

Reframing War: British Military Painting 1854 to 1918.

Two Volumes

Volume 1 of 2

Dorothy Nott

PhD

University of York

History of Art

April 2015

ABSTRACT

In this thesis I argue for a reassessment of the place within art historical research of a neglected cohort of late-Victorian battle artists who continued to paint military scenes into the second decade of the twentieth century. I chart the move towards a graphic representation of the rank and file in the art of Elizabeth Butler (1846-1933) which served to alert the public and the art world to the brutal effects of war on the individual soldier and how this move impacted on her fellow late-Victorian, and now little-known, battle artists such as Ernest Crofts (1847-1911), John Charlton (1849-1917), Richard Caton Woodville (1856-1927), William Barnes Wollen (1857-1936), and Godfrey Douglas Giles (1857-1941). I examine their visual representations of a growing awareness of the actual consequences of war on the ordinary soldier, and look at the effects on their art of an increasing imperialistic outlook at the end of the nineteenth century, and especially during the Second Boer War (1899-1902), within the context of an expanding media, technological developments, photography and changes in uniform. A particular focus is the effect on their art of the change from scarlet to khaki in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

A primary concern of this thesis is the exploration of the “modernity” of late nineteenth-century British battle painting and the relationship of selected works by these artists to that elusive and ill-defined term, modernism. It is within this context that I explore the reception of these artists and their works by contemporary audiences alongside their transition into the twentieth century. The reasons for their declining popularity and complete omission from the official war artist schemes of the First World War are examined together with their legacy into the twenty-first century.

LIST OF CONTENTS

	Page Number
VOLUME 1	
ABSTRACT	2
LIST OF CONTENTS	3
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	6
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	13
AUTHOR'S DECLARATION	14
INTRODUCTION	15
CHAPTER ONE	
THE CHANGING FACE OF BATTLE: ELIZABETH BUTLER'S MILITARY PAINTING	31
<i>Visualising Humanity</i>	36
<i>Visualising Soldiers</i>	43
<i>The Spectacle of War</i>	52
<i>The Pathos of War</i>	61
CHAPTER TWO	
THE 'BOHEMIAN WITH A BRUSH' RICHARD CATON WOODVILLE AND HIS CONTEMPORIES	79
<i>Imperial Representations</i>	86
<i>Muscular Christianity</i>	106
<i>The Pleasure Culture of War</i>	109

<i>Press and Propaganda</i>	117
<i>The Pro-Boers</i>	122
CHAPTER THREE	
RELINQUISHING SCARLET	130
<i>Gentlemen in Khaki: “A Richer Dust”</i>	133
<i>Photography</i>	147
CHAPTER FOUR	
EXHIBITING WAR; EXHIBITING HISTORY	159
<i>A Challenging Transition</i>	163
<i>Exhibiting War</i>	168
<i>Exhibiting History</i>	192
<i>Contemporary History Paintings and Public Entertainment</i>	206
CHAPTER FIVE	
“MANDARISM” VERSUS MODERNISM	213
<i>The “Alleged Miracle” of World War One Official War Artist Schemes</i>	215
<i>Butler and the Politics of Inclusion</i>	225
<i>Sargent’s “Gassed”</i>	228
CONCLUSION	240
<i>A Question of Legacy</i>	240
<i>Those Neglected Works</i>	254
ABBREVIATIONS	258

BIBLIOGRAPHY	260
<i>Newspapers and Periodicals</i>	260
<i>Unpublished Sources</i>	261
<i>Published Sources</i>	262

VOLUME 2

LIST OF CONTENTS	330
ILLUSTRATIONS	331

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

- Figure 1 Butler, Elizabeth, *Missing* (1873), dimensions unknown, (original, oil on canvas), whereabouts unknown; image from photograph provided by Viscount Gormanston for the exhibition, *Lady Butler, Battle Artist 1846-1933* at the National Army Museum, 1987.
- Figure 2 Meissonier, Jean-Louis Ernest, *1814: Campagne de France* (1864), 51.5 x 76.5, oil on wood, Musée d'Orsay, Paris, accession no: 94DE58708/RF1862.
- Figure 3 Barker, Thomas Jones, *The Charger of Captain Nolan Bearing Back his Master to the British Lines* (1855), 43 x 53.5, oil on board, National Gallery of Dublin, accession no: NGI 1965.
- Figure 4 Butler, Elizabeth, *Image from Sketchbook* (1862), National Army Museum, London, accession no: 6310-353-2.
- Figure 5 Butler, Elizabeth, *Calling the Roll after an Engagement, Crimea* (1874), 91 x 182.9, oil on canvas, Royal Collection Trust/©HM Queen Elizabeth II, accession no: RCIN 405915.
- Figure 6 Butler, Elizabeth, *Balaclava* (1876), 103.4 x 187.5, oil on canvas, Manchester City Art Gallery, accession no: 1898.13.
- Figure 7 Turner, Joseph Mallord William, *Field of Waterloo* (1818), 147.3 x 238.8, oil on canvas, Tate Britain, London, accession no: N00500.
- Figure 8 Woodville, Richard Caton, *Saving the Guns at Maiwand* (1882), 133 x 199, oil on canvas, Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool, accession no: WAG 140.
- Figure 9 Woodville, Richard Caton, *The Charge of the 21st Lancers at Omdurman* (1898), 153.4 x 245.8, oil on canvas, Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool, accession no: WAG 152.
- Figure 10 Butler, Elizabeth, *Dawn of Waterloo. The "Réveille" in the Bivouac of the Scots Greys on the Morning of the Battle* (1893-95), 126.4 x 196.3, Falkland Palace, Fifeshire.
- Figure 11 Butler, Elizabeth, detail of *Dawn at Waterloo*.

- Figure 12 Butler, Elizabeth, detail of *Dawn of Waterloo*.
- Figure 13 Butler, Elizabeth, *Evicted* (1890), 236 x 177.8, oil on canvas, Department of Irish Folklore, University College Dublin, accession no: D132.10.00001.
- Figure 14 Butler, Elizabeth, *The Defence of Rorke's Drift* (1880), 120.2 x 214, oil on canvas, Royal Collection Trust/©HM Queen Elizabeth II, accession no: RCIN 405897.
- Figure 15 Paton, Joseph Noel, *Home (The Return from the Crimea)* (1855-56 and 1859), 94 x 79, oil on panel, Royal Collection Trust/©HM Queen Elizabeth II, accession no: RCIN 406954.
- Figure 16 Barker, Thomas Jones, *The Allied Generals with their Officers of their Respective Staffs before Sebastopol* (1856), 64.2 x 141, oil on canvas, private collection.
- Figure 17 Luard, John D'Albiac, *A Welcome Arrival* (1857), 75.5 x 100.9, oil on canvas, National Army Museum, London, accession no: 1958-08-18-1.
- Figure 18 Simpson, William, *Commissariat Difficulties* (1855), from *Scenes of the War in the East*, 27 x 42, lithograph, National Army Museum, London, accession no: NAM. 1971-02-33-490-13, image 142111.
- Figure 19 Simpson, William, *Summer in the Crimea* (1857), 24.9 x 35.4, watercolour over pencil, the British Museum, London, accession no: 1971,0515.10.
- Figure 20 Paton, Joseph Noel, *The Commander-in-Chief, Crimea* (1855), 33.7 x 45.7, pen and ink, private collection.
- Figure 21 Brown, Ford Madox, *Work* (1852-65), 137 x 197.3, oil on canvas, Manchester City Art Gallery, accession no: 1885.1.
- Figure 22 Leech, John, *Grand Military Spectacle: The Heroes of the Crimea Inspecting the Field Marshals* (1855), wood engraving, *Punch* xxix, 179-3, November 1855.
- Figure 23 Fenton, Roger, *Hardships in Camp* (1855), wet collodion print, Gernsheim Collection, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin, Texas.

- Figure 24 Fenton, Roger, *Valley of the Shadow of Death* (1855), wet collodion print, Gernsheim Collection, Harry Ransom Humanities Center, University of Texas at Austin, Texas.
- Figure 25 Pott, Laslett John, *On the March from Moscow* (1873), 80 x 119.5, oil on canvas, private collection.
- Figure 26 Fildes, Samuel Luke, *Applicants for Admission to a Casual Ward* (1874), 142.3 x 247.7, oil on canvas, Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, University of London, accession no: THC 0021.
- Figure 27 Butler, Elizabeth, detail of *Balaclava*.
- Figure 28 Sargent, John Singer, *Gassed* (1919), 231 x 611.1, oil on canvas, Imperial War Museum, London, accession no: IWM ART 1460.
- Figure 29 Butler, Elizabeth, detail of *Balaclava*.
- Figure 30 Butler, Elizabeth, detail of *Balaclava*.
- Figure 31 Butler, Elizabeth, detail of *Balaclava*.
- Figure 32 Kennington, Eric, *The Kensingtons at Laventie* (1915), 139.7 x 152.4, oil on glass, Imperial War Museum, London, accession no: IWM ART 15661.
- Figure 33 Woodville, Richard Caton, *All That Was Left of Them* (1902), 66 x 99, oil on canvas, Queens Own Lancers, Thoresby, Nottinghamshire, accession no: 17.28.
- Figure 34 Butler, Elizabeth, *The Remnants of an Army, Jellalabad, January 13th 1842* (1879), 132 x 234, oil on canvas, Tate Britain, London, accession no: N01553.
- Figure 35 Woodville, Richard Caton, *The Next Moment I Felt Myself Soaring Skyward* (1923), 13.3 x 22.5, watercolour, Treasure House, Beverley on loan from Burnby Hall, Pocklington, East Yorkshire, accession no: DDBU/1/5/32.
- Figure 36 Woodville, Richard Caton, *Gentleman in Khaki* (1899), statue in bronze, taken from the illustration to accompany *The Absent-minded Beggar* by Rudyard Kipling and Arthur Sullivan. Various venues.
- Figure 37 Butler, Elizabeth, *The 28th Regiment at Quatre Bras* (1875), 97.2 x 216.2, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne, accession no: P-309.9-1.

- Figure 38 Woodville, Richard Caton, *Cronje Surrenders to Lord Roberts at Paardeberg*, wood engraving, *Illustrated London News*, 31 March 1900.
- Figure 39 Woodville, Richard Caton, *Their Ordeal by Fire: the Grenadier Guards at the Battle of Biddulphs Berg*, wood engraving, *Illustrated London News*, 28 July 1900.
- Figure 40 Woodville, Richard Caton, *The Night Charge of the 19th Hussars near Lydenberg on November 7th 1900*, wood engraving, *Illustrated London News*, 15 December 1900.
- Figure 41 Woodville, Richard Caton, *The Relief of the Light Brigade, 25 October 1854* (1897), 76.2 x 114.3, oil on canvas, National Army Museum, London, accession no: 1989-01-1-1.
- Figure 42 Woodville, Richard Caton, *The Dangers of Mercy: Indian Ambulance-Bearers under Fire*, wood engraving, *Illustrated London News*, 9 June 1900.
- Figure 43 Giles, Godfrey Douglas, *The Race for the Kopje* (1902), 106.7 x 162.5, oil on canvas, Horsepower: the Museum of the Kings Royal Hussars, Winchester, accession no. 613.
- Figure 44 Bacon, John Henry Frederick, *The Relief of Ladysmith* (1900) 76 x 114, oil on canvas. National Army Museum, accession no: NAM 1996-04-1-1.
- Figure 45 Penny, Edward, *The Marquis of Granby Relieving a Sick Soldier* (1765), 101 x 127, oil on canvas, National Army Museum, London, accession no: 1963-07-31-1.
- Figure 46 Barker, Thomas Jones, *The Relief of Lucknow* (1859), 105.4 x 181.3, oil on canvas, National Portrait Gallery, London, accession no: NPG 5851.
- Figure 47 Joy, George William, *General Gordon's Last Stand* (1893), 236 x 175, oil on canvas, Leeds City Art Gallery, accession no: LEEAG.PA.1920.0274.
- Figure 48 Butler, Elizabeth, *Scotland Forever!* (1881) 101.5 x 193, oil on canvas. Leeds City Art Gallery, accession no: LEEAG.PA1888.0002.

