained that “the accomplished

¹⁶⁹ Cocks, 2003a: 17-18.

¹⁷⁰ Genesis 19:24.

¹⁷¹ Carden, 2004: 12.

¹⁷² MJ/SR/5405, LMA, 1873.

¹⁷³ Cocks, 2003a: 20.

¹⁷⁴ Cocks, 2003a: 20.

¹⁷⁵ MJ/SR/5405, LMA, 1873.

languages of Europe in the nineteenth century supply no terms for this persistent feature of human psychology, without importing some implication of disgust, disgrace, vituperation".¹⁷⁶ Chris White theorised that this development was an indirect, "avoidance of naming the beast" which developed into "mere insults".¹⁷⁷

The idea that sodomy was beyond nature and understanding has biblical connotations of ungodliness, but it was also supported by the idea that it crossed the boundary of common humanity. The association of the public urinal emphasised this idea of the unclean and tainted 'sodomite', who would use this "open and public space" to sin "against the order of nature".¹⁷⁸ Certainly, the fact that Solomon was caught in a public urinal went some way towards the condemnation of his 'degraded' character, by future writers. However, at the point of his arrest, Solomon would not have been seen in law or society as a homosexual, but as a 'sodomite'. According to Michel Foucault's paradigm of social construction, the concept of homosexuality as a type of person did not occur in Germany until 1870 with Karl Westphal's article on "contrary sexual sensations" when the practice of sodomy was reordered into a type of sexual sensibility.¹⁷⁹ In England, however, it was first mentioned in a publication, by Krafft-Ebing in 1892, in a medical book on sexual 'deviancy'.¹⁸⁰ The new critical understanding of homosexuality that Foucault's work proposed gave the impression that homosexuality had no heritage before the 1870s and that it "was just a certain repertoire of acts, not a personality trait".¹⁸¹ In fact, Graham Robb argues that nineteenth-century male 'sodomites' were no different than some modern understandings of male homosexuality, in that they shared "similar daily experiences, a shared culture, and of course an ability to fall in love with people of their own sex".¹⁸²

¹⁷⁶ Halperin, 1990: 17.

¹⁷⁷ White, 1999: 2.

¹⁷⁸ MJ/SR/5405, LMA, 1873.

¹⁷⁹ Westphal, *Archiv für Psychiatrie und Nervenkrankheiten*, 1869: 73-108. The date of the article was actually 1869. Foucault, 1998: 43.

¹⁸⁰ Halperin, 1990: 15.

¹⁸¹ Robb, 2003: 11.

¹⁸² Robb, 2003: 12.

Homosexuality was categorized as a crime ‘against public decency’ but this also included the offences of indecent exposure, loitering, vagrancy and disorderly behaviour.¹⁸³ However, the prosecution of such crimes of ‘public offence’ was made difficult because of the articulation of the law itself. The offence must have been ‘public’ enough to be witnessed by another person or persons. In this sense, ‘public’ did not equate with a physical location, but rather it indicated that the crime had been committed in the full or partial view of someone else. These crimes could still be prosecuted even if they took place in a private home or gentleman’s club, for example.¹⁸⁴ The indictment of Solomon and Roberts is worded in such a way that it firmly designates their crime as public, by intimating the presence of the general public as possible offended witnesses. It described the scene of the crime as

a certain urinal frequented and resorted to by many of the liege subjects of our Lady the Queen for a necessary purposes [sic] and in a certain open and public place[...] in the sight and view of such persons [...] there being and then and there passing[...] to the great damage and common nuisance of all the liege subjects.¹⁸⁵

The offence is regarded as public because of evidence provided by PC Mitchell in the first instance, and suggested by members of the public “passing and re-passing” and to their “great damage and common nuisance”¹⁸⁶. However, Cocks suggests that the rules requiring the evidence of a witness, which would then specify the act as public, were imperfect. His research suggests that a witness, in some cases, did not actually have to confirm the crime visually, for the accused to be found guilty.¹⁸⁷ The police were reluctant to regulate private homes and spaces because of a respect for privacy, a lack of manpower, and the already discussed difficulty in providing substantiated evidence, although Robb believes that there

¹⁸³ Cocks, 2003a: 23.

¹⁸⁴ Cocks, 2003a: 34.

¹⁸⁵ MJ/SR/5405, LMA, 1873.

¹⁸⁶ MJ/SR/5405, LMA, 1873.

¹⁸⁷ Cocks, 2003a: 36.

is a common misconception that ‘private’ offences of ‘unnatural’ behaviour could not be prosecuted until the 1885 Labouchere Amendment.¹⁸⁸

Writing in 2003, Robb calls this amendment “the biggest non-event” in the history of homosexual law because its intention to outlaw all acts of ‘gross indecency’ in public and private was already in effect.¹⁸⁹ He also suggests that conviction rates for this type of crime before and after the Amendment were practically identical and that there was no significant rise until the twentieth century.¹⁹⁰ Cocks furthers this argument by suggesting that the “amendment did not revolutionize the law or move its focus from sexual acts to particular ‘homosexual’ types of people”, because despite the new creation of the charge of ‘gross indecency’ that made all sexual acts between men illegal, “changes in statute were mainly confirmations of existing common law practices”.¹⁹¹ Cocks’ research into nineteenth-century court convictions of sodomy show that the effect that the Amendment intended appears to have been adapted in courts during the eighteenth century for the settled practice of the common law at this time, and was to treat any attempt to commit a crime as an offence in itself. Therefore, Cocks suggests that the Amendment was simply “part of a process” which had begun a century earlier.¹⁹² Until recently, scholars discussing the historical legality of homosexuality would have disagreed with this. In 1990, Richard Dellamora regarded the Labouchere Amendment as a marked “decisive turn for the worse in the legal situation of men in Britain, who engaged in sexual activities with other men”.¹⁹³ However, Cocks believes that the 1898 amendment regarding soliciting was far

¹⁸⁸ Robb, 2003: 20.

¹⁸⁹ Robb, 2003: 20. The repeal of offences regarded as buggery or gross indecency occurred in the Sexual Offences Act 2003, and came into force 1 May 2004. Interestingly, it now contains the latest offence against “sexual activity in a public lavatory”. See *The United Kingdom Parliament Website* www.publications.parliament.uk (accessed 6 February 2007).

¹⁹⁰ Robb, 2003: 21.

¹⁹¹ Cocks, 2003a: 31.

¹⁹² Cocks, 2003a: 17.

¹⁹³ Dellamora, 1990: 200.

more damaging to homosexuality, because it encompassed the idea of the ‘homosexual’ as a type of person in law, by prosecuting the “importuning” of a “homosexual offence”.¹⁹⁴

In Solomon’s case, evidence for the prosecution of attempted sodomy was also allowed by the courts in the form of a physical examination, and both men were subjected to this humiliation. They were examined at Marylebone Police Station on the evening of their arrest by the police surgeon for the Marylebone division, thirty-five year old Frederick William Spurgin, who is described as “living at 14 Henrietta St” in Cavendish Square.¹⁹⁵ Spurgin’s examination, illustrated in his testimony, was highly intimate and rigorously clinical in its execution.

For centuries, physicians had been subjecting men and women to medical examinations of their genitalia and rectums for traces of sodomy. In 1858 the British *Quarterly Journal of Practical Medicine and Surgery* discussed the French physician, Dr. Auguste Ambroise Tardieu’s “important memoir” on the ‘Medico-legal Relations of Paederasty’.¹⁹⁶ His book *Étude Médico-légale sur les Attentats aux Mœurs*, published in 1857, helped to facilitate the decisions of French courts in respect of legal cases involving ‘pédérastie’.¹⁹⁷ Tardieu was an influential forensic doctor and a legal expert in sexual crimes, becoming professor of forensic medicine at the Faculty of Medicine in Paris in 1861.¹⁹⁸ The book was re-published seven times between 1857 and 1858 and found a prominent place on the bookshelves of doctors and policemen in Britain.¹⁹⁹ According to William A. Peniston, Tardieu and his disciples remained the leading authorities on pederasty and sodomy in France well into the 1880s.²⁰⁰ It is quite possible then, that Spurgin, as a physician and member of the Royal College of Surgeons, would have been

¹⁹⁴ Cocks, 2003a: 31.

¹⁹⁵ MJ/SB/C/020, LMA, 1873. There is another documented case of Spurgin examining a subject for signs of sexual abuse in 1880 while working for the Marylebone police. See Jackson, 2000:79-80. According to his obituary Spurgin held the position of divisional police surgeon in Marylebone for forty-seven years which was a record in police service. Anon, *British Medical Journal*, 1 November 1931: 759.

¹⁹⁶ Anon, 1858: 528-530. For a full definition of the French term ‘pédérastie’ see chapter three.

¹⁹⁷ Translated as the Medical-legal Study of the Offences against Public Decency. Gay, 1986: 224.

¹⁹⁸ Aldrich and Wotherspoon, 2001: 432.

¹⁹⁹ Aldrich and Wotherspoon, 2001: 433.

²⁰⁰ Peniston, 2004: 59.

aware of Tardieu's work.²⁰¹ Spurgin's examination of Solomon and Roberts seems to adhere quite closely to Tardieu's model, which was primarily concerned with the identification of signs of passive or active sodomitic behaviour.

Tardieu's instructions to the physician were explicitly set out in his memoir. In the first instance, the physician was required to discover through examination whether "pederastic habits" existed.²⁰² The results of this examination, Tardieu explained, could be "characteristic of active habits" or "characteristic of passive habits", or negative.²⁰³ The sign, suggested by Tardieu, of the "active habits" of the sodomite was the "remarkable" size and shape of the penis, which could be "generally very slender, sometimes though rarely very large", but "in either case the departure from the normal size" was "excessive in one direction or the other".²⁰⁴ The penis could also be "twisted on itself so that the *meatus urinarius*" was "turned obliquely to the right or left".²⁰⁵ The *glans*, or bulbous head of the penis, was "enlarged" and "flattened" in order that it corresponded "exactly to the infundibuliform [funnel shaped] disposition of the anus".²⁰⁶ The twisted or corkscrew nature of the penis could be explained by the "peculiar motion required for affecting an entrance into the resisting anal orifice".²⁰⁷ Tardieu's successor, Dr Paul Brouardel, explained that there was "more variety in the shape and size of the penis" than there "was in the face" and that genital anomalies were akin to, or the result of, deviancy and therefore an indicator of the 'sodomite'.²⁰⁸

Verlaine, as previously mentioned, was subjected to a rigorous genital and anal examination by two Belgian doctors, Vleminckx and Semal, five months after Solomon's

²⁰¹ Spurgin was well appointed, being a member of the Royal College of Surgeons, a member of the Licensed Society of Apothecaries, and a member of the Royal College of Physicians, Edinburgh. Information gathered from the UK Medical Register for 1875 at www.ancestry.co.uk (accessed Dec 2008).

²⁰² Anon, 1858: 530.

²⁰³ Anon, 1858: 530.

²⁰⁴ Anon, 1858: 529.

²⁰⁵ Anon, 1858: 529. The *meatus urinarius* is, according to an early nineteenth-century publication on human anatomy, "the small vertical slit" at the "apex" of the "glans penis", "which is bounded by two, more or less, protuberant labia". See Wilson, 1840: 567.

²⁰⁶ Anon, 1858: 529.

²⁰⁷ Anon, 1858: 529.

²⁰⁸ Robb, 2003: 44.

arrest, on the 16th July 1873. They concluded that Verlaine bore “on his person the signs of active and passive pederastic habits”, noting that “the penis is short and not voluminous” and that his “anus” could “be dilated rather significantly by a moderate separation of the buttocks.”²⁰⁹ However, they also noted that “the folds of the sphincter” had no lesions and no marks” and “the contractibility” of the anus remained “more or less normal”.²¹⁰ Despite Verlaine’s sexuality being irrelevant in law to his conviction for shooting his lover, Rimbaud, Robb suggests that the examination which concluded that Verlaine was guilty of “recent habits” and not of “inveterate, old habits” appears to have been sufficient evidence for the jury to find Verlaine to blame, and on 8th August he was sentenced to two years in prison with a fine of two hundred francs and transferred to Petits Carmes prison.²¹¹

In Solomon’s case, Spurgin’s examination of the artist’s penis determined that it was “natural in appearance”.²¹² He also found “nothing unnatural” about Roberts’ penis. This perhaps suggests that Spurgin could find no signs of active “pederasty” in either man. He also determined that Solomon’s rectum was “perfectly natural in appearance”; however, he found Roberts’ rectum “red and unhealthy in appearance”.²¹³ It could be concluded that the “redness” in Roberts’ rectum, was a symptom of what Tardieu described as a “recent attempt”, in which the rectum would be “well marked according to the degree of violence used”.²¹⁴ Beck and Dunlop’s *Elements of Medical Jurisprudence*, originally published in America in 1825, suggested a “few words on the crime against nature”, describing how the rectum would show signs of “inflammation, excoriation, heat, and contusion” after sodomy had taken place.²¹⁵

²⁰⁹ Ivry, 1998: 71.

²¹⁰ Ivry, 1998: 71.

²¹¹ Robb, 2003: 28. Ivry, 1998: 73.

²¹² The Queen Vs. George Roberts and Simeon Solomon, Middlesex Sessions, London Metropolitan Archive, MJ/SPE/1873/06.

²¹³ MJ/SPE/1873/06, LMA.

²¹⁴ Anon, 1858: 529.

²¹⁵ Beck and Dunlop, 1825: 71. *Elements of Medical Jurisprudence* was widely read in Britain; the seventh edition being reproduced in 1842. For more information see Forth and Crozier, 2005.

It is unclear from Spurgin's report why Roberts' rectum looked "unhealthy": however, Tardieu's interpretation of the unhealthy rectum was extensive. He suggested that the passive sodomite could show signs of excessive development of the buttocks, infundibuliform deformity of the anus, laxity of the sphincter, effacement of the anal folds, warty excrescences, extreme dilatation of the orifice, incontinence of faeces, ulcerations, syphilis, and of foreign bodies introduced into the anus.²¹⁶ He also made note that "blennorrhagia [mucous discharge] of the rectum" and "syphilis" were signs of sodomitic activity, and it can be seen from the documentation that Spurgin made extensive comments on the nature of the "fluids" and "juices" that he discovered during his examination. Upon examining Solomon, he said of the artist's penis:

there was a slight mucous discharge issuing from it. I examined his clothes and found a patch about the size of my hand on the front of his shirt. It was wet. There was a smaller patch a little higher up on the shirt and some on the trousers. I examined these fluids and the juices [...] but did not detect any spermatozoa. My opinion is that it was not seminal fluid though it had that appearance at first sight. I asked Solomon how he accounted for the patch on his trousers. He said he did not know. I examined the fluid issuing from the penis of Solomon but did not find any spermatozoa in that.²¹⁷

During cross-examination Spurgin revealed that there was also "a patch higher" on Solomon's shirt "which was dry", but he could not say whether this was "mucous". He also stated that, upon mentioning the stain to "the prisoner", Solomon answered that it was a "nocturnal emission".²¹⁸ It could be suggested that, by using this term, Solomon was denying any conscious responsibility and was perhaps suggesting his sexual inactivity. According to William Acton in 1858, the definition of a "nocturnal emission" was an event that "generally happens during sleep, and occurs with, but does not depend on, erotic dreams"; however the "patient may not be aware of its occurrence until he notices it on his shirt in the morning".²¹⁹ In addition, Spurgin's examination of Roberts' rectum revealed

²¹⁶ Anon, 1858: 529.

²¹⁷ MJ/SPE/1873/06, LMA.

²¹⁸ MJ/SPE/1873/06, LMA.

²¹⁹ Acton, 1858: 156.

that there was “no appearance of seminal fluid” and that “his shirt was wet but not with seminal fluid. I could not say that the fluid on the shirt of either of them was urine”.²²⁰

It seems certain that Spurgin was attempting to identify seminal fluid on the body and clothes of both men. In Tracy C. Becker and Rudolph August Witthaus’s *Medical Jurisprudence, Forensic Medicine and Toxicology* (1894), it was suggested that “the detection of seminal stains upon clothing and other substances” was of “frequent medico-legal importance in cases of alleged or suspected rape or sodomy.”²²¹ It also noted that “in rape or sodomy the seminal fluid is apt to adhere tenaciously to the hair, about the genitals or anus”, and it is clear that Spurgin’s examination was thorough in both the genital and anal areas. It also appeared to be Spurgin’s intention to make a clear distinction between seminal fluid and non-seminal fluid, which, as suggested by Becker and Witthaus “could only be diagnosticated by the recognition of the characteristic morphological elements, the spermatozoa, by microscopic examination”.²²²

However, it appeared that Spurgin was unconvinced that sodomy, either active or passive, had occurred between the two men. The series of abnormalities, described by Tardieu, was evidently missing from Solomon’s genitalia and Spurgin’s use of the word ‘normal’ could alternatively indicate that he believed that anal intercourse had not taken place. His suggestion that there was an absence of seminal fluid on Solomon’s rectum appears to confirm this. Spurgin suggested that “if the offence had been actually committed”, he had “no doubt there would have been”.²²³ Equally, Spurgin’s confirmation that an absence of spermatozoa in any of the “fluids” found on Solomon meant that seminal fluid was not present. However, conversely, the fact that Spurgin mentioned that he could not detect any spermatozoa in the fluids could also uphold medically that Solomon was a potential sodomite. During the middle part of the nineteenth century,

²²⁰ MJ/SB/C/020, LMA, 1873.

²²¹ Witthaus and Becker, 1894: 78.

²²² Witthaus and Becker, 1894: 78.

²²³ MJ/SPE/1873/06, LMA.

spermatozoa were proven to be a fertilizing agent, and therefore the lack of spermatozoa in male semen was sometimes seen as a sign that non-procreative – or ‘unnatural sex’ had occurred.²²⁴

It can also be seen from the documentation that Spurgin doubted that the men were inebriated, which differed from PC Mitchell’s evidence that the prisoners had been drinking, for Spurgin confirms that “neither of the prisoners was drunk”.²²⁵ However, Spurgin could not confirm that the men were using the urinal for its conventional function, but instead appeared to imply that there was no medical evidence to suggest that either man had committed sodomy.

This determination, perhaps, corresponds with Tardieu’s second direction to the examining physician, which concluded that “when there is no material trace to raise the least doubt in the mind and conscience of the surgeon he should distinctly express a negative conclusion”; however, he also warned that “if a direct examination of the organs does not remove every motive for suspicion, if the surgeon fears to be contradicted by alleged facts and even by the accumulated proofs of a flagrant offence, reserve is necessary”.²²⁶

When considered as a whole, the evidence in Solomon’s arrest documents is inconsistent and the charge of attempted sodomy inconclusive. This is suggested by the doctor’s examination and the arresting officer’s conflicting version of events with both Spurgin and Roberts. To reinforce this conclusion, PC Mitchell recorded at the end of the arrest statement that, after the prisoners were charged at the police station, he re-visited the urinal and noticed that “there was no appearance of anyone having had an emission there”.²²⁷ This only adds more weight to the inconclusiveness of the charge of attempted sodomy. However, despite these inconsistencies, the jury saw fit to find Solomon and

²²⁴ Weeks, 1989: 99.

²²⁵ MJ/SPE/1873/06, LMA.

²²⁶ Anon, 1858: 530.

²²⁷ MJ/SPE/1873/06, LMA.

Roberts guilty. Unfortunately for both men Spurgin's medical opinion appears to have been immaterial, despite the general opinion that he was "much respected" and "endowed with very sound judgement and diagnostic sense".²²⁸ Tardieu confirmed that, in sodomy cases, it was "possible that in certain persons the vicious habits may leave no traces impressed on the physical conformation",²²⁹ and *Medical Jurisprudence* (1861) stated that "the facts" were "commonly sufficiently proved without medical evidence".²³⁰

Question of the Asylum

In Robert Ross's biography of Solomon, published in 1911 in the *Bibelot*, Ross described how the artist was "placed in a private asylum by his friends" upon his release from prison.²³¹ Ross then described an unusual event that he alleged happened towards the end of Solomon's incarceration in the asylum. Ross explained that the "scandal having subsided", and "showing no further signs of eccentricity", Solomon was sent out to post a letter in order that he might take the chance to escape and return to "the practice of his art".²³² However, the scheme appeared to have failed because, as Ross exclaimed, Solomon "returned to the asylum in half an hour!". The use of the exclamation mark at the end of this description appears to suggest that Ross was astounded and bemused by Solomon's behaviour, going on to describe it as "almost an evidence" of the artist's "insanity".²³³ Ross indicated that, after this incident, Solomon was "officially dismissed" by the asylum, but gave no further information or indication of what might have happened to him thereafter.

²²⁸ Anon, *British Medical Journal*, 1 November 1931: 759.

²²⁹ Anon, 1858: 530.

²³⁰ Swaine Taylor, 1861: 540.

²³¹ Ross, *The Bibelot*, April 1911: 144. Ross's first Solomon obituary notice was published on the 24th August 1905, ten days after the artist's death, in the *Westminster Gazette*, 1-2. A revised version of this appeared in the *Academy* on the 28th December, 1905, 1336-1337, and re-published with editorial changes in *Masques and Phases*, 1909. This version was re-printed in *The Bibelot* in 1911.

²³² Ross, *The Bibelot*, April 1911: 144. Reynolds retells Ross's asylum story in his 1985 monograph on the artist, but suggests that the date was 1880. Reynolds is the only source for this date, but it does not correspond with any of the contemporary remarks about Solomon's possible detention, which all suggest a time immediately after Solomon was released from prison in 1873.

²³³ Ross, *The Bibelot*, April 1911: 144.

It is unclear whether Ross's story has any legitimacy. However, in Ross's article about Solomon, published in the *Academy* in December of 1905, Ross stated that he had "the pleasure of seeing" Solomon "last, as late as 1893".²³⁴ In this article, Ross also provided other details of Solomon's life after his arrest in 1873, such as the artist's arrest in Paris, which is discussed in chapter three, and his involvement in a burglary, which is discussed in chapter four. It is possible that these stories were conveyed to Ross by Solomon himself at one of their meetings, and were perhaps elaborated upon by Ross, but as yet there is no direct evidence to suggest this.

Ross's claim of Solomon's confinement in an asylum is not the only contemporary reference to the event. On the 30th March 1873, the editor of *Punch*, Shirley Brooks, wrote in his diary that he had visited the painter Henry Nelson O'Neil at his studio, whereupon O'Neil had told him "an odd thing" about Solomon.²³⁵ O'Neil informed Brooks that Solomon was in "a criminal lunatic asylum".²³⁶ The date of O'Neil's letter to Brooks perhaps confirms Ross's suggestion, since Solomon was released from Clerkenwell House of Detention only six days before O'Neil's letter was written. At this point, as already suggested, Solomon had not been tried, and instead had been bailed to the care of his cousin, who had, as we have seen, paid a surety of £200 for Solomon's release.²³⁷ By paying a surety, Salaman would have agreed to take responsibility for Solomon's behaviour, making sure that he abided by the conditions of the bail; although, there is no suggestion in the trial or indictment documents that Solomon's admission to an asylum was a bail requirement, or that the bail requirements were anything other than what was normally required by law.²³⁸

²³⁴ Ross, *Academy*, 23 December 1905b: 1337.

²³⁵ Diaries of Shirley Brooks, London Library, 1873, London Library. My thanks go to Roberto C. Ferrari for informing me of this source.

²³⁶ Diaries of Shirley Brooks, London Library, 1873.

²³⁷ X071/ 100, LMA.

²³⁸ Parliament, 1863:63. According to Great Britain Parliamentary Papers for 1863, a person offered bail must obtain a surety that "in the opinion of the court, will be sufficient to ensure his appearance at the time and place when and where he is to be tried, and with such surety or sureties to enter into a recognizance accordingly".

O’Neil refers to Solomon’s admission into a ‘lunatic criminal asylum’ rather than a general lunatic asylum. The only criminal lunatic asylum in Britain, in 1873, that was specifically designed for the criminally, or dangerously insane, rather than the more generally insane, was the newly appointed Broadmoor, in Crowthorne, Berkshire. That said, Bethlem, at St George’s Fields, Southwark, and Fisherton House Asylum in Salisbury also took both the insane and criminally insane.²³⁹ It is unlikely that Solomon was sent to any of these asylums after his trial, for the criteria for admission into any of them was a finding by a jury of criminal insanity.²⁴⁰ Once found criminally insane by a jury, a person was deemed unfit to plead or go to trial. There is no mention in the trial documents of the jury finding Solomon anything but guilty of attempted sodomy, and he was certainly deemed sane enough to make a plea for his innocence. It could be suggested that O’Neil assumed that Solomon had been sent to a criminal lunatic asylum because of the loose association between sodomy and madness at the time; however, these rumours of Solomon’s whereabouts after the arrest will be examined in more detail later on in this chapter.

Nonetheless, there is a period of nearly nine months between Solomon’s release from prison on the 24th February and late November 1873 that remains unaccounted for. Perhaps it is not out of the question to suggest that the Solomon or Salaman families may have placed the artist in a private asylum at some time during this period. Foucault suggested that, from the 1870s, the medical profession began to “incarcerate homosexuals in asylums” because they were looked upon as either “libertines or delinquents”.²⁴¹ In the mid-nineteenth century, Solomon may have been classified by the medical profession as a ‘libertine’ with the kind of ‘insanity’ that was traced, according to Michael J. Weiner, to an

²³⁹ Bailey, 1981: 219.

²⁴⁰ Bailey, 1981: 218-19. According to Victor Bailey, a jury would use the ‘right-wrong test’ to determine criminal insanity at this time. The rule accorded that if the perpetrator of a crime determined that they *had been unaware of what they were doing, or unaware that they were doing anything wrong*, then they could be legally deemed criminally insane by a jury.

²⁴¹ Foucault, Kritzman, and Sheridan, 1990: 115.

“indulgence in drink and irregular sex”.²⁴² Weiner suggests that it was considered that a cure for this kind of ‘insanity’ was systematic moral discipline, which could be acquired from a stay in a lunatic asylum. Even if this was unsuccessful, the insane person could at least “respond to the rewards and punishments of institutional rules”, thereby “demonstrating a degree of rational responsibility”.²⁴³ In his 1919 biography of the art dealer, Murray Marks, Dr. G. C. Williamson suggested that Solomon “suddenly went out of his mind in a prison cell” and “for a while was under constraint”. Williamson also suggested that, “after the efforts of a few friends”, Solomon was “placed under the charge of a medical man” and “gradually grew better”.²⁴⁴

Other references to Solomon’s admission to an asylum appeared on the 19th April 1873, albeit less convincingly, when Dante Gabriel Rossetti, writing to Ford Madox Brown, indicated that “Davies”, an “intimate” of Solomon’s, had suggested to him that the artist was in “semi-confinement” after having “escaped from the law”.²⁴⁵ It is unclear what the poet William Davies was referring to when he referred to “semi-confinement”, but he may have been inferring that Solomon was in partial detention, which would tend to rule out prison. William Michael Rossetti was also uncertain what Davies meant when he commented on the letter in his diary four days later.²⁴⁶ He revealed that Davies had sent the letter in answer to Dante’s queries that rumours were being spread regarding Solomon’s detainment somewhere. William’s diary reveals that Davies had confirmed to Dante that “the recent statements about S. Solomon are true”, but it is clear that William was uncertain where Solomon has been detained, and suggested that “what is not defined” in

²⁴² Wiener, 1994:124. The OED defines a ‘Libertine’ as “a man who is not restrained by moral law” who “leads a dissolute” and “licentious life”. See www.dictionary.oed.com/entrance.dtl (accessed 18 Jan 2009).

²⁴³ Wiener, 1994: 124.

²⁴⁴ Williamson, 1919: 160.

²⁴⁵ Doughty and Wahl, 1967: 1162. Seymour suggests that the name Davies in this letter applies to Rossetti’s friend Mrs. Edward Davies, (who owned two of Solomon’s paintings) although because Rossetti addresses Solomon’s friend as simply ‘Davies’, it would more likely imply that this person was male. Oswald Doughty, who edited the Rossetti letters, suggests that this was the poet William Davies. See Seymour, 1986: 207.

²⁴⁶ Bornand, 1977: 263.

Davies's letter is whether Solomon had been "detained in an asylum, after production of some sort of legal evidence of unsoundness of mind" or "what else may be the fact".²⁴⁷

The *British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review* for 1855 determined that the evidence of a medical doctor in a court of law would be required to pronounce "unsoundness of mind" in an individual.²⁴⁸ There is no evidence in the arrest documents for 1873 that Solomon's medical examiner, Spurgin, arrived at that conclusion. The *Medico-Chirurgical Review*, endorsed "caution" before the "confinement of an alleged lunatic" because of the difficulty of diagnosing the unsound mind of an individual, unless it was "obviously and unmistakably the product of a diseased intellect".²⁴⁹ However, the *Review* also stressed that that before making this diagnosis, the medical practitioner should compare "the mind of the alleged lunatic at the period of suspected insanity with its prior, natural, and healthy manifestations".²⁵⁰ In other words, it is likely that Solomon's previous state of mind would have been taken into consideration before any diagnosis of "unsoundness of mind" was considered. However, the Calendar of Prisoners recorded that Solomon had "no record of previous convictions", and the Criminal Registers for England and Wales (1791-1892), have no record of any other convictions of Solomon apart from his arrest in 1883 for burglary, which is discussed in chapter three, despite suggestions to the contrary from Solomon's contemporaries, which are discussed in more detail later on in this chapter.²⁵¹ It would, therefore, seem unlikely that Solomon's mind was deemed unsound in a court of law at this time.

If Solomon had been sent to an asylum by his family, the likely place, according to the London Metropolitan Archive, would have been the Colney Hatch asylum.²⁵² Colney Hatch (also known as Friern Hospital, New Southgate, London) had a close association

²⁴⁷ Bornand, 1977: 263.

²⁴⁸ Anon, 1855: 213.

²⁴⁹ Anon, 1855: 213.

²⁵⁰ Anon, 1855: 214.

²⁵¹ X071/ 100, LMA. See also: Criminal Registers, Middlesex and Home Office, The National Archives, HO26/27.

²⁵² Jewish Genealogy: A Summary of Sources for Jewish Genealogy at London Metropolitan Archives and Elsewhere, London Metropolitan Archive, Information Leaflet No. 32.

with the United Synagogue, allowing Jewish patients suffering from mental illness to practice their religion and receive kosher food. There is no mention of Solomon's admission amongst the records of the Colney Hatch asylum between the years of 1873 and 1881.²⁵³ In addition to Colney Hatch, an asylum administered by the county of Middlesex, there were numerous other private asylums, also called 'licensed houses' or 'retreats' in the Greater London area.²⁵⁴ As already mentioned, Ross suggested that Solomon had been "placed in a private asylum". Unfortunately, very few records of what were also called private madhouses still exist, and it is almost impossible to establish whether Solomon was resident at any of these. It is feasible that Solomon could have been cared for at home. As already noted, Davies suggested that Solomon was in "semi-confinement", which, perhaps, alluded to the kind of "home treatment" of the insane, described by J. C. Bucknill in 1880.²⁵⁵ In Bucknill's report on 'The Care of the Insane', he suggested that it was common for members of a family to be confined at home if a physician deemed it appropriate to provide a 'certificate' for those of "unsound mind".²⁵⁶ Bucknill also determined that this was the preferred method of confinement for the "middle and upper classes" and that, "in a very considerable number of cases", insanity ran "a short course", and the insane recovered "in domestic life with no great amount of treatment".²⁵⁷ However, again, it is difficult to determine whether Solomon's family took this course of action for, as Bucknill revealed, there were "no official record of lunatics living with their families" at this time.²⁵⁸

What is clear is that confused and conflicting rumours of Solomon's detainment, and reasons for his confinement either in prison or in an asylum, had become highly

²⁵³ I have made a thorough search of the extant records of the Colney Hatch Lunatic Asylum, held at the London Metropolitan Archive. Register of Male Admissions 1839-1877 H11/HLL/B/03, Register of Admissions 1853-1906 H11/HLL/B/05.

²⁵⁴ Roberts, 'Mental Health History', 1981-2009. www.mdx.ac.uk/WWW/STUDY/mhhglo.htm#Asylums (accessed 23 January 2009). According to Henry Burdett, writing in 1891, there were twenty-two 'private madhouses' receiving private patients in the inner London area, and five receiving both private and pauper patients. See Burdett, 1891:661-62.

²⁵⁵ Bucknill, 1880:24.

²⁵⁶ Bucknill, 1880:24.

²⁵⁷ Bucknill, 1880:114.

²⁵⁸ Bucknill, 1880:118.

dramatised. By the 7th July 1873, Charles Augustus Howell, writing to D.G. Rossetti claimed that there was “a report all over London that Solomon has assaulted his mother with the intention of ravishing her, and nearly killed the lady!”²⁵⁹ It is unclear where Howell came by this rumour, and considering that Howell suggested that the rumour was “all over London”, it is the only allegation that I have encountered of Solomon’s attempted Oedipal rape; however, as suggested earlier, the legal definition of sodomy at the time also included incest, and it is possible that Howell was making a crude allusion to this.

Gossip and Rumours

Rumours about Solomon’s fate were rife, perhaps because there was no mention of the trial or arrest in the London newspapers. Speculations were, therefore, being fuelled by a lack of information. That Solomon’s arrest was not reported is unusual, because newspapers were keen to report trials associated with crimes ‘against nature’ in the nineteenth century, particularly when they concerned a public figure.²⁶⁰ Morris Kaplan explains that the trial of Ernest Boulton and Frederick Park was “subject to intense and protracted scrutiny” and “reported in extensive detail in the major newspapers”.²⁶¹ Boulton and Park, who were arrested for appearing in public dressed in women’s clothing two years before Solomon’s arrest, were even parodied in the illustrated papers. For example, in 1870, the front page of the *Illustrated Police News* was dominated by an illustration of the two men standing in the dock dressed as men, with two accompanying sketches, on either side, of each man posing separately for studio photographs as women.²⁶² Cocks suggests that the general public were fascinated by trials of this nature and the courts of the Metropolis were generally full of people treating the event as a form of popular theatre.²⁶³ Solomon himself, writing to

²⁵⁹ Cline, 1978: 261.

²⁶⁰ Cocks, 2003a: 26. The *Times* printed reports about the Marylebone Police Court session of the 12th February and the Middlesex Sessions held at Clerkenwell on the 24th March, but omitted to mention Solomon and Roberts case.

²⁶¹ Kaplan, 2005: 24.

²⁶² Anon, *Illustrated Police News*, 14 May 1870: front page.

²⁶³ Cocks, 2003a: 87.

Swinburne in 1871, reported how *Reynold's Newspaper* and the *Daily Telegraph* had published “everything” regarding Boulton and Park, encouraging Solomon to attend the trial, which I discuss in more detail in Chapter five.²⁶⁴

At the time, Solomon was at the height of his artistic fame, and his association with other prominent artists made him a well-known figure. It is therefore difficult to account for the fact that there was no mention of Solomon’s crime or even his arrest details in *The Times* or elsewhere. Taking the Boulton and Park case as an example of the amount of unwanted newspaper exposure that could be generated by such a ‘scandal’, it is likely that Solomon’s arrest was silenced either by a member of the family, a sympathetic person or by somebody who had something to gain by keeping this information quiet.

Two regional newspapers, however, did report that something had happened to Solomon. This perhaps suggests that whoever censored the London papers did not have the same influence outside the metropolis. For example, the *Manchester Guardian*’s ‘London Correspondent’ reported, at the end of April, that there were “rumours” about “poor Simeon Solomon” which he feared were “too true”.²⁶⁵ The *Hampshire Telegraph and Sussex Chronicle* re-printed the *Guardian*’s report word-for-word on the 3rd May; it was not picked up by any other newspaper.²⁶⁶

The London Correspondent recorded that Solomon had been ‘overtaken’ by an “illness of a serious and most distressing kind”, and the journalist feared that his readers must treat “the artistic career of this promising artist” as a “closed book”.²⁶⁷ If the “rumour” had been picked up by the *Guardian*’s London office by the end of April, gossip about Solomon must either have become widespread, or spread along networks of gossip including the *Guardian* circle. It seems most likely, however, that such gossip was

²⁶⁴ Lang, 1959b: 144, n1.

²⁶⁵ Anon, *The Manchester Guardian*, 29 April 1873: 5.

²⁶⁶ Anon, *Hampshire Telegraph and Sussex Chronicle* 3 May 1873: 3.

²⁶⁷ Anon, *The Manchester Guardian*, 29 April 1873: 5.

widespread because Solomon's reported "illness" was related to other rumours circulating at the time that I have already mentioned.

As well as reporting Solomon's detention in 'a criminal lunatic asylum', O'Neil reported to Brooks that the artist had been detained "for finding a *formosum Alexiae* in a butcher's boy at Hampstead".²⁶⁸ He continued that he had "always had an instinctive hate of that S.S." and joked that "Frith hoped he was a pork butcher".²⁶⁹ Despite William Powell Frith's crude anti-Semitic joke, the popular painter had been a close friend of Solomon's older brother, Abraham. In Frith's 1888 autobiography, for example, he described how he and Abraham had attended Sass's school of art in Bloomsbury and fondly described Abraham as a "young man with great ability".²⁷⁰ Frith's distaste for Solomon seems to have arisen not only from his Jewishness, but also from his Aestheticism. After all, Frith's *The Private View of the Royal Academy* (1881) had also described how he had mocked "pure Aesthetes", such as Wilde, for the "aesthetic craze", of their "eccentric garments", and "self-elected" taste in art and dress.²⁷¹ In addition, Frith's close associates at *Punch*, such as George du Maurier, had published vicious anti-Semitic caricatures of Jews alongside cartoons that mocked the 'un-English' enthusiasm of the Aesthetes.²⁷²

O'Neil and Frith were friends and founder members of the informal sketching club, the *Clique*, along with Richard Dadd and Augustus Egg.²⁷³ They were also members of the private gentlemen's club, the Garrick Club in Covent Garden, whose members at the time

²⁶⁸ Diaries of Shirley Brooks, London Library, 1873, London Library. *Formosum* is Latin for 'finely formed', 'beautiful', 'well-shaped' or 'handsome'. It is also the opening line to Virgil's Second Eclogue, "*Formosum pastor Corydon ardebat Alexia*" (The shepherd *Corydon* burned with passion for handsome Alexis). See Clausen, 2003. Thanks to Peter Quirk for informing me of this source.

²⁶⁹ Diaries of Shirley Brooks, London Library, 1873, London Library.

²⁷⁰ Frith, 1888: 37. After his death, an auction of Abraham's collection of paintings included "a small original study" of *A Huff* (1859) by Frith. Anon, *The Lady's Newspaper*, 23 March 1863: 383.

²⁷¹ Frith, 1888: 441. For more on Frith, anti-Aestheticism and *A Private View* see Edwards, 2006:86-90.

²⁷². For *Punch* and anti-Semitism see Levy, 2005. Hennegan suggests that du Maurier's 'un-English' sentiment about the Aesthetes was a coded way of describing them as 'un-manly'. For more on Frith, du Maurier, *Punch* and anti-Aestheticism see Hennegan, 1990.

²⁷³ For more on the *Clique* and W.P. Frith see: Bills and Knight, 2006.

included Rossetti, Frederick Leighton, John Everett Millais and Solomon himself.²⁷⁴ It seems more than likely that O’Neil and Frith were involved in highly speculative gossip about Solomon’s circumstances with others at the Garrick Club, and that the *Guardian*’s London Correspondent may have obtained his information about Solomon from Brooks who had been leader writer on the *Illustrated London News*, the *Morning Chronicle* and many of the best periodicals of the day and, as editor of *Punch*, would have been well acquainted with the city’s journalists.²⁷⁵

Evidence also reveals that rumours were rife amongst Solomon’s former friends. For example, it is well known that the artist’s arrest and initial detention were a cause for concern particularly for Swinburne around this time, for there was an increasingly marked sense of fear and disquiet in his letters, as will be seen. However, on the 14th February, three days after Solomon’s arrest, Swinburne appeared unaware of Solomon’s circumstances, joking to his friend, the Welsh anthologer, George Powell that “S.S. minus his Jewish *barbiche* must be an obscene spectacle”.²⁷⁶ This directly refers to Solomon having shaved his beard at the end of January. In a letter to Eleanor Tong, wife of one of Solomon’s patrons, Jonathan Tong, which Roberto C. Ferrari dates as 30th January 1873, Solomon revealed that he had “shaved everything off except” his “moustache and nose” and that he looked “such a fright” but that he did not “wish it to be generally known” unless anyone noticed it, and until that time he would “say nothing about it to a soul”.²⁷⁷ He also disclosed that his “mother wept and wrung her hands until the wires broke” when she saw him, but suggested that “of course” he would “let it grow again”.²⁷⁸ Solomon did not explain why he decided to shave off his beard, although it would be assumed that he

²⁷⁴ For more on the Garrick Club see: Wansell, 2004.

²⁷⁵ For more on Shirley Brooks see: Layard, 1907.

²⁷⁶ Lang, 1959b: 231.

²⁷⁷ Letter to Mrs Tong, University of Rochester, Manuscript Collection, Rochester, University of Rochester, Manuscript Collection, 30 January 1873. Eleanor Tong is also known for her second marriage to the Liverpool iron merchant William Coltart, see chapter five. Thanks go to Roberto C. Ferrari for sharing his transcription of the Tong/Solomon letter with me. Ferrari discusses this letter in more detail in Ferrari, *The Journal of Pre-Raphaelite Studies*, Spring 2003: 23-34.

²⁷⁸ Letter to Mrs Tong, University of Rochester, Manuscript Collection, 30 January 1873. It is unclear what the source of this idiom is.

must have been aware of the distress that his actions would have caused his orthodox mother. Allen Peterkin describes how, for the orthodox Jew, the removal of a beard was considered a profound insult.²⁷⁹ In addition, facial hair was associated with masculinity and respectability at this time, and, as Matt Cook suggests, those without beards were associated with fashion, bohemianism and the avant-garde.²⁸⁰ A decade or so later, Cesare Lombroso, writing in the *Contemporary Review* in 1895, would suggest that the absence of a beard was a sign of atavism and, therefore, degenerate.²⁸¹

The depiction of a beardless Solomon, sketched by the artist at the end of the letter, does not, however, reflect the smooth-face of the avant-garde bohemian (Fig. 1). Instead, the image looks much older than Solomon's thirty-three years; his hair looks thin, his eyes sunken and tired, his face slightly bloated. It does not resemble any of the extant photographic images of the artist taken around this time. David Wilkie Wynfield's photograph of Solomon in Aesthetic costume, taken around three years before the Tong letter, is a more candid representation of the artist's bohemianism despite the additional beard (Fig 2). The illustration on the letter was clearly private, intended only for Mrs Tong's appreciation, and it remains unclear why Solomon chose to illustrate himself in this way.

It seems likely that Swinburne was aware of Solomon's delayed hearing at the Middlesex Sessions on the 10th March for, on the 11th, Swinburne wrote to Powell, asking, "have you heard any news good or bad of our Wandering Jew?"²⁸² By employing this anti-Semitic term to describe Solomon, Swinburne was clearly distancing himself from the artist and his crime. The rest of the letter is equally disparaging. He is no longer an

²⁷⁹ Peterkin, 2001: 90-91. Instructions on the wearing of beards can be found in Leviticus (19:26-28) "Ye shall not round the corners of thy beard". Peterkin stresses that non-orthodox or reform Jews may be allowed to shave daily, but they must desist from shaving during *shiva* (seven day mourning ritual).

²⁸⁰ Cook, 2003: 61.

²⁸¹ Lombroso, *Contemporary Review*, July 1895: 46.

²⁸² Lang, 1959b: 234. This is a reference to the biblical myth of the Wandering Jew, who taunted Christ on his way to Calvary and was subsequently condemned to walk the earth alone for eternity, or until he accepted Christ as his Messiah. It subsequently became a stock figure of suffering and Jewish 'evilness', particularly in the nineteenth century. See Soussloff, 1999: 90-91.

individual or close friend of Swinburne's, he has become the "Israelite" and, as Thaïs. E. Morgan suggests, Solomon had now become "the Other: homosexual and Jewish".²⁸³

This reaction to Solomon is in marked contrast to the letter that Swinburne wrote to George Powell in November 1872 when Swinburne was still seen to be sending his "love to Simeon" and expressing his sorrow at not being able to meet with him.²⁸⁴ It is clear that, up until his arrest in February 1873, Solomon remained on close terms with Swinburne and London's artistic society. For example, on the 7th January 1873, the sculptor Hamo Thornycroft recorded in his diary that he had partied at "the Solomons".²⁸⁵ Previous entries in Thornycroft's diary appear to suggest that Solomon and his sister, Rebecca, regularly entertained artist guests at the beginning of January every year and that, as early as 1861, the Solomons were hosting large parties. Du Maurier's letters record that he attended many of these. In 1861, he recorded that "Miss Mansford sang before 200 people including 'Cimabue' (Lord Leighton)" at the Solomons' party.²⁸⁶ In the collected memoirs of the four Macdonald sisters, the women recall the Solomons hosting many "lively parties" in the early 1860s.²⁸⁷ Later on, in 1868, the artist and aristocrat George Howard, the 9th Earl of Carlisle, enjoyed a late night at a Solomon party and "was not home till 12".²⁸⁸

The New Year party that Thornycroft attended in 1873 suggests that Solomon and Rebecca's parties were still popular destinations for London's fashionable artistic set, in spite of the mixed reviews Solomon's work was receiving in the press at that time. For instance on the 11th November 1872, the *Times* coverage of the Dudley Gallery exhibition described how the forms in Solomon's painting *Autumn Love* were "marred by some more or less palpable failure of proportion".²⁸⁹ Equally unimpressed by Solomon's work at the Dudley Gallery, G. P. Lathrop, writing in New York for the *Independent*, recorded that the

²⁸³ Morgan, 1996a: 80.

²⁸⁴ Lang, 1959b: 191. A letter from Swinburne to George Powell.

²⁸⁵ Diary of W H Thornycroft c.1870s-1885, Henry Moore Institute Archive,

²⁸⁶ Du Maurier, 1951: 33.

²⁸⁷ Baldwin, 1960.

²⁸⁸ Diaries of Rosalind Howard, Castle Howard Archive, 1867/68/69.

²⁸⁹ More commonly known as *Love in Autumn*, painted in Florence in 1866. Anon, *The Times*, 11 November 1872: 4.

faces in Solomon's work were "weak and poverty stricken" and that "the painter" had "done nothing remarkable since his 'Habet'".²⁹⁰ Conversely, the characteristically partisan *Jewish Chronicle* "spoke in terms of high praise" for *Autumn Love*, describing the painting as "one of the best emanating from" Solomon's "skilled pencil".²⁹¹ Despite the *Jewish Chronicle*'s admiration of Solomon's work, though, the consensus amongst none Jewish reviewers at this time was that it was "unwholesome in sentiment".²⁹² This kind of criticism became particularly prominent after Robert Buchanan's scathing attack on Rossetti's "fleshy school" in 1871 and its sickly "effeminacy".²⁹³ Buchanan suggested that "English society of another kind" went "into ecstasy over Mr. Solomon's pictures" which were "pretty pieces of morality such as 'Love dying by the breath of Lust'" and that Solomon lent "actual genius to worthless subjects", thereby producing "veritable monsters".²⁹⁴ Morgan suggests that Buchanan was implying that Solomon was being duplicitous by producing beautiful work that represented immoral (i.e. effeminate) subjects.²⁹⁵

It is well known that Buchanan's attack affected Rossetti particularly badly, and its effect on Solomon can be seen in a letter to Swinburne in 1871, in which he seems to be fully aware that his "designs and pictures" had "been looked upon with suspicion", and in which he acknowledged that he, rather prophetically, would "probably have to suffer still".²⁹⁶ However, unlike Rossetti, who suffered a physical and mental breakdown in 1872, Solomon continued to produce and exhibit homoerotic imagery even though it was poorly received by critics. Nonetheless, despite the public disapproval of his work, Solomon and

²⁹⁰ Lathrop, *The Independent: Devoted to the Consideration of Politics, Social and Economic Tendencies, History, Literature, and the Arts* (New York), 14 March 1872: 2. George Parsons Lathrop was an American poet, novelist and critic who was an acquaintance of Henry James and Mark Twain. See the *Catholic Encyclopedia* at www.newadvent.org/cathen/16051b.htm, (accessed 3 March 2007).

Solomon's painting *Habet* was painted in 1865 and received the best public and critical reception of all his paintings. For a close reading of this painting see Prettejohn, 1999.

²⁹¹ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 8 November 1872: 433.

²⁹² Anon, *The Times*, 11 November 1872: 4.

²⁹³ Buchanan, *Contemporary Review*, October 1871: 338-39.

²⁹⁴ Buchanan, *Contemporary Review*, October 1871: 339. See chapter five for more details about this work.

²⁹⁵ Morgan, 1999: 117.

²⁹⁶ Lang, 1959b: 159.

his sister's well-attended and successful parties suggest that his private reputation remained unaffected, even though some of his circle was aware that he had already been involved in at least one other brush with the law.

For example, on 1st April 1873, William Michael Rossetti's diary indicates that the painter William Bell Scott had informed him of "some startling news" about Solomon, which John Trivett Nettleship had hinted at only "a few evenings ago".²⁹⁷ Rossetti suggested that a "final catastrophe" seemed "positive" but that the "precise facts" were "unknown".²⁹⁸ It is possible that Rossetti was already alert to some of Solomon's earlier indiscretions from as early as 1867. He wrote in his diary on the 20th August that he had called upon his brother Dante, after being informed of Solomon's return from Italy, and heard "excessively queer stories" about the artist who was behaving "as if nothing has happened."²⁹⁹ In 1917, Edmund Gosse, in a letter to Ross, recalled that Ford Madox Brown had informed him of "S.S.'s first lapse" when he was "suddenly obliged to leave England".³⁰⁰ Gosse recalled that the year of this 'lapse' was 1870, which is possible considering that Solomon made a hasty trip to Rome in the spring of that year with Oscar Browning, but there is no extant documentary evidence to substantiate this.

Circumstantial evidence, however, that lends itself to this possibility comes from Solomon himself, who writing to his brother Sylvester's wife, Eliza, on the 21st February 1870, admitted that his "behaviour has been perfectly disgraceful", and he could "hardly ask" her to forgive him.³⁰¹ It is unclear from the letter what "disgraceful behaviour" Solomon is referring to, but he goes on to say to Eliza that he will go and see her "one evening" that "week", but warned her that he "must not make a promise" because when he

²⁹⁷ Bornand, 1977: 252.

²⁹⁸ Bornand, 1977: 252.

²⁹⁹ Diaries of William Michael Rossetti, University of British Columbia Library, Special Collections and University Archives Division, AW1.R7741. Thanks go to Roberto C. Ferrari for informing me of this source.

³⁰⁰ Ross, 1952: 315.

³⁰¹ Falk, 1937: 326. Falk suggests that this letter was lent to him by courtesy of A. M. H. Solomon, the painter's nephew. This was Alfred Michael H. Solomon, eldest son of the artist's brother Sylvester and son of Eliza.

did he always had a “desire to break it”.³⁰² Despite ending the letter with “believe me, in spite of my conduct”, Solomon seemed anything but contrite. Fully aware of his inconsistent behaviour, but evidently not prepared to do anything about it, he suggests that his sister-in-law forgive him anyway. Similarly aware of the negative effect that this “behaviour” was having on his reputation, he mischievously suggested that it was giving him a “pretty character”.³⁰³

Hints of another possible arrest appear in a letter already mentioned, between D. G. Rossetti and Madox Brown, of the 19th April 1873, in which Davies claimed that Solomon had “just escaped the hand of the law for the second time, accused of the vilest proclivities”.³⁰⁴ Despite the various intimations of a previous arrest that I have mentioned, the Criminal Registers for England and Wales record no other convictions for Solomon apart from his arrest in 1883 for burglary, which I examine in chapter four.³⁰⁵ The information on the 1873 arrest documents appear to be consistent with this register and confirms that Solomon had no previous convictions. However, if the artist had been involved in a sexual scandal in private, then it is almost impossible to establish whether these rumours were correct, because no official record of the event or events would have been made.

Nonetheless, the gossip and rumours of Solomon’s arrest and whereabouts were widespread. Gosse recalled in 1924 how Solomon’s “terrible downfall” both “thrilled” and “shocked all the circle”, but “Swinburne most of all”.³⁰⁶ However, there is only a sense of urgency and panic in Swinburne’s letters at this time, and despite Gosse’s recollection in 1920 that Swinburne had been “quite aware” of the “nature” of Solomon’s “notorious vices”, the poet distanced himself very quickly from Solomon’s ‘crime’.³⁰⁷ For example, in

³⁰² Falk, 1937: 326.

³⁰³ Falk, 1937: 326.

³⁰⁴ Doughty and Wahl, 1967: 1162.

³⁰⁵ Criminal Registers, Middlesex and Home Office, The National Archives, HO26/27

³⁰⁶ Letter from Gosse to T J Wise, British Library, Ashley Collection, Ashley B4273, ff. 11-12.

³⁰⁷ Letter from Gosse to T J Wise, British Library, Ashley Collection, Ashley 1755, ff.18.

the letter, already mentioned, to Powell on the 11th March 1873, Swinburne remarked that Solomon's "aberrations" were a "subject of real uneasiness and regret" to him, and Swinburne thanked "merciful Providence" that they "were not as this Israelite".³⁰⁸ While Swinburne was happy to share a private interest in the erotic writings of the Marquis de Sade and the sexual possibilities of flagellation with Solomon, he was, as Morgan suggests, more importantly concerned with his public reputation and trying to win a prominent place in English poetry.³⁰⁹ It appears that Swinburne's 'regret' was that Solomon had acted out his sexual fantasies in public and had been exposed, and the poet's 'unease' at the situation was fuelled by the threat of his own exposure through his close association with Solomon.

It is clear from reading this correspondence that, as Morgan suggests, homosexual panic had gripped Swinburne and much of Solomon's close circle.³¹⁰ As Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick suggests, the heterosexual, or closeted homosexual, male must traverse "the treacherous middle stretch of the modern homosocial continuum", ever worried about the threat of their own possible homosexuality.³¹¹ Certainly, in D. G. Rossetti's letter to Ford Madox Brown on the 19th April 1873, Rossetti recalled how Davies hoped that he would "never see" Solomon again and that Burne-Jones was "sickened to death with the beastly circumstances".³¹² This reference to Solomon's "beastly circumstances" was perhaps an affirmation that Solomon was unlike them. Instead, they were distinguishing Solomon's

³⁰⁸ Lang, 1959b: 234.

³⁰⁹ Morgan, 1996a: 80. All of Swinburne's erotic letters to Solomon written until the end of 1872 have been destroyed, although some of Solomon's replies still exist and can be found in Lang, 1869-1882 and Meyers, 2005. They demonstrate the sexually explicit nature of the conversations that Swinburne and Solomon engaged in and the fear that both men had of them falling into the wrong hands. Solomon admitted that he had destroyed some of them just in case, see Lang, 1959b:141-144 - Letters to Swinburne dated 1st May 15th May 1871). In addition, an undated letter, written about this time from Burne-Jones to Swinburne, disclosed Burne-Jones's involvement with this secret correspondence and his involvement in the burning of the "wicked contents". See LeBourgeois, *Notes and Queries*, March 1973: 93.

³¹⁰ Morgan, 1996a: 80. See Swinburne's Simeon Solomon: Notes on his Vision of Love and Other Studies, *Dark Blue*, no. 1 (July 1871), 568-78. Solomon was noticeably upset with Swinburne in 1872, when the writer published a not entirely complementary review of Solomon's *A Vision of Love Revealed in Sleep*. This review was originally published on 1st July 1871 in the *Dark Blue*. Reprinted in *The Bibelot* 1908, Swinburne says that the poem "should be more clearer of purpose" and have "some thread of clearer connection". He also says that it should have "more body of drawing, more shapeliness of thought and fixity of outline". However, Swinburne "completely exonerated" Solomon "from the charge of ingratitude and ungraciousness". See Lang, 1959b:191.

³¹¹ Sedgwick, 1990: 187, 188.

³¹² Doughty and Wahl, 1967: 1162.

behaviour as carnal, animal-like, and therefore inhuman, uncivilised and unmanly. By referring to Solomon like this, the circle distanced themselves from his actions. Sedgwick also suggests that “homosexual panic is the most private, psychologised form” in which men “experience their vulnerability to the social pressure of homophobic blackmail”.³¹³ Certainly, this appears to have been the fear that the circle had of being associated with Solomon, for Davies advised D. G. Rossetti to “burn” the letter.³¹⁴

Swinburne continued to panic about any association with Solomon or his crime, and as Morgan suggests, in May the poet omitted to include his review of Solomon’s prose poem, *A Vision of Love Revealed in Sleep*, in a list of previously published reviews sent to Theodore Watts. Also in May, according to Gosse, he physically distanced himself from Solomon by travelling to Oxford to take counsel with the dons Walter Pater and Ingram Bywater.³¹⁵ It appears that Gosse had explained to Ross, in a letter dated 20th August 1917, that Gosse had gone “by appointment” to see Swinburne on the 23rd May, and found the poet “flown”.³¹⁶

This chapter has examined, for the first time in any detail, the arrest documents that relate to Solomon’s arrest for attempted sodomy in 1873, which have been, until now, virtually ignored by Solomon scholars. By doing this I have helped to make sense of what actually happened to Solomon at this time, and demonstrate, for example, the intimate and humiliating physical examination that both he and George Roberts were forced to endure. I have also demonstrated that, despite the jury’s conviction of both men, the evidence against Solomon and Roberts in the arrest documentation appears to be inconclusive. In addition, I have also discussed the question of Solomon’s alleged detention in an asylum, mentioned by the artist’s contemporaries at the time of his arrest and after, and have

³¹³ Sedgwick, 1985: 89.

³¹⁴ Doughty and Wahl, 1967: 1162.

³¹⁵ Ross, 1952: 315.

³¹⁶ Ross, 1952: 315.

concluded that this matter also remains inconclusive due to the lack of any documented evidence. This chapter also makes a study of the reaction of Solomon's contemporaries to the artist's arrest during 1873, and the gossip and rumours that ensued afterwards, and by doing this; I suggest the homosexual panic that gripped much of Solomon's close circle at this time.

Chapter two continues to examine the letters and correspondence of Solomon's close circle during the latter part of 1873, and discusses the possible whereabouts of the artist after the trial. I also discuss Solomon's trip to Devon, and make mention of the work he continued to produce in 1873.

CHAPTER II

1873: SOLOMON'S WHEREABOUTS AND THE TRIP TO DEVON

Swinburne confirmed the trip to Oxford in a letter to Powell sent on the 6th June 1873 after he had returned home, and admitted that he had been given a “gleam of comfort” by Pater, who “appeared to have more hope” of Solomon’s “ultimate recovery and rehabilitation” than from the “horrid version” he had heard of the “form of his insanity”.³¹⁷ Pater’s “hope” of Solomon’s recovery appears to have been encouraged by a meeting with Solomon’s sister, Rebecca, who seems to have provided Pater with a more accurate version of events than the “horrid” versions circulating. It is clear from the letter that Pater did not pass on all of the information to Swinburne, because Swinburne asked Powell if he had “any detail of the matter at first hand”, as Swinburne “did not”, although he imagined that Pater did.³¹⁸ It is clear, from the tone of Swinburne’s letter, that whatever was passed on by Pater had calmed the poet, and the panic present in his earlier letters had to some extent subsided. Instead of fear for his own safety, there is a sense of sadness and regret in Swinburne’s letter for the “real affection and regard” he had for Solomon who possessed “genuinely amiable qualities”.³¹⁹ Swinburne noted how “seriously unhappy” he had been and how the “distress” had “haunted and broken” his “sleep”. Swinburne’s description of Solomon in the letter as a “poor unhappy little fellow” is a much more compassionate response to the artist than the angry, anti-Semitic taunts of the previous letters. It is possible that Swinburne had been calmed by the suggestion that Solomon’s actions were brought on by insanity. Swinburne described in the letter how Solomon was “out of his mind” and lamented how “hideous” it was to lose a friend “to madness”.³²⁰ As a result, Swinburne released himself from any direct association with the crime of sodomy, and from any potential guilt at cutting his former friend, because Solomon had “*done* things amenable to

³¹⁷ Lang, 1959b: 253. It appears that this was a response to a letter already written by Powell to Swinburne on the “wretched subject” of Solomon that no longer exists.

³¹⁸ Lang, 1959b: 253.

³¹⁹ Lang, 1959b: 253.

³²⁰ Lang, 1959b: 253.

law” that if carried out by a “sane man would make it impossible for any one to keep up his acquaintance and not be cut by the rest of the world as an accomplice”.³²¹

On the 6th August 1873, D. G. Rossetti wrote to Madox Brown regarding a letter that Rossetti had received that day from Howell.³²² Rossetti suggested that Howell had enclosed a cheque “drawn by him to ‘Signor Orazio Buggioni’ for £972!” It seems likely that the cheque was a banker’s cheque, and Rossetti suggested he was returning it to Howell that day. Rossetti also mentioned that he would ask Howell whether Solomon had “made this appropriate change of name and secured through him a large order for artistic facetiae?”³²³ The name on the cheque is an obvious pun on the word ‘bugger’ and the mention of artistic “facetiae” both a pun on the word faeces, and a reference to the booksellers’ euphemism for pornography or a “book with a certain amount of sexual interest” that “should be avoided by anyone who is not a bookseller”.³²⁴ On the same day Rossetti wrote back to Howell and returned the “awe-inspiring cheque”, which he suggested he could not accept because he could “pretend neither to so prodigious a payment nor to so flattering a patronymic”.³²⁵ In other words, by returning it, Rossetti was making it clear to Howell and Madox Brown, despite the humorous nature of the bogus cheque, that he was not a “bugger” like Solomon.

These two letters also perhaps suggest that, by this date, Solomon’s close circle had become aware of the details of the arrest. However, it seems clear from Swinburne’s letter of the 6th June, that the poet had been given information about the arrest from Pater which Swinburne had evidently not passed on to anyone else apart from Powell, who may already have known about the “wretched subject”.³²⁶ As already mentioned, Howell had written to Rossetti on the 7th July, a month after Swinburne’s meeting with Pater, and incorrectly

³²¹ Lang, 1959b: 253.

³²² Doughty and Wahl, 1967: 1205.

³²³ Doughty and Wahl, 1967: 1205.

³²⁴ Dictionary, 'The Oxford English Dictionary', www.dictionary.oed.com/entrance.dtl, 2009.

³²⁵ Cline, 1978: 279.

³²⁶ Lang, 1959b: 253.

suggested that Solomon had “ravished” and nearly killed his own mother.³²⁷ This lack of information by Howell might suggest that Swinburne had attempted to keep to himself any of the facts given to him by Pater. However, writing in 1917 to Ross, Gosse recalled that Madox Brown had informed Gosse of the arrest in 1873, which Gosse remembered as occurring in May of that year, although it is possible that Gosse was remembering the month in which he was informed by Madox Brown and not the date of the arrest, which is incorrect.³²⁸

In the summer of 1873, then, the details of Solomon’s arrest were still not well known beyond the people already mentioned. On the 6th October, the *Liverpool Mercury* reported the ‘Liverpool Exhibition of Paintings’ at the Free Library, in which Solomon had entered the watercolour, *Dawn*, painted in 1871.³²⁹ The painting appears to have been exhibited without any objection, and the reporter who reviewed the painting in the *Mercury* appeared to be oblivious of, or indifferent to the contemporary controversy that surrounded the artist. He characterised the painting as a “work of considerable poetic power, and strength of tone and execution” which was “full of good work” despite “wanting a little in anatomical precision and development”.³³⁰ Similarly, in July, the *Graphic* reported the inclusion of “Mr F. Hollyer’s copies of pictures by E. B. Jones, S. Solomon, and F. Madox Brown” at the ‘International Exhibition’ at the South Kensington Museum, which were described as “remarkably well produced”.³³¹

As well as advancing the suggestion that the details of Solomon’s arrest were still generally unknown, the *Mercury* report provides information to help fill in the nine month gap in Solomon’s life from his release from prison at the end of February 1873 until his documented reappearance in Devon in mid-November 1873. As previously suggested,

³²⁷ Cline, 1978: 261.

³²⁸ Ross, 1952: 315. Much has been written about Gosse’s unreliability as a source. In 1984 Harold Oriel commented that “Gosse is not a completely reliable witness to what he knows or what he has read”. See Oriel, 1984: 178.

³²⁹ Anon, *The Liverpool Mercury*, 6 October 1873: 6.

³³⁰ Anon, *The Liverpool Mercury*, 6 October 1873: 6.

³³¹ Anon, *The Graphic*, 12 July 1873: 36.

there is little extant documentary evidence available that gives us clues to Solomon's activities and whereabouts in that period. For example, Seymour has observed that there were no entries for Solomon in the London Postal Directory after 1873, and determined that it was "probable that he fled London".³³² In *Kelly's 1873 London Post Office Trades Directory*, Solomon appears under the collective title "artists", and his address is recorded as 12 Fitzroy Street, which had been his studio before the arrest.³³³ Solomon also appears in the addresses section of *Kelly's Post Office Directory* for 1873 at Fitzroy Street and his occupation is described as "artist".³³⁴ It is probable that 12 Fitzroy Street was not Solomon's full time residence; rather, it was his professional address and the place where he entertained guests and patrons. Seymour suggests that Solomon took over his new studio at Fitzroy Street in January 1868, after living with his mother at 18 John Street, Bedford Row, following his return from Italy in the late summer of 1867.³³⁵ However, according to Rosalind Howard's diaries, George Howard visited Solomon in his "studio" as early as November 1867, and then called upon him at his "house" near "Bedford Row" in December 1867.³³⁶ This suggests that Solomon had occupied the studio at Fitzroy Street prior to January 1868 and that John Street was considered his home address.

In 1874, as Seymour suggested, Solomon is absent from the addresses section of *Kelly's*, and is missing from the trades sections.³³⁷ Solomon's mother Catherine is still recorded as residing at John Street, but this time with two lodgers.³³⁸ Other members of the family do appear in the 1874 directory and Solomon's older brothers Sylvester and Isaac,

³³² Seymour, 1986: 206.