- Figure 49 Anon, *With our Bobs to Pretoria*, postcard, copyright, ©The British Library Board, 1865 c. 2.
- Figure 50 Charlton, John, *Routed: Boers Retreating* (1900), 151.1 x 240, oil on canvas, private collection.
- Figure 51 Woodville, Richard Caton, *Burning the Farm of a Treacherous Burgher*, wood engraving, reproduced under the title, *A Painful Duty* in Wilson, H.W. *With Flag to Pretoria*, vol. 2, 1901: 582.
- Figure 52 Butler, Elizabeth, *Within Sound of the Guns* (1903), 66.7 x 87, oil on canvas, Army Staff College, Shrivenham, Wiltshire, accession no: 20520.
- Figure 53 Butler, Elizabeth, *Yeomanry Scouts on the Veldt* (1903), 99.7 x 138.7, oil on canvas, Downside Abbey, Somerset.
- Figure 54 Woodville, Richard Caton, detail of *The Charge of the 21st Lancers at Omdurman*.
- Figure 55 Sargent, John Singer, *Colonel Ian Hamilton, CB, DSO* (1898) 138.4 x 78.7, oil on canvas, Tate Britain, London, accession no: N05246.
- Figure 56 Stone, Marcus, *The Soldier's Return* (1900), 102 x 135, oil on canvas, private collection.
- Figure 57 Shaw, John Liston Byam, *The Boer War*, 101.8 x 76, oil on canvas, Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery, accession no: 1928 P204.
- Figure 58 Anon, *Spion Kop*, (1900), Emmanuel Lee Collection, National Media Museum, Bradford, accession no: 2012-5040.
- Figure 59 Anon, *Boer Internee*, undated, Emmanuel Lee Collection, National Media Museum, Bradford, accession no: 2012-5040.
- Figure 60 Charlton, John, *French Artillery Crossing the Flooded Aisne* (1915), 112 x 183.5, oil on canvas, Laing Art Gallery, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, accession no: TWCMS: C10000.
- Figure 61 Lund, Neils Möller, *The Corporation of London. The Heart of the Empire* (1904), 137 x 183, oil on canvas, Guildhall Art Gallery, London, accession no: 11092.

- Figure 62 Butler, Elizabeth, *Rescue of Wounded, Afghanistan* (1905), 80 x 152.5, oil on canvas, Army Staff College, Shrivenham, Wiltshire, accession no: 20511.
- Figure 63 Butler, Elizabeth, *On the Morning of Waterloo. The Cuirassiers' Last Réveil*, (1914), 106.5 x 142, oil on canvas, private collection.
- Figure 64 Butler, Elizabeth, *The London Irish at Loos* (1916), 30.5 x 25.5, watercolour, Irish Rifles Regimental Museum, Camberwell, London, uncatalogued.
- Figure 65 Butler, Elizabeth, *Eyes Right* (1916), 41 x 58, watercolour over pencil, private collection.
- Figure 66 Butler, Elizabeth, *In the Retreat from Mons: the Royal Horse Guards* (1927), 61 x 96.5, oil on canvas, Royal Hospital, Chelsea, London, accession no: 502.
- Figure 67 Woodville, Richard Caton, *General Wolfe Climbing the Heights of Abraham on the Morning of the Battle of Quebec* (1906), 43.2 x 68.6 (supported), watercolour and pencil heightened with white, Tate Britain, London, accession no: NO5203.
- Figure 68 Woodville, Richard Caton, *Poniatowski's Last Charge at Leipzig* (1912), 35.5 x 25, oil on panel, Tate Britain, London, accession no: N05205.
- Figure 69 Woodville, Richard Caton, *Napoleon Crossing the Bridge to Lobau Island* (1912), 35.5 x 25, oil on panel, Tate Britain, London, accession no: N05202.
- Figure 70 Woodville, Richard Caton, *Marshal Ney at the Battle of Eylau* (1913), 35.5 x 25, oil on panel, Tate Britain, London, accession no: N05204.
- Figure 71 Anon, *The Making of the 'Illustrated London News'. How the Paper is Produced Each Week*, photograph, *Illustrated London News*, 2 September 1911.
- Figure 72 Crofts, Ernest, *Roundhead Patrol* (1905), 91.4 x 71, oil on canvas, private collection.
- Figure 73 Crofts, Ernest, *The Surrender of the City of York to the Roundheads* (1908), 213.3 x 129.5, oil on canvas, private collection.
- Figure 74 Abbey, Edwin Austin, *The Play Scene in Hamlet* (1897),

155.6 x 245.1, oil on canvas, Yale University Art Gallery, Hartford, Connecticut, accession no: 1937.2171.

- Figure 75 Abbey, Edwin Austin, *The Trial of Anne Hutchinson* (1901), engraving, Harvard College Library, Hollis No: 002847136.
- Figure 76 Sargent, John Singer, *Sir Frank Swettenham* (1904), 258 x 142.5, oil on canvas, National Portrait Gallery, London, accession no: NPG 4837.
- Figure 77 Nevinson, Christopher Richard Wynne, *La Mitrailleuse* (1915), 61 x 50.8, oil on canvas, Tate Britain, London, accession no: N03177.
- Figure 78 Mudie-Cooke, Olive, *Burnt-Out Tank* (1917), 23.8 x 31.1, watercolour, Imperial War Museum, London, accession no: IWM ART 5398.
- Figure 79 Spencer, Stanley, *Travoy's Arriving with Wounded at a Dressing-Station, Smol, Macedonia, September 1916* (1919), 182.8 x 218.4, oil on canvas, Imperial War Museum, London, accession no: IWM ART 2268.
- Figure 80 Woodville, Richard Caton, *Return to Mons* (1919), 101 x 153, oil on canvas, Officers Mess, Queens Own Lancers, Catterick, accession no: R452 5L.
- Figure 81 Brueghel the Elder, Pieter, *Der Blinden* (1568), 84 x 154, tempera on canvas, National Museum of Capodimonte, Naples, accession no: Q 1.
- Figure 82 Sargent, John Singer, *A Crashed Airplane* (1918), 34.2 x 53.3, watercolour, Imperial War Museum, London, accession no: IWM ART 001610.
- Figure 83 Nevinson, Christopher Richard Wynne, *Harvest of Battle* (1919), 182.8 x 317.5, oil on canvas, Imperial War Museum, London, accession no: IWM ART 1921.
- Figure 84 Wollen, William Barnes, *The Last Stand of the 44th at Gundamuck, 1842* (1898), 68 x 124, oil on canvas, Essex Regimental Museum, Chelmsford, Essex, accession no: ER11094.
- Figure 85 Pemble, John, *As its Bicentenary Approaches, a Bloody Battle and its Consequences are Newly Appraised, the Guardian*, 29 November 2014: 9.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to so many people in the course of my research for this thesis, starting with the staff and students of the History of Art Department in the University of York. In particular I should like to thank my supervisor, Dr Sarah Victoria Turner (now at the Paul Mellon Centre in London), who has been encouraging, enthusiastic and supportive throughout, in spite of the distance between London and York. I am grateful too to Professor Jason Edwards, my internal supervisor who has kept his word to ensure that I was fully supported by the department following Dr Turner's departure, and to Dr Richard Johns who joined my TAP panel.

I have benefited from generous travel funding from the Paul Mellon and from the department which has helped enormously in my journeys to all those diverse and far-flung regimental museums and other venues from Sussex, to Falkland Palace. I am enormously grateful to the staff of many institutions and private homes, in particular, the National Army Museum (especially Pip Dodd), Oliver Hawkins at Humphrey's Homestead at Greatham, Sussex, Downside Abbey, Falkland Palace, the Royal Collection, the Royal Academy, Beverley Treasure House, British Library Boston Spa, Tate Britain, the Walker, Leeds City, Manchester City, Bury and Ferens Art Galleries, the Army Staff College, The Queens Own Lancers and the Museum of the Irish Rifles in Camberwell, all of whom have welcomed my endless enquiries and dealt with them with generosity, good humour and common sense. I am also grateful to Paul Bennett who advised me on army structure and to my patient friend Joe Callan for helping me find my way around my laptop.

I should like to dedicate this thesis to the memory of my late husband, Bert Watson, himself an alumnus of the University of York, and with whom I shared a love of enquiry.

AUTHOR'S DECLARATION

With the exception of the quotations and paraphrased remarks from published or unpublished sources, which have been acknowledged in the text, the following thesis represents my own original contribution. This thesis has not previously been presented for an award at this, or any other, University, nor been published elsewhere.

INTRODUCTION

No great art ever yet rose on earth, but among a nation of soldiers [. . .]. There is no great art possible to a nation but that which is based on battle.¹

In 1873, a young and relatively unknown artist exhibited her first large military oil painting, entitled *Missing* (fig.1), at the Royal Academy. Although the work was skied, it received reasonable reviews, the *Architect* praising the “capital drawing of the horse” and the “honest and artistic” manner of representation of the figures, which deserved “a place lower down” on the wall.² The theme of the painting was taken from the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71, which “was still uppermost in [the public’s] thoughts”.³ It shows a wounded French colonel “riding a spent horse, and a young subaltern of Cuirassiers, walking alongside”, both “‘missing’ after one of the French defeats, making their way over a forlorn landscape”.⁴

Although military in subject-matter, the work pointedly avoided conflict and showed instead the sheer fatigue of the two men, struggling to reach safety, each taking comfort in their physical proximity. Centrally placed on the canvas, the younger soldier with eyes closed clings trustingly with both hands to his officer, as if to a father figure. He leans wearily into the side of the solitary mount with an expression of utter exhaustion. He can go no further. The colonel shifts the reins into his right hand to free his left, tacitly giving permission for this intimate gesture of reassurance, as he looks desperately towards the horizon for signs of rescue or shelter. Their uniforms are crumpled and torn and the younger soldier appears to have lost his cap along the way. The horse, meanwhile, drops its head disconsolately and paws feebly at the ground with its

¹ These words were spoken by John Ruskin in a commencement speech entitled *War* delivered to the cadets graduating from the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich in December 1865, Ruskin, 1904: 116.

² The *Architect*, 24 May 1873: 273, which ignoring Butler’s descriptive words, refers to “the figures of victor and captive”.

³ Butler, 1993: 78.

⁴ Butler, 1993: 78.

front hoof. This pathetic triangular composition is set against a large bleak sky, with evidence of a war-ravaged countryside in a broken tree stump to the right, patches of gorse and stones to the left. Whilst some art historians have claimed that this painting was modelled on early nineteenth-century French military art, with particular reference to Jean-Louis Ernest Meissonier (1815-91), *Missing* distinguishes itself by its close attention to the individual suffering of these two men.⁵ Whereas Meissonier in his painting, *1814: Campagne de France*, (1864) (fig.2) depicts collective endurance as Napoleon leads his troops in the snow, *Missing* dwells on the individual emotions of the two men fatally separated from their regiment, inviting the viewer to contemplate their plight, their fatigue, their courage and their human companionship in adversity. This is a scene of extreme desolation, and one which in its hopelessness seeks to evoke empathy in the viewer.

The choice of just such an isolated incident in British battle art was not entirely novel, as Thomas Jones Barker (1815-82) had shown in 1855 when he exhibited his painting entitled *The Charger of Captain Nolan Bearing Back his Master to the British Lines* (fig.3). Rather than representing the heat of battle, Barker portrayed the lifeless body of the captain as his faithful horse returned with him to the British camp following the Charge of the Light Brigade, but with a marked absence of the effects of war on Nolan's body or his pristine uniform. Instead, he appears asleep, expressionless, as if the transition from life to death is essentially bloodless and without pain, a purely anaesthetised, dreamlike and accordingly more palatable, representation for a public audience. Not so *Missing*, which in its sympathetic rendering of the two men focussed on the misery which war can bring to soldiers far from home, not just during, but after a battle. This was something new in British battle painting and the artist, Elizabeth Butler, formerly Thompson (1846-1933), was

⁵ Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 22, 163.

delighted with her success, her first at the Academy.⁶ Not only was the painting well reviewed; it sold.⁷

This was not her first military venture. As a child she had filled her sketch-books with drawings of soldiers, horses, battles and tournaments (fig.4), and had “relieved [her] feelings” of frustration in the elementary class at the South Kensington School of Art “by ornamenting the margins of [her] drawing paper with angry scriblings of horses and soldiers in every variety of fury”, keen to follow her own artistic inclinations, when instructed to copy “hateful scrolls and patterns”.⁸ On her nineteenth birthday, her visit to the site of the battle of Waterloo made a deep and lasting impression on her, as her thoughts were filled with “those slaughtered legions, dead half a century ago, lying in heaps of mouldering bones under that undulating plain”.⁹ Already Butler was interested in the pity and not the glory of war, though she did enjoy the splendour of parades and colourful red uniforms, and by 1868 was submitting watercolours on a military subject to both the Society of Female Artists and the Dudley Gallery. It was one of her paintings at the Dudley, *Soldiers Watering Horses* (1872) (private collection), completed after a visit to witness army manoeuvres in Southampton, which caught the eye of Manchester industrialist, Charles Galloway. When buying this painting, he commissioned Butler to produce an oil painting on a military theme of her choosing. Butler elected to paint a scene from the Crimean War of 1854-56, *Calling the Roll after an Engagement, Crimea* (the *Roll Call*) (fig.5). It was this painting, exhibited at the

⁶ This was her third submission to the Royal Academy, the previous two entries having been rejected, notwithstanding the success in Italy of her second entry, *The Magnificat*, which was returned damaged, Butler, 1993: 66, 77. For ease of reference Butler will be referred to under her married name throughout.

⁷ Unfortunately the current whereabouts of this painting are unknown and in the 1987 exhibition of Butler’s work it was represented by a photograph, courtesy of Viscount Gormanston, a descendant through Butler’s daughter, Ellen, Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 54.

⁸ NAM, 6310-3-2; Butler, 1993: 8; other sketchbooks dated 1866? [sic] and 1866 are held in the British Museum under references 1966,0118.1.2-29 and 1966,0118.2.1-42.

⁹ Butler, 1993: 25.

Academy in 1874, which changed her life and arguably transformed battle art in late nineteenth-century Britain.

In his 1980 article, 'Representing the Great War', Jon Bird refers to the structured values and beliefs of the Edwardian society of thirty years later, and the "tendency towards the maintenance and reproduction of the social body" being of "such force as to severly [sic] restrict any expression of oppositional ideologies".¹⁰ I would argue that this is too absolute a view, and ignores the effect of Butler's more nuanced oeuvre on late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century battle art, a genre hitherto generally viewed as purely formulaic. In this thesis, I chart the move towards a graphic representation of the rank and file in Butler's art which served to alert the public and the art world to the brutal effects of war on the individual soldier and how this move impacted on her fellow late-Victorian, and now little-known, battle artists such as Ernest Crofts (1847-1911), John Charlton (1849-1917), Richard Caton Woodville (1856-1927), William Barnes Wollen (1857-1936), and Godfrey Douglas Giles (1857-1941). A primary concern of this thesis is the exploration of the "modernity" of late nineteenth-century British battle painting and the relationship of selected works by these artists to that elusive and ill-defined term, modernism. As Raymond Williams has so cogently argued, modernism is an artificial construct and one which depends on a selective tradition, frequently neglecting those works of art which do not fall conveniently into such categories as Post-Impressionism, Fauvism, Expressionism, Futurism or Vorticism. In considering the onset of modernism, he argues that without the earlier novelists of the nineteenth century, such as Charles Dickens, Gustave Flaubert or Nikolai Gogol there would be no Marcel Proust, Franz Kafka or James Joyce.¹¹ This proposition is, by analogy, a useful tool when considering developments within the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century art worlds, and I aim to

¹⁰ Bird, 1980: 42.

¹¹ Williams, 1989a: 32.

show how this late-Victorian cohort of war artists similarly impacted on a later generation.

In order to pursue my argument for their place within this continuum, my approach has been influenced by the view of art historians David Peters Corbett and Lara Perry, that modernism reflects social change.¹² At the same time, as has been demonstrated by Elizabeth Prettejohn, it is acknowledged that the modern study of art history has ancient foundations, and that modernists are interested in continuity as well as rupture.¹³ In countering the claims by Charles Harrison that British, and specifically English, art has little to contribute to any history of modernism, Peters Corbett and Perry argue convincingly for modernism in art as being “oppositional” or “socially progressive”, “whether formally innovative or not”.¹⁴ This definition allows for a wide spectrum of artistic responses, and one which enables modernism to be used as much as a critical tool for assessment as a thing in itself. Whilst recognising, therefore, that these late-Victorian artists would see themselves very much as part of the tradition of patriotism and Empire, and do not claim to revolutionise artistic style, I argue that their representations of the mid to late nineteenth-century army can equally be seen as reflecting contemporary concerns.¹⁵ These are painters who offered the public a fresh emphasis on the individual and nameless soldier – his pain, his sufferings, his heroism and his nationalism – at or close to scenes of battle at times of historic importance; so much so that I question whether, and how far, without them there would be such a flourishing of battle art in World War One.

Why, therefore, have these nineteenth-century painters specialising in military subject-matters been so forgotten? Has their claim to

¹² Peters Corbett and Perry, 2000: 2.

¹³ Prettejohn, 2012: 1; Feldman, 2001: 453.

¹⁴ Peters Corbett and Perry, 2000: 2; Roger Fry, too, lamented a “low standard of artistic conscience” referring to British art as a “minor school”, cited in Cork, 1999: 57.

¹⁵ Peters Corbett and Perry, 2000: 2.

being “modern” been eclipsed by the urge to focus, and to be seen to focus purely on the present? Or has their art now become so linked to politically disconcerting ideas of the British nation and Empire as to obscure their value in assessing their influence into the twentieth century, thereby impeding scholarly engagement with their work? In particular, their perceived support for British colonial expansion as of right makes for uncomfortable reading in the context of twenty-first century sympathies and beliefs. Were they themselves casualties of a new kind of warfare in which any experience of past conflict put them at a disadvantage? How was modernity encountered through battle art within this period leading up to the First World War and how did these artists “engage with modern life and experience”?¹⁶ It is significant that, even amongst scholars working in the field of art and empire, these artists have been and continue to be neglected as if they constitute merely a footnote to the history of nineteenth-century painting, with little consideration as to what new insights a study of their work might bring to the history of battle painting as a whole. I shall be seeking to redress the balance by arguing that they made a significant contribution to the genre of what we might call “war art” of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, reinvigorating the genre during this period and as such they deserve greater recognition. I argue that they responded to contemporary concerns through their subject-matter, and in particular their focus on the rank and file, just as they laid the foundations for an explosion of battle art arising from the experience of the First World War. More specifically, I shall suggest that it was these artists who first highlighted the suffering of the ordinary soldier in context, both on and close to the battlefield in such a manner that the viewer could not fail to notice the connection, and which facilitated subsequent development of this more humanitarian approach to battle art.

In reflecting upon these issues, my thesis will explore the manner in which these military artists approached their work, what innovations

¹⁶ Peters Corbett and Perry, 2000: 5.

they introduced and developed, where they exhibited and how their works were viewed, before moving on to question their legacy. Is there something particular about military painting which facilitates an understanding of the transition through late-Victorian visual culture into the twentieth century? This was a period which began and ended with significant wars; wars between Europeans and not, like “Victoria’s Little Wars”, governed by the urge to expand and maintain trading relationships on a colonial basis; where war, however physically remote, was not just an isolated event, but an ongoing condition.¹⁷ Such scholarly attention as has been afforded this genre of nineteenth-century painting has generally been consigned to footnotes, articles in journals or otherwise scant mention in generalised texts on art of the period. Few, if any, have reflected upon the way in which the development of the work of these military artists serves as an important link between the aftermath of Waterloo and the onset of World War One. Interest in the army has frequently been the province rather of military historians, often focussing on the overall strategy of great commanders or the intricate tactics of a particular engagement, and using the occasional colourful painting merely as cover illustration.¹⁸

Such previous studies as there are have tended to dwell on the comparison with France and it has been well documented that, unlike the French, Britain had no firmly established tradition of military painting.¹⁹ Indeed, as J.W.M. Hichberger comments, there was an “intense debate” in the first half of the nineteenth century as to whether such a genre existed in Britain at all, as confirmed by the

¹⁷ This is taken from the title to Byron Farwell’s 1973 book on colonial wars during Victoria’s reign, 1837-1901; Favret, 2010: 39.

¹⁸ See Driver, 2010: 146-57 where the author describes a similar experience in relation to Walter Crane’s map of the British Empire; as an example of a military historian using Butler for his cover illustration see Richard Holmes in *Redcoat: The British Soldier in the Age of Horse and Musket* featuring *Scotland Forever!*

¹⁹ I have adopted the definition of military as pertaining to ground forces (more recently ground and air forces) as opposed to naval forces, the exploits of which have been more extensively covered. See, for example, the naval works on display at the National Maritime Museum, Greenwich.

Newcastle Chronicle when reviewing Butler's 1876 painting, *Balaclava* (fig.6), opining that "France and Germany, and especially France, can paint the nervous fury the indescribable tumult, the wild roar and crash of battle", whilst British "picturings of conflict of battle have been mostly still-life studies".²⁰ Artistic interest in the field of battle was regarded in nineteenth-century Britain as being more suited to the supposedly bloodthirsty temperament of the French and the self-aggrandisement of their leaders. Certainly it was felt that French, rather than British artists, were steeped in the tradition of military pictures in the high art manner of history paintings, which ran counter to the allegedly more pacific nature of the British. Paul Usherwood and Jenny Spencer-Smith confirm this view of French dominance in their 1987 catalogue of Butler's work, citing the *Athenaeum's* criticism of British battle paintings exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1887 that "[m]ilitary art of this kind would attract little praise in Paris, where they do things incomparably better".²¹ Similarly, Matthew Lalumia has observed that, notwithstanding a British and allied victory at Waterloo, there "existed no British counterpart to the new French iconography that glorified Bonaparte as a semi-divine martial figure, or that portrayed war with Romantic fervor" [sic], in contrast to the treatment of Vice-Admiral Nelson in naval art.²² As Athol Mayhew observed in 1884 "[b]attle painting boiled but few pots on English hearths until very lately", singling out Butler, Crofts and Woodville in his list of British military painters "who have gained their reputation *principally* through the production of military or naval pictures".²³ In a peculiarly ambivalent manner, art critics in the nineteenth century continued to measure British battle artists against their French counterparts, generally to the detriment of the former, whilst at the

²⁰ Hichberger, 1988: 2; *Newcastle Chronicle*, 12 August 1876.

²¹ Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 160.

²² Lalumia, 1981: 78.

²³ Mayhew, 1884: 50, 51. I am not aware of any naval paintings by Butler, Crofts or Woodville.

same time deprecating the militant nature of the country which produced the models to which artists were encouraged to aspire.²⁴

British war artists generally sought to avoid the more vivid portrayals of military battle scenes, concentrating instead on portraits of commanders-in-chief and their staff, with or without a panoramic background of unidentifiable (and expendable) figures on the battlefield, reflecting a propensity towards portraiture in British art, or on topographical drawings.²⁵ These latter were regarded as “low art”, frequently used purely for logistical or educational purposes and with little aesthetic merit, while the former concentrated on the aristocracy, surveying the field of battle from a safe distance and ignoring the role of the ordinary soldier actively engaged in the battle below.²⁶ Academic artists were not often inspired to represent actual conflict on the battlefield as Mayhew confirms, writing that George *Waterloo Jones* (1786-1869), “was the sole battle-painter, pure and simple, of his day”.²⁷

I do not suggest that all nineteenth-century war paintings entirely overlooked the common soldier, but apart from genre pictures, for example, featuring veterans returning from battle, little attention was given to their individuality and affect. Nor was it until 1770, with *The Death of General Wolfe* (National Gallery of Canada) by Benjamin West (1738-1820), that the commander was shown as vulnerable on the field of battle, elevating military art to the essentially didactic tone of history painting, a genre which briefly became “highly regarded” in the first half of the nineteenth century.²⁸

²⁴ As Edward Morris has demonstrated, art education in Britain was seen to be vastly inferior to that in France, Morris, 2005: 26-49.

²⁵ See, for example, the painting by John Wootton (1686-1764) of *George II on the Field of Dettingen (1743)*.

²⁶ Lalumia comments that “[t]his system of dominance in military affairs by titled men who were great property holders was viewed with especial pride as an important element of Britain’s unwritten constitution”, Lalumia, 1984: 12.

²⁷ Mayhew, 1884: 51; George Jones, R.A., became Keeper of the Royal Academy. He was known as *Waterloo Jones* on account of his frequent choice of this battle as his subject, Harrington, 1993: 107.

²⁸ Harrington, 1993: 114.

By the 1850s as Peter Harrington has noted, academic artists, such as Barker, had already moved away from historical military scenes to highlight particular contemporary incidents, so that in spite of a renewed interest in historical portrayals at the end of the century, paintings tended to focus on incident rather than on panoramic views. These in turn were criticised for being “anecdotal” and inferior, reducing the status of military painting to a niche market outside the more highly prized genre of history painting, a market generally favoured by military personnel and, increasingly, wealthy industrialists such as Galloway.²⁹

More recently, scholars have considered the consequences of war on the different ranks as early as the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Philip Shaw, for instance, in his 2013 work *Suffering and Sentiment in Romantic Military Art* has drawn attention to evidence of an incipient sympathetic public engagement in wartime scenes of this period, challenging the notion that military art was restricted to the glorification of war. He cites as an example *Field of Waterloo* (1818) (fig.7), by J.M.W. Turner (1775-1851) which, he argues, in its portrayal of women searching among the bodies of the dead after the battle, is “by no means a simple celebration of victory”, but rather “emphasises war’s tragic consequences”.³⁰ His analysis demonstrates how Turner’s focus is nevertheless on the costs of war to a class of people and he does not address the impact on the individual *as* individual. Meanwhile, Mary Favret in her study of suffering on the home front in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, where wars were remote but virtually continuous, considers how conflict was experienced at a distance through art and literature. She explores how “the everyday” was “wedded to an awareness of war”, but an awareness that was absorbed at one remove, maintaining a distinction between imagination and actuality.³¹

²⁹ Harrington, 1993: 237.

³⁰ Shaw, 2013: 4-5; caption for the painting as exhibited at Tate Britain, ref: NOO500.

³¹ Favret, 2009: 160.

In focussing on the period 1854 to 1918, this thesis will chiefly examine the artworks produced by this afore-mentioned cohort of late-Victorian artists in three different major wars, the Crimean War (1854-56), the Second Boer War (1899-1902) and the First World War (1914-18) and show how representations of these disparate conflicts relate to and are influenced by each other. Chapter one will deal with the first of these wars, tracing the development towards an emphasis on the individual heroism and privations of ordinary soldiers, the effects (and affect) of battle on both mind and body as well as the domestic consequences at home, set against the rising influence of the illustrated press. It will show how even in the chaos and spectacle of battle, there was space for the quiet intimacy of male physical comfort. In chapter two, I examine the Second Boer War, exploring the rise of patriotism at the end of the century, together with an emphasis on sacrifice, chivalry, sport and manliness, influenced by a public school education, alongside the counter-balance of the peace movement. In chapter three, changes in army uniform, in particular the move from glamorous scarlet to plain khaki, are considered along with the effects of photography and film. Chapter four deals with the period of transition from the end of the nineteenth century up to the First World War, the position of this genre of painting within the particular nature of the Edwardian period, and how the late-Victorian battle artists adapted to this new era. I then examine the policy and practice of the World War One official war artist scheme in chapter five, ending with a comparison of the works of Butler, who was not part of the scheme, and John Singer Sargent (1856-1925), who was.