³³³ *Kelly's London Post Office Trades Directory*, 1873.

³³⁴ *Kelly's London Post Office Directory*, 1873.

³³⁵ Seymour, 1986:157-58. Seymour does not provide any documentary evidence to support the suggestion that Solomon took over the studio at Fitzroy Street in January 1868.

³³⁶ Diaries of Rosalind Howard, Castle Howard Archive, 1867/68/69. Dates are 10th November and 11th December 1867. According to the diaries Howard also visited Solomon at his 'studio' on the 15th December 1867. He then made other frequent visits throughout 1868 and 1869. My thanks go to Alison Brisby, assistant curator at Castle Howard, for her assistance in locating this information.

³³⁷ *Kelly's London Post Office Directory*, 1874.

³³⁸ This does not necessarily suggest that Catherine had taken in lodgers because she was in financial need. According to the earlier censuses the Solomon family had taken in lodgers as early as 1861. The census for this year records five "boarders" living with the family at John Street. See 1861 England Census - Solomon Family, National Archives, RG9/183. In *Kelly's 1872 directory* Catherine had one lodger, an architect named Mileham Charles who was also one of her lodgers in 1874. See *Kelly's London Post Office Directory 1872*.

who were boot and shoe manufacturers trading as Sylvester Solomon & Co, are recorded as occupying business premises at 9 Tuilerie Street, Hackney.³³⁹ This suggests that the company remained unaffected by the “scandal” at this time. However, as I explain in chapter three, the brothers would file for bankruptcy three years later in 1877.³⁴⁰ Rebecca similarly does not appear in either the pre- or post-1873 directories, although she shared the Fitzroy Street studio with her brother.³⁴¹ For example, in an undated letter from Rebecca to D. G. Rossetti, written on original John Street stationery, the original address has been crossed out and replaced underneath with the words “studio” and the address as Fitzroy Street.³⁴² Another indication that Rebecca shared this space with Solomon can be seen in other letters, including an undated one to Howell in which she asks him to call at her “mother’s house” because it “would be better that” her mother “should also see” him, otherwise he could “call at my studio” at Fitzroy Street.³⁴³ This might indicate that, despite sharing a studio with her brother, Rebecca was still expected to have a chaperone, in this case her mother, when meeting male clients alone.

Despite being absent from the London directories after 1873, there is no documentary evidence to show that, as Seymour suggested, Solomon “fled London” immediately after he was released from prison. The views of other writers and scholars in this matter appear to be contradictory. Reynolds, like Seymour, suggested that Solomon was “obliged to leave London”. However, as already discussed, Ross determined that

³³⁹ *Kelly's London Post Office Commercial Directory*, 1874.

³⁴⁰ Anon, *The London Gazette*, 9 March 1877: 39. By 1874 it is likely that only three of Solomon’s siblings were still alive from an original total of eight children. It is probably that the artist’s oldest brother Aaron died in 1874. I would like to thank Pam Solomon for allowing me to have a copy of her father’s family tree, which has been expanded by me from various genealogical sources. H. Solomon, *Solomon Family Tree, 1777 – present day*.

³⁴¹ The 1851 and 1861 census indicates that Rebecca had left the family home at John Street by 1851 and was living with brother Abraham. See 1851 England Census - Abraham and Rebecca, National Archives, HO 107/1494 and 1861 England Census - Abraham and Rebecca, National Archives, RG9/173. However, after Abraham’s death in 1861 Rebecca appeared to have moved back to John St, which is indicated by the 1871 census. See 1871 England Census - Solomon Family, National Archives, RG10/371.

³⁴² Letter from Rebecca Solomon to Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas. My thanks to Roberto C. Ferrari for providing me with a transcript of this letter.

³⁴³ Letter from Rebecca Solomon to Charles Augustus Howell, University of Manchester, John Rylands University Library, University of Manchester, John Rylands University Library. My thanks again go to Roberto C. Ferrari for providing me with a transcript of this letter.

Solomon was “placed in a private asylum” upon his release from prison.³⁴⁴ It is also unclear when Solomon vacated the studio at Fitzroy Street, although it is likely that it could have been some time towards the end of the 1870s. I make this claim because there is documentary evidence to show that Rebecca was still using Fitzroy Street as a studio over two and a half years after Solomon’s arrest, and, in addition, both Solomon and Rebecca continued to produce work in this period that would have required some kind of studio space. *The Medical Press and Circular*, dated 13th October 1875, reported that the journal had been asked by “Miss Rebecca Solomon, of 12 Fitzroy Street, London” to state that “just before his death Dr Hughes Bennett commissioned her to paint a life-size portrait of himself, which is now on view at her studio”.³⁴⁵ The journal also commented that “Miss Solomon” would “be happy to show her work any day” that “week between the hours of 2 and 4pm”.³⁴⁶ This commission will be explored in more detail in chapter three; however, it is clear that Rebecca was using the studio at this time.³⁴⁷ It is also apparent that, as well as creating work, Rebecca was exhibiting it, and despite Pamela Gerrish-Nunn’s affirmation that Rebecca “was absent” from any exhibitions in 1873, this was not the case.³⁴⁸ The *Era* reported that Rebecca had exhibited at the Dudley’s winter exhibition in November 1873 with a work titled *Enoch Arden*, which the *Era* thought would find “many admirers”.³⁴⁹ The painting is described as an oil, and dated 1873, suggesting that Rebecca was probably working on it in that year.

It seems likely then that Solomon was also using the studio after his arrest to produce work. I have obtained records of eighteen dated works produced by Solomon

³⁴⁴ Reynolds, 1985: 82 and Ross, *The Bibelot*, April 1911: 144.

³⁴⁵ Anon, *The Medical Press & Circular*, 13 October 1875: 311. Thanks to Roberto C. Ferrari for sharing this reference with me.

³⁴⁶ Anon, *The Medical Press & Circular*, 13 October 1875: 311.

³⁴⁷ Also present at 12 Fitzroy Street in 1874 and 1875 was Frederic Lessner, a tailor. See *Kelly’s London Post Office Directory*, 1874 and 1875. In 1872 *Kelly’s* recorded a Miss Susannah West residing at the address, which is described as a “Boarding House”. See *Kelly’s London Post Office Directory* 1872. This suggests that the property was simultaneously rented out to many different people.

³⁴⁸ Gerrish-Nunn, 1985: 23.

³⁴⁹ Anon, *The Era*, 2 November 1873: 4. Charlotte Yeldham has also recorded Rebecca’s entry into this exhibition. See Yeldham, 1984: 92.

between the beginning of 1873 and the end of 1875, which include a commission by the barrister Charles Alfred Swinburne that Seymour recorded in her 1986 PhD thesis.³⁵⁰ Evidence for the commission of four watercolour paintings can be found in a descriptive catalogue of the collection of watercolours written and “printed for private circulation” by C. A. Swinburne, who incidentally, was no relation of his more famous namesake.³⁵¹ The barrister recorded in the catalogue that he gave Solomon the commission in 1872 and allowed him to choose the subjects, but asked the artist to “produce a beauty, a brilliancy, and intensity of colour equal to any oil painting”.³⁵² C. A. Swinburne suggested that, during that time, Solomon was “then a young man, a famous colourist, and a rising painter”, and it is interesting that C. A. Swinburne’s firm of solicitors, Swinburne and Parker, was situated just around the corner from John Street, the Solomon family home.³⁵³

The catalogue also includes a small appreciation of the artist’s work, written by C. A. Swinburne, who noted that he had “nothing finer as regards colour” and that the “drawing and composition” was “worthy of the painter”.³⁵⁴ The titles of the works, according to the catalogue, were *A Jewish King and his Page*, (*The Acolyte*, 1873) (Fig. 3), *Greeks Going to a Festival*, (1873) (Fig. 4), and a pair of paintings dedicated to one of Solomon’s favourite themes, *The Song of Solomon*, otherwise known as the *Song of Songs*, which are titled *The Bride* (1872) (Fig. 5) and *The Bridegroom* (1873) (Fig. 6).³⁵⁵ Seymour noted that the four works had “labels in the artist’s handwriting” upon them which described the commission.³⁵⁶ It is clear from this information that two of the paintings

³⁵⁰ Seymour, 1986: 208.

³⁵¹ Swinburne, 1900.

³⁵² Swinburne, 1900: 27. Seymour quotes directly from C. A. Swinburne’s catalogue that Solomon was a “rising genius”, however C. A. Swinburne calls him a “rising painter”. There are also other minor mistakes in her transcription of this catalogue. See Seymour, 1986: 209. In his 2000 PhD thesis on Solomon, Henry Sandberg directly copies Seymour’s quotes, for his mistakes are identical. Sandberg, 2000: 170.

³⁵³ Anon, *The Times*, 31 Oct 1877: 12. An article in this edition confirms that C. A. Swinburne’s firm “Swinburne & Parker” had offices at “23 Bedford Row, London”.

³⁵⁴ Swinburne, 1900: 27.

³⁵⁵ In 1908 Julia Ellsworth Ford published a version of *The Song of Songs* illustrated with drawings by Solomon, which she suggested were executed when he was seventeen years old. Ford, 1908a: 7. Despite the fact that they are undated, Seymour suggests that, because of their more sophisticated illustrative style, they were drawn in the 1870s. Seymour, 1986: 216.

³⁵⁶ Seymour, 1986: 208, n460.

were dated 1873 by Solomon, but were commissioned in 1872, and one commissioned in 1872 and dated 1872. However, *Greeks Going to a Festival* was commissioned in 1873 and dated 1873. It seems likely, then, that at least part of this commission must have been finished sometime after the arrest, for there is a limited time period between the beginning of 1873 and the arrest on the 11th February for at least two of the works to have been completed, and one to have been started and then finished.

The catalogue records that *A Jewish King and his Page* and *Greeks Going to a Festival* were hung in C. A. Swinburne's drawing room at Beech-Hurst, his house in Andover, alongside works by Turner, Rossetti, Poynter, Millais and others.³⁵⁷ The *Bride* and *Bridegroom* were hung in the dining room alongside a work by Turner, and some other lesser-known artists. C. A. Swinburne said of the *Bride* and *Bridegroom* that the "drawing, colouring, and composition" was "exceptionally good" and, "if not quite after the manner of the conventional treatment of sacred subjects", they were "still natural and original".³⁵⁸ In 1985, Steven Kolsteren published a study into Solomon's lifelong treatment of the *Song of Songs*, and determined that Solomon used the subject as a private mythology, and suggested that these paintings are not easily decipherable because of their highly personal meaning.³⁵⁹ It is interesting that Solomon chose this theme for part of this commission, and particularly at this time, because according to Morgan, it represented the artist's continuous re-thinking about the problem of his sexuality and its "implicit challenge to the marital norm".³⁶⁰ It suggests that despite the fact that Solomon was probably working on these paintings before and after his arrest and subsequent release from prison, he was continuing to produce work on a subject that invoked this personal dilemma. It also seems likely that C. A. Swinburne was content to continue with the commission despite Solomon's conviction, and that he was not worried about purchasing the paintings after they were

³⁵⁷ Swinburne, 1900: 11-63.

³⁵⁸ Swinburne, 1900: 85.

³⁵⁹ Kolsteren, 1985: 47.

³⁶⁰ Morgan, 1996: 69.

completed.³⁶¹ In addition, C.A. Swinburne was not afraid to display his purchases for the next thirty years in those rooms in his house where, presumably, he did most of his entertaining.

After his death in July 1904, C. A. Swinburne's collection of "water-colour drawings" and "modern pictures" was auctioned at Messrs Christie, Manson and Woods, and comprised "fifty-nine drawings and three pictures" which "released a total of £2,993 3s".³⁶² Included in the sale were works by D. G. Rossetti, Poynter, Turner, and Millais; however, none of the Solomon paintings are listed in the "more important" works in the *Times* report. Seymour records that the paintings were bought by the art collector, Hugh Lane, and given to the Dublin City Gallery in 1912 where they remain today.³⁶³ It is interesting to note that in her book on Lane, published in 1921, Lady Augusta Gregory mentioned that Lane had "for some years kept himself unmoved, perhaps, disdainful of, any modern work", and related a story of how she had asked him to bid "for a little picture by Simeon Solomon" that she "coveted".³⁶⁴ Unfortunately, however, Gregory did not win the "beautiful" painting which she suggested Lane "would surely have bought for the gallery" only a "few years later". She estimated that "his awakening" to the modern school occurred after the Hone Exhibition which took place in Dublin in 1901.³⁶⁵ This incident appears to have been recorded in Gregory's diary, and, on the 5th March 1900, she wrote that she had walked over to Christie's with Lane "as there were Simeon Solomons to be sold", and despite setting her heart on "a lovely little thing with a musician on it" with a reserve price of £2-3, was outbid. The painting was sold for £14.³⁶⁶

As already suggested, there is evidence that Solomon completed at least six other works in 1873. Among them was a re-working of the *Bride* and *Bridegroom*, which is

³⁶¹ For a description of these paintings see Seymour, 1986: 208-211.

³⁶² Anon, *The Times*, 4 July 1904: 11.

³⁶³ Seymour, 1986: 208.

³⁶⁴ Gregory, 1921: 56.

³⁶⁵ Gregory, 1921: 56.

³⁶⁶ Pethica, 1996: 1233-234.

mentioned by both Seymour and Reynolds, titled *The Voice of My Beloved that Knocketh* (1873) (Fig. 7).³⁶⁷ Seymour describes how the imagery of the *Bride* and *Bridegroom* has been joined together to form a single watercolour painting.³⁶⁸ At the bottom of the painting is an inscription from ‘Solomon’s Song Chapter Five’ in the old testament which reads, “It is the voice of my Beloved that knocketh, saying: Open to me, my sister, my love, my dove, my undefiled; for my head is filled with dew, and my locks with drops of the night”. It now seems probable that this painting was commissioned by Frederick Craven, a successful Manchester calico printer, and one of Burne-Jones and Rossetti’s key patrons.³⁶⁹ In the Christie, Manson and Woods sales catalogue for 18th May 1895, the posthumous sale of Craven’s art collection included *The Voice of My Beloved that Knocketh*, which is recorded as being purchased by “Clay” for £42.³⁷⁰ The catalogue also suggested that the painting had been exhibited at the Manchester Jubilee Exhibition of 1887, where it was, presumably, exhibited by Craven.³⁷¹ It is unclear who the buyer ‘Clay’ was, and the present location of the painting is unknown.

In addition to the Craven commission, Solomon produced a chalk and watercolour painting, titled *Allegorical Self Portrait* (1873) (Fig. 8), a work titled *Night* (1873) (Fig. 9), which is a drawing on paper, and *Study, Female Figure* (1873) (Fig. 10), a watercolour and oil on paper. Solomon’s *Allegorical Self Portrait* is currently in the collection of the Minneapolis Institute of Arts who describe it as a “poignant self-portrait” of Solomon who is “recognizable by his mass of wavy hair, lowered eyelids, aquiline nose and sharp

³⁶⁷ Seymour, 1986: p416, fig 193. Reynolds, 1985: fig 66. In 1975 Alfred Werner reproduced an illustration of *The Voice of My Beloved that Knocketh* in an article titled ‘Simeon Solomon: A Rediscovery’. See Werner, *Art and Artists*, January 1975: 6-11.

³⁶⁸ Seymour, 1986: 209, n463.

³⁶⁹ For more on Rossetti’s northern industrialist patrons see: Thomas, 2004.

³⁷⁰ The Choice Collection of Modern Pictures and Water-Colour Drawings Formed by Frederick Craven, Christie, Manson and Woods Sale Catalogue, 1895. Craven died on the 11th April 1894 aged 77 years at his home at Thornbridge, Bakewell, Derbyshire. See Anon, *Manchester Times*, 13 April 1894: 8. He is described in the *Bristol Mercury & Daily Post* as a J.P. “formerly of the firm of Bayley and Craven, muslin and delaine printers, Manchester.” See: Anon, *Bristol Mercury & Derby Post*, 14 April 1894: 4.

³⁷¹ Also in Craven’s collection and sold at this auction was Solomon’s *The Sleepers and the One That Waketh* (1871), also exhibited at the Manchester Jubilee Exhibition 1887. A. G. Temple noted that this painting was “one of the best” of Solomon’s works, and that it showed “three almost life-sized heads, but painted with much feeling, although the hands are a little wanting in their modelling”. See Temple, 1897: 335-36.

chin”.³⁷² However, the image is not as easily recognisable as a self-portrait of the artist as the Institute might suggest. The facial features that the institute describe (the lowered eyelids and aquiline nose) could be attributed to any of the anonymous faces that appear in the other 1873 paintings, not to mention any number of ‘Symbolist’ artworks, whilst the suggestion that the image is recognisable as Solomon because of the “mass of wavy hair” is questionable. There is no evidence from the extant photographs and contemporary descriptions of the artist that Solomon had a mass of wavy hair. Instead, as the title suggests, this is an allegorical self-portrait and not an accurate portrayal of the artist.

Another extant work for 1873 is the drawing *Night*, which the Peter Nahum gallery described in 1989 as one of the earliest of Solomon’s Symbolist drawings to use “such an intense full-faced expression”.³⁷³ The gallery also suggested that the drawing had originally been owned by the “artist’s family” and was being sold by the gallery “by descent”.³⁷⁴ Solomon informed Julia Ellsworth Ford, in an undated meeting before he died in 1905, that “Night, Sleep, Death and the Stars” were the “themes” he loved the best.³⁷⁵ In Solomon’s prose poem, *A Vision of Love Revealed in Sleep*, published in 1871, the subject of the drawing, described by the Nahum gallery as the veil of night being drawn across the day, is illustrated: “he sank beneath her sacramental kiss, and Day was lulled to death in the all-embracing arms of Night”.³⁷⁶

In 2008, the auction house, Bloomsbury, failed to sell a Solomon watercolour in its London salerooms which was titled *Study of a Woman with Red Hair* and dated 1873 by the catalogue (Fig. 11).³⁷⁷ The painting shows an unusually garish, vividly painted female head in profile. Despite its unusual colouration, this painting is more akin to Solomon’s

³⁷² See The Minneapolis Institute of Arts website at www.artsmia.org/viewer/detail.php?v=12&id=1686 (accessed 12 March 2009).

³⁷³ Anon, *Burlington Magazine*, July 1989: xviii.

³⁷⁴ Anon, *Burlington Magazine*, July 1989: xviii.

³⁷⁵ Ford, 1908a: 24.

³⁷⁶ Solomon, 1871: 18.

³⁷⁷ This auction took place on the 8th of May 2008. The title of the sale was *Modern British Art* and *Study of a Woman with Red Hair* was sold as Lot 1. According to the auction catalogue it was expected to make £2000 - £3000.

much later works of heads in profile, such as *Head of a Young Man*, (1888) (Fig. 93) and not of the much more finely drawn and carefully painted works of 1873 that have already been mentioned. In addition, it is very difficult to see the date, which is painted underneath Solomon's monogram, on the bottom right-hand corner of the drawing. This monogram resembles the one produced on *Greeks Going to a Festival* (1873) (Fig. 4), but this is unlikely to help in the painting's dating because the monogram also resembles one reproduced on *Ava Maria Gratia Plena*, painted in 1888 (Fig. 94). The last piece of work accredited to Solomon in 1873 was sold at Sotheby's in 1985. The catalogue reveals that it is a pencil and red crayon drawing titled *Meditation*, although because the drawing is now in an unknown location, and an illustration of the work was not included in the catalogue, it is unclear what this drawing looks like.³⁷⁸

Solomon's trip to Devon

As well as producing the nine works already mentioned, and exhibiting at the Liverpool Exhibition of Paintings at the beginning of October 1873, Solomon spent the end of 1873 in Devon. There are varying reports of the artist's visit to Devon sometime in 1873 in the historiography, but most of them are characteristically vague. Reynolds suggested that Solomon stayed "for some months as the guest of Mrs Pender Cudlip", who I discuss shortly, although he gives no dates or sources for this visit.³⁷⁹ Rupert Croft-Cooke related how, "before the year was out", Solomon was staying with friends in Devonshire, "giving widely advertised public readings of Dickens".³⁸⁰ If there is, however, evidence to suggest that, by mid-November 1873, Solomon had left London and travelled to Devon, there is no indication he was forced to flee. On the contrary, a letter from Theodore Watts-Dunton to

³⁷⁸ The drawing was sold as Lot 437 on the 30th May 1985 at Sotheby's in London.

³⁷⁹ Reynolds, 1985: 82.

³⁸⁰ Croft-Cooke, 1967: 56.

Swinburne, dated 21st November, suggests that Solomon was in good humour and spirits, and not as Falk suggested in 1937, “in revolt against society”.³⁸¹

In the letter, Watts-Dunton recorded a “strange meeting” he had had “two or three weeks since” in Torquay.³⁸² He stated that, on a visit to the Palaeolithic caves at Kent’s Cavern, he had asked directions of a man approaching him, only to discover that it was Solomon, who stared back at him “in a fascinated manner”, which might suggest that Solomon was surprised to see Watts-Dunton, but not perturbed by the meeting.³⁸³ Solomon told Watts-Dunton that he was staying with Colonel Brine at Shaldon, and that he was going out “into the best society to be had in these remote parts”, inviting Watts-Dunton to call.³⁸⁴ This invitation and the suggestion that the artist was openly socialising with the best Devon society tend to suggest that Solomon was not hiding away. Watts-Dunton commented that Solomon looked “very well”, which perhaps signifies that the artist was in relaxed and trusted company, and remained untroubled about the events nine months before.³⁸⁵

Swinburne’s reply to Watts-Dunton revealed that the poet had “heard before” that Solomon was “in Devonshire staying with some old friends”.³⁸⁶ This reply, written on the 1st December 1873, was sent by Swinburne after his return from Henley-on-Thames, where he went to convalesce after a “violent cough and cold” which was “hardly beginning to improve”.³⁸⁷ This illness might suggest that Swinburne’s anxiety about Solomon’s arrest was manifesting itself into physical ailments. It is unclear who had informed Swinburne of this news, but the information given to the poet was that Solomon had been “giving *public*

³⁸¹ Meyers, 2005: 304. Falk, 1937: 328.

³⁸² Meyers, 2005: 304.

³⁸³ Watts-Dunton describes Kent’s Cavern as “the famous place” where “an immense cavern in the red rock, under the floor of which human work of industry have been found mingled with bones of lion, elephant, and other carnivorous animals of a tropical climate”. Meyers, 2005: 304. For a nineteenth-century exploratory description of the caves, see Silliman and Dana, *The American Journal of Science and Arts*, January, March, May 1867: 372-83.

³⁸⁴ Watts-Dunton calls him ‘Bryne’.

³⁸⁵ Meyers, 2005: 304.

³⁸⁶ Lang, 1959b:260-61.

³⁸⁷ Lang, 1959b:260-61.

readings in his own name” from “Dickens in the neighbouring town with great success”.³⁸⁸

There is no mention in the main newspapers for the east Devon area about Solomon giving these readings, although it is possible that the smaller local newspapers may have advertised the events; and despite the apparent success of Solomon’s readings, there appears to be no contemporary reports of the events in journals or correspondence.³⁸⁹ It is clear, however, from Swinburne’s use of italics that he was astounded that Solomon would be appearing in public at this time. Swinburne suggested that Solomon, “from his own account”, was “living in a round of balls and local theatricals”. He also “declared that “everything connected” with Solomon was “so extraordinary that nothing can be expected to happen in his case except that which seems unlikeliest.”³⁹⁰ The letter does not make it clear whether Swinburne was referring to Powell’s “own account” or Solomon’s. It seems, however, that Swinburne was so astonished by Solomon’s behaviour that he suggested that he would “hear next” of the artist’s “presentation at court with a promise of reversion” of the “vacant presidential chair” belonging at that time to the Academy’s president, Sir Francis Scott.³⁹¹

This letter appears to suggest that Powell had corresponded with Solomon during the artist’s stay in Devon. However, no correspondence between the two men during and after 1873 can be found. Swinburne suggested to Watts-Dunton that he had written “a long letter of elder brotherly advice” to Powell warning him not to be “led away by any kindly and generous feeling towards an unfortunate man” who Powell and Swinburne had regarded once as a friend.³⁹² Swinburne also cautioned Powell about renewing any “intimacy by correspondence or otherwise” with Solomon since Powell risked involving himself in “equivocal or questionable relations” with a “person who has deliberately

³⁸⁸ Lang, 1959b: 261.

³⁸⁹ The main newspaper from the east Devon area was the *Trewman's Exeter Flying Post*, which, as suggested, does not publicise Solomon’s readings. There are at least another ten smaller local newspapers and supplements for the Torquay area that cover this period. An extensive search would be required to clarify whether Solomon’s public readings of Dickens might be correct.

³⁹⁰ Lang, 1959b: 261.

³⁹¹ Lang, 1959b: 261.

³⁹² Lang, 1959b: 261.

chosen to do what makes a man and all who associate with him infamous in the eyes of the world".³⁹³ Clearly, this advice to Powell is further evidence of Swinburne's anxiety about being associated with Solomon, and perhaps Swinburne's anxiety about being associated with Powell, if Powell continued corresponding with Solomon. This also suggests that, contrary to his letter to Powell in June, in which the poet appeared to imply that Solomon "was out of his mind" with "madness", by December Swinburne believed that Solomon "deliberately" chose to commit the "crime".

Colonel John Jones Brine and his wife, Caroline, lived at Teign Cottage, Shaldon, Teignmouth; where Solomon would have stayed during his visit with them in 1873.³⁹⁴ The cottage is described in a sale notice of 1859 as a "desirable and genteel residence", situated "contiguous to the Estuary of the River Teign", commanding "sea and land views".³⁹⁵ The sale notice also recorded that the cottage comprised "good dining and drawing rooms, five bedrooms with kitchen and other domestic offices, including a coach house, harness room and two stalled stable".³⁹⁶

It is clear from extant correspondence between Solomon and Swinburne that the artist had been previously acquainted with the Brines. The artist had stayed with them on an earlier occasion in 1871, and in a letter dated 1st May 1871 to Swinburne "care of Colonel Brine", Solomon wrote that he was finding "Devonshire and the sea lovely".³⁹⁷ Solomon also wrote that he was staying with a "great admirer" of Swinburne's and that he had read most of Swinburne's *Songs before Sunrise* to Mrs Brine, a fact suggesting that Swinburne was not familiar with the Brine family.³⁹⁸

³⁹³ Lang, 1959b: 261.

³⁹⁴ 1871 England Census - Brine Family, The National Archive, RG10/2074 and a notice of Colonel Brine living at 'Teign Cottage' in 1878, see White, 1878: 691.

Later on in the 1880s the Brines would move to *The Ness* in Shaldon.

³⁹⁵ Anon, *Trewman's Exeter Flying Post*, 17 March 1859: front page.

³⁹⁶ Anon, *Trewman's Exeter Flying Post*, 17 March 1859: front page.

³⁹⁷ Lang, 1959b: 141-42.

³⁹⁸ Lang, 1959b: 142. In a letter dated 15th May 1871, Solomon repeated to Swinburne that he had read the poet's 'Songs before Sunrise' to Mrs Brine.

Solomon's friend, artist Thomas Armstrong, was also a regular visitor to the Brines in Shaldon, having first met the family in 1866 in Henley-on-Thames after the Brines had returned from India.³⁹⁹ With this in mind, it seems possible that Armstrong may have introduced Solomon to the Brines, although it is unclear when this might have occurred. In April 1881, Armstrong married one of the Brine's daughters, Alice, at the British Embassy in Paris and continued to make frequent visits to Shaldon.⁴⁰⁰

The Brines were both staunch members of the Liberal party and the women's suffrage movement in Teignmouth.⁴⁰¹ In the 1880s, Colonel Brine became the vice-chairman of the Teignmouth Liberal Association, and Caroline Brine became the delegate for Shaldon in the Teignmouth Division. In a "clear and incisive speech" in 1886 at the Working Men's Liberal Association, Caroline urged the working men present not to "imbibe their politics so much at the club or public house", but instead to "buy their daily paper and read it at their own firesides".⁴⁰² The Brines, then, supported the idea of temperance that fitted within the framework of mid-Victorian Liberalism alongside public morality and self-control.⁴⁰³ With this in mind, it is interesting to note that Reynolds suggested that Solomon's "season of recuperation" ended abruptly when his "drinking habits" proved "too much of a strain" for his hostess, and he was obliged to leave; which, if true, would fit with the Brines' strict Liberalism.⁴⁰⁴ However, Reynolds does not cite this reference to Solomon's over-indulgence and it is difficult to clarify whether this actually occurred.

³⁹⁹ Lamont, 1912: 26. Thomas Armstrong was lodging at the home of a watchmaker named "Beck" on the High Street at Henley-on-Thames in the summer of 1866. Lamont suggests that the Brines stayed at the same house, and that the Brine's Persian cat became the "means of an introduction" after being found eating Armstrong's "evening chop" one day, which "started a lifelong intimacy". Colonel Brine was a member of Her Majesty's Indian Military Force, Madras Infantry, and retired in 1869. See Anon, *Freeman's Journal & Daily Commercial Advertiser*, 25 March 1869: no page number.

⁴⁰⁰ Lamont, 1912: 49, 100.

⁴⁰¹ Crawford, 2006: 145. Elizabeth Crawford has described Caroline Brine as a "well-known, local political personality" and "undoubtedly the progenitor of Teignmouth's nineteenth-century suffrage". On the 18th September, two months before Solomon arrived in Devon, Caroline had attended a public meeting in Teignmouth, which discussed the "Political Disabilities of Women", as a noted speaker.

⁴⁰² Crawford, 2006: 145.

⁴⁰³ For more on Victorian Liberalism see Bellamy, 1990.

⁴⁰⁴ Reynolds, 1985: 82.

As already mentioned, Reynolds suggested that Solomon may have stayed with Mrs Pender Cudlip during his time in Devon. Again, Reynolds does not reveal any sources, although it is possible that he got this information from Croft-Cooke's *Feasting with Panthers* (1968), which suggested that Solomon stayed with the Cudlips.⁴⁰⁵ However, Croft-Cooke's information goes uncited and it difficult to be certain that Solomon actually stayed with the Cudlips. It is clear that the artist had stayed with both the Cudlips and the Brines during his trip to Devon in 1871, and so it is possible that he might have stayed with both families again in 1873. In Solomon's letter to Swinburne in May 1871, Solomon wrote that he was staying with "another admirer" of Swinburne's, "Miss Annie Thomas, the novelist, now Mrs Pender Cudlip"; and Solomon joked that he begged "to state that" he "did not pend her Cudlip" and "would scorn the action".⁴⁰⁶ In addition, the Cudlips are recorded in the 1871 census as living at 15 Petitor Villa, (now Road), St Mary Church, Torquay, which is only five miles from the Brines' home at Shaldon; and, as previously mentioned, Solomon had informed Watts-Dunton that while in Devon Solomon was going out "into the best society".⁴⁰⁷

In Edwin Lee's *Watering Places of Britain* (1859), Lee suggested that there was a "good deal of agreeable society in the winter season" to be found in Torquay, though not of a "*bruyant* [noisy] character".⁴⁰⁸ Lee also indicated that "lectures" on "popular topics" were given, as well as "exhibitions of various kinds", which is interesting given Swinburne's assertion that Solomon was giving readings of Dickens in this area.⁴⁰⁹ However, Lee states that Teignmouth "from its more exposed position" was much colder

⁴⁰⁵ Croft-Cooke, 1967: 58.

⁴⁰⁶ Lang, 1959b: 142.

⁴⁰⁷ 1871 England Census - Cudlips, National Archives, RG10/2089. It is also worth mentioning that C. A. Swinburne had a connection to Devon, and in particular Torquay, where he was married in 1863 to Frederica Frances Entwistle, although there is no suggestion at present that he, or his wife, were acquainted with the Brines or Cudlips, despite his father also being a high-ranking army man like Colonel Brine. See Anon, *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 8 April 1863: 654. C. A. Swinburne's father was Colonel Joseph Swinburne of the 83rd foot regiment.

For Watts-Dunton letter to Swinburne see Meyers, 2005: 304.

⁴⁰⁸ Lee, 1859: 302.

⁴⁰⁹ Lee, 1859: 302.

than Torquay and “would not be recommended as a winter residence” and that, in contrast to Torquay, “scarcely any visitors” remained during “this season”, which suggests that if Solomon had been taking part in a “round of balls and theatricals”, as Swinburne suggested, it probably took place at Torquay.⁴¹⁰

It is unclear whether the Brines or Cudlips were aware of Solomon’s arrest, although they certainly might have been. After all, according to the *Englishwoman’s Review*, the Brines were in London on the 28th April 1873, two months after Solomon’s arrest, attending a suffrage meeting at the Hanover Square Rooms.⁴¹¹ They were also well acquainted with Armstrong, who was part of Solomon’s London circle, and of course, Solomon may have revealed something himself, but it remains unclear how candid he might have been, particularly as the Brines’ were staunch Liberals.

In this chapter I have continued to examine the letters and correspondence of Solomon’s close circle, written during the latter part of 1873, and examined in detail Solomon’s trip to Devon and his possible whereabouts after the trial. I have also made a study of the artistic activity of both Solomon and Rebecca during this period, noting all the extant work produced during this year, the commissions completed, and the national exhibitions that showed both artists’ work. By doing this I have demonstrated that both Solomon and Rebecca continued to be active artistically after the arrest, and that Solomon was not perhaps as troubled and unsettled after the arrest as previously suggested in the scholarship.

In chapter three I make a study of Solomon’s life and his artistic output during the period between 1874 and 1878. I also discuss Solomon’s arrest in Paris in 1874, Rebecca’s continued artistic practice, and Solomon’s alleged publication *Cleopatra’s Needle* (1877).

⁴¹⁰ Lee, 1859: 324 and Lang, 1959b: 261.

⁴¹¹ Anon, *The Englishwoman’s Review*, 1 July 1873: 201.

CHAPTER III

1874 – 1878: THE ARREST IN PARIS, *CLEOPATRA'S NEEDLE* (1877), HOLLYER, AND HARDSHIP

At the beginning of 1874, Solomon was probably still in Devon. In a letter dated 2nd January 1874, Swinburne wrote to Watts-Dunton that he was “going into Cornwall for ten days with Prof. Jowett”.⁴¹² Swinburne noted that Jowett was also visiting Torquay, although Swinburne had “no wish” to join him because he did not want to “encounter” the “Platonist”. This supports the idea that Solomon may have stayed with the Cudlips in Torquay as well as the Brines in Teignmouth. It seems likely that Swinburne had heard about Solomon staying in Torquay from Powell, because, as already suggested, it is clear from Swinburne’s letter of December 1873 that Powell was in contact with Solomon. The January 1874 letter confirms Powell’s response to Swinburne’s caution of December 1873 to keep clear from Solomon. As Swinburne noted in the January letter, Powell had responded to Swinburne’s “little fraternal lecture” on caution “very nicely, in two or three sensible and grateful words”.⁴¹³

No surviving evidence reveals the date that Solomon eventually left Devon, however, it is probable that this occurred between mid-January and the beginning of March 1874, because the next documented evidence of Solomon’s location can be found in the *Registres des Jugements du Tribunal Correctionnel de la Seine*.⁴¹⁴ This record shows that Solomon was arrested for “outrage public a la pudeur”, or outrage to the public decency, in Paris on the 4th March 1874, one year after the artist’s conviction in London. Despite Ross’s brief mention that Solomon had been arrested in Paris in his 1905 article, it quickly

⁴¹² Lang, 1959b: 264-65.

⁴¹³ Lang, 1959b: 264-65.

⁴¹⁴ Registres Des Jugements De Tribunal Correctionnel De La Seine, Archives de Paris, D1U6, 68010, 1874, Archives de Paris. My thanks to Dr Natalie Ford for translating this document.

fell out of the historical record, going unmentioned by Reynolds, Seymour and Lambourne.⁴¹⁵

Some of the arrest details were subsequently, inadvertently discovered in the Paris archives by William A. Peniston in the mid 1990s, who published them in his 1996 work on homosexuality and criminality in Paris.⁴¹⁶ Since much of the material relating to this arrest had, therefore, been left untouched in the Paris archives, I discuss below for the first time in any detail a translation of the judgement relating to this arrest, and the police record.⁴¹⁷

The judgement, dated 18th April 1874, recorded that on the 4th March 1874, “Siméon Salomon” [sic] a thirty-three-year-old painter and bachelor from London, who was living at the Hôtel de Paris et d’Osborne on the rue du Dauphin, was arrested in a public urinal at the Place de la Bourse in Paris with a seventeen-year-old ‘shop boy’ Henri Lefranc of 48 rue du Vertbois. The document noted that, after investigation and discussion with Solomon and Lefranc, the court decreed that both men should be charged with “mutually indulging in obscene contact in public” and that this was a “crime identifiable and punishable under article 330 of the penal code”. The judgement was followed by a description of this particular article, which asserted that “any person” who had “committed a public act of indecency” would be “punished by a prison sentence of between three months and two years and by a fine of between sixteen francs and two hundred francs”.⁴¹⁸ Solomon was sentenced to three months in prison and Lefranc was given six months. Both men were charged with paying sixteen francs in fines and fifty-five francs, seventy-nine centimes in expenses and three francs in stamps. The judgement also determined that a

⁴¹⁵ Ross suggested that “Solomon used to boast that he had been in prison in every country in Europe; but besides London there is no evidence that he was arrested elsewhere than in Paris, where he was detained three months”. Ross, *The Westminster Gazette*, 24 August 1905a: 1-2.

⁴¹⁶ Peniston, 1996, Ross, *The Westminster Gazette*, 24 August 1905a: 1-2: 134 and Peniston, 1996. Ross does not give any dates for the arrest.

⁴¹⁷ I am indebted to William A. Peniston for providing me with the reference numbers for the 1874 arrest: documents that he had not had time to research in Paris.

⁴¹⁸ DIU6, 68010, 1874, Archives de Paris.

further period of “physical imprisonment” would be afforded the two men if they did not pay the fine and expenses within twenty days of the judgement.⁴¹⁹

It is unclear whether Solomon had travelled to Paris with anyone, or whether he had funded the trip himself. Karl Baedeker’s 1878 *Paris and its Environs: With Routes from London to Paris, Paris to the Rhine*, suggested to the English traveller that “good second class hotels” could be found on the rue du Dauphin.⁴²⁰ Baedeker described the Hôtel de Paris et d’Osborne as being located in central Paris at numbers 4 and 6 rue du Dauphin (now called rue Dauphine), on the left bank of the Seine, positioned at the northern end of the street looking towards the oldest bridge over the Seine, the Pont Neuf. Solomon’s choice of a good second-class hotel perhaps suggests that he was not yet struggling financially.

Solomon’s choice of the Hôtel de Paris et d’Osborne as a place to stay while in Paris may not, however, have been solely influenced by price and guidebook recommendations, but, perhaps, also by location. The hotel was positioned within an area that was noted for its associations with a queer Paris subculture. For example, Leslie Chocquette, quoting Ali Coffignon’s *Paris Vivant: La Corruption à Paris* published in 1889, suggests that the Palais de Justice and the Bourse were recorded as daytime “cruising spots” for nineteenth-century homosexual men.⁴²¹ Michael Sibalis documents that over thirteen per cent of the arrests for *pédérastie* in Paris occurred in the public urinals at the Place de la Bourse. However, Sibalis states that this activity would have happened at night because “the business quarter was conveniently deserted”.⁴²² The *Registres des Jugements* do not give any information about the time of Solomon’s and Lefranc’s arrest; however, a police register of 1874 titled *Pédérastes et Divers*, (Pederasts and Others) obtained from Les Archives du Musée de la Préfecture de Police in Paris, records that the men were

⁴¹⁹ D1U6, 68010, 1874, Archives de Paris.

⁴²⁰ Baedeker, 1878: 7.

⁴²¹ Choquette, 2001: 158. Also see Coffignon, 1889.

⁴²² Sibalis, 1999: 21.

arrested at eight-thirty in the evening which would support Sibalis's suggestion of night-time cruising.⁴²³

It is perhaps useful to note, at this point, that *pédéraste* and *pédérastie*, which appear in the French documents, were used by the French police from the 1730s as replacements for the words *sodomite* or *sodomie*. Unlike the term *sodomite*, which referred exclusively to the sexual act of buggery by any gender with any other or any animal, the *pédéraste* described a “man whose sexual desire” was “oriented exclusively toward other men”.⁴²⁴ It did not refer to a sexual preference for children and must not be confused with the modern British term *paedophile*.⁴²⁵

The police register also records some information that differs from the details on the court document. The entries for Solomon and Lefranc are dated 4th March 1874, which was the date the two men were arrested. However, Solomon is recorded as living at the Hôtel de la Tamise on the Rue de Rivoli and not at the Hôtel de Paris et d'Osborne. It is unclear why Solomon is recorded as staying in two different hotels, unless he moved to the second hotel after he was initially arrested, but this is assuming that he was not held in police custody before the trial. The two hotels were located very close to each other. Baedeker's guide to Paris confirms that the Hôtel de la Tamise was another “good second-class” hotel on the corner of the rue de Rivoli at 4, rue d'Alger.⁴²⁶ The Hôtel de la Tamise still exists and is situated on the right bank of the Seine overlooking the Jardin des Tuileries, where, as Florence Tamagne suggests, “queens known by their *noms de guerre* would meet”.⁴²⁷ It is less than half a mile from the Louvre and a mile from the Hôtel de Paris et d'Osborne. It is also less than half a mile from the Champs Elysées, which Sibalis suggests was considered an important site for the homosexual subculture with nearly

⁴²³ Pédérasts et Divers, Les Archives du Musée de la Prefecture de Police, Paris, BB6: 247 & 248.

⁴²⁴ Rey, 1988: 188. Rey notes that the decision of the French police to change the terminology from *sodomie* to *pédéraste* might indicate a “greater acceptance of homosexuals and their subculture”.

⁴²⁵ The French term *pédophile* is dated towards the end of the nineteenth century, and like the British term also refers to adults who are sexually attracted to children. See 'Oxford English Dictionary': www.dictionary.oed.com.

⁴²⁶ Baedeker, 1878: 7.

⁴²⁷ Tamagne, 2004: 53.

twenty-seven per cent of arrests for *pédérastie* between March 1873 and March 1879 occurring in the public urinals in this area.⁴²⁸ In *Sexual Life in Our Times* (1907), the German sexologist Iwan Bloch recorded that an “Urning’s ball” was held at the rue de Rivoli in 1864 at which “150 men, many of them in women’s clothing, took part.”⁴²⁹

Another difference in the details of the court judgement and the police register is the location in which Solomon and Lefranc were arrested. The police register records that Solomon and Lefranc were arrested at the Boulevard de Bonne Nouvelle, and not at the Place de la Bourse, as suggested in the court document. The Boulevard de Bonne Nouvelle is situated to the north east of the Bourse and is approximately one mile away. Again, it is unclear why this information differs from the court record because it appears to refer to the same conviction. The police register also contains a record of the court judgement of the 18th April, which was added later in red ink after the initial arrest details. Tamagne suggests that men seeking sex with other men mostly circulated around the Grand Boulevards such as the Bonne Nouvelle, so it is conceivable that Solomon and Lefranc could have been arrested there.⁴³⁰ The police register does not record whether the two men were arrested in a public urinal at the Boulevard de Bonne Nouvelle. However the court judgement very clearly states that Solomon and Lefranc were arrested in a public urinal at the Bourse. A photograph of a public urinal or *vespasienne*, a metal multi-compartmented toilet that replaced the outmoded *urinoir*, exists, dated circa 1875, showing its location at the Bourse (Fig. 12).⁴³¹ David Pike suggests that the narrow metal bands that surrounded the *vespasiennes* barely obscured the physical act of urination, and the physical act of buggery would, similarly, have been barely obscured.⁴³² It appears, then, that men were taking a significant risk of being seen by the police or passers-by when using the

⁴²⁸ Sibalis, 1999: 21.

⁴²⁹ Bloch, 1909: 517.

⁴³⁰ Tamagne, 2004: 53.

⁴³¹ Sibalis, 1999: 20. The *urinoir* was an open hole in the ground. For more on Parisian public toilets see Pike, 2005.

⁴³² Pike, 2005: 234.

vespasiennes. Robb suggests that many prosecutions were the result of “specific complaints from members of the public who heard unseemly noises coming from public urinals”.⁴³³

Despite homosexual acts being decriminalized in France by the revolutionary *Code Pénal* of 1791, Robb suggests that, in the nineteenth century, male prostitution was policed with an “extraordinary effort”, because it was thought that *pédérastie* deprived the sufferer of courage, family feeling and patriotism”, and was unlike ‘normal’ prostitution, in that it did not perform a ‘useful’ function.⁴³⁴ Sodomy was still considered a violation of the social order and was classed, as in Solomon’s case, as an “outrage to the public decency”, and dealt with according to civil and criminal codes.⁴³⁵ These were defined as any activity that might disrupt the family and particularly if it provoked a public scandal.⁴³⁶ Peniston suggests that police registers, such as the one that contained Solomon’s and Lefranc’s arrest details, also contained the details of thieves and vagrants, or “others”.⁴³⁷ Peniston explains that the Préfecture de Police recorded the details of *pédérastes* alongside those of petty criminals because, although sodomy was not illegal, the police believed that it attracted other crimes against property and persons, “such as theft, blackmail, and extortion” as well as more serious crimes such as assault and murder.⁴³⁸

It seems clear from the police register that Lefranc was a petty thief as well as a male prostitute, since he appears two years later in the police register on the 28th December 1876 under the pseudonym Raphael Maximillien Dumont. In that document, Lefranc and twenty-one-year-old salesman Ernest Baudry are described as the victims of “seduction”, and the seducer is named as aristocrat Vicomte Léon de Kersaint.⁴³⁹ However, the record

⁴³³ Robb, 2003: 29.

⁴³⁴ Robb, 2003: 28. The Code was created during the French Revolution. As Michel Rey noted, before that time sodomites were burned at the stake, which was symbolic of heavenly fire. For more on sodomy in France in the eighteenth century and the Code Pénal of 1791 see Rey, 1989.

⁴³⁵ BB6, Les Archives du Musée de la Préfecture de Police, 1874.

⁴³⁶ Peniston, 1996: 130.

⁴³⁷ Peniston, 2002: 169.

⁴³⁸ Peniston, 2002: 169.

⁴³⁹ BB6: Les Archives du Musée de la Préfecture de Police, 1874:1034.

also shows that at the same time Lefranc had been arrested for having sex with a man named Bossière after stealing his watch. The police records also note that Lefranc was arrested a week before he was caught with Solomon, on the 24th February 1874, for “soliciting men” with “café boy” Paul Masson, at the Passage des Panoramas near the Bourse.⁴⁴⁰ Lefranc and Masson were not charged. On this occasion, Lefranc is recorded as being eighteen years old, the same age that he initially gave to the police when he was arrested with Solomon. The record also documents that Lefranc was known to the police as Eugène Evivert as well as Raphael Maximillien Dumont. However, in the court judgement of the 4th March 1874 his parents are described as Edouard and Céline Maréchal leaving it unclear what Lefranc’s real identity was.⁴⁴¹

As already mentioned, Lefranc was sentenced to six months in jail in 1874 and Solomon was given three months. It is unclear whether Solomon actually served this term in prison because it is not recorded in the extant evidence. However, the court judgement does not suggest that either man was given a suspended sentence and, unlike Solomon’s London trial, there is no suggestion of any family assistance or involvement. It seems likely, however, that, as was the case with Solomon’s London partner-in-‘crime’, Lefranc received a longer prison sentence than Solomon because of his social class, and possibly because of his previous arrest. Peniston suggests that young men who re-offended like this were probably male prostitutes, and their other occupations were invented for the benefit of the police.⁴⁴² This seems likely, for in the court judgement Lefranc describes himself as a “shop boy” and in the police record he is described on a number of occasions as a “wine clerk”. It is also possible that his frequent use of pseudonyms and different years of birth were designed to bring him a kind of legal anonymity.

⁴⁴⁰ Pédérasts et Divers, BB6: 189 & 190. Les Archives du Musée de la Préfecture de Police, Paris.

⁴⁴¹ Peniston notes that a seventeen-year-old wine clerk named Eugène Dumont, also known as *La Brunette*, was part of a group of male prostitutes and thieves that were investigated by the police in 1876. Lefranc used both of these names as pseudonyms and it does not seem out of the question to suggest that this could also be him. Peniston, 1996: 133.

⁴⁴² Peniston, 1996: 135.

As already suggested, Solomon was tried under article 330 of the penal code, which prescribed a prison term of three to six months and a fine of sixteen to two hundred francs, which is recorded in the 1874 judgement.⁴⁴³ Crimes of sodomy were dealt with under this jurisdiction and punishments tended to be much more liberal than those in Britain.⁴⁴⁴ That said, Solomon was taking more of a chance with his liberty in Paris than in London. Robb suggests that the “mere absence of anti-sodomitical laws” in France “did not bring immunity from harassment and prosecution”, and that France was a much “more dangerous place for homosexuals than England”.⁴⁴⁵ This appears to be due, in part, to the eagerness of the chief officer of the Parisian vice squad at the time, François Carlier, to arrest and convict *pédérastes*.⁴⁴⁶ Peniston explains that Carlier believed that male prostitution was a “small step from petty thievery to grand larceny” and “clearly constituted a major criminal problem” and therefore “advocated more stringent laws against male prostitution in particular”.⁴⁴⁷ Robb suggests that the Parisian police performed “mass round-ups” of prostitutes, both male and female, and that from 1860 to 1870 over one thousand *pédérastes* were prosecuted in Paris compared to almost the same amount in England and Wales during the same period.⁴⁴⁸

Robb’s statistics also show that, in 1865, ten per cent of those men convicted of *pédérastie* were foreigners, perhaps indicating some kind of naive sexual tourism, although it is unclear whether Solomon travelled to Paris purely to find sex. However, Peniston suggests that “many foreigners may have sought out Paris because of its reputation for openness and toleration”, although the keen arrest policy of suspected *pédérastes* by the Parisian police appears to suggest a quite different reality on the ground.⁴⁴⁹ What does seem likely, when looking at the documentary evidence, is that Solomon may have chosen

⁴⁴³ BB6, Les Archives du Musée de la Préfecture de Police, 1874.

⁴⁴⁴ Peniston, 1996: 130.

⁴⁴⁵ Robb, 2003: 28.

⁴⁴⁶ Robb, 2003: 28.

⁴⁴⁷ Peniston, 1996: 130.

⁴⁴⁸ Robb, 2003: 28.

⁴⁴⁹ Peniston, 2004: 77.

the location of his hotel to be close to those areas that were well known as ‘cruising’ locations for men seeking sex with men.

If Solomon had served three months in prison in Paris after his conviction of 28th April, then he was unlikely to have returned to England before the end of July. Apart from the documentary evidence from the Paris arrest and the January letter from Swinburne to Watts-Dunton, no other extant information about Solomon’s whereabouts in 1874 has emerged. It is clear, however, that the artist produced some work in that year, which I discuss later, and that Rebecca continued to exhibit. On the 21st March, *The Examiner* noted that Rebecca was amongst “other artists whose works in oil” were “deserving notice” at the *Society of Lady Artists Exhibition* at Great Marlborough Street in London.⁴⁵⁰ Gerrish-Nunn suggests that Rebecca exhibited two oils, *A Roman Peasant* (1869) and *Fra Francesco* (1869), at this exhibition. The two paintings had also been exhibited at the Dudley’s winter exhibition in 1869, with the *Times* commenting that *Fra Francesco* was “impressive in character and powerful in colour” and “far superior to her rather commonplace group of Roman Peasants at a fountain”.⁴⁵¹

Gerrish-Nunn also records that Rebecca exhibited “several old pieces, along with only two new ones” at both the Manchester Exhibition and the Liverpool Exhibition in 1874.⁴⁵² These two autumn exhibitions ran almost concurrently. The Royal Manchester Institution’s ‘Autumn Exhibition of Pictures’, was held between 16th September 1874 and 2nd January 1875, and Rebecca showed two paintings there, *Enoch Arden* (1873) and *Rosalind* (1872).⁴⁵³ At the Fourth Liverpool Corporation Annual Exhibition, which began

⁴⁵⁰ Anon, *The Examiner*, 21 March 1874: 294. The *Examiner* stated that the exhibition was a “practical protest against the prejudices of those who hold that women are less capable than men of adhering to any pursuit calling for sustained thought and labour”. *The Art Journal* also made mention of the exhibition, praising the “figure paintings” of some of the women artists including Rebecca’s *A Roman Peasant*. See Anon, *Art Journal*, May 1874: 146.

⁴⁵¹ Anon, *The Times*, 26 Oct 1869: 5. Gerrish-Nunn suggests that *A Roman Peasant* was also exhibited at the Dudley in 1871. See Gerrish-Nunn, 1985: 22.

⁴⁵² Gerrish-Nunn, 1985: 23.

⁴⁵³ *Enoch Arden* had been exhibited at the Dudley Gallery the previous year, and *Rosalind* had also been exhibited at the Dudley in 1872. See Yeldham, 1984: 98, 100. *The Jewish Chronicle* review of the Dudley Gallery exhibition of 1872 described Rebecca’s *Rosalind* as “a Shakespearian subject characteristically

on 7th September and ended 12th December, she exhibited *Helena and Hermia* (1869) and *Spring Time* (1869), also known as *Primavera*.⁴⁵⁴ It is unclear whether Rebecca completed any paintings in 1874, but, as I suggested in chapter two, she still appears to have been using the studio at 12 Fitzroy Street, until at least the end of 1875. However, as Gerrish-Nunn points out, the paintings that she chose to exhibit appear to be pre-1873, apart from *Enoch Arden*, which might suggest that she was struggling to get commissions due to the effect of Solomon's arrest the previous year, or that her own output had slowed down or stopped in response. For example, in May 1874, the *Jewish Chronicle* lamented that "Miss R. Solomon" was "unrepresented" at the Royal Academy exhibition, perhaps suggesting that its journalists were unaware of the problems that the family had encountered.⁴⁵⁵ Later that June, it also noted that the "pictures bearing upon Biblical and Jewish subjects" at the Academy exhibition were "remarkably few" and emphasised that it was disappointed that, apart from "a few works by Mr. Simeon Solomon, (Hebrew in nomenclature, but Hellenic in type and manner of execution)", no notable pictures "upon Jewish subjects" had recently been produced.⁴⁵⁶

The *Jewish Chronicle* may have been aware then that during 1874 Solomon had produced at least two paintings which represented Jewish subjects. The first painting, which now resides in the National Gallery, in Washington, is titled *King Solomon* (Fig. 13). The gallery dates the painting to either 1872 or 1874, but it is unclear why there is a discrepancy.⁴⁵⁷ It shows a seated King Solomon in regal attire, and is described by Seymour as one of the four old-testament themed paintings that Solomon completed

treated". It continued by suggesting that the "delicate handling of the work" was "unfortunately marred by the effect of an almost vertical light caused by the picture being hung too high" and that the "drawing and colouring of the work" were "good and the expression fully" conveyed the "idea of the following lines attached to the title of the picture of the catalogue: Enter Rosalind with a paper, reading /From the east to western India/ No jewel is like Rosalind;/ All the pictures fairest lined/ Are but black to Rosalind;/ Let no fair be kept in mind/ But the fair of Rosalind." Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 8 November 1872: 433.

⁴⁵⁴ *Helena and Hermia* was exhibited at the Royal Academy in May 1869. Thanks go to Roberto C. Ferrari for this information. For contemporary reviews of the Manchester and Liverpool exhibitions, see: Anon, *Guardian*, 10 September 1874: 5. and Anon, *Guardian*, 7 September 1874: 5.

⁴⁵⁵ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 22 May 1874: 117.

⁴⁵⁶ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 12 June 1874: 170.

⁴⁵⁷ See www.nga.gov/cgi-bin/tinfo_f?object=76152 (accessed 4th May 2008).

between 1874 and 1876.⁴⁵⁸ Seymour suggests that Solomon made a return to these themes because he recognised a “ready audience” for his work. This perhaps suggests that this audience were still prepared to purchase work from Solomon in this period, and that his paintings were still in demand despite the arrest; or perhaps it was simply that Solomon’s new patrons were oblivious to the scandal.

The painting was originally owned by the art dealers, Durlacher Brothers, who had been based in Bond Street, London, since 1843. Solomon is likely to have met the brothers, George and Alfred Durlacher, and their father Henry, through the art dealer Murray Marks. Marks’s biography suggests that he had been very friendly with Solomon, Rebecca and Abraham for many years, and as I suggested in chapter one, appeared to have been aware that Solomon had been sent to prison after an “escapade”.⁴⁵⁹ It seems likely, then, that, after a “close friendship” with the Durlachers until “the time of his death”, which encompassed forty years, Marks might have discussed this information with the brothers.⁴⁶⁰ In other words, the Durlacher brothers may have been aware of Solomon’s arrest when they purchased the painting.⁴⁶¹

The second painting dated 1874, titled *A Bishop of the Eastern Church* (Fig. 14), is now in a private collection. Also among the other four extant works for 1874 are a drawing titled *Pomona*, (Fig. 15), which is illustrated in Reynolds’s 1985 monograph on Solomon.⁴⁶² The second work *A Hebrew Maiden* was also a pencil drawing, and was sold to a private collector in 1988 by Phillips Auctioneers in London, but had been previously exhibited at the Baillie Gallery’s posthumous exhibition of Solomon’s drawings and paintings in London in 1905, although it is unknown who originally owned this work.⁴⁶³

⁴⁵⁸ Seymour, 1986: 213.

⁴⁵⁹ Williamson, 1919: 160.

⁴⁶⁰ Williamson, 1919: 14.

⁴⁶¹ In 1966, the Durlacher dealership, (whose New York branch had been sold to Kirk Askew in 1937 by George Durlacher), held an exhibition of paintings and drawings by Solomon in New York. *King Solomon* was amongst the works exhibited.

⁴⁶² Reynolds, 1985: plate 67.

⁴⁶³ This work was sold at Phillips Auctioneers of London (now known as Phillips de Pury Company), on the 21st November 1988 in an auction titled *English Drawings & Watercolours*.

It is worth noting that the Baillie Gallery exhibition appears to have produced two catalogues, with the lists of Solomon's work in both catalogues varying greatly. Unfortunately, neither catalogue quotes either a publishing or edition date. It is, therefore, unclear in what order they were printed. The accepted amount of work shown at the exhibition, noted by all Solomon scholars to date, is one hundred and twenty two, and this information appears to have come from one of the catalogues, which I will call version one.⁴⁶⁴ However, version two of the catalogue contains a list of one hundred and sixteen works by Solomon, and of these, twenty works do not appear in version one.⁴⁶⁵ In addition, twenty-eight works that appear in version one do not appear in version two, but this suggests that there were a potential one hundred and forty two works shown at the gallery in 1905. Appendix one gives a full list of the works published in both catalogues.

The Baillie Gallery Exhibition was held at 54 Baker Street, between 9th December 1905 and 13th January 1906. John Baillie, of 1 Princes Terrace, Palace Court, announced in the *Jewish Chronicle* that he was intending "to hold an exhibition of the earlier works of the late Simeon Solomon".⁴⁶⁶ Baillie requested that "he would be glad to hear of the whereabouts of any early pictures by the artist, and to know if their owners" were "willing to lend them for the exhibition". Baillie was an artist, born in New Zealand, who became a member of the New Zealand Academy of Fine Arts in the mid 1890s.⁴⁶⁷ Around 1897, he came to London and opened the Baillie Gallery, which was originally situated in Bayswater, and in 1911, as a preliminary to the forming of the National Gallery in Wellington, Baillie was asked to take four hundred works by British painters out to New Zealand by the New Zealand Academy.⁴⁶⁸ It is unclear whether Baillie knew Solomon, but

⁴⁶⁴ Baillie, 1905b. Thanks go to Roberto C. Ferrari for sharing with me the information contained in this version of the Baillie catalogue.

⁴⁶⁵ Baillie, 1905a.

⁴⁶⁶ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 6 October 1905: 22.

⁴⁶⁷ Platts, 1980: 31.

⁴⁶⁸ Only one of Solomon's works can be found in the New Zealand National Gallery (now renamed Museum of New Zealand, Te Papa Tongarewa), and this is titled *Head* (1895) (Fig. 187). However, this work was not part of the Baillie requisition, and instead was gifted to the gallery in 1957 by Archdeacon F. H. D. Smythe. See www.collections.tepapa.govt.net (accessed 4 June 2009).

it seems likely, given that he had arranged this exhibition, that he was admirer of the artist's work.

The final dated works for 1874 are photographic reproductions by Frederick Hollyer of two of Solomon's drawings: *Love Confronted by Death*, (Fig. 16) and *Until the Day Break and the Shadows Flee Away* (Fig. 17). The two Hollyer reproductions are currently in the Birmingham Museum and Art Galleries' collection, although it is unclear whether the original drawings still exist. The museum suggests that *Until the Day Break and the Shadows Flee Away* is closely related to another work by Solomon with the same title, now in the collection of the British Museum, and dated 1869 (Fig. 18).⁴⁶⁹

There are three extant dated works for 1875 and two of these are on Jewish themes. The first work is an oil on canvas titled *Aaron with the Scroll of Law* (Fig. 19), which is now in the collection of the Southampton City Art Gallery.⁴⁷⁰ In this painting, Solomon has painted Aaron, the elder brother of Moses and the first High Priest, carrying the Scroll of Law or Torah on which the Pentateuch is written.⁴⁷¹ The second work is *David Mourning Absalom* (Fig. 20), which Seymour describes as having possible "autobiographical overtones", such that the feelings of grief that David feels for his "brilliant but wayward son" might echo those felt by Solomon's family towards the artist himself.⁴⁷² It is unclear whether this was Solomon's intention, and because there is so little information about Solomon's life in 1875 and 1876, it is difficult to know what the family were thinking of Solomon at this time. The third work, which is now in the collection of the Jewish Museum, is a red chalk drawing and is titled *Seven Cherubs Dancing* (Fig. 21).

The earliest reference to Solomon in 1875 is in a talk given by artist Frederic Shields to the Manchester Literary Club on the 11th January 1875.⁴⁷³ It was reported that

⁴⁶⁹ See www.preraphaelites.org (accessed 20 July 2009). This is the Birmingham Museum and Art Galleries dedicated website containing their Pre-Raphaelite collection.

⁴⁷⁰ See www.southampton.gov.uk (accessed 23 March 2009).

⁴⁷¹ The Torah refers to the five books of Moses or Pentateuch. See the *Catholic Encyclopedia* www.newadvent.org (accessed 12 Nov 2008).

⁴⁷² Seymour, 1986: 213. *David Mourning Absalom* (1875) is in a private collection.

⁴⁷³ Anon, Manchester Literary Club, 1875.

Shields gave a paper on both Solomon's and Ford Madox Brown's work to the members of the club, and illustrated the talk with drawings by the two artists. Unfortunately the content of the paper is, as yet, unknown, but according to Ernestine Mills (artist and apprentice to Shields), writing in 1912, Shields had "always expressed the greatest admiration" for Solomon.⁴⁷⁴ Mills also noted that Shields had advised a friend from Manchester, "Mr Johnson", to purchase some of Solomon's chalk drawings, and that Solomon had written "a friendly letter of thanks". It is possible that 'Mr Johnson' was Shields early patron Richard Johnson of Fallowfield in Manchester, but it is unclear when he might have purchased the drawings.⁴⁷⁵ Shields is perhaps one of Solomon's only early acquaintances that was still prepared to talk in public about the artist's work at this time, however, as Prettejohn suggests, it was also "an act of courage" for Pater to mention a painting of Bacchus by a "young Hebrew", the following year, despite the omission of Solomon's name, in his essay 'A Study of Dionysus' published in the *Fortnightly Review*.⁴⁷⁶

However, despite Shields' public support of Solomon, it is clear that it was limited. Mills records that near the end of Solomon's "tragic career", Shields came across Solomon again "and would have befriended him" if it had been "possible".⁴⁷⁷ This might suggest that, by the time Shields met with Solomon again, either Solomon's social circumstances had declined to such an extent that Shields felt that he was unable associate with the artist, or Shields was still subject to the same kind of homosexual panic felt by Swinburne and others.

Although there are no other extant contemporary references to Solomon until the end of 1875, there are some references to Rebecca, and particularly to the studio that she formerly shared with Solomon before the London arrest. The following journal and newspaper reports appear to support Rebecca's use of Fitzroy Street. Although the reporter

⁴⁷⁴ Mills, 1912: 103.

⁴⁷⁵ Mills, 1912: 66.

⁴⁷⁶ Prettejohn, 1999: 38. Pater, *Fortnightly Review*, December 1876: 752-72.

⁴⁷⁷ Mills, 1912: 103.

who wrote the 1875 article for the *Jewish Chronicle* appeared to have visited the studio at Fitzroy Street, he did not make note of Solomon's presence.

As *The Medical Press and Circular* reported on 13th October 1875, Rebecca had been commissioned by the late Dr Hughes Bennett to "paint a life-size portrait" of himself.⁴⁷⁸ The *Circular* suggested that the painting was now on view at her studio at 12 Fitzroy Street.⁴⁷⁹ The *British Medical Journal* obituary for Dr John Hughes Bennett, dated 9th October 1875, suggested that he was born in London in 1812, and died in Norwich in 1875, and that a marble bust of him, by the Scottish sculptor William Brodie, existed at the University of Edinburgh where he was Professor of Physiology.⁴⁸⁰ It is unclear how Dr Bennett knew of Rebecca's work because, according to the obituary, he spent much of the previous six years abroad with ill health, and it is unlikely that Rebecca had an international profile. The *British Medical Journal* also mentioned the commission on the 16th October 1875, saying that Dr Bennett's "friends and admirers" may have been interested to know that "an excellent and lifelike portrait" of the "distinguished physician" was painted "shortly before his death by Miss R. Solomon", and was "now on view at her studio, 12, Fitzroy Street".⁴⁸¹

Two months before, on the 20th August, the *Jewish Chronicle* printed an article titled *Pictures by Miss Rebecca Solomon*, which suggested that there were "recently, to be seen" at Rebecca's "studio, two portraits which for vigour, force and directness" left "little, if anything, to be desired".⁴⁸² Unfortunately, only the Bennett portrait is mentioned, and it remains unclear who the other sitter was, although the *Chronicle* suggests that both sitters were male and of "considerable distinction". The *Chronicle* describes the Bennett portrait as "extraordinarily faithful" to the sitter, "not alone in mere facial resemblance, but in the

⁴⁷⁸ The location of this painting is unknown.