I have used Butler as a connective thread throughout this thesis, and not only on account of her longevity – she was born before the Crimean War and survived the First World War by over a decade – but also on account of what I am arguing was her radical, arguably subversive, portrayal of the common soldier seen close to, and those

psychological effects of war not truly recognised until well into the twentieth century. I examine the influence of her work and the themes she championed. I explore the way in which these themes were adopted and adapted by her contemporaries and were made popular even at a time when Butler herself was falling out of favour. I draw attention to the contributions of her contemporaries, many of whose works straddled the academic and popular art markets, locating these artists within a changing world. This was a period incorporating the move from the well-established world of Queen Victoria with its increasing interest in the army and the individual soldier, to the uncertain milieu of King Edward VII; from the expansion of Empire, to a fin-de-siècle anxiety when that staunch imperialist, Joseph Chamberlain, started to speak of Britain as “the weary Titan”; when Britain’s traditional naval supremacy was being challenged from different directions; when three-fifths of the adult male population were found unfit for military service and war, a new technological war, was threatening.³² As Williams has observed, the late nineteenth century was peculiar in witnessing the “greatest changes ever seen in the media of cultural production”.³³ I examine how the works of these battle artists were influenced by these changing circumstances and pressures, when what it meant to be “modern” was constantly shifting. I explore how they were viewed by the critics and the public, then and now, as they responded to current events, from the public outrage following the treatment of the ranks in the Crimea, to the growth of popular imperialism, through to disillusionment with the conduct and outcome of the Boer War. I then give consideration to the current venues of these works of art and their display within the context of debates such as that surrounding the 2013 Tate rehang.³⁴

³² Friedberg used this as the title of his book, citing Chamberlain’s remark in 1902, “[t]he weary Titan staggers under the too vast orb of its fate”, Friedberg, 1988: [u/p] frontispiece; see Searle, 2004: 305 for statistics on fitness for military service.

³³ Williams, 1989a: 33.

³⁴ See Turner, 2009: 20-21; see also Bendor Grosvenor’s *ArtHistoryNews* blog, accessed 19 May 2013 where he laments, “[i]sn’t it sad that so much great art has to be hidden away?”

I place great emphasis on the need for a close, descriptive, analysis of several of their paintings and illustrations in order to come to a greater understanding of their conceptions and the social, historical, political and economic factors which informed them. As Briony Fer has written, “as soon as we use concepts to think about pictures or ascribe meaning to them, we use language,” as this is our common medium of synthesis and interpretation.³⁵ However unsatisfactory words may be, and they are indeed ephemeral, subjective and of their time, as Jaš Elsner argues, art historians “have no choice”, notwithstanding the “whiff” of “betrayal”, “but to do interpretative description”.³⁶ At the same time, I argue that it is important, if not essential, for the viewer to combine a thorough consideration of the image itself with any such detailed verbal analysis, for as Walter Sickert observed, “if it could be described in words, there would be no need to paint it”.³⁷ Close examination of the images is particularly significant in tracking changes in artistic practice during this period when several artists, as they turned to the illustrated press for employment, adapted their style of work to fit the pressures of topicality, subsequently importing elements of this different genre into their academic work. Woodville, in particular, was noted for his “slap dash” approach to his exhibited work, raising issues of “finish” and impressionism. According to Hichberger, he “appears to have been trying to synthesise the dashing freedom of his newspaper drawings with the demands of an academic audience” to the extent that his painting, *A Chip off the Old Block* (Anne S.K. Brown Military Collection), was exhibited in 1900 while the canvas was still damp.³⁸

³⁵ Fer, 1994: 15; see her discussion which follows (15-21) of the different emphases of two critics, the one, Max Buchon, placing emphasis on subject matter, the other, Emile Zola, on the medium of painting. See also the following who discuss this issue: Holly, 2007: 42; Elsner, 2010: 10-27; Mitchell, 1994: 151-81.

³⁶ See Sontag, 2003: 25-26 on reading an image and Pettejohn, 2012: 261 f/n 56, who distances herself from Elsner’s proposition that art history can and should be seen as “nothing other than ekphrasis, or more precisely, an extended argument built on ekphrasis”, urging that any interpretation must constantly be measured against the image itself.

³⁷ Cited in Tickner, 2000: 26.

³⁸ Woodville, 1914: 82; Hichberger, 1988: 96; Harrington, 1993: 277.

Even more significant for Butler in terms of her legacy is the way close analysis signposts a change in emphasis after she withdrew temporarily from public view in late 1899 in sympathy with her husband, William Butler, when he resigned his post as Commander-in-Chief of the army in South Africa. His subsequent and vitriolic victimisation as “pro-Boer” affected her both personally and artistically, leading her to restrict her output significantly during and after this period. As a consequence, her later work was characterised by increasingly less challenging images as she ceased to present a psychological profile of her subjects, choosing rather to privilege action over demeanour. She was never to regain her former influence or popularity, and she herself records overhearing a visitor to the Royal Academy in 1905 comment “[h]ow are the mighty fallen” in front of her painting, *Homeward in the Afterglow: A Cistercian Shepherd in Medieval England* (private collection).³⁹

It may be queried as to why the work of these artists matters in the twenty-first century. Why should we care whether they languish in store or in regional regimental museums, seen only by a very restricted, and, in some cases, almost exclusively military audience? My response to this is to argue for a closer examination of their work in a period which covered some fifty years, during which society underwent vast and irreversible changes in areas such as technology, literacy, class structure; a period during which they consistently produced pictures of a significantly different nature to war paintings prior to 1854.⁴⁰ The major wars of this period were seen through the prism of military painting, illustrations, drawings, prints, posters, cartoons and photographs, the accumulation of which informs these changes in painting and society. If modernism is to be understood as the “transformation of nineteenth-century societies” in “contested

³⁹ Butler, 1993: 241; while Butler attributes this painting to 1905, it is recorded in the Royal Academy as entry no 959 in 1908, Graves, 1985: 249.

⁴⁰ I have chosen this date to coincide with the outbreak of the Crimean War.

areas of representation thrown up by the new conditions of experience in modernity”, then these works and these artists are of significance for what they say about their late-Victorian and Edwardian modernities.⁴¹

In these four years of centennial commemoration of the First World War (2014-18), it is especially apposite to bring into focus the state of British military painting at the outset, during and at the end of the conflict. This was a war characterised like no previous war by the collective desire to mourn, to be seen to mourn, to commemorate and to remember. The senseless loss of millions of lives across Europe, Asia and America was a hard burden for the survivors to bear, but a burden eased in part by the artistic contribution of the period. It is not my intention here to offer a detailed analysis of the works of the official war artists, such as C.R.W.Nevinson (1889-1946), Paul Nash (1889-1946), Stanley Spencer (1891-1959), Eric Kennington (1888-1960), Wyndham Lewis (1882-1957) and David Bomberg, (1890-1957) who have already been much researched. Instead, I argue that it is too simplistic to imagine that their works were without British (military) provenance, and suggest that they formed part of that trajectory of battle painting during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, which moved from the more formal portraits, to genre painting, to a humanitarian focus on the predominantly white individual soldier, to his pain and suffering and finally to the collective anger and despair engendered by the new technological face of trench and aerial warfare.

It is significant, too, that in the midst of this “war to end war”, the centenary of Waterloo in 1915 was not forgotten.⁴² As will be developed in chapter four most of these late-Victorian battle painters

⁴¹ Peters Corbett and Perry, 2000: 2.

⁴²This quotation is taken from H.G.Wells’ 1914 publication *The War That Will End War*, subsequently shortened in 1918 to “the war to end war” in *The Fourth Year*. The resonance of Waterloo continues as evidenced by the exhibition at the British Museum due to open in 2015, featuring the response of British artists to Napoleon Bonaparte.

were called upon to contribute to an international exhibition in the heart of the City of London as part of a propaganda exercise, with works chosen specifically to help remind the public and stir their blood with images of the glorious exploits of the past. In two of his entries, *Saving the Guns at Maiwand* (1881) (fig.8) and *The Charge of the 21st Lancers at Omdurman* (1898) (fig.9), Woodville features British soldiers as the underdog in their heroic struggles against adversity, while Butler emphasises their courage under fire in “*Steady the Drums and Fifes!*” *The 57th (Die-Hards) Drawn up under Fire on the Ridge of Albuera* (1897) ((The Queen’s Regiment, Canterbury). At a time of crisis it is evident that these artists, whose works were displayed alongside rousing images of Nelson and Napoleon Bonaparte, had not been neglected and their style, if considered traditional, still appealed to the public they were required to inspire. This was especially persuasive in the period prior to conscription, not introduced until 1916, and I suggest is just one indication of the much-overlooked significance of British battle painting. In this thesis my aim is for a critical re-assessment of the works, ideals, practices and legacy of these late Victorians in order to contribute to re-evaluations of diverse artistic connections either side of 1900.

CHAPTER ONE

THE CHANGING FACE OF BATTLE: ELIZABETH BUTLER'S MILITARY PAINTING

As you know, Nikolai, the period that precedes an engagement is the most unpleasant-it's the only time when you have the time to be afraid, and fear is one of the most unpleasant feelings.⁴³

Butler understood this anticipatory fear which she demonstrably evokes in her painting. As she made clear in her autobiography, her principle was not to paint conflict, but to concentrate on the emotions of the ordinary soldier away from the action of battle.⁴⁴ Nor, given her many travels, did she ever personally witness an engagement, viewing only battlefields after the event and regimental displays and charges put on for her personal benefit.⁴⁵ Some of these displays were magnificent, and Butler's privileged position within society ensured that she had access to unlimited assistance from the army. She records that Colonel Browne, "who did all in his power to help me with the military part of it", had "the whole Waterloo uniform made for me at the Government clothing factory in Pimlico" in preparation for her 1875 painting *The 28th Regiment at Quatre Bras*.⁴⁶ This is not to say that she was totally removed from the horrors of war, especially after her marriage in 1877 to a soldier, as evidenced by her poignant comment that "soldiers' wives in war time have to feel the sickening sensation on waking some morning when news of a fight is expected of saying to themselves, 'I may be a

⁴³ Figes, 2011: 184, citing Leo Tolstoy's letter to his brother from the Crimea in 1855.

⁴⁴ Butler, 1993: 148; she did not always keep to her policy of avoiding conflict as is evident from both her teenage sketchbooks and her painting of *The Defence of Rorke's Drift* 1879.

⁴⁵ Butler, 1993: 96-100. She was also very fortunate in her upbringing which ensured for her the opportunity to travel through Europe as a child and into Africa as a married woman, visiting the battlefield site at Waterloo on her nineteenth birthday where she had a guided tour by a veteran; she was to return to Napoleonic themes on several occasions during her career, Butler, 1993: 24.

⁴⁶ Butler, 1993: 96-100; see also Usherwood, 1992: 166 for a discussion of how Butler appealed both to a middle-class audience and the aristocratic army establishment which offered her such assistance.

widow’”.⁴⁷ When she died in 1933, a correspondent to *The Times* records her words: “Thank God; I never painted for the glory of war, but to portray its pathos and heroism. If I had ever seen a corner of a battle-field, I could never have painted another war picture.”⁴⁸

In the aftermath of the Crimean War, Butler was instrumental in changing the tenor of academic British military art by concentrating on the effect of war on the individual soldier and aiming to represent “the *private’s* point of view – not mine, as the principal witnesses were from the ranks”.⁴⁹ This would seem to be the key motivation in all her military painting, although both her early and phenomenal success and her subsequent obscurity raise many questions. How, for example, did a young female artist come to execute the painting of the year in 1874, and a battle painting at that? Why did she concentrate on history paintings of military scenes and not the more obvious landscapes or still-life art common amongst her female counterparts? Why was her success so short-lived? How far was she assisted or impeded in her career by her marriage to a general? How should we view her legacy into the twentieth and twenty-first centuries in terms of military art and, in particular, her contribution, if any, to modernism? In order to examine these questions and to situate Butler within this still much under-researched genre of nineteenth-century battle painting, this chapter explores the development of her radical approach as a painter of military scenes, mainly, but not exclusively within the context of the events surrounding the Crimean War.

Although Hichberger comments that “the details of Butler’s career are better known than those of any other British battle painter”, apart

⁴⁷ Butler, 1993: 153, who also became aware during the First World War of the difference between the real thing and a regimental parade, writing that “[t]his is war, and there is no doubt the bearing of the men is different. They were always smart, always cheery, *but not like this*”, Butler, 1993: 254.

⁴⁸ *The Times*: 4 October 1933; the official obituary is dated 3 October 1933; this quotation comes from an unnamed correspondent, whose letter appeared the following day.

⁴⁹ Butler, 1993: 149.

from her autobiography and Wilfrid Meynell's monograph in the 1898 *Art Annual*, there is surprisingly still no biography of Butler.⁵⁰ She is omitted altogether in both Linda Nochlin's list of nineteenth-century women artists in *Women, Art and Power*, as well as in *Local/Global: Women Artists in the Nineteenth Century* edited by Deborah Cherry and Janice Helland.⁵¹ Gill Perry ignores her in her essay 'Women Artists, 'Masculine' Art and the Royal Academy of Art' notwithstanding Butler's near election as the first woman to the Academy in 1879.⁵² Similarly, Griselda Pollock makes no reference to Butler in *Vision and Difference, Differencing the Canon: -Feminist Desire and the Writing of Art's Histories* or her essay, 'Art, Art School, Culture: -Individualism after the Death of the Artist'. This is surprising when considering Pollock's critique of a modernist art history which celebrates a selective tradition – a tradition she calls a “particular and gendered set of practices” – seemingly unaware of a contemporary claim that Butler had “shown her sisters which way they should go”.⁵³ Nor is Butler referred to in more recent scholarship by either Favret in *War at a Distance* or Shaw, whose study, while primarily addressing the period up to 1850, strays into a discussion of painters of a much later date.⁵⁴ When reviewing the 1987 exhibition of Butler's works at the National Army Museum, art critic John Spurling referred to Butler and her husband as “outsiders” on account of their Roman Catholicism and Irish connections, while

⁵⁰ She is also mentioned in *A Little Kept*, the memoirs of her daughter, Eileen Gormanston.

⁵¹ Hichberger, 1988: 75. During the course of my research I have encountered two academics researching Butler with a view to publishing a biography, one an art historian, the other a lecturer in English. I have not had the opportunity of reading either as yet unpublished work. While Ellen Clayton's 1876 two volume *English Female Artists* is dedicated to Butler, her entry is relatively modest, given her enormous popularity at the time. Even William Butler's own autobiography fails to mention his wife by name, referring only to the fact of his marriage.

⁵² Perry, 1999: 90-107.

⁵³ Pollock, 1988: 72; Pollock, 1996: 50-67; the quotation is from George Augustus Sala in the *Daily Telegraph*, cited in Meynell, 1898: 7, who goes on to say that with Butler's painting of the *Roll Call*, “we see a manacle knocked off a woman's wrist and a shackle hacked off her ankle”; see also Usherwood's assessment of her “critical and popular success of such magnitude that, for a while, it seemed a new era for women artists in Britain was about to dawn”. Usherwood, 2004: 132.

⁵⁴ Generally this work deals with the eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries, though it does include references to the twentieth century and mid-nineteenth century paintings of the Crimean War.

John Russell Taylor suggested that while Butler may have been sidelined on account of her gender, this approach came

funnily enough from both sides in the battle of the sexes: marriage and child-bearing as well as the patronizing attitude of men [which] held her back from a truly professional career and of late feminists have failed to take up her cause largely because of some obscure feeling that she was not really a woman artist.⁵⁵

My aim for this chapter is a re-assessment of Elizabeth Butler's portrayal of the individual soldier and her representation of his experience of war. Central to my argument lie Butler's single-minded focus on and empathy for the sufferings of ordinary soldiers, which allowed for a significant change in the way that the rank and file of the army was viewed by the public, and which in turn led to a reworking of ways of representation within battle art.⁵⁶ Through a close analysis of selected paintings, I examine how Butler's approach altered the way both the British art world and the general public viewed this genre, firstly at the time and then, later, towards the end of the century, set against the pressure of subsequent disruptions to her approach. Butler's somewhat mysterious disappearance from public awareness towards the last decade of the century and her legacy will be considered in subsequent chapters, as I evaluate her contribution to the field of Victorian and early twentieth-century military painting; a contribution, which, I would argue, has hitherto been greatly undervalued, if not completely dismissed, by art historians.

As the *Scarborough Mercury* remarked of Butler's 1876 painting, *Balaclava*, "[t]o truly appreciate this work it must be studied in detail".⁵⁷ This is true for all her work which can be most clearly understood through a careful visual analysis of the intense detail

⁵⁵ *New Statesman*, 5 June 1987; *The Times*, 2 June 1987.

⁵⁶ Hichberger, 1988: 77 outlines a "few basic types of battle pictures" including "the last stand", "the charge", "after the battle" and "the march past" all of which, she contends, Butler pioneered.

⁵⁷ *The Scarborough Mercury*: 23 September 1876.

which was integral to her art.⁵⁸ In spite of what has been called visual art's "glorious resistance to being fully verbalized", the very words used to describe an image can be of assistance in reaching a deeper understanding of the artistic motivation.⁵⁹ Language, however, is, as Elsner has commented, "a generalizing tool", mediated through personal experiences and values.⁶⁰ It cannot of itself reproduce the totality of the image and so it is crucial to start with, and return to the painting and to allow space for what Griselda Pollock has described as "some good hard looking".⁶¹ It is by a close scrutiny of selected Butler's works, therefore, that I examine how carefully she developed a narrative in her pictures. Her technique of building layer upon layer of dramatic storyline is mirrored in the physical construction of her paintings where the design is drawn firstly on a piece of tinted paper in charcoal and white chalk, and then on canvas, boldly outlining the figures in what she called a "shell jacket" – to sharply define the form – before adding their uniforms and accoutrements.⁶² I argue that it is essential to take time to read these narratives attentively, to observe the outward presentation of her characters, their facial expressions and their bodily interactions, one with another, in order to understand the novelty and significance of Butler's approach.⁶³

It may be queried why this detail is important and how it compares with more modern interpretations of war and suffering, but it is, I shall argue, at the heart of why many Victorians so appreciated and admired her work. I suggest that it is this very detail in Butler's work in combination with her adherence to a subject matter of military engagement, which has made it difficult for a twenty-first century

⁵⁸ Fowler, 1991: 34.

⁵⁹ Elsner, 2010: 26.

⁶⁰ Elsner, 1995: 10-27.

⁶¹ Pollock, 1995: 38.

⁶² See Butler, 1993: 81; Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 20 give a fuller description of her technique. A modern equivalent of the "shell jacket" might be lycra; Butler makes it clear throughout her autobiography that she prepared carefully for all her paintings.

⁶³ See the *Graphic*, 20 May 1876, which refers to Butler's "power of entering into the life of her soldiers".

audience, used to the faster pace of moving images and sparer canvases, to read and to absorb her work. It has to be remembered that a significant proportion of Butler's contemporary audience, whose inclinations were for their domestic spaces to be completely filled with what we might now regard as clutter, would be familiar with a crowded canvas, as the popularity of the 1858 painting *Derby Day* (Tate Britain) by William Powell Frith (1819-1909), testifies.⁶⁴ "Victorian viewers", as Lisa Tickner has remarked, "knew how to read a painting like a novel".⁶⁵ Nochlin's somewhat dismissive – and anachronistic – comment that Butler "may remind us more of Cecil B. de Mille than Cezanne" with her cast of thousands is, I would venture, not only exaggerated, but indicative of a twentieth-century perspective, looking back to Butler through the theatrical spectacle of twentieth-century media.⁶⁶ It should also be remembered that Butler was acutely conscious of the need to satisfy an exacting military audience with detailed accuracy of her uniforms if she were to avoid criticism, writing that she felt "rather fettered" by an almost tyrannical obsession with military minutiae and an awareness that "some people might say that I was too anxious to be correct in minor military details, but I feared making the least mistake in these technical matters".⁶⁷

Visualising Humanity

In *Dawn of Waterloo. The "Réveille" in the Bivouac of the Scots Greys on the Morning of the Battle* (1893-95) (fig.10), Butler shows the regiment waking up on the battlefield and although many soldiers are still asleep, the nervous tension is palpable and a sense of foreboding pervades the camp. As W.H.Pennington, a Crimean

⁶⁴ Feldman, however, questions the modern view of Victorian parlours as a "place of Philistine prejudices, airless and overstuffed", Feldman, 2002: 468.

⁶⁵ Tickner, 2002: 18.

⁶⁶ Harris and Nochlin, 1976: 54; I am not aware that this criticism has ever been levelled at later war artists as, for example, Stanley Spencer, whose paintings are full of minute detail.

⁶⁷ Butler, 1993: 81-82, 99.

veteran observed, “it is at the hour immediately preceding daybreak that the pulse of nature would appear to beat most faintly”.⁶⁸ In this large, busy and detailed painting, the composition is essentially flat, with the uncertain sky taking up more than one third of the canvas, significantly broken only by the two mounted soldiers arriving as portents of doom, signalling the break of day and the transition from sleep to battle, inertia to furious activity, their trumpets raised high as they sound the *réveille*, and for those already awake, a certain frisson is established.

To the rear of the painting, the horizon is turning creamy-white, rising to a grey-pinky-grey streak with horizontal clouds of darker grey, gradually shading into yet darker grey at the top. Shafts of pale sunlight streak the faces and clothes of the central figures, highlighting them against the dark background, their red uniforms with white cross bands providing both contrast and reflection as the light falls on the creases in the cloth, allowing Butler to create two focal points, one emanating from the trumpeters, the other, more intimate, concentrating on the figures round the fire.

To the left of the painting is a row of white horses, the “greys”, waiting in line to be saddled and mounted. Some bend their heads to feed whilst others appear restless, unsettled by the increasing activity in the camp. As he stands with his back to the horses a soldier, dressed in a dull red cape and helmet, holds his sword away from his body as he deliberately wipes it clean in preparation for battle; an eerie reference to the blood which will soon cover the blade is left hanging in the air. It is a tribute to Butler’s skill that she manages to convey a sense of slow-motion in this movement by the height and downwards angle at which the sword is being held, a sense of anticipation readily recognised by those who have experienced the interminable seconds before inevitable disaster.

⁶⁸ Pennington, 1906: 44; Pennington was Butler’s model in *Balaclava*.

To the front left of the canvas, lying on his stomach before a fire, a still sleepy soldier raises his head to look around, supporting himself by his forearms. His feet are splayed straight out behind him while the backs of his legs down to the ankles are covered by diaphanous deathly white gauze, which settles like a shroud around him. To his left, his companion is fast asleep on his stomach, his head turned to the right and his arms by his sides. Further still to the front, another soldier lies on his side with his legs foetally drawn up, his bare fist clenched in the chill of the morning and his cap lying just proud of his head. His sword and holster lie within reach, glinting silver in the dawn light. As he sleeps, he too is surrounded by a gauze-like material on which he is resting, in a sinister evocation of winding sheets for the dead. Situated at the point of his sword, his comrade is awake and alert, his scarlet coat catching the early light as he rests his left hand on one knee, his right hand under his duller red cloak as he too watches the trumpeters, a set and dignified expression on his pale face. In the crook of his left elbow can be seen the sleeping head of his colleague, cradled childlike, as he lies wrapped in a dark blanket, the light illuminating his immobile features, whilst behind him a group of soldiers begin to rouse themselves.

As in *Missing*, the central action of the painting is triangular in composition, the two mounted trumpeters forming the peak which opens out to encompass the kneeling soldier to the left and a seated soldier to the right. The trumpeters are both dressed in army red, red feathers in their bearskins, a red echoed across the canvas, in what Michael Baxandall might describe as a “liturgical” colour, indicating sacrifice and the Passion.⁶⁹ The focus of the triangle is the young soldier staring straight out of the canvas into the distance beyond, clearly lost in thought, almost certainly contemplating his fate as he

⁶⁹ Baxandall, 2003: 139-40, who argues in his section “anomalous red” that one interpretation of the use of red in Renaissance painting is that it is “readily associable with the red of the blood Christ shed for us”. Red, he states is “one of the four liturgical colours, in mid-fifteenth-century Europe, a live and appropriate code, where red would stand for Sacrifice and the Passion”.

sits, ready dressed in his headgear and greatcoat (fig.11), and there is much in his presentation to recall the central traumatised figure in Butler's earlier, 1876, painting *Balaclava*. As Wilfrid Meynell, writing in 1898, commented, "the face of a plain soldier [. . .] is at the very centre of the picture".⁷⁰ Literally and metaphorically, then, this soldier's face, with the dawn light on his cheeks and forehead, the cavernous shadows round his eyes and mouth, is pivotal to the painting and to its clear message. What will the end of the day bring for him? Will he still be alive? Will he be injured or a prisoner? Will there be victory or defeat? These have all become crucial questions in which the spectators now share an emotional investment. Directly in front of him and lying at right angles is a sleeping soldier, his arms folded across his chest, his head slightly raised and turned to the front. Notwithstanding the lack of engagement between these two figures, the overwhelming reference of their positioning is to the *pietà*, an impression heightened by the ethereal white shroud, settling softly like clouds around the sleeping soldier who, symbolically, has lain down his sword.⁷¹

To the right of the triangle is the seated soldier, smartly dressed, a white feather on his bearskin and white cuffs on his red jacket (fig.12). He is leaning forward, stretching out a white gloved hand to touch gently the prostrate figure before him; whether to wake him or to check if he is dead or alive is uncertain for the head of his comrade is thrown back awkwardly, as if he has been left as he fell. With his left hand to his cheek and his right still grasping his sword, this figure, too, is covered in ghostly gauze, reflecting a secondary light on the faces of these central figures.