⁴⁷⁹ Anon, *The Medical Press & Circular*, 13 October 1875: 311.

⁴⁸⁰ Anon, *British Medical Journal*, 9 October, 1875: 473, 477. The marble bust by Brodie still exists at the University of Edinburgh.

⁴⁸¹ Anon, *British Medical Journal*, 16 October 1875: 502.

⁴⁸² Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 20 August 1875: 334.

possession of that subtle something which causes a counterfeit presentiment to be almost a living and breathing reproduction of a familiar form". The *Chronicle* also suggested that both portraits marked "a distinct advance on the part of the painter" and that Rebecca showed herself "to be possessed of those high qualities in portraiture which" had "hitherto been supposed to be the exclusive prerogative of the stronger sex".⁴⁸³

The end of the report also mentioned that Rebecca had completed another painting titled *Rosalind* which was on show in her studio and described as "a charming study of the head of an Italian girl, brought into relief against a background of orange leaves and fruit" intended to represent "Shakespeare's heroine" from *As You Like It*. It seems likely, from the description, that this painting is the one already referred to in chapter two which was shown at the Royal Manchester Institution's 'Autumn Exhibition of Pictures' the previous year, but which is dated 1872 by Gerrish-Nunn.

From the evidence of letters written in November 1875 by John Addington Symonds, Solomon was clearly beginning to experience "difficulties" at that time.⁴⁸⁴ Writing to his close friend Horatio Forbes Brown, Symonds suggested that no one would exhibit Solomon's pictures. Symonds was also touched "to the quick to hear that a really great artist" was having financial problems, and asked Forbes Brown to get Hollyer to "send him down some of SS's drawings and pictures for his inspection".⁴⁸⁵

Hollyer was a photographer and publisher of art who had moved out of his premises in Kentish Town, north-west London in the year that Solomon was first arrested to set up business in the more affluent Pembroke Square, Kensington.⁴⁸⁶ He was responsible for photographing the work of many of the leading painters of the day including Leighton, Burne-Jones, Rossetti, Holman Hunt and Madox Brown. He also made

⁴⁸³ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 20 August 1875: 334.

⁴⁸⁴ Schueller and Peters, 1968: 388.

⁴⁸⁵ Schueller and Peters, 1968: 388.

⁴⁸⁶ Hammond, 'Hollyer, Frederick (1838-1933)', www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/58918, 2004.

a series of popular photographic portraits of the famous artists.⁴⁸⁷ In 1865, Hollyer had reproduced a series of twenty drawings by Solomon, which, as Seymour suggests, made “clear reference” to Solomon’s “homosexuality and sadomasochism”.⁴⁸⁸ Among these was *Spartan Boys about to be Scourged at the Altar of Diana* (1865) (Fig. 22), in which Solomon shows a group of naked young men about to be ritually birched.⁴⁸⁹ William E. Fredeman suggested that this book of photographs was titled *Sketches Invented and Drawn by Simeon Solomon for his Friend E. J. Poynter*.⁴⁹⁰ Solomon met Poynter at the Royal Academy Schools in 1855 and the two men remained friends until Solomon’s arrest, although Poynter continued to purchase Solomon’s work as late as 1891.⁴⁹¹

In spite of the scandal, Hollyer also continued to reproduce Solomon’s work in the new *platinotype* or platinum print process, which, as Anne Hammond suggests, produced prints that were “so subtly evocative as to have suggested modifications to the painters”.⁴⁹² As I will discuss in chapter six, Hollyer’s prints of Solomon’s work would be responsible for bringing a new American audience to the artist’s work.

There is no extant information on Solomon’s whereabouts for 1876, and records of only three dated works currently exist for this year. The first, an oil painting titled *Moses*, continues the trend towards Jewish themed works in this period, and is briefly discussed by Seymour, who suggests that the painting was sold at Christie’s in 1973 with the title *Bearded Rabbi* but exhibited at the Whitechapel Gallery at the end of 1906 with the title *Moses*.⁴⁹³ It is unclear why Seymour suggests this, however, if the painting is the work

⁴⁸⁷ Amongst the many contemporary celebrities that Hollyer photographed, portraits of George Bernard Shaw, Ellen Terry, John Ruskin, Thomas Hardy, William Morris and the Pre-Raphaelites can be seen in the Victoria and Albert Museum’s collection. See www.vam.ac.uk (accessed 2nd October 2008).

⁴⁸⁸ Seymour, 1986: 104.

⁴⁸⁹ For more on this drawing and Swinburne’s influence over Solomon’s sadomasochistic drawings in this period see: Morgan, 1996a: 61-65.

⁴⁹⁰ Fredeman, 1965: 215.

⁴⁹¹ See chapter six.

⁴⁹² Hammond, ‘Hollyer, Frederick (1838-1933)’, www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/58918, 2004. The platinum print was also known as Platinotype after the Platinotype Company in London. This company manufactured the platinum paper used in the process. This chemical process, patented in 1873, is described in detail by William Henry Burbank: see Burbank, 1887: 55-64.

⁴⁹³ Seymour, 1986: 214 n465. Christie’s in London sold the *Bearded Rabbi*, which is dated 1876, on 15th June 1973. The Whitechapel Gallery’s ‘Exhibition of Jewish Art and Antiquities’ was held between 7th November

referred to in the Whitechapel Gallery's catalogue, then it appears to have been owned by Loyce Knowles, who also lent *Biondina*, dated 1876. Apart from its title, no other information is known about this work, including its current whereabouts, however, the Italian title appears to suggest that the subject of the work may have been a fair haired woman. A work that appears in version one of the Baillie Gallery catalogue is titled *The Lemon Seller*, is also dated 1876, and was lent to the gallery by Mrs Hermann Cohen, who was Myer Salaman's daughter, Bessie.⁴⁹⁴

Loyce Knowles appears to have been a keen patron of Solomon's early and later work. Her son, Guy Knowles, inherited his mother's collection of Solomon paintings, some of which, as previously suggested, were gifted to the Manchester City Art Gallery in 1930. Guy Knowles' obituary suggests that both his mother, and father Charles Julius Knowles, had a "deep love and understanding of all the arts, particularly of sculpture and drawing".⁴⁹⁵ Two exhibition catalogues for 1905 record that Loyce Knowles owned three more Solomon works including *Love Bleeding* (1870), *Love Bound and Wounded* (1870) and *David Playing Before Saul* (date unknown).⁴⁹⁶ The obituary also records that the Knowleses were close friends of sculptor Alphonse Legros, and that Loyce and her husband "enjoyed the intimate friendship of many English and French artists". However, it is unclear whether the Knowles knew Solomon, but it seems likely considering their close friendship with Legros, who had accompanied Solomon on visits to George Howard's London home in 1868.⁴⁹⁷

Despite the lack of any extant information on Solomon in 1876, it is evident that Rebecca was still working and exhibiting, although it is unclear whether she was still using the Fitzroy Street studio. The *Jewish Chronicle*'s report, on the 16th June, of the 'Institute

and 16th December 1906. Anon, *Exhibition of Jewish Art and Antiquities: Whitechapel Art Gallery* (1906). See Appendix I for a list of the works shown at this exhibition.

⁴⁹⁴ Baillie, 1905b.

⁴⁹⁵ Anon, *The Times*, 8 May 1959: 15.

⁴⁹⁶ These works were also lent to the Baillie Gallery and Whitechapel exhibitions of 1906.

⁴⁹⁷ Rosalind Howard noted in her diary on the 16th January 1868 that Solomon and Legros had paid the Howards a visit at 5 o'clock that day. Diaries of Rosalind Howard, Castle Howard Archive, 1867/68/69.

of Painters in Water-colours' exhibition, stated that Rebecca had just completed "a portrait of the late Sir Anthony Rothschild" which the newspaper spoke "very highly" of, and it seems likely that, as an exhibitor, Rebecca would have been a member of this institute.⁴⁹⁸

On the 18th June, Rebecca was present for the unveiling of the Rothschild portrait at the Jews' Free School, Bell Lane, East London.⁴⁹⁹ *The Jewish Chronicle* described how the portrait was not painted from life, but "nevertheless executed in a manner which" reflected "the highest credit upon the gifted artist".⁵⁰⁰ The *Chronicle's* admiration of Rebecca's painting continued in a third, more detailed report of the work, published at the end of June in which the newspaper commented on Rebecca's quite "masculine genius for portrait painting".⁵⁰¹

In addition to the *Chronicle's* enthusiastic reports in 1876, Rebecca was included in Ellen Creathorne Clayton's *English Female Artists* published that year in two volumes.⁵⁰² The publication shows a descriptive list of female artists that were currently practising at the time that the book was published. However, Clayton's only mention of Solomon is in one sentence, in which she describes both the artist and his brother Abraham, who had died fourteen years earlier, as artists that had been of "good reputation".⁵⁰³ In other words, Clayton seems to be suggesting that artistically, at least, Solomon was as deceased as his brother. In addition, Clayton only acknowledged the artistic help that Abraham provided to his sister and ignored any mention of the close artistic and personal relationship that Rebecca had with Solomon.

⁴⁹⁸ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 16 June 1876: 170.

⁴⁹⁹ This painting was exhibited at the Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition at the Royal Albert Hall in 1887. It was lent by the Jews' Free School. The exhibition catalogue describes Sir Anthony Rothschild as the "second son of Nathan Meyer Rothschild, and member of the banking firm of N. M. Rothschild & sons, London" and "President of the Jews' Free School, of which he was a magnificent supporter" who "died in 1876". Anon, *Catalogue of Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition 1887. Royal Albert Hall.*, (1887). The Jews' Free School, which is now located in Camden Town, still owns the Rothschild painting.

⁵⁰⁰ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 23 June 1876: 182.

⁵⁰¹ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 30 June 1876: 195.

⁵⁰² Clayton, 1876.

⁵⁰³ Clayton, 1876: 129-130.

Rebecca's status as a practising artist in this period is also evidenced by a mention in the *Jewish Chronicle* of her attendance at the 'Examination for Drawing at the School of Art', in South Kensington.⁵⁰⁴ The article also mentions that Rebecca had been "successful" in the exam and that she was under the tutelage of M. Alphonse Lambert. The only mention of Solomon in 1876 is in a letter from Swinburne to Richard Monckton-Milnes, Lord Houghton, dated 1st June 1876.⁵⁰⁵ Monckton-Milnes owned a vast erotic library, which, as Rupert Croft-Cooke suggested in 1967, introduced Swinburne and Solomon to the work of the Marquis de Sade and other sado-masochistic publications.⁵⁰⁶ Croft-Cooke also suggested that Swinburne wrote a series of long letters to Monckton-Milnes over a period of eighteen years, which made references to de Sade. Swinburne's letter of June 1876 contains a reference to the poet's approval of the satisfaction that could be gained by the flogging of boys of good families, and ends with a mention of an advertisement that he has seen in the *Guardian* from a "widow" who wished to place "two of her daughters" under the charge "of a lady, who would, when necessary, administer the birch-rod".⁵⁰⁷ This, Swinburne sardonically appeared to suggest to Monckton-Milnes, was an indication that "Solomon's precept" was "not yet out of date."⁵⁰⁸ In contrast to Swinburne's last reference to Solomon in the letter written in 1874, Swinburne appeared to be less cautious about naming the artist, rather than using epithets such as the "Platonist".⁵⁰⁹ This might suggest that, by 1876, Swinburne's anxiety about being associated with Solomon and his arrest had begun to wane.

Solomon was again in Swinburne's thoughts the following year. In February 1877, Swinburne wrote to Watts-Dunton about an "obligation" that Swinburne had to the

⁵⁰⁴ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 30 June 1876: 206.

⁵⁰⁵ Lang, 1960: 191-192.

⁵⁰⁶ Croft-Cooke, 1967: 29. Solomon was invited to Monckton-Milnes' home at Fryston Hall, near Wakefield, in 1868. Reynolds suggests that Solomon arrived in fancy dress "impersonating a Jewish prophet" and "declaimed long passages of Hebrew ritual in a sonorous voice". Reynolds, 1985: 15.

⁵⁰⁷ Croft-Cooke, 1967: 29.

⁵⁰⁸ Lang, 1960: 192.

⁵⁰⁹ Lang, 1959b: 264-265.

journalist of the *Athenaeum*, Thomas Purnell.⁵¹⁰ Swinburne's "ten year" obligation to Purnell for introducing the poet to Italian patriot Giuseppe Mazzini was something that Swinburne felt unable to repay. In the letter to Watts-Dunton, Swinburne penned a mock reply to Purnell in which he described how he would stand by what he said "like a man" and be happy to "prove" his "sense of obligation" but "in any other way than the one now apparent".⁵¹¹ It is unclear in what way Swinburne felt that this obligation was meant to be repaid, but the poet suggested to Watts-Dunton that if he really did "answer in earnest to such effect as this" then he should feel himself "unworthy to take the hand of such a creature as that poor wretch Solomon".⁵¹² In addition, Swinburne intimated that if he should ever "degrade" himself to the "level of a very Bulgar", then he would rather "die a Poet Laureate!" The reference to a "Bulgar", is, of course, an allusion to Solomon as a 'bugger', and indicates Swinburne's lingering distaste for the artist and his 'crime'.

The first indication of Solomon's whereabouts since his arrest in Paris in 1874 appears in letters that the artist sent to Howell in 1877.⁵¹³ The first letter, dated, 25th September, records that Solomon was living at "34 John Street, Pentonville", in Islington, which, perhaps, is the first suggestion that he had moved away from his mother's address at 18 John Street, Bedford Row, and was living independently from the family for the first time.⁵¹⁴ It is likely that the artist was a boarder at 34 John Street, because the English census for 1881 records that, four years later, the residents of this property were carriage driver Ebenezer Batson, his wife and two lodgers.⁵¹⁵ The 1881 English census records that

⁵¹⁰ Lang, 1960: 276-280.

⁵¹¹ Lang, 1960: 280.

⁵¹² Lang, 1960: 280.

⁵¹³ My thanks go to Roberto C. Ferrari for providing me with transcripts of these letters.

⁵¹⁴ Letter to Charles Augustus Howell from Simeon Solomon - 1 Oct 1877, John Ruskin, The Pre-Raphaelites, and the Arts and Crafts Movement Collection, John Rylands University Library, University of Manchester, Microfilm.

⁵¹⁵ 1881 England Census - 34 John Street, The National Archive, RG11/228.

Solomon's mother Kate was no longer in residence at the family home by that year and her last appearance in the *London Post Office Directory* at 18 John Street was 1875.⁵¹⁶

Nevertheless, it is unclear when Kate left the family home, although it can be seen that her financial circumstances had changed for the worse by April 1881, because by that time she was living as a lodger in Hackney, at 27 Darnley Road.⁵¹⁷ This address is a few streets away from Solomon's older brother, Sylvester, who lived at 38 King Edward Road, Hackney, with his wife and four children, and it seems probable that Kate may have moved to Hackney to be near her son who died five months after the census was taken.⁵¹⁸

Du Maurier had described the Solomons as "tremendously rich people", after dining with them in 1861 and the will of Solomon's father Michael in 1854 reveals the unmistakable wealth of the family at that time.⁵¹⁹ The 1861 and 1871 English censuses suggest that the family were employing three servants in their large, four-storey town house at John Street.⁵²⁰ However, it is significant that a large proportion of the family wealth was distributed to Abraham alone on his father Michael's death in December 1854. The original will, dated July 1854, reveals that after the sale of the property "19 Middlesex Street", which was one part of a larger group of houses owned by Solomon's father, the money was originally to be paid to his surviving children "share and share alike". However, in a codicil to the original will, written one month before Michael died, in November 1854, that part of the will was revoked, and Abraham became the sole benefactor of the sale of 19 Middlesex Street, as a "reward and recompense for the great and varied benefits" he had "bestowed" upon his father and his family and to which his

⁵¹⁶ 1881 England Census - Kate Solomon, The National Archives, RG11/301 and Kelly's London Post Office Directory, 1875.

⁵¹⁷ Another female lodger is recorded as living at this address. Her name was Kate Hart (b1840), but it is unclear whether the two women knew each other, or whether Kate Hart was a relative of Abraham's wife, Ella Hart.

⁵¹⁸ Sylvester died on the 13th September and was buried at West Ham Cemetery. Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 21 October 1881: front page.

⁵¹⁹ Will of Michael Solomon, Public Record Office, The National Archives, prob 11/2207. At this time the family were living at 10 Chesterfield Street, King's Cross and probably moved to John Street in the late 1850s. The will records the ownership of "19 Middlesex Street", and six other houses with unspecified addresses, along with other property such as jewellery and plate.

⁵²⁰ Du Maurier, 1951: 56. 1861 England Census - Solomon Family, National Archives, RG9/183 and 1871 England Census - Solomon Family, National Archives, RG10/371.

“eminent goodness so justly” entitled him.⁵²¹ There is no suggestion that any of the other siblings, including Solomon, received any money from their father’s will, although it is unclear what provoked the father’s hasty change of mind.

Solomon’s brothers Sylvester and Isaac appear to have continued to run the family business ‘M & S Solomon and Co’, which later became ‘Sylvester Solomon and Co’ in 1869 after the original company was dissolved.⁵²² However, by March 1877 the Solomon family’s prosperity was in decline. The *London Gazette* recorded the bankruptcy of the boot and shoe manufacturing business, which had been based in Hackney, and both Sylvester and Isaac were summoned to meet with their creditors in the City.⁵²³ As already suggested, Sylvester died four years later, but it appears that at some point Isaac re-established the business, under the same trading name, until the business became bankrupt again in 1885.⁵²⁴ A notice in the *Gazette*, dated 13th February 1904, reveals that Isaac was still paying dividends of 2s 3¼d towards the original bankruptcy, which suggests that he continued to struggle financially into old age, although it is unclear what impact, if any, Solomon’s arrest had on the family business and his brothers’ financial problems.⁵²⁵

The content of Solomon’s letters to Howell, of 1877, suggest that Solomon was also desperate for money. He may have been struggling particularly at this time because, as Symonds suggested, nobody would exhibit his work. However, in light of the new financial position of his family any support that Solomon may previously have been receiving from his mother and brothers had now ceased.

The first letter reveals that Solomon had walked from his home in Islington to Howell’s residence, which at that time was Chaldon House, North End Road, Fulham; a distance of approximately seven miles.⁵²⁶ Solomon wrote at the bottom of the letter that the

⁵²¹ Will of Michael Solomon, Public Record Office, The National Archives, prob 11/2207.

⁵²² Anon, *The London Gazette*, 2 July 1869: 3770.

⁵²³ Anon, *The London Gazette*, 9 March 1877: 39.

⁵²⁴ Anon, *The London Gazette*, 5 May 1885: 2075. Isaac was pronounced bankrupt on the 1st May 1885.

⁵²⁵ Anon, *The London Gazette*, 13 February 1903: 983.

⁵²⁶ Merrill, 'Howell, Charles Augustus (1840? - 1890)', www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/39340, 2004.

“thread of Ariadne” was “almost necessary” for his journey, which seems to suggest that Solomon was unfamiliar with walking the route.⁵²⁷ It is likely that because of the distance involved, and Solomon’s social class, that this would be the kind of journey that the artist would normally have taken in a cab; a form of transport he could, presumably, no longer afford. The walk to Howell’s house, however, appears to have been a necessity for Solomon, for the letter suggests that Solomon was desperate to see Howell in order to sell some of his work. The letter stated that Solomon had taken the “original drawing of the ‘Habet’” for Howell to see, although, as he did not have an appointment, the two failed to meet. The letter also documents that Howell had called upon Solomon “a little time ago” when the painter was out.⁵²⁸ Solomon indicates that the two men had previously spoken to each other in the street and thanks Howell for the “kind expressions” made towards him.⁵²⁹ Despite Howell’s elaborate rumour, sent to D. G. Rossetti in 1873, about Solomon “ravishing” his own mother, Howell was now prepared to re-establish some kind of contact with the artist.⁵³⁰ Solomon’s desperation for money can also be seen by his plea to Howell to send him “something” [sic] as soon as Howell had “received the two drawings” that Solomon had sent. However, it is clear that Howell was unsure about purchasing any of Solomon’s work, because Solomon stressed that he had not fixed “any price” on the drawings because he was aware of “how uncertain” Howell was.

The second letter, dated two days later on the 27th September, continued the desperate tone of the first. It is clear that Howell had not replied to Solomon’s first letter, and the artist, once again, reiterated that he was at that moment in “great” and

⁵²⁷ Letter to Charles Augustus Howell from Simeon Solomon, 25 Sept 1877, John Ruskin, The Pre-Raphaelites, and the Arts and Crafts Movement Collection, John Rylands University Library, University of Manchester, Microfilm. In classical mythology this is a reference to the thread that Ariadne gave to Theseus so that he could find his way in and out of the Labyrinth after killing the Minotaur.

⁵²⁸ The current location of this drawing is unknown.

⁵²⁹ Solomon suggests that the men met in “Gt. C. St”, although it is unclear which street this refers to. In 1877 there are a number of possible central London streets that fit Solomon’s abbreviation including Great Chapel Street, just off Oxford Road and Great Castle Street, off Regent Street.

⁵³⁰ See chapter two.

“considerable want of something”.⁵³¹ Solomon also reiterated that he had “made no arrangement” for the price of the drawings and would leave it up to Howell to make a suggestion, and hoped that Howell would write “directly” as soon as he had seen the drawings. The last sentence of the letter is an indication that it had been a long time since Solomon had been in the rich and lavish surroundings of his former life, and that his life now was very different. Solomon exclaimed to Howell “how beautiful” Howell’s “place” was and that it was like “going into a new world” to him “or rather, a world that” he had “known but was again new”.⁵³²

Five days later, it was clear that Howell had still not replied to Solomon, because on the 1st October the artist once again wrote to Howell stressing that he had been “anxiously expecting to hear” from him, and asked Howell to reply as soon as he could.⁵³³ This letter indicates the subject of the second drawing, which Solomon described as a “smaller one of the fainting girl”, although it is unclear what work he is referring to. The fourth letter is undated, but was undoubtedly written some days after the letter of the 1st October.⁵³⁴ There is still a sense of desperation in the tone of this letter, but an added sense of Solomon’s irritation with Howell for his lack of contact. Solomon suggested that he could “hardly understand” why he had not heard from Howell, particularly after Solomon had visited his mother Kate that day, and been informed that Howell had been enquiring after him. Solomon suggested to Howell that if Howell did not consider the drawings “finished” enough for his “purpose”, then he should send Solomon a “line as soon as possible” to inform Solomon “one way or the other” whether he wished to “retain the two

⁵³¹ Letter to Charles Augustus Howell from Simeon Solomon - 27 Sept 1877, John Ruskin, The Pre-Raphaelites, and the Arts and Crafts Movement Collection, John Rylands University Library, University of Manchester, Microfilm.

⁵³² Letter to Charles Augustus Howell from Simeon Solomon - 27 Sept 1877, John Ruskin, The Pre-Raphaelites, and the Arts and Crafts Movement Collection, John Rylands University Library, University of Manchester, Microfilm.

⁵³³ Letter to Charles Augustus Howell from Simeon Solomon - 1 Oct 1877, John Ruskin, The Pre-Raphaelites, and the Arts and Crafts Movement Collection, John Rylands University Library, University of Manchester, Microfilm.

⁵³⁴ Letter to Charles Augustus Howell from Simeon Solomon - 1877, John Ruskin, The Pre-Raphaelites, and the Arts and Crafts Movement Collection, John Rylands University Library, University of Manchester, Microfilm.

drawings”. He also asked if Howell could send him “something at once on account” and asked Howell to write on receipt of Solomon’s letter. Unfortunately, there are no documented replies from Howell to this set of letters and it remains unclear whether Howell bought the drawings from Solomon or not.

Solomon’s financial problems during this period seem to correspond with the low output of work that he produced. One work exists for this period, a black chalk drawing titled *Amor* (Fig. 23), which is dated 1877 by the artist. However, Seymour suggests that “probably around this time” Solomon produced a series of “four large panels depicting allegories of the seasons”.⁵³⁵ An illustration of one of these panels, titled *Spring*, is painted in oils, and appears in Seymour’s thesis.⁵³⁶ Seymour suggests that the panels “must have been commissioned by one of Solomon’s few remaining friends or family members” which were “perhaps intended for a folding screen or decorative scheme for a room”.⁵³⁷ If Seymour is correct and these panels should be dated for this period, then her proposal that they were commissioned by family is possible considering Solomon’s financial situation. However, as already suggested, it is unlikely that Solomon’s immediate family would have been able to support him with commissions at this time, and it more likely that his extended family, which included the Salaman family and their extended family, would have been responsible.

Cleopatra’s Needle

In 1965, Fredeman suggested that Solomon had privately published a play in 1877 titled *Cleopatra’s Needle, or The Labours of Cupid: A Farce in One Act*.⁵³⁸ The anonymous play parodies the contemporary fuss that surrounded the siting of the Egyptian obelisk in London. Fredeman proposed that this play was accredited to Solomon by the bibliographer

⁵³⁵ Seymour, 1986: 215.

⁵³⁶ Seymour, 1986: 215.

⁵³⁷ Seymour, 1986: fig. 202.

⁵³⁸ Fredeman, 1965: 214. Anon, 1877.

Thomas J Wise in the British Museum's *Ashley Catalogue*, but Fredeman advised that no other confirmation of Solomon's authorship of the play existed. It is likely that Fredeman was referring to Wise's publication *The Ashley Library*, published in eleven volumes, between 1922 and 1936, which recorded Wise's collection of "printed books, manuscripts and autograph letters", which was subsequently given to the British Library.⁵³⁹ However, Ferrari suggests that the manuscript of the play contains an annotation that reads 'Ashley 1754', which relates to a letter in the Ashley collection dated 1871 from Solomon to Swinburne.⁵⁴⁰ This letter, which Terry L. Meyers published in 2005, was attached to the manuscript of *Cleopatra's Needle* and then subsequently removed by the British Library.⁵⁴¹ The letter of 1871 pre-dates the manuscript, and there is nothing in the content of the letter that would connect it with the play. However, Ferrari suggests that Fredeman is likely to have attributed the authorship of the play to Solomon because the letter was attached to the manuscript when the British Library received the Ashley collection. Ferrari claims that this theory is likely because, on two other occasions, Wise attached letters written by Solomon to legitimate copies of the artist's *A Mystery of Love in Sleep* (1871) and *A Vision of Love Revealed in Sleep* (1871).⁵⁴²

In spite of Ferrari's claims to the contrary, Wise is not, however, a reliable source for the authentication of *Cleopatra's Needle*. After all, Laurie E. Maguire and Thomas L. Berger suggest that Wise and accomplice Harry Buxton Foreman were "two of the greatest forgers of all time",⁵⁴³ who selected individual pieces of poetry or prose from other

⁵³⁹ Wise, 1922 - 1936.

⁵⁴⁰ My thanks go to Roberto C. Ferrari for allowing me to reproduce some of his unpublished research into the authorship of *Cleopatra's Needle*, and for providing me with his transcript of the manuscript that is currently held at the British Library. The letter from Solomon to Swinburne is one of a number in the Ashley Library collection that was originally collected by Wise. These letters were published in Jean Overton Fuller's autobiography of Swinburne in 1968. See Fuller, 1968. In the biography Fuller proposed a questionable theory about Swinburne and Solomon's predilection for sodomy, which she claimed might originate from both men having been smacked by a nanny or from the flagellation that they had both experienced at boarding school. It is unclear whether Solomon had a nanny, but he did not attend boarding school. (pp178-79).

⁵⁴¹ Meyers, 2005: Vol 1, p248.

⁵⁴² Ferrari asserts that the letter designated 'Ashley A1753' was attached to *The Mystery of Love Revealed in Sleep* and letter 'Ashley A4273' was attached to *Vision of Love Revealed in Sleep*.

⁵⁴³ Maguire and Berger, 1998: 37.

published volumes and re-printed them as ‘first edition’ pamphlets. They then re-produced a list of the pamphlets in single-author bibliographies in order that the forgeries could be legitimised and sold on to collectors. Wise and Foreman’s forgery operation was exposed by John Carter and Graham Pollard’s *An Enquiry into the Nature of Certain Nineteenth Century Pamphlets* (1934) and in 1945 they suggested that Wise’s forgeries were “strewn through the pages of *The Ashley Library Catalogue*”.⁵⁴⁴

It is also uncertain whether Solomon was the author of this play for other reasons. As Ferrari suggests, the play contains characters that could be described as anti-Semitic. The two characters in question, “Abraham Isaacs” and his son “Ichabod”, are typical stereotypes of nineteenth-century Jews. The men are money collectors, and simpletons, who speak in a stereotypically ‘Germanic-Yiddish’ accent, which leaves them open to ridicule. Ichabod uses the phrase “Vy, vot ish dish?” and Abraham exclaims “Vot vash dat noish?” Another non-Jewish character notes, with a truly anti-Jewish sentiment, that “with the perspicacity” of their “race”, they “have struck the nail in once”.⁵⁴⁵ I would suggest that it would seem unlikely that Solomon would have written and published something that was so anti-Semitic, particularly for his, or his family’s, pleasure. In 1871, Solomon is known to have privately published two spoof lectures, titled *Two Treatises on Scientific Subjects: with Noble and Striking Views of Remarkable Women*, which I believe were probably published to amuse his friends and family.⁵⁴⁶ However, if Solomon is the author of the play, then perhaps it was written in this way in order that it would appeal to a wider non-Jewish audience, hence the ‘amusing’ stereotypical Jewish characters. This would, in turn, perhaps raise more money for the artist. The reason that I make this suggestion is that,

⁵⁴⁴ Carter and Pollard, 1983.

Weber, *Modern Language Notes*, May, 1945: 347.

⁵⁴⁵ Anon, 1877.

⁵⁴⁶ A copy of this publication was sold at Sotheby’s in London in 1974. It is now at the University of Cincinnati Library. It is an autographed presentation copy with a note by Frederick Locker-Lampson, which reads “this is by Simeon Solomon, and it is a curious example of what passes for wit and humour”, see Solomon, 1871. It includes two spoof lectures on “astronomy” and “chemistry”, and Holiday remembered in the early 1860s Solomon giving “rein to his scientific propensities” and “writing natural histories, which were replete with “facts” such as “the young” of the made-up bird “*Vespertilio Grafii*” breaking its “shell with a teaspoon”. Holiday, 1914: 98.

as already shown, Solomon was desperately in need of money in 1877, and was finding it increasingly difficult to sell his artwork. Therefore, the publishing of an anonymous play might have been a way of making an income, although there is no evidence to suggest that this play sold well, was staged, or made any money.

A detail that *might* loosely connect Solomon to the manuscript is the mention in the play of Dr Erasmus Wilson, who funded the delivery of the obelisk from Egypt to London. Wilson appeared to have been a close friend of C. A. Swinburne, who, as already discussed, commissioned Solomon in 1873 to paint four watercolour paintings. Wilson's book on the history of obelisk was "affectionately dedicated" to his "esteemed" friend C. A. Swinburne for aiding him "in carrying out the project of securing the British Obelisk to Great Britain".⁵⁴⁷ Despite this new information, it is likely that the question of Solomon's authorship of *Cleopatra's Needle* seems unlikely and will remain unanswered.

In 1878-1879, Solomon did, though, collaborate with Hollyer on two publications of the artist's designs. The first, *Eight Designs for the Song of Songs*, demonstrates, as Cruise suggests, Solomon returning stylistically to an earlier period of precise line drawings (Figs. 24 – 31).⁵⁴⁸ This return to a much earlier phase in Solomon's artistic development confused Ford in 1908, who re-printed the designs in her book, *King Solomon and the Fair Shulamite*, describing them as being drawn by Solomon when he was only seventeen years old.⁵⁴⁹ Another six photographic prints were published by Hollyer in 1879 as *The Book of Ruth* (Figs. 33 - 39). These drawings are stylistically different to the first, and Cruise suggests that they have a "distinctive baroque style" that Solomon "employed from the mid-1870s onwards".⁵⁵⁰

⁵⁴⁷ Wilson, 1878: dedication page.

⁵⁴⁸ Cruise, 2005: 177. Copies of these designs can now be found at the Jewish Museum and the Victoria and Albert Museum. Cruise suggests that Hollyer probably retained the original drawings which he lent to the Bailey Gallery Exhibition in 1905, See Baillie, 1905a.

⁵⁴⁹ Ford, 1908b: 7.

⁵⁵⁰ Cruise, 2005: 178.

There is almost no documented information available for Solomon's whereabouts in 1878, and it is unclear whether he was still living in Islington. However, what is known is that Solomon's work was shown at the 58th Exhibition of Pictures at the Royal Manchester Institution, and, apart from the designs for the *Song of Songs*, only one other work is known for this year. The painting is titled *The Magic Crystal* (Fig. 32), but has variously been known as *Study: Male Figure* and *The Crystal Globe*.⁵⁵¹ Seymour titled it *Study for Eternal Silence* because she believed that the theme was taken from a passage in *A Vision of Love Revealed in Sleep* that describes 'Eternal Silence'.⁵⁵² The painting was originally owned by Loyce Knowles and exhibited at the Baillie Gallery as *The Magic Crystal* in 1905.⁵⁵³ What is interesting about this image is that it was painted in oils, which suggests that, at the time it was painted, Solomon could afford the materials.

In this chapter I have discussed the period of Solomon's life between 1874 and 1878. For the first time in the scholarship I have studied the documents that relate to Solomon's arrest in Paris in 1874 for "indulging in obscene contact in public" with shop-boy Henri Lefranc.⁵⁵⁴ In addition, I have made a survey of the work produced by Solomon and noted Rebecca's artistic activity during this period in order that it can be seen that despite previous scholarly assumptions that Rebecca's "disastrous impulses" were as "disruptive" as her brother's, she continued to obtain commissions and work as an artist. I have also recorded the beginning of the decline in Solomon's financial circumstances and the financial impact that his arrest may have had on close family members.

In chapter four I discuss the period of Solomon's life between 1879 and 1883, and his first admission to St Giles' workhouse in 1879. I also make a survey of his artistic

⁵⁵¹ Seymour, 1986: 12.

⁵⁵² Seymour, 1986: 216. The passage begins "within the temple the traveller was one who stood by the throne; he bore in one hand a crystal globe wherefore the eye of Death were ever averted, for he might not look therein". Solomon, 1871: 24.

⁵⁵³ Baillie, 1905a: iii.

⁵⁵⁴ DIU6, 68010, Archives de Paris.

output, discuss the publication in 1881 of the Dalziel brothers' *Bible Gallery*, and, for the first time, examine newly discovered trial documents that relate to Solomon's arrest for burglary in 1883.

CHAPTER IV

1879 – 1883: FIRST ADMISSION TO THE WORKHOUSE, DALZIELS' *BIBLE GALLERY* (1881), AND THE BURGLARY

Despite Hollyer's publication of six of Solomon's drawings in *The Book of Ruth* in 1879, documented evidence demonstrates that the 'difficulties' Solomon was experiencing, which Symonds alluded to in 1875, had become extreme. As will be seen, by the end of the year Solomon had attempted to sell letters from Swinburne, and voluntarily admitted himself into the workhouse for the first time. A letter from Rebecca to D. G. Rossetti, which has subsequently been dated 1879, reveals that Simeon was not alone: Rebecca also had "great difficulties" in this period.⁵⁵⁵

For a "very long time", Rebecca informed Rossetti, she had suffered problems in a "monetary way"; her "embarrassments" "increased through a severe family trouble" that she believed he was aware of. She also suggested that "from circumstances" Rossetti "may have almost forgotten" her. This is the first documented indication that Rebecca had been directly affected by Solomon's arrest, and that her own financial decline had begun to parallel her brother's. The letter also demonstrates how Rebecca had been ostracised by the artistic elite that had formerly befriended and employed her.⁵⁵⁶

However, if the date of the letter is to be accepted as accurate, then it is clear that Rebecca would still have been using the studio at 12 Fitzroy Street as late as 1879, which would suggest that she was still producing work at this time.⁵⁵⁷ Despite this, the letter clearly shows that writing to Rossetti was an act of desperation for Rebecca. She hoped that Rossetti would "pardon the very great liberty" that she had taken in "addressing" him

⁵⁵⁵ Letter from Rebecca Solomon to Dante Gabriel Rossetti, University of British Columbia Library, Rare Books and Special Collections: Angeli Dennis Collection, (Box 4, Folder 11). My thanks go to Roberto C. Ferrari for providing me with his transcript of this letter. Ferrari suggests that '79?' appears in pencil underneath the address at the right hand side of the letter, which may have been added later by W. M. Rossetti. The Angeli-Dennis Collection, of which this letter is part, was originally owned by W. M. Rossetti's granddaughters Helen Rossetti Angeli and Imogene Dennis, and consists of correspondence, diaries, etc of the Rossetti family. It is also possible, then, that the letter could have been dated by the Rossetti granddaughters.

⁵⁵⁶ Rebecca had initially worked with Millais, Frith and the Scottish artists John Phillip and Thomas Faed, as an assistant and copier. See Gerrish-Nunn, 1985: 20-21.

⁵⁵⁷ The letter is addressed 12 Fitzroy Street.

and “infringing upon” his “former friendship”, and regretted that she “should have to request such a favour”. Nevertheless, Rebecca asked Rossetti if he could “render” her “some slight temporary help” for which she “would most gratefully return any work” that he required, such as “preparatory assistance” that she had “done for many in the profession”.⁵⁵⁸ It is unclear whether Rossetti answered this letter, and there is no evidence to suggest that Rossetti subsequently gave Rebecca any work or other help.

On the 15th October 1879, Swinburne indicated to Gosse that Solomon was selling the poet’s letters to Solomon from “past years”, which contained “much foolish burlesque” and “regrettable nonsense” that was “never meant for any stranger’s eye who would not understand the mere childishness of the silly chaff indulged in long ago”.⁵⁵⁹ Swinburne’s panic at being linked with Solomon and his crime by the sale of these letters is apparent in the poet’s words. Swinburne’s fury at Solomon and fear of the possible consequences caused the poet to describe Solomon in the letter as a “thing unmentionable alike by men and women” and “as equally abhorrent to either”, in short, as the embodiment of sodomy.⁵⁶⁰ It is unclear what happened to these letters, but in 1920 Gosse enclosed, in a correspondence with Wise, “letters from Simeon Solomon” that contained “direct responses” to Solomon’s “notorious vices, and an implication that A. C. S. was quite aware of their nature”.⁵⁶¹ It is possible that Gosse purchased the letters from Solomon after receiving the letter from Swinburne in 1879 and then subsequently sent them to Wise years later. However, Gosse advised Wise to destroy the letters “at once”, and while it is unclear whether this was done, as already suggested, letters between Solomon and Swinburne can

⁵⁵⁸ Letter from Rebecca Solomon to Dante Gabriel Rossetti, University of British Columbia Library, Rare Books and Special Collections: Angeli Dennis Collection, (Box 4, Folder 11).

⁵⁵⁹ Lang, 1961: 107.

⁵⁶⁰ In the same letter Swinburne’s panic at being exposed by Howell was also mentioned. He describes how Howell was “habitually amusing mixed companies of total strangers by obscene false anecdotes about” Swinburne’s “private eccentricities of indecent indulgence as exhibited in real or imaginary *lupanaria*”.

⁵⁶¹ Letter from Gosse to T J Wise, British Library, Ashley Collection, Ashley 1755, ff.18. Thanks to Roberto C. Ferrari for providing me with his transcript of this letter.

be found in Wise's Ashley Library, three of which were attached to Solomon's 1871 publications.⁵⁶²

Apart from the six drawings that Solomon produced for Hollyer's *Book of Ruth*, there are only records of two other works for this year. The first is a pencil drawing titled *Divine Charity and Sleep* (Fig. 40), which is now at the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford. The other work, titled *Memoria*, was exhibited at the Baillie Gallery Exhibition and lent by 'Mrs Sutton', but nothing else is known about it, and it is unclear, at present, who Mrs Sutton was.⁵⁶³ However, both Baillie Gallery catalogues record that Mrs Sutton lent another eight of Solomon's work to the exhibition.⁵⁶⁴

It is clear that, by Christmas 1879, Solomon's "difficulties" had become critical and he had become homeless. The *Endell Street Creed Register* for 1879 reveals that Solomon was admitted to St Giles' Workhouse, in Endell Street, on the 21st December and discharged five days later on the 26th.⁵⁶⁵ It has always been presumed amongst Solomon scholars that Solomon did not enter the workhouse until 1885. This suggestion appears to have originated from Lambourne's article for the *Jewish Historical Society Transactions* in 1968, which he had originally given as a paper to the society in 1965.⁵⁶⁶ Lambourne's footnotes reveal that he used the same *Examinations* document for this article that I later use in chapter five to discuss Solomon's second admission into the workhouse in 1884.⁵⁶⁷ However, it seems likely that Lambourne failed to look at the *Creed Registers* for the

⁵⁶² All these letters from the Ashley Collection are recorded in Lang, 1959b and Meyers, 2005: Vol I, 213-215, 248.

⁵⁶³ Baillie, 1905a. *Memoria* (1879) appears as No. 41 in this catalogue. An undated work of the same name appeared in the Whitechapel Art Gallery's 'Exhibition of Jewish Art and Antiquities', the following year, and lent by 'Dr Savage', Anon, *Exhibition of Jewish Art and Antiquities: Whitechapel Art Gallery* (1906): The work appears in this catalogue as No. 995.

⁵⁶⁴ In version one of the catalogue these include *Behold the Bridegroom Cometh* (undated), *The Pot of Basil* (1885), *Air* (1866), *Memoria* (1879), and *An Allegory* (undated). From version two of the catalogue she loaned *Moses* (1881), *Obediens usque ad Mortem* (1881), *The Hesperides* (undated) and *Dr Faustus* (1886). See Appendix I.

⁵⁶⁵ Endell St Creed Register London Metropolitan Archive, XO20/057.

⁵⁶⁶ Lambourne, *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, 1968: 285.

⁵⁶⁷ Parish of St Giles-in-the-Fields & St George, Bloomsbury Workhouse Examinations: Folio No 65320, London Metropolitan Archive, HOBG/502/41.

Endell Street workhouse, and did not notice Solomon's first admission in 1879, which was not subsequently recorded on the *Examinations* record.

Lambourne's transcription of the *Examinations* document was also inaccurate, and this inaccuracy, combined with Seymour's misinterpretation of Lambourne's information, is partly responsible for the current assumption. Despite the fact that Lambourne correctly determined from the *Examinations* document that the first admission recorded on this manuscript was 1884, he gave no other details apart from paraphrasing a note attached to the workhouse file, which was written by the Guy's Hospital superintendent. Lambourne incorrectly dated this note in his footnotes as the 15th July 1885, (it is actually dated the 11th July).⁵⁶⁸ In her dissertation, Seymour suggested that, according to Lambourne, Solomon was first admitted to St Giles' Workhouse "as a pauper" on the 15th July 1885, but this was never actually Lambourne's suggestion.⁵⁶⁹ This initial confusion still continues to appear in Solomon publications. In the catalogue for the 2005 Solomon exhibition, *Love Revealed*, the chronology states that Solomon was admitted to the workhouse in 1885.⁵⁷⁰

No other documentation relating to Solomon's admission to St Giles' workhouse in 1879 exists. However, the information on the *Creed Register* notes that Solomon was of "Hebrew persuasion", aged forty years and was admitted by the Strand Board of Guardians at his "own request".⁵⁷¹ If Solomon had been admitted directly by the workhouse Master, then this would have indicated that he was in urgent need of assistance.⁵⁷² However, the usual route for admission, which Solomon may have taken, first required that the applicant was interviewed by the Relieving Officer of each union, who would establish the pauper's circumstances and make a decision based on the evidence provided.⁵⁷³ At some point, the

⁵⁶⁸ Lambourne, *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, 1968: 286, n17.

⁵⁶⁹ Seymour, 1986: 222, n484.

⁵⁷⁰ Cruise, 2005: 185.

⁵⁷¹ Endell St Creed Register, LMA, XO20/057.

⁵⁷² Higginbotham, 'The Workhouse', www.workhouses.org.uk/ (accessed 29 January 2007).

⁵⁷³ Higginbotham, 'The Workhouse', www.workhouses.org.uk/, (accessed 29 January 2007).

applicant would then be summoned by the local Board of Guardians, in this case the Strand Board of Guardians, to justify this application. It is almost certain that Solomon would have experienced this process, which was designed specifically as an intimidating ritual in order that the applicant was in no doubt about his/her new lowly place in society.⁵⁷⁴ The process involved, in most cases, a court-like setting, in which the person to be interviewed was required to stand in a ‘dock’ before the seated members of the Board. This scene was designed specifically by the Poor Law Commission to ensure that applicants were fully aware that they were entirely responsible for their own penury, and that this state of being was a ‘crime’. The process was also designed to lessen the applicants’ individuality by stripping them of any property that they might own in compensation for the relief that the Board might offer.⁵⁷⁵ However, because the Board of Guardians could technically only relieve an applicant if s/he was deemed to be truly destitute, it is likely that on admission to the workhouse in 1879 Solomon was in a very bad state and may not have had many possessions.

The new Poor Law Act of 1834 was specifically designed to deter applications of assistance from people in poverty, by making it as difficult as possible for them to do this.⁵⁷⁶ For the able-bodied pauper, the only form of relief available was detention in the workhouse, which was designed to be harsh and forbidding. According to the Poor Law Commissioners in 1834, the workhouse system was the only “dependable remedy” for the “mitigation and ultimate extinction of the various evils” of poverty created by the old Poor Law system.⁵⁷⁷ St Giles’, or Endell Street workhouse, as it was also known, was no exception. In 1865, the *Lancet* reported on the appalling conditions there. It described an

⁵⁷⁴ Crowther, 1983: 193. The new Poor Law Act of 1834 created the Board of Guardians in order to administer and manage each individual union. It was made up of an elected body of men, and generally included magistrates, and at least one representative of each union. However the parish of St Giles-in-the-Fields and St George, Bloomsbury, which administered the St Giles’ workhouse, did not have a Board of Guardians until the 1867 Metropolitan Poor Act. See Longmate, 1974: 64-65.

⁵⁷⁵ Crowther, 1983: 194.

⁵⁷⁶ For more on the new Poor Law Act of 1834 see Brundage, 2002.

⁵⁷⁷ Driver, 1993: 58.

“absence of pure light”, no ventilation, overcrowding, dirt, “disorder and neglect”.⁵⁷⁸ This report followed the tragic death of St Giles’ inmate Richard Gibson in 1864. The *Times* reported the details of Gibson’s death and the inquest that followed, including Police Constable George Manners’ harrowing account of Gibson’s condition. For example, Manners suggested that, upon entering ward 47 - a ward for “convalescents and people who could get around a little” - Gibson was “in the most dreadful state” possible.⁵⁷⁹

By the time that Solomon was admitted to St Giles’ at the end of 1879, a new workhouse infirmary had been erected on the north side of Shorts Gardens. On the first and second floors were wards for imbecile inmates, with two padded rooms. The third and fourth floors provided space for itch and bad leg cases.⁵⁸⁰ However, despite improvements, conditions were still deliberately designed to be as basic as possible. The Poor Law Board recommended long hours of picking oakum and making sacks, and paupers were required to have their hair cropped and wear uniforms as a visible symbol of their status.⁵⁸¹ On admission, after being stripped of any possessions that he might be carrying, Solomon would have been required to remove his clothes, which were then taken away to be fumigated, and only returned upon his release.⁵⁸² He would then have had his hair cropped and been bathed in a communal bath.⁵⁸³

It is probable that Solomon left the workhouse on the 26th December 1879 in a worse state than when he had entered. Any possessions or money that he had arrived with would be retained by the Board of Guardians to pay for his stay, so he would have departed with only the clothes that he had worn on arrival.⁵⁸⁴ Solomon’s condition at this time is further substantiated by a letter of 29th Feb 1880 written by D. G. Rossetti to Jane

⁵⁷⁸ Anon, *The Lancet*, 15 July 1865.

⁵⁷⁹ Anon, *The Times*, 18 May 1865: 11. Manners went on to say that Gibson was “delirious” and “had a large wound on his back; his brown skin was marked with red spots from itch or vermin; his person was in a filthy condition; his shirt was soiled with excrement, and his sheets were slightly soiled in the same way; there was a most nauseous smell about him; his hair was very much matted”.

⁵⁸⁰ Higginbotham, 'The Workhouse', www.workhouses.org.uk, (accessed 29 January 2007).

⁵⁸¹ Longmate, 1974: 92-93.

⁵⁸² Crowther, 1983: 195.

⁵⁸³ Longmate, 1974: 93.

⁵⁸⁴ Crowther, 1983: 194.

Morris.⁵⁸⁵ Rossetti expressed his pity for “poor S.S” after Solomon had written to Burne-Jones from hospital seeking help. Although Burne-Jones did not reply to Solomon, Rossetti appeared to suggest that Burne-Jones had made enquiries to Solomon’s doctor, who told him that the artist had arrived at hospital “not only ragged but actually without shoes”. The letter also suggests that a “friendly meeting” was planned by artist Henry Holiday and his wife Kate, in order that Burne-Jones and his wife Georgiana could visit Solomon.⁵⁸⁶

This letter seems to reinforce the idea that Solomon had been released from the workhouse without any money or possessions. It also suggests that there was still some sympathy for Solomon’s plight at this time from his old friends and colleagues.⁵⁸⁷ The letter indicated that Holiday was already in contact with Solomon, although it is unclear how long this had been the case. Holiday’s *Reminiscences* (1914) describe the “sorrow” that Solomon’s “many friends” felt that the artist’s life had “ended under a heavy cloud” which had “gathered in the seventies and darkened the remainder” of his days.⁵⁸⁸ Holiday’s recollections reveal that he had respected Solomon’s “straightforward nature” and “faithful friendship” as well as his “devotion to his art and his fund of original humour”. However, Holiday’s apparent fondness for his “valued friend” is also accompanied by his bewilderment at Solomon’s “morbid growth” in later life, which he describes as an “aberration”.⁵⁸⁹ It seems clear, though, that despite Solomon’s later “inexplicable” behaviour, Holiday seems to have been prepared to help his former friend.⁵⁹⁰ In a similar way, Georgiana Burne-Jones’s *Memorials* (1971) describe how she and her husband had become friends with the artist, but were “dumb” to the “tragedy of his broken career”.⁵⁹¹

⁵⁸⁵ Bryson, 1976: 143.

⁵⁸⁶ Bryson, 1976: 143.

⁵⁸⁷ Penelope Fitzgerald suggested in her biography of Burne-Jones, published in 1975, that “Ned” had “put in a good word” for Solomon during the trial of 1873, however there is no documented evidence to suggest that this occurred. See Fitzgerald, 1989: 151.

⁵⁸⁸ Holiday, 1914: 37.

⁵⁸⁹ Holiday, 1914: 37.

⁵⁹⁰ In response to Holiday’s *Reminiscences*, William de Morgan commented to Holiday in 1914 that “nothing” had come close “to poor Simeon in tragedy”. See Stirling, 1922: 351.

⁵⁹¹ Burne-Jones, 1971: 260.

It is unclear what practical assistance the Holidays or Burne-Joneses gave to Solomon during this time, and there is no documented information about the artist's whereabouts after he was released from the workhouse at the end of 1879. There is, however, evidence of at least seven dated works executed by Solomon in 1880. The first, titled *Dawn*, was exhibited at the Baillie Gallery in 1905 and owned by Solomon's first cousin, George Nathan, who would be present at Solomon's inquest in 1905.⁵⁹² On the 5th August 1880 the *Manchester Guardian* reported that a "really imaginative drawing" by Solomon of the "dawn over the sea" which was "one of the best things" that the artist had done, had been exhibited at the "exhibition in Ancoats" in Manchester.⁵⁹³ It is uncertain whether this work was the one owned by Nathan, because Solomon's painting *Dawn* (1871) had been exhibited, as already suggested earlier, in 1873 by the Liverpool Exhibition of Paintings at the Free Library. Nonetheless, it is an indication that Solomon's extended family were purchasing his work at this time and that his work was still being shown.

The second work, also exhibited at the Baillie Gallery, is titled *A Rabbi*, and was owned by Cyril Flower, Lord Battersea. Flower was a politician and art collector who patronised George Watts, James Tissot, Millais and Alfred Gilbert.⁵⁹⁴ Reynolds indicates that Solomon visited the Lake District with Flower in 1868, after their visit to Monckton-Milne at Fryston.⁵⁹⁵ Flower appears to have been a patron of Solomon's, and it is clear that he owned some of the artist's earlier work including *Three Priests* (1863) and *Love Singing to Memory* (1862), which were also exhibited at the Baillie Gallery.⁵⁹⁶ However, as well as *A Rabbi*, Flower owned other works by Solomon that were executed after 1873. These works include *The Medusa Head*, which is undated, but is likely to be from the post-1873

⁵⁹² See chapter seven for more information about Nathan and Solomon's inquest in 1905. There is no other information about this painting, including its current whereabouts.

⁵⁹³ Baillie, 1905a: iv. Anon, *The Manchester Guardian*, 5 August 1880: 8. Despite its publication date of 1881, the *Bible Gallery* was released in November 1880. See Anon, *The Bristol Mercury and Daily Post*, 11 Sept 1880: 6.

⁵⁹⁴ Davis, 'Flower, Cyril, Baron Battersea (1843-1907)', www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/41325, 2004.

⁵⁹⁵ Reynolds, 1985: 15.

⁵⁹⁶ Baillie, 1905a: iii.

period, since Solomon recreated the Medusa theme in many other works from this period.⁵⁹⁷ In addition, Flower also owned a work produced near the end of Solomon's life, titled *Speak, Lord, for Thy Servant Heareth* (1905). Both of these works were exhibited at the Baillie Gallery, and *The Medusa Head* was also exhibited at the Whitechapel Art Gallery's, 'Exhibition of Jewish Art and Antiquities' in 1906.⁵⁹⁸

Three other works, titled *Head of a Girl* (1880) (Fig. 41), *Head of a Woman* (1880) (Fig. 42), and *Head* (c1880) (Fig. 43) are crayon and chalk drawings, which are now at the Fogg Museum of Art at Harvard University and The Art Institute of Chicago.⁵⁹⁹ The last extant work for this year is a pencil drawing titled *Two Sleepers and the One Who Watcheth*, which is now in a private collection.

In 1881, the Dalziel Brothers George, Edward and John, published *Dalziel's Bible Gallery*, which contained six engravings of Solomon's work from an earlier period.⁶⁰⁰ These include *Melchizedek Blesses Abram* (Fig. 44), *Hagar and Ishmael* (Fig. 45), *Abraham and Isaac* (Fig. 46), *The Infant Moses* (Fig. 47), *Naomi and her Child Obed* (Fig. 48), and *Hosannah!* (Fig. 49), which were all engraved onto woodblocks by the Dalziel brothers around 1862-1863.⁶⁰¹ Cruise suggests that the brothers probably contacted Solomon in 1862 to ask him to contribute to a forthcoming illustrated bible because they had seen the artist's *Mother of Moses* (1860) which was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1860.⁶⁰² Kolsteren suggests that Solomon wrote to the Dalziels, at the end of 1862, saying that he was seeking the permission of the owners of his paintings in order that this work

⁵⁹⁷ These works are *Head of Medusa* (1884) (Fig. 60), *The Sleep of Remorse*, (1886) (Fig. 73), *Doubt* (1886) (Fig. 71), *Medusa Erotica* (1889) (Fig. 99), *The Tormented Conscience* (1889) (Fig. 96), *Let Not Thine Eyes See Aught Evil Itself, but be its Shadow Upon Life Enough for Thee* (1890) (Fig. 113), *Corruptio Optimi Pessima* (1893) (Fig. 143), *The Tormented Soul* (1894) (Fig. 154), *Perseus with the Head of Medusa* (1896) (Fig. 207), *Medusa* (1900) (no image, see Appendix II for details). Also included in this list is *Love and Hate* (date unknown), (Fig. 253), and *Love and Lust*, (date unknown) (Fig. 254).

⁵⁹⁸ Baillie, 1905a: v, and Anon, *Exhibition of Jewish Art and Antiquities: Whitechapel Art Gallery* (1906).

⁵⁹⁹ Seymour titles Fig. 42 as *Head of a Girl*, however the Fogg Museum title is *Head of a Woman*. Seymour, 1986: 218.

⁶⁰⁰ Dalziel Brothers, 1881.

⁶⁰¹ Illustrations of the woodblocks and engravings can be found in the *Love Revealed* catalogue, see Cruise, 2005: 85, 87-88, 92-94, 96.

⁶⁰² Cruise, 2005: 85.

could be reproduced as engravings by the brothers.⁶⁰³ In their published recollections of forty years of engraving, the Dalziels revealed, that the original concept of an illustrated bible was abandoned in the early 1860s due to “disappointments of help” which they had “confidently relied upon”.⁶⁰⁴ Instead, in the early 1880s, the brothers decided to publish some of the engravings that they had “made in a folio under the title of ‘Dalziel’s [sic] Bible Gallery’”.⁶⁰⁵

On the 13th November 1880, the *Manchester Guardian* published an article titled *Christmas Books*, which advertised the *Bible Gallery* as “probably” holding the “first place among the gift books of the year”.⁶⁰⁶ It suggested that Solomon was among the many “distinguished English artists” selected for the publication, which also included Leighton, Poynter, Sir Lindsay Coutts, Madox Brown, Edward Armitage and Burne-Jones. However, the article only chose to focus on Poynter’s and Solomon’s work, and suggested that some of Solomon’s work was “portrayed with great directness and verisimilitude”: “remarkable instances of this” included *Naomi and her Child Obed* and *Hagar and Ishmael*.

It is unlikely that, eighteen years after the wood blocks were originally engraved, the Dalziel brothers would have needed Solomon’s permission to publish the engravings. The 1867 amendment to the 1735 Engraving Copyright Act, decreed that the original maker of an image had “the sole right and liberty of printing and reprinting” an engraving for “twenty-eight years” from the date of its first publication.⁶⁰⁷ However, since the Dalziels’ original illustrated bible had been abandoned in the early 1860s, this meant that

⁶⁰³ Kolsteren, www.ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/skolsteren, (July 27, 2005). Unfortunately, as of the 6th July 2009 this page no longer exists on the internet. Kolsteren’s article had reproduced a letter, from his own collection, from Solomon to “Mr. Dalziel”, which Kolsteren dated to the end of 1862.

⁶⁰⁴ Dalziel and Dalziel, 1901: 101. It seems that the project had been too “elaborate”, and that artists such as Millais, Hunt, Watts and Leighton had already committed to work for another publisher. (102). In the Dalziel brothers’ published recollections, Solomon’s *Hosannah!* is reprinted on page 254. The brothers suggested that it was a “beautiful work” and remembered “well” the “small picture” that Solomon “painted of the subject” which “hung on the line at the R.A. and was looked upon as the work of a coming man” (259).

⁶⁰⁵ Dalziel and Dalziel, 1901: 101.

⁶⁰⁶ Anon, *The Manchester Guardian*, 13 November 1880: 9.

⁶⁰⁷ Underdown, 1863: 35. The original copyright for engravings was prepared on the insistence of Hogarth, whose engravings had, to some extent, been plagiarised. The amendment to the act was passed for the benefit of Hogarth’s widow who wanted the copyright extended to “prints of all kinds” and the term of ownership extended.

the first publication of Solomon's work was not until 1881.⁶⁰⁸ This suggests that, from 1881, Solomon's copyright for these six images would then have finished in 1909. It seems likely that Solomon's approval must have been obtained by Aley Fox when he re-published all six of the works that appear in *Dalziels' Bible Gallery*, in his *Art Pictures from the Old Testament*, in 1894.⁶⁰⁹ However, another fourteen of Solomon's works that had been engraved by the Dalziels, but never published by them, appeared in Fox's edition, and presumably no copyright permission was needed for these works.⁶¹⁰ Around 1900, Fox re-published this volume with an additional seventeen works by various artists, and an attached supplemental volume titled *Our Lord's Parables* illustrated with twenty works by Millais.⁶¹¹

Sadly, Solomon probably would not have received any more money from the publication of his work in 1881. Kolsteren suggests that the *Bible Gallery* project was a commercial failure, and that only two hundred of the one thousand copies eventually sold.⁶¹² This appears to be despite the many reviews that appeared in the press, who described it variously as "a memorial of the highest style of English wood engraving" and "a trophy of English art".⁶¹³ The failure of the *Bible Gallery* may have been down to its price. The *Preston Guardian* records that, in 1884, H. Robinson's Book Emporium were selling the *Bible Gallery* in their bargain books section for 30s.⁶¹⁴ The original price of the

⁶⁰⁸ In 1882, Forty-two of the original illustrations from *Dalziels' Bible Gallery* were exhibited at the "sixty-second exhibition at Manchester of pictures and other works", and it seems likely that Solomon's work was exhibited amongst the "distinguished artists". Anon, *Liverpool Mercury*, 23 October 1882: 6.

⁶⁰⁹ Fox, 1894. The full title of this book was *Art Pictures from the Old Testament: Sunday Readings for the Young: A Series of Ninety Illustrations from Original Drawings*, and was published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

⁶¹⁰ The extra Solomon etchings are *Abraham and the Three Angels*, *Abraham's Sacrifice*, *The Passover*, *The First Offering of Aaron*, *The Burnt Offering*, *Offering Incense*, *Offering the First-Fruits of the Harvest*, *"He Shall Order the lamps"*, *"Righteousness and Peace have Kissed each other"*, *The Feast of Tabernacles*, *Ruth and Naomi*, *"And David Took an Harp"*, *Jewish Women Burning Incense* and *Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego* engraved by the Dalziels between 1862 and 1863.

⁶¹¹ Fox, 1900. The title of this publication is *Art Pictures from the Old Testament and Our Lord's Parables: A Series of One Hundred and Seventeen Illustrations*, and has a red cover unlike the 1894 editions blue/green. Under the Copyright Act of 1911, the term for published engravings with a known author rose to fifty years. See Derclays, 2009: 180.

⁶¹² Kolsteren, www.ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/skolsteren, (July 27, 2005).

⁶¹³ Anon, *Glasgow Herald*, 13 Nov 1880: 4.

⁶¹⁴ Anon, *The Preston Guardian*, 27 December 1884: front page. The 'bargain price', based on a currency conversion, was £70.

volume, which had been bound in vellum and printed on ‘India paper’ had been £5 5s, which is equivalent to approximately £254 today.⁶¹⁵ It is clear that, three years after its publication, the book was selling for much less than its original retail value.⁶¹⁶

There is very little information about Solomon or his whereabouts in 1881 and 1882. He does not appear in the 1881 England census, taken in April of that year, although Rebecca was living at 182 Great Titchfield Street, Marylebone.⁶¹⁷ The census indicates that Rebecca was still referring to her occupation as “artist painter”, and was probably renting a room at this address. She was joined there by two families, with various working-class occupations, such as plasterer, tailor and hairdresser. Rebecca’s occupation status seems to suggest that she still considered herself to be an artist, although there is no record of any of her work produced after 1876. The census data seems to imply that Rebecca was perhaps producing and selling some work in order that she could pay her rent and keep herself, although it is clear from her address that she was only able to afford one room in a crowded building among people that were of a lower social status than she had previously been used to.⁶¹⁸

⁶¹⁵ The National Archives currency converter available at www.nationalarchives.uk/currency/default0.asp#mid (accessed 1 August, 2009). ‘India paper’ was so named for its similarity to the fine papers from India and China. It was primarily used for Bibles and prayer-books. ‘Oxford English Dictionary’, www.dictionary.oed.com, (accessed 14 August 2009).

⁶¹⁶ The “bargain price” of 30s, based on a currency conversion, was approximately £70.

⁶¹⁷ 1881 England Census - Rebecca Solomon, National Archives, RG 11/136. The occupations of the people living at this address were master builder, teacher of music, tailor and plasterer. The other piece of family information for this period is that on the 13th September 1881 Solomon’s brother Sylvester, who had continued the Solomon family business with older brother Isaac, died at his home in Hackney and was buried at West Ham cemetery. Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 16 September 1881: front page. Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 21 October 1881: front page. It is unclear why Solomon may not have appeared in the 1881 census, however there are many reasons why this could have happened. Firstly, people who were not included in the census could have been those without an address (i.e. living on the streets), and those who were living in a prison or asylum. In this instance only the person’s initials would appear on the enumerator’s form making it impossible to identify them. Secondly, the person may not have completed an entry on the form, or it may not have been picked up by the enumerator. In addition, endless mistakes were made by the enumerators when they were copying the information over to the census book. See www.censusuk.co.uk (accessed 5 May 2009).

⁶¹⁸ A small advert appeared in the *Times* at the end of 1881 requesting work from a person with the initials R. S. at 182 Great Titchfield Street. The advert stated that this person was looking for a place as a “Good plain”, cook “to a single gentleman or widower where a housemaid and footman are kept”. It also stated that this person had “good references”. In the 1881 England census, only Rebecca had the initials R.S. at the Great Titchfield Street address and it seems possible that this advert could have been placed by her. Anon, *The Times*, 2 Dec 1881: 12.

On the 3rd February 1881, the *Manchester Guardian* reported that Solomon had sent a “study, very rich in colour, of a Jewish Rabbi”, to the “Artists’ Agency” and that a collection of pictures were now on view.⁶¹⁹ The article appears to suggest that there were only minor artists exhibiting at this small exhibition, and most of them appear to have been local Manchester artists. It is unclear whether this unidentified work was sent to the exhibition by Solomon himself, or by the owner of the work. However, there were a number of Solomon’s patrons in Manchester such as “Mr Johnson”, referred to in chapter three, who, as already suggested, purchased some of Solomon’s chalk drawings in 1875.⁶²⁰

Despite the lack of information about Solomon between 1881 and 1882, it is clear that he produced some work. As already suggested in this chapter, works titled *Moses* (1881) and *Obediens usque ad Mortem* (1881) were owned by Mrs Sutton and exhibited at the Baillie Gallery in 1905. Another work also shown at the Baillie, dated 1881, and titled *Child with Apples* was owned by Dr George Henry Savage, who lent other Solomon works to the exhibition.⁶²¹ Savage was a psychiatrist, whose most famous private patient was Virginia Woolf.⁶²² He was also a consulting physician to several private asylums, including Roehampton and The Priory, although it is unclear whether there is any connection between Savage and Solomon’s possible detainment in a private asylum in 1873. Savage’s daughter, Marguerite Gertrude Droeser, also owned one of Solomon’s paintings, which was exhibited at the Baillie and titled *Carrying the Law* and dated 1875. It is unclear whether this is the same painting that has already been described in chapter three titled *Aaron with the Scroll of Law* which was also produced in 1875. In addition, I have discovered in auction catalogues two other works executed in 1881, titled *Study of a*

⁶¹⁹ Anon, *The Manchester Guardian*, 3 February 1881: 6.