Behind this group, other soldiers are rousing themselves slowly; one, to the right of the painting, is holding up his cloak like a tent from

⁷⁰ Meynell, 1898: 17.

⁷¹ This too has echoes of the earlier *Balaclava*, where a lancer bears a young trumpeter back in his arms from the Charge of the Light Brigade.

which he is emerging, the blood-red lining livid in the morning light. Another clutches his cloak around his knees as he stares at a deadly pyramid of weaponry in front of him. In the foreground various items of battle gear are apparent, notably a dull red bundle which, disturbingly, could contain a small man or boy but which shows no signs of life.

This is a landscape where there are no birds, no wind, just a still and foreboding backdrop to the battle to come and shattered only by the sound of the trumpet. Although there are similarities between this painting and the 1888 painting *The Dream* (Musée D'Orsay) by Edouard Detaille (1848-1912), Butler's soldiers are not dreaming of a glorious outcome with Wellington riding at the front of a conquering army. This is far from a scene of keen anticipation, and there is no suggestion that these soldiers are spoiling for a fight. The subject-matter here is of that very pregnant pause before battle and *the* most famous battle of the nineteenth century for the British at that, as the troops wet and weary from the previous day's exertions awake in the full knowledge that today is to be the most significant and terrifying of their lives. Here they are on the field of battle before a momentous struggle, uncertain as to how they will fare. John Keegan in his book, *The Face of Battle*, confesses that, even with his many years of writing on battles and lecturing officer recruits at Sandhurst, he personally has very little understanding of the actual experience of a battle.⁷² When talking of the cadets in the moment of realisation that fighting is inevitable he puts it like this: "[t]hese feelings [. . .] are the products of some of man's deepest fears; fears of wounds, fear of death, fear of putting into danger the lives of those for whom one is responsible".⁷³

This, then, is a representation for the viewer of dramatic, adrenalin-filled anticipation, full of danger, uncertainty and awesome

⁷² Keegan, 2004: 15.

⁷³ Keegan, 2004: 18.

premonition, a slow burning precursor to life and death activity. It is essentially the soldiers' story where Butler, by centring on the individual, is able to create an arena for the rank and file, allowing her to express their fear, stoicism and exposure in a manner unique at that time in British military art, and an arena which allows for a sympathetic appreciation by viewers of what it might really feel like to anticipate violent death and injury away from home. References to childhood, such as the cradling of a soldier in the crook of an arm, to their foetal positions while asleep, to motherhood in the pietà and the caring touch of hands, emphasise the youth and vulnerability of the soldiers and make for Butler her point that "the fact that counts is the power of touching the people's heart, an "organ" which remains the same through all the changing fashions in art".⁷⁴ It sits well with the sentiments expressed by a Russian orderly at the siege of Sebastopol who recalled "that grave-like silence [which] contained within it something sinister: everybody felt that something terrible was approaching, something powerful and threatening, with which we would fight out life and death".⁷⁵ It is truly chilling.

By the time she painted *Dawn of Waterloo*, Butler's career as a military painter had stagnated, her early successes of 1874 to 1879 long past, owing in part to her choice of subject, refusing to bend with the public's increasing appetite for imperial, swashbuckling triumphalism. Instead she continued to focus on British heroic military disasters as in, for example, *Floreat Etona* (1898) (private collection), an incident from the First Boer War (1880-81), or immoral domestic policy as in *Evicted* (1880) (fig.13), which dignifies a poor Irish tenant whose house has been torched.⁷⁶

⁷⁴ Butler, 1993: 90. She goes on to relate "an argument [she] once had with Lawrence Alma-Tadema on this matter of touching the heart. He laughed at me, and didn't believe in it at all."

⁷⁵ Figes, 2011: 366, citing Prokofii Podpalov, orderly to General Gorlev, in the Redan, Sebastopol in June 1855.

⁷⁶ See Usherwood, 1988: 32; Butler writes in her autobiography how on hearing of the eviction she "got an outside car and drove off to the scene, armed with my paints. On getting there I found the ruins of the cabin smouldering, the ground quite hot under my feet and I set up my easel there", Butler, 1993: 158. Eileen

Although this latter is, unusually, not a battle painting as such, it has that same insight into the effects of an aggressive action the victim is powerless to prevent alongside a stoical acceptance of the same, and significantly was an incident Butler was able to witness personally.⁷⁷ With the exception of some of her work in the First World War, Butler's only real nod in the direction of representing actual conflict as an adult, *The Defence of Rorke's Drift* in 1879-80 (fig.14), was at the express request of Queen Victoria.⁷⁸ Butler, who commented disparagingly that "everyone was still hurrahing over the defence of Rorke's Drift in Zululand as though it had been a second Waterloo", tried actively to avoid the subject, but the Queen would not be diverted, even insisting that Butler include more Zulus in the painting in order to highlight the British triumph.⁷⁹ Notwithstanding the positive public reception of this work which is referred to by Usherwood and Spencer-Smith as her "last great popular success" at the Royal Academy, the painting was not well received by the critics, who deplored her use of colour and described the overall representation as suffering "from not giving the main idea of the engagement in question", and "having a wooden, theatrical quality".⁸⁰ As a result of the dip in her popularity, *Dawn of Waterloo* did not receive the hoped for public acclaim when exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1895, although in style and execution it belongs firmly within the corpus of her earlier works, and was apparently

Gormanston, Butler's daughter, refers to her father's experience as a twelve year old of witnessing just such an eviction which made a deep impression on him and suggests he persuaded Butler to make an eviction the subject of an Academy painting, Gormanston, 1953: 21. Butler was always aware that the subject would not be popular in England and she was proved correct; *Evicted* remained unsold and was hung in the Butler's dining room at Dover Castle, Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 95. *Floreat Etona* depicts an incident in an unsuccessful attack on Laing's Nek, South Africa in 1881 when one old Etonian is urging on another just before he is fatally shot.

⁷⁷ Butler records that the woman was "very philosophical, and did not rise to the level of my indignation as an ardent English sympathiser", Butler, 1993: 158.

⁷⁸ Her 1917 painting, *The Dorset Yeoman at Agagia, 26th Feb. 1916* (Dorset County Council), which also shows conflict, was similarly commissioned.

⁷⁹ Butler, 1993: 149: the *Spectator* reported that "rumour says that a certain great personage for whom the picture was painted expressed disappointment at there being so few Zulus in the composition, whereupon Miss Thompson stuck a few more into the corner of the picture" cited in Hichberger, 1988: 82.

⁸⁰ Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 80; quotation from the *Spectator* cited by Hichberger, 1988: 82.

much admired by the soldiers, from “the generals down to the traditional last drummer” at the Club House Aldershot.⁸¹ Nor was it placed well by the hanging committee to Butler’s great and lasting distress.⁸² Her meteoric rise to fame had been halted and her influence on battle art, temporarily at least, suspended.

Visualising Soldiers

These men bear pain and mutilation with unshrinkable heroism
and die without complaint.⁸³

Representations of ordinary soldiers by the art establishment had largely avoided visualisation of their characters and emotions, focussing instead on images of impassive military commanders in full dress uniform, or rows of faceless soldiers in a topographical panorama. In accordance with the public view of their social value, these ordinary troops had not been considered sufficiently worthy of individualised representation and consequently little thought had been given to the manner of their portrayal. The idea that a painter – and especially a female painter – could derive artistic interest from a private soldier’s body was novel and potentially shocking. While it is true that earlier depictions of the deaths of Nelson and Wolfe had shown individual dying heroes, these representations were of known personalities, were romanticised and, like Captain Nolan, largely bloodless. Both had achieved immortal status by dying at the very moment of their victories; they were not represented in the agonies of death, but rather almost seraphically, surrounded by their faithful and grieving subordinates in quasi-religious poses reminiscent of the *pietà*. Whilst in both cases the hero is comforted by his fellow officers, nevertheless a respectful personal space around the actual body is observed, fearful lest the “intimacy of the caress” would transgress an unwritten taboo, and a clear line of sight is afforded the

⁸¹ Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 107-108.

⁸² Butler, 1993: 194, and she sought “consolation” in Paris. She was still upset by the Royal Academy’s treatment of her the following year when she sent her next painting to the New Gallery instead, Butler, 1993: 205.

⁸³ Vicinus, 1989: 84, quoting Florence Nightingale.

viewer with the dying hero as its focus.⁸⁴ It is as if to encroach upon this space would be to engender a “sense of violation [which] is at once more acute and personal”, and where religious resonances abound – as in Christ’s injunction to Mary Magdalen not to touch Him as He had not yet ascended to His Father in Heaven.⁸⁵

The initial paucity of military paintings exhibited at the Royal Academy during the Crimean War reflected a period of hesitation as the fine art world drew breath, struggling to negotiate a way to represent the conflict, to find a truly British, and celebratory, voice which would appeal to the wider constituency, a voice which was left rather to print sellers and dealers.⁸⁶ Britain, it was widely believed, was not a military nation, unlike its continental neighbours, and it is certainly true that during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries “public experience of war was [. . .] remarkably indirect”.⁸⁷ Such wars as were fought were miles away on foreign soil, “human perception and feeling” limited by their distance.⁸⁸ It was not surprising therefore that, initially, portrayals of the 1854 Battle of Alma by both Jones and Edmund Walker (1836-82) followed the more usual panoramic and distanced approach with a large scale view of the battlefield.⁸⁹ Neither was particularly well regarded, Walker’s painting showing a simplistic and stylized representation of the clash between the British and Russian armies, with a mass of anonymous but identical soldiers, whilst Jones’s canvas was said to be a preliminary study only for a full scale work which did not follow.

⁸⁴ Das, 2005: 27.

⁸⁵ Das, 2005: 7; see the Gospel according to St John, chapter 20, verse 17.

⁸⁶ Hichberger, 1988: 52-53.

⁸⁷ Bonehill and Quilley, 2005: 41; Mayhew, 1884: 50 confirms this view, writing that “[b]efore the advent of Miss Thompson a fashion had grown and taken deep root among us that we had never been and never would be a military nation”.

⁸⁸ Favret, 2010: 1.

⁸⁹ See Harrington, 1993: 138; Walker’s birth year is uncertain and may well be earlier as he is known to have been active between 1836 and 1862, NAM database.

When Edward Armitage (1817-96), sent by Ernest Gambart to the war zone, exhibited alongside William Simpson (1823-99) at the 1856 Crimean Exhibition, he abandoned this more panoramic approach, choosing instead to highlight more discrete episodes in his two paintings, *The Battle of Balaclava* and *The Battle of Inkerman*, though neither featured the impact of war on the individual. Opinion was divided, the *Art Journal* referring to his “imperfect conception” of the battle by failing to show “more of the field and more of the dispositions of the enemy”, while the *Illustrated London News* refers to his “large, nobly conceived and finely executed pictures”.⁹⁰ Although Gambart had intended Armitage’s paintings to be engraved for a wider public audience, this never happened, possibly, as suggested by the *Art Journal*, as a result of the Indian Uprising of 1857, or, as Hichberger postulates, on account of Gambart’s dissatisfaction with the result.⁹¹ Whatever the reason, neither painting appears to have survived.

It was only with the two paintings by Thomas Jones Barker, submitted to the Royal Academy in 1855, that we can detect a shift in the approach to the depiction of war. The first represented the dead body of Captain Nolan and the second *Major General Williams and his Staff Leaving Kars 28 November 1855* (1857) (National Army Museum), featured a capitulation by a British regiment. Both these works dwelt on an individual incident, eschewing a grander overview of the battle. Neither reflected well on the military command, Barker instead profiling the admirable qualities of the horse in the first painting and those soldiers whose duty it was just “to do or die” in the second.⁹² The point is well made as Barker offers up the moral high ground to the vulnerable who, in their obedient stoicism, have merited recognition through their centrality in the composition.

⁹⁰ Cited in Hichberger, 1988: 55; *ILN*, 22 March 1856.

⁹¹ Hichberger, 1988: 54, citing the *Art Journal*, 1861: 30.

⁹² Lewis-Stempel, 2007: 191, quoting Private Parsons who describes how a “soldier has no place for fine feeling, and at the call of duty he must do or die, and leave the sentiment for others”.

This focus on the rank and file was followed and developed by other respected artists, including Scottish academician, Joseph Noel Paton (1821-1901). These scenes of “quiet felicity”, often portraying the returning trooper, had the advantage of appealing to a more domestic sensibility, emphasising the effect of war on the soldier’s family.⁹³ They were also significantly more attractive to a growing middle-class market mainly on account of the more manageable size of their canvases.⁹⁴ In *Home* (fig.15), painted twice, once in 1855-56, and again in 1859, Paton depicts an intimate scene of a family reunited on the soldier’s return from the Crimea. The central figure is a wounded corporal in the 1st battalion Scots Fusilier Guards, seated, and with his eyes practically closed in utter exhaustion. Kneeling at his feet is his young wife, her eyes similarly closed as if in silent prayer, whilst behind him his mother leans her head forward onto his shoulder, her white cap obscuring her face, her hand reaching forward to touch her son in comfort. There is no distancing here, with the three figures in a triangular, interlocking formation, the soldier’s right hand round his wife’s waist, and the wife’s right arm reaching forward to replace her husband’s missing arm, making him whole again and linking with the older woman in a regenerative circle.⁹⁵ The scene is both intimate and touching, and it is clearly easy to see how it would appeal to mid-Victorian families at home, eagerly hoping for an early reunion with their loved ones. Signs of hope and renewal are evident in the sleeping baby in the cradle to the left of the group, and indications of a former life are illustrated by a fishing rod hanging above the bed. The cotton reel which has fallen to the floor as the wife has risen to greet her husband and a Bible, with spectacles resting on the open page, indicate that life had continued for the family in the soldier’s absence, though his injuries show that from now on it can never quite be the same again.