⁶²⁰ Another Manchester patron, Dr Crompton, was reported in the *Manchester Guardian* on the 3rd October, to be selling his art collection because he was leaving Manchester. The report suggests that he was also selling Solomon’s *The Painter’s Pleasaunce* (1861) by auction. Anon, *The Manchester Guardian*, 1881: 3.

⁶²¹ Baillie, 1905a. These include *Amor Dei* (1883), *Bacchus* (1883). He also lent *Sadness* (no date), *Wisdom and Folly (drawing)* (no date), *Drawing* (no date), *Memoria* (no date), and *Roma* (no date) to the Whitechapel Art Gallery ‘Exhibition of Jewish Art and Antiquities’ in 1906. Anon, *Exhibition of Jewish Art and Antiquities: Whitechapel Art Gallery* (1906).

⁶²² Andrews, ‘Savage, Sir George Henry (1842-1921)’, www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/38635, 2004.

Woman (Fig. 50) and *Standing Figure with Peacock Feather* (Fig. 51). Both are executed in coloured chalks, pencil and watercolour on paper, although the provenance of these works is unclear.⁶²³ A pencil drawing titled *Angel and Youth* (Fig. 52), dated 1881, is now in the John Hunov Art Collection in Copenhagen.

Along with a lack of any information about Solomon in 1882, there are only records of three dated works available for this year. Two works were exhibited at the Baillie Gallery in 1905 and were titled *Spring* and *Children Bringing Gifts to Cupid*.⁶²⁴ Neither of the exhibition catalogues identifies a lender for these works and there is no other information known. It seems, however, clear that both works were for sale, because both catalogues indicated that any works that were not “specified as lent” could be bought.⁶²⁵ The third work, of which there is an image, is titled *Nox* (Fig. 53). It is a pencil and blue chalk drawing and was sold at Christie’s in 2007.⁶²⁶

There is no more documented information about Solomon until the last month of 1883. In December of this year, the *Times*, *Lloyds Weekly Newspaper*, the *Illustrated Police News* and the *Leeds Mercury* recorded Solomon’s arrest and subsequent acquittal for attempted burglary.⁶²⁷ These reports and the extant police documents relating to this arrest have never been published or studied.⁶²⁸

The record of Depositions reveals that on the 7th December, at the Police Court at Clerkenwell, Solomon, thirty-four-year-old tailor Frederick Smith and his wife Ada, twenty-four, were charged with “feloniously breaking and entering a warehouse in the occupation of one Thomas Gates” and stealing “ten thousand metal leaves, a quantity of gold-beaters [sic] skin, a quantity of gold and ten thousand aluminium leaves of the value

⁶²³ *Study of a Woman* (1881) was sold at Bonhams in 2007 and made £2,000. *Bonhams Auction Catalogue - Victorian Art - 20 March 2007*, (2007a):: Lot 112. *Standing Figure with Peacock Feather* (1881) remained unsold at Sotheby’s in 1999. *Sotheby’s Auction Catalogue - Old Masters and 19th Century European Art - 9 July 1999*, (1999).

⁶²⁴ Baillie, 1905a.

⁶²⁵ Baillie, 1905a and Baillie, 1905b.

⁶²⁶ *Christie’s Auction Catalogue - British Art on Paper - 5 June 2007*, (2007a).

⁶²⁷ Anon, *The Times*, 20 December 1883: 2. and Anon, *The Illustrated Police News*, 29 December 1883: 3. Anon, *Lloyds Weekly Newspaper*, 9 December 1883: 2.

⁶²⁸ My thanks go to Roberto C. Ferrari who drew my attention to the report of the arrest in the *Times*.

together of one hundred pounds”.⁶²⁹ The charge was made before magistrate Thomas J. Barstow, who, during the proceedings of the 7th December, heard witness statements from Gates’ son, Talbot Hammond Gates, and Detective Constable John Robinson. According to the record, Solomon and the Smiths were in attendance at the hearing. Barstow was required to make a record at the Police Court in the form of sworn depositions of the evidence by witnesses before they were then passed on to the Crown. These depositions were then placed before the grand jury at the beginning of the Quarter Sessions who decided whether a “true bill” of indictment should be supported. The accused were entitled to be present while the witnesses were giving evidence at the Police Court and could be questioned, but they could not be compelled to answer.⁶³⁰ Confessions made by the accused were only admissible at the trial if they were made “voluntarily without the inducement of fear or favour”.⁶³¹

Talbot Hammond was fifteen years old when he gave evidence at the police court.⁶³² He explained that he assisted his father at the Gates’ business premises at 44, Hatton Wall, and that, on the morning of the 6th, had arrived at the warehouse only to discover that it had been “broken into”.⁶³³ Talbot explained that “entry had been effected through” a “trapdoor in the roof” and that various items of gold and gold leaf had been removed or upset. John Robinson of G Division was next to give his evidence. The *Times* also published these facts by the 20th December, having earlier covered the trial on the 19th at the adjourned December Sessions for Criminal Business at the Clerkenwell Sessions

⁶²⁹ Deposition of Frederick Smith & Simeon Solomon, London Metropolitan Archive, No 48 - MJ/SPE/1883/53 The charge of felony included all the capital offences against the person and property and was a much more serious crime than a misdemeanour, Depositions were always taken first before a magistrate before the case was given to the grand jury at trial see Cornish et al., 1978: 57, 60).

⁶³⁰ Cornish et al., 1978: 60. For more information on the criminal law system in England in the nineteenth century see Cornish, W. R, J. Hart, A. H. Manchester, and J. Stevenson, *Crime and Law in Nineteenth Century Britain* (Dublin, 1978).

⁶³¹ Cornish et al., 1978: 248.

⁶³² I have taken his year of birth from the 1881 England Census - Thomas Gates, The National Archives, RG11/313.

⁶³³ No 48 - MJ/SPE/1883/53, LMA.

House.⁶³⁴ The *Times* coverage provides some extra detail which probably came up during the trial and which does not appear in Robinson's written statement; there is, however, also some inconsistency.

Robinson stated under oath that he arrived at the warehouse at eleven o'clock on the morning of the 6th to examine the crime scene.⁶³⁵ He recorded that "close to the iron safe" were "two jemmys", (which were produced as evidence to the court), "twelve steel wedges, a dark lantern, and a box of matches".⁶³⁶ The *Times* added to Robinson's list "a rope ladder, 20ft long".⁶³⁷ Robinson remarked how the internal office door had been broken open and "an entry had been made through a trap door in the roof". The detective recalled how he had climbed onto the roof of the Hatton Wall warehouse whereupon he noticed that there were "some pieces of gold leaf" on the roof of no. 50, three doors away.⁶³⁸ The *Times* reported that Robinson followed this trail of gold leaf and discovered that it "ceased on a skylight of that roof".⁶³⁹ The report then indicated that Robinson went back into the warehouse and onto the street where he proceeded to the front door of no. 50, Hatton Wall. Here, he discovered that the door-latch was undone. He made his way up the stairs of no. 50 to the third floor landing, where he found more traces of gold leaf. Robinson testified that, "in a back room" on that floor, he discovered Solomon. The constable spoke to Solomon and said that he was "a police officer and was going to search his room", at which Solomon replied "very well".⁶⁴⁰ Robinson reported that when he discovered more traces of gold leaf on the carpet, Solomon said to him "I don't live in this

⁶³⁴ Anon, *The Times*, 20 December 1883: 2.

⁶³⁵ A note attached to the front of the Deposition document states that "Detective Hayden", also of G Division, would corroborate Robinson's evidence because he was also present during the examination of the warehouse and at the time of the arrest of Solomon and the Smiths.

⁶³⁶ No 48 - MJ/SPE/1883/53, LMA. The OED describes a "Jemmy" is a type of hinged crowbar used by burglars and a "dark lantern" is a lantern with a slide or arrangement by which light can be concealed. Both of these implements were generally associated with burglars. *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, www.dictionary.oed.com (accessed 21 Feb 2008).

⁶³⁷ Anon, *The Times*, 20 December 1883: 2.

⁶³⁸ No 48 - MJ/SPE/1883/53, LMA.

⁶³⁹ Anon, *The Times*, 20 December 1883: 2.

⁶⁴⁰ No 48 - MJ/SPE/1883/53, LMA.

room. Mr Smith, his wife and Mr Sloman slept there last night”.⁶⁴¹ The *Times* reported that Robinson immediately arrested Solomon after the artist pointed out that he didn’t live in the room. However, Robinson’s own statement suggests that, in fact, the constable had decided to leave the premises at that point without arresting Solomon, and instead returned twelve hours later, at eleven o’clock in the evening. Solomon appears to have either remained at, or returned to, the premises that evening despite having ample opportunity to flee before the return of the police. On returning to the property, Robinson noted that Smith and his wife had arrived back at the building and were discovered in the room on the third floor. At the same time, Solomon was seen to be standing on the landing outside that room. Robinson’s evidence might imply that Solomon was innocent and that he had remained at 50, Hatton Wall simply because he had nothing to hide. However, because of the inaccuracy of the *Times* report, this information would only have been heard by those present during the trial. The general public would assume that the artist had been arrested immediately that morning. In reality, Robinson actually arrested Solomon, Smith and his wife together at the same time that night, and charged them with “breaking and entering” the Gates’ warehouse. Solomon responded to the charge by saying, “I know nothing about it”. However, Smith retorted angrily, declaring, “do what you want with me but don’t interfere with my wife”.⁶⁴² Robinson then reported that Solomon and the Smiths were taken to Clerkenwell Police station. While at the station the constable noticed “a quantity of gold leaf” on Smith’s clothing, whereupon Smith “at once took off his hat and tore it, and took his coat off and threw it down, and then tore his shirt and neck tie” and shouted “now you bastards do what you like”.⁶⁴³

⁶⁴¹ Mr Sloman remains unidentified. The 1881 England census reveals that a Mr M Stourman lived in a room at this address in this year and is a possible match.

⁶⁴² No 48 - MJ/SPE/1883/53, LMA.

⁶⁴³ No 48 - MJ/SPE/1883/53, LMA.

The tearing up of clothes, according to Seth Koven, was common amongst inmates of the workhouse, and was meant as an act of defiance against authority.⁶⁴⁴ It was often an effective way of taking control by forcing officials to replace torn clothes with valuable new ones. It is possible that Smith was replicating this behaviour, and he may well have had experience of workhouse life, although, because Smith's name was so common, this is impossible to verify. Nonetheless, it seems likely that the act of destroying clothes was a sign of Smith's defiance because he was more than likely making an attempt to destroy any evidence of gold that was on his clothing. It was also noted by "counsel", at the end of Robinson's evidence, that Smith had been drinking and was "excited", which more than likely fuelled his violent outburst.⁶⁴⁵

Following the arrest, Solomon and the Smiths were held on remand at the Clerkenwell House of Detention for twelve days before their trial on the 19th December. Solomon's previous stay, ten years before in 1873, was also twelve days long and he would therefore have been familiar with the prison. It is possible to get an idea what Solomon's experience of the House of Detention would have been like by referring to Henry Mayhew's *The Criminal Prisons of London*, a detailed survey of London's prisons published in 1862. Mayhew describes, from a first-hand account, the system of delivery of prisoners, their initial admission, prison conditions, and rules that must be adhered to.⁶⁴⁶ Mayhew's descriptions of prisons and poverty in the nineteenth century are not, though, a neutral source. As A. L. Beier has suggested, Mayhew disapproved of "street vendors, vagrants and other criminals", and his reporting of the conditions that they lived in was an attempt to control them by "exposing them to respectable society" and thus "spurring the authorities to suppress them".⁶⁴⁷ Nonetheless, Mayhew's description of prison life is useful

⁶⁴⁴ Koven, 2006: 69.

⁶⁴⁵ No 48 - MJ/SPE/1883/53, LMA.

⁶⁴⁶ Mayhew and Binny, 1971.

⁶⁴⁷ Beier, 2008: 88.

in enabling an approximation of the kind of processes and environment that Solomon might have experienced at this time.

Solomon would have been transported with other prisoners to the House of Detention in a prison van, following his first overnight stay in the cells of the Police Court in Clerkenwell, on the 7th December. He would have arrived at the imposing front gate of the House of Correction and been taken from the police van to the outer hall of the prison. From there, he would have been moved down to the basement where all prisoners were “thoroughly searched, their property taken from them, and their names and ages carefully set down”.⁶⁴⁸ Then, he would have been escorted to the bathrooms and “cleansed”, after which, he would have had the extensive prison rules read to him.

Mayhew describes how the prison cells were “11 feet by 7 feet wide and 8 feet 8 inches high” with an asphalt floor and brick ceiling.⁶⁴⁹ Ventilation was provided by a grill above a small window and through an iron grating on the floor near the door. There was no heating in the cell and the prisoners ate their meals alone, via food served through a trap in the door. Each of the cells, according to Mayhew, was furnished with “a small table, a three-legged stool, a stone night utensil, an iron wash basin and a coir hammock”.⁶⁵⁰ Despite the austere accommodation, Solomon’s twelve days in the House of Correction would not have been as difficult as his short stay in St Giles’ workhouse in 1879. In the remand prison, the daily diet was more generous than the workhouse, and prisoners were not required to work. They were allowed to wear their own clothes, and a prison uniform was only allocated to a prisoner if the clothes they had arrived in were in a “bad condition”.⁶⁵¹ Prisoners were allowed to have visits from friends and family for two hours each day and given a fairly generous, but regulated daily exercise period in the prison yard.

⁶⁴⁸ Mayhew and Binny, 1971: 613.

⁶⁴⁹ Mayhew and Binny, 1971: 618.

⁶⁵⁰ Mayhew and Binny, 1971: 618.

⁶⁵¹ Mayhew and Binny, 1971: 614.

It is likely that Solomon would have been accommodated amongst his own class; but he would have had to attend regularly a Christian “Divine Service” with the other prisoners.

Even though general conditions in the House of Correction were somewhat better than the workhouse, strict rules concerning silence from all prisoners was enforced. Singing, whistling or shouting in cells were deemed “acts of disorder”, and were punishable by the use of solitary confinement or withdrawal of food. Silence was also required from prisoners as they were escorted to the “airing yards” or chapel. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault describes how this form of prison discipline was the nineteenth-century’s “most powerful machinery for imposing a new form on the perverted individual”.⁶⁵² In other words, the practice of isolating a prisoner, both physically and mentally, and applying a strict regime of rules and discipline was designed not only to deprive them of their liberty, but more importantly to “re-educate” and “reform” by giving prisoners time alone to reflect and find remorse. Foucault also determines that this isolation guaranteed a complete power over prisoners that could “not be overthrown by any other influence”. Solitude and silence were, thus, the “primary condition” for “total submission” in nineteenth-century prisons.⁶⁵³

Although Solomon was detained in a remand prison and had not yet been tried, there was no differentiation in the type of punishment administered by the House of Detention and the House of Correction. As Foucault suggests, the differences occurred only in the intensity of the punishment.⁶⁵⁴ The prison system was designed to deprive liberty and “reform” the criminal, regardless of whether they were accused or sentenced.⁶⁵⁵

While still detained in the House of Detention, Solomon and the Smiths were again brought to the police court at Clerkenwell on the 13th December. Here, the examination of Gates’ housekeeper, Mary Ann Hale, was heard before the magistrate Barstow. Hale stated

⁶⁵² Foucault, 1977: 236.

⁶⁵³ Foucault, 1977: 237.

⁶⁵⁴ Foucault, 1977: 233.

⁶⁵⁵ Foucault, 1977: 233-34.

that she lived at 25 Hamilton Road, Highbury, and worked as housekeeper to the Gates family. She alleged that on the evening before the burglary, on the 5th, she had shut up the Gates' warehouse at nine o'clock, where she found it "quite safe". The following morning, she opened it up again at nine and found the place in "confusion and the things strewed about".⁶⁵⁶

Having heard Hale's evidence, and the other witness statements given on the 7th, Solomon and Smith were asked by the magistrate if they had anything to say in answer to the charge. They were told that they could provide witnesses at this point in the proceedings, which neither man did. Smith answered that he "was very drunk" and knew "nothing about it". Solomon said he was "perfectly ignorant of the affair till the detective came in the morning".⁶⁵⁷ Smith's wife, Ada, was not required to answer the charge and instead was released at the end of the session, presumably because the magistrate decreed that there was not enough evidence against her.⁶⁵⁸

On the 19th December at the December Adjourned Sessions for Criminal Business at the Sessions House, Clerkenwell, both Solomon and Smith were tried before Mr S. Prentice. Sitting for the assistant judge was Mr J. D. Fletcher. Also in attendance was the chairman of the Second Court and other justices. The *Times* reported that Mr Purcell defended Solomon, and that the prosecution was represented by Mr Brindley; Smith was not represented by a defence lawyer, since he was probably unable to raise the necessary 1.3s.6d for counsel, which was organised by the dock brief system.⁶⁵⁹ As an act of charity, a judge would sometimes ask counsel to defend a poor prisoner, but this was not evident in Smith's case.⁶⁶⁰ It is unclear whether Solomon was able to afford his own counsel, although this seems unlikely considering his circumstances. The *Times* report of

⁶⁵⁶ No 48 - MJ/SPE/1883/53, LMA.

⁶⁵⁷ No 48 - MJ/SPE/1883/53, LMA.

⁶⁵⁸ However there is no explanation given on the documentation to indicate why Ada Smith was actually discharged.

⁶⁵⁹ Anon, *The Times*, 20 December 1883: 2. In the 1881 census Richard Lyndsey Purcell of South Kensington and John B. Brindley are recorded as barristers at law.

⁶⁶⁰ Cornish et al., 1978: 58.

the 20th contended that, during the trial, Solomon spoke of how he “usually slept in the kitchen” of number 50.⁶⁶¹ This might suggest that he did not have enough money to afford to rent a room in the building at this date.

The jury’s Indictment of Solomon and Smith duplicated the original felony charge of the 7th December. However, the amount of goods alleged to have been stolen had changed. Instead of the original ten thousand metal leaves missing, the men were now charged with stealing one hundred thousand metal leaves. In addition, fifty thousand gold leaves were added to the total, and the quantity of goldbeater’s skin was revealed to be six hundred. Despite the additions, the monetary value remained the same at a total of £100.⁶⁶²

According to a hastily scribbled list at the back of the Indictment document, Gates and his son Talbot were present at the trial. The 1881 England census recorded that Gates was employed as a “poor rates collector and gold beater’s skin manufacturer” who employed “four men and five women”, and lived in Hackney with his wife and three sons.⁶⁶³ The *Times* report of the trial revealed that “after the case had proceeded for some time”, the prosecution lawyer, Brindley, decided that “he ought not to proceed further against Solomon”.⁶⁶⁴ The decision appears to have been reached after the announcement that Solomon was “an artist, and had been a student at the Royal Academy”.⁶⁶⁵ The judge, Mr Prentice, agreed with this assessment and directed the jury to find Solomon not guilty. The official verdict of the jury, which appears on the Calendar of Prisoners, stated that

⁶⁶¹ Anon, *The Times*, 20 December 1883: 2.

⁶⁶² Indictments December Adjourned Sessions 17th Dec 1883, London Metropolitan Archive, MJ/CB/013 X071/035 1882-1889. The date of the indictment document is the 17th Dec however the Adjourned December Sessions was not heard until the 19th.

⁶⁶³ As a Poor Rate Collector it would have been Thomas Gates responsibility to collect the ‘poor rate’. An Act of 1601 had laid down that each parish was to be responsible for the maintenance of its own paupers. It was the responsibility of each person resident in a parish or township to contribute to the poor law. See Charlesworth, www.vahs.org.uk/vahs/papers/charlesworth.pdf, (12 Jan, 2006).

1881 England Census - Thomas Gates, The National Archive, RG11/313. The census also records that in 1881 Gates and his family lived at 104 King Edward Road, Hackney. As previously suggested, Solomon’s older brother Sylvester is also recorded as living in King Edward Road, at no 38, on the 1881 census. The manufacture of goldbeater’s skin involved using prepared cattle gut to separate the leaves of gold foil during the operation of beating. Anon, 'Oxford English Dictionary', www.dictionary.oed.com (accessed 21 Feb 2006).

⁶⁶⁴ Anon, *The Times*, 20 December 1883: 2.

⁶⁶⁵ Anon, *The Times*, 20 December 1883: 2.

Solomon was found “not guilty of warehouse breaking, larceny and receiving”.⁶⁶⁶ At this point in the proceedings, Smith, who was able to represent himself, but who could not be called to give evidence on his own account, called Solomon as a witness.⁶⁶⁷ Solomon stated that Smith was “intoxicated on the night of the robbery and went to bed at eleven o’clock in a very drunken state”. He also claimed that Smith had been “intoxicated for three or four days before” the robbery.⁶⁶⁸

Despite the fact that Solomon’s evidence seems to have suggested that Smith was too drunk to have committed the burglary, the jury found Smith guilty of “warehouse breaking, larceny, and receiving”.⁶⁶⁹ The jury appears to have taken into account three previous convictions against Smith (some with aliases), which Sessions Warder Donald Robertson was able to prove. Smith, presumably in a last attempt to redeem himself, claimed that he had “been recently employed by a firm”. Therefore, before the sentence was passed, the court deemed it necessary to send Smith away until “the truth” of his “statement” was known. Later in the day, Smith was recalled and the court heard that that he had not been in any employment for twelve months and that “he had not been known to do anything”. This statement appears to have sealed Smith’s fate, and the judge sentenced him without hesitation to “seven years penal servitude and three years subsequent police supervision”.⁶⁷⁰

The Calendar of Prisoners gives some indication of what Smith’s previous convictions were, but Solomon’s serious 1873 conviction for attempted sodomy is absent from his record.⁶⁷¹ Despite Solomon’s reduced social circumstances, he seems again to have been protected by his former standing as an artist and student at the Royal Academy.

⁶⁶⁶ Calendar of Prisoners London Metropolitan Archive, MJ/CP/13.

⁶⁶⁷ Before 1898 the accused could not give evidence on oath, however s/he was allowed to address the court in his/her own defence but not as a sworn witness subject to cross-examination, see Cornish et al., 1978: 57.

⁶⁶⁸ Anon, *The Times*, 20 December 1883: 2.

⁶⁶⁹ MJ/CP/13, LMA.

⁶⁷⁰ Anon, *The Times*, 20 December 1883: 2.

⁶⁷¹ MJ/CP/13, LMA. This document reveals that Frederick Mooney (Smith’s first alias) was convicted at the Middlesex Sessions in 1867 for an unknown crime. He received twelve months penal servitude. Newspaper reports also indicate that Frederick Dooley (Smith’s second alias) was arrested and charged with “stealing a

As previously stated, four newspapers reported the burglary. Two days after the arrest on the 9th December, *Lloyds Weekly Newspaper* published a small report titled ‘Burglary at Gold Beater's Warehouse’.⁶⁷² It made particular note of the use of the rope ladder that the “prisoners” had used to “descend through the trapdoor”: information that had not been revealed in Robinson’s written evidence.⁶⁷³ On the 15th December the *Illustrated Police News* mistakenly reported that the burglary had occurred on the 5th and that the value of the property stolen was £180.⁶⁷⁴ The *Times* report of the 20th, which I have already discussed together with the arrest and trial documents, was the largest and most comprehensive newspaper coverage.⁶⁷⁵ The following day the *Leeds Mercury* reported ‘A Burglary in Hatton Garden’.⁶⁷⁶ This report appears to be a summary of the information given in the *Times*, with the difference that only Solomon’s surname is reproduced in this account. This is the only newspaper coverage that I have discovered to date outside London. On the 29th, the *Illustrated Police News* published a very brief second report on the detail of Solomon’s acquittal at the trial and Smith’s conviction.⁶⁷⁷

All the newspaper reports stated that Solomon lived at 50 Hatton Wall. However, during the trial, as already suggested, it transpired that he only slept in the kitchen.⁶⁷⁸ The 1881 England census reveals that 50 Hatton Wall accommodated six families at this time; making a total of seventeen people living in the building.⁶⁷⁹ The area had long been associated with the gem and jewelry trade, and despite the building’s apparent crowdedness, the occupations of the residents, who are recorded as porters, French

silver jug, the property of a Mr. Henry Huggins” in 1871 and sentenced to eighteen months hard labour. See: Anon, *The Times*, 12 September 1871: 9. In 1874 he was charged in his own name with “stealing a purse and £1 0s 6½d in money from the person of Mrs. Annie Stanley” and sentenced to “seven year's penal servitude and five years police supervision”, see: Anon, *The Times*, 23 December 1874: 11. He was still under police supervision when he was arrested for the 1883 burglary.

⁶⁷² Anon, *Lloyds Weekly Newspaper*, 9 December 1883: 2

⁶⁷³ Anon, *Lloyds Weekly Newspaper*, 9 December 1883: 2

⁶⁷⁴ Anon, *The Illustrated Police News*, 15 December 1883: 2.

⁶⁷⁵ Anon, *The Times*, 20 December 1883: 2.

⁶⁷⁶ Anon, *The Leeds Mercury*, 21 December 1883: 5.

⁶⁷⁷ Anon, *The Illustrated Police News* December 29 1883: 3.

⁶⁷⁸ Reported by the *Times*. Anon, *The Times*, 20 December 1883: 2.

⁶⁷⁹ 1881 England Census - 50 Hatton Wall, National Archives, RG11 343.

polishers and painters, suggest that they had modest incomes.⁶⁸⁰ With this in mind, Solomon's suggestion that he only slept in the kitchen seems to indicate that he could not afford to rent a room in the building at this time, even though he was still producing work at this time, because, according to the *Times*, he was "engaged in drawing when found by the police".⁶⁸¹

There are records of only nine dated works for 1883. Of these, two appear to have been commissioned by members of Solomon's family, including *Helen*, owned by the unidentified 'Miss Solomon', and *Cupid's Playground* owned by the artist's first cousin, Jennie Salaman, daughter of Myer, whose relationship with Solomon I discuss in chapter six.⁶⁸² Two more works, *Amor Dei* and *Bacchus*, as already suggested, were owned by Dr Savage. In addition, *Cupid* and *The Winged and Poppied Seed*, which was owned by Bessie Cohen (nee Salaman), sister of Jennie, appear in version one of the Baillie Gallery exhibition catalogue, but not in version two.⁶⁸³ To date, I am only able to find images of three of the seven works, two of which have been sold at various auctions. The first is a pencil and coloured chalk drawing titled *Cupid's Defeat* (Fig. 54), dated September of 1883, and the second, a pencil and coloured chalk drawing titled *Cupid and Amorini Targeting a Kneeling Woman* (Fig. 55). The third is a coloured chalk drawing titled *Seated Angel* (Fig. 56), which is now at the Minneapolis Institute of Arts.⁶⁸⁴

Solomon's name has also been connected with a second burglary in the extant scholarship. At the end of August 1905, Ross wrote an obituary for the artist, which was published in the *Westminster Gazette*.⁶⁸⁵ In the article, Ross claimed that Solomon had broken into the house of a "well-known artist" and "former friend", who he did not identify

⁶⁸⁰ 1881 England Census - 50 Hatton Wall, National Archives, RG11 343

⁶⁸¹ Anon, *The Times*, 20 December 1883: 2.

⁶⁸² Both works were exhibited at the Baillie Gallery Exhibition of 1905. Jennie Salaman is recorded in the catalogue under her married name of Mrs Herbert D. Cohen. Baillie, 1905a.

⁶⁸³ Baillie, 1905a.

⁶⁸⁴ *Cupid and Amorini Targeting a Kneeling Woman* (1883), was sold as Lot 154 Christie's at 2007: see *Christie's Auction Catalogue - British Art on Paper - 5 June 2007*, (2007a): 150. *Cupid's Defeat* (1883) was sold at Christie's in 2005, see *Christie's Auction Catalogue - British Art on Paper - 9 June 2005*, (2005a): 96.

⁶⁸⁵ Ross, *The Westminster Gazette*, 24 August 1905a: 1-2.

at the time. Ross claimed that Solomon had visited the house one afternoon to ask for assistance, and left after being given a “generous dole”.⁶⁸⁶ Having noted the “remoteness” of the neighbourhood, Ross claimed that Solomon decided that the house “lent itself favourably to burgling operations”. Solomon is then alleged to have returned that evening in the company of a “housebreaker”. However, while “studying the dining-room silver”, the noise of the “burglars” disturbed the sleeping occupants upstairs. Ross reported that both men were in a drunken state, and the “unwilling host good-naturedly dismissed them”.⁶⁸⁷

In 1937, Bernard Falk claimed that Ross, “beguiled by Solomon’s romancings”, forgot that he was listening to a “consummate hoaxer” and accepted the artist’s account of the burglary as true.⁶⁸⁸ Falk believed that the story of the burglary was a favourite “yarn” of Solomon’s, which “gave him a melancholy, sadistic satisfaction” to tell. Falk’s version of the event is similar to Ross’s, albeit imbued with the exaggerated vocabulary of the sensationalist tabloid news journalist.⁶⁸⁹ Falk described how “twelve hours after having been hospitably entertained” by a “fellow painter”, Solomon arranged with an accomplice to “crack the crib”. Unfortunately, the men were “fortified by copious potations”, and as they were about to collect “the booty”, the noise of the break-in awoke the household, who being “too amused to be really angry” let both of the men go.⁶⁹⁰ Falk believed that “the episode had no more solid foundation than Solomon’s perfervid imagination” and that the “myths” were “designed to lend Solomon’s degraded years an air of picturesqueness”.⁶⁹¹ Falk, like Ross, did not name the alleged victim of the burglary. Charles Ricketts’s 1902 journal, though, revealed that the “famous painter” was Burne-Jones.⁶⁹² He recalled that, on a visit to the Carfax Gallery in St James’s, he had met with

⁶⁸⁶ Ross, *The Westminster Gazette*, 24 August 1905a: 1-2.

⁶⁸⁷ Ross, *The Westminster Gazette*, 24 August 1905a: 1-2.

⁶⁸⁸ Falk, 1937: 316.

⁶⁸⁹ Falk, 1937.

⁶⁹⁰ Falk, 1937: 316.

⁶⁹¹ Falk, 1937: 316.

⁶⁹² Lewis, 1939: 75.

Ross who had told him an astonishing thing” about Solomon. Ross informed Ricketts that, “after the gift of a fiver, old Solomon was struck by the advantageous situation of the Grange for a comfortable burglary”.⁶⁹³ He described how Solomon had communicated this information to “his friend, Jim Clinch, the burglar”, and “in anticipation of success”, both men “got drunk and committed the burglary so grossly that Lady Burne-Jones heard a noise, alarm was given, and Philip was sent out for a policeman”.⁶⁹⁴ When the police arrived and the men “were unlocked from the room in which they had been suspected”, Solomon was discovered to be one of the burglars. Ross then described how Burne-Jones “had to bribe the policeman heavily” in order that they would not “take the thieves in charge.”⁶⁹⁵

It is unclear when this alleged burglary was to have taken place. Certainly Burne-Jones had lived at ‘The Grange’ in West Kensington, Fulham since 1867, and had died there in 1898. Neither Ross, Falk, nor Ricketts give a date for this incident, but if it had occurred then, it was probably before 1893. This is the year that Ross claimed he met Solomon, when the artist had been “full of racy stories” about “policemen and prisons” which he claimed to have “wide experience” of.⁶⁹⁶ There is no mention of the burglary in any of Burne-Jones’ correspondence or papers, and none of Solomon’s contemporaries apart from Ross and Ricketts mention the story. It is, therefore, very difficult to determine whether this incident actually ever happened.

In this chapter I have examined the period of Solomon’s life between 1879 and 1883, and Solomon’s first admission to St Giles’ workhouse in 1879. In addition I have discussed the difficult conditions at St Giles’ workhouse and the process of admission that Solomon was

⁶⁹³ Lewis, 1939: 75.

⁶⁹⁴ Lewis, 1939: 75. Philip was Burne-Jones’s son. There are no records of a ‘Jim Clinch’ being arrested in the London or Middlesex area for burglary or theft during the nineteenth century, and it seems likely that this is a fabricated name. See: England and Wales Criminal Registers - 1791 - 1892, The National Archive, HO26 and HO27.

⁶⁹⁵ Lewis, 1939: 75.

⁶⁹⁶ Ross, *The Bibelot*, April 1911: 1337.

likely to have followed. I have also described how Rebecca was also struggling financially during this period, and how Solomon had been forced to sell Swinburne's letters. This chapter has also made a survey of Solomon's artistic output for this period, made mention of how Solomon's extended family were still buying his work, and observed how the Holidays and Burne-Joneses were still in touch with Solomon. I have also considered the publication in 1881 of the Dalziel brothers' *Bible Gallery*, and, for the first time, examined newly discovered trial documents that relate to Solomon's arrest for burglary in 1883.

In chapter five I discuss the period of Solomon's life between 1884 and 1887, making mention of Solomon's second admission to the workhouse and the aftermath of the burglary trial, including new evidence that suggests Solomon's residences during this period. In addition, the chapter will examine Solomon's relationship with Count Stenbock, and his alleged involvement with the anonymously published *Sins of the Cities of the Plain* (1881).

CHAPTER V

1884 – 1887: THE WORKHOUSE, *SINS OF THE CITIES OF THE PLAIN* (1881), AND COUNT STENBOCK.

By June 1884, six months after the burglary trial, Solomon's financial circumstances had become substantially worse. The *Examinations* document of the St Giles' Workhouse, which was briefly mentioned in chapter four, suggests that on the 12th June Solomon was admitted to the workhouse for the second time. The artist was brought in "ill and destitute" by a man named John Boylett, who gave his address as 7 Dyott Street.⁶⁹⁷

It is uncertain who Boylett was and what relationship he might have had with the artist, because he does not appear in Solomon's documented life until this date. However, the workhouse document suggests that Solomon had been living at the same address as Boylett, and that both men were boarders. In addition, the 1881 English census provides some clues to Boylett's life.⁶⁹⁸ It records that he was living at the same address in Dyott Street; that he was born in London about 1847; was 'unmarried', and that his occupation was 'carman'. A contemporary description of the occupation of carman was provided by Charles Booth, who, as the introduction suggests, published a seventeen-volume study on urban poverty in London between 1889 and 1992.⁶⁹⁹ Like Mayhew, Booth is not a neutral source, and according to Rosemary O'Day and David Englander, was neither an academic nor a social scientist, with the result that his work was flawed and inevitably "different in its intention, execution and presentation" to modern social surveys. With that as a rider, however, and as with Mayhew, Booth's work provides an approximate consideration and insight into the conditions of poverty in London, and Solomon's possible place within them.⁷⁰⁰

⁶⁹⁷ Parish of St Giles-in-the-Fields & St George, Bloomsbury Workhouse Examinations: Folio No 65320, London Metropolitan Archive, HOBG/502/41.

⁶⁹⁸ 1881 England Census - John Boylett, The National Archives, RG11/325.

⁶⁹⁹ Booth, 1903: 326.

⁷⁰⁰ O'Day and Englander, 1993: 187.

The occupation of carman, or its plural carmen, is described by Booth as “persons” employed in “driving or taking charge of vehicles which carry merchandise”. The work, according to Booth, had long hours, was not too exhausting, and “undoubtedly provides a living wage”, but that “for such long hours” the pay was “low” and there was “perhaps no man’s employment” which yielded “so small a return per hour”.⁷⁰¹

It is probable, then, that Boylett’s income was poor, but allowed him enough money to rent a bed in what the census describes as a “boarding house”. The census reveals that another ninety-three men, mostly of Irish origin, with various occupations and trades (for example baker, painter and labourer) were also living at numbers 7, 8 and 9 Dyott Street, which appears to have been combined into one address. According to Booth’s survey notebook of July 26th 1898, Dyott Street, just off New Oxford Street, had houses on the west side only, of which four housed the St Giles’ Mission.⁷⁰² Booth’s poverty map of 1898, which accompanied the study of the London poor, classified this half of Dyott Street as a ‘purple’ section, mostly containing people of ‘classes C and D’ which Booth described as “the poor – including alike those whose earnings are small because of irregularity of employment “ and those who are “ill paid”.⁷⁰³ Booth recorded that, in the streets that he characterised as ‘purple’, there lived a “very wide range of character” with a “mixture of poverty”, where a street may be “poor only at one end” perhaps because of “bad building”.⁷⁰⁴ However, despite its poverty, Dyott Street appeared to have improved in the fourteen years since Solomon and Boylett had lived there. Booth stressed in his notebook that Dyott Street was “better since removal of lodging house”.⁷⁰⁵

⁷⁰¹ For a fuller description of the occupation of carman, including wages and working conditions see (Booth, 1903: 323-33).

⁷⁰² Survey Notebook No: B354 p105. Available online from the *Charles Booth Online Archive*, London School of Economics & Political Science, www.booth.lse.ac.uk.

The St Giles’ Mission provided homes for discharged convicts with nowhere else to go. See Morrison, 1891: 227.

⁷⁰³ Booth, 1902: 20, 40.

⁷⁰⁴ Booth, 1902: 179.

⁷⁰⁵ Booth, 1902: 179.

It is unclear whether the lodging house in question was Solomon's home at 7–9 Dyott Street. However, by 1891 the England census was clearly classifying this property as a "common lodging house", which still housed ninety-nine male residents.⁷⁰⁶ The 'common lodging house' was described by one of Booth's researchers, R. A. Valpy, as housing for "the poorer classes of Her Majesty's subjects". Valpy also documented that these houses were usually located in "black spots which betoken a miserable combination of poverty, vice and crime".⁷⁰⁷ It is also evident, from Valpy's study, that the district of St Giles' was one of the principal centres of "common lodging house life", unsurprising in an area dominated by Booth's 'lowest grade' of people.⁷⁰⁸

From Valpy's comprehensive chapter on these types of lodging houses, it is possible to identify the kind of social and practical conditions that Solomon was living in at Dyott Street, and to approximate his possible relationship to Boylett. Valpy defines the common lodging house as "a house in which beds are let out by the night or by the week, in rooms where three or more persons not belonging to the same family may sleep at night".⁷⁰⁹ The houses were under the control of the Metropolitan Commissioner of Police and were periodically inspected at any time of day or night by officers who were supposed to enforce strict rules regarding "cleanliness, ventilation and other sanitary arrangements".⁷¹⁰ However, according to Valpy, these inspections were not always adhered to and many houses harboured "thieves and such bad characters".⁷¹¹

Solomon would have appeared in Booth's lowest 'class A', as a type of person who was "found in the common lodging houses and lowest streets" and who were "labourers,

⁷⁰⁶ 1891 England Census - Dyott St, The National Archives, RG12/212.

⁷⁰⁷ Booth, 1904: 205. According to Kevin Bales, Booth used twenty researchers for his study of the *People of London*. However, little is known of R.A. Valpy who contributed only one chapter for Booth, titled 'Common Lodging Houses'. Bales, *Journal of Historical Sociology*, June 1996: 129.

⁷⁰⁸ Booth, 1904: 213. On Booth's Poverty Map the area is delineated with the colour black which classifies Booth's 'lowest grade' or 'class A'. Interestingly according to Peter Gay, Booth criticised all English censuses, including the 1881 census, for their "porous categories and inconsistent classifications". Gay, 1993: 457.

⁷⁰⁹ Booth, 1904: 205.

⁷¹⁰ Booth, 1904.

⁷¹¹ Booth, 1904.

loafers and semi-criminals - the elements of disorder”,⁷¹² by virtue of his accommodation and geographical location. Solomon also appears in Booth’s lowest class because, as an occupant of a common lodging house, he was considered essentially ‘homeless’, or in Valpy’s definition of the word, one who “enjoys no family life”.⁷¹³ The majority of men living at 7-9 Dyott Street, referred to on both the 1881 and 1891 censuses, are described as mostly ‘unmarried’, with only a few exceptions registered as widowed.⁷¹⁴

Valpy’s description of the common lodging house paints a vivid picture of what life might have been like for Solomon and his fellow residents. Valpy described how, for four old pennies a night, a man could apply for a night’s lodging and remain entirely anonymous. Upon entering the lodging house, a man would be given two numbers, one for the number of his room and another for his bed. Payment of this fee would always be in advance and “any person able to pay” would be given a room for the night.⁷¹⁵

According to Valpy, the kitchen in this type of house provided a common living area that provided a “bright coke fire” which was “kept burning day and night”. The furniture was of the “roughest description” and the cooking apparatus of the “simplest kind”. Because of a lack of crockery or dishes, Valpy also described how “an old newspaper” would often supply “the want of a plate” and “a few old jam pots” would be “the only provision for tea or coffee”.⁷¹⁶ This scene of extreme poverty continued in Valpy’s description of the “sleeping rooms” in the common lodging house. These rooms contained “rows of small iron bedsteads, arranged as in hospital wards, only closer

⁷¹² Booth, 1902: 40. The following chapter on ‘Homeless Men’ by Booth and Margaret A. Tillard classified 286 “homeless” men as having mostly “indifferent or fair” character. Few were described as having a “good” character and eighty more as “none, or doubtful or bad”. Booth, 1904: 223.

⁷¹³ Booth, 1904: 206.

⁷¹⁴ 1881 England Census - John Boylett, The National Archives, RG11/325 and 1891 England Census - Dyott St, The National Archives, RG12/212. I examine the nineteenth-century association between ‘homeless men’ and same-sex desire more closely in chapter six in reference to Solomon’s time spent in common lodging houses and the casual ward of the workhouse.

⁷¹⁵ Booth, 1904: 216.

⁷¹⁶ Booth, 1904: 208.

together, the number in each room being carefully adapted to the cubic space required by law”.⁷¹⁷

It seems probable from this description of the sleeping arrangements of the common lodging house, that Boylett knew Solomon simply because they occupied adjacent beds, or perhaps in the same room of the Dyott Street lodging house. In his report, Valpy acknowledged that “a man may lodge for years in a house” and “only be known to the landlord” by “the number of the bed he occupies” or by a “nickname given by the other lodgers”.⁷¹⁸ However, these men do not remain anonymous on the yearly census data, and it is probable that this documentation is the only record of them having lived at these addresses. Therefore, it is not possible to suggest that Boylett and Solomon had any other connection apart from the fact that they were both paupers living at the same address. However, what is clear from the *Examinations* document is that Boylett delivered Solomon to the St Giles’ Workhouse when he was destitute and without the means of a night’s rent.

The law related to Settlement and Removals required that a pauper must be resident in the parish in which s/he had applied for relief, or they could be removed to the last parish in which they were last legally settled. Solomon’s *Examinations* document reveals that he had been living in the Holborn area for the past seven months and was therefore eligible to enter the St Giles’ workhouse. Two other addresses appear on the document, one of which records an address in the parish of Holborn. This address is described as Fullwood’s Rents, and it is clear that Solomon had lived there for three months. Therefore, this might suggest that Solomon had lived at Dyott Street, also in Holborn, for the previous four months from February 1884.

It also seems likely that Solomon had not lived at Dyott Street very long, for the workhouse document reveals that the artist “never had any settled home” since July

⁷¹⁷ Booth, 1904: 209.

⁷¹⁸ Booth, 1904: 210.

1876.⁷¹⁹ This seems to confirm the idea that after Solomon's mother left the family home at 18 John Street around this time, and the family business became bankrupt the following year, Solomon's major financial problems began. However, the *Examinations* document suggests that Solomon was now not only destitute, but also ill. The document does not detail Solomon's medical problems, but on admission to the workhouse he would have been examined by a doctor to see if he was "labouring under any disease of the body or mind" and then "placed in the sick ward" as necessary.⁷²⁰

According to Cunningham's *Handbook of London, Past and Present* (1850) Fullwood's Rents was a "narrow paved court, with a gate at the end, leading into Gray's-Inn-Walks".⁷²¹ It was located only a minute's walk away from the artist's former family home at John Street, and on Booth's poverty map it was coloured dark blue indicating the "very poor casual" who had "chronic want" and who were principally "casual labourers and others living from hand to mouth".⁷²² Booth's notebooks record that the area "used to be very rough", and there were "two common lodging houses" on the north side which "harbour a few thieves".⁷²³ The 1881 England census appears to show hundreds of mostly male lodgers living at Fullwood's Rents in lodging houses, and it seems likely that Solomon had been lodging in one of these houses.⁷²⁴

The other address that was referred to on the *Examinations* document was 43 Wakefield Street, Regent's Square, Bloomsbury.⁷²⁵ In contrast, Wakefield Street was an address coloured pink by Booth, which denoted people of 'classes E and F', which, according to the key, indicated "working class comfort", people of "good ordinary earnings" who lived "without servants".⁷²⁶ However, the area in which Wakefield Street

⁷¹⁹ Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41.

⁷²⁰ Archbold, 1856: 309.

⁷²¹ Cunningham, 1850: 193. It was also known as Fuller's Rents, and is now known as Fulwood Place.

⁷²² Booth, 1902: 40.

⁷²³ Booth, 'Charles Booth Online Archive: Survey Notebooks', www.booth.lse.ac.uk/, 1886-1903. (accessed 7 May 2006).

⁷²⁴ 1881 England Census - Fullwood's Rents, The National Archives, RG11/340.

⁷²⁵ Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41.

⁷²⁶ Booth, 1902: 20, 40.

lay also appeared to be one of social contrasts. Booth said of the area that there were “some good lodging-houses and hotels occupied by well-to-do people” and rents were “pretty high”, although the area was also marked by “a few thoroughly bad places, insanitary and dilapidated and occupied by a very low class”.⁷²⁷

According to the 1881 England census, 43 Wakefield Street was divided into three households comprising of one lodger, one boarder and a household of eight people of whom two were related to the head of the household and three were boarders and two lodgers.⁷²⁸ The occupations of the people living at this address and in the houses on either side, such as police constable, lithographic draughtsman, and short-hand clerk to solicitor, would qualify in Booth’s terms as ‘classes E and F’, or “the regularly employed and fairly paid working class”.⁷²⁹ This tends to suggest that, for the five months that Solomon was living at this address, presumably as a lodger, his income was sufficient enough for him to rent a room in a much more comfortable area, because this accommodation is in marked contrast to the poverty of his existence in the common lodging house at Dyott Street.

For a short time in 1870, a small area of Wakefield Street had also been associated with Booth’s ‘class H’, which translates as the “lower and upper middle class and all above this level”.⁷³⁰ It was reported in the *Times* that year that rooms at 13 Wakefield Street had been rented out to the twenty-two year old Ernest Boulton.⁷³¹ As I noted in chapter one, Boulton and his confrere Park were arrested in 1870 for “personating women at places of public resort for unlawful purposes”.⁷³² The two men were famously arrested while

⁷²⁷ Booth, 1902: Appendix 10. Area is marked as F4 on Booth’s poverty map.

⁷²⁸ 1881 England Census - 43 Wakefield St, The National Archives, RG11/193. The census definition of ‘boarder’ was “a person who shared the dinner table with the family” and the definition of ‘lodger’ was “a person who had separate accommodation to the householder”. However, census enumerators often inaccurately defined the members of a household. Each household within a building is defined by the enumerator by one single dash and a double dash separates households in separate buildings. In the case of 43 Wakefield Street, there seems to be a discrepancy, as one boarder appears as a household in itself, which does not follow the census definition of that term. For more information on the censuses see www.familyhistory.uk.com (accessed 13 June, 2007).

⁷²⁹ Booth, 1902: 20.

⁷³⁰ Booth, 1902.

⁷³¹ Upchurch, *Gender and History*, April 2000: 130, 153 n16. The stockbroker was his uncle.

⁷³² Anon, *The Times*, 30 April 1870: 11. The article reveals that on first questioning Boulton gave his name as ‘Cecil Graham’ and supplied a false address.

attending a performance at the *Strand Theatre* in full ladies dress.⁷³³ Boulton, also known as ‘Lady Stella Clinton’ and Park, who was variously known as ‘Mrs Mabel Foster’, ‘Mrs Jane’, ‘Fanny Graham’ or ‘Miss Fanny Winifred Park’, were brought to trial a year later on the more serious felony charge of “having visited places of public resort for an unlawful and abominable crime”.⁷³⁴ Both men were subsequently acquitted.

The *Times* reporting of the case also revealed that, at 13 Wakefield Street, the men stored female dresses and jewellery and many letters and photographs that would later be used in an attempt to incriminate them.⁷³⁵ Boulton and Park had been observed there, according to the journalist, by a police constable on duty for the two previous weeks in April 1870, “entering and leaving No. 13 at all hours of the night” dressed as women.⁷³⁶ In addition, Henry Holland, a driver, reported that he had picked the men up from a “Mrs Park’s” at No. 13, and, “on arriving there, the prisoner Park came out, dressed as a woman. He, or she, said ‘My sister is not ready,’ and desired me to drive to a restaurant in Newcastle Street, Strand Park”.⁷³⁷

Charles Upchurch suggests that the two men had rented 13 Wakefield Street for almost a year before they were arrested, and while it was evident that they and their friends were using the address for the purpose of cross-dressing, this fact was ignored by their landlady. In fact, the landlady, Martha Stacey, was also aware that the two men were sharing a bed, even though there were two available. She did not question them about this, nor did she approach them when they arrived dressed as men and departed from the house

⁷³³ For more on the Boulton and Park arrest and trial see Upchurch, *Gender and History*, April 2000: 127-57 and Pearsall, 1969: 461-66, Cocks, 2003a: 105-114.

⁷³⁴ Upchurch, *Gender and History*, April 2000: 127, and Anon, *The Times*, 30 May 1870: 13.

⁷³⁵ Anon, *The Times*, 30 April 1870: 11. The actual wording in the *Times* reads “Witness (Det. William Chamberlain, E Division, metropolitan police) afterwards went to the house, 13, Wakefield Street, and found a number of photographs representing the prisoners in ladies’ and gentlemen’s costume. A quantity of silk dresses, earrings, pearl powder, and articles of dress for men were found also”. Other items were also noted in Anon, *The Times*, 16 May 1870: 13. Here it was reported that chignons, a small bottle of chloroform, a bottle of bloom of roses, and a “great quantity of wadding, used for padding” were found.

⁷³⁶ Anon, *The Times*, 30 April 1870: 11.

⁷³⁷ Anon, *The Times*, 14 May 1870: 10. Holland reported that ten days later he also picked them up from 13 Wakefield Street “dressed as ladies”.

dressed as women.⁷³⁸ Upchurch suggests that the cross-dressing Boulton and Park enjoyed a “degree of public mobility and self-expression” due to the area in London that they chose to inhabit.⁷³⁹ This was roughly within a region of the West End “bordered by the Strand to the south, Regent’s Park to the north and west, and Gray’s Inn Road to the east”, in which Wakefield Street is located.⁷⁴⁰

Upchurch’s research concludes that the Metropolitan police in the 1860s chose to ignore any cross-dressing ‘behaviour’ in this area of the West End, because it was not illegal in itself, and was consequently difficult to police, for it had to be proved that the cross-dresser was a male prostitute before a conviction could take place.⁷⁴¹ Boulton and Park’s acquittal was based on this premise. Despite the prosecution’s attempts at linking the men with the act of sodomy, it could not be soundly proven medically or circumstantially.⁷⁴²

As I suggested in chapter one, the arrest, trial and acquittal of Boulton and Park was reported in great detail in the *Times*, and Solomon had suggested, in a letter written to Swinburne in 1871, that *Reynold’s Newspaper* and the *Daily Telegraph* had published “everything” about the trial.⁷⁴³ However, according to the letter dated the 15th May 1871, Solomon’s interest in the case went beyond reading about it in the newspapers. He revealed to Swinburne that on the Friday before, he was “taken by Hurt’s counsel to the trial”.⁷⁴⁴ Louis Charles Hurt was a post office clerk, cross-dresser and friend of Boulton.

⁷³⁸ Upchurch, *Gender and History*, April 2000: 133, 154 n31. For Martha Stacey’s complete witness statement see Anon, *The Times*, 14 May 1870: 10. According to the 1871 England census, Martha Stacey was living at 13 Wakefield Street, and was living with her seventy-two year old mother Mary, a ‘Chapel Keeper’. She is described as forty-eight years old and unmarried. A granddaughter was also living with them. Only one lodger remained living at the address. 1871 England Census - 13 Wakefield St, The National Archives, RG10/216. In contrast the 1881 census reveals seventeen people making up three families and three lodgers living at this address 1881 England Census - 13 Wakefield St, The National Archives, RG11/193.

⁷³⁹ Upchurch, *Gender and History*, April 2000: 127-57.

⁷⁴⁰ Upchurch, *Gender and History*, April 2000: 134.

⁷⁴¹ Upchurch, *Gender and History*, April 2000: 136.

⁷⁴² Upchurch, *Gender and History*, April 2000: 143. Boulton and Park were found guilty of the original police misdemeanour (a none indictable offence and an offence less serious than the charge of felony) and given a small fine and two years probation during which time they were not allowed to cross-dress.

⁷⁴³ Lang, 1959b: 144, n1.

⁷⁴⁴ Lang, 1959b. The trial began on the 9 May 1871 and lasted for six days. Solomon must have been present on the fourth day.

Along with the merchant, John Stafford Fiske, he was added as a defendant in the 1871 trial, and charged with “having been concerned with Boulton and Park in committing certain offences against public decency and conspiracy”.⁷⁴⁵ Nevertheless, no significant evidence was presented against Hurt or Fiske during the trial and both men were subsequently acquitted.⁷⁴⁶

No other information has come to light regarding Solomon’s exact purpose for attending the Boulton and Park trial. However, it does appear from the letter in question that Solomon knew something of Hurt and possibly Fiske, for he says that “it must be very hard for Hurt and Fiske to be mixed up with the other two”, (meaning Boulton and Park).⁷⁴⁷ As mentioned before, Solomon also makes it clear that he was ‘taken’ to the trial by Hurt’s counsel, but, according to the contemporary documentation, this does not seem to imply that he was involved in the trial.⁷⁴⁸ Instead, it is likely that Solomon attended out of curiosity by himself, perhaps to stand in the public gallery. Solomon may also have known Hurt’s counsel, Mr Abrams.⁷⁴⁹

In 1993, Peter Mendes suggested that Solomon had another, later connection with Boulton and Park.⁷⁵⁰ There are many mistakes in Mendes’s work, and the evidence appears to be circumstantial; however Mendes claimed that it was possible that Solomon had been involved with the creation of the pornographic novel *Sins of the Cities of the Plain; or, the Recollections of a Mary-Ann*, which was published in 1881.⁷⁵¹ The novel describes the sexual encounters of the ‘narrator’ (Mr Cambon) with “Jack Saul”; the ‘mary-ann’ or effeminated male prostitute referred to in the title, and Saul’s own account of his life on the

⁷⁴⁵ Anon, *The Times*, 13 June 1870: 13.

⁷⁴⁶ Upchurch, *Gender and History*, April 2000: 156 n67. Four other men were also involved in the case. They were Lord Arthur Pelham Clinton, the son of the Duke of Newcastle, and lover of Park who committed suicide in June 1870; Martin Luther Cumming; W. S. Somerville and C. H. Thomas. Martha Stacey (the landlady of 13 Wakefield Street) had revealed in the trial that the house was small and had three storeys with “two rooms on each floor”. Thomas rented the two rooms on the ground floor for 10s a week and Boulton two rooms on the first floor. Anon, *The Times*, 14 May 1870: 10.

⁷⁴⁷ Lang, 1959b: 144.

⁷⁴⁸ Boulton and Others Offence: Unnatural Offences, The National Archive, DPP 4/6.

⁷⁴⁹ Anon, *The Times*, 13 June 1870: 13. Abrams name appears as Hurt’s counsel in this article.

⁷⁵⁰ Mendes, 1993.

⁷⁵¹ Anon, *Sins of the Cities of the Plain*, 1881.

streets of London. As Morris B. Kaplan suggests, the character of Saul is undoubtedly based on John Saul, who took the witness stand at the Cleveland Street Scandal of 1889-90, and described himself as a “professional sodomite”.⁷⁵² Saul was called as a central witness when Lord Euston, one of the aristocrats who were alleged to have frequented a male brothel at 19 Cleveland Street, took the editor of the *North London Press* to court for libel.⁷⁵³ Saul’s call to the witness stand was intended to support the allegations that the newspaper had printed of Euston’s sexual misconduct; however the editor was found guilty and sentenced to one year in jail.

Sins of the Cities also includes reference to Saul’s attendance at “the ball given at Haxwell’s Hotel in the Strand” at which “Lord Arthur and Boulton, whom he addressed as Laura were standing before a large mirror”, and at which Park also attended dressed “as a lady, dancing with a gentleman from the city”.⁷⁵⁴ Mendes states that Saul was “clearly involved” in the Boulton and Park trial, but it is unclear where this information came from. Saul does not mention having any involvement in the trial in *Sins of the Cities*, although events at Haxwell’s Hotel were brought up at the trial with the intention of incriminating Boulton and Park.⁷⁵⁵ In addition, there is no indication from the trial documents that Saul was present in any official capacity.⁷⁵⁶ Mendes also claimed that Solomon “probably appeared as a witness for the defence” at the trial, but this is also unlikely, because, as already suggested, Solomon’s name does not appear on the trial documentation. It is uncertain where Mendes obtained this information, although since Mendes makes use of other quotations from Solomon’s letters written to Swinburne in the early 1870s, it seems likely that he misinterpreted the suggestion that has already been made above that Solomon was taken to the trial by Hurt’s council.

⁷⁵² Kaplan, 2005: 216.

⁷⁵³ Ernest Park was editor of the *North London Press*. For more on the Cleveland Street Scandal see Hyde, 1976 and Simpson, Chester, and Leitch, 1976.

⁷⁵⁴ Anon, *Sins of the Cities of the Plain*, 2006: 57, 60.

⁷⁵⁵ Mendes, 1993: 215.

⁷⁵⁶ Boulton and Others Offence: Unnatural Offences, The National Archive, DPP 4/6.

Mendes suggests that “sometime after 1873, when he was arrested and fined on a homosexual charge, and after which he needed money for drink”, Solomon approached a collector of pornography, James Campbell Reddie, “with the project of publishing Saul’s ‘memoirs’”.⁷⁵⁷ Mendes makes it clear that this idea is purely speculation, goes on to suggest that Campbell paid Solomon for the memoirs and then “edited them with a view to publication”. Campbell died circa 1879, and Mendes suggests that the collector’s pornographic manuscripts were passed on to the publisher William Lazenby (also known as Duncan Cameron), who published *Sins of the Cities of the Plain* in 1882.⁷⁵⁸ Unfortunately, Mendes’s dating of this publication by Lazenby is incorrect, because the first publication of *Sins of the Cities* was 1881.

Mendes appears to be implying that Solomon knew Saul through his acquaintance with Boulton and Park, and that the artist probably met with Saul after the trial, although there is no documented evidence to endorse this idea. It is clear that Solomon continued a friendship with Boulton after the trial. This is revealed in a letter to Powell, probably dated December 1871, in which Solomon reported that he was in Manchester with a “charming lady of the name of Bolton [sic]” whom he was going to the theatre with that evening “with friends” to see “Bluebeard”.⁷⁵⁹ It also seems likely that Solomon knew Campbell through membership of the Cannibal Club, which Matt Cook describes as a “sexually libertarian but reactionary sub-group of the Anthropological Society of London”.⁷⁶⁰ Swinburne appears to have introduced Solomon to the club in 1871; its members also

⁷⁵⁷ Mendes, 1993: 216. Patrick J. Kearney suggested that there was “good circumstantial evidence” that Saul had sold his memoirs to Solomon and that both Solomon and Reddie had edited the volume together. However, Kearney’s ‘evidence’ appears to be based on Mendes’s inference that Solomon moved in the same circles as Boulton and Park and, therefore, the artist must have known Saul. See Kearney, 2006: 443.

⁷⁵⁸ Mendes gives two dates for Reddie’s death: 1878 and 1879.

⁷⁵⁹ Letter from Simeon Solomon to George Powell 1871, National Library of Wales, George Powell Collection, Thanks to Roberto C. Ferrari for providing me with a transcript of this letter. According to the *Manchester Times*, “Bluebeard” was a pantomime shown at the Prince’s Theatre in Manchester on “boxing night” 1871. The article appears to suggest that this performance was for one night only, which would date the letter to the 26th December 1871. Anon, *Manchester Times*, 30 December 1871: 5.

⁷⁶⁰ Cook, 2003: 91.

included Duncan Cameron (Lazenby), founder Richard Burton and Monckton-Milnes.⁷⁶¹

Lisa Z. Sigel suggests that from the 1860s through to the 1880s, the members of the Cannibal Club “wrote and read much of British pornography”.⁷⁶² It seems likely that Solomon may have known Campbell before his introduction to the club, because in a letter to Swinburne, dated September 1869, Solomon asked Swinburne if he has heard that Campbell “was going to publish a popular ‘Justine’?”⁷⁶³

Mendes also suggests that the name of the narrator in *Sins of the Cities*, Mr Cambon, could have been constructed by combining the names Campbell and Solomon, or that it could have been a fusion of Cameron (Lazenby’s alias) and Solomon.⁷⁶⁴ I would suggest, however, that the evidence that Mendes’s produces to argue that Solomon was the likely author of Saul’s memoirs is too circumstantial. Mendes seems to rely on the premise posed by bibliographer and collector of erotica, Henry Spencer Ashbee, who proposed that the characterisation of Boulton and Park almost appeared to have been “sketched from personal acquaintance”.⁷⁶⁵ However, Ashbee never claimed that Solomon was the author, and made no suggestion about who the author might have been. In addition, Mendes does not make it clear when he thinks Solomon could have written *Sins of the Cities*, although, presumably, it would have had to be before 1878-9 when Campbell died and after 1873 when the artist, according to Mendes, “needed money for drink”.⁷⁶⁶ In addition there is no documented evidence that Solomon knew Saul or that he made any arrangement with Campbell to edit and publish the novel.

⁷⁶¹ Lang, 1959b: 135. This letter from Swinburne to Richard Burton reads “I shall bring my friend Solomon, yours in the Cannibal faith”.

⁷⁶² Sigel, 2002: 112.

⁷⁶³ Lang, 1959b: 31-32. Lang mistakenly refers to ‘Capell’ instead of Campbell, which was rectified by Fuller. See Fuller, 1968: 175. The erotic novel *Justine* was written by the Marquis de Sade in 1797. See Bloch, 2002.

⁷⁶⁴ Mendes, 1993: 216.

⁷⁶⁵ Mendes, 1993: 216. Ashbee published three bibliographies of erotica between 1877 and 1885 and using the pseudonym Pisanus Fraxi. The volume that contains information about *Sins of the Cities* is *Catena Librorum Tacendorum* published in 1885. See Fraxi, 1962: 194.

⁷⁶⁶ Mendes, 1993: 216.

It is possible that Solomon had visited Boulton at his address at Wakefield Street, and the letter to Powell makes clear that Solomon continued an acquaintance with him after the trial. It is also possible that Solomon was attracted to the area because, as Upchurch suggests, it was an area that enjoyed a “degree of public mobility and self-expression”.⁷⁶⁷ It also seems apparent that Solomon’s income sometime during 1883 or 1884 must have been substantial enough for him to afford to lodge in the more affluent area of Wakefield Street, but it is also clear from the common lodging house addresses that appear on the *Examinations* document, that the artist’s income and circumstances fluctuated dramatically.

The early claims of Ross and Falk seem to suggest that Solomon simply “sank to the gutter” due to an “appalling Bohemianism” after his arrest in 1873 despite “every effort” made by “friends and relatives to reclaim him”; but the evidence provided by Solomon’s addresses seems to suggest that the artist’s life did not simply go into uncontrollable decline.⁷⁶⁸ Instead, the documented evidence suggests that there were periods of time when Solomon did not live in the kind of poverty that Falk associated him with. Falk’s chapter on Solomon which was published in 1937, but written just after the artist’s death in 1905, contains much detailed information about Solomon’s life as a “vagabond” and “professional mendicant” amongst the “ne’er-do-wells” of the St Giles’ and Seven Dials areas of central London.⁷⁶⁹ Ross put Solomon’s ‘decline’ down to “intemperance” along with his “other vices” and Falk went further by suggesting that Solomon’s “permanent degradation” was due to a “persistent lack of self-control, indistinguishable from madness” and that he used the studios that his “ever-sympathetic” relatives rented for him to sleep off “drunken orgies”.⁷⁷⁰ Despite these sensationalist

⁷⁶⁷ Upchurch, *Gender and History*, April 2000: 127-57.

⁷⁶⁸ Ross, *The Westminster Gazette*, 24 August 1905a: 1-2.

⁷⁶⁹ Falk, 1937: 16, 315. Falk said that he met with Solomon a few months before the artist died, and wrote an article about him for the *London Evening News*. The report was never published, but instead, became the basis for Falk’s published chapter on Solomon in 1937. Falk also suggests that some information appeared in a “weekly periodical”, but it is unclear which periodical this is. (318).

⁷⁷⁰ Falk, 1937: 311. Ross, *The Westminster Gazette*, 24 August 1905a: 1-2.

accounts, it is more than likely that Solomon had an addiction to alcohol because there is some contemporary evidence that alludes to this, such as the records of Solomon's health, which are recorded in the St Giles's *Examinations* document. However, Ross himself, suggested that when he met with Solomon "as late as 1893" the artist appeared "not aggressively alcoholic", and Falk also suggested that Solomon had "sober moments".⁷⁷¹ However, it is likely that Solomon's alcoholism was also economically determined. For example by the financial crisis of his family, and also by the macro-economic situation in the nineteenth-century, in which there was no welfare state to speak of for Solomon to obtain aid.

Falk's article, *The Tragedy of Simeon Solomon*, had a major impact on subsequent Solomon scholarship. As late as 1965, William Fredeman, author of much important work on the Pre-Raphaelites, remembered Falk's writing on Solomon as "the best, and almost the only analysis" of the artist's life.⁷⁷² And, in the same year, Lambourne described Falk's work as that to "which all subsequent writers on Solomon will always be indebted".⁷⁷³ Until only recently, Falk's description of Solomon after his arrest, as a worthless vagrant living on the streets, shunning the consistent efforts of his family and friends to help him, was the standard scholarly view. Seymour, writing in 1986, suggested that Solomon was "doomed as an artist, and condemned to a life of destitution" after the arrest of 1873, with little investigation into the remaining thirty-two years of the artist's life.⁷⁷⁴ She also quoted Falk as the source of her assertion that Solomon's family's efforts "failed" when he did not respond to their help and that the family "finally concluded that he was hopeless".⁷⁷⁵ However, in contradiction of this statement, she acknowledges that from "1880 to the end of his life, Solomon produced a huge body of work".⁷⁷⁶

⁷⁷¹ Ross, *Academy*, 23 December 1905b: 1337. Falk, 1937: 318. Adlard, 1969: 48.

⁷⁷² Fredeman, 1965: 214.

⁷⁷³ Lambourne, *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, 1968: 286. This was based on a paper given to the Jewish Historical Society in February 1965.

⁷⁷⁴ Seymour, 1986: 204.

⁷⁷⁵ Seymour, 1986: 221.

⁷⁷⁶ Seymour, 1986: 221.

The next suggestion of Solomon's whereabouts, after he was released from the workhouse, is printed in a letter that the artist wrote to Hollyer, that described Solomon's first encounter with the 'decadent' Count Stenbock.⁷⁷⁷ The letter was printed in Brian Reade's 1970 anthology of male homosexuality in English literature, and Reade suggested that the date of the letter was "about 1886".⁷⁷⁸ However, it is likely that the date of the letter corresponds to the period of time that the Grosvenor Gallery's '8th Summer Show' was open. I suggest this because Solomon refers in the letter to visiting the Grosvenor with Stenbock and viewing Burne-Jones's painting *King Cophetua and the Beggar Maid* (1884). The painting, which was enthusiastically received by the *Times*, was exhibited for the first time at the Grosvenor Gallery between the 1st May and the 5th August 1884, and the letter can, therefore, only have been written during this period.⁷⁷⁹ I would also suggest that it is likely that Solomon wrote this letter after he was released from his second stay at St Giles' workhouse for the following reasons.

As already suggested, the *Examinations* document of St Giles', recorded that Solomon was admitted to the workhouse on the 12th June and discharged on the 25th June 1884.⁷⁸⁰ Solomon's "present place of abode" is described as "7 Dyott Street"; however, the address recorded on the letter to Hollyer is "13 Newton Street, Holborn". Of course, it is possible that Solomon had moved from Newton Street to Dyott Street in the period between the 1st May and his 12th June admission, although the Newton Street address is not noted in the section of the *Examinations* document which recorded his previous addresses. It would seem likely that an address as recent as Newton Street would be recorded. In addition, Solomon reveals in the letter that Stenbock had provided him with a "coat and waistcoat" and "£5", which he "of course, accepted".⁷⁸¹ If Solomon had received this help

⁷⁷⁷ Reade, 1970: 37.

⁷⁷⁸ Reade, 1970: 36.

⁷⁷⁹ Anon, *The Times*, 1 May 1884: 6. The *Times* reported that the painting was "superb", transcended "all else in the gallery" and was the "finest work" that Burne-Jones had ever painted. It also went as far as to suggest that the painting was the "finest pictures ever painted by an Englishman".

⁷⁸⁰ Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41.

⁷⁸¹ Reade, 1970: 37.

from Stenbock before the 12th June, then it seems probable that he would not have needed to enter the workhouse.

Stenbock was born in Cheltenham to a Baltic-German aristocratic father and English mother.⁷⁸² He was a poet and short-story writer who lived for two years in Estonia on the family's vast estates, returning to London around 1887 where he established friendships with writers and artists Aubrey Beardsley, Wilde's friend More Adey, Arthur Symons, Lionel Johnson, publisher Herbert Horne, and W. B. Yeats amongst others. Yeats portrayed Stenbock as a "scholar, connoisseur, drunkard, poet, pervert" and the "most charming of men" and Symons described him as "bizarre, fantastic, feverish, eccentric, extravagant, morbid and perverse".⁷⁸³ In addition, Stenbock appears to have been infatuated with Solomon and his work. Stenbock's fervour for the artist appeared, according to John Adlard, in some of Stenbock's work during 1881 when he was only twenty-one.⁷⁸⁴ Adlard suggests that, in a manuscript book of Stenbock's, discovered in Sweden, Stenbock transcribed a poem that was "founded on a picture by Simeon Solomon", which, Adlard suggests, was also "much influenced" by Solomon's prose poem *Vision of Love*.⁷⁸⁵ Stenbock's passion for Solomon is also revealed in the poet's first privately published book of poetry *Myrtle, Rue and Cypress*, in which he dedicates "the myrtle thereof" to Solomon.⁷⁸⁶ In the Renaissance, Myrtle symbolised everlasting love and conjugal fidelity, and by dedicating the myrtle to Solomon, Stenbock appeared to be revealing the intensity of feeling that he had not just for Solomon's work, but for the artist himself.⁷⁸⁷ Stenbock's fascination with Solomon is also evident in the similarity between the poet's staff-and-serpent monogram and Solomon's, which appears on the dedication page of *Myrtle, Rue and Cypress*.⁷⁸⁸ Solomon acknowledged this likeness himself in the

⁷⁸² Adlard, 1969.

⁷⁸³ Yeats, 1955. Symons quoted in Adlard, 1969: 89.

⁷⁸⁴ Adlard, 1969.

⁷⁸⁵ Adlard, 1969: 21.

⁷⁸⁶ Stenbock, 1992.

⁷⁸⁷ Hall, 1996: 219.

⁷⁸⁸ Stenbock, 1992: dedication page.

letter of 1884 when he suggested that Stenbock had “adopted” his “old monogram” but that the artist had “made him a new one”.⁷⁸⁹

Adlard suggests that Stenbock’s infatuation with Solomon probably began at Oxford where Stenbock studied for four terms between 1879 and 1880.⁷⁹⁰ Ross mentioned that “photographs” of Solomon’s work such as “*Antinous*” and “*Love Dying from the Breath of Lust*” found a renewed popularity amongst the “‘cultured’ undergraduates” who read “Shelley and burned incense” and could be found on the walls of those students at that time.⁷⁹¹ However, Ross also suggested that when “aunties and uncles” came to visit, the Burne-Jones and Botticelli pictures were left in place and the Solomon’s were taken down “for the occasion”. Wilde also seems to have been fascinated by Solomon’s work, and at Oxford in 1877 he wrote an article for the *Dublin University Magazine*, linking the names of Burne-Jones and Rossetti with Solomon, and describing him as “that strange genius”.⁷⁹² Later on, in 1897, Wilde would bemoan the loss of his “Simeon Solomons” in an open letter to Lord Alfred Douglas, published by Ross as *De Profundis* in 1905, after his property was sold at auction in 1895.⁷⁹³

Solomon’s letter to Hollyer appears to suggest that this was the artist’s first meeting with Stenbock. In it, he says that he had received a letter from Stenbock asking for Solomon to “go to him as soon as possible”.⁷⁹⁴ Solomon described how he had had a “delightful” day with Stenbock, whose kindness was “most singular”. Stenbock’s eccentric nature is also revealed in the letter. He is described as greeting Solomon with a “low and truly Oriental salute” while “swinging a silver censer before an altar covered with lilies,

⁷⁸⁹ Reade, 1970: 37.

⁷⁹⁰ Adlard, 1969: 9, 21.

⁷⁹¹ Ross, 1909: 83. Swinburne mentions two paintings by Solomon titled *Antinous*, and Prettejohn suggests that one of these was probably Solomon’s painting *Bacchus* (1867), although it is unclear which painting Ross was referring to. See Swinburne, *Dark Blue*, July 1871: 573 and Prettejohn, 1999: 46. The Baillie Galley catalogue revealed that an undated Solomon work titled *Love Dying from the Breath of Lust* was owned by “Mrs Birnstingl”, although the present location of this work is unknown. See also the *Love Revealed* catalogue for an illustration dated 1865 with the same title, and also see *Love and Lust* (date unknown) (Fig. 254), which appears to be the same theme. Baillie, 1905a, Cruise, 2005: 144, Pl. 98.

⁷⁹² Wilde, *Dublin University Magazine*, July 1877: 126. Wilde was at Magdalen College, Oxford, between 1874 and 1878.

⁷⁹³ Wilde, 1905.

⁷⁹⁴ Reade, 1970: 37.

myrtles, lighted candles and a sanctuary lamp burning with scented oil". Solomon depicted Stenbock as "a tall, graceful intellectual looking girl" who was "not exactly good-looking" but whose "eyes and expression" were "very beautiful". Solomon suggested that Stenbock was wearing a "magnificent blood red silk robe embroidered in gold and silver" and that he talked to Solomon about "everything" that interested the artist, and "played beautiful religious music on the piano and harmonium".⁷⁹⁵ Stenbock also offered Solomon the use of his room (perhaps to work in) and, as already suggested, gave Solomon gifts of money and clothes. Solomon then suggested that the two men had gone that day to the "Newsroom" after visiting the Grosvenor and Solomon had, "after so much pleasure", lost a drawing that he had "carefully begun of 'Perseus with the Head of Medusa'" and another smaller unnamed drawing.⁷⁹⁶

There are records of two works by Solomon with this title. The first is dated 1896 (Fig. 207), sold at auction in Germany in 1998, and the second is undated, but is now at Birmingham City Art Gallery (Fig. 259).⁷⁹⁷ In a later letter to Ross, Solomon mentioned that he was "going to commence a drawing" for Stenbock titled *Perseus with the Head of Medusa* "in illustration of the splendid two verses of D. G. Rossetti".⁷⁹⁸ The date of this letter is unclear. It first appeared in a compilation of Ross's letters edited by Margery Ross in 1952 and was then re-printed in Adlard's book on Stenbock in 1969.⁷⁹⁹ The letter is addressed "City News Room, Ludgate Circus, E.C." by Solomon, which according to

⁷⁹⁵ Reade, 1970: 37.

⁷⁹⁶ There were many 'news rooms' in central London and it is unclear which one this might have been. Baedeker's guide to London suggests that most were supplied with English and foreign newspapers and entry cost about 2d. See Baedeker, 1889: 17.

⁷⁹⁷ Anon, *Galerie Auktion Burkard - Kunst Des 20 Jahrhunderts Leitgenossische Kunst - 21 November 1998*, (1998): 18.

⁷⁹⁸ Ross, 1952: 33. Rossetti wrote a poem to accompany his painting *Aspecta Medusa* (1867) with the same title. The "splendid verses" that Solomon is referring to are "Andromeda, by Perseus saved and wed; / Hanked each day to see the Gorgon's head; / Till o'er a fount he held it, bade her lead, / And mirrored in the wave was safely seen / That Death she lived by. Let not thine eyes know / Any forbidden thing itself, although / It once should save as well as kill: but be / Its shadow upon life enough for thee". Rossetti, 1881: 187.

⁷⁹⁹ Ross, 1952: 33 and Adlard, 1969: 51. Margery Ross suggested the name "Count Sherelork" in her transcript of the letter; however, Adlard suggested that Solomon was referring to Count Stenbock, and that the writing on the original letter was "far from clear".

Baedeker in 1883, was situated at 5 St Bride Street, Ludgate Circus.⁸⁰⁰ At first glance, Solomon could be referring to the drawing *Perseus with the Head of Medusa* that he had lost in the newsroom in 1884. However, I would suggest that the letter is probably dated later than Solomon's 1884 letter to Stenbock, and was written after the late 1880s and before 1895 when Stenbock died.⁸⁰¹ This is primarily due to Ross's age. He was only seventeen-years-old when he met Wilde in 1886, probably through his brother Alex, who was a member of the Saville Club where Wilde occasionally dined, and it seems likely that his contact with Solomon would have come after this.⁸⁰²

The likely dating of the letter to the late 1880s seems to suggest that Solomon was in contact with Stenbock for a number of years before the poet died. Solomon recorded in his letter to Hollyer that he was "incredibly indebted" to Hollyer for "being the means of procuring" for him "so kind, generous and desirable a friend", and suggested that Stenbock wished Solomon "to take a room near him", but the artist feared that "it would be too dear" for him.⁸⁰³ It is also clear that Stenbock was commissioning work from Solomon and allowing the artist to work in his rooms, and it, therefore, seems possible that some of the work that Solomon produced during this period might have been executed in Stenbock's rooms. However, Reynolds suggests that, by 1888, "Solomon was entertaining hopes of being commissioned to decorate Stenbock's home", but that "their initial flurry" of friendship "was waning", and the "Count was tiring of Solomon's continued importunities".⁸⁰⁴ It is unclear where Reynolds obtained this information, but there is evidence to show that, around 1887, Stenbock had expressed, in a letter addressed to his family in Estonia, that Solomon was "in the worst condition and the bane" of his "life".⁸⁰⁵

⁸⁰⁰ Baedeker, 1883: 16.

⁸⁰¹ Stenbock died of cirrhosis of the liver at his mother's home near Brighton on the 26th April 1895. Beckson, 'Stenbock, Count Stanislaus Eric (1860 - 1895)', www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/61445, 2004. (accessed 23 January 2006).

⁸⁰² Borland, 'Ross, Robert Baldwin (1869-1918)', www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/37915, 2004. (accessed 12 September 2005).

⁸⁰³ Reade, 1970: 37.

⁸⁰⁴ Reynolds, 1985: 89.

⁸⁰⁵ Adlard, 1969: 48.

Reynolds remarks that Stenbock did not commission any frescoes and instead “brought the association” with Solomon “to a premature close”.⁸⁰⁶ Again, it is unclear, without any documented evidence whether there is any truth in Reynolds statements.

However, Stenbock’s patronage of Solomon in this period might explain why the artist was able to produce oil and watercolour paintings in 1884. After producing mostly chalk and pencil drawings for the previous five years, there is a record of Solomon producing one oil painting titled *Youth at Dusk* in 1884. The work, which was sold at Sotheby’s in 1996, is now in the hands of a private collector, and apart from its size, no other information is available about this work.⁸⁰⁷ In addition, a watercolour, titled *Head of a Man* (Fig. 57) was produced, and is also now in a private collection. There are also another five known works for this year including coloured chalk and pencil drawings titled *How Beautiful is Death* (Fig. 58), *O Pot, O Pot* (Fig. 59), *Head of Medusa* (Fig. 60) and a pencil drawing titled *Good Tidings*.⁸⁰⁸ There is also a record of another work for 1884 which was exhibited at the Baillie Gallery exhibition of 1905, titled *Suffer Little Children*, although no other information is known about this work.⁸⁰⁹

It seems possible that Solomon’s association with Hollyer, in addition to Stenbock, might also have been financially beneficial to him at this time. This can be explained by the first signs of Solomon’s work being received in America as early as 1884, in the form of Hollyer’s platinotype reprints of the artist’s work. H. B. Merriman, writing for the Massachusetts *Andover Review*, authored an article in 1884 titled ‘The English Pre-Raphaelite and Poetical School of Painters’.⁸¹⁰ In the *Review*, which titled itself as a *Religious and Theological Monthly*, Merriman suggested that both Solomon’s and Albert

⁸⁰⁶ Reynolds, 1985: 90.

⁸⁰⁷ *Sotheby's Auction Catalogue - Victorian Pictures - 5 May 1996*, (1996b):100. Size is given as 480x345mm.

⁸⁰⁸ *How Beautiful is Death* (1884) is also inscribed “when death winds thee about with the chill white raiment / thou shalt know how beautiful he is”. It was sold at Christie’s in 1992. See *Christie's Auction Catalogue - 19th Century Paintings - 29 October 1992*, (1992b): 13. See Appendix II for the auction sale details of the other works and their current location details.

⁸⁰⁹ Baillie, 1905a.

⁸¹⁰ Merriman, *The Andover Review: a Religious and Theological Monthly* June 1884: 594.

Moore's work were "known" in America "by photographs from their pictures". The work that Merriman had seen was "chiefly groups of ideal heads of an impassioned and mysterious beauty" although "somewhat sentimental and lacking in force". Merriman also suggested that work such as *Until the Day Break and the Shadows Flee Away* (Fig. 17), had a "subtle flavour of renunciation and pain".⁸¹¹

At the same time that copies of Solomon's work were being received, perhaps for the first time in America, John LeBourgeois suggested that Frederick Locker Lampson had privately published an autobiography, of which one copy was presented to the Bodleian Library, which described Solomon as a "spiteful looking and rather splenetic looking little man, with a sister exactly like himself".⁸¹² Lampson's distaste for Solomon went further, by his inclusion of an abusive limerick purportedly composed by D. G. Rossetti, which went,

There is a young painter called Solomon,
Whose father, they say, was a dolly-man,
His father's old clothes,
And his sister's hook-nose,
Were the earliest playthings of Solomon.⁸¹³

The slang term 'dolly-man' was applied mostly to Jews.⁸¹⁴ The early nineteenth-century 'dolly-man' ran the 'dolly-shop', which was essentially an illegal rag-and-bone shop or pawn-shop for the very poor. It seems clear that the reference to Solomon's father as a 'dolly-man' is used as a term of abuse, because documented evidence shows that Solomon's father was, in fact, a successful businessman and manufacturer.⁸¹⁵ In addition,

⁸¹¹ Merriman, *The Andover Review: a Religious and Theological Monthly* June 1884: 594. In chapter six, I discuss Hollyer's photographic copies of Solomon's work and their reception in America from the 1880s in more detail.

⁸¹² LeBourgeois, *Notes and Queries*, 1971: 254.

⁸¹³ LeBourgeois, *Notes and Queries*, 1971: 254.

⁸¹⁴ Beale and Partridge, 2002: 326.

⁸¹⁵ Solomon's father Michael was a respected member of the London Jewish community and only the second Jew to be afforded the Freedom of the City (as a Freeman of the Hatter's Company). Around the time of Solomon's birth, Michael and his brother Abraham, resurrected their father Aaron's ailing business of manufacturing Leghorn hats, which was registered at the family home in Sandy's Street. They reinvested £50,000 in the business and upon purchasing new premises began successfully embossing paper doilies and other paper goods. For more information on the early Solomon family business, see Lambourne, 1985: 6.

the reference to Rebecca's 'hook-nose' is clearly meant to be offensive because it refers to the stereotypical caricature of the 'hook-nosed' Jew. However, it is unclear whether this limerick was actually written by Rossetti, because there is no additional documented evidence to verify Lampson's claim, although it does seem likely that this limerick may have been composed before 1873 because the first line describes Solomon as a young painter.

It is clear that Solomon was once again in a desperate state by July 1885, despite Stenbock's patronage and Hollyer's continued assistance. A letter written by the superintendent of Guy's Hospital, John Charles Steele, which can be found attached to the St Giles' *Examinations* document, reveals that Solomon was suffering from "ulcers of his legs" and that "no hospital in London" was "likely to receive him". A note in the *Examinations* document remarked that Solomon had "bad feet" and was "destitute".⁸¹⁶ It seems possible that Solomon's leg ulcers were caused by alcoholism. Braun-Falco et al, describe how the pre-disposing factors of leg ulcers are alcoholism, malnutrition, vitamin deficiency, and exposure to cold.⁸¹⁷ It is also suggested that this kind of leg ulcer is found primarily on the bottom of the feet and that most sufferers have alcoholic liver disease. Solomon's leg ulcers seem to suggest, therefore, that the artist had been chronically alcoholic for a considerable amount of time.

In his letter to the "relieving officer of St Giles", Steele suggested that Solomon required "only rest and bandaging" in the workhouse infirmary, and that as Solomon "resided" in the St Giles' district, Steele "hoped that the relieving officer would "give him an admission".⁸¹⁸ It is clear from the letter that Solomon had been sent to Guy's Hospital in order that he could be admitted there, although it is unclear by whom. However, as a voluntary hospital, Guy's was restrictive about the 'sick paupers' it would admit. As

⁸¹⁶ Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41. As suggested in chapter four, the date of this letter was inaccurately transcribed by Lambourne, and then subsequently referenced incorrectly by Seymour as the date of Solomon's first admission to the workhouse.

⁸¹⁷ Braun-Falco et al., 2000: 1008.

⁸¹⁸ Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41.

Margaret Stacey suggests, “the treatment of the sick was confused with the discouragement of pauperism” and therefore, perversely, voluntary hospitals turned the sick poor away to the workhouse infirmary in the hope that this would deter them from poverty.⁸¹⁹

The letter also suggested that Solomon was “an artist in broken down circumstances”, and that his “health utterly” incapacitated him “from following his employment, but that he would “be able to begin work again” after a short period.⁸²⁰ This is in contrast to Lambourne’s suggestion that the letter recorded that Solomon was “a broken-down artist”.⁸²¹ I would suggest that Lambourne’s reading of the letter indicates that Solomon’s career as an artist was ‘broken-down’, whereas Steele’s letter seems to suggest that only Solomon’s circumstances were broken-down, and that the artist’s occupation was intact, and that he would be able to continue after he was well.

The potential cause of leg ulcers, as described above, might also suggest that Solomon had spent periods of time on the streets, although there is no documented evidence to suggest this at this time, and the *Examinations* document records that before being admitted to the workhouse infirmary, the artist had lived for four months at “28, Winchester Street, Pentonville”.⁸²² This address was only two streets away from 34 John Street, where, as suggested in chapter three, Solomon had previously lived in 1877. Booth classified this street as a ‘pink’ area, which contained “fairly comfortable” occupants of “good ordinary earnings”.⁸²³ The 1881 England census appears to be consistent with Booth’s analysis, because the occupations of the residents of 28 Winchester Street at this time were dressmaker, coachman, and printer.⁸²⁴ The census also reveals that there were four households in this building, and one of these appears to have been a single lodger. It seems likely then that Solomon would have rented a room or rooms in this building, and

⁸¹⁹ Stacey, 2006: 63.

⁸²⁰ Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41.

⁸²¹ Cruise, 2005: 185.

⁸²² Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41

⁸²³ ‘Charles Booth Online Archive’, www.booth.lse.ac.uk/, (accessed 1 February, 2006).

⁸²⁴ 1881 England Census - 28 Winchester St, The National Archive, RG11/355.

that his income was sufficient enough for him to do so. This seems to imply that, as already suggested, Solomon's financial circumstances were erratic, which I would suggest is more than likely a consequence of his alcoholism.

Despite Steele's recommendation that Solomon "ought to get well in six weeks time", the artist was discharged from the infirmary sixteen days later on the 27th July. It seems likely that Steele's advice may not have been adhered to, because as Stacey suggests, the medical staff were under the control of the non-medically trained workhouse master and it would have been his/her decision to discharge a sick pauper.⁸²⁵ In addition, Stacey suggests that conditions in the workhouse infirmaries were "deplorable" in comparison to the voluntary hospitals, with inadequate hygiene, and a shortage of baths and toilets. Most of the nursing care was also given by other paupers. It seems unlikely, then, that Solomon would have received proper care, and it is probable that he left the infirmary in either the same, or a worse state than he had arrived.

There is no other documented information to suggest what happened to Solomon after he left the workhouse infirmary at the end of July 1885. However, a piece of information that reveals another person in Solomon's life at this time appears on the *Examinations* document. The document shows that Boylett's name had been crossed out in the section titled "respectable persons to whom the Pauper is known", presumably indicating that he was no longer associated with Solomon, and a "friend" named "Mr Burke", of "9 Bloomsbury Street" had been added.⁸²⁶ The 1884 *Business Directory of London* records that "Burke & co, Mount Makers" had a business premises at 9 Bloomsbury Street, and the 1882 *London Directory* reveals a little more information, and the name of "Mrs Lydia Burke" of "B & co, artist's mounts manufacturers" at the same address.⁸²⁷ In the 1881 England Census, Lydia P. Alden, her husband James Alden and

⁸²⁵ Stacey, 2006: 63 – 64.

⁸²⁶ Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41.

⁸²⁷ The Business Directory of London, J.S.C. Morris, 1884, Kelly's London Post Office Directory, Kelly's Directories, 1882.

sons Ernest and Frederick were all “picture mounters (card makers)” living at 9 Bloomsbury Street, and more searching reveals that Lydia Alden’s maiden name was Burke.⁸²⁸ This seems to suggest that Alden might have been the ‘Mr Burke’ suggested in the *Examinations* document and that he was, perhaps, using his wife’s maiden name and the name of the business.⁸²⁹ It also seems likely that Solomon had met Alden through the mount making business, although it is unclear whether Alden was an old or new acquaintance.

Other information for 1885, taken from the workhouse *Examinations* document, shows that the name and address of Solomon’s “nearest relative” was recorded as Solomon’s mother Kate, who, in June 1884 was still living in Hackney at Rose Villa, 253 Mare Street.⁸³⁰ By Solomon’s next admission to the infirmary in July 1885, she had moved and was living at 124 Victoria Park Road, Hackney. Both Mare Street, Victoria Park Road, and Kate’s other known Hackney address, Darnley Road, were all within the same vicinity, suggesting that Kate may have lived in Hackney until she died in December 1886. Despite Kate’s geographical distance from Solomon, it seems likely that he still had some level of contact with her because he appears to have been aware of her addresses and, in addition, he claimed her as his next-of-kin. It would seem probable that he would have used Rebecca’s address and ‘nearest relative’ status if he no longer had a relationship with his mother.

Despite Solomon’s period of destitution and illness in 1885, there are records of at least thirteen works completed in this year. Most of the works, of which there are images, appear to be chalk and pencil drawings on paper. I have been able to identify an auction record of one oil painting for this year titled *Flosshilda*, which was, perhaps, painted in the

⁸²⁸ 1881 England Census - 9 Bloomsbury Street, National Archives, RG11/321. Lydia Preston Burke married James Alden in 1865 in London. Anon, 'England and Wales Freebmd Marriage Index', www.ancestry.co.uk, 1837-1915. (accessed 5 Oct 2008).

⁸²⁹ Lydia’s father Thomas Haswell Burke, who had also been a mount maker and embosser, appears to have died early in 1861 and cannot have been Solomon’s friend Mr Burke. Anon, 'England and Wales Freebmd Death Index', www.ancestry.co.uk, 1837-1915.

⁸³⁰ Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41.

earlier part of 1885 when Solomon appears to have been more prosperous.⁸³¹ The titles of the chalk and pencil drawings are: *The Spirit of Shelley* (Fig. 61), *Woman's Head in Profile with Drapery* (Fig. 62), *The Angel of Light* (Fig. 63), *Love* (Fig. 64), *Cupid Carried in Triumph by Two Cherubs* (Fig. 65), *Somnium* (Fig. 66) and *Oval Portrait of an Androgyne* (Fig. 67). Four other works were exhibited at the Baillie Gallery and exhibition in 1905.⁸³² One was titled *The Pot of Basil* and was owned by 'Mrs Sutton'. Another, *Sintram* was lent by J. A. Fuller Maitland, son of the art collector William Fuller Maitland, suggesting that it may have originally been owned by Maitland senior. Two others, titled *Isanthe* and *Hyperion*, appear in the Baillie catalogue, but no information other than their titles is given. There is also a record for a pencil drawing sold at auction titled *Scutum Conscientiae*.⁸³³

Despite little extant information about Solomon's whereabouts in the following few years, it is clear that he did not return to the workhouse until May 1889.⁸³⁴ Instead, it is apparent that, in comparison to previous years, Solomon was fairly productive in 1886 and 1887, completing at least thirty-seven works in that period. The works for 1886 of which I have acquired images (Figs. 68 – 82) are all either coloured chalks or pencil drawings, and they include such works as *Perseus: a Type of Temptation* (Fig. 82), which was shown at

⁸³¹ This painting was sold at Christie's in 1989, but unfortunately I was unable to find an image of the painting. See *Christie's Auction Catalogue - Symbolist Paintings and Watercolours - 1 December 1989*, (1989): Lot 1089.

⁸³² Baillie, 1905a.

⁸³³ See Appendix II for auction sale and current location details. It is also interesting to note that one of the artist's earlier paintings titled *Young Jeremiah* (1862?) was shown at the Whitechapel Fine Arts Exhibition at St. Jude's School House in Commercial Street. Graves, 1905-1906: vol 4: 2180. My thanks go to Roberto C. Ferrari for informing me of this exhibition. I would suggest that this work is the oil painting *Child Jeremiah* (1862). For more information on this painting see Cruise, 2005: 89. In addition, one painting by Rebecca was also shown titled *The Clown behind the Curtain* (c1858), and lent by Lady Burdett-Coutts. This painting was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1858, and the *Jewish Chronicle* gave the following description. "Miss Solomon's picture "Behind the Curtain", is a first-rate work, the subject is 'a Caravan Strolling Actors,' 'Just a goin' to begin', but before the clown smears his cheeks with rouge and grimaces a welcome to the gaping crowd, he plays a real part in a domestic scene. Stretched on a wretched pallet lies a young acrobat sick and lame from a recent accident, and closely watching the boy sits the unhappy mime his father, the mother too is there, dressed as a tragedy queen, and looking on with no less anxiety, and the youngest of the family a little danseuse, is preparing for the show. Nothing can well be finer than the expressions of the poor clown's face, and all the attributes of his figure and dress, together with the whole entourage, are truthful in the extreme; the squalid finery of the caravan and all the poverty stricken expedients of its inmates are perfect; and again we congratulate Miss Solomon on the extraordinary progress which she has made." Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 4 June 1858: 197.

⁸³⁴ Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41

the Baillie Gallery Exhibition and owned by “Mrs Myer Salaman”.⁸³⁵ As suggested in chapter one, Myer Salaman was Solomon’s first cousin who had been responsible for paying the artist’s surety during the 1873 trial. Myer died in 1896, although his wife, Sarah, outlived him by thirty-five years, sending two other works to the Baillie exhibition, including *Zephyr* (1887) (Fig. 83) and *The Eternal Sleep* (1887). This is perhaps evidence of the continued support of the Salaman family during this time.

Some of Solomon’s earlier work was shown at two exhibitions in 1886. The Liverpool Exhibition displayed *Love in Winter* (1866) (now known as *Love in Autumn*), *Lady in a Chinese Dress* (1865), and *Greek Priest* (or *A Greek High Priest*) (1868).⁸³⁶ All three works were owned by Liverpool iron merchant William Coltart and his wife Eleanor, formerly Tong, who is also mentioned in chapter one. The Coltarts were a wealthy couple who owned a number of Solomon’s paintings.⁸³⁷ They also exhibited *Lady in a Chinese Dress* at the Newcastle Exhibition in 1886, and, in addition, lent the painting to the Manchester Royal Jubilee Exhibition in 1887, along with *Love in Winter*.⁸³⁸ In *Art of Painting in the Queen’s Reign* (1897), A. G. Temple, the first director of the Guildhall, discussed some of the Coltarts’ collection, which he described as an example of Solomon’s “best work”.⁸³⁹ It seems clear that the Coltarts continued to enthusiastically support Solomon, albeit from a distance, purchasing his work at auctions and exhibiting his paintings, and Eleanor appears to have maintained this support after the death of her husband in 1903, until her own death in 1917. In 1886, the Coltarts purchased *The Guardian Angel* (untraced) from a Christie’s auction of William Graham’s collection, and

⁸³⁵ Baillie, 1905a.

⁸³⁶ Graves, 1905-1906: 2180-82.

⁸³⁷ The Brown & Brown auction of Eleanor Coltart’s collection, in Liverpool in 1917, listed the following paintings for sale: *Girl at Fountain* (1865), *The Mystery of Faith* (1870), *Lady in Chinese Dress* (1865), *Virgin and Child*, and *St Joseph* (undated), *The Angel of Death* (undated), *Poetry: Seated Figure of a Lady at a Table with Book of Poems* (1864), *The Greek Priest* (1867), *Juliet* (undated), *Love in Winter: Cupid Seeking Revenge from the Wintry Blast* (1866). See: *Brown & Brown Auction Catalogue: Auction of Works from Eleanor Coltart's Collection - 30 Oct - 5 Nov*, (1917). Thanks to Roberto C. Ferrari for providing me with this information.

⁸³⁸ Lambourne and Seymour, 1985: 69. Roberto C. Ferrari has also pointed out to me that Graves suggests that *Hosannah!* (1861) was also exhibited at Manchester in 1887. Graves, 1905-1906: 1242-3.

⁸³⁹ Temple, 1897: 335. Temple also mentioned that “Mrs Salaman” had “several” of Solomon’s works, but “none of them in very mature condition”.

in 1894 they loaned *Love in Winter* to the Corporation of London Art Gallery Exhibition at the Guildhall.⁸⁴⁰ In 1901, they also loaned *Love in Winter* to the Glasgow Exhibition and in 1906 Eleanor lent *Greek Priest* and *The Mystery of Faith* (1870) to the Whitechapel Art Gallery's Spring Exhibition.⁸⁴¹ In addition, Eleanor lent *Love in Winter*, *Night after the Ball* (1863), *Girl at Fountain* (1865), 'And he shall give his Angels Charge over Thee' (1863), *Greek Priest*, *Lady in a Chinese Dress*, and *Mystery of Faith* to the Royal Academy's 'Exhibition of Works by Deceased Artists' also in 1906, and to the Franco-British Exhibition in London in 1908 and the International Fine Arts Exhibition in Rome she sent three paintings.⁸⁴²

By the end of 1886 Solomon experienced the double loss of both Rebecca and his mother. On the 20th November, Rebecca was involved in a fatal accident with a Hansom cab on Euston Road. Her death certificate reveals that the cause of death was "exhaustion and shock caused by the wheels of a Hansom cab".⁸⁴³ The document also reveals that she was living at 212 Euston Road, which suggests that she was close to her home when she died. As already suggested, the last address recorded for Rebecca was 182 Great Titchfield Street in 1881, which was approximately half a mile from 212 Euston Road. The 1881 England census reveals that there were four families living in this house.⁸⁴⁴ The first family had four boarders living with them, and it seems likely that Rebecca may also have been a boarder when she lived there five years later. The occupations of the residents of the house were fishmonger, plumber, and Metropolitan police sergeant, and seem to have been of a similar social class to those living at Great Titchfield Street.⁸⁴⁵ This might suggest that, unlike Solomon, Rebecca's circumstances had stayed relatively stable. However, in 1928,

⁸⁴⁰ *Christie, Manson and Woods Sale Catalogue: Mr William Graham's Collection - 2 April 1886*, (1886): and Graves, 1905-1906: 1243.

⁸⁴¹ Graves, 1905-1906: 1242-3 and 2180-3.

⁸⁴² At the Franco-British Exhibition Eleanor lent *Love in Winter* and *Greek High Priest*. At Rome she sent *Greek High Priest* and *Mystery of Faith*. My thanks go to Donato Esposito for providing me with this information from his own research.

⁸⁴³ Certificate of Death - Rebecca Solomon, General Register Office, DYC 012554. An inquest was held on the 24th November; however, the documentation relating to this inquest no longer exists.

⁸⁴⁴ 1881 England Census - 212 Euston Road, The National Archive, RG11/197.

⁸⁴⁵ See chapter four.

Forrest Reid claimed that “something went amiss” with Rebecca, “and in the end she came to disaster”.⁸⁴⁶ Tales of Rebecca’s life mirroring that of Solomon appear to have been started by Marks. In 1919, in D. G. Williamson’s biography of Marks, Williamson stated that Rebecca was “merry at times and deep in depression at others” and that she was “high spirited” and “resented constraint of any sort”, despite “all the efforts of her friends”.⁸⁴⁷ This suggestion that Rebecca was also an alcoholic and had the same unruly nature as her brother developed into more sinister accusations of sexual ‘deviancy’, which Welby T. Earle expressed as her “disastrous impulses”.⁸⁴⁸ In 1933, Frances Winwar suggested that Rebecca and Solomon had gained their “disregard for conventions” from “some obscure seed”, “where morals existed only to be ignored and laws to be broken”.⁸⁴⁹

There is, however, no documented evidence (even on the death certificate) to suggest that Rebecca was also an alcoholic, although this presumption has continued to be repeated by scholars without any tangible evidence. Gerrish-Nunn suggested in 1985 that, “as has been alleged”, Rebecca was “eventually a drunkard”, but provided no new evidence to support this claim.⁸⁵⁰ Gerrish-Nunn also suggested that Rebecca “was living apart from the various members of her family who were still alive”, because of her “rejection”, and that a “picture of an isolated” woman “inevitably rises”.⁸⁵¹ However, Rebecca’s last address was only a few streets from Wakefield Street, one of Solomon’s addresses in 1884, and, until her death, Solomon continued to live within approximately half a mile of her. It is also clear that her move away from her mother was not recent. As already suggested, Solomon’s mother had moved to Hackney, perhaps to be nearer her son Sylvester, as early as the mid-1870s. Rebecca, though, stayed in central London,

⁸⁴⁶ Reid, 1928: 103.

⁸⁴⁷ Williamson, 1919: 157.

⁸⁴⁸ Earle, 1929: 58.

⁸⁴⁹ Winwar, 1933: 183.

⁸⁵⁰ Gerrish-Nunn, 1985: 23.

⁸⁵¹ Gerrish-Nunn acknowledges that only Rebecca’s brother Isaac, her mother and Solomon were still alive from an original family of nine. It is unclear where Isaac was living in 1886, but as suggested in chapter three, Isaac had gone bankrupt for a second time in 1885 and remained in debt for at least another nineteen years. It is possible that he died in early 1905.

presumably to be near her studio at Fitzroy Street. There is no documented suggestion that she was rejected by any member of her family.

Rebecca's death, despite its tragic nature, was not reported in any newspaper, and even the *Jewish Chronicle* did not report her death or publish an obituary. On the 15th December, Solomon's mother Kate died, and, like Rebecca, her death was not advertised in the *Chronicle*'s birth, marriage and death columns. It seems likely that the death of the last two closest members of Solomon's family, only three weeks apart, had a profound effect on the artist. It, perhaps, comes as no surprise that, as already suggested, Stenbock recorded in 1887 that Solomon was "in the worst condition".⁸⁵²

Despite this, Solomon produced at least seventeen works in this year and was apparently still selling his work to Stenbock, who recorded that he had "acquired lots more Sims" and "got into an awful row for showing 'Amor et Libido'".⁸⁵³ Solomon's work for 1887 appears to have been primarily coloured chalk and pencil drawings. He produced at least sixteen works, and of these I have discovered eight images, (Figs. 83 – 91). As already suggested Sarah Salaman lent two works to the Baillie Gallery Exhibition with this date, titled *Zephyr* (Fig. 83), and *The Eternal Sleep*.⁸⁵⁴ Other work dated 1887 and exhibited at the Baillie exhibition were *The Unappeased Desire* and *Study of a Child* owned by H. T. Tucker, and *Immortal Love*, *Nirvana*, and *The Dawn*, which were for sale.⁸⁵⁵

The 1887 Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition, at the Royal Albert Hall, exhibited two of Solomon's "etchings on India paper" from the collection of the "late Alfred

⁸⁵² Adlard, 1969: 48.

⁸⁵³ A work titled *Amor et Libido* was shown at the Whitechapel Art Gallery in 1906. It was lent by William More Adey who was a friend of Stenbock's and his literary executor. Adey also lived with Ross for fifteen years and was also a close friend of Wilde's. It seems likely that Adey's *Amor et Libido* originally belonged to Stenbock. Adey also lent *Lust without the Gate of Life*, *A Deacon Bearing the Monstrance*, *The Prodigal Son*, *Spes*, *Fra Angelico*, and *Isabella* (all dates unknown) to the exhibition. See Anon, *Exhibition of Jewish Art and Antiquities: Whitechapel Art Gallery* (1905), Anon, *Exhibition of Jewish Art and Antiquities: Whitechapel Art Gallery* (1906), Beckson, 'Stenbock, Count Stanislaus Eric (1860 - 1895)', www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/61445, 2004. (accessed 23rd Jan 2006).

⁸⁵⁴ Baillie, 1905a.

⁸⁵⁵ This may have been Major General H. T. Tucker.

Newman” titled *Circumcision* and *Passover*, and ten “photographs from drawings illustrating Jewish ceremonials”.⁸⁵⁶ These were titled *Circumcision*, *Marriage*, *Mourning*, *Carrying the Scroll of the Law in Synagogue*, *Sabbath Eve*, *Eve of Passover*, *Fast for Destruction of Temple*, *Day of Atonement*, *Feast of Tabernacles*, and *Feast of Dedication of the Temple* and were lent by “A. Solomon”.⁸⁵⁷ The date of the etchings is likely to be 1862. On the 18th July 1862, Cundall, Downes & Co, of 108 New Bond Street, London, advertised a series of Solomon’s “drawings of Jewish ceremonials” which were available for “one guinea”.⁸⁵⁸ In August, the journal *Once a Week* published two of these illustrations and in 1866 *The Leisure Hour* serialised the ten engravings.⁸⁵⁹

In this chapter I have discussed Solomon’s life between the years 1884 and 1887. I have examined Solomon’s second admission to the workhouse and, for the first time, suggested Solomon’s places of residence during this period. I have used Charles’s Booth’s nineteenth-century sociological survey to give an approximation of the kind of environment that Solomon would have been living in, and thus, obtained information which suggests that there were period of time when Solomon did not live in abject poverty. I have also discussed Solomon’s connection with Boulton and Park and Solomon’s possible involvement with the publication of *Sins of the Cities of the Plain* (1881). In addition, I have also examined Count Stenbock’s relationship with, and patronage of Solomon, and investigated the claims made by scholars concerning Rebecca’s ‘alcoholism’ and her family’s alleged rejection of her.

⁸⁵⁶ Anon, *Catalogue of Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition 1887. Royal Albert Hall.*, (1887):

⁸⁵⁷ This may have been Solomon’s first cousin, Aaron, whose father Abraham was Michael Solomon’s brother.

⁸⁵⁸ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 18 July 1862: 4.

⁸⁵⁹ Jacobs, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 3 June 1866: 16. The following engravings appeared in volume 15 of, Anon, *The Leisure Hour*, 3 Feb - 20 Dec 1866: No 736 - 3 February, 1866 - *The Feast of Dedication* - p73, No. 742 - 17 March, 1866 - *Initiation into the Covenant of Abraham* - p168, No. 745 - 7 April, 1866 - *Celebration of the Passover* - p217, No. 752 - 26 May, 1866 - *The Marriage Ceremony* - p329, No. 755 - 16 June, 1866 - *The Eve of the Jewish Sabbath* - p377, No. 761 - 28 July, 1866 - *The Fast of Jerusalem* - p476, No. 765 - 25 August, 1866 - *The Day of Atonement* - p540, No. 769 - 22 September, 1866 - *The Feast of Tabernacles* - p604, No. 772 - 13 October, 1866 - *The Rejoicing of the Law* - p653, No. 783 - 20 December, 1866 - *The Week of Mourning* - p824.

In chapter six I discuss Solomon's life between 1888 and 1896, and make mention of his relationship with poet Lionel Johnson and the Rhymers' Club; Hollyer's continued support and export of Solomon's work as reproductions to America, and the reception of the artist's work in that country. I also suggest Solomon's interest in Catholicism and his contributions to Herbert Horne's publication, the *Century Guild Hobby Horse*.

CHAPTER VI

1888 – 1896: JOHNSON, HORNE, AND HOLLYER

In 1997, Adrian Frazier suggested that the poet Lionel Johnson “was at the centre of homosexual circles at Oxford” in 1888, where “he was friends” with Solomon.⁸⁶⁰

However, it is unclear whether Frazier was suggesting that Johnson met Solomon at Oxford, or that he was fascinated with the artist’s work at that time. Indeed, Frazier quotes Ian Fletcher as the source of this information, but it is clear that Fletcher suggests that Johnson may have met Solomon at Herbert Horne’s residence in London in 1889.⁸⁶¹

Writing to Arthur Galton on the 2nd April 1889, Johnson described how he was “trembling” and “in terror” on account of Solomon, whom he had met with “for two whole hours” at Horne’s house.⁸⁶² Johnson recorded that he had talked to Solomon while “that wicked person” (meaning Horne), “pretended to have business in the outer room”. Johnson then suggested that because he had been so “gracious”, Solomon had “turned up the next day” and asked Horne where Johnson lived because the artist “liked” Johnson “immensely, but not in any improper way”.⁸⁶³

Before meeting with Solomon, Johnson was in communication with the artist and purchasing his work. In August 1888, Johnson noted that Solomon had produced “two magnificent drawings” for him titled “an Head of Sleep” and “an Antinous”, which Johnson described as “the very incarnation of beautiful, and probably, vicious youth”.⁸⁶⁴ Fletcher suggests that there was “much allusion” to Solomon from Johnson at this time, and that Johnson “was to write a poem on Antinous”.⁸⁶⁵ As mentioned in chapter five, Ross recorded that ‘photographs’ of Solomon’s work found popularity amongst the “cultured undergraduates” at Oxford, and one of these works was titled *Antinous*. It seems

⁸⁶⁰ Frazier, 1997: 9.

⁸⁶¹ Fletcher, 1982: xxxiv. Frazier references page xxii but this is clearly incorrect.

⁸⁶² Fletcher, 1982: xxxiv.

⁸⁶³ Fletcher, 1982: xxxiv.

⁸⁶⁴ Fletcher, 1982: xxxiii.

⁸⁶⁵ Fletcher, 1982: xxxiv. Johnson wrote in his poem *Julian at Eleusis* (which was dedicated to Edmund Gosse): “Wondrous Antinous! Oh, fairer thou, / Than the dim beauty of Christ crucified; / Thee too among the Everlasting Ones, / with Eleusinian feast, have I adored”. Johnson, 1897: 13.

clear that there was a resurgence of interest in Solomon's work amongst Oxford undergraduates that appears to have begun, perhaps, around Wilde's time during the late 1870s, lasting until at least the end of the 1880s when Johnson was a student, and was influenced by Pater's Aestheticism. Frazier suggests that Irish poet Edward Martyn also came "under the spell of Pater", and admired with him "the beauty of the Catholic ritual", believing that the "wisest spend their life in art and song".⁸⁶⁶ Frazier notes that, because of this influence, Martyn began by 1892 to "collect pictures" by Solomon and, like his close friend Stenbock, to "play religious music on the organ". Adlard suggested that Stenbock's interest in Solomon was "hardly surprising" considering that the artist's work had a "great vogue" amongst the undergraduates and "many college rooms were decorated with his paintings, or with reproductions of them";⁸⁶⁷ although, Fletcher, albeit sardonically, suggested that Johnson's "cultivation" of Solomon "doubtless in part accounted for Johnson's second class in classical moderations in 1888".⁸⁶⁸

Fletcher claims that, by 1888, Solomon was being patronised by Horne.⁸⁶⁹ This date seems likely because, in a letter to Horne from Arthur Symons, dated the 14th September 1888, Symons wrote that he hoped to meet with Horne "in whom he had been directing inquiries" about Solomon.⁸⁷⁰ However, despite Horne, Johnson and Symons' patronage, and Stenbock's continued interest in the artist, apart from those mentioned by Johnson I have only discovered records of eight works by Solomon for this year, although it is unclear why. One of these works is titled *Et Lux in Tenebris Lucet* and was lent to the Baillie Gallery Exhibition by "the Misses Pater": Walter's sisters, Hester and Clara Ann.⁸⁷¹ The sisters also sent an untitled work to the exhibition, although it is unidentified in the Baillie catalogue. It seems likely that these works had originally been owned by Pater, who

⁸⁶⁶ Frazier, 1997: 23.

⁸⁶⁷ Adlard, 1969: 21.

⁸⁶⁸ Fletcher, 1953: xxv.

⁸⁶⁹ Fletcher, 1982: xxxiv.

⁸⁷⁰ Beckson, 1987: 42.

⁸⁷¹ Clara was a tutor who taught Greek, Latin and the Classics at King's College, London. One of her student's at that time was Virginia Woolf. See Brake, 'Pater, Clara Ann (Bap, 1841, D. 1910)', www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/48505, 2004. (accessed 3 May 2008).

had died in 1896, and could have been purchased by him around 1888, at the time when Pater's Aestheticism at Oxford was significantly influential to under-graduates such as Johnson.⁸⁷² However, it is also clear that Horne sent Pater one of Solomon's drawings for Pater's fiftieth birthday, which was on the 4th August. In a letter to Horne, from Pater, dated the 9th August 1889, Pater thanked Horne for "so choice a gift", which Pater described as a "beautiful and characteristic drawing by S. Solomon."⁸⁷³

Other works exhibited at the Baillie exhibition, and dated 1888, were titled *A Vision* and *Study of Heads*, although no images exist for these works. Of the works with extant images, the first is titled *Love Wounded* (Fig. 95), which is now at the Beinecke Library at Yale, and the second is a Hollyer print titled *Ava Maria Gratia Plena* (Fig. 94). Cecil F. Crofton bequeathed the following two works with this date to the Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery in 1908. Both were executed in chalks on paper and are titled *Night and Sleep* (Fig. 92) and *Head of a Young Man* (Fig. 93). According to his obituary in the *Times*, Crofton was an actor who worked primarily during the 1880s and 1890s, who appeared in a large variety of parts chiefly in the London area.⁸⁷⁴ It is possible that Crofton may have bumped into Solomon at some point, because the actor appeared in the Drury Lane theatres, which are situated in the area of St Giles and close to the St Giles' workhouse on Endell Street. Crofton also owned, and subsequently bequeathed to Birmingham, *Cupid* (1886) (Fig. 78), *The Sleeping Endymion* (1887) (Fig. 85), *An Angel (Love)* (1887) (Fig. 84), and *Twilight, Pity and Death* (1889) (Fig. 103).

It seems likely that, during 1889, Solomon was struggling with alcoholism. Seymour suggests that in May of that year, Solomon wrote to Horne, from an address at

⁸⁷² Fletcher, 1982: xxxiii. In April 1888 Johnson said upon meeting Pater that the don was "gracious and merciful" and "an ugly pig, though learned and charming". For more on Pater and Oxford, see Dowling, 1994.

⁸⁷³ Evans, 1970: 164.

⁸⁷⁴ Anon, *The Times*, 26 Nov 1935: 12. Crofton also bequeathed books to the Senate House Library at the University of London in 1932. The collection consists of eighteenth-century English literature and seventeenth and eighteenth-century French literature. See www.ull.ac.uk/specialcollections/crofton.shtml (accessed 1 Sept 2009).

“81 Long Acre”, suggesting that he was “seriously unwell”.⁸⁷⁵ Seymour dates the letter in her footnotes as the 9th March.⁸⁷⁶ It seems likely that March is the correct date, because by the 9th May, Solomon was back in St Giles’ workhouse.⁸⁷⁷ The letter is also addressed “care of Mr Hart”, and Seymour suggested that this meant that Ernest Hart, (who was Abraham’s brother-in-law), had taken Solomon “into his home”. This appears to have been unlikely. Hart’s address in 1889 was 38 Wimpole St, West London, and his only other property, according to the *Jewish Chronicle*, was a country cottage near Totteridge in North London.⁸⁷⁸ It is now clear that 81 Long Acre was not Hart’s home but actually the address of a London public house, the Freemason’s Arms.⁸⁷⁹

The Freemason’s Arms is still located at the eastern end of Long Acre, where it crosses Drury Lane and meets Great Queen’s Street in Covent Garden. In the 1880s, this public house accommodated lodgers. In the 1881 England census, two lodgers are recorded at this address, living with the publican and his wife.⁸⁸⁰ Booth also made note of this public house in his notebooks, which he referred to as the Freemason’s Tavern, allocating the area as ‘pink’ on his poverty map, indicating “working class comfort” and the “lower middle class”.⁸⁸¹

In 1889, the tavern was advertising in the *Jewish Chronicle* as the “best accommodation for balls, banquets, dinners, wedding breakfasts” and “barmitzfahts”. It also promoted “special cuisine arrangements to meet Jewish requirements” and promised “the most scrupulous care taken in preparing food according to Jewish rites”.⁸⁸² In 1858, the *Jewish Chronicle* recorded Hart’s attendance at a dinner organised by the Grosvenor

⁸⁷⁵ Seymour, 1986: 221.

⁸⁷⁶ Seymour, 1986: 221, n481.

⁸⁷⁷ Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41.

⁸⁷⁸ Information gathered from Anon, 'British Phone Books, 1880-1984 Releases 1-3', www.ancestry.com, 1889.and Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 14 Jan 1898: 12-13.

⁸⁷⁹ This information was taken from the 1891 England Census - 81 Long Acre, The National Archive, RG12/213.

⁸⁸⁰ 1881 England Census - 81 Long Acre, The National Archive, RG11/329.

⁸⁸¹ Booth, 'Charles Booth Online Archive: Survey Notebooks', www.booth.lse.ac.uk/, 1886-1903.

⁸⁸² Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 18 September 1889: 16.

Square School of Medicine that took place at the Freemason's Tavern.⁸⁸³ It seems clear that the Freemason's Arms or Tavern was frequented by Jews and that Hart himself was familiar with the place.

With Solomon's alcoholism in mind, it is intriguing that Hart did not take Solomon into his home at Wimpole Street. According to Diana Maltz, Hart and his wife Alice were 'missionary aesthetes', people that "insisted that art should serve a social purpose" and "the enhancement of everyday life for everyone".⁸⁸⁴ Alice's sister, Henrietta Barnett, edited the magazine *The House Beautiful and the Home: A Journal for Those Who Design, Beautify, Furnish and inhabit Houses*, which was, according to Maltz, "a missionary aesthetic tour de force", whose articles "not only suggested where to buy the perfect early English-style cabinet", but also honoured "the work being done to make the homes of the poor happier and healthier".⁸⁸⁵ The Harts themselves had 'at homes' where they invited the poor to view their collections of Japanese porcelain, and according to Ross, Hart was an avid purchaser of Solomon's pictures and drawings.⁸⁸⁶

As missionary aesthetes, it might have been expected then that the Harts would have taken Solomon into their own home when he was in need, but the evidence is to the contrary. Why Hart did not do this is unclear, especially since he was involved in the investigation into the Poor Law Union workhouses. Hart's *Lancet* articles were backed by some of Britain's most influential poor-law campaigners, such as Florence Nightingale.⁸⁸⁷ In 1865, it was Hart who published a response to the *Lancet* article of that year, referred to in chapter four, which reported the appalling conditions in St Giles' workhouse. Hart became involved in the social reform of workhouses, hospitals and asylums, and was commissioned by the *Lancet* to investigate the infirmaries attached to London's forty-three

⁸⁸³ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 14 May 1858: 175.

⁸⁸⁴ Maltz, 2006: 3.

⁸⁸⁵ Maltz, 2006: 27.

⁸⁸⁶ Maltz, 2006: 27. and Ross, *The Westminster Gazette*, 24 August 1905a: 1-2. In his 1905 obituary of Solomon, Ross notes that the artist "had ready purchasers" for his work from the "well-to-do" Hebrew community, such as "Dr. Ernest Hart".

⁸⁸⁷ Koven, 2006: 26.

workhouses. As a consequence, in 1867 the Metropolitan Poor Act was introduced which made major changes into the care and provision for London's sick and poor.⁸⁸⁸ It seems possible then, that while the Harts were content with campaigning on behalf of the poor and allowing them to visit on occasion, they were unwilling to give this particular pauper in-law a home. Nonetheless, Solomon's period of time living at the Freemason's Arms was brief, because on the 2nd May the artist was admitted to St Giles' workhouse "ill" and "destitute".⁸⁸⁹ He was released nine days later on the 11th May, but returned on the 4th July "destitute" and in a state of "debility".⁸⁹⁰ This time Solomon was released only two days later, on the 6th July.

The contents of a letter now in the Horne Foundation in Florence, parts of which are quoted in both Reynolds and Seymour, perhaps suggests that Solomon was fully conscious of his predicament.⁸⁹¹ Reynolds suggests that the letter is from 1889, although it is undated, and describes it as "obviously written when Solomon was drunk".⁸⁹² I would suggest that this letter is typical of Solomon's sardonic wit, but that the wit is tainted with anger and could therefore have been the product of a drunken moment. The letter's contents are also rambling and disjointed. However, as already suggested in chapter three, Solomon enjoyed satire, and had privately published two spoof comic lectures in 1871. He was also known, by his friends, for his "happy knack" of parody and Seymour suggests, when referring to this letter, that "even in his poverty" Solomon "never lost his quick wit and humour".⁸⁹³

The letter appears to be a comic spoof which Solomon addressed from "the Angel Gabriel, Upper Circle, Heaven", to himself, who he described as "His Servant S.S.

⁸⁸⁸ Koven, 2006: 25. For more information on Ernest Hart, see Behlmer, *British Medical Journal*, 3 Oct 1990: . In 1866, Hart was lampooned by *Punch* in the article on workhouse reform: "List to Ernest Hart – a Hart that can feel for another – and no longer let the pauper sing in his sick room". Anon, *Punch*, 14 April 1866: Archives, 2000: 2

⁸⁸⁹ Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41.

⁸⁹⁰ The OED describes 'debility' as "a condition of being weak and feeble". Anon, 'Oxford English Dictionary', www.dictionary.oed.com, (accessed 9 Sept 2008).

⁸⁹¹ Reynolds, 1985: 93. Seymour, 1986: 221. Seymour suggests that the letter is titled "Memorandum".

⁸⁹² Reynolds, 1985: 93.

⁸⁹³ Holiday, 1914: 86. Seymour, 1986: 221.

[monogram inserted], of whose domicile no man knoweth even unto this day.”⁸⁹⁴ It is likely that this sentence is an allusion to the artist’s lack of a permanent residence, but perhaps it also refers to his perceived elusiveness. Solomon also wrote that the “Seraph Mandate observeth that our hitherto dear servant S.S. [monogram] hath most greatly sinned against our Majesty”.⁸⁹⁵ This, of course, is a reference to Solomon’s conviction for sodomy in 1873, and the words echo those found on the arrest documents which state that Solomon had committed the “detestable and abominable crime of buggery against the peace of our Lady the Queen, her Crown and Dignity”.⁸⁹⁶ The next sentences recorded that the ‘Seraph’ or angel, was aware that Solomon “hath mingled with the ungodly” and “hath done things which he ought not to have done”. However, despite Solomon’s acknowledgement of his ‘sins’ he remained philosophical, suggesting that “if in this life there is nothing, it follows that in the future there is something”.⁸⁹⁷

The letter also describes a vision in which the angel is led to see “the Holy man in Pembroke Square” who commands him to “love the poor little ones, and feed them especially the poor lamb which hath need of thy sorrow”.⁸⁹⁸ The address in Pembroke Square was Hollyer’s Kensington studio, and the ‘Holy man’ is obviously a reference to the photographer. However, without a doubt, there is a note of sarcasm in Solomon’s words, as Hollyer is asked to ‘love’ and ‘feed’ the ‘poor lamb’, which is likely to be Solomon. This might suggest that Solomon was in some way resentful of Hollyer’s assistance, and the artist’s annoyance is further reinforced by the letter’s other reference to Hollyer as “the Anti-Christ” of “Pembroke Square”.⁸⁹⁹ Seymour suggests that “Hollyer’s ‘sin’ may well have been that he remained faithful to the artist”; however, Ross claimed that when he met the artist around 1893 that Solomon had “no indignant feeling towards

⁸⁹⁴ Seymour, 1986: 221.

⁸⁹⁵ Seymour, 1986: 221.

⁸⁹⁶ Indictment - Middlesex Sessions Roll, London Metropolitan Archive, No 22 - MJ/SR/5665.

⁸⁹⁷ Reynolds, 1985: 93.

⁸⁹⁸ Reynolds, 1985: 93.

⁸⁹⁹ Reynolds, 1985: 93.

those who assisted him”.⁹⁰⁰ It is clear though, that at this meeting, Solomon was “not aggressively alcoholic”, which might suggest that he was more reasonable when he was sober.

Solomon’s use of Christian terminology in this letter might be indicative of an interest in, or possible conversion to Catholicism towards the latter part of the artist’s life. In Everard Meynell’s *Life of Francis Thompson*, published in 1913, Meynell, who knew both Solomon and the poet Thompson, alludes to the idea that both men may have found “inspiration” before “the altars of the Carmelite Church in Kensington”.⁹⁰¹ William Gaunt described Thompson in *The Aesthetic Adventure* (1945) as a “worn, wild, neglected looking man with a straggling beard”, who, by the time Solomon met him on the streets, was consumptive and an opium addict.⁹⁰² It is unclear, however, whether Solomon, like Thompson, became a Catholic convert, and because all the records relating to the Carmelite Church in Kensington were destroyed with the building during the Second World War, it is now impossible to find any documentary evidence to verify this claim.⁹⁰³ However, anecdotal tales of Solomon’s conversion do exist, and in D. G. Williamson’s biography of Marks, published in 1919, Williamson suggests that Marks remembered a “solemn lecture” that Solomon had given him on the subject, which was “interspersed with stories from the Talmud”, and Solomon’s insistence that “his friends” ought “to become Catholics at once”.⁹⁰⁴ Williamson also suggested that Solomon’s “love of ritual and colour and his strange interest in allegory” attracted the artist to the Catholic church, and it is clear that many of Solomon’s later works, in particular, recall the iconography of the Christian church. An image, such as the undated *S. Aloysius de Gonzaga* (Fig. 270), which features a head in profile of the venerated saint holding a small crucified Christ are undoubtedly Catholic, and images of Christ on the cross, such as Solomon’s *The Crucifixion* (c1894)

⁹⁰⁰ Ross, *Academy*, 23 December 1905b: 1337.

⁹⁰¹ Meynell, 1913: 323.

⁹⁰² Gaunt, 1945: 128.

⁹⁰³ Thanks go to Colin Cruise for providing me with this information.

⁹⁰⁴ Williamson, 1919: 162.

(Fig. 156) are also commonly used in Catholic iconography. Rebecca J. Lester suggests that graphic representations of suffering in the Crucifixion scene, central to Catholic theology, are pervasive in Carmelite iconography. Solomon's many depictions of the head of Christ may also be suggestive of Solomon's time spent with the Carmelite nuns in Kensington.⁹⁰⁵

Imagery that is distinctively Carmelite appears in the undated *Glastonbury* (Fig. 232), which shows a nun wearing the scapular of the Carmelite Order. The brown scapular (or habit, consisting of brown cloth, draped over the shoulders, that hangs down the front and back) is peculiar to the Order, and was given by the Virgin Mary to Saint Simon Stock in 1251, and was worn by the Carmelites as an expression of trust in Mary's motherly protection.⁹⁰⁶ Other Carmelite imagery, which may also appear in Solomon's work, includes references to mountains and stars, and may appear in work such as *The Moon and Sleep* (1894) (Fig. 151), This imagery is suggestive of Mount Carmel in Palestine, where the order originated.⁹⁰⁷

Reynolds suggests that the poet and Catholic convert Alice Meynell, whose son Everard published the Thompson biography, befriended both Solomon and Thompson and it was through her encouragement that Solomon became a visitor to the Carmelite Church in Kensington, where the artist found "shelter and rest".⁹⁰⁸ However, as already suggested, it is unclear whether Solomon converted to the Catholic faith, but regardless it is clear that his family buried him as a Jew.

Despite Solomon's struggle with drink, he produced at least thirteen works in 1889, and of these I have obtained nine images (figs. 96-104); and at the Whitechapel Fine Art's Exhibition in 1889, two of Solomon's works were shown titled *Perseus* and *Music at*

⁹⁰⁵ Lester, 2005.

⁹⁰⁶ Carroll, 1989: 115. The colours brown and cream are used in Carmelite imagery.

⁹⁰⁷ Thanks go to Johan Bergström-Allen of the Carmelite Friary in York, for information on Carmelite iconography and suggestions of possible connections between Solomon's work and the Carmelites.

⁹⁰⁸ Reynolds, 1985: 90.

Dawn, although the date of these works is unclear.⁹⁰⁹ Again, most of the extant works for 1889 appear to have been made using coloured chalks on paper, but two were executed in watercolours. The first work, titled *A Chinaman*, was sold at auction in 1982 and the second titled *Head of a Girl* (Fig. 98) is now in a private collection.⁹¹⁰ As already suggested, *Twilight, Pity and Death* (Fig. 103), was owned by Crofton, although apart from one other work, titled *The Evening Star*, it is unclear who the original owners of the works were. *The Evening Star* was lent to the Baillie Gallery Exhibition by Dr. Bertram Abrahams. Abrahams was the husband of Jane Simmons, who was daughter of Solomon's first cousin Rachel Salaman. Seymour reveals that Solomon called Jane "Hypatia" in a letter to Horne in 1893, and it is clear that during that year the artist was staying with the Simmons family.⁹¹¹ In addition to the work lent by Abrahams, who also lent an undated work, *Young Pan*, Rachel lent an oil painting titled *Diana and Endymion* (now known as *The Moon and Sleep*) (1894) (Fig. 151) to the Baillie exhibition, although the catalogue does not indicate who lent the work.⁹¹² Rachel also owned another oil painting executed by Solomon in 1894 titled *Hero at Abydos* (Fig. 153), and an undated watercolour titled *Profile Study of a Woman's Head* (Fig. 260). Seymour suggests that Rachel "regularly bought" Solomon's "work for small sums", during "the last two decades of [his] life".⁹¹³ However, Seymour quotes directly from *The Tate Gallery Biennial Report* that "5 shillings seemed to be the standard price" that Rachel paid, but confusingly the date of this report is 1872-73, and it is unclear what relevance this has to the last two decades of Solomon's life.⁹¹⁴

⁹⁰⁹ Graves, 1905-1906: 2180.

⁹¹⁰ See Appendix II for details.

⁹¹¹ Seymour, 1986: 221.

⁹¹² Information taken from the Geffrye Museum Catalogue. See Lambourne and Seymour, 1985: 80. *The Moon and Sleep* (1894) is now part of the Tate collection; the Tate suggest that the painting was presented to them by Rachel Simmons' granddaughter, (and the Abrahams' daughter) Margery Abrahams in 1873. See www.tate.org.uk (accessed 3 May 2008).

⁹¹³ Seymour, 1986: 220.

⁹¹⁴ Seymour, 1986: 220, n475.