⁹³ Roberts, 1982: 89, citing a review in *Blackwoods Magazine* in 1869.

⁹⁴ Roberts, 1982: 89.

⁹⁵ That the wife is able to make her husband whole resonates with the New Testament miracle of Christ raising Lazarus from the dead.

In the *Athenaeum* this painting was described as “full of poetry [. . .] the best work the late war has yet called forth”.⁹⁶ The *Art Journal* commented on its “moving eloquence”, whilst Ruskin referred to it as a “most pathetic and precious picture” and certainly Paton has captured an element of the pity of war.⁹⁷ Yet the challenge of a realistic and raw representation of the effects of battle, or the reality of life at the front, has not been fully met by mid-Victorian artists. Whilst we are made aware that the soldier has lost his arm, the dominant atmosphere of the scene is peaceful as his loving family gathers him up in its bosom, far removed from the horrors of war. In its appeal to both soldiers and their families, it was immediately popular as evidenced by a number of paintings on a similar theme, including *Story of Balaclava* (1855) (private collection) by Rebecca Solomon (1832-86), *Home Again* (Tate Britain) in 1856 by James Collinson (1825-81) and *Well-Known Footstep* (private collection) in 1857 by Richard Redgrave (1804-1888). All featured an explicitly domestic scene where the homes of the soldiers are tidy, calm and well-ordered and, although praised for “simplicity and truth”, present a reassuringly idealised picture of mid-Victorian Britain. There is very little to confront the realities of war on the ground in such works which emphasise instead the ability of the family to absorb and make good the soldiers’ experiences.

Hichberger has suggested that Butler’s “method was, theoretically, based on genre painting in its emphasis on unidealised individuals” and it is tempting to see her paintings as a series of portraits of victims, such as Paton’s corporal. It is demonstrably true that it was not uncommon for artists to represent generals and other notables gathered together, as evidenced by the work of Augustus Egg (1816-63), Barker (fig.16) and the photographer, Roger Fenton (1819-69).⁹⁸

⁹⁶ The *Athenaeum*, 10 May 1856.

⁹⁷ *Art Journal*, 1856: 161.

⁹⁸ Hichberger, 1988: 83; See Augustus Egg, *The Council of War* (1856), in the Royal Collection, Barker, *The Allied Generals before Sebastopol* (1856), (private

Certainly there are elements of this in Butler's work with its clear focus on character representation, as she followed her sister Alice Meynell's advice to "love the soldier and to love him individually, not in battalions", but, I would argue, this is unnecessarily restrictive, for her conception and ambition were on a grander scale.⁹⁹ Significantly, at no time did she follow the popular trend for portraying the families either on the soldiers' return or on receiving news of their death, concentrating instead almost exclusively on male subjects, and all are represented in context, close to the war front. She may well have gone into the "byways of battle" as advised by her family and in her concern to avoid actual conflict, but in so doing, she has used the larger canvas of war and its devastation to grapple with the horrors of death, injury and annihilation and to move away from "the cloak of cleanliness and heroism that Victorian ideology and war propaganda had wrapped around" contemporary images.¹⁰⁰ Whereas nineteenth-century women were generally excluded from "access to the high realm of History Painting", Butler's novelty lay in her ability to frame her close attention to intimate detail ostensibly within this respected academic genre (as seen in *Dawn of Waterloo*), and through which she was able to convey truths about a soldier's life, his "lived experience".¹⁰¹

Representation of suffering was not a new phenomenon in the nineteenth century and as Susan Sontag has observed, such iconography "has a long pedigree".¹⁰² This can be seen, for example, in Greek sculpture, the early religious paintings of Christ's Passion through to the secular series, *The Disasters of War* (1812-15)

collection) and Roger Fenton, *Council of War Held at Lord Raglan's Headquarters* (1855) (Gernsheim Collection).

⁹⁹ Alice Meynell, who (along with her husband, Wilfred Meynell) wrote as John Oldcastle in *Merry England*, vol.8 1886: 209.

¹⁰⁰ *Merry England*, vol.8, 1886: 209; Das, 2005:43.

¹⁰¹ Nochlin, 1994a: 86; see Zakreski, 2006: 62, in her discussion of history painting, generally regarded as "beyond the scope of the female artist's power and imagination"; final quotation is from Charles Ricketts, cited in Peters Corbett, 2004: 5.

¹⁰² Sontag, 2003: 36.

Spanish National Library) by Francisco Goya (1746-1828), while Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519), in his advice to fellow painters, advocated that “the image should appal”.¹⁰³ What was new in British battle painting of the 1870s was a move towards a realistic depiction of war, and one which represented not just the glamour, but also the resulting ruination; one which responded to contemporary concerns and which brought home that

[t]his is what it's like. This is what war does. And that is what it does, too. War tears, rends. War rips open, eviscerates. War dismembers. War ruins.¹⁰⁴

Already in the eighteenth century there was clearly an awareness of suffering, to which Philip Shaw has drawn attention, citing Francis Hutcheson's words in 1755, that “[w]hen we see or know the pain, distress or misery” of others, “we feel a strong sense of pity and a great proneness to relieve”.¹⁰⁵ The issue for the painter was how to represent Sontag's description in a way that did it justice, and justice to the total experience – the drama, the fear, the pain, the suffering, the noise, the smells and even the boredom. Was it in fact possible to represent such multi-sensory experiences through the material medium of paint? As Terry Eagleton has queried in the *Ideology of the Aesthetic*, “[h]ow could a word, as opposed to a pair of nostrils, capture the aroma of anything”?¹⁰⁶ By analogy, how could Victorian artists, especially those without direct experience, interpret the essence of the battlefield in a two-dimensional work of art, in a way which could be readily appreciated? With her “uncompromising truthfulness”, Butler undoubtedly captured the sense of the pain, distress and misery of others in her representation of soldiers, whilst

¹⁰³ Sontag, 2003: 61; Goya's series of etchings was not made available until 1863.

¹⁰⁴ Sontag, 2003: 7; compare this with George Augustus Sala's comment on Butler's *Balaclava* “[w]e know now, thanks to the painter's genius, what war is—a bloodthirsty brawl, and what war really means—namely, slaughter and mutilation, blood, ruin, agony and death”, cited in Lalumia, 1984: 143.

¹⁰⁵ Shaw, 2013: 12.

¹⁰⁶ Eagleton, 1990: 343; see, too, Charles Dowie cited in Sillars, 1987: 3-4, “words cannot convey even a suggestion of the sounds heard and the emotion felt, when every faculty is heightened, when every nerve is tense.”

acknowledging the multi-dimensional sensations provoked by war.¹⁰⁷ As has already been noted in *Dawn of Waterloo*, she demonstrated an awareness of the power of touch between the men, which ran counter to the “dissociation of touch from sight” within a “separation of the senses” in the nineteenth century as observed by Jonathan Crary.¹⁰⁸ Obliquely, too, sound is evidenced by the trumpets at *réveille* in *Dawn of Waterloo*, and, later in *Balaclava* (fig.6), inversely referenced in both the silent instrument of the dead trumpeter and the catatonic insensibility of the traumatised hussar. As Nicholas Saunders has observed, in relation to World War One with its “landscape of trenches, dug-outs, deafening artillery bombardments and blind advances across smoke-filled No Man’s Land, the visual sense was often denied”.¹⁰⁹ I do not wish to suggest that Butler denied the power of looking, but rather that she was able to convey a more rounded sense of the battle experience by her close attention to sensory detail.

That apart, was there a balance between realistic representation and what the public could accept, especially in an era prior to twenty-first century instantaneous news, flashing graphic images of conflict, torture and terror twenty-four hours every day? How did the viewer receive those representations where the “images of war and of the cruelties carried out in these conflicts tested the limits of what we look at and how we look”?¹¹⁰ When voluntarily submitting to images of violence, say, at the cinema, or on the television, it is not uncommon for the viewer to deflect his or her gaze momentarily to filter the visual impact, hardly daring to look, yet secretly wanting to see, and allowing the imagination to supply the details. Others positively enjoy the looking, and treat it almost as a sport or an erotic

¹⁰⁷ *The Morning Post*, 7 May 1874.

¹⁰⁸ Crary, 1998: 19.

¹⁰⁹ Saunders, 2004: 9, writing of experiences in the First World War. This is not dissimilar to descriptions of the bombardments outside Sebastopol, “the heaviest in history until that time”, where the “cannonade was incessant” and where an experienced artillery man confessed that he “could not understand or make out anything”, so heavy was the attack, Figes, 2011: 356-59.

¹¹⁰ Nead, 2011: 306.

experience, deriving a “morbid thrill” from the sight of a body mutilated or in pain.¹¹¹ Philip Gourevitch and Errol Morris, in their work on the atrocities in Abu Ghraib prison, comment of a young military policewoman Sabrina Harman that “she liked to look. She might recoil from violence, but she was drawn to its aftermath” adding that “when others would want to look away she’d want to look more closely”.¹¹² Harman wrote to her father that on “June 23 I saw my first dead body. I took the pictures! The other day I heard my first grenade go off. Fun!”¹¹³ In actions that were on the brink of “war tourism” with the denigration of the dignity of her subjects, the pictures she took included

a body just arrived and drenched in undimmed blood, mummified bodies smoke blackened here and ashen there; extreme close-ups of their ghastly faces, their lifeless hands, the torn flesh and bone of their wounds a punctured chest, a severed foot.¹¹⁴

While Harman may have enjoyed taking such photographs, and it seems she did, in a sinister evocation of Edmund Burke’s comment that there could be a degree of delight “in the real misfortunes and pains of others”, as Ernst van Alphen asks, how far do artists have to brace themselves for the task of representation?¹¹⁵ Not only does the artist have to confront the horrific cost of battle and to find ways to do it justice, there is additionally the issue of the effect on those portrayed and their loved ones to consider, for just as there is an “ethical quality of remembering”, so there is an ethical dimension to representation.¹¹⁶ Given the very personal nature of the experience, what right does either the artist or the spectator have to look at images of people *in extremis* and without their consent? Does he or she risk the charge of belittling the enormity of the experience for the sufferers quite apart from any issue of artistic competence? If so, how far did Butler and her contemporaries deal with these ethical issues? Or did

¹¹¹ Das, 2005: 153.

¹¹² Gourevitch and Morris, 2009: 74.

¹¹³ Gourevitch and Morris, 2009: 74.

¹¹⁴ Gourevitch and Morris, 2009: 74.

¹¹⁵ Sontag, 2003: 87; Van Alphen, 1993: 42.

¹¹⁶ Sontag, 2003: 103; Malvern refers to “artistic guilt at preying on the deprivations and suffering of others.” Malvern, 2004: 91.

they recognise an overarching morality, a morality which it is the duty of the serious artist to promote to the best of his or her ability in order to strike at the very essence of their subject-matter and allow the spectator to reverence?¹¹⁷

The Spectacle of War

War is such a peculiar thing – inaugurated by the whims of few, affecting the fate of many.¹¹⁸

Butler was only eight years old at the outbreak of the Crimean War in 1854, but it is clear that it captured her imagination along with that of a large section of the general public. Nearly forty years had elapsed since the British had been engaged militarily against a European power and the 1815 army of Wellington at Waterloo was only a distant and imperfect memory. These forty years had not improved the state of the army which, although employed almost continuously in various parts of the Empire, had not been tested against a European enemy of similar military stature. Many of the officers were elderly and were led by Lord Raglan, who, while serving under Wellington, had lost his right arm at Waterloo. In spite of his disability and his sixty-five years of age, he was considered by the army to be “just the man for the job”.¹¹⁹ The British public was initially excited by the prospect of war and “supremely self-confident” given Britain’s then dominant position on the world stage, waiting eagerly for the expected news of success.¹²⁰ “Suddenly a change came over the people with every sight of the Queen’s uniform calling forth emotions of enthusiasm” so that “the pulse of the whole country beat for her soldier sons”, and by November 1854

¹¹⁷ In his novel, *The Painter of Battles* (2006), Arturo Perez-Réverte explores this issue when his main character is pursued by a war veteran whose photograph he took without permission; see also Tucker, 2012: 5 citing the condemnation by Mieke Bal of a “pleasure that is parasitical on the pain of others” and the analysis of Robben Island in Coombs, 2003: 88-89.

¹¹⁸ Morris, 2011: 30.

¹¹⁹ Known mainly as an administrator, Raglan had one advantage in that he could converse fluently in French even though he regularly referred to his French allies as “the enemy”, Royle, 2000: 113.