On the 27th June 1890, Solomon was again admitted to St Giles' workhouse, "destitute", and suffering from "rheumatism".⁹¹⁵ He was discharged fifteen days later on the 12th June. Unfortunately, there is no other information about Solomon's whereabouts in this year, although it is clear that he stayed out of the workhouse for another six months, and completed at least twelve works. Interestingly, three of these works are oil paintings. They are titled *Tannhäuser* (Fig. 106), after the minstrel-knight in German legend, *Night* (Fig. 115), and *Love, Joy, Peace, Longsuffering, Gentleness, Goodness, Faith, Meekness, Temperance* (Fig. 114). The latter is an unusually sized painting for Solomon because it is long and thin: approximately 460mm long and 170mm in height, unlike his generally smaller squarer works for this period. It is unclear for whom this painting might have been commissioned, but it was sold at Sotheby's in 1973, reaching a hammer price of £150, and sold again in 2006 for £21,600.⁹¹⁶ Three other works are watercolours and are titled *A Rabbi* (Fig. 108), *Profile Head* (Fig. 109), and *Creation* (Fig. 116), and another five works are coloured chalk or pencil drawings (Figs. 105, 110-113).⁹¹⁷

The fact that Solomon was able to execute six paintings in this year might suggest a period of sobriety and stability. However, as already suggested by the 20th January 1891, Solomon was once again admitted to St Giles' workhouse. Similarly to the previous visit, the *Examinations* document recorded that Solomon was "destitute" and suffering from "rheumatism".⁹¹⁸ On this occasion, he was detained for just under four weeks, and was discharged on the 18th February. This longer stay might suggest that Solomon was in a worse physical condition than in 1890. Unfortunately, as with the previous year, there is little extant information about Solomon's whereabouts for 1891, although the 1891 England census, taken on the 5th April, recorded that a man with nearly all of the same

⁹¹⁵ Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41.

⁹¹⁶ *Sotheby's Auction Catalogue - 1973*, (1973): Lot 338. *Sotheby's Auction Catalogue - Victorian and Edwardian Art - 27 June 2006*, (2006a): 22-23.

⁹¹⁷ Another chalk drawing titled *Head of Hypnos or Dawn*, now at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, is dated 189? by the museum, and cannot, therefore, be accurately placed in the chronology.

⁹¹⁸ Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41.

details as Solomon, was living as a boarder in a lodging house at 6 Betterton Street, which linked Drury Lane and Endell Street, and ran parallel to Short's Gardens and the site of Saint Giles' Workhouse.⁹¹⁹ The census recorded that a single man with Solomon's name, born in "London City" and aged forty-nine, was living with another seventy-seven male 'boarders'.⁹²⁰

There are, however, some discrepancies in the record. Solomon would have been fifty years old on the night of the census and, in addition, the occupation of this boarder is recorded as "drug man".⁹²¹ It is clear that the three England censuses in which Solomon's occupation is recorded, consistently describe him as artist or painter, and there is no evidence to suggest that Solomon had any other occupation.⁹²² As suggested earlier, census enumerators invariably transcribed census information incorrectly, and there are many instances of inaccurate details appearing on the nineteenth-century census records, including dates of birth and occupations.⁹²³ It seems possible that despite the discrepancy in occupation, the other details on the census form point to this person being Solomon. In addition, the location of 6 Betterton Street, close to the St Giles' workhouse, and its description as a lodging house, corresponds with the location and type of accommodation that Solomon had been using for over ten years. It also seems likely that Booth's record of Betterton Street as 'dark blue' or "very poor, casual, chronic want" appears appropriate for the only kind of accommodation that Solomon would be likely to get after leaving the workhouse approximately six weeks earlier.⁹²⁴

From examination of the census records, extant correspondence and the records of the St Giles' Board of Guardians, it is clear that Solomon continued to return to the St

⁹¹⁹ 1891 England Census - Simeon Solomon, The National Archives, RG12/210.

⁹²⁰ The exact location of Solomon's birth was 3 Sandy's Street, Bishopsgate Without, City of London.

⁹²¹ The OED describes a "drug man" as a "maker of seller of medicinal drugs". Anon, 'Oxford English Dictionary', www.dictionary.oed.com, (accessed 1 Sept 2009).

⁹²² In the 1861 census Solomon is described as a painter/artist; the 1871 census describes him as a painter, and the 1901 census describes his occupation as artist scenic. 1861 England Census - Solomon Family, National Archives, RG9/183, 1871 England Census - Solomon Family, National Archives, RG10/371, 1901 England Census: Person in Institution Details, National Archives, London, RG13/238/125/4/18

⁹²³ See www.familyhistory.uk.com (accessed 13 June, 2007).

⁹²⁴ Booth, 1889.

Giles area throughout the rest of his life. According to Falk and Ross, Solomon “preferred to be a vagabond and consort with the ne’er-do-wells of London”,⁹²⁵ and “enjoyed in his own particular way” the “main sewer”, rejecting “fiercely all attempts at rescue and reform”.⁹²⁶ It is unclear why Solomon stayed in this area, but it may be that Falk and Ross were not far from the truth. Seymour suggests that Solomon joked that he preferred the St Giles’ workhouse because it was “so central”, but an historical contextualisation of the area provides additional clues to its hold on Solomon and his bohemian lifestyle.⁹²⁷

From accounts of St Giles’ in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the area historically held a fascination which both attracted and repulsed. Both St Giles’, and its neighbour, the Seven Dials area, were renowned for their overcrowding, poverty and deplorable conditions.

In 1837, Charles Dickens wrote a vivid description of the Seven Dials area, in *Bell’s Life in London*.⁹²⁸ He deliberated over the complicated “maze of streets, courts, lanes and alleys” which provided a “mixture of Englishmen and Irishmen” accommodated in “dirty, straggling houses”.⁹²⁹ In 1861, he revisited the St Giles’ area in a short story titled ‘On Duty with Inspector Field’, and described “tumbling houses” amidst a “compound of sickening smells”, and “heaps of filth” with their “vile contents, animate, and inanimate, slimily overflowing into the black road”.⁹³⁰ In addition, the novelist’s early fascination with the area is recorded in John Forster’s 1872 *Life of Charles Dickens*.⁹³¹ Forster noted that, as a young boy, Dickens had a “profound attraction of repulsion” to St Giles’ and frequently persuaded a guardian to walk him through the Seven Dials area. Dickens later recalled to Forster “what wild visions of prodigies of wickedness, want, and

⁹²⁵ Falk, 1937: 16.

⁹²⁶ Ross, *The Westminster Gazette*, 24 August 1905a: 1-2.

⁹²⁷ Seymour, 1986: 222. This account was given to Seymour by Raphael Salaman, grandson of Myer Salaman.

⁹²⁸ *Bell’s Life in London*, 27 Sept 1837 (‘Scenes and characters No. 15’). Re-printed in Slater, 1994, 70-75.

⁹²⁹ Slater, 1994: 70-73.

⁹³⁰ Dickens, 1868: 176.

⁹³¹ Forster, 1872: 19.

beggary arose in my mind out of that place!”⁹³² Dickens employed his early childhood memories of this area later in his fiction. F. S. Schwarzbach suggests that the ‘attraction of repulsion’ to St Giles’ that Dickens experienced was a culmination of the suffering he had endured as a child and the suffering of others he witnessed in these areas of poverty, both of which contained elements that were genuinely attractive to the writer.⁹³³

Writing in 1850, Thomas Beames described the area of St Giles’ as providing “the lowest conditions under which human life is possible”.⁹³⁴ Dyott Street, which was indicated as Solomon’s “place of abode”⁹³⁵ at the time of his admission to the St Giles’ Workhouse in 1884, was described by Beames as part of the “famous Rookery” of St Giles’.⁹³⁶ This Rookery was occupied by the Irish poor from the mid-eighteenth century, and was again recorded as “remarkable” for its “poverty and vice”.⁹³⁷

In addition, Mayhew’s sociological survey, *London Labour and the London Poor*, (- 1862) contained a section on ‘A Visit to the Rookery of St Giles’ and its Neighbourhood’.⁹³⁸ In the “company of a police officer” and “Mr Hunt, inspector of police and of the lodging houses” of St Giles’, Mayhew, visited the area and the neighbouring streets of Seven Dials.⁹³⁹ Hunt provided Mayhew with a brief description of the Rookery, as it had been twenty years previously, and recalled an “endless intricacy” of courts and yards crossing each other, occupied by numerous lodging houses in which prostitutes, thieves and cadgers thrived.⁹⁴⁰ However, since some of these streets had been demolished

⁹³² Forster, 1872: 19.

⁹³³ Schwarzbach, 1979: 25. Dickens’ fascination for the St Giles’ and central areas of London was lifelong. As a young man, he enjoyed the close proximity of working close to the St Giles’ and Seven Dials areas, at Covent Garden. According to Schwarzbach, all of the places that Dickens could walk on foot in a few minutes from his place of work, including St Giles’, figure in the writer’s important literary works.

⁹³⁴ Beames, 1970: 19.

⁹³⁵ Parish of St Giles-in-the-Fields & St George, Bloomsbury *Workhouse Examinations*: Folio No 65320, London Metropolitan Archive, HOBG/502/41.

⁹³⁶ Beames, 1970: 22. The word ‘Rookery’ is a term first coined in the late eighteenth century meaning a “cluster of mean tenements densely populated by people of the lowest class”. ‘Oxford English Dictionary’, www.dictionary.oed.com.

⁹³⁷ Beames, 1970: 22.

⁹³⁸ Mayhew, 1862.

⁹³⁹ Mayhew, 1862 294-95.

⁹⁴⁰ Mayhew, 1862 299-301. A ‘cadger’ according to Hunt was a “beggar by profession” who “preferred a life of mendicancy to any other”. Those given the title ‘cadger’ were described as any “impostor” posing as a

to make way for New Oxford Street between 1842 and 1847, Hunt suggested that the area was now “considerably changed” and the inhabitants were “rapidly rising in decency”.⁹⁴¹ Despite this, Mayhew still witnessed many scenes of extreme poverty including brothels, low lodging houses and prostitutes who “prowl about at night” looking for “drunken men to plunder”.⁹⁴²

By the 1890s, it would seem that the artistic middle-class bohemians and decadents of this era were acquainted with, and attracted to, the St Giles’ area, because in 1897 the caricaturist and writer Max Beerbohm chose to site his satirical decadent character, Enoch Soames at Solomon’s former residence at Dyott Street, suggesting that Soames lived “near the Museum” and had “rooms at Dyott Street”.⁹⁴³ In addition, in the late 1890s, the decadent poet and Rhymers’ Club member, Ernest Dowson, in the company of author Robert Thurston Hopkins, played a regular game of “Blind Chivvy” through the “by-ways, alleys and courts” of central London.⁹⁴⁴ Hopkins described this game with Dowson, in his essay ‘A London Phantom’.⁹⁴⁵ The two men “sometimes rove forlornly about the foggy London streets, initiated bohemians, tasting each other’s enthusiasms, sharing money and confessions”.⁹⁴⁶ The route that they took from the ‘Bun House’ at 417 The Strand, to Dowson’s lodgings at 152 Euston Street, would have taken them straight through the St Giles’ area, passing through Solomon’s former residence at Dyott Street.⁹⁴⁷ Hopkins described these streets as the “slinking alleys and byways which then were not well known to the average London man”.⁹⁴⁸ There is perhaps a sense of excitement in Hopkins’ telling

sailor, cripple or member of the “poor Irish” who was given to begging while also carrying around “five to thirty sovereigns” around their neck. (301).

⁹⁴¹ Mayhew, 1862: 301.

⁹⁴² Mayhew, 1862: 301.

⁹⁴³ Beerbohm, 1919: 14.

⁹⁴⁴ Flower and Maas, 1967: 440.

⁹⁴⁵ Flower and Maas, 1967: 440-443. The essay is published as ‘Appendix D’, in *The Letters of Ernest Dowson*.

⁹⁴⁶ Flower and Maas, 1967: 440.

⁹⁴⁷ The ‘Bun Shop’ was a Yates’s Wine Lodge, frequented, according to Thurston by Dowson. It opened in the 1890s and was also known as the ‘Tram Shed’.

⁹⁴⁸ Flower and Maas, 1967: 440. In 1935 Thurston Hopkins published *Life and Death at the Old Bailey*, which included a chapter on the Whitechapel Murders entitled ‘Shadowing the Shadow of a Murderer’. Remarkably, in this chapter Hopkins proposed Ernest Dowson as a Jack the Ripper suspect, giving him the

of this tale as the story culminates in the two men being dramatically chased through the streets by a “derelict hawker with a Gladstone bag” who aroused an “essence of terror and repulsion” in them.⁹⁴⁹

Along with Dowson, Johnson was a member of the Rhymers’ Club, which had been established around 1890, at the time when Horne, Johnson, artist Selwyn Image, publisher Arthur Mackmurdo and others were sharing a house at 20 Fitzroy Street.⁹⁵⁰ Founder members such as Yeats and poet Ernest Rhys met originally at the ‘Cheshire Cheese’ in Fleet Street to read poetry, and Yeats recalled Johnson’s uninterrupted veneration of Solomon, when he described “some religious picture” by the artist being hung next to a “portrait of Cardinal Newman” in Johnson’s rooms.⁹⁵¹ In addition, writing in November 1891 to William Symington McCormick, John Davidson wrote that he had gone to a Rhymers’ meeting the Friday before at Johnson’s rooms at Fitzroy Street, which was “walled with books and overpowering pictures” by Solomon.⁹⁵² It is also clear that Solomon himself was associating with the Rhymers’, because Yeats described how “one might meet” the “ragged figure” of Solomon “as of some fallen dynasty” in the rooms of one of the Rhymers’.⁹⁵³ Johnson’s admiration of Solomon’s work, then, persisted after his student days at Oxford, but this attraction might have extended, perhaps, to Solomon’s perceived lifestyle and the area that he lived in. To the Rhymers, Solomon might have been seen as the true bohemian; an artist who had appeared to cast aside all attempts at ‘respectability’, and was knowingly living in poverty in the area of St Giles’ that so attracted Dowson.

pseudonym Mr Moring, but using the same description of Dowson taken almost directly from *The London Phantom*.

⁹⁴⁹ Flower and Maas, 1967: 442-443.

⁹⁵⁰ Alford, 1996: 6.

⁹⁵¹ Yeats, 1955: 168.

⁹⁵² Sloan, 1995: 175.

⁹⁵³ Yeats, 1955: 305. In 1917, Yeats remembered reading “a prose allegory” of Solomon’s “some thirty years ago”, and recalled the line “a hollow image of fulfilled desire”, and suggested that the ‘hollow image’ was representative of “happy art”, (the actual line is “a hollow image of unappeased desire”). Yeats, 1955: iv. Harold Bloom suggested that Yeats was suggesting that tragic art was happy, yet expressed “also the ‘poverty’” or “imaginative need” of its creator. See Bloom, 1970: 181.

In 1891, Solomon's earlier painting *Bacchus* (1867) was shown at the Whitechapel Fine Arts Exhibition, and on the 2nd October the *Birmingham Daily Post* reported that two of Solomon's works, *The Painter's Pleasaunce* (1861) and *Dawn* (1871), had been exhibited at the Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery's "important exhibition of pictures".⁹⁵⁴ The newspaper suggested that Solomon was "an artist whose work" was "comparatively unfamiliar even to art lovers in the provinces" and that he had "disappeared from exhibitions very much for the last twenty years". The *Manchester Guardian* also commented on Solomon's inclusion in the exhibition, albeit as a "lesser satellite" of the "Pre-Raphaelite school".⁹⁵⁵ On the 13th November, for the first time since 1876, the *Jewish Chronicle* mentioned Solomon's name in an article titled 'Jews and Art'.⁹⁵⁶ Unlike the *Guardian*, the *Chronicle's* reporter, S. M. Samuels, elevated Solomon's status to "one of the founders of the Pre-Raphaelite brotherhood", but only seemed to be aware of the artist's later work, which he disliked, suggesting that Solomon "never achieved anything greater than sketches and drawings of an unimportant character". The article also included a large positive reference to Abraham, but did not mention Rebecca, which is unsurprising given that Abraham died many years before Solomon's arrest, and, unlike Rebecca, Abraham's memory had not become tainted with his younger brother's 'scandal'.

As well as appearing in the Birmingham exhibition in 1891, Solomon's painting *Bacchus* (1867) was used as the frontispiece to Horne's and Mackmurdo's publication *The Hobby Horse*.⁹⁵⁷ Fletcher describes how the publication was conceived after the creation of the Century Guild Circle, which was founded in 1882 under the influence of William Morris by Horne, Mackmurdo, and Image as an associate.⁹⁵⁸ It ran from 1884 until 1892 as *The Century Guild Hobby Horse*, and under Horne's influence the Guild attempted to

⁹⁵⁴ Graves, 1905-1906: 2180. Anon, *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 October 1891: 4.

⁹⁵⁵ Anon, *The Manchester Guardian*, 14 October 1891: 8.

⁹⁵⁶ Samuel, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 13 November 1891: 33.

⁹⁵⁷ Horne, *The Century Guild Hobby Horse*, July 1891: frontispiece.

⁹⁵⁸ Fletcher, 1982: xxxiii.

“seek to emphasise the Unity of Art” by “dignifying Art in all its forms”.⁹⁵⁹ It was an expensive volume, elaborately decorated, and printed on Italian paper. The writer Edgar Jepson, who was a regular visitor to Rhymers’ meetings, described the *Hobby Horse* as “the link between the Pre-Raphaelites and the poets of the ‘nineties’”, and it seems fitting then that Solomon’s work was represented.⁹⁶⁰ In 1893, another of Solomon’s works titled *Corruptio Optimi Pessima* (1893) (Fig.143) was published in the *Hobby Horse*.⁹⁶¹ In 1907, Lawrence Binyon suggested that Horne had donated a Solomon pen and ink drawing titled *Two Loves in a Field of Flowers Flying to Embrace Each Other* (date unknown) to the British Museum in 1896, which, Binyon claimed, was used as a tailpiece in an issue of the *Hobby Horse*.⁹⁶² However, it is unclear what has happened to this work, because the museum only has a woodcut of *Corruptio Optimi Pessima*, presented by Horne in 1896, currently in its collection.

Solomon executed at least six works during 1891, and one of these was owned by Horne.⁹⁶³ It is titled *Love at the Waters of Oblivion* (Fig. 120), and is a red chalk drawing on paper. Another red chalk drawing is titled *The Village Wit* (Fig. 119), and one other work *Solis Osculum Daphnia Mors Felix* (Fig. 117) was also made using chalks. Solomon also produced an oil painting titled *Head of Christ* (Fig. 118), and there is a record of a watercolour sold at auction in 1988 titled *Head of Saint Michael*.⁹⁶⁴ In addition, another work for this year has just come to light titled *Portrait of an Angel* (Fig. 121) but it is unclear what medium was used.

There is little information about Solomon’s whereabouts for the next few years; but after he was discharged from the workhouse on the 18th February 1891, he did not return until July 1897. As already suggested, Seymour noted that Solomon was living with his

⁹⁵⁹ Tschudi-Madsen, 2002: 146.

⁹⁶⁰ Quoted in Alford, 1996: 7. See Jepson, 1933.

⁹⁶¹ Horne, *The Century Guild Hobby Horse*, 1893: 51.

⁹⁶² Binyon, 1933: 113.

⁹⁶³ Seymour suggests that Solomon created “at least forty-five drawings for Horne between September 1888 and December 1893. Seymour, 1986: 220.

⁹⁶⁴ See Appendix II for details.

cousins, the Simmons, at 41 Gordon Square on the 13th February 1893, although it is unclear how long he stayed at this address.⁹⁶⁵ Ross also met with Solomon in 1893, and, as indicated in chapter five, found him “extremely cheerful and not aggressively alcoholic”, and full of “delightful and racy stories about poets and painters, policemen and prisons.”⁹⁶⁶ It seems possible that the artist’s life may have been relatively stable during this period, and this is perhaps reflected in the enormous amount of work he produced between 1892 and the end of 1896. There are records of at least one hundred and seventeen works produced during this period, his most prolific since 1873.

In contrast to the relatively few extant works for 1891, I have discovered records of at least fifteen produced in 1892. Of these I have obtained eleven images (Figs. 122 - 133), two of which are a matching pair of paintings in oil: *Cherub with Roses* (Fig. 127) and *Cherub with Fruit* (Fig. 128), although they were both sold at Sotheby’s in 1992 as *Night and Day*.⁹⁶⁷ Ten of the fifteen works were made using red chalk and of these, one, titled *My Love is a Rose among Thorns*, was exhibited at the Baillie Gallery Exhibition and owned by Mrs Birnstingl.⁹⁶⁸ The other works in red chalk are *Eros, the God of Love* (Fig. 122), *Quia Multum Amavit* (Fig. 124), *Winged and Poppied Seed* (Fig. 125), *Hypnos the God of Sleep* (Fig. 126), *Christ and St John* (Fig. 129), *Night and her Child Sleep* (Fig. 130), *A Venetian Study* (Fig. 131), *Head of a Girl* (Fig. 132), and *Night Bidding the Dream to Descend to Earth* (Fig. 133). In addition, two works were produced in watercolour, titled

⁹⁶⁵ Seymour, 1986: 221, n482.

⁹⁶⁶ Ross, *Academy*, 23 December 1905b: 1337. On the 15th April 1893, the *Saturday Review* noted that a “charming little work” of Solomon’s titled *Dante and Beatrice* (c1859-63) that was “exquisitely finished”, and owned by Ross. Ross lent this work to the Whitechapel Art Gallery’s ‘Exhibition of Jewish Art and Antiquities’ in 1906 along with Solomon’s *Christ Blessing Little Children*, *The Finding of Moses* (sketch), *Ezekiel and the Angel* (sketch) (1861), and *Abraham and Isaac* (c1862). *Saturday Review* article quoted in Koch, 1900: 405. Anon, *Exhibition of Jewish Art and Antiquities: Whitechapel Art Gallery* (1906): *Dante and Beatrice* was bequeathed to the Tate by Ross in 1919, and *Ezekiel and the Angel* is now at the British Museum.

In 1913, Ross sent Gosse some “curious and interesting drawings” by Solomon, which Gosse was “glad” to receive, but worried about depriving Ross of “anything so precious”. Gosse suggested that these drawings were from 1856 or 1857 and probably part of Solomon’s “sketching-club period”. However, it is unclear which works they were. See Ross, 1952: 256-57.

⁹⁶⁷ *Sotheby's Auction Catalogue - 14 March 1992*, (1992): These painting may also have been sold at Lawrences Auctioneers Ltd in 1986 as *Cupids in River Landscapes* (1892). See *Lawrences Auctioneers Ltd Catalogue - 30 Oct 1986*, (1986): Lot 113.

⁹⁶⁸ Baillie, 1905a. The work was sold by auction in 1980, see Appendix II.

Christ and Youth (Fig. 123), and *The Shadow of the Cross*, the latter of which was sold at Sotheby's in 1980.⁹⁶⁹

It is also clear that, from 1892, Solomon's work was being sold in Oxford Street. The *Glasgow Herald's* London Correspondent reported that "admirers of the school of Doré and Rossetti" now had the chance to purchase "some remarkable drawings" of Solomon's in a "shop window" in that location.⁹⁷⁰ The correspondent also indicated that these drawings were made in red chalk, and it is possible that some of these may have been the works described above. It seems likely that Solomon used chalk because it was cheap and produced swift and effective drawings that could be sold quickly, although it is unclear why all the drawings were in red, whether a product of aesthetic choice, fortuitousness or necessity. The reporter suggested that the drawings were "original", but implied that Solomon had intended to use all of them as compositions for oil paintings, but that only "one or two" had been used in that way.⁹⁷¹ This seems unlikely since Solomon could not have afforded a large amount of oil paint, and because the chalk drawings, although not as profitable individually as oil paintings, probably made money on a more regular basis, which would have been essential for Solomon, who clearly lived hand to mouth for long periods at this time in his life. More likely seems the idea that the shop made the claim as a way of promoting the work, particularly since academic artist's sketches and drawings were increasingly in vogue in this period. The article also suggested that "attention" would be "arrested" by *Love Dying of the Breath of Hate*, which was described as having a "power" and a "beauty of expression". In addition, it was explained that despite none of the drawings being framed, they had not been "valued commensurately with the talent and rare power" which they displayed "in conception and execution".⁹⁷²

⁹⁶⁹ See Appendix II for details.

⁹⁷⁰ Anon, *Glasgow Herald*, 25 August 1892: 5.

⁹⁷¹ Anon, *Glasgow Herald*, 25 August 1892: 5.

⁹⁷² Anon, *Glasgow Herald*, 25 August 1892: 5. I have been unable to identify this drawing; however the subject matter seems very similar to *Love and Hate* (undated) (Fig. 253).

In 1911, Luella M. Wilson, writing for the American periodical *Fine Arts Journal*, described a trip to London in 1905, in which she “strayed by chance into the little art shop of Mr Thomas, on Oxford Street”, and found “a room filled” with a “hundred or more” of Solomon’s “chalk drawings”.⁹⁷³ It seems possible that this shop was the same one referred to in the *Glasgow Herald* article, because Ford also acknowledged a Mr Thomas of 14 New Oxford Street, in 1908, for allowing her to reproduce some of Solomon’s work.⁹⁷⁴ Wilson seems to suggest that Solomon’s professional relationship with Thomas lasted until the artist’s death in August 1905, because Thomas suggested that “a few days before” Solomon “was found dying on the street”, he “brought his last drawing to Mr Thomas” which Wilson subsequently titled *Retrospection* (1905) (Fig. 227). It is unclear whether this drawing was Solomon’s last work, but the story appears to suggest that Solomon was taking work to Thomas for him to sell until the artist’s death. Wilson’s visit to the shop in 1905 appears to suggest that Thomas continued to sell Solomon’s work posthumously, and the information provided by Ford seems to reveal that Thomas took over the “copyright” of the work that was still in his possession.⁹⁷⁵ It is also interesting to note that Thomas related a story to Wilson about Solomon’s ‘scandal’. He suggested to her that, at the age of “thirty-five”, Solomon “became engaged to a very beautiful and charming young lady” but, “for some unknown reason which even his closest friends never knew”, Solomon broke the engagement, and “from this time his course” went “steadily downward”.⁹⁷⁶ This is the only reference that I can find to this story, and I would suggest that it might have been invented by Thomas, perhaps for Wilson’s sake.

Wilson’s interest in Solomon began, perhaps, in her native America. Hollyer’s export of reproductions of Solomon’s work to America appears to have begun at the beginning of the 1890s and the photographer was known to American art critics. Indeed, at

⁹⁷³ Wilson, *Fine Arts Journal*, September 1911: 163.

⁹⁷⁴ Ford, 1908a: acknowledgements page.

⁹⁷⁵ See above.

⁹⁷⁶ Wilson, *Fine Arts Journal*, September 1911: 165.

the end of 1892, the American art critic Sidney Trefusis Whiteford published the first part of a two-part article on Solomon in the American periodical *The Art Amateur* published in New York.⁹⁷⁷ This was the first full-length article on Solomon to appear since the artist's arrest, and was titled 'A Half-Forgotten Genius'. In the article, Whiteford thanked Hollyer for refreshing the writer's "recollections of much of the artist's work", and revealed that he had in his possession a "beautiful head in watercolours".⁹⁷⁸ In the second part of the article, published in January 1893, Whiteford recalled a visit to Solomon's studio in Gower Street where the writer witnessed Solomon complete a red chalk drawing of the artist's early friend, the Academician William Blake Richmond.⁹⁷⁹ The article also reprinted Solomon's eight illustrations for *The Song of Songs*, which, as suggested in chapter three, was published in 1878.

In April 1895, the *Art Amateur* reproduced another Hollyer photograph of a Solomon drawing titled *Night and her Child Sleep* (known as *Night and Sleep*) (1872), and, in September 1899, a Hollyer reproduction of *Lead Pencil Drawing* (c1890s) (Fig. 214).⁹⁸⁰ Hollyer had been advertising the sale of a catalogue of his "Reproductions" in the *Art Amateur* since 1896, which could be obtained in the United States via his American agents "Willis and Clements" of 1624 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.⁹⁸¹ By 1897, this company had become "The London Art Publishers", although they continued to trade from the same address, and to sell Hollyer's reproductions of Solomon's work, alongside that of Watts, Burne-Jones and Rossetti to an American audience. Indeed, Hollyer's reproductions of these artist's works appear at regular intervals in the *Art Amateur* between the mid-1880s and 1900.⁹⁸² In addition, in 1895, the *New Haven Register* had revealed that Cutler's Art Store in the town was selling "beautiful platinotype copies" of the "great Pre-Raphaelite

⁹⁷⁷ Whiteford, *The Art Amateur*, December 1892: 7-9 and Whiteford, *The Art Amateur*, January 1893: 46-47.

⁹⁷⁸ Whiteford, *The Art Amateur*, December 1892: 8.

⁹⁷⁹ Whiteford, *The Art Amateur*, January 1893: 46.

⁹⁸⁰ Anon, *The Art Amateur*, Sept 1899: 75.

⁹⁸¹ Anon, *The Art Amateur*, Nov 1896: 106.

⁹⁸² Anon, *The Art Amateur*, June 1897: 147.

painters”.⁹⁸³ The article noted that the “great works” of Burne-Jones, Rossetti, Watts and Solomon would be “intensely interesting to all lovers of true art” and that “Mr Cutler” would “cheerfully” show them to “anyone desiring to see them”. The following year, S. A. Walker, writing for the American journal *The Independent*, was noting an exhibition of Solomon’s work at the McClees Galleries in Philadelphia.⁹⁸⁴ Walker confirmed that “a hundred drawings in black and white and in red chalk (with a few water-colour paintings)” by Solomon were now on show at the gallery, and that these works had come from the “Klackner Galleries” in New York. Unfortunately, the gallery suggested that Solomon’s sketches were “less successful and less serious” than the other Pre-Raphaelites, and described them as a “Burne-Jones without convictions”. However, the gallery confirmed that they “cared most” for titles such as *Sleep at the Antechamber of Death* (1896) (Fig. 194) *Paolo e Francesca da Rimini* (date unknown) (Fig. 231) and amongst the “watercolors” they liked *The Angel of Death* (1895) (Fig. 184).

I would suggest that these original Solomon works were probably exported to America by Hollyer, perhaps with the help of his Philadelphia agents. However, Hollyer’s commercial connection with America during this time was probably originally formed via his contacts through the ‘Linked Ring’ which was created in April 1892 by a small group of distinguished British photographers.⁹⁸⁵ The Linked Ring was an elite brotherhood founded to promote photography as a fine art and was designed as a breakaway movement from the established Royal Photographic Society that favoured science and technology and was resistant to change.⁹⁸⁶ Hollyer was closely connected to both organisations: he was elected to the Linked Ring in June 1892; and made a fellow of the RPS in 1895.⁹⁸⁷ The

⁹⁸³ Anon, *The New Haven Register*, 9 October 1895: 2.

⁹⁸⁴ Walker, *The Independent: Devoted to the Consideration of Politics, Social and Economic Tendencies, History, Literature, and the Arts (New York)*, 29 October 1896: 7.

⁹⁸⁵ Harker, 1979: xi.

⁹⁸⁶ Hannavy, 2008: 220.

⁹⁸⁷ Harker, 1979: 154.

group welcomed foreign involvement and there were ‘Links’, or members, in Paris, Vienna and New York.⁹⁸⁸

It seems possible that as the market for Aestheticism began to come to an end in Britain after the Wilde trials, Hollyer may have been seeking a new market in America for Solomon’s Aesthetic drawings. Jonathan Freedman suggests that the American taste for British Aestheticism may have begun as early as the late 1880s and early 1890s in periodicals designed specifically for female tastes, and initially focused on interior design.⁹⁸⁹ Freedman also suggests that the “gentry intellectuals” of the Boston Arts and Crafts Society specifically guided the efforts of the newly sponsored teaching of Aesthetic arts and design classes, and were behind the trend for Aesthetic home decoration in America. It seems consistent then, that in 1902, the Soule Art Company in Boston were selling fifty-four of Solomon’s prints in their catalogue.⁹⁹⁰ The catalogue described Solomon’s work as “modern” which the company defined as meaning “contemporaneous”, and suggested that they were “prepared to supply all the objects” in the catalogue and “furnish the best print”. New York based writer Ford, who was in contact with Hollyer, also produced a vast list of his reproductions of Solomon’s work at the back of her 1908 American monograph on Solomon.⁹⁹¹ Hollyer is quoted as saying that he had some “very interesting” work of Solomon’s that Ford might find “worthwhile” seeing, and Ford visited the “studio” of an “ardent admirer” of Solomon’s where her “host” introduced her to the artist.⁹⁹²

I would suggest that the ‘host’ is likely to have been Hollyer, because it is clear that Ford was in communication with him, and she also suggested that her first interest in Solomon began when she saw some of his “photographs of Solomon’s paintings and drawings brought from England many years ago” which “aroused” her “immediate

⁹⁸⁸ Harker, 1979: 110.

⁹⁸⁹ Freedman, 1990: 105.

⁹⁹⁰ Anon, *Complete Art Reference Catalogue*, (1902): See Appendix III for full list.

⁹⁹¹ Ford, 1908a: 74-77. The list is titled “photographs after Solomon, partial list”. See Appendix III.

⁹⁹² Ford, 1908a: 21.

interest”.⁹⁹³ Ford also suggested that the ‘host’ had also been a “kind friend” to Solomon and showed her “many of Solomon’s crayons and water-colors that he possessed”. All the illustrations in Ford’s publication are Hollyer reproductions, and, as suggested in chapter three, Ford re-published Solomon’s designs for the *Song of Songs*, which had originally been published by Hollyer in 1878 as *King Solomon and the Fair Shulamite*, in 1908.⁹⁹⁴

Hollyer’s photographic copies of Solomon’s work were, however, reaching American shores eight years before the Linked Ring was established, and, as already mentioned in chapter five, H. B. Merriman, writing for the Massachusetts *Andover Review* in 1884, described how both Solomon’s and Albert Moore’s work were “known” in America “by photographs from their pictures”.⁹⁹⁵ In 1898, another small mention of Solomon was made in the American theological journal the *Biblical World* by John Powell Lenox.⁹⁹⁶ Lenox was a Chicago art collector who, over the years, accumulated thousands of pictures dealing entirely with the life of Christ.⁹⁹⁷ Lenox’s reference to the artist contradicts Whiteford’s suggestion that Solomon was “half-forgotten” at the end of the 1890s, and instead describes Solomon as “an English artist much talked about in London these days, whose sketches and drawings are making him famous”, which suggests that Lenox had little knowledge of Solomon.⁹⁹⁸

⁹⁹³ Ford, 1908a: 17.

⁹⁹⁴ Ford, 1908b. The Hollyer/Solomon images published in Ford’s monograph titled *Simeon Solomon: An Appreciation* are *Nirvana* (1893) (Fig. 137), *Many Waters Cannot Quench Love* (1886) (Fig. 80), *Spiritual Wife of Michaelangel* (c1893) (Fig. 135), *Vision in the Crystal Globe* (1893) (Fig. 140), *Until the Day Break* (1894) (Fig. 147), *My Soul and I* (1894) (Fig. 159), *Dante in Exile* (1895) (Fig. 168), *Will o’ the Wisp* (1895) (Fig. 185), *Death Awakening Sleep* (1896) (Fig. 205), *Night and her Child Sleep* (date unknown) (Fig. 228), *Ignis* (date unknown) (Fig. 229), *Diana* (date unknown) (Fig. 230), *Paulo e Francesca da Rimini* (date unknown) (Fig. 231), *The Angel Gabriel Waiting for the Annunciation* (1897) (Fig. 213), *David and Saul* (1896) (Fig. 202), *One Watching in the Night* (1894) (Fig. 157), *Dante and Beatrice* (1859-63), *Sleep* (1894) (Fig. 166), *Illustration to the Song of Songs (Desire of the Bride)* (1878) (Fig. 28), *The Sleepers and the One that Watcheth* (1870), *Love Bound and Wounded* (1870), *Blooming of the Thorn* (date unknown).

⁹⁹⁵ Merriman, *The Andover Review: a Religious and Theological Monthly* June 1884: 594.

⁹⁹⁶ Lenox, *The Biblical World*, December 1898: 380-99.

⁹⁹⁷ The New York Public Library holds the John Powell Lenox archive and is the best source of additional information. See the online catalogue at www.catnyp.nypl.org/record=b3928911 (accessed 5 October 2008). In 1900, Michigan’s *Bay View Magazine* also repeated Lenox’s statement about Solomon’s fame in London.

⁹⁹⁸ Lenox, *The Biblical World*, December 1898: 395. Whiteford, 1892 & 93. In 1900, Michigan’s *Bay View Magazine* also repeated Lenox’s statement about Solomon’s current fame in London. Anon, *Bay View Magazine*, January 1900: 141.

Lenox described *The Veil of the Temple was Rent in Twain* (date unknown) (Fig. 283) as “characteristic” of Solomon’s work, which perhaps again suggests Lenox’s unfamiliarity with Solomon’s earlier career, and that Lenox only had access to the later Hollyer reproductions. Lenox praised *The Veil of the Temple*’s “charm of conception” and “beautiful simplicity”, adding that, “with few but telling strokes of his pencil the artist has suggested a countenance striking in effect and yet elusive like a face in a dream, leaving in a masterful way the completion of the portrait to the devout fancy of the beholder”.⁹⁹⁹

In the same publication, eight years later, the Reverend Henry E. Jackson, a Presbyterian minister, commended a Hollyer copy of Solomon’s drawing *David and Saul* (1896) (Fig. 202), for its accurate “reading” of the “hearts of David and Saul”, and “the vicarious love of one man for another”.¹⁰⁰⁰ This suggestion could be read as a reaffirmation of the minister’s strict Presbyterian belief in the ‘friendship’ of David and Saul or seen as an acknowledgement of Solomon’s use of David and Saul as models for same-sex desire.¹⁰⁰¹ In addition, Jackson suggests that the “blackness of despair” on Saul’s face and “the light of love” on David’s was “the true spirit of a man’s whole life” and “a window of the soul”, which he is able to “hide and reveal at the same time”, which perhaps suggests Jackson’s own identification with Solomon’s sexuality.¹⁰⁰²

In addition to these American articles, the American writer Charlotte Endymion Porter, published a book of her poetry titled *Lips of Music* in 1910, which she illustrated with two of Solomon’s later works, *Nirvana* (1893) (Fig. 137) and *The Vision of Love in Sleep*.¹⁰⁰³ Porter was from Philadelphia, and with her life-long friend Helen Armstrong Clarke, edited, amongst other things, three editions of Shakespeare and the complete works of both Robert Browning and Elizabeth Barrett-Browning.¹⁰⁰⁴ As already suggested,

⁹⁹⁹ Lenox, *The Biblical World*, December 1898: 396.

¹⁰⁰⁰ Jackson, *The Biblical World*, June 1906: 441.

¹⁰⁰¹ See Seymour, *Journal of Homosexuality*, June/July 1997: 97-119, for a comprehensive study of Solomon’s use of biblical subjects to construct a socially marginal homosexual identity for himself.

¹⁰⁰² Jackson, *The Biblical World*, June 1906: 440.

¹⁰⁰³ Porter, 1910.

¹⁰⁰⁴ Holland, 2002: 136.

Hollyer's American agents were situated in Philadelphia, and selling the photographer's reproductions of Solomon's work, and the McClees Galleries in Philadelphia had also exhibited Solomon's work, and it is therefore likely that Porter came into contact with Solomon's work in the city.

In 1893, Solomon produced at least seventeen works, and of these, as already noted, *Corruptio Optimi Pessima* (Fig. 143) was reproduced in Horne's *Hobby Horse*. The other works are mostly drawings using pencil, chalk or charcoal, including *A Vision of Wounded Love* (Fig. 134), *Night Looking upon her Beloved Child* (Fig. 136), *The Healing Night and Wounded Love* (Fig. 141), *The Rabbi* (Fig. 142), *For the Night Must Pass before the Coming Day* (Fig. 144) and three works sold at auction titled *Angelus Irae Dei*, *L'Amor che Muove il Sole*, and *In the Summer Twilight*.¹⁰⁰⁵ At least two of the works are Hollyer prints titled *Nirvana* (Fig. 137) and *Love Singing to Memory* (Fig. 139), but it is interesting to note that another photographic reproduction, *Jesus before Pilate* (Fig. 145), is attributed to the American Charles C. Pierce.¹⁰⁰⁶ Other Solomon reproductions that have been ascribed to Pierce include *Jesus (Esto Fidelis Usque Ad Mortem Et Tibi Dabo Coronam Vitae)* (1899) (Fig. 216), *Jesus before Pilate* (undated) (Fig. 273), and *Jesus* (undated) (Fig. 274). All of these photographic reprints by Pierce, a Los Angeles photographer, can be found in the University of Southern California's vast collection of Pierce photographs.¹⁰⁰⁷ The Online Archive of California suggests, however, that as well as making his own photographs, Pierce obtained the negatives and prints of other photographers, eradicated the existing signatures and stamped his own name on the images.¹⁰⁰⁸ It is therefore unclear whether the Solomon reproductions were originally produced by Pierce. The only other photographic reprints of Solomon's work appear to

¹⁰⁰⁵ See Appendix II for more information on the works without images.

¹⁰⁰⁶ Another work also exists which resembles *Nirvana*, and is titled *Esoteric Buddhism* (Fig. 138). It is undated and is now in a private collection, but I have ascribed it circa 1893 due to its similarity with the other work. Thanks go to Jane Cowan for allowing me to reproduce this image.

¹⁰⁰⁷ See www.usc.edu (accessed 7 May 2009).

¹⁰⁰⁸ See www.oac.cdlib.org (accessed 3 Aug 2009).

have been made primarily by Hollyer, whose photographs and art prints were being received in America in the mid 1880s and 1890s, and it is possible that Pierce obtained Hollyer's originals in America and made them his own.

In spite of this transatlantic success, however, and staying out of the workhouse for over five years, Solomon's alcoholism still remained problematic. At the time of the 1894 Corporation of London's Art Gallery Exhibition at the Guildhall, for example, A.G. Temple noted that Solomon's "apparel" was in a "very dilapidated condition", which Temple believed indicated Solomon's "straitened circumstances".¹⁰⁰⁹ Temple recalled how Solomon had called to see him after visiting the Guildhall because the artist had heard that two of his paintings, *Love in Autumn* (1866) and *The Sleepers, and the One that Awaketh* (probably *The Sleepers and the One that Watcheth*) (1870), were being shown. Temple also remembered how he was "pleased to be able to give" Solomon "an introduction to a firm of art publishers in the West End". It seems possible that this firm, as mentioned above, was W. A. Mansell & Co of 405, Oxford Street in the West End of London. However, as early as 1891, it seems that Mansell & Co were selling reproductions of Solomon's work on Oxford Street, although Temple does not give a date for Solomon's introduction to the firm.¹⁰¹⁰ An advert in the December 1891 edition of the *Review of Reviews* suggested that Mansell & Co were selling "six facsimile reproductions" of Solomon's drawings for 10s 6d each on Oxford Street.¹⁰¹¹ In addition, Ford suggested that alongside Thomas and Hollyer, W. A. Mansell held the copyright to some of the drawings that she had published in her 1908 monograph.¹⁰¹²

There is little information about Solomon between 1894 and 1896, apart from the small amount of information produced above. However, the artist produced at least eighty-

¹⁰⁰⁹ Temple, 1918: 132.

¹⁰¹⁰ Stead, 1891: advertisement, no page number.

¹⁰¹¹ Stead, 1891: advertisement, no page number.

¹⁰¹² Ford, 1908a: acknowledgements page. Ford heard about from W. M. Rossetti, who wrote to Ford in 1908 suggesting that she contact the firm because they owned a large number of photographs of Solomon's work. Peattie, 1990: 634-65. An advertisement for W. A. Mansell & co in Williamson, 1899: 145, says that the company were "art photographers, publishers and dealers" who took photographs of pictures, sculpture, and views and offered a picture framing service.

five works during that period, and of those, sixty-four extant images appear in Figs. 146-211. The work that Solomon was producing in this period appears to be mostly a mixture of chalk and pencil drawings, some watercolours and three oils. In addition, about twenty-six of these works exist as platinotype copies made by Hollyer, and nearly all of them appear in an album of forty-three Solomon prints produced by Hollyer around 1900.¹⁰¹³ The Baillie Exhibition catalogue records that two of Solomon's 1894 works - *Nirvana* and *Christianity* - were owned by Lady Katharine Somerset.¹⁰¹⁴ According to her divorce decree, Lady Katharine was daughter of the tenth duke of St Albans, William Beauclerk and became Lady Somerset when she married her first husband Henry Somerset.¹⁰¹⁵ Also sent to the Baillie Gallery and dated 1894 was *Passionis Amoris Fructus* owned by journalist and art critic, Everard Meynell, who wrote the first *Dictionary of National Biography* entry on Solomon in 1912.¹⁰¹⁶ Meynell wrote to W. M. Rossetti in 1912 requesting information for the article and, in answer to Meynell's queries, Rossetti answered that he "loathed" Solomon and "all that" related "to his personality".¹⁰¹⁷ In contrast, as Angela Thirlwell suggests, Georgiana Burne-Jones responded to Meynell's enquiries with more sympathy for Solomon, suggesting that she was pleased that Meynell had been chosen to write the article because Meynell knew and cared for Solomon's work which was "surely the right key to a man".¹⁰¹⁸

¹⁰¹³ This album is owned by Peter Nahum at the Leicester Galleries, London. The description of the album suggests that these works are mounted in a card and cloth album, although a couple of the prints are missing. See www.leicestergalleries.com/art-and-antiques/detail/15571 (accessed 5 Jan 2008).

¹⁰¹⁴ Baillie, 1905a.

¹⁰¹⁵ Anon, *The Times*, 20 May 1920: 5.

¹⁰¹⁶ Meynell, 1912.

¹⁰¹⁷ Thirlwell, 2003: 318.

¹⁰¹⁸ Thirlwell, 2003: 318. In 1998 the two letters to Meynell, quoted by Thirlwell, were included in a sale of Meynell's manuscripts and letters by C. R. Johnson, Rare Books, London. Also included in the sale was other research information for the DNB article including a reply by Meynell to Georgiana's letter, and an excerpt of this was included in the bookseller's information. Meynell noted that "from none of my friends can I learn the things I care to learn", but Georgiana's information had been "more valuable" than "everything else set down" about Solomon. Meynell also noted that he had obtained other information about Solomon's "passionate care for goodness"; how the artist had burnt his hand over a lamp "in a fit of repentance"; and how he gave away "his only" coat. Thanks go to Roberto C. Ferrari for informing me of this source. It is available on Ferrari's website www.simeonsolomon.org/meynell.html (accessed 5 Jan 2008).

The watercolours produced in this period include *Study of a Woman*, dated the 22nd December 1894 (Fig. 164), *Sleep* (1894) (Fig. 166), *Head of a Young Man* (1894) (Fig. 163), *Renewal of the Vows on the Scroll of Law* (1895) (Fig. 171), *Summer* (1895) (Fig. 176), *Night Looking Upon her Beloved Child* (1895) (Fig. 178), *Angel Boy* (1895) (Fig. 182), *Head* (1895) (Fig. 187), *The Archangel Gabriel* (1895), *Night* (1896), *Delphike* (1896) (Fig. 188), *L'Angelo della Morte* (1899) (Fig. 196) and *Christ and Peter* (1896) (Fig. 204).¹⁰¹⁹ Two of the three oils, *The Moon and Sleep* (1894) (Fig. 151) and *Hero at Abydos* (1894) (Fig. 153), as already suggested earlier, were owned by Solomon's cousin, Rachel Simmons; the third oil painting is titled *The Annunciation* (1894) (Fig. 152), but it is unclear who owned this work.

A letter to Oscar Browning, written possibly around 1895 or early 1896, reveals that Solomon was living at 113 Gray's Inn Road.¹⁰²⁰ An advert from the *Illustrated Police News* in August of that year records that "C. Dean", a "medical herbalist", was situated there, and according to Booth, this 'pink' area comprised of people who were "fairly comfortable" and of "good ordinary earnings".¹⁰²¹ It is unclear how long Solomon lived at this address, but it may indicate that his financial circumstances at that particular time were fairly good, although not without difficulties. After all, Solomon indicated that it was "so very many years" since Browning had heard from him, but acknowledged nonetheless that Browning might "have heard of" him, which seems to suggest that Solomon was fully aware of the rumours and gossip that had surrounded him. The artist commented that he was writing to Browning to see if he could "or would, afford a little, at the present moment" because he remembered Browning's "great friendliness of long past". However, Solomon suggested that he was aware that he had "not the slightest claim" upon Browning, but indicated that he would be "happy to execute" any work for him, in the "way of heads,

¹⁰¹⁹ For more information on *L'Archangel Gabriel* and *Night* see Appendix II.

¹⁰²⁰ Letter to Oscar Browning from Simeon Solomon, Oscar Browning Collection, King's College Library and Archive, University of Cambridge, MS# 1/1531. My thanks go to Roberto C. Ferrari for his transcript of Solomon's letters to Browning.

¹⁰²¹ Anon, *The Illustrated Police News*, 15 August 1896: 8. Booth, 1889.

subject, &c”, and that “should such be the case”, Solomon would be “grateful” if Browning could “advance” the artist a “small sum for present requirements”. In the last paragraph of the letter, Solomon records that he is aware that he has “had to fight a hard battle” but “from force of circumstances” did “not yet appear to be the victor”; perhaps a reference to his ongoing struggle with alcoholism.

In Browning’s memoirs, published in 1910, he noted that Solomon was aware early that the “temptations of a London life” were “ruining him”.¹⁰²² Although it is unclear whether Browning was referring to Solomon’s homosexuality or his drinking problems, because Browning suggested that at that time Solomon “wished to go to Rome” to escape these temptations, but it is clear that, while the artist was in Rome with Browning on their second trip in 1870, he became interested in a young English man called Willie, and at some point during their stay, Solomon separated from Browning in order that he could spend time with Willie.¹⁰²³

At the end of the letter, Solomon revealed that he still had many “sterling friends” who had “come forward” when he was in “great need”, which tends to contradict Ross’s suggestion that Solomon “rejected fiercely all attempts at rescue and reform”, and in a moment of regret or perhaps because he was in need of a commission, Solomon hoped that Browning would “pardon” what he had “done”.¹⁰²⁴ It seems possible that Browning did, in some way, forgive Solomon, because in another letter written this time to “dear Oscar” on the 19th February 1896, it seems as if Browning had responded positively to Solomon’s previous letter, and that the two men were now on friendlier terms.¹⁰²⁵ However, on this occasion, Solomon suggested that he was “in a little trouble just now” and asked if

¹⁰²² Browning, 1910: 107.

¹⁰²³ Seymour, 1986: 183. Seymour suggests that Solomon did not appear to comprehend that Browning might be aggrieved by this, and this appears to be suggested in Solomon’s correspondence with Browning, at that time, which is quoted by Seymour, in which Solomon described “all the loveable things about” the boy (183).

¹⁰²⁴ Ross, *The Bibelot*, April 1911: 146. Letter to Oscar Browning from Simeon Solomon, Oscar Browning Collection, King's College Library and Archive, University of Cambridge, MS# 1/1531.

¹⁰²⁵ Letter to Oscar Browning from Simeon Solomon, Oscar Browning Collection, King's College Library and Archive, University of Cambridge, MS# 1/1531. This letter also appears in Reynolds, 1985: 91.

Browning could lend him “eight or ten pounds” until he had “finished the picture” that he was painting, and that he would “deem it a great favour”. It is unclear whether Browning responded to this request, or whether the painting that Solomon was in the process of finishing was for Browning or somebody else, but Browning’s memoirs suggest that he had assisted Solomon with money in earlier times when the artist was “in pecuniary difficulties”.¹⁰²⁶ Browning’s memoirs do not reveal the communication that he had with Solomon at this time, and instead, suggest that Browning “lost sight” of Solomon around 1874 and he did not speak with the artist until shortly before Solomon’s death. Browning recalled that while “driving in a hansom through Fleet street”, he saw the artist “on the pavement not much altered”, and “jumped out” of the cab to meet Solomon, upon which there were “exclamations of ‘Oscar’ and ‘Simeon’” as they “embraced each other”.¹⁰²⁷ However, Browning’s description of Solomon as ‘not much altered’ is in contradiction to another of his earlier comments in the memoirs in which he suggests that Solomon’s “life closed in darkness and misery”.¹⁰²⁸

The second letter to Browning records that Solomon had moved west from Gray’s Inn Road out to 359 Edgware Road. Booth’s poverty map shows that this address in Edgware Road was in an area depicted as ‘pink’ or “working class comfort” and the “lower middle class” and some ‘red’ areas described as “middle class” and “well to do”.¹⁰²⁹ The 1891 England census appears to show that the residences at 359 Edgware Road would have been classed in Booth’s ‘pink’ class because their occupations include upholsterer, tailor and sugar confectioner.¹⁰³⁰ This, perhaps, suggests that despite Solomon’s request for financial help from Browning, he was not struggling with the kind of poverty that he had previously experienced.

¹⁰²⁶ Browning, 1910: 107.

¹⁰²⁷ Browning, 1910: 108.

¹⁰²⁸ Browning, 1910: 107.

¹⁰²⁹ Booth, 1889.

¹⁰³⁰ 1891 England Census - 359 Edgware Road, The National Archive, RG12/3.

On the 11th and 13th July, Leighton's collection of "ancient and modern pictures and watercolour drawings" was sold by Christie, Manson and Woods.¹⁰³¹ Lot 269 of the collection was a Solomon drawing titled *The Study of a Female Figure* (date unknown), which was subsequently bought by Poynter for a halfpenny, or approximately twelve pence if converted to today's currency.¹⁰³²

Four months before the Leighton sale, and not long after Solomon's second letter to Browning was written, Solomon's cousin, Myer Salaman, died of pneumonia on the 1st April.¹⁰³³ Despite the gross value of his estate being recorded as £298, 674 4s 11d at the time of his death, and leaving much of this to family and friends, Salaman did not mention Solomon in his will.¹⁰³⁴ Similarly, Ernest Hart, who died a very wealthy man the following January, did not leave Solomon anything in his will.¹⁰³⁵ This might reinforce Seymour's suggestion that Solomon's family "finally concluded that he was hopeless", but this phrase is taken directly from Falk who actually suggested that the family only "temporarily abandoned" Solomon.¹⁰³⁶ However, Falk does not suggest a date for when this may have occurred, although it is clear that by July 1897 Solomon's circumstances had deteriorated sufficiently for him to apply for admission to the workhouse again.

In this chapter I have discussed Solomon's continued artistic output and the various exhibitions which were still showing his work. I have also examined Solomon's relationship with the poet Lionel Johnson, and the Rhymers' fascination with the artist and his 'bohemian' lifestyle in the slums of St Giles. In addition, I have explored Solomon's continued problems with alcoholism; the help that Solomon's extended family were still providing, and the dates of Solomon's admissions to St Giles' workhouse. This chapter has

¹⁰³¹ Anon, *Christie, Manson and Woods Sale Catalogue: Collection of the Late Right Honourable Lord Leighton of Stretton*, (1886):

¹⁰³² The National Archives currency converter available at www.nationalarchives.uk/currency/default0.asp#mid (accessed 1st August, 2009).

¹⁰³³ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 3 April 1896: front page.

¹⁰³⁴ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 19 May 1905: 29.

¹⁰³⁵ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 14 Jan 1898: 12-13.

¹⁰³⁶ Seymour, 1986: 221. Falk, 1937: 313.

also examined Solomon's contributions to Herbert Horne's *Century Guild Hobby Horse*, and the letters that he wrote to both Horne and Oscar Browning, and suggested Hollyer's continued support of Solomon, and the photographers export of Solomon's reproductions to America and their reception there. I have also made mention of Solomon's work being sold on Oxford Street, and the artist's possible interest and attraction to Catholicism by way of the Kensington Carmelites and Francis Thompson.

In chapter seven I will discuss Solomon's life from 1897 until his death in 1905. I also examine Solomon's first documented stay at the notorious 'casual ward' on Macklin Street and describe Solomon's possible experience of this place using contemporary reports. I also discuss the identification of the casual ward, common lodging houses and homelessness, with the idea of the 'tramp' and the connection between Solomon, homelessness and homosexuality, which was possibly alluded to by journalist Bernard Falk. In addition I will discuss the details of Solomon's death.

CHAPTER VII

1897 – 1905: THE CASUAL WARD AND DEATH.

After at least five years absence, Solomon entered the workhouse again on the 16th June 1897. This information is recorded in the *Creed Register* for the areas of St Giles' and Bloomsbury, but does not appear in the *Examinations* document.¹⁰³⁷ Unfortunately, the register does not record why Solomon was admitted or when he was discharged. Four weeks later Solomon applied for admission to St Giles' workhouse again on the 12th July 1897, because he had "no home", but was refused entry and instead referred for the first recorded time to the casual ward attached to the workhouse.¹⁰³⁸ It is unclear why Solomon's circumstances appear to have declined so quickly after a long period of relative stability, although the letters to Browning do appear to suggest that the artist's financial situation might have been beginning to change.

The St Giles' casual ward for vagrants was located at 25-27 Macklin Street, to the northeast of the main workhouse site. Solomon's rejection from the main workhouse may have been an indication that he was either not ill enough for the workhouse infirmary or not necessarily considered destitute enough for the main workhouse. According to General William Booth of the Salvation Army, in his report on the state of London's poor titled *In Darkest England and the Way Out*, published in 1890, admission into the casual ward was for men "only temporarily out of employment" and "seeking work" who did not want to give up their liberty by going to the workhouse.¹⁰³⁹ However, it is clear from the workhouse *Examinations* document that Solomon voluntarily admitted himself because he was homeless. George Perris's publication in 1914 appears to support this suggestion, when Perris recorded in *The Industrial History of Modern England*, that the casual ward was designed not just for men seeking work, but for "penniless men"; specifically

¹⁰³⁷ Endell St Creed Register 1895-1898, London Metropolitan Archive, XO20/065.

¹⁰³⁸ Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41.

¹⁰³⁹ Booth, 1890: 68.

“tramps”, but that the “fundamental principle of making the relieved person’s condition worse than that of the self-supporting labourer” was a “sin”.¹⁰⁴⁰

Booth suggested that it was impossible for the “unemployed Casual” to properly resume “after his night’s rest the search for work” and that under the existing regulations those “seeking shelter from the streets” were forced to stay in the casual ward for a “whole day and two nights”.¹⁰⁴¹ The *Examinations* document appears to suggest that Solomon’s stay in the ward was so traumatic that he was admitted almost directly upon his release to the main workhouse suffering from illness and destitution.¹⁰⁴² The strict regime that Solomon would have been forced to endure in the Macklin Street casual ward was recorded first-hand by an inmate, in Booth’s report on the state of London’s poor.¹⁰⁴³ A “tramp” recalled that

about thirty a night go to Macklin Street, where they keep you two nights and a day, and more than that if they recognise you. You have to break 10 cwt. of stone, or pick four pounds of oakum. Both are hard. 1 pint gruel and 6 oz. bread for breakfast; 8 oz. bread and 1 1/2 oz. cheese for dinner; tea same as breakfast. No supper. It is not enough to do the work on. Then you are obliged to bathe, of course; sometimes three will bathe in one water, and if you complain they turn nasty, and ask if you are come to a palace.¹⁰⁴⁴

Booth supported the statement made by the inmate, suggesting that “the stone breaking test” was “monstrous”, and that “half a ton of stone from any man in return for partially supplying the cravings of hunger” was “an outrage”.¹⁰⁴⁵ Booth also claimed that if the inmate of the casual ward refused or was unable to perform the tasks set then they could be “dragged before a magistrate and committed to gaol as a rogue and vagabond”, but that in the casual ward the inmate was treated as a criminal anyway.

In November 1897, the novelist Arnold Bennett suggested that during that year Solomon “didn’t live anywhere,” and “had no home. If he could afford it, he slept at a

¹⁰⁴⁰ Perris, 1914: 226.

¹⁰⁴¹ Booth, 1890: 68 – 69.

¹⁰⁴² Booth, 1890: 69. Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41.

¹⁰⁴³ Booth, 1890.

¹⁰⁴⁴ Booth, 1890: 71.

¹⁰⁴⁵ Booth, 1890: 69.

common lodging house; if not, on the Embankment.”¹⁰⁴⁶ As shown above, this information is corroborated by the *Examinations* document; however, the records for other years also seem to indicate that Solomon was deemed ‘homeless’, as early as 1884, by the Board of Guardians.¹⁰⁴⁷

As already suggested in chapter five, Solomon had spent some time living in and out of various common lodging houses in central London. In 1904, Valpy’s chapter on ‘Common Lodging Houses’, written as part of Booth’s study, revealed that the “derelicts of humanity” would “seem to spend their lives interchangeably between the common lodging house” and “the casual ward”.¹⁰⁴⁸ In Booth’s study, Solomon would have been categorized during these times as the ‘lowest class’ of person because, as an occupant of a common lodging house, he was considered essentially ‘homeless’, or in Valpy’s definition of the word, one who “enjoys no family life”.¹⁰⁴⁹ Valpy’s definition of the ‘homeless’ person appears to indicate that being a ‘homeless’ man had nothing to do with the absence of a dwelling place (for all of these men were housed) and much to do with the absence of a wife and children. As well as being without a family, a ‘homeless’ man was essentially de-masculinised because he was unemployed, employment being one of the defining characteristics of manliness.¹⁰⁵⁰

However, these ideas were not new. Writing in the 1860s Mayhew witnessed “a number of the poorest imbeciles” he had noticed in the course of his “rambles through the great metropolis”, and made particular note of the middle-aged men who were “very shabbily dressed and some half naked” who “squatted drearily” on benches.¹⁰⁵¹ Mayhew noted that these men had “little manliness left” and recalls that his companion, Mr Hunt described them as “chiefly vagrants” who were “sunk in profound ignorance and

¹⁰⁴⁶ Flower, 1932: 63.

¹⁰⁴⁷ Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41. The wording reveals that he “never had any settled home”.

¹⁰⁴⁸ Booth, 1902-1903. Booth, 1904: 211-12

¹⁰⁴⁹ Booth, 1904: 206.

¹⁰⁵⁰ Koven, 2006: 73.

¹⁰⁵¹ Mayhew, 1862 297.

debasement, from which they were utterly unable to rise”.¹⁰⁵² In the 1890s, ‘Homeless Men’, written by Margaret A. Tillard and Booth as part of his study,¹⁰⁵³ described the men without anywhere to live who inhabited the casual wards and common lodging houses of London as “morally worthless” and a “social danger”.¹⁰⁵⁴

Seth Koven believes that the idea of linking male homosexuality with ‘tramps’ began in the 1860s with the publication of *A Night in a Workhouse*, written by the editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, Frederick Greenwood.¹⁰⁵⁵ ‘A Night’ was published as a series of ‘slumming’ reports by Greenwood’s brother James, who disguised himself as a homeless tramp in order that he could experience what it was like to spend a night in the casual ward of Lambeth Workhouse. Frederick’s initial idea that the reports would cause a media sensation became true. Advertised with various “startling particulars”, readers could enjoy the exploits of “Old Daddy”, “The Swearing Club” and the “Adventures of a Young Thief”.¹⁰⁵⁶ Readership of the *Pall Mall Gazette* multiplied overnight and the stories provoked passionate and public responses from other journalists and writers, the Metropolitan Police, other state officials and members of the public, both affluent and poor.¹⁰⁵⁷

However, it would appear that in James Greenwood’s slumming experience at the Lambeth casual ward, homelessness was not the only ‘sin’ that a casual was committing. *A Night in a Workhouse* also revealed that inmates were guilty of “unspeakable” vices.¹⁰⁵⁸ Greenwood revealed how “no language with which” he was acquainted was “capable of conveying an adequate conception of the spectacle” he “then encountered”.¹⁰⁵⁹ James, dubbed the ‘Amateur Casual’ by his brother Frederick, described how “in not a few cases two gentlemen had clubbed beds and rugs and slept together. In one case four gentlemen

¹⁰⁵² Mayhew, 1862

¹⁰⁵³ Booth, 1902-1903.

¹⁰⁵⁴ Booth, 1904: 220.

¹⁰⁵⁵ Koven, 2006: 25.

¹⁰⁵⁶ Koven, 2006: 27.

¹⁰⁵⁷ Koven, 2006: 47.

¹⁰⁵⁸ Koven, 2006: 43.

¹⁰⁵⁹ Koven, 2006: 38.

had so clubbed together”.¹⁰⁶⁰ During the night James compared the “foul words raged in the room” with the “fate of Sodom”, and overheard “abominable” things that he “dare not even hint at”, and became worried about “how it would be” when a young boy “without a single rag to his back” asked if he could share James’s “doss”.¹⁰⁶¹ Koven suggests that the ‘Amateur Casual’ believed that he had witnessed “an orgiastic scene of sex between men and youths”, because James quoted that “what was done was worse than what was said, and what was said was abominable beyond description or decent imagination”.¹⁰⁶²

One of the possible legacies of this nineteenth-century idea and responses to *A Night in a Workhouse* was the 1898 Amendment to the Vagrancy Act, which made law the close identification between homelessness and ‘sexual deviancy’. The Act decreed that any “male person who in any public place persistently solicited or importuned for immoral purposes” would “be deemed a rogue and a vagabond and would be dealt with accordingly”.¹⁰⁶³ Another legacy to the Greenwood brothers’ adventures in slumming in casual wards was the creation of ‘fashionable slumming’ mentioned by James Granville Adderley in an article for the *English Illustrated Magazine* in 1893.¹⁰⁶⁴ Adderley berated fashionable slumming, which he described as “self-serving entertainment” for the middle-classes, which trivialized poverty and which disguised “social altruism” with “prurient curiosity”.¹⁰⁶⁵ However, despite Adderley’s condemnation of fashionable slumming he believed that it also encouraged ‘Christian’ charity and he encouraged the “upper classes” to “courageously investigate that creature whom they call a ‘cad’ and discover lurking his heart and soul”.¹⁰⁶⁶

Falk suggested that he met Solomon some months before the artist’s death in a tavern in the notorious slum area of Seven Dials, and in a sense Falk was fulfilling his own

¹⁰⁶⁰ Koven, 2006: 42.

¹⁰⁶¹ Koven, 2006: 44.

¹⁰⁶² Koven, 2006: 47.

¹⁰⁶³ Koven, 2006: 73.

¹⁰⁶⁴ Koven, 2006: 6.

¹⁰⁶⁵ Koven, 2006: 7.

¹⁰⁶⁶ Koven, 2006: 7.

slumming experience. Subsequently, in Falk's publication he claimed that he sought to "rescue" the "Pre-Raphaelite painter who fell from glory to the gutter" from "undeserved oblivion".¹⁰⁶⁷ However, Falk believed that Solomon "preferred to be a vagabond" and had been "incapable of being reclaimed from a vagabond life".¹⁰⁶⁸ It is possible that Falk specifically used the term vagabond to describe Solomon's status, which literally means "itinerant beggar, loafer or tramp", because, to Falk, Solomon was not just another one of the 'outcast poor', he was also "happy in his degradation" among the "very dregs of humanity".¹⁰⁶⁹ Falk's suggestion that Solomon was seemingly unwilling to change from a life of vagabondage is perhaps another allusion to Solomon's "perverse inclinations".¹⁰⁷⁰ In the idea promoted by the Greenwood brothers' casual ward slumming, as a vagabond or tramp living in and out of the casual wards of central London, Solomon might have been imagined to have had an inclination towards same-sex desire, and Falk already knew that Solomon possessed this inclination due to the artist's previous conviction of attempted sodomy. It seems probable that Falk, as a journalist, was also well aware of the Greenwood brothers' *A Night in a Workhouse*, for Koven has suggested that it "routed the literal and imaginative footsteps" of journalists after it was published.¹⁰⁷¹

As already suggested, Solomon was admitted to the main workhouse on the 12th July, four days after his initial admission to the casual ward.¹⁰⁷² The *Examinations* document reveals that the artist was "ill" and "destitute" and had lived "all over London since boarding house", although it is unclear which boarding house this is referring to. The *Creed Register* records that Solomon was not discharged from the workhouse until the 3rd November 1897, which suggests a lengthy stay of just under four months.¹⁰⁷³ This is the

¹⁰⁶⁷ Falk, 1937: 15

¹⁰⁶⁸ Falk, 1937: 16, 311.

¹⁰⁶⁹ Anon, 'Oxford English Dictionary', www.dictionary.oed.com (accessed 21 Feb 2006). Falk, 1937: 316.

¹⁰⁷⁰ Falk, 1937: 312.

¹⁰⁷¹ Koven, 2006: 74. Many journalists followed in the slumming footsteps of the Greenwood brothers, including the American journalist Jack London who posed as a 'casual', in 1902, in order that he could experience the life of a tramp for his publication *People of the Abyss*.

¹⁰⁷² Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41.

¹⁰⁷³ Endell St Creed Register 1898-1900, London Metropolitan Archive, XO20/035.

longest period of time that Solomon had stayed in the workhouse, and might indicate that he was considered to be too ill to be discharged. When, ultimately, Solomon was released on the 3rd November, he appears to have lasted only twenty-one days outside the workhouse before he was re-admitted on the 24th November.¹⁰⁷⁴ Unfortunately, neither the *Creed Register* nor the *Examinations* document suggests when Solomon was discharged on this occasion.

It seems unsurprising that because Solomon spent a considerable amount of time in the workhouse during 1897 that I could only find two extant works for that year. Both of these works appear as Hollyer prints and are titled *Twilight and Sleep* (Fig. 212) and *The Angel Gabriel Waiting for the Annunciation* (Fig. 213). Falk suggested that because the St Giles' workhouse recognised Solomon's "lamentable history", the artist "was considerably treated and allowed to practice his art at will", however, this was clearly incorrect, because it can be seen that Solomon's artistic output was far greater during the period spent out of the workhouse than during the time spent in it.¹⁰⁷⁵ Falk also suggested that "once the drink" got "hold of" Solomon while in the workhouse, the artist's "tongue was inclined to wag free" and Solomon's "fellow paupers" would learn from him that they were "sheltering under the same roof as a once-famous painter". In addition, Falk recalled a story of how Solomon had "roughed out a sketch in half an hour" and left the workhouse to sell it to a "nearby dealer for a couple of sovereigns" so that he could substantiate his "drunken boasts". Again, this seems like another fanciful story by Falk considering the harsh regime of the workhouse in which alcohol was strictly forbidden, and the movements of the inmates were closely regulated.¹⁰⁷⁶

On the 19th June, when Solomon is likely to have been resident in the workhouse, Christie, Manson and Woods were auctioning Solomon's former patron, James Leathart's,

¹⁰⁷⁴ Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41.

¹⁰⁷⁵ Falk, 1937: 318.

¹⁰⁷⁶ Pick and Anderton Hey, 1999: 194.

“choice collection of modern pictures and drawings”.¹⁰⁷⁷ Leathart’s collection had been exhibited the previous year between the 13th June and the 31st July at the Goupil Gallery, and adverts for the exhibition described the exhibition as “a Pre-Raphaelite collection” with pictures by Rossetti, Burne-Jones, Leighton, Holman Hunt, Solomon and others.¹⁰⁷⁸ According to the catalogue seven of Solomon’s early paintings were included in the sale, and *Who is he that cometh from Edom with Dyed Garments from Bozrah* (1862) raised the largest amount of money, selling for £35 to the art dealers Thomas Agnew & Sons of Manchester.¹⁰⁷⁹

In addition to the Leathart auction in 1897, one of Solomon’s earlier paintings, *Dawn* (1871) was shown at the Corporation of London Art Gallery at the Guildhall, three years after the gallery had exhibited two of Solomon’s other early paintings in 1894.¹⁰⁸⁰ As already mentioned in chapter five, the Guildhall’s first director, A. G. Temple, made a small mention of the Coltarts’ collection of paintings in *Art of Painting in the Queen’s Reign*, published in 1897.¹⁰⁸¹ Temple commended a small selection of Solomon’s work, painted between 1866 and 1870, including *A Greek High Priest* (1867), which he described as “superb”, “strong” and “brilliant” and suggested that “the painter’s power of expression”, in the *Elevation of the Host* (1870), was “exceptional”.¹⁰⁸² Temple avoided making any mention of Solomon’s life, either early or late, but I would suggest that it likely that by this date Temple would have been aware of the ‘scandal’ surrounding Solomon’s life, because he was involved in the British and International Art worlds as a critic, writer and curator, and it would seem remarkable that he would be ignorant of Solomon’s fate. However, this mention of Solomon only appeared two years after Wilde’s

¹⁰⁷⁷ Anon, *The Times*, 17 June 1897: 18.

¹⁰⁷⁸ Anon, *The Times*, 13 June 1896: 2. For more on Leathart’s patronage of Solomon see Ferrari, 2005.

¹⁰⁷⁹ Other paintings include *Judith Going to the Assyrian Camp*, *Sappho and Erinna in the Garden of Mytilene* (1864), *St Michael of Good Children* (1864), and *Queen Esther Hears of Haman’s Plot for the Destruction of the People* (1860). Thanks go to Roberto C. Ferrari for providing me with this information.

¹⁰⁸⁰ Graves, 1905-1906: 1243.

¹⁰⁸¹ Temple, 1897.

¹⁰⁸² Temple, 1897: 335.

conviction for gross indecency, and is perhaps the reason why Temple only chose to discuss Solomon's work.

On the 5th March 1898 Christie, Manson and Woods auctioned the art collection of Edward Chambers Nicholson, which contained two of Solomon's drawings, titled *The Little Improvisatrice* (1867) and *Female Heads* (date unknown).¹⁰⁸³ Nicholson was a chemist and dye manufacturer who owned the Atlas Dye Works at Hackney Wick in London.¹⁰⁸⁴ Little is known about Nicholson's private life although it is clear from the auction catalogue that he was a collector of art.

Apart from one extant work for 1898, I have been unable to find any further information about Solomon for this year. The title of the one watercolour is *Saint John the Baptist* (Fig. 215). I could also only find records of three dated works for 1899. The first titled *Sleep* was shown at the Baillie Gallery Exhibition, although no other information can be traced about this work.¹⁰⁸⁵ The third, which has already been mentioned, is a photographic print by Pierce titled *Jesus (Esto Fidelis Usque Ad Mortem Et Dabo Tibi Coronam Vitae)* (Fig. 216), and the final work is a watercolour sold at Christie's in 2007 titled *Head of a Woman with Red Hair in Profile to the Left* (Fig. 217).¹⁰⁸⁶

Solomon was, once again, admitted to the workhouse on the 8th November 1899, although it is unclear when he was discharged.¹⁰⁸⁷ He was re-admitted "ill" and "destitute" on the 26th December, and appears to have been transferred straight to the casual ward. The *Examinations* document records that for the three weeks prior to this admission, Solomon had been living at 19 Macklin Street and "all over place". As already suggested, the Casual Ward was located at 25-27 Macklin Street, and unsurprisingly, therefore, Macklin Street was categorised as a 'black' area, suggesting the "lowest class" of "vicious semi-criminal"

¹⁰⁸³ Christie, Manson and Woods Sale Catalogue: Collection of Edward Chambers Nicholson, (1898).

¹⁰⁸⁴ Goodall, 'Nicholson, Edward Chambers (1827-1890)', www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/50657, 2004. (accessed 1 July 2009).

¹⁰⁸⁵ Baillie, 1905a.

¹⁰⁸⁶ Christie's Auction Catalogue - British Art on Paper - 21 Nov 2007, (2007d):30.

¹⁰⁸⁷ Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41.

people.¹⁰⁸⁸ The 1901 England census reveals that 19 -21 Macklin Street was a lodging house, housing forty-one male lodgers with a separate area that lodged thirteen women.¹⁰⁸⁹ In 1891 Booth had confirmed that the street was “full of common lodging houses” and “houses let in furnished apartments”, and suggested that number 19 had been a “desperate” place, but had “improved in character”.¹⁰⁹⁰ Nonetheless, it is clear that Solomon’s circumstances were dire in this period, which might suggest why he appears to have produced so little work.

On the 28th May 1900, Solomon again applied for admission to the workhouse, and was sent instead to the casual ward. Three months later, on the 30th August, the artist was admitted to the workhouse “destitute from prison”, but it is unclear how long he remained there.¹⁰⁹¹ It is also unclear why Solomon was in prison during this period, but unfortunately the court and prison records for the Clerkenwell area have not survived for this year.¹⁰⁹² The 1901 England census reveals that Solomon was, again, resident in St Giles’ workhouse on the night of the 31st March, and on the enumerator’s form he is described as an artist, living on his “own account”.¹⁰⁹³ In 1901 Solomon was admitted twice to the workhouse. The first occasion was on the 15th July and on the second occasion he was admitted “destitute” only one month later on the 13th August. However, according to the documentation, he did not return to the workhouse after this occasion until nearly four years later, when on the 10th March 1905 he was admitted on his “own request”.

In 1900 Solomon had completed at least eleven works, and of these I have obtained four images. These works are a chalk drawing titled, *A Waker, A Nocturne, A Sleeper* (Fig. 218), a crayon drawing titled *Angel Giving a Blessing* (Fig. 220), a pencil drawing titled *Allegorical Head* (Fig. 221), and an oil painting titled *Head Study* (Fig. 219). Two other

¹⁰⁸⁸ Booth, 1889.

¹⁰⁸⁹ 1901 Census: 19 Macklin Street, The National Archive, RG13/238.

¹⁰⁹⁰ Booth, 1904: 74.

¹⁰⁹¹ Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41.

¹⁰⁹² Information obtained from the staff of the London Metropolitan Archive.

¹⁰⁹³ 1901 England Census: Person in Institution Details, The National Archives, RG13/238.

works for this year were exhibited at the Baillie Gallery Exhibition and are titled *Love Singing to Memory* and *The Dreamer*, and four other works have appeared at auctions in the 1980s and 1990s.¹⁰⁹⁴ One other work appears in Seymour's 1986 thesis and is titled *Trust in the Life to Come*, and is mentioned briefly by her.¹⁰⁹⁵ I have not discovered any works executed in either 1902 or 1904, however there is one extant pencil drawing for 1901 titled *L'Amour Amigueux* (Fig. 222), and records of two works for 1902, of which one is a pencil drawing titled *The Boy John* which was sold at Sotheby's in 1990, and *Sorrow*, exhibited at the Baillie Gallery.¹⁰⁹⁶

There is little information about Solomon, apart from his admission into the workhouse, after 1900; however, according to Reynolds, the 1901 Glasgow International Exhibition showed two of Solomon's earlier paintings, *Love in Autumn* (1866), and *The Mystery of Faith* (1870).¹⁰⁹⁷ In the same year the *Jewish Chronicle* reported that Solomon's painting *The Painter's Pleasure* (probably *The Painter's Pleasaunce*) (1861) had been exhibited at the Whitechapel Art Gallery in Whitechapel, East London, and commented that the "Jewish element was almost as numerous as the Christian" but of "a better class".¹⁰⁹⁸ In the Geffrye Museum Catalogue published in 1985, it was claimed that Solomon won a "gold medal" at the "Exposition Universelle" in Paris in 1900, however, according to the *Official British Catalogue* of the Paris Exhibition in 1900 none of Solomon's works were exhibited.¹⁰⁹⁹ The confusion may lie in the fact that Solomon J. Solomon exhibited a painting titled *Laus Deo* (c1899), but it is unclear whether he won a medal.¹¹⁰⁰ In addition, the Geffrye catalogue also claimed that Solomon had won a "bronze medal" at the 1889 Paris Exposition Universelle, however, this also seems unlikely,

¹⁰⁹⁴ See Appendix II.

¹⁰⁹⁵ Seymour, 1986: 217, Fig. 206.

¹⁰⁹⁶ See Appendix II for auction information. Baillie, 1905a.

¹⁰⁹⁷ Reynolds, 1985: 94.

¹⁰⁹⁸ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 15 March 1901: 14.

¹⁰⁹⁹ *Paris Exhibition, 1900. British Official Catalogue* (1900). Lambourne, *Solomon, a Family of Painters: Abraham Solomon (1823-1862), Rebecca Solomon (1832-1886), Simeon Solomon (1840-1905)*, (1985): 83.

¹¹⁰⁰ *Paris Exhibition, 1900. British Official Catalogue* (1900): 265.

because, again, none of Solomon's works were shown at this exhibition; however, Solomon J. Solomon exhibited a painting titled *Samson* (1887).¹¹⁰¹

Solomon was admitted to the workhouse on the 10th March 1905 at his own request, although it is unclear on what date he was discharged. On the 21st May he was admitted again, but this time by the police, after being charged with "alcoholism". Reynolds suggests that four days later, on the 25th May, "as was his habit", Solomon visited his cousin George Nathan, where "he collected clothes and pocket money".¹¹⁰² It is likely that this information was taken from *The Times* account of Solomon's inquest, although the report suggests that Solomon visited his cousin the day before, on the 24th, after agreeing to a "commission for a drawing which was never executed".¹¹⁰³ Nathan was Solomon's first cousin once removed; his mother being Fanny Salaman, Myer Salaman's sister. The 1901 England census records that Nathan was an "ostrich feather manufacturer", which might suggest that he worked for Myer's ostrich feather business.¹¹⁰⁴ The census also records that Nathan was living at 2 Spanish Place, Manchester Square, with two of his siblings, Bessie and Gerald Nathan, and it is likely that this address in Marylebone is the one that Solomon will have visited in May 1905, because Nathan was still living at this address as late as 1919.¹¹⁰⁵

Reynolds suggests that "on returning to St Giles", from Nathan's residence, Solomon "collapsed from a heart attack and was taken to King's College Hospital"; however, the *Times* report suggests that Solomon was "found lying on the footpath in Great Turnstile, High Holborn", and "after complaining of illness" the artist was "transferred to St Giles' workhouse".¹¹⁰⁶ It is unclear where Reynolds obtained this information, because the coroner's court records for the Holborn area have not survived for

¹¹⁰¹ Anon, 1981. Thanks go to Roberto C. Ferrari for providing me with this information.

¹¹⁰² Reynolds, 1985: 94.

¹¹⁰³ Anon, *The Times*, 18 August 1905: 9.

¹¹⁰⁴ 1901 England Census: George Nathan, The National Archives, RG13/108.

¹¹⁰⁵ Anon, 'British Phone Books', www.ancestry.co.uk, 1880-1984. (accessed 5 May 2009).

¹¹⁰⁶ Reynolds, 1985: 94. Anon, *The Times*, 18 August 1905: 9.

the year 1905; however, the King's College Hospital records for that period do record that a patient with the surname Solomon was brought in at that time suffering from "concussion" and was seen by a Dr Dalton.¹¹⁰⁷ Unfortunately Dr Dalton's case notes no longer survive, and it is therefore impossible to determine whether this was Solomon.

Reynolds also suggests that despite Solomon's "bronchitis and weak heart" he was "soon discharged" from the hospital and subsequently "fell dead" from "a second heart attack in the dining hall" of St Giles' workhouse on the 14th August.¹¹⁰⁸

The inquest report from the *Times* is consistent with Reynolds' suggestion that Solomon "expired in the dining hall" of the workhouse, but it recorded that Solomon had "remained in the house" due to "bronchitis and alcoholism".¹¹⁰⁹ The *Examinations* document confirms that Solomon died at "9.15am" on the morning of the 14th, and the *Times* recorded that an inquest was held at the St. Giles's Coroner's Court, three days later, on the 17th by "Mr Walter Schroder".¹¹¹⁰ The Holborn Coroner's Court and Mortuary, which incorporated St Giles' and Bloomsbury, was a redbrick, Gothic-style building, located at Macklin Street, on the same street as the St Giles' casual ward, and this is where Solomon's inquest would have been held, and where his body would have lain before it was taken away for burial by his relatives.¹¹¹¹ The *Times* confirmed that medical officer, Dr A C Allen, had reported that Solomon had died of "heart failure consequent on aortic disease of that organ and other ailments" and that "the jury returned a verdict

¹¹⁰⁷ Information provided by the London Metropolitan Archive. Thanks go to Katharine Higgon, archive assistant at King's College Hospital, who provided me with the information about the index of Dr Dalton's case notes, ref: C99.

¹¹⁰⁸ Reynolds, 1985: 95.

¹¹⁰⁹ Anon, *The Times*, 18 August 1905: 9.

¹¹¹⁰ Folio No 65320, LMA, HOBG/502/41.

¹¹¹¹ Black, 2006: 23.

accordingly”.¹¹¹² Solomon was buried on the same day of the inquest at Willesden Jewish Cemetery, in Beaconsfield Road, Willesden.¹¹¹³

In this chapter I have discussed Solomon’s life from 1897 until his death in 1905. I have also examined Solomon’s first documented stay ‘casual ward’ and described Solomon’s possible experience of this place using contemporary reports. In addition, I have also discussed the identification of the casual ward, common lodging houses and homelessness, with the idea of the ‘tramp’ and the connection between Solomon, homelessness and homosexuality, which was possibly alluded to by journalist Bernard Falk. I have done this by using Seth Koven’s research into the ‘slumming’ activities of the Greenwood brothers in various nineteenth-century London casual wards, and by examining the 1898 Amendment to the Vagrancy Act. I have also suggested that because of Solomon’s deteriorating circumstances, he produced little work during this period, and have discussed the final details of his death in the workhouse on the 14th August 1905.

What follows is a postscript to Solomon’s death. It illustrates the continued enthusiasm for the artist’s work after his death, which is epitomised by the major posthumous shows of his work and the continuous sale and advertisements of his work.

¹¹¹² Anon, *The Times*, 18 August 1905: 9. The *Register of Inquests* for 1905 recorded that Solomon died of “syncope” (loss of consciousness), “sudden heart failure” and “disease of the aortic valves”. The death was deemed “natural” and the cost of the post-mortem was £3 2s 6d. Register of Inquests Central Division, 1904-1912, London Metropolitan Archive, COR/A/10 (X9/10).

¹¹¹³ Anon, 'London, England, Deaths and Burials', www.ancestry.co.uk, 1813-1980. (accessed 22 Sept 2009).

POSTSCRIPT

Despite the harsh critical claims made about Solomon's character in the obituaries that I discussed in the introduction, Solomon's work remained popular after his death. Before he died in August 1905, Solomon produced at least another six dated works, and it seems likely that he would have had to complete these before he became ill at the end of May that year. Of these works, one is a roughly sketched black chalk drawing titled *Dante Ailghieri Divino Poeta Firenze Ravenna* (Fig. 223), another, which is *Untitled* (Fig. 224), is a pencil drawing that can now be found at the Beinecke Library at Yale University. Three other works are Hollyer reproductions, are titled *Orpheus and Eurydice* (Fig. 225), *Speak Lord, for thy Servant Heareth* (Fig. 226), (originally owned by Lord Battersea), and *Retrospection* (Fig. 227), which was given this title by Wilson and reproduced in her 1911 article.¹¹¹⁴ As previously suggested, *Retrospection* was also the work that Wilson claimed was Solomon's last. In addition, another work dated 1905 appears in the Baillie Gallery Exhibition catalogue, titled *Spirit of Evil*, although there is no other information for this work.

As suggested in chapter three, the Baillie Gallery Exhibition was held at 54 Baker Street, between 9th December 1905 and 13th January 1906. It was advertised halfway through its run, in the *Times* on the 16th December.¹¹¹⁵ However, despite John Baillie's original request for examples of Solomon's earlier work, the catalogue records that the majority of the pieces loaned were from the post-1873 period. Most of the lenders to the exhibition have been mentioned in other chapters of this thesis. However, in addition to those lenders, Solomon's first cousin once removed, Lawrence B. Phillips, lent *The Prodigal Son* (1863).¹¹¹⁶ As already suggested in chapter six, Meynell had lent *Passionis*

¹¹¹⁴ Wilson, *Fine Arts Journal*, September 1911: 162-66.

¹¹¹⁵ Anon, *The Times*, 16 December 1905: 2.

¹¹¹⁶ Phillips was a retired watch manufacturer, whose grandmother was Hannah Phillips (nee Solomon); the sister of Solomon's father Michael. Information gathered from Solomon family tree.

Amoris fructus (1888) and an undated work, titled *Paolo and Francesca*, to the gallery.¹¹¹⁷

In a small article for the *Bystander*, published on 20th December 1905, Meynell mentioned the Baillie exhibition.¹¹¹⁸ Despite his enthusiasm for Solomon's work, Meynell noted that "to the student", the exhibition was "full of interest – and warning". The article is accompanied by two of Solomon's sketches, both from a private collection, perhaps Meynell's, although neither of the works is titled or dated.¹¹¹⁹

At the same time that approximately one hundred and forty two of Solomon works were being shown at the Baillie Gallery, sixteen were shown at the Royal Academy's 'Winter Exhibition of Work of the Old Masters and Deceased Artist's of the British School' at Burlington House, held between 1st January and 10th March 1906.¹¹²⁰ As already suggested in chapter five, Eleanor Coltart lent seven of Solomon's paintings to the exhibition, and the Hugh Lane Gallery sent five, including C. A. Swinburne's original commissions of 1873: *The Bride, The Bridegroom, The Priest and the Acolyte (A Jewish King and his Page)*, and *Greeks Going to a Festival* (Figs. 3-6).¹¹²¹ The *Times* review of the exhibition on the 20th December 1905 commented on the "considerable numbers" of works that were being shown by the "unfortunate" artist, who had "died so miserably the other day".¹¹²² L. Houseman, writing for the *Manchester Guardian* was also surprised by the "sudden appearance" of Solomon's work in "two places" that winter, which he suggested revealed "such fine and rare qualities".¹¹²³ Houseman suggested that the sixteen "remarkable" watercolours were grouped with those of Rossetti, and that "by good fortune" it was "possible to form a fairly just estimate of the artist's powers" by visiting both exhibitions. However, the *Times*, reporting on the Royal Academy show two months

¹¹¹⁷ A Hollyer reproduction titled *Paolo e Francesca da Rimini* (date unknown) (Fig. 231) might be a copy of this work.

¹¹¹⁸ E.M, *The Bystander*, 20 December 1905: 609.

¹¹¹⁹ E.M, *The Bystander*, 20 December 1905: 609.

¹¹²⁰ Graves, 1905-1906: 1242. Seymour suggests that this exhibition was held a year after the Baillie Gallery, but this is clearly incorrect. Seymour, 1986: 222.

¹¹²¹ For other work shown see Appendix I. Thanks go to Donato Esposito for providing me with a list of paintings exhibited at the Royal Academy.

¹¹²² Anon, *The Times*, 20 Dec 1905: 6.

¹¹²³ Housman, *The Manchester Guardian*, 5 January 1906: 14.

later, criticised Solomon as an “unequal and unsatisfactory” artist, and suggested that the “morbidly which ruined his moral and physical life” was “only too apparent” in the “weak, undecided watercolours”.¹¹²⁴

Just over two weeks after the Royal Academy show ended, the Whitechapel’s Spring Exhibition began, on the 29th March 1906. Six of Solomon’s paintings were exhibited, including the Coltarts’ *Greek Priest* (1868) and *Mystery of Faith* (1870). Two other undated works were lent by Carfax & Co of London: *A Pre-Raphaelite Studio Fantasy* and *A Morning Call on the Six Movers (uninspired) of Mankind*.¹¹²⁵ As well as lending Solomon’s work to the exhibition, in the December 1906 issue of the *Burlington Magazine* Carfax & Co were also advertising the sale of Solomon’s work at their London, Bury Street premises.¹¹²⁶ The company continued to advertise regularly the sale of Solomon’s work, amongst other artists including William Blake and Aubrey Beardsley, in adverts placed in the *Burlington* until 1911, which emphasises that there was a continued market for Solomon’s work at this time.¹¹²⁷ The Carfax Gallery at 24 Bury Street was opened by William Rothenstein and John Fothergill in the late 1890s, and, according to Rothenstein in 1931, was a “serious business” designed to “encourage young artists”.¹¹²⁸ Rothenstein’s *Men and Memories* (1931) also noted that Ross took control of the gallery for a time when Rothenstein was engaged elsewhere, suggesting that despite Ross’s comments that Solomon had “ceased to produce work of any value” after 1887, Ross was active in the business of selling Solomon’s later works at the Carfax.¹¹²⁹

Nevertheless, in 1908, Ross reviewed the Franco-British Exhibition in London, with artist and designer Charles Ricketts, in an article published by the *Burlington*, and

¹¹²⁴ Anon, *The Times*, 16 February 1906: 7.

¹¹²⁵ *A Pre-Raphaelite Studio Fantasy* and *A Morning Call on the Six Movers (uninspired) of Mankind* were sold at Bonhams in 2008. Both works are early teenage sketches by Solomon. *Bonhams Auction Catalogue - Victorian Watercolours and Illustrations from a Private Collection - 19 Nov 2008*, (2008): Lot 15.

¹¹²⁶ Anon, *Carfax & Co Ltd, Bury Street, London: Sale of Simeon Solomon Paintings Advert*, (1906): no page number.

¹¹²⁷ Anon, *Carfax & Co Ltd, Bury Street, London: Sale of Simeon Solomon Paintings Advert*, (1911): no page number.

¹¹²⁸ Rothenstein, 1931: 345.

¹¹²⁹ Rothenstein, 1931: 345. Ross, *The Bibelot*, April 1911: 146.

appeared surprised that Solomon's work was "unusually well represented", and, in addition, noted that the artist was a "freak of the English School".¹¹³⁰ Despite this, he appeared irritated that Solomon's *Love in Winter (Love in Autumn)* (1866) was "badly hung", and praised it as "one of his best pictures", despite it being "weakly drawn".¹¹³¹ In a comment which is also inconsistent with his management of the Carfax Gallery and the sale of Solomon's work, Ross repeated his earlier claim about Solomon's "detestable" and "hideous chalk drawings" which he suggested were executed when Solomon was "sunk in the lowest depths of drink and misery", and which were of "no artistic significance or interest".¹¹³²

Six months after the Whitechapel's Spring show, the gallery opened an exhibition of Jewish Art and Antiques on the 7th November 1906, which the *Jewish Chronicle* reported in some detail. The *Chronicle* suggested that the part of the exhibition devoted to deceased artists was one of the most "valuable portions", and contained a "wonderful collection" of Solomon's "brilliant drawings and paintings".¹¹³³ This enthusiasm for Solomon's work is reminiscent of the *Chronicle*'s earlier opinion of Solomon in their obituary to the artist, which, as suggested in the introduction, was a positive affirmation of his status as a Jewish artist amongst gentiles. However, this article, for the first time, also elevated Solomon's status as an "eminent artist among Anglo-Jewish artists such as the Royal Academician Solomon A. Hart".¹¹³⁴

In 1907, the *Chronicle* reported the "splendid exhibition" of Jewish artists in Berlin, which, in addition to artists such as Camille Pissaro, exhibited work by

¹¹³⁰ Ricketts, *The Burlington Magazine* July 1908: 197. The Franco-British Exhibition provided an opportunity to cement the *Entente Cordiale* between France and England signed in 1904 and was the largest exhibition of its kind in Britain. It attracted eight million viewers and was a 'summing up of the achievements of a progressive age'. For more on this exhibition see Coombes, 1987. Charles de Sousy Ricketts published the *Dial* between 1889 and 1897 with his life-long partner Charles Haslewood Shannon. The journal embraced a blend of English Pre-Raphaelitism and French Symbolism. For more on Ricketts see Delaney, 'Ricketts, Charles De Sousy (1866-1931)', www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35746, 2004. (accessed 12 October 2006).

¹¹³¹ Ricketts, *The Burlington Magazine* July 1908: 197.

¹¹³² Ricketts, *The Burlington Magazine* July 1908: 198.

¹¹³³ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 9 November 1906: 4-5. See Appendix I for a full list of the Solomon works shown at the exhibition.

¹¹³⁴ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 9 November 1906: 4-5.

Solomon.¹¹³⁵ Richard I. Cohen suggests that the Berlin Exhibition of Jewish Artists, (Ausstellung jüdischer Künstler), was a chance to “arouse a sense of national pride in Jewish achievement” and to “reconnect the Jew with a lost sense of aesthetics”.¹¹³⁶ Cohen also suggests that the exhibition’s emphasis on contemporary Jewish artists was deliberate, because the exhibition sought to shed light on these artists’ “unique backgrounds” and the “different facets” of the “modern experience”.¹¹³⁷ It is unclear which Solomon works were exhibited at this exhibition, but the curators evidently considered Solomon’s ‘unique’ background important and modern enough for his work to be included amongst the one-hundred-and-forty-seven works exhibited by sixty-seven artists from all over Europe and Palestine.

In the following years, Solomon’s work remained in the public eye. Between 1908 and 1912, his work was exhibited at the Whitechapel’s Spring Exhibition, the aforementioned Franco-British Exhibition in London, Messrs Agnew’s Manchester Galleries, the Westminster Exhibition, the South London Art Gallery in Peckham Road, and the International Fine Art’s Exhibition in Rome.¹¹³⁸ In addition to these exhibitions, as late as 1912, according to the *Times*, Hollyer was still selling “colour prints” of Solomon’s work from his studio at Pembroke Street, and as already mentioned, Carfax & Co were advertising Solomon’s work for sale in the *Burlington* in 1911, demonstrating that the artist’s watercolours and drawings were still in demand seven years after his death, despite Ross’s assertions that Solomon’s later work was “repulsive” with the “added horror of being the shadows of once splendid achievements”.¹¹³⁹

¹¹³⁵ Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 22 November 1907: 13.

¹¹³⁶ Cohen, 1998: 209.

¹¹³⁷ Cohen, 1998: 209.

¹¹³⁸ See Appendix I for more details of the works shown. Messrs Agnew’s Manchester Exhibition referred to in Anon, *The Manchester Guardian*, 2 November 1910: 6. The Westminster Exhibition referred to in Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 28 July 1911: 16-17. The South London Art Gallery Exhibition mentioned in Anon, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 31 May 1912: 25.

¹¹³⁹ Ross, *The Bibelot*, April 1911: 147.

CONCLUSION

As suggested in the introduction, the gay theatre director and playwright Neil Bartlett felt puzzled in 1988 over why he could not find “any books about a man named Simeon Solomon?”¹¹⁴⁰ Indeed, it was still impossible to find any dedicated literature about Solomon in mainstream bookstores until the publication of the *Love Revealed* catalogue in 2005, which published some of the latest research on Solomon’s early life and career.¹¹⁴¹ Reynolds’ monograph on Solomon, published in 1985 has been out of print for many years, and because of its limited issue of five hundred copies, is now only available for a greatly inflated price from specialist sources.¹¹⁴² Seymour’s thesis has never been published, Lambourne’s promised biography has never materialised, and despite the recent resurgence of interest in the artist in scholarly periodicals, the only other reliable current source of information on Solomon is available online at Ferrari’s website.¹¹⁴³

As I have demonstrated, the literary and historical neglect of the artist has been much influenced by his early historiography, which characterized him as a drunken and degenerative miscreant and the instigator of his own downfall. I have also shown that Ross’s early speculative tales of Solomon’s ‘scandalous’ and ‘eccentric’ behaviour have been reproduced and elaborated upon consistently by later writers such as Falk, and that this writing still has some influence today. It has also been seen that Solomon has been associated with the post-1895 characterization of Wilde as a ‘tragic’ homosexual male, and Solomon’s withdrawal from society, and decision to remain in an impoverished state have been misperceived as a sign of this. However, as suggested, the continued illegality of homosexual acts until 1967 and the general climate of homophobia have also had a huge impact on the negative reaction and disregard shown to Solomon’s life and work. In

¹¹⁴⁰ Bartlett, 1988: 30.

¹¹⁴¹ Cruise, 2005.

¹¹⁴² Reynolds book is currently being sold for anything up to £100 on specialist internet book sights. Thank you to Simon Reynolds for this information.

¹¹⁴³ See www.simeonsolomon.org.

addition, the history of Solomon as a crucial member of the second-wave of Pre-Raphaelites was effectively erased by his absence from the official Pre-Raphaelite chronicles that were published shortly after his death. For example, Solomon does not appear in either Holman-Hunt's two-volume *Pre-Raphaelitism and the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood* (1905), or in Ford Madox Ford's *The Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood: A Critical Monograph* (1907).¹¹⁴⁴ However, Madox Ford, (grandson of Madox Brown), did mention Solomon in his collection of four novels *Parade's End* (1924-1928), which described the artist as "one of the weaker and more frail aesthetes".¹¹⁴⁵

By using extensively-researched biographical material and newly discovered archival documents, I have challenged the negative perception of Solomon in the early historiography, re-evaluated the artist's life after 1873, and demonstrated the artist's unrepentant attitude to his sexuality, revealing his ongoing pursuit of sexual fulfilment, evidenced by his arrest in Paris and continued involvement with other notable homosexual men, such as Count Stenbock. I have also shown that, at the end of his life, Solomon held no grievances towards any of his previous friends, appeared to have been content with his life and felt devoid of bitterness, in direct contrast to Wilde's bitter reaction to his conviction and subsequent societal rejection.¹¹⁴⁶

Unlike Wilde's, I have also revealed that Solomon's family did not entirely abandon him, continuing to support him by commissioning work and assisting him financially. It is also now clear, from my extensive survey of Solomon's work after 1873, that the artist produced a huge body of work that was popular on both sides of the Atlantic and across the Channel right up to his death.

This thesis does not so much, therefore, conclude, as end with a provocation to further research, particularly before 1873, since there is, clearly, still much more to learn about an artist who so usefully challenges the idea of the late-Victorian tragic gay male

¹¹⁴⁴ Holman Hunt, 1905 and Ford, 1907.

¹¹⁴⁵ Madox Ford, 2001: 52.

¹¹⁴⁶ See Wilde's articulated sense of regret, guilt and disgrace in *De Profundis*, Wilde, 1911.

generation. In addition, as suggested in the introduction, my survey of Solomon's work produced after 1873 is not exhaustive, and much work still needs to be done in order to reveal the full extent of Solomon's artistic output. It is also clear that new, documented information about Solomon's life after 1873 is still coming to light with the daily addition of online archives and databases, that will, hopefully, add more detail to Solomon's previously under-researched and misunderstood later life.

APPENDIX I

SIMEON SOLOMON, WORK IN EXHIBITIONS POST 1873

Sept – Oct 1873Liverpool Exhibition of Paintings, Free Library*Dawn*1873London International Exhibition IV, South Kensington Museum

Mr F. Hollyer's copies of pictures by Simeon Solomon and others

187858th Manchester Exhibition for Modern Artists.

Work shown

1880Exhibition in Ancoats, Manchester*Dawn*1881The Artist's Agency, Bridge Street, Manchester*Study of a Jewish Rabbi*1885Whitechapel St Judes, Fine Arts Exhibition*Young Jeramiah*11th May 1886Liverpool Exhibition*Love in Winter**Lady in a Chinese Dress**Greek Priests*1886Newcastle Exhibition*Lady in a Chinese Dress*1887Manchester, Royal Jubilee Exhibition(no.114) *Love in Winter*, lent by William Coltart(no.328) *Hosanna!*, lent by J H Hutton Esq(no.1352) *A Lady in a Chinese Dress*, lent by William Coltart [watercolour](no.1372) *The Sleepers and the One that Waketh*, lent by Frederick Craven [watercolour](no.1484) *Untitled*, lent by Frederick Craven

"It is the voice of the beloved that knocketh, saying 'Open to me, my sister, my love, my dove, my undefiled; for my head is filled with dew, and my locks with the drops of the night' " Solomon's Song, verse 2

1887 Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition, Royal Albert Hall

(no. 1239) Two Etchings on India Paper,

1. *Circumcision*
2. *Passover Eve Service*

(no. 1283) Ten photographs from Drawings illustrating Jewish Ceremonials,

1. *Circumcision*
2. *Marriage*
3. *Mourning*
4. *Carrying the Scroll of the Law in Synagogue*
5. *Sabbath Eve*
6. *Eve of Passover*
7. *Fast for Destruction of Temple*
8. *Day of Atonement*
9. *Feast of Tabernacles*
10. *Feast of Dedication of the Temple*,
lent by A. Solomon.

1889

Whitechapel Fine Arts Exhibition

Music at Dawn

Perseus

1891

Whitechapel Fine Arts Exhibition

Bacchus

October – Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery

Painters Pleasaunce

Dawn

1894

Corporation of London Art Gallery Exhibition, Guildhall

Love in Autumn

The Sleepers and the One that Watcheth

1895

Goupil Gallery

Beatrice

1896 June

Goupil Gallery, James Leatheart's Collection

7 works shown

1897

McClees Galleries, Philadelphia, USA

100 drawings in black and white with a few water colour paintings

1897

Corporation of London Art Gallery Exhibition, Guildhall

Dawn

1901

Glasgow International Exhibition

Love in Autumn
The Mystery of Faith

Whitechapel Art Gallery
Painters Pleasure [sic]

7th Oct – 29th Nov 1903
Whitechapel Spring Exhibition
Youth and Girls (possibly *Summer Twilight*)

1904
Leicester Galleries Exhibition
1 work shown

23rd March - 3rd May 1905
Whitechapel Art Gallery, British Art Fifty Years Ago.
The Mother of Moses Sending him Away
Greek Priest
The Mystery of Faith

9th Dec 1905 – 13th Jan 1906
Baillie Gallery, 54 Baker St, London, Paintings and Drawings by the Late Simeon Solomon (Version 1 of the catalogue)

(works shown in **bold** were not included in version 2 of the catalogue below)

- (no. 1) ***Cupid* (1883)**
- (no. 2) ***Atlanta* (1866)**
- (no. 3) ***Chanting the Gospels* (1867)**
- (no. 4) *Love Bleeding* (1870), lent by Mrs Knowles
- (no. 5) *Three Priests* (1863), lent by Lord Battersea
- (no. 6) ***Moses* (1876), lent by Mrs Knowles**
- (no. 7) *Ruth and Naomi* (1861)
- (no. 8) ***The Lemon Seller* (1876), lent by Mrs Hermann Cohen**
- (no. 9) *Cupid's Playground* (1883), lent by Mrs Herbert D. Cohen
- (no. 10) *A Rabbi* (1880), lent by Lord Battersea
- (no. 11) *The Prodigal Son* (1863), lent by Lawrence B. Phillips, Esq.
- (no. 12) *And Abraham Kissed the Lad* (1863), lent by Mrs. Myer Salaman
- (no. 13) *An Allegory* (1857)
- (no. 14) [unknown] lent by The Misses Pater
- (no. 15) *Zephyr* (1887), lent by Mrs. Myer Salaman
- (no. 16) *Suffer Little Children* (1884)
- (no. 17) *The Eternal Sleep* (1887), lent by Mrs. Myer Salaman
- (no. 18) ***A Study* (1865), lent by The Exors. of Philip Rathbone, Esq**
- (no. 19) ***Biondia* (1876), lent by Mrs Knowles**
- (no. 20) ***A Daughter of Judeae* (1864), lent by Miss Maurice Davis**
- (no. 21) *Love Singing to Memory* (1862), lent by Lord Battersea
- (no. 22) *Hebrew Maiden Lamenting* (1871), lent by Mrs. Edward Davies
- (no. 23) *The Magic Crystal* (1878), lent by Mrs Knowles
- (no. 24) *Love and Death* (1865-74), lent by Mrs Trower
- (no. 25) *Perseus, a Type of Temptation* (1886), lent by Mrs. Myer Salaman
- (no. 26) ***A Votive Offering*, (1863), lent by R. Phené Spiers, Esq.**

- (no. 27) ***The Young Antinous* (1884), lent by More Adey Esq.**
 (no. 28) *Scenes from the Life of David* (1856), lent by A. W. H. Solomon, Esq.
 (no. 29) *A Hebrew Harpist*, lent by Mrs. Edward Davis
 (no. 30) ***Crossing the Brook* (1867), lent by The Exors. of Philip Rathbone, Esq.**
 (no. 31) *Many Waters Cannot Quench Love* (1895)
 (no. 32) *Study of a Head*
 (no. 32) *Study of a Head*, lent by Dr Savage
 (no. 33) *A Triptych* (1893?)
 (a) *Arise my Love, my Dove, my Spouse*
 (b) *For Love is Strong as Death*
 (c) *I Arise Up to Open to my Beloved*
 (no. 34) *Love in Autumn* (study) (1894)
 (no. 35) *Sir Galahad* (1889)
 (no. 36) ***A Grecian Priestess* (1865), lent by The Exors. of Philip Rathbone, Esq.**
 (no. 37) *Sir Galahad*
 (no. 38) ***A Portait*, lent by Miss C. de H. Harris**
 (no. 39) ***Abraham and Isaac***
 (no. 40) *Carrying the Law* (1856-75), lent by Mrs Droeser
 (no. 41) ***The Destroyer* (1867)**
 (no. 42) *Behold, the Bridegroom Cometh*, lent by Mrs. Sutton
 (no. 43) *Bacchus* (1883), lent by Dr Savage
 (no. 45) ***Jepthah and his Daughter***
 (no. 46) *The Pot of Basil* (1885), lent by Mrs Sutton
 (no. 47) *The Token*, lent by Mrs. Myer Salaman
 (no. 48) *Mystical Union* (1865)
 (no. 49) *Helen* (1883), lent by Miss Solomon
 (no. 50) *Study of Heads* (1888)
 (no. 51) *Et Lux in Tenebris Lucet* (1888), lent by The Misses Pater
 (no. 52) *The Unappeased Desire* (1887), lent by H. T. Tucker, Esq.
 (no. 53) ***The Winged and Poppied Sleep* (1883), lent by Mrs Hermann Cohen**
 (no. 54) *The Dawn* (1887)
 (no. 55) *Cupid, from 'Cupid and Psyche'*, lent by H. J. Tucker, Esq.
 (no. 56) ***O, Salve Anita* (1855), lent by Mrs Cohen**
 (no. 57) ***Good-night* (1861)**
 (no. 58) *Amor dei* (1883), lent by Dr. Savage
 (no. 59) *Hebrew Maiden* (1874)
 (no. 60) ***Study for 'The Prodigal Son'* (1857), lent by More Adey, Esq.**
 (no. 61) ***Ruth and Naomi***
 (no. 62) *Nicodemus*
 (no. 63) *La Figliuolina degli Oleandri* (1895)
 (no. 64) *Le Sieur René*
 (no. 65) ***Portrait of an Englishwoman*, lent by Mrs Hermann Cohen**
 (no. 66) *The Artist's Mother*
 (no. 67) *The Archangel Gabriel* (1896)
 (no. 68) *Nirvana* (1894), lent by Lady Katherine Somerset
 (no. 69) *Sintram* (1885), lent by J. A. Fuller Maitland, Esq.
 (no. 70) *Christianity* (1894), lent by Lady Katherine Somerset
 (no. 71) *The Medusa Head*, lent by Lord Battersea
 (no. 72) *Dawn and Twilight* (1895)
 (no. 73) *Beatrice*, lent by Dr. Tom Robinson
 (no. 74) *Miriam*
 (no. 75) *Dawn* (1880), lent by George Nathan, Esq.

(no. 76) *The Avenging Angel* (1895)(no. 77) *Reverie*, lent by Dr. Tom Robinson(no. 78) *Air* (1866), lent by Mrs Sutton(no. 79) *The Evening Star* (1890), lent by Dr Bertram Abrahams(no. 80) *Ophelia* (1887), lent by J. A. Fuller Maitland, Esq.(no. 81) *The Angel of Death*(no. 82) *The Awakened Conscience*(no. 83) *Anima mea tristia est* (1886), lent by Dr Savage(no. 84) *Child with Apples* (1881), lent by Dr. Savage(no. 85) *Immortal Love* (1886)(no. 85) *Immortal Love* (1887)(no. 86) *Maria foederis Arca* (1896)(no. 87) *Eight Designs for the Song of Solomon*, lent by Frederick Hollyer, Esq.(no. 88) *The Angel of Children* (1895)**(no. 89) 'Behold, this fair assemblage, stoles of snowy white, how numberless', *Vision of Dante, Paradiso Canto xxx***(no. 90) *Memoria* (1879), lent by Mrs Sutton(no. 91) *Study of a Child* (1887), lent by H. T. Tucker, Esq.(no. 92) *A vision* (1888)(no. 93) *Ianthe* (1885)(no. 94) *Angel of Fire* (1896)**(no. 95) *Gesthemanis sudor sanguines***(no. 96) *Passionis Amoris fructus* (1888), lent by Everard Meynell, Esq.(no. 97) *Night and Her Child Sleep***(no. 98) *Night and Morning***(no. 99) *St. John*(no. 99) *St. John* (1894)(d) *Arise my Love, my Dove, my Spouse*(e) *For Love is Strong as Death*(f) *I Arise Up to Open to my Beloved*(no. 100) *Young Christabel*(no. 101) *Diana and Endymion* (1894)(no. 102) *St. Peter*(no. 103) *Christ and Peter*, lent by Dr. Tom Robinson(no. 104) *Isabella* (1897)(no. 105) *Hero*(no. 106) *The Angel of Death* (1896)(no. 107) *Dante in Exile* (1895)(no. 108) *An Allegory*, lent by Mrs Sutton(no. 109) *Speak, Lord, for Thy Servant heareth* (1905), lent by Lord Battersea(no. 110) *My Love is a Rose among Thorns* (1892), lent by Mrs. Birngstingl(no. 111) *Orestes*(no. 112) *Angel of Death*(no. 113) *A Vision of Wounded Love* (1893)(no. 114) *Christ Kissing Moses*, lent by Mrs Herman Cohen(no. 115) *The Avenging Angel* (1895)(no. 116) *Young Pan*, lent by Dr Bertram Abrahams(no. 117) *Galatea*, lent by Miss Solomon(no. 118) *Six Panels forming a Screen*(no. 119) *Love dying from the breath of Lust*, lent by Mrs Birnstingl(no. 120) *Love Singing to Memory* (1900)(no. 121) *Paolo and Francesca*, lent by Everard Meynell, Esq.

(no. 122) *Habet* (an autotype), lent by Mrs. Edward Davis

Baillie Gallery, 54 Baker St, London, Paintings and Drawings by the Late Simeon Solomon (Version 2 of the catalogue)

(the works shown below were not included in version 1 of the above catalogue)

- (no. 37) *Moses* (1881), lent by Mrs. Sutton
- (no. 38) *Obediens usque ad mortem* (1881), lent by Mrs Sutton
- (no. 44) *The Hesperides*, lent by Mrs Sutton
- (no. 52) *Ritratto di Laura* (1896)
- (no. 62) *Dr. Faustus* (1886), lent by Mrs Sutton
- (no. 68) *The Boy Christ*
- (no. 71) *Julius Caesar* (1886)
- (no. 84) *Spring* (1882)
- (no. 85) *Children bringing Gifts to Cupid* (1882)
- (no. 86) *The Perseus Dream*
- (no. 93) *Spirit of Evil* (1905)
- (no. 98) *Vespertina* (1895)
- (no. 99) *Phoebus Apollo* (1895)
- (no. 100) *Rebuke them not*
- (no. 104) *Nirvana* (1887)
- (no. 107) *Sorrow* (1900)
- (no. 109) *Sleep* (1900)
- (no. 110) *Angelus Crepusculi* (1886)
- (no. 112) *Hyperion* (1885)
- (no. 115) *The Dreamer* (1900)

1st Jan – 10th March 1906

Royal Academy, 'Exhibition of Works by the Old Masters and Deceased Masters of the British School' – 57th Winter Exhibition

- (no.108) *Love in Winter* (1866), lent Mrs William Coltart
- (no.110) *The Finding of Moses*, lent Modern Art Gallery, Dublin
- (no.114) *The Mother of Moses*, lent W R Rawlinson
- (no.116) *Hosanna* (1861), lent Mrs. Charles Bayley
- (no.129) *Night after the Ball* 1863, lent Mrs William Coltart
- (no.180) *A Prelude by Bach*, lent Ernest Brown, [watercolour]
- (no.181) *The Bride*, lent Dublin, [watercolour]
- (no.182) *The Bridegroom*, lent Dublin, [watercolour]
- (no.183) *Girl at Fountain [Rebecca at the Well?]*, lent by Coltart) [from 1865, watercolour, 'half-figure to left, holding a vase to be filled at a fountain; red drapery, long fair hair; foliage background']
- (no.185) *Greek Priest*, lent by Coltart, [from 1867, watercolour]
- (no.186) *Lady in a Chinese Dress*, lent by Coltart, [from 1865, watercolour]
- (no.187) *Greeks going to a festival*, lent Dublin, [from 1873, watercolour]
- (no.189) *Poetry*, lent Dublin, [from 1864, watercolour]
- (no.190) *The Priest and the Acolyte*, lent Dublin, [from 1873, watercolour]
- (no.191) *Mystery of Faith*, lent by Coltart, [from 1870, watercolour]
- (no.193) "*And he shall give his angels charge over thee*", lent by Coltart, [from 1863, watercolour]

29th March – 9th May 1906

Whitechapel Art Gallery (Spring Exhibition)

(no.144) *Girl's Head*, lent by G Gilbert Dalziel

(no.202) *Caricature- 'A Pre-Raphaelite Studio Fantasy'*, lent Carfax & Co, London

(no.203) *Caricature- 'A Morning Call on the Six Movers (uninspired) of Mankind'*, lent Carfax & Co, London

(no.425) *Greek Priest*, lent by Mrs William Coltart

(no.428) *The Mystery of Faith*, lent by Mrs William Coltart

(no.430) *The Mother of Moses Sending Him Away*, lent by William George Rawlinson, included in *British Art Fifty Years Ago: Thirty Reproductions of Famous Pictures, with Descriptive Letterpress* (London and Scarborough: E T W Dennis, 1905)

7th Nov – 16th Dec 1906

Whitechapel Art Gallery, Exhibition of Jewish Art and Antiquities.

(no. 842) *Sadness*, lent by Dr Savage

(no. 843) *Helena*, lent by F. S. Franklin, Esq

(no. 844) *Wisdom and Folly* (drawing), lent by Dr Savage

(no. 845) *Amor et Libido*, lent by More Adey, Esq.

(no. 846) *Drawing*, lent by Dr. Savage

(no. 847) *Christ Blessing Little Children*, lent by Robert Ross, Esq.

(no. 848) *The Finding of Moses* (sketch), lent by Robert Ross, Esq.

(no. 849) *Ezekiel and the Angel* (study), lent by Robert Ross, Esq.

(no. 850) *Hagar and Ishmael*, lent by Messrs. Carfax and Co., Ltd

(no. 851) *Female Head*, lent by Ernest L. Franklin, Esq

(no. 852) *Christ and the Rabbi, Ben Israel*, lent by Randall Davies, Esq., F. S. A.

(no. 853) *Pencil Drawing of Artist's Brother*, lent by Mrs. Sylvester Solomon

(no. 854) *A. Head*, lent by F. S. Franklin, Esq

(no. 946) *Crayon Drawing*, lent by Dr. Savage

(no. 947) *Et Lux in Tenebris Lucet*, lent by Ernest L. Franklin, Esq.

(no. 948) *The Meeting of Dante and Beatrice*, lent by Robert Ross, Esq

(no. 949) *Lust Without the Gate of Life*, lent by More Adey, Esq.

(no. 950) *Babylon, the Golden Goblet*, lent by Carfax and Co, Ltd.

(no. 951) *The Bridegroom*, lent by Hugh F. Lane, Esq.

(no. 952) *Scenes from the Life of David*, lent by A. M. H. Solomon, Esq.

(no. 953) *A Deacon Bearing the Monstrance*, lent by More Adey, Esq.

(no. 954) *Daphne*, Lent by F. S. Franklin, Esq.

(no. 955) *Memoria*, lent by Dr. Savage

(no. 956) *Hypatia* (exhibited in R.A., 1857). (The late Rachel Levison), lent by Mrs. Adolph Arnolz

(no. 957) *The Prodigal Son*, lent by More Adey, Esq.

(no. 958) *In the Temple of Venus*, lent by the Victoria and Albert Museum

(no. 959) *Spes*, lent by More Adey, Esq.

(no. 960) *Biondina* (1876), lent by Mrs Knowles

(no. 961) *Jove Relating Tales to Girls*, lent by the Rev. Canon Hichens

(no. 962) *Hosanna*, lent by Mrs. Charles Bayley

(no. 963) *Three Priests*, lent by Lord Battersea

(no. 964) *A Rabbi*, lent by Lord Battersea

(no. 965) *The Magic Crystal* (1878), lent by Mrs Knowles

(no. 966) *Moses* (1876), lent by Mrs Knowles

(no. 967) *The Walk*, lent by the Rev. Canon Hichens

(no. 968) *Medusa Head*, lent by Lord Battersea

(no. 969) *Cupid's Playground*, lent by Mrs Herbert Cohen

- (no. 970) *Love Bound and Wounded* (1870), lent by Mrs Knowles
 (no. 971) *The Old Student*, lent by R. Ichenhauser, Esq.
 (no. 972) *The Mother of Moses*, lent by W. G. Rawlinson, Esq.
 (no. 973) *The Sleepers and the One that Keeps Watch*, lent by the Rev. Canon Hichens
 (no. 974) *In the Valley of the Shadow of Death*, lent by R. Ichenhauser
 (no. 975) *Isaac and Rebecca*, lent by Messrs. Carfax and Co., Ltd
 (no. 976) *Roma*, Lent by Dr. Savage
 (no. 978) *The Prodigal Son*, lent by More Adey, Esq.
 (no. 979) *The Angels Appearing to Abraham*, lent by Michael Solomons
 (no. 980) *Abraham and Isaac*, lent by Robert Ross, Esq.
 (no. 981) *Fra Angelico*, lent by More Adey, Esq
 (no. 982) *The Bridegroom of Death*, Lent by Mrs Herbert Cohen
 (no. 983) *Paolo and Francesca*, lent by Ernest L. Franklin, Esq
 (no. 984) *Pencil Drawing*, lent by M. S. Nathan, Esq
 (no. 985) *Isabella*, lent by More Adey, Esq
 (no. 986) *C. de H. Harris*, lent by Miss C. de H. Harris
 (no. 987) *Portrait of Himself*, Lent by Messrs, Carfax and Co., Ltd
 (no. 988) *The Sacrifice of Isaac*, lent by Michael Solomon, Esq
 (no. 989) *The Death of Henry Carson*, lent by More Adey, Esq

1907

Jewish Exhibition – Berlin

Solomon's work shown

1908

Whitechapel Art Gallery (Spring Exhibition)

(no.36) *David playing before Saul*, lent by Mrs C J Knowles

14th May 1908

Franco-British Exhibition, London

Mother of Moses

Love in Winter

Greek High Priest

1910

Messrs Agnew's Manchester Galleries

Painter's Pleasaunce

1911

Westminster Exhibition

Greek High Priest

1911

ROME, International Fine Arts Exhibition

Paintings

(no.89) *The Mother of Moses*, lent William George Rawlinson
 Watercolours

(no.575) *A Greek High Priest*, lent by Mrs Coltart

(no.576) *The Mystery of Faith*, lent by Mrs Coltart

1912

South London Art Gallery, Peckham Road

Solomon's work exhibited

APPENDIX II

WORK BY SOLOMON POST 1873 WITHOUT IMAGES

Year	Title	Medium	Size in mm	Auction	Exhibitions/ Owned by	Current Location
1873	<i>Meditation</i>	pencil/red crayon	254x279	Sotheby's (1985, lot 437)		Priv Coll
1874	<i>The Hebrew Maiden</i>	pencil	304x203	Phillips (1988, lot 76)	Baillie	
1876	<i>Moses</i>				1906 W/C Mrs Knowles	
	<i>The Lemon Seller</i>				Baillie	
	<i>Biondia</i>				1906 W/C Mrs Knowles	
1877	<i>Spring</i>					JM
1878	<i>My Vineyard which is Mine is before Me</i>					JM
1879	<i>Memoria</i>		355x228		Baillie Mrs Sutton Dr Savage	
	<i>A Girl Swooning in the Arms of Another</i>	Pencil/chalk	355x228	Christie's (1981, Lot 16)		Priv Coll
1880	<i>A Rabbi</i>				Lord Battersea	
	<i>Dawn</i>				George Nathan	
	<i>Sleep</i>	chalk	381x279	Sotheby's (1983, Lot 247)		Priv Coll
	<i>Two Sleepers and the one who Watcheth</i>	drawing				Priv Coll
1881	<i>Moses</i>				Baillie Mrs Sutton	
	<i>Obediens usque ad mortem</i>				Baillie Mrs Sutton	
	<i>Child with Apples</i>				Baillie Dr Savage	
1882	<i>Spring</i>				Baillie	Priv Coll
	<i>Children Bringing Gifts to Cupid</i>				Baillie	
1883	<i>Helen</i>				Baillie Miss	

					Solomon	
	<i>Amor Dei</i>				Baillie Dr Savage	
	<i>Bacchus</i>				Baillie Dr Savage	
	<i>Cupid</i>				Baillie	
	<i>The Winged and Poppied Sleep</i>				Baillie Mrs Hermann Cohen	
	<i>Cupid's Playground</i>				Baillie Mrs Herbert D Cohen	
1884	<i>Suffer Little Children</i>				Baillie	
	<i>Youth at Dusk</i>	Oil on board	480x 345	Sotheby's (1996)		Priv Coll
	<i>Good Tidings</i>	pencil	279x547	Sotheby's (1990, lot 295)		Priv Coll
1885	<i>The Pot of Basil</i>				Baillie Mrs Sutton	
	<i>Sintram</i>				Baillie J. A. Fuller Maitland	
	<i>Scutum Conscientiae</i>	pencil	406x279	Christie's (1990)		Priv Coll
	<i>Isanthe</i>				Baillie	
	<i>Flosshilda</i>		330x254	Christie's (1989, lot 1089)		Priv Coll
	<i>Hyperion</i>				Baillie	
	<i>Dr Faustus</i>				Baillie Mrs Sutton	
	<i>Julius Caesar</i>				Baillie	
	<i>Immortal Love</i>				Baillie	
	<i>I Sleep, my Heart Waketh</i>	Coloured chalk	355x279	Christie's (1984, Lot 104)		Priv Coll
	<i>Augelus Crepusculi</i>				Baillie	
	<i>Ophelia</i>				Baillie J. A. Fuller Maitland	
1887	<i>Study of a Child</i>				Baillie H.T. Tucker	
	<i>The Eternal Sleep</i>				Baillie Mrs Myer Salaman	
	<i>The Unappeased</i>				Baillie H. T. Tucker	

	<i>Desire</i>					
	<i>Immortal Love</i>				Baillie	
	<i>Nirvana</i>				Baillie	
	<i>Gabriel</i>	Pencil	406x220	Sotheby's (1980, lot 125)		Priv Coll
	<i>The Dawn</i>				Baillie	
	<i>Et Lux in Tenebris Lucet</i>				Baillie The Misses Pater/Ernest L. Franklin	

1888	<i>A Vision</i>				Baillie	
	<i>Study of Heads</i>				Baillie	
	<i>Sleep</i>		380x280			Priv Coll
	<i>Within the Ivory Gates</i>	Coloured chalk	406x279	Phillips, (1988, lot 101)		Priv Coll
	<i>Portrait of a Youth</i>	Red chalk/pape r	445x320	Bonhams (2002)		Priv Coll
	<i>Head of a Girl</i>	Red chalk	295x250	Sotheby's (1995)		Priv Coll
	<i>A Chinaman</i>	watercolo ur	254x203	Sotheby's (1982, lot 120)		Priv Coll
	<i>The Evening Star</i>				Baillie Dr Bertram Abrahams	
1890	<i>Matutina</i>		533x178	Sotheby's (1988, lot 394)		Priv Coll
1891	<i>Head of St Michael</i>	watercolo ur	279x203	Christie's (1988, lot 34)		Priv Coll
1892	<i>A Happy Day- dream</i>	chalk	508x381	Sotheby's (1981, lot13)		Priv Coll
	<i>Head of a Young Man</i>					Priv Coll
	<i>My Love is a Rose Among Thorns</i>	Red chalk	431x330	Sotheby's (1990, lot55)	Baillie Mrs Birnstingl	Priv Coll
	<i>The Shadow of the Cross</i>	watercolo ur	381x200	Sotheby's (1980, lot131)		Priv Coll
1893	<i>Diana the Huntress</i>		406x304	Lawrences (1986, lot131)		Priv Coll
	<i>Angelus Irae Dei</i>	chalk	381x254	Sotheby's (1980, lot 46)		Priv Coll

	<i>L'Amor che Muove Il Sole</i>	Red chalk	431x330	Christie's (1986)		Priv Coll
	<i>In the Summer Twilight</i>	Chalk drawing	482x431	Christie's (1989, lot 26)		Priv Coll
	<i>Love in Autumn (study)</i>				Baillie	
1894	<i>Nirvana</i>				Baillie Lady Katherine Somerset	
	<i>Christianity</i>				Baillie Lady Katherine Somerset	
	<i>Passionis Amoris Fructur</i>				Baillie Everard Meynell	
	<i>St John</i>				Baillie	
	<i>Profile of a Man</i>	pencil	305x235	Christie's (1996)		
	<i>Dawn and Twilight</i>				Baillie	
1895	<i>La Figliuolina degli Oleandri</i>				Baillie	
	<i>Many Waters Cannot Quench Love</i>				Baillie	
	<i>The Avenging Angel</i>				Baillie	
	<i>Vespertina</i>				Baillie	
	<i>Phoebus Apollo</i>				Baillie	
	<i>The Archangel Gabriel</i>	watercolour	355x228	Binoche et Godeau, France (1989)		Priv Coll
1896	<i>Night</i>	watercolour	308x238		Gift of Roger Wolcott, 1905, to Boston	Boston
	<i>Angel of Fire</i>				Baillie	
	<i>Greek Priest</i>		431x330	Christie's (1983, lot 70)		Priv Coll
	<i>As Diotina Speaking unto Charikles</i>	pencil	381x457	Sotheby's (1983, Lot 70)		Priv Coll
	<i>The Eve of Saint Agnes</i>	crayon	355x279	Champin, Lombrail & Gauter		Priv Coll

				(1987, lot 25)		
	<i>Spes Invicta</i>					Priv Coll
	<i>Death Awakening Sleep</i>					Priv Coll
	<i>Isabella</i>				Baillie	
1899	<i>Sleep</i>				Baillie	
1900	<i>Love Singing to Memory</i>				Baillie	
	<i>The Dreamer</i>				Baillie	
	<i>Trust in the Life to Come</i>				Baillie	
	<i>Burning Light</i>		762x250	Sotheby's (1987, lot 319)		Priv Coll
	<i>Medusa</i>		584x457	Christie's (1982, lot 176)		Priv Coll
	<i>Priest with a Monstrance</i>		762x635	Lawrences (1986, lot 126)		Priv Coll
	<i>Head of a Girl</i>	pencil	270x200	Sotheby's (1997)		Priv Coll
1903	<i>The Boy John</i>	pencil	371x264	Christie's (1990, lot 295)		Priv Coll
	<i>Sorrow</i>				Baillie	
1905	<i>Spirit of Evil</i>				Baillie	

Abbreviations

Baillie - Baillie, J. *Catalogue of an Exhibition of Paintings and Drawings by the Late Simeon Solomon: 116 Works Listed*. (London, 1905a).

Priv Coll – Private Collection

W/C - *Exhibition of Jewish Art and Antiquities: Whitechapel Art Gallery* (London, 1906).

APPENDIX III

SOLOMON PRINTS BY FREDERICK HOLLYER

From the *Complete Art Reference Catalogue* (Boston, 1902), 1179.

Solomon, (Simeon). Modern Painters

Magdalen (Head)
 The Fruit of the Passion of Love
 Head of Medusa
 "My soul is sorrowful unto death"
 Ave Maria.- Angel of the Annunciation
 Ecce Ancilla Domini
 Somnium in Somnio
 The Doubt of Pandora
 Waiting till Daybreak
 Night and her Child, Sleep.
 Isabella and Lorenzo
 "And angels ministered unto Him"
 The Raising of Jairus' Daughter
 Head of Child Christ

p1180

The Mystical Bridegroom
 "Dixit sponsus veni dilecta mea"
 Hertha
 Annunciation
 Night bidding the Dream to Descend to Earth
 Paolo and Francesca da Rimini
 Hero at Abydos Awaiting Leander
 "Nessum maggior dolore"
 "Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief"
 The Angel of the Children
 "He giveth His beloved sleep"
 Diana and Endymion
 The Rose of Sharon
 "I am my beloved's, and he is mine"
 The Angel of Wrath
 "For their angels do always behold the face of my Father"
 St. Peter
 Between Shine and Shade
 The Angel of Death
 The Avenging Angel
 The Child of Hermes and Aphrodite
 "Lord, it is I"
 Dante's Dream

Mercurius rusticus
The Dawn of Love
Twilight and Sleep
Love Confronted by Death
Time, the Consoler and Comforter
Hope
Apollo and Daphne
Many Waters Cannot Quench Love
Love Singing to Memory
Mignon
"And Jesus turned and looked upon Peter"
Blind Bartimaeus
Imperial Rome
Conscience
Orestes
"Man is born to trouble", etc.
Head of Christ

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources: Unpublished

Letters

Letter from Edmund Gosse to T. J. Wise, London, British Library, Ashley Collection. Ashley 1755, ff.18, Sept 30, 1920.

Letter from Edmund Gosse to T. J. Wise, London, British Library, Ashley Collection. Ashley B4273, ff. 11-12, April 15, 1924.

Letter to Charles Augustus Howell from Simeon Solomon - 1 Oct 1877, Manchester, John Ruskin, The Pre-Raphaelites, and the Arts and Crafts Movement Collection, John Rylands University Library, University of Manchester. Microfilm, 1877.

Letter to Charles Augustus Howell from Simeon Solomon - 1877, Manchester, John Ruskin, The Pre-Raphaelites, and the Arts and Crafts Movement Collection, John Rylands University Library, University of Manchester. Microfilm,

Letter to Charles Augustus Howell from Simeon Solomon - 27 Sept 1877, Manchester, John Ruskin, The Pre-Raphaelites, and the Arts and Crafts Movement Collection, John Rylands University Library, University of Manchester. Microfilm, 1877.

Letter to Charles Augustus Howell from Simeon Solomon, 25 Sept 1877, Manchester, John Ruskin, The Pre-Raphaelites, and the Arts and Crafts Movement Collection, John Rylands University Library, University of Manchester. Microfilm, 1877.

Letter to Oscar Browning from Simeon Solomon, Cambridge, Oscar Browning Collection, King's College Library and Archive, University of Cambridge. MS# 1/1531,

Letter to Oscar Browning from Simeon Solomon, Cambridge, Oscar Browning Collection, King's College Library and Archive, University of Cambridge. MS# 1/1531, 1896.

Letter from Rebecca Solomon to Charles Augustus Howell, Manchester, University of Manchester, John Rylands University Library.

Letter from Rebecca Solomon to Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Austin, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas.

Letter from Rebecca Solomon to Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Vancouver, University of British Columbia Library, Rare Books and Special Collections: Angeli Dennis Collection. (Box 4, Folder 11), 23 Sept 1879?

Letter from Simeon Solomon to George Powell 1871, Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, George Powell Collection.

Letter from Simeon Solomon to Mrs Tong, 30 January 1873. Rochester, University of Rochester, Manuscript Collection.

Census Documents

The National Archives, Kew

- 1851 England Census - Abraham and Rebecca, HO 107/1494, 1851.
 1861 England Census - Abraham and Rebecca, RG9/173, 1861.
 1861 England Census - Solomon Family, RG9/183, 1861.
 1871 England Census - 13 Wakefield St, RG10/216, 1871.
 1871 England Census - Brine Family, RG10/2074, 1871.
 1871 England Census - Cudlips, RG10/2089, 1871.
 1871 England Census - Solomon Family, RG10/371, 1871.
 1881 England Census - 9 Bloomsbury Street, London, RG11/321, 1881.
 1881 England Census - 13 Wakefield St, RG11/193, 1881.
 1881 England Census - 28 Winchester St, RG11/355,
 1881 England Census - 34 John Street, RG11/228,
 1881 England Census - 43 Wakefield St, RG11/193, 1881.
 1881 England Census - 50 Hatton Wall, London, RG11 343, 1881.
 1881 England Census - 212 Euston Road, RG11/197, 1881.
 1881 England Census - Fullwood's Rents, RG11/340, 1881.
 1881 England Census - John Boylett, RG11/325, 1881.
 1881 England Census - Kate Solomon, RG11/301, 1881.
 1881 England Census - Rebecca Solomon, RG 11/136, 1881.
 1881 England Census - Thomas Gates, RG11/313, 1881.
 1881 England Census - 81 Long Acre, RG11/329, 1881.
 1891 England Census - 359 Edgware Road, RG12/3, 1891.
 1891 England Census - Dyott St, RG12/212, 1891.
 1891 England Census - Simeon Solomon, RG12/210, 1891.
 1891 England Census - 81 Long Acre, RG12/213, 1891.
 1901 Census: 19 Macklin Street, RG13/238, 1901.
 1901 England Census: George Nathan, RG13/108, 1901.
 1901 England Census: Person in Institution Details, RG13/238/125/4/18, 31 March, 1901.
 1901 England Census: Person in Institution Details, RG13/238, 1901.

Manuscripts and Unpublished Sources

Boulton and Others Offence: Unnatural Offences, The National Archives, Kew. DPP 4/6,

Calendar of Prisoners, December 1883, London, London Metropolitan Archive.
 MJ/CP/13.

Calendar of Prisoners, 24 February, 1873, London, London Metropolitan Archive. X071/
 100.

Certificate of Death - Rebecca Solomon, London, General Register Office. DYC 012554,
 Nov 1886.

Deposition of Frederick Smith & Simeon Solomon, 17 December 1883, London
 Metropolitan Archive, No 48 - MJ/SPE/1883/53.

Diaries of Rosalind Howard, North Yorkshire, Castle Howard Archive. 1867/68/69,

Diaries of Shirley Brooks, London, London Library, 1873.

Diaries of William Michael Rossetti, Vancouver, University of British Columbia Library, Special Collections and University Archives Division. AW1.R7741, 1866-1892.

Diary of W H Thornycroft c1870s-1885, Henry Moore Institute Archives, Leeds.

Endell St Creed Register 1895-1898, London Metropolitan Archive. XO20/065.

Endell St Creed Register 1898-1900, London Metropolitan Archive. XO20/035.

Endell St Creed Register, London Metropolitan Archive. XO20/057, 1879.

England and Wales Criminal Registers: 1791 - 1892, The National Archives, Kew. HO26 and HO27.

Indictment - Middlesex Sessions Roll, 17 December 1883, London Metropolitan Archive. No 22 - MJ/SR/5665.

Indictments December Adjourned Sessions, 17 Dec 1883, London Metropolitan Archive. MJ/CB/013, X071/035 1882-1889.

Middlesex Sessions Roll: Adjourned Sessions, 24 February, 1873, London Metropolitan Archive. MJ/SB/C/020.

Parish of St Giles-in-the-Fields & St George, Bloomsbury Workhouse Examinations: Folio No 65320, London Metropolitan Archive. 12 June 1884, HOBG/502/41.

Pédérasts et Divers, Les Archives du Musee de la Prefecture de Police, Paris. BB6, 1874.

Private Solomon Family Tree, 1777 – present lent by Pam Solomon, (with additional research by Carolyn Conroy).

Register of Inquests Central Division, 1904-1912, London Metropolitan Archive. COR/A/10 (X9/10), 1905.

Registres Des Judgements De Tribunal Correctionnel De La Seine, Archives de Paris. DIU6, 68010, 18 Avril, 1874.

Sessions of the Peace, February 1873, London Metropolitan Archive. MJ/SR/5405.

The Queen vs. George Roberts and Simeon Solomon, Middlesex Sessions, 24 February, 1873, London Metropolitan Archive. MJ/SPE/1873/06.

Will of Michael Solomon, Public Record Office, The National Archives. Prob 11/2207, 1854/55.

Primary Sources: Published

Books

Anon. *Cleopatra's Needle, or the Labours of Cupid: A Farce in One Act* (London, 1877).

- _____. *Papers of the Manchester Literary Club* (Manchester, 1875).
- _____. *The Sins of the Cities of the Plain: Or the Recollections of a Mary-Ann* (London, 1881).
- _____. *Sins of the Cities of the Plain* (1881; New York, 2006).
- Bryson, J. (ed.) *Dante Gabriel Rossetti and Jane Morris: their Correspondence*, (Oxford, 1976).
- Burke, T. *Son of London* (London, 1948).
- Burne-Jones, G. M. *Memorials of Edward Burne-Jones*, 2nd ed (1904; New York, 1971).
- Cline, C. L. (ed.) *The Owl and the Rossettis: Letters of Charles A. Howell and Dante Gabriel, Christina, and William Michael Rossetti*, (University Park, 1978).
- Dalziel Brothers. *Dalziels' Bible Gallery* (London, 1881).
- Doughty, O. and J. R. Wahl. (eds.) *Letters of Dante Gabriel Rossetti 1871-1876*, 4 vols, Vol. 3 (Oxford, 1967).
- Du Maurier, D. (ed.) *The Young George Du Maurier: A Selection of His Letters, 1860-67*, (London, 1951).
- Evans, L. (ed.) *Letters of Walter Pater*, (Oxford, 1970).
- Flower, D., and H. Maas. (eds.) *The Letters of Ernest Dowson*, (London, Melbourne, 1967).
- Flower, N. (ed.) *The Journals of Arnold Bennett*, 3 vols Vol. 1 (London, Toronto, Melbourne, Sydney, 1932).
- Ford, J. E. *Simeon Solomon: An Appreciation* (New York, 1908a).
- _____. *King Solomon and the Fair Shulamite From "The Song of Songs" with Illustrations after Drawings by Simeon Solomon* (New York, 1908b).
- Fox, A. *Art Pictures from the Old Testament: Sunday Readings for the Young: A Series of Ninety Illustrations from Original Drawings* (London, 1894).
- _____. *Art Pictures from the Old Testament and Our Lord's Parables: A Series of One Hundred and Seventeen Illustrations* (London, 1900).
- Fraxi, P. (H. S. Ashbee) *Bibliography of Prohibited Books: Catena Librorum Tacendorum*, 3 vols. Vol. III (1885; New York, 1962).
- Frith, W. P. *My Autobiography and Reminiscences* (London, 1888).
- Graves, A. *The Royal Academy of Arts: A Complete Dictionary of Contributors and their Work from its Foundation in 1769 to 1904*, 8 vols. Vol. 4 (London, 1905-1906).

- Gregory, L. *Hugh Lane's Life and Achievement, with Some Account of the Dublin Galleries* (London, 1921).
- Johnson, L. *Ireland with Other Poems* (London, 1897).
- Lamont, L. M. *Thomas Armstrong, C. B: A Memoir* (London, 1912).
- Lang, C. Y. *The Swinburne Letters* 6 vols (New Haven, 1869-1882).
- . (ed.) *The Swinburne Letters (1869-1875)*, 6 vols Vol. II (New Haven, 1959b).
- . (ed.) *The Swinburne Letters (1875-1877)*, 6 vols Vol. III (New Haven, 1960).
- . (ed.) *The Swinburne Letters (1877 - 1882)*, 6 vols Vol. IV (New Haven, 1961).
- Layard, G. S. *A Great "Punch" Editor: Being the Life, Letters, and Diaries of Shirley Brooks* (London, 1907).
- Madox Ford, F. *Parade's End* (1924-28; London, 2001).
- Meyers, T. L. (ed.) *Uncollected Letters of Algernon Charles Swinburne*, 3 vols (London, 2005).
- Meynell, E. *The Life of Francis Thompson* (London, 1913).
- . *Solomon, Simeon (1840-1905), Vol. 1, The Dictionary of National Biography Supplement Jan 1901-Dec 1911*, (London, 1912).
- Mills, E. (ed.) *The Life and Letters of Frederic Shields* (New York, 1912).
- Parliament, G. B. *Parliamentary Papers: Great Britain Parliament, House of Commons* (London, 1863).
- Peattie, R. W. (ed.) *Selected Letters of William Michael Rossetti*, (University Park, London, 1990).
- Pethica, J. (ed.) *Lady Gregory's Diaries, 1892-1902*, (Oxford, 1996).
- Porter, C. E. *Lips of Music* (New York, 1910).
- Ross, M. *Robert Ross Friend of Friends: Letters to Robert Ross, Art Critic and Writer* (London, 1952).
- Ross, R. *Masques and Phases* (London, 1909).
- Rossetti, D. G. *Poems* (London, 1881).
- Rothenstein, W. *Men and Memories: A History of the Arts 1872 to 1922, Being the Recollections of William Rothenstein*, 2 vols. Vol. 1 (London, 1931).
- Schueller, H. M. and R. L. Peters. (eds.) *The Letters of John Addington Symonds (1869-1884)*, 3 vols, Vol 2, (Detroit, 1968).

Solomon, S. *A Mystery of Love Revealed in Sleep* (London, 1871).

———. *A Vision of Love Revealed in Sleep* (London, 1871).

———. *Two Treatises on Scientific Subjects. With Nobel and Striking Views of Remarkable Women* (London, 1871).

Stenbock, E. *Stanilaus Myrtle, Rue and Cypress* (1883; London, 1992).

Swinburne, C. A. *A Descriptive Catalogue of a Collection of Water-Colour Pictures and Painter-Etchers' Art at Beech-Hurst, Andover with Observations Thereon, Cursive and Discursive* (London, 1900).

Symons, A. 'The Painting of the Nineteenth Century', in *Studies in the Seven Arts* (London, 1906), 54-61.

Temple, A. G. *The Art of Painting in the Queen's Reign* (London, 1897).

———. *Guildhall Memories* (London, 1918).

Wise, T. J. *The Ashley Library*, 11 vols (London, 1922 - 1936).

Yeats, W. B. *Autobiographies* (1926; London, Basingstoke, 1955).

Journal Articles

Anon. The British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review, or, Quarterly Journal of Practical Medicine and Surgery July-Oct ed. Vol. XXII (London, 1858).

———. The British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review, or, Quarterly Journal of Practical Medicine and Surgery July-Oct ed. Vol. XVI (London, 1855).

———. 'Night by Simeon Solomon', *Burlington Magazine* (July 1989), xviii-xix.

———. 'Carfax & Co Ltd, Bury Street, London: Sale of Simeon Solomon Paintings Advert', *The Burlington Magazine* 10, No. 45, (Dec 1906), not numbered.

———. 'Carfax & Co Ltd, Bury Street, London: Sale of Simeon Solomon Paintings Advert', *The Burlington Magazine* 20, No. 103, (Oct 1911), un-numbered.

———. 'Advertisement for Hollyer Reproductions', *The Art Amateur* 35, no. 6 (Nov 1896), 106.

———. 'Advertisement for Hollyer Reproductions', *The Art Amateur* 37, no. 1 (June 1897), 147.

———. 'Art VI - Events of the Quarter', *The Englishwoman's Review* (1 July 1873), 201.

———. 'Illustrations of Jewish Customs', *The Leisure Hour*, (3 Feb - 20 Dec, 1866).

- _____. 'Marriage of C. A. Swinburne', *The Gentleman's Magazine*, (8 April, 1863), 654.
- _____. 'Obituary of Frederick William Spurgin', *British Medical Journal* 2, no. 3643 (1 November 1931), 759-60.
- _____. 'Obituary of John Hughes Bennett, M.S., F.R.S.E.' *British Medical Journal* 2 (9 October, 1875), 473-78.
- _____. 'Simeon Solomon', *Bay View Magazine* (January 1900), 141.
- _____. 'Society of Lady Artists, Great Marlborough Street', *Art Journal* (May 1874), 146.
- _____. 'St Giles & St George, Bloomsbury', *The Lancet*, (15 July, 1865).
- _____. 'The Collector', *The Art Amateur* 41, no. 4 (Sept 1899), 75.
- _____. 'The International Exhibition IV', *The Graphic*, (12 July, 1873), 36.
- _____. 'The Late Dr. Hughes Bennett', *British Medical Journal* 2 (16 October 1875), 502.
- _____. 'The Late Dr. Hughes Bennett', *The Medical Press & Circular* (13 October 1875), 311.
- _____. 'Workhouse Reform', *Punch* 50 (14 April 1866), 160.
- Burke, T. 'The Strange Case of Simeon Solomon', *Lilliput Magazine* (July 1844), 38-40.
- E.M. 'Simeon Solomon', *The Bystander* (20 December 1905), 609.
- Jackson, H. E. 'The Language of the Face', *The Biblical World* 27, no. 6 (June 1906), 440-41.
- Horne, H. P. *The Century Guild Hobby Horse* 4, no. 23 (July 1891).
- _____. 'Illustration Corruptio Optimi Pessima 1893', *The Century Guild Hobby Horse*, no. 2 (1893), 51.
- Lathrop, G. P. 'The Dudley Gallery Exhibition', *The Independent: Devoted to the Consideration of Politics, Social and Economic Tendencies, History, Literature, and the Arts* (New York) 24, no. 1215 (14 March 1872), 2.
- Lenox, P. J. 'The Supreme Face of the Christian Centuries', *The Biblical World* 12, no. 6 (December 1898), 380-99.
- Merriman, H. B. 'The English Pre-Raphaelite and Poetical School of Painters', *The Andover Review: a Religious and Theological Monthly* 1, no. 6 (June 1884), 594.
- Pater, W. 'A Study of Dionysus', *Fortnightly Review*, no. 20 (December 1876), 752-72.
- Ricketts, C. R. R. 'The Franco-British Exhibition', *The Burlington Magazine* 13, no. 64 (July 1908), 197-98.

- Ross, R. 'Simeon Solomon', *Academy* (23 December 1905b), 1336-37.
- . 'Simeon Solomon (a Biography)', *The Bibelot* 17 (April 1911), 139-51.
- Stead, W. T. (ed.) *The Review of Reviews*, July - Dec Ed. Vol. 4 (London, 1891).
- Symons, A. 'Simeon Solomon: From Studies in Seven Arts by Arthur Symons 1906', *The Bibelot* 17 (1911), 152-58.
- Walker, S. A. 'Fine Arts: Philadelphia Notes', *The Independent: Devoted to the Consideration of Politics, Social and Economic Tendencies, History, Literature, and the Arts (New York)* 48, no. 2500 (29 October 1896), 7.
- Whiteford, S. T. 'A Half Forgotten Genius (Part One)', *The Art Amateur*, no. 27 (December 1892), 7-9.
- . 'A Half Forgotten Genius (Part Two)', *The Art Amateur*, no. 28 (January 1893), 46-47.
- Wilde, O. 'The Grosvenor Gallery', *Dublin University Magazine* 90 (July 1877), 118-26.
- Wilson, L. M. 'Simeon Solomon: A Dreamer of Dreams', *Fine Arts Journal* (September 1911), 162-66.

Newspaper Articles

The Jewish Chronicle

- Anon. 'Advert for the Freemason's Tavern', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (18 September, 1889), 16.
- . 'Advert For: Series of Jewish Photographs and Drawings by Simeon Solomon', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (18 July, 1862), 4.
- . 'At the Royal Academy (Second Notice)', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (12 June, 1874), 170.
- . 'Death of Mr Ernest Hart', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (14 Jan, 1898), 12-13.
- . 'Death of Simeon Solomon', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (18 August, 1905), 22.
- . 'Death of Simeon Solomon', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (24 February, 1905), 20.
- . 'Deaths - Mr Myer Salaman', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (3 April, 1896), front page.
- . 'Deaths - Mr Sylvester Solomon', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (16 September, 1881), front page.
- . 'Exhibition of the Royal Academy', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (4 June, 1858), 197.

- . 'Fine Arts', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (8 November, 1872), 433.
- . 'Grosvenor Square School of Medicine', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (14 May, 1858), 175.
- . 'Is There a Jewish Art?' *The Jewish Chronicle*, (28 July, 1911), 16-17.
- . 'Jewish Exhibition in Berlin', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (22 November, 1907), 13.
- . 'Jews Free School - Scholarship Day', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (23 June, 1876), 182.
- . 'John Baillie Request', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (6 October, 1905), 22.
- . 'Pictures by Miss Rebecca Solomon', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (20 August, 1875), 334.
- . 'Rebecca Solomon Portrait of Sir Anthony De Rothschild', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (30 June, 1876), 195.
- . 'Royal Academy', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (22 May 1874), 117.
- . 'South London Art Gallery Exhibition', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (31 May, 1912), 25.
- . 'The Exhibition of the Institute of Painters in Water-Colour', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (16 June, 1876), 170.
- . 'The Jewish Exhibition - Deceased Artists', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (9 November, 1906), 4-5.
- . 'The Late Abraham Solomon', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (16 January, 1863), 5.
- . 'The Maccabeans: Art Dinner', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (24 February, 1905), 11.
- . 'The Whitechapel Art Gallery', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (15 March, 1901), 14.
- . 'Tombstone - Mr Sylvester Solomon', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (21 October, 1881), front page.
- . 'Town and Table Talk', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (30 June, 1876), 206.
- . 'Wills - Nathan Salaman', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (19 May, 1905), 29.
- Jacobs, G. 'In View', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (3 June, 1983), 16.
- Levy, A. B. 'Solomon's Strange Return', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (1 February, 1963), 30.
- Samuel, S. M. 'Jews and Art', *The Jewish Chronicle*, (13 November, 1891), 33.

The Times

- Anon. 'An Obituary', *The Times*, (19 August, 1905), 5.

- _____. 'Burlington House Exhibition', *The Times*, (16 February, 1906), 7.
- _____. 'Cabinet Pictures in Oil', *The Times*, (26 Oct, 1869), 5.
- _____. 'Case of Richard Gibson', *The Times*, (18 May, 1865), 11.
- _____. 'Decree Granted to Lady Katharine Somerset', *The Times*, (20 May, 1920), 5.
- _____. 'Inquest', *The Times*, (18 August, 1905), 9.
- _____. 'Middlesex Sessions', *The Times*, (20 December, 1883), 2.
- _____. 'Middlesex Sessions - Sept 11', *The Times*, (12 September, 1871), 9.
- _____. 'Middlesex Sessions: December 22', *The Times*, (23 December, 1874), 11.
- _____. 'Mr Cecil Crofton', *The Times*, (26 Nov, 1935), 12.
- _____. 'Mr Guy Knowles Benefactor of the Fitzwilliam', *The Times*, (8 May, 1959), 15.
- _____. 'Places Wanted', *The Times*, (2 Dec, 1881), 12.
- _____. 'Police', *The Times*, (13 June, 1870), 13.
- _____. 'Police', *The Times*, (30 April, 1870), 11.
- _____. 'Sale of the Late James Leathart's Collection of Paintings.' *The Times*, (17 June, 1897), 18.
- _____. 'Sale of Pictures: The Late Mr Charles Alfred Swinburne', *The Times*, (4 July, 1904), 11.
- _____. 'Simeon Solomon at Baillie Gallery Advertisement', *The Times*, (16 December, 1905), 2.
- _____. 'Swinburne and Parker Solicitors', *The Times*, (31 Oct, 1877), 12.
- _____. 'The Dudley Gallery Exhibition', *The Times*, (11 November, 1872), 4.
- _____. 'The Grosvenor Gallery', *The Times*, (1 May, 1884), 6.
- _____. 'The Men in Women's Clothes', *The Times*, (30 May, 1870), 13.
- _____. 'The Pre-Raphaelite Exhibition at the Goupil Gallery', *The Times*, (13 June, 1896), 2.
- _____. 'The Young Men in Women's Clothes', *The Times*, (16 May, 1870), 13.
- _____. 'Winter Exhibition at Burlington House', *The Times*, (20 Dec, 1905), 6.
- _____. 'Young Men in Women's Clothes', *The Times*, (14 May 1870), 10.

Manchester Guardian

- Anon. 'Annual Exhibition of the Liverpool Corporation', *The Manchester Guardian*, (7 September, 1874), 5.
- _____. 'Christmas Books', *The Manchester Guardian*, (13 November, 1880), 9.
- _____. 'From Our London Correspondent', *The Manchester Guardian*, (29 April, 1873), 6.
- _____. 'Messrs Agnew's Manchester Galleries', *The Manchester Guardian*, (2 November, 1910), 6.
- _____. 'Our London Correspondent', *The Manchester Guardian*, (18 August, 1905), 6.
- _____. 'Royal Manchester Institution', *Manchester Guardian*, (10 September, 1874), 5.
- _____. 'Sale of Picture', *The Manchester Guardian*, (1881), 3.
- _____. 'The Artist's Agency', *The Manchester Guardian*, (3 February, 1881), 6.
- _____. 'The English "Pre-Raphaelites" at the Birmingham Art Gallery', *The Manchester Guardian*, (14 October, 1891), 8.
- _____. 'The Exhibition in Ancoats', *The Manchester Guardian*, (5 August, 1880), 8.
- Housman, L. 'The Work of Simeon Solomon', *Manchester Guardian*, (5 January, 1906), 14.

Other London Newspapers

- Anon. 'Advertisements and Notices', *The Illustrated Police News*, (15 August, 1896), 8.
- _____. 'Art Notes', *The Illustrated London News*, (6 January, 1906), 34 col 3.
- _____. 'Bankruptcy - Receiving Orders', *The London Gazette*, (5 May, 1885), 2075.
- _____. 'Burglary at Gold Beater's Warehouse', *Lloyds Weekly Newspaper*, (9 December, 1883), 2.
- _____. 'In the London Bankruptcy Court', *The London Gazette*, (9 March, 1877), 39.
- _____. 'Items of News', *The Illustrated Police News*, (15 December, 1883), 2.
- _____. 'Military Promotions and Exchanges', *Freeman's Journal & Daily Commercial Advertiser*, (25 March, 1869), no page number.
- _____. 'Notice of Dividends', *The London Gazette*, (13 February, 1903), 983.
- _____. 'Notice', *The London Gazette*, (2 July, 1869), 3770.

- _____. 'Society of Lady Artists, Marlborough Street', *The Examiner*, (21 March, 1874), 294.
- _____. 'Solomon Arrest for Burglary', *The Illustrated Police News* (December 29, 1883), 3.
- _____. 'Winter Exhibition at the Dudley Gallery', *The Era*, (2 November, 1873), 4.
- _____. 'Young Men Charged with Appearing in Women's Clothes', *Illustrated Police News*, (14 May, 1870), front page.

Ross, R. 'A Note on Simeon Solomon', *The Westminster Gazette*, (24 August, 1905a), 1-2.

M.W. 'Art Notes', *The Illustrated London News*, (26 August, 1905), 312 col 1-2.

Other UK Newspapers

- Anon. 'Art, Science and Literature', *The Bristol Mercury and Daily Post*, (11 Sept, 1880), 6.
- _____. 'A Burglary in Hatton Garden', *The Leeds Mercury*, (21 December, 1883), 5.
- _____. 'Blighted Genius', *Daily Mirror*, (18 August, 1905), 4.
- _____. 'Bluebeard', *Manchester Times*, (30 December, 1871), 5.
- _____. 'Book Now on Sale', *The Preston Guardian*, (27 December, 1884), front page.
- _____. 'Dalziels' Bible Gallery', *Glasgow Herald*, (13 Nov, 1880), 4.
- _____. 'Death of Frederick Craven', *Manchester Times*, (13 April, 1894), 8.
- _____. 'Death of Mr Frederick Craven', *Bristol Mercury & Derby Post*, (14 April, 1894), 4.
- _____. 'Manchester Royal Institution Exhibition', *Liverpool Mercury*, (23 October, 1882), 6.
- _____. 'Our London Correspondent', *Glasgow Herald* (25 August, 1892), 5.
- _____. "'Painters Pleasure [sic]" and "Dawn"'. ' *Birmingham Daily Post*, (2 October, 1891), 4.
- _____. 'Sale of Abraham Solomon's Work', *The Lady's Newspaper* (23 March 1863), 383.
- _____. 'Teign Cottage for Sale', *Trewman's Exeter Flying Post*, (17 March 1859), front page.
- _____. 'The Liverpool Exhibition of Paintings, Free Library', *The Liverpool Mercury*, (6 October, 1873), 6.

_____. 'The Royal Academy', *Hampshire Telegraph and Sussex Chronicle* (3 May, 1873), 3.

_____. 'Tragedy of Blighted Genius', *Daily Mirror*, (19 August, 1905), 4.

International Newspapers

Anon. 'A Wasted Genius. A Tragedy of Art', *The Advertiser*, Australia, (27 September, 1905), 9.

_____. 'A Wasted Life', *The Piqua Daily Call*, (7 Oct, 1905), 6.

_____. 'The Great Pre-Raphaelite Painters', *The New Haven Register*, (9 October, 1895), 2.

Directories

British Phone Books, 1880-1984 Releases 1-3, www.ancestry.com (accessed 10 July 2007).

British Phone Books, BT Archives, www.ancestry.co.uk (accessed 6 May 2009).

Kelly's London Post Office Directory, London, 1872.

Kelly's London Post Office Directory, London, 1873.

Kelly's London Post Office Trades Directory, London, 1873.

Kelly's London Post Office Commercial Directory, London, 1874.

Kelly's London Post Office Directory, London, 1874.

Kelly's London Post Office Directory, London, 1875.

Kelly's London Post Office Directory, London, 1882.

The Business Directory of London, London, J.S.C. Morris. 1884.

Auction Catalogues

Christie, Manson and Woods Sales Catalogues: Nineteenth Century

Collection of the Late Right Honourable Lord Leighton of Stretton (London, 1886).

Mr William Graham's Collection (London, 2 April, 1886).

The Choice Collection of Modern Pictures and Water-Colour Drawings Formed by Frederick Craven (London, 18 May 1895).

Collection of Edward Chambers Nicholson (London, 1898).

Christie's Auction Catalogues: Twentieth Century

- Symbolist Paintings and Watercolours - 1 December 1989* (London, 1989).
- Victorian Watercolours - 13 Nov 1992* (London, 1992a).
- 19th Century Paintings - 29 October 1992* (London, 1992b).
- Victorian Pictures and Drawings - 4 November 1994* (London, 1994).
- Victorian Paintings, Drawings & Watercolours -14 March 1997* (London, 1997a).
- Victorian Pictures - 6 June 1997* (London, 1997b).
- British Watercolours - 7 April 1998* (London, 1998).
- Christie's Auction Catalogue - 4 November 1999* (London, 1999).
- Christie's Auction Catalogue - 2 May 2000* (New York, 2000).
- British Art on Paper - 7 June 2001*, (London, 2001).
- British Art on Paper - 21 Nov 2002* (London, 2002).
- British Art on Paper - 20 Nov 2003* (London, 2003a).
- British Art on Paper - 5 June 2003* (London, 2003b).
- The John Schaeffer Collection at Rona - 16 May 2004* (Sydney, Australia, 2004).
- British Art on Paper - 9 June 2005* (London, 2005a).
- British and Continental Watercolour - 28 Sept 2005* (London, 2005b).
- British and Continental Watercolours - 29 Nov 2006* (London, 2006a).
- British Art on Paper - 16 Nov 2006* (London, 2006b).
- British Art on Paper - 5 June 2007* (London, 2007a).
- Christopher Wood, a Very Victorian Eye - 28 Feb 2007* (London, 2007b).
- 19th Century European Art and Oriental Art - 24 October 2007* (New York, 2007c).
- British Art on Paper - 21 Nov 2007* (London, 2007d).
- British and Continental Watercolour Drawings - 11 Dec 2007* (London, 2007d).

Sotheby's Auction Catalogues

Sotheby's Auction Catalogue - 1973 (London, 1973).

Sotheby's Auction Catalogue - 1974 (London, 1974).

British and Continental Pictures - 12 Oct 2005 (London, 1979).

Early English Drawings & Victorian Watercolours - 21 Sep 1988 (London, 1988).

Sotheby's Auction Catalogue - 1990 (New York, 1990).

Victorian Paintings and Watercolours - 4 March 1992 (London, 1992).

Sotheby's Auction Catalogue - 14 March 1992 (London, 1992).

Victorian Pictures - 3 Nov 1993 (London, 1993a).

Victorian Drawings and Watercolours - 5 November 1993 (London, 1993b).

Victorian Pictures Including Works from Forbes Magazine Collection - 9 June 1994
(London, 1994).

Victorian Pictures - 6 Nov 1995 (London, 1995a).

Drawings from Britain and the Continent - 10 July 1995 (London, 1995b).

Victorian Pictures - 6 Nov 1996 (London, 1996a).

Victorian Pictures - 5 May 1996 (London, 1996b).

Realms of the Mind: Fantasy Art and Illustration - 30 Oct 1997 (London, 1997).

'Victorian Pictures' Including Works by Burne-Jones and his Circle - 11 Nov 1998
(London, 1998a).

Realms of the Mind: Fantasy Art and Illustration - 12 Nov 1998 (London, 1998b).

Victorian Pictures - 3 June 1998 (London, 1998c).

Old Masters and 19th Century European Art - 9 July 1999 (New York, 1999).

Victorian Pictures - 19 Dec 2001 (London, 2001).

European & American Paintings, Drawings & Sculpture - 7 Nov 2003 (New York, 2003a).

The British Sale - 12 June 2003 (London, 2003b).

The Collecting Eye of Seymour Stein - 11 Dec 2003 (New York, 2003c).

19th Century European Paintings - 1 Oct 2003 (London, 2003d).

Victorian and Edwardian Pictures - 25 Nov 2004 (London, 2004a).

The British Sale: Paintings, Drawings and Watercolours - 26 March 2004 (London, 2004b).

British and Continental Pictures - 12 Oct 2005 (London, 2005).

Victorian and Edwardian Art - 27 June 2006 (London, 2006a).

Victorian and Edwardian Art - 14 Dec 2006 (London, 2006b).

Fine Art, Old Masters and 19th Century European Art - 28 Jan 2006 (New York, 2006c).

Victorian and Edwardian Art - 12 July 2007 (London, 2007).

Victorian and Edwardian Interiors - 15 July 2008 (London, 2008).

Bonham's Auction Catalogues

Fine English Watercolours and Drawings - 2 Nov 1995 (London, 1995).

Nineteenth Century Paintings - 28 June 2005 (London, 2005).

Victorian Art - 20 March 2007 (London, 2007a).

Victorian Paintings, Drawings and Watercolours - 21 June 2007 (London, 2007b).

Victorian Paintings, Drawings and Watercolours - 21 Nov 2007 (London, 2007c).

British and Continental Pictures - 27 Nov 2007 (London, 2007d).

British and Continental Pictures - 30 Oct 2007 (London, 2007e).

Contents of One of the Renowned Artist's Studios on Talgarth Road - 24 July 2007 (London, 2007e).

Victorian Watercolours and Illustrations from a Private Collection - 19 Nov 2008 (London, 2008).

Other Auction Catalogues

Brown & Brown Auction Catalogue: Auction of Works from Eleanor Coltart's Collection - 30 Oct - 5 Nov (Liverpool, 1917).

Champin, Lombrail & Gautier Auction Catalogue - Les Symbolists - 25 Oct 1987, (France, 1987).

Galerie Auktion Burkard - Kunst Des 20 Jahrhunderts Leitgenossische Kunst - 21 November 1998 (Germany, 1998).

Lawrences Auctioneers Ltd Catalogue - 30 Oct 1986 (Crewkerne, 1986).

New Orleans Galleries Auction Catalogue - 28 Jan 2007 (New Orleans, USA, 2007).

Phillips Auction Catalogue - *Fine English Watercolours & Drawings* - 2 Nov 1987 (London, 1987).

Phillips Auction Catalogue - *Fine English Watercolours & Drawings* - 6 Nov 1989 (London, 1989).

Phillips Auction Catalogue - *British and European Watercolours and Portrait Miniatures* – 9 Nov 1999 (London, 1999).

Skinner Auction Catalogue - *American and European Paintings* - 31 May 1996, (Boston, 1996).

Exhibition and Other Catalogues

Baillie, J. *Catalogue of an Exhibition of Paintings and Drawings by the Late Simeon Solomon*: 116 Works Listed. (London, 1905a).

———. *Catalogue of an Exhibition of Paintings and Drawings by the Late Simeon Solomon*: 122 Works Listed. (London, 1905b).

Complete Art Reference Catalogue (Boston, 1902).

Catalogue of Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition 1887. Royal Albert Hall (London, 1887).

Exhibition of Jewish Art and Antiquities: Whitechapel Art Gallery (London, 1905).

Exhibition of Jewish Art and Antiquities: Whitechapel Art Gallery (London, 1906).

Koch, T. W. *Handlist of Frames Reproductions of Pictures and Portraits Belonging to the Dante Collection* (New York, 1900).

Paris. Exposition Universelle. Worlds Fair of 1889 (1889; New York, 1981).

Paris Exhibition, 1900. British Official Catalogue (London, Paris, 1900).

Online Archives

Charles Booth Online Archive, London School of Economics & Political Science
www.booth.lse.ac.uk/ (accessed 1 February 2006).

Charles Booth Online Archive: Survey Notebooks, London School of Economics,
www.booth.lse.ac.uk/ (accessed 12 July 2007).

England and Wales FreeBMD Death Index, The National Archives, Vol 1b, page 161,
www.ancestry.co.uk (accessed 5 Oct 2008).

England and Wales FreeBMD Marriage Index, The National Archives, Vol 1b, page 269,
www.ancestry.co.uk (accessed 2 October 2008).

London, England, Deaths and Burials, London Metropolitan Archive, Register of Deaths in the St Giles' Workhouse, www.ancestry.co.uk (accessed 22 Sept 2009).

Secondary Sources

Books and Book Chapters

Acton, W. *Practical Treatise on Diseases of the Urinary and Generative Organs in Both Sexes* (Philadelphia, 1858).

Adlard, J. *Stenbock, Yeats and the Nineties* (London, 1969).

Aldrich, R. and G. Wotherspoon (eds.) *Who's Who in Gay and Lesbian History: From Antiquity to World War II* (New York, 2001).

Alford, N. *Rhymers' Club: Poets of the Tragic Generation* (1994; New York, 1996).

Archbold, J. Frederick. *The Poor Law, Comprising the Whole of the Law of Settlement, and all the Authorities Upon the Subject of the Poor Law Generally* (London, 1856).

Baedeker, K. *Paris and its Environs: With Routes from London to Paris, Paris to the Rhine* (Leipzig, 1878).

———. *London and its Environs: Including Excursions to Brighton, the Isle of Wight, Etc.* (London, 1883).

———. *London and its Environs: Handbook for Travellers* (London, 1889).

Bailey, V. *Policing and Punishment in Nineteenth Century Britain* (London, 1981).

Baldwin, A. W. *The Macdonald Sisters* (London, 1960).

Bartlett, N. *Who Was That Man? A Present for Mr Oscar Wilde* (London, 1988).

———. 'A Vision of Love Revealed in Sleep', in M. Wilcox, (ed.) *Gay Plays: Volume Four* (London, 1990), 81-112.

Beale, P. and E. Partridge. (eds.) *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*, 8th ed. (London, 2002).

Beames, T. *The Rookeries of London* (1850; 1852; London, 1970).

Beck, T. R. and W. Dunlop. *Elements of Medical Jurisprudence* (London, 1825).

Beckson, K. *Arthur Symons: A Life* (Oxford, 1987).

Beerbohm, M. *Seven Men* (London, 1919).

- Beier, A. L. 'Henry Mayhew and the Language of the Underclass in Mid-Nineteenth-Century London', in A. L. Beier and P. Osofsky, (eds.) *Cast Out: Vagrancy and Homelessness in Global and Historical Perspective* (Ohio, 2008), 88-116.
- Bellamy, R. (ed.) *Victorian Liberalism: Nineteenth Century Political Thought and Practice* (London, 1990).
- Bills, M. and V. Knight *William Powell Frith: Painting the Victorian Age* (Yale, 2006).
- Binyon, L. *English Water-Colours* (London, 1933).
- Black, N. *Walking London's Medical History* (London, 2006).
- Bloch, I. *The Sexual Life of Our Time in its Relations to Modern Civilization* Translated by M. Eden Paul (1907; London, 1909).
- . *Marquis De Sade: His Life and Works* (1906; London, 2002).
- Bloom, H. *Yeats* (New York, Oxford, 1970).
- Booth, C. *Descriptive Map of London Poverty 1889, Life and Labour in London - First Series Maps* (London, 1889).
- . *Life and Labour of the People in London - First Series* 4 vols. Vol. 2 (1891; London, 1902).
- . *Life and Labour of the People in London* 17 vols (London, 1902-1903).
- . *Life and Labour of the People in London - Second Series* 4 vols. Vol. 3 (1896, 1903).
- . *Life and Labour of the People in London - First Series* 4 vols. Vol. 1 (1889, 1891, 1902; London, 1904).
- Booth, G. W. *In Darkest England and the Way Out* (London, 1890).
- Borland, M. *Wilde's Devoted Friend: A Life of Robert Ross 1869-1918* (Oxford, 1990).
- Bornand, O. *The Diary of W. M. Rossetti 1870-1873* (Oxford, 1977).
- Braun-Falco, O., G. Plewig, H. H. Wolff, and W. H. C. Burgdorf. *Dermatology* (Berlin, New York, 2000).
- Browning, O. *Memories of Sixty Years at Eton, Cambridge and Elsewhere* (London, 1910).
- Brundage, A. *The English Poor Laws, 1700-1930* (Hampshire, 2002).
- Bucknill, J. C. *The Care of the Insane and their Legal Control* (London, 1880).
- Burbank, W. H. *Photographic Printing Methods* (New York, 1887).

- Burdett, H. C. *Hospitals and Asylums of the World* (London, 1891).
- Carden, M. *Sodomy: A History of a Christian Biblical Myth* (London, 2004).
- Carroll, M. P. *Catholic Cults and Devotions: A Psychological Inquiry* (Quebec, 1989).
- Carter, J. and G. Pollard. *An Enquiry into the Nature of Certain Nineteenth Century Pamphlets* 2nd ed. (1934; Aldershot, 1983).
- Choquette, L. 'Homosexuals in the City: Representations of Lesbian and Gay Space in Nineteenth-Century Paris', in J. Merrick and M. Sibalis, (eds.) *Homosexuality in French History and Culture* (New York, London, Paris, 2001).
- Christian, J. *Symbolists and Decadents* (London, 1977).
- Clausen, W. *A Commentary on Virgil, Eclogues* (1994; Oxford, 2003).
- Clayton, E. C. *English Female Artists* 2 vols. Vol. 2 (London, 1876).
- Cocks, H. G. *Nameless Offences: Homosexual Desire in the Nineteenth Century* (London, New York, 2003a).
- Coffignon, A. *Paris Vivant: La Corruption À Paris* (Paris, 1889).
- Cohen, E. *Talk on the Wilde Side* (London, 1993).
- Cohen, R. I. *Jewish Icons: Art and Society in Modern Europe* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1998).
- Cook, M. *London and the Culture of Homosexuality, 1885-1914* (Cambridge, 2003).
- Coombes, A. E. 'The Franco-British Exhibition: Packaging Empire in Edwardian England', in J. D. C. Beckett, (ed.) *The Edwardian Era* (London, 1987), 152-66.
- Cooper, E. 'A Vision of Love: Homosexual and Androgynous Themes in Simeon Solomon's Work after 1873', in Geffrye Museum Exhibition Catalogue, *Solomon, a Family of Painters: Abraham Solomon (1823-1862), Rebecca Solomon (1832-1886), Simeon Solomon (1840-1905)* (London, 1985), 31-35.
- . *The Sexual Perspective: Homosexuality and the Arts in the Last 100 Years in the West* 2nd ed. (1986; London, 1994).
- Cornish, W. R., J. Hart, A. H. Manchester, and J. Stevenson. *Crime and Law in Nineteenth Century Britain* (Dublin, 1978).
- Crawford, E. *The Women's Suffrage Movement in Britain and Ireland* (UK, 2006).
- Croft-Cooke, R. *Feasting with Panthers: A New Consideration of Some Late Victorian Writers* (London, 1967).
- Crowther, M. A. *The Workhouse System 1834-1929: The History of an English Social Institution* (1981; London, 1983).

- Cruise, C. *Love Revealed: Simeon Solomon and the Pre-Raphaelites* (London, 2005).
- Cunningham, P. *Handbook of London, Past and Present* (London, 1850).
- Dalziel, G. and E. Dalziel *The Brothers Dalziel: A Record of Fifty Years' Work in Conjunction with Many of the Most Distinguished Artists of the Period 1840-1905* (London, 1901).
- Davenport-Hines, R. *Sex, Death and Punishment: Attitudes to Sex and Sexuality in Britain since the Renaissance* (London, 1991).
- Dellamora, R. *Masculine Desire: The Sexual Politics of Victorian Aestheticism* (Chapel Hill, London, 1990).
- Derclays, E. *Research Handbook on the Future of EU Copyright* (London, 2009).
- Dickens, C. *The Works of Charles Dickens in Thirty-Four Volumes* 35 vols. Vol. 34 (London, 1868).
- Dowling, L. *Hellenism and Homosexuality in Victorian Oxford* (Ithaca, London, 1994).
- Driver, F. *Power and Pauperism: The Workhouse System, 1834-1884* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Earle, W. T. *The Victorian Romantics 1850-1870: The Early Works of Dante Gabriel Rossetti, William Morris, Burne-Jones, Swinburne, Simeon Solomon and Their Associates* (London, 1929).
- Edwards, J. *Alfred Gilbert's Aestheticism: Gilbert Amongst Whistler, Wilde, Leighton, Pater and Burne-Jones* (Hampshire, Burlington, 2006).
- Ellis, H. H, and J. A. Symonds *Sexual Inversion* 6 vols. Vol. 1, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (London, 1897).
- Falk, B. *Five Years Dead: A Postscript To "He Laughed in Fleet Street"* (London, 1937).
- Ferrari, R. C. 'Pre-Raphaelite Patronage: Simeon Solomon's Letters to James Leathart and Frederick Leyland', in C. Cruise, (ed.) *Love Revealed: Simeon Solomon and the Pre-Raphaelites* (London, 2005), 47-55.
- Fielding, H. *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Late Increase of Robbers and Related Writings* (Dublin, 1751).
- Fitzgerald, P. *Edward Burne-Jones: A Biography* (1975; London, 1989).
- Fletcher, I. (ed.) *The Complete Poems of Lionel Johnson*, (London, 1953).
- . (ed.) *The Collected Poems of Lionel Johnson* (New York, London, 1982).
- Ford, F. M. *The Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood: A Critical Monograph* (London, 1907).
- Forster, J. *The Life of Charles Dickens*. 2 vols. Vol. 1 (London, 1872).

- Forth, C. E. and I. Crozier. *Body Parts: Critical Explorations in Corporeality* (Lanham, 2005).
- Foucault, M. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* Translated by A. Sheridan (1975; London, 1977).
- . *The History of Sexuality Volume I* (1976; London, 1998).
- Foucault, M., L. D. Kritzman, and A. Sheridan. *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977-1984* (London, 1990).
- Frazier, A. 'Queering the Irish Renaissance: The Masculinities of Moore, Martyn and Yeats', in A. Bradley and M. Gialanella Valiulis, (eds.) *Gender and Sexuality in Modern Ireland* (Massachusetts, 1997), 8-38.
- Fredeman, W. E. *Pre-Raphaelitism: A Bibliocritical Study* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965).
- Freedman, J. *Professions of Taste: Henry James, British Aestheticism, and Commodity Culture* (California, 1990).
- Fuller, J. O. *Swinburne: A Critical Biography* (London, 1968).
- Gaunt, W. *The Aesthetic Adventure* (Oxford, 1945).
- Gay, P. *The Bourgeois Experience, Victoria to Freud: Volume II, the Tender Passion* 5 vols, (New York, 1986).
- . *The Bourgeois Experience: Victoria to Freud: Volume III, the Cultivation of Hatred*, 5 vols, (London, 1993).
- Gerrish-Nunn, P. 'Rebecca Solomon', in Geffrye Museum Exhibition Catalogue, *Solomon, a Family of Painters: Abraham Solomon (1823-1862), Rebecca Solomon (1832-1886), Simeon Solomon (1840-1905)* (London, 1985), 19-23.
- Hall, J. *Subjects and Symbols in Art* (1974; London, 1996).
- Halperin, D. M. *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality and Other Essays on Greek Love* (New York, 1990).
- Hannavy, J. *Encyclopedia of Nineteenth-Century Photography Vol I* (New York, 2008).
- Harker, M. *The Linked Ring* (London, 1979).
- Hennegan, A. 'Personalities and Principles: Aspects of Literature and Life in *Fin-De-Siècle* England', in M. Teich and R. Porter, (eds.) *Fin De Siècle and Its Legacy* (Cambridge, 1990), 170-215.
- Holiday, H. *Reminiscences of My Life* (London, 1914).
- Holland, P. *Editing Shakespeare* (Cambridge, 2002).

- Holman Hunt, W. *Pre-Raphaelitism and the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood 2 Vols* (London, 1905).
- Hyde, M. H. *The Cleveland Street Scandal* (New York, 1976).
- Ivry, B. *Arthur Rimbaud* (Somerset, 1998).
- Jackson, L. A. *Child Sexual Abuse in Victorian England* (New York, 2000).
- Jeffery-Poulter, S. *Peers, Queers, and Commons: The Struggle for Gay Law Reform from 1850 to the Present* (Oxford, 1991).
- Jepson, E. *Memories of a Victorian* (London, 1933).
- Johnson, W. S. *Living in Sin: The Victorian Sexual Revolution* (Chicago, 1979).
- Kaplan, M. B. *Sodom on the Thames: Sex, Love, and Scandal in Wilde Times* (New York, 2005).
- Katz, J. N. *Gay American History: Lesbians and Gay Men in the USA* (1976; New York, London, 1992).
- Kearney, P. J. 'Sins of the Cities of the Plain', in M. Hope Ditmore, (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Prostitution and Sex Work* (USA, 2006).
- Koven, S. *Slumming: Sexual and Social Politics in Victorian London* (2004; Princeton, 2006).
- Krafft-Ebing, R. Von. *Psychopathia Sexualis: With Especial Reference to Contrary Sexual Instinct* Translated by C. G. Chaddock (1886; Philadelphia, London, 1892).
- Lambourne, L., et al in Geffrye Museum Exhibition Catalogue, *Solomon, a Family of Painters: Abraham Solomon (1823-1862), Rebecca Solomon (1832-1886), Simeon Solomon (1840-1905)*, (London, 1985).
- . 'The Solomon Family', in Geffrye Museum Exhibition Catalogue, *Solomon, a Family of Painters: Abraham Solomon (1823-1862), Rebecca Solomon (1832-1886), Simeon Solomon (1840-1905)* (London, 1985), 6-7.
- Lambourne, L., and G. M. Seymour. 'Catalogue of Works', in Geffrye Museum Exhibition Catalogue, *Solomon, a Family of Painters: Abraham Solomon (1823-1862), Rebecca Solomon (1832-1886), Simeon Solomon (1840-1905)* (London, 1985), 65-82.
- Lee, E. *The Watering Places of England: Considered with Reference to their Medical Topography and Remedial Resources* (London, 1859).
- Lester, R. J. *Jesus in Our Wombs: Embodying Modernity in a Mexican Convent* (Berkeley, 2005).
- Levy, R. S. *Antisemitism: A Historical Encyclopedia of Prejudice and Persecution* (London, 2005).

- Lewis, C. (ed.) *Self-Portrait Taken from the Letters and Journals of Charles Ricketts, R.A. Collected and Compiled by T. Sturge Moore* (London, 1939).
- Longmate, N. *The Workhouse* (London, 1974).
- Maguire, L. E. and T. L. Berger. *Textual Formations and Reformations* (Delaware, 1998).
- Maltz, D. *British Aestheticism and the Urban Working Classes 1870-1900, Beauty for the People* (Basingstoke, 2006).
- Mayhew, H. *London Labour and the London Poor: those that will not Work*, 4 vols. Vol. 4 (London, 1862).
- Mayhew, H. and J. Binny *The Criminal Prisons of London and Scenes of Prison Life* (1862; London, 1971).
- Mendes, P. *Clandestine Erotic Fiction in English 1800-1930* (Aldershot, 1993).
- Morgan, T. E. 'Perverse Male Bodies: Simeon Solomon and Algernon Charles Swinburne', in P. Horne and R. Lewis, (eds.) *Outlooks: Lesbian and Gay Sexualities and Visual Cultures* (London, 1996), 61-85.
- . 'Victorian Effeminacies', in R. Dellamora, (ed.) *Victorian Sexual Dissidence* (Chicago, 1999), 109-25.
- Morgan, T. H. *Heredity and Sex* (New York, 1913).
- Morrison, W. D. *Crime and its Causes* (London, 1891).
- Nordau, M. *Degeneration*, 2nd ed (1895; Lincoln, 1993).
- O'Day, R. and D. Englander *Mr Charles Booth's Inquiry: Life and Labour of the People in London Reconsidered* (London, Rio Grande, 1993).
- Oriel, H. *Victorian Literary Critics* (London, 1984).
- Pearsall, R. *The Worm in the Bud: The World of Victorian Homosexuality* (London, 1969).
- Pemble, J. (ed.) *John Addington Symonds: Culture and the Demon Desire* (Basingstoke, 2000).
- Peniston, W. 'Love and Death in Gay Paris: Homosexuality and Criminality in the 1870s', in J. Merrick and B. T. Ragan, (eds.) *Homosexuality in Modern France* (New York, Oxford, 1996), 128-45.
- . 'Pederastes, Prostitutes, and Pickpockets in Paris in the 1870s', in J. Merrick and M. Sibalís, (eds.) *Homosexuality in French History and Culture* (New York, London, Oxford, 2002).
- . *Pederasts and Others: Urban Culture and Sexual Identity in Nineteenth-Century Paris* (New York, London, Oxford, 2004).

- Perris, G. *The Industrial History of Modern England* (London, 1914).
- Peterkin, A. *One Thousand Beards: A Cultural History of Facial Hair* (Vancouver, 2001).
- Petrow, S. *Policing Morals: The Metropolitan Police and Home Office 1870-1914* (Oxford, 1994).
- Pick, J. and M. Anderton Hey *Building Jerusalem: Art, Industry and the British Millennium* (Amsterdam, 1999).
- Pike, D. L. *Subterranean Cities: The World beneath Paris and London, 1800-1945* (New York, 2005).
- Platts, U. *Nineteenth-Century New Zealand Artists: A Guide and Handbook* (Christchurch, 1980).
- Prettejohn, E. 'The Monstrous Diversion of a Show of Gladiators: Simeon Solomon's Habet!' in C. Edwards, (ed.) *Roman Presences: Receptions of Rome in European Culture* (Cambridge, 1999), 157-72.
- . 'Walter Pater and Aesthetic Painting', in E. Prettejohn, (ed.) *After the Pre-Raphaelites: Art and Aestheticism in Victorian England* (Manchester, 1999).
- Reade, B. (ed.) *Sexual Heretics: Male Homosexuality in English Literature from 1850-1900*, (London, 1970).
- Reid, F. *Illustrators of the Sixties* (London, 1928).
- Rey, M. 'Parisian Homosexuals Create a Lifestyle, 1700-1750: The Paris Archives', in R. P. Maccubbin, (ed.) *'Tis Nautre's Fault: Unauthorized Sexuality During the Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1988), 179-91.
- . 'Police and Sodomy in Eighteenth-Century Paris: From Sin to Disorder', in K. Gerard and G. Hekma, (eds.) *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe* (New York, 1989).
- Reynolds, S. *The Vision of Simeon Solomon* (Stroud, 1985).
- Robb, G. *Strangers: Homosexual Love in the 19th Century* (London, 2003).
- Schwarzback, F. S. *Dickens and the City* (London, 1979).
- Sedgwick, E. K. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York, 1985).
- . *Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1990).
- Sibalis, M. 'Paris', in D. Higgs, (ed.) *Queer Sites: Gay Urban Histories since 1600* (London, New York, 1999).
- Sigel, L., Z. *Governing Pleasures: Pornography and Social Change in England, 1815 –*

- 1914 (New Brunswick, New Jersey, London, 2002).
- Simpson, C., L. Chester, and D. Leitch. *The Cleveland Street Affair* (Boston, Toronto, 1976).
- Slater, M. (ed.) *Dickens' Journalism: Sketches by Boz and Other Early Papers, 1833-39*, (Ohio, 1994).
- Sloan, J. (ed.) *Selected Poems and Prose of John Davidson* (Oxford, 1995).
- Soussloff, C. M. *Jewish Identity in Modern Art History* (California, 1999).
- Stacey, M. *The Sociology of Health and Healing* (1988; New York, 2006).
- Stirling, A. M. W. *William De Morgan and His Wife* (London, 1922).
- Strachey, J. (ed.) 'Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality (1905)' in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. 7 (London, 1959).
- Swaine Taylor, A. *Medical Jurisprudence* (London, 1861).
- Swinburne, A. C. 'Simeon Solomon: Notes on His Vision of Love and Other Studies', *Dark Blue*, no. 1 (July 1871), 568-78.
- Tamagne, F. *History of Homosexuality in Europe, 1919-1939* (New York, 2004).
- Thirlwell, A. *William and Lucy: The Other Rossettis* (New Haven, London, 2003).
- Thomas, D. W. *Cultivating Victorians: Liberal Culture and the Aesthetic* (Philadelphia, 2004).
- Tschudi-Madsen, S. *The Art Nouveau Style: A Comprehensive Guide* (1956; New York, 2002).
- Underdown, E. M. *The Law of Art Copyright* (London, 1863).
- Wansell, G. *The Garrick Club: A History* (London, 2004).
- Weeks, J. *Sex Politics and Society: The Regulation of Sexuality since 1800*, 2nd ed (1981; Essex, 1989).
- . *Coming Out: Homosexual Politics in Britain from the Nineteenth Century to the Present* (1977; London, 1990).
- . *Sex, Politics & Society: The Regulation of Sexuality since 1800* (1981; 1989; New York, 1994).
- . 'Havelock Ellis and the Politics of Sex-Reform', in *Making Sexual History* (Malden, USA, 2000), 16-52.
- West, D. J. *Homosexuality*, 2nd ed. (London, 1960).

- White, C. (ed.) *Nineteenth-Century Writings on Homosexuality: A Sourcebook*, (London, 1999).
- White, W. *History, Gazetteer and Directory of the County of Devon Including the City of Exeter* (London, 1878).
- Wiener, M. J. *Reconstructing the Criminal: Culture, Law, and Policy in England, 1830-1914* (Cambridge, 1994).
- Wilde, O. *De Profundis* (London, 1905).
- Williamson, G. C. *Bernardino Luini* (George Bell & Sons, 1899).
- . *Murray Marks and his Friends* (London, 1919).
- Wilson, E. *The Anatomists's Vade Mecum* (London, 1840).
- . *Cleopatra's Needle* (London, 1878).
- Winwar, F. *Poor Splendid Wings: The Rossettis and their Circle* (Boston, 1933).
- Witthaus, R. A. and T. C. Becker *Medical Jurisprudence, Forensic Medicine and Toxicology*, Vol. 2 (New York, 1894).
- Yeldham, C. *Women Artists in Nineteenth Century France and England: their Art Education, Exhibition Opportunities and Membership of Exhibiting Societies and Academies, with an Assessment of the Subject Mater of their Work and Summary Biographies*, II vols. Vol. II (New York, London, 1984).

Journal Articles

- Bales, K. 'Lives and Labours in the Emergence of Organised Social Research, 1886-1907', *Journal of Historical Sociology* 9, no. 2 (June 1996), 113-38.
- Behlmer, G. 'Ernest Hart and the Social Thrust of Victorian Medicine', *British Medical Journal* (3 Oct 1990), 711-13.
- Buchanan, R. 'The Fleshly School of Poetry: Mr D. G. Rossetti', *Contemporary Review*, no. 18 (October 1871), 334-50.
- Endelman, T. M. 'Anglo-Jewish Scientists and the Science of Race', *Jewish Social Sciences* 11, no. 1 (Fall 2004), 52-82.
- Ferrari, R. C. 'Simeon Solomon: A Bibliographic Study', *The Journal of Pre-Raphaelite Studies* 8 (Spring 1999), 69-90.
- . 'The Unexplored Correspondence of Simeon Solomon', *The Journal of Pre-Raphaelite Studies* 12 (Spring 2003), 23-34.
- Houlbrook, M. 'The Private World of Public Urinals: London 1918-57', *The London*

Journal 25, no. 1 (2000), 52-70.

Kolsteren, S. 'Simeon Solomon and Dante Gabriel Rossetti', *The Journal of Pre-Raphaelite Studies* 2 (May 1982), 35-48.

———. 'Simeon Solomon and the Romantic Poets', *The Journal of Pre-Raphaelite Studies* 4 (May 1984), 62-69.

———. 'The Dream of Simeon Solomon', *Dreamworks: An Interdisciplinary Quarterly* 5 (1986-87), 113-22.

Lambourne, L. 'A Simeon Solomon Sketchbook', *Apollo* 85 (January 1967), 59-61.

———. 'Abraham Solomon, Painter of Fashion and Simeon Solomon Decadent Artist', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 21 (1968), 59-61.

LeBourgeois, J. 'D. G. Rossetti in the Private Books of Frederick Locker-Lampson and Lady Mount-Temple', *Notes and Queries* 18 (1971), 254-55.

———. 'Swinburne and Simeon Solomon', *Notes and Queries* 20 (March 1973), 91-95.

Lombroso, C. 'Atavism and Evolution', *Contemporary Review*, no. 68 (July 1895), 42-49.

Seymour, G. M. 'Simeon Solomon and the Biblical Construction of Marginal Identity in Victorian England', *Journal of Homosexuality* 33 (June/July 1997), 97-119.

Silliman, B., and J. Dana 'Exploration of Kents Cavern Devonshire', *The American Journal of Science and Arts*, no. Second Series (January, March, May 1867), 372-83.

Treble, R. 'Abraham, Rebecca and Simeon Solomon', *The Burlington Magazine* 128 (1986), 53-54.

Upchurch, C. 'Forgetting the Unthinkable: Cross Dressers and British Society in the Case of the Queen vs. Boulton and Others', *Gender and History* 12, no. 1 (April 2000), 127-57.

Weber, C. J. 'Review', *Modern Language Notes* 60, no. 5 (May, 1945), 347-49.

Werner, A. 'Simeon Solomon: A Rediscovery', *Art and Artists* 9 (January 1975), 6-11.

Westphal, K. F. O. 'Die Konträre Sexualempfindung. Symptom Eines Neuropathischen (Psychopathischen) Zustandes', *Archiv für Psychiatrie und Nervenkrankheiten* 2, no. 1 (1869), 73-108.

PhD Theses

Sandberg, H. 'The Androgynous Vision of a Victorian Outsider: The Life and Work of Simeon Solomon' PhD, Drew University, 2000.

Seymour, G. M. 'The Life and Work of Simeon Solomon (1840-1905)' PhD, Univ. of California, Santa Barbara, 1986.

Dictionary of National Biography Online

Andrews, J. *Savage, Sir George Henry (1842-1921)*, Dictionary of National Biography, www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/38635 (accessed 12 August 2007).

Beckson, K. *Stenbock, Count Stanislaus Eric (1860 - 1895)*, Dictionary of National Biography, www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/61445 (accessed 23 January 2006).

Borland, M. *Ross, Robert Baldwin (1869-1918)*, Dictionary of National Biography, oxforddnb.com/view/printable/37915 (accessed 12 September 2005).

Brake, L. *Pater, Clara Ann (Bap, 1841, D. 1910)*, Dictionary National Biography, www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/48505 (accessed 3 May 2008).

Davis, J. *Flower, Cyril, Baron Battersea (1843-1907)*, Dictionary of National Biography, www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/41325 (accessed 4 June 2008).

Delaney, J. G. P. *Ricketts, Charles De Sousy (1866-1931)*, Dictionary of National Biography, www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35746 (accessed 12 October 2006).

Goodall, F. *Nicholson, Edward Chambers (1827-1890)*, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/50657 (accessed 1 July 2009).

Hammond, A. *Hollyer, Frederick (1838-1933)*, Dictionary of National Biography, www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/58918 (accessed 9 September 2005).

Merrill, L. *Howell, Charles Augustus (1840? - 1890)*, Dictionary of National Biography, www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/39340 (accessed 3 March 2007).

Palladino, P. *Salaman, Redcliffe Nathan (1874-1955)*, Dictionary of National Biography, www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/35911 (accessed 23 March 2006).

Online Articles

Charlesworth, L. 'The Acts of 1601: Connections between Poor Relief and Charity in a Legal and Local Context', www.vaahs.org.uk/vaahs/papers/charlesworth.pdf, (accessed 12 Jan, 2006).

Kolsteren, S. 'Simeon Solomon and Dalziel's Bible Gallery', www.ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/skolsteren, (accessed July 27, 2005).

Websites

www.ancestry.co.uk (accessed 5 May 2008).

Oxford English Dictionary, Oxford University Press, www.dictionary.oed.com (accessed 21 Feb 2006).

Ferrari, R. C. www.simeonsolomon.org (accessed 14 Sept 2006).

Higginbotham, P. *The Workhouse*, www.workhouses.org.uk/ (accessed 29 January 2007).

Roberts, A. *Mental Health History* Middlesex University,
www.mdx.ac.uk/WWW/STUDY/mhhglo.htm#Asylums (accessed 23 January 2009).

Image Websites (all accessed between 1 May 2005 and 30 Sept 2009).

www.artic.edu
www.artmuseums.harvard.edu
www.artsmia.org
www.bloomsburyauctions.com
www.britishmuseum.org
www.collectionx.museum
www.collectionsx.tepapa.govt.nz
www.durtro.com
www.georgetown.edu
www.hughlane.ie
www.jewishmuseum.org.uk
www.johnhunov.dk
www.leicestergalleries.com
www.louvre.fr
www.maasgallery.com
www.manchestergalleries.org
www.metmuseum.org
www.mga.org
www.nga.gov
www.ort.org
www.preraphael.org
www.preraphaelites.org
www.simeonsolomon.org
www.usc.edu
www.victorarwas.com
www.wichitaartmuseum.org

Other

Jewish Genealogy: A Summary of Sources for Jewish Genealogy at London Metropolitan Archives and Elsewhere, London Metropolitan Archives. Information Leaflet No. 32, (June 2006).

Poor Law Records in London and Middlesex, London Metropolitan Archives. Information Leaflet. (London, 2000).