¹²⁰ Royle, 2000: 120, 206.

the *Illustrated London News* was reporting that “The Dreadful Glories of the War Have Rendered the Army more Popular than Ever it Was at Any Previous Period of British History.”¹²¹ The frisson conjured up by the thought of battle was thrilling and exemplified by the words of General Earle: “[i]t was the last battle of the old order. We went into action in all our finery with colours flying and bands playing”.¹²² What the public initially saw was the traditional imagery, the splendour of war, and it was only when viewed close to through verbal and visual reports that they began to see “war not as a beautiful, orderly and gleaming formation, with music and beaten drums, streaming banners and generals on prancing horses, but war in its authentic expression – as blood, suffering and death”.¹²³

Regardless of the excitement evoked by the concept of glorious battles, during the war itself it was the genre paintings, such as that by Paton, which dominated the commercial art world, a move enhanced by the rising prominence of print-sellers. By 1855 the *Illustrated Times* was reporting that London was “alive with illustrations of the war” endorsing J.S.Brattton’s observation that “war is a major subject of *popular art*,” (my italics) as a result of which “the bombardment of visual and specifically pictorial stimuli became inescapable; the world was saturated with pictures”.¹²⁴ According to Orlando Figes, this was a period when “the public appetite for vivid descriptions of the Crimean campaign was insatiable”, with the “greatest interest [. . .] reserved for images”.¹²⁵ The public had become energised by the war and was eager for information, leading to an explosion of popular artworks, theatrical spectacles, panoramas, lithographs and cartoons in what Stephanie Markovits has referred to as the “generic permeability of the art of

¹²¹ Royle, 2000: 121 citing Timothy Gowing; *ILN*, 25 November 1854. This comment surprisingly was made after the notorious Charge of the Light Brigade.

¹²² Cited by Keller, 2001: 1.

¹²³ Tolstoy, 2006: 192.

¹²⁴ *Illustrated Times* cited in Harrington, 1993: 138; Bratton, 1980: 119; Booth, 1981: 8.

¹²⁵ Figes, 2011: 306.

the period”.¹²⁶ Until this point, civilians had been largely unaware of the conditions on the ground, gaining their information from the front, such as it was, from the generals, and often couched in self-serving terms, reinforced by the more traditional academic paintings, highlighting the splendour of the battles fought, rather than the cost in human misery.¹²⁷ This situation was partially redressed by the timely creation of the *Illustrated London News* in 1842, providing the public with regular news items and factual comments at a period of increasing literacy, along with sketches and cartoons, though even this publication was initially reporting that “the arrangements for the conveyance of the troops to their destination [were] of the largest and most perfect character”.¹²⁸ Speed of publication was of the essence and by the end of April 1855 it was possible for news to reach London from Varna, on the Crimean coast, within a few hours.¹²⁹ During the campaign, circulation of the paper increased exponentially, its popularity underlined by the painting *A Welcome Arrival* (1857) (fig.17) by John D’Albiac Luard (1830-60), which shows soldiers unpacking a parcel from home in a hut decorated with cuttings from the newspaper, offering a reassuring picture of home comforts, but with no hint of the horror of war as represented later by Butler.¹³⁰ This was a period of time when images of war were predominantly popular and ephemeral rather than academic and durable, a popularity which extended through many and diverse manifestations, featuring absurdities and mismanagement rather than lasting distress.

Nevertheless, Crimea as a theatre of war offered excellent opportunities for the graphic representation of events and the *Illustrated London News*, along with print companies, was quick to send out independent civilian representatives to ensure the receipt of

¹²⁶ Markovits, 2009: 168.

¹²⁷ See, for example, *The Battle of Waterloo* by William Allan (1782-1850), exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1843.

¹²⁸ *ILN*, 23 September 1854: 287.

¹²⁹ Figes, 2011: 305.

¹³⁰ Stauffer, 2012: 81.

speedy and accurate sketches for publication.¹³¹ Colnaghis sent William Simpson to the Crimea in 1854, just too late for the spectacular Charge of the Light Brigade, while the *Illustrated London News* followed with well established artists such as Joseph Archer Crowe (1825-96), Charles Baudelaire's "painter of modern life", Constantine Guys (1802-92) and Edward Angelo Goodall (1819-1908).¹³² At the same time, the editor of *The Times*, J.T.Delane, sent out his special correspondent, William Howard Russell (1820-1907) who provided the public with a written day-to-day account of events as he saw them. Described by one of his friends as having an eye like a "lens", and speaking the "plain truth", he railed in particular at the incompetence of the authorities, and their inability to provide for the men in what turned out to be a bitter winter, comparing their fortunes adversely with those of the French troops.¹³³

Simpson complemented Russell's accounts with his series of sketches entitled *The Seat of the War in the East* illustrating the poor communications and terrible conditions the troops had to endure, as for example in *Commissariat Difficulties* (fig.18), where he provides critical visual confirmation of a lack of proper infrastructure. Anticipating the landscape of World War One he shows the troops, their carriages and buffalo being sucked down into the muddy water before ever reaching the battle front, with the inevitable consequences of disease, injury and unnecessary hardship. Other print companies used drawings sent back by the soldiers themselves while the press produced several special supplements, relating to the few successes of a mishandled war, much of which had little about it to celebrate. Here was a war, arguably the first "total war" and a forerunner to the wars of the twentieth century, which was being

¹³¹ In 1855 they were followed by the *Illustrated London Times*, which sent out the artist, Julian Portch.

¹³² Baudelaire's essay on Guys was not written until 1863.

¹³³ Censorship was introduced following reports that Russian soldiers were reading British newspapers in the trenches and that Tsar Nicholas 1 had first read of the British ultimatum in the columns of *The Times*, Markovits, 2009: 2.

fought (or not fought) under the microscope of public opinion and the public did not like what it saw.¹³⁴

Although these artists tended to confine themselves more to the miserable conditions with which the troops had to contend, Simpson, by then known as *Crimean Simpson*, did produce a striking watercolour, *Summer in the Crimea* (fig.19), which in its simplicity is menacing.¹³⁵ In visual confirmation of Walter Benjamin's view that "the materiality of death disrupts representation", Simpson depicts what is at first sight an almost dreamlike still-life, with a lizard, hallucinatory convolvulus and a butterfly in the foreground, but which on closer inspection reveals itself to be a cruel, almost surreal juxtaposition of life and death, for just as the butterfly settles to feed, the cannonball beneath it is about to explode.¹³⁶ In the background, other explosions can be seen on the battlefield where anonymous soldiers are sharing the butterfly's fate, and although we do not see these soldiers close to, Simpson's representation hints at the darker side of war on the field, where death and injury are inevitable, hints which are subsequently developed later in the century.¹³⁷

Meanwhile, John Leech (1817-64) of *Punch* and his fellow cartoonists maintained a constant output of witty, pungent criticisms aimed at the army hierarchy and government, while Paton, that respected academician, eschewed fine art as he, too, turned to cartoons, producing a vicious representation of a skeletal commander-in-chief, Lord Raglan, on a skeletal horse, riding roughshod over unopened chests of sought after food, clothing and

¹³⁴ Figes, 2011: xix.

¹³⁵ Guys did however show dead bodies in his drawing for the *Illustrated London News*, entitled *Our Artist on the Battlefield of Inkerman*, dated 3 February 1855, though the bodies were all face down with no obvious sign of injury, Stauffer, 2012: 81.

¹³⁶ Benjamin cited in Goodwin and Bronfen, 1993: 19; see also the discussion in Schleifer, 1993: 312-33.

¹³⁷ See Amy Lowell's 1919 poem *Peace*, "Perched upon the muzzle of a cannon/A yellow butterfly is slowly opening and shutting its wings", cited by Higonnet, 1993: 198.

equipment in a sinister parody of heroic battle commanders (fig.20).¹³⁸ In his work for *Punch* early on in the war, Leech, like Butler later in the *Roll Call*, had likened the common soldier to a navvy in a cartoon entitled *What Our Navvies Are Likely to Do*, referencing *Work* (fig.21) by Ford Madox Brown (1821-93), praising him for his physical power and sheer masculine spirit.¹³⁹ With news of the army's setbacks he became increasingly caustic, highlighting the inadequacies of the establishment in the provision of food, warm clothing and accommodation. In his 1855 drawing, *Grand Military Spectacle: The Heroes of the Crimea Inspecting the Field Marshals* (fig.22), he cleverly reversed the practice of featuring generals as elevated heroes by portraying the commanders as those under scrutiny from the troops and who did not pass muster. The message was clear; it was the men at the front, the common soldiers who had patiently endured the disease, the extreme cold, the shelling, the endless hours in dismal trenches and the incompetence of their social superiors, who emerged as the celebrated of the campaign. Once again, the resonance of this in the First World War is unmissable.

This revolution in illustrated news transmission transformed the way in which the army was viewed and to a large extent reinvented the public perception of the common soldier, previously seen as an underclass but now elevated to heroic status through suffering, often at the expense of the aristocratic officer class. I suggest that it also eased the way for the positive reception of Butler's sympathetic representations at the Royal Academy in the 1870s. Far from the glorious triumphs initially anticipated, the public, thanks to this "living-room" war, was learning of administrative failures,

¹³⁸ Lalumia, 1983b: 31; the *Art Journal*, 1895: 123-24 describes how Paton resisted requests to publish this drawing for fear of injuring Raglan's reputation; see also Leech's cartoon *New Game of Follow my Leader*, lampooning the practice of the aristocracy pleading "urgent private affairs" to return home during the conflict, *Punch*, 24 November 1855, a practice not available to the private soldier for whom desertion was a serious offence, Hichberger, 1988: 136.

¹³⁹ *Punch* 1854.12.16.242 discussed in Barringer, 2005: 40.

inadequate planning, tactical blunders, death, injury and disease.¹⁴⁰ Concern for the men at the front inspired an overwhelming response in Britain to the Crimean Fund set up by *The Times*, sending out money, food parcels and warm clothes. Even Queen Victoria claimed to be “busily knitting for the army”.¹⁴¹ When the injured returned home, the Queen made it her business to visit hospitals and invited veterans to attend at Buckingham Palace to receive the specially instituted Victoria Cross, pointedly a medal available for the first time to all ranks. Both these events were celebrated in contemporary artworks as, for example in *Queen Victoria’s First Visit to her Wounded Soldiers* by Jerry Barrett (1824-1906) (National Portrait Gallery), exhibited in 1865, and *Presentation of the Crimean Service Medals* (1857) (Royal Collection) by George Housman Thomas (1824-68) which was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1858.¹⁴² It is no coincidence that it was the Queen who insisted on a private view of Butler’s *Roll Call* at Buckingham Palace before purchasing it for her own collection.

Alongside the few academic paintings of the Crimea, photography, still in its infancy, had little to offer in terms of the soldiers’ experience of war. Not only was it handicapped by an inability to take action shots, but Roger Fenton was further restricted by his agenda of support for the then establishment rather than an insistence on absolute truth.¹⁴³ Consequently, his photographs, like Paton’s *Home*, and Luard’s *A Welcome Arrival*, are generally comforting, concentrating on army personnel and life in the camp. His photograph entitled *Hardships of Camp Life* (fig.23), for example, shows three soldiers relaxing as they enjoy a drink outside a solidly

¹⁴⁰ Stauffer, 2012: 80.

¹⁴¹ Figes, 2011: 304; Queen Victoria also asked the Duke of Newcastle, as Secretary for War to write to Lord Raglan in November 1854 to ensure that no private soldier in the ranks would “believe that his conduct is unheeded”, adding that “[t]he Queen thanks him-his Country honours him”. Royle, 1999: 292.

¹⁴² Lalumia, 1984: 80-81.

¹⁴³ John Stauffer rejects this view and offers as a possible explanation Fenton’s dislike of unpleasant images and his adherence to taste alongside his reluctance to get too close to the fighting, Stauffer, 2012: 82.

built wooden hut with little sign of the so-called hardships of the title and bears no relation to Simpson's more graphic representations. Very few photographs show the effects of battle. The *Interior of the Redan*, for example, portrays only material debris after shelling, while "*The Valley of the Shadow of Death*" (fig.24) exists in two versions, both believed to be taken the same day in April 1855, featuring an isolated terrain after the battle, one at least of which is said by both Sontag and Ulrich Keller to be artificially constructed and misleading.¹⁴⁴ Neither shows evidence of death or injury to army personnel or animals. Joseph Cundall (1818-95) and Robert Howlett (1831-58) alone, in their photographic images of limbless veterans offer a visual confirmation of the human cost of war, but only after the wounds have been nicely cleaned up and neatly dressed. It was not for another decade, during the American Civil War of 1860-65 that photography really "bolstered the primacy of vision" when Oliver Wendell Holmes was moved to suggest to those who wanted to know what war looked like that they "look at this series of illustrations" which showed "nothing but bodies, ordinary bodies, the casual by-products of war".¹⁴⁵

Meanwhile, Robert Burford (1791-1861) seized on the Crimean War as a suitable subject for his Leicester Square venue, exhibiting large panoramic scenes from the Battle of Alma in the manner of mid-nineteenth-century British battle painting, and the Siege of Sebastopol (1855). It was not unusual for the depiction of battles, both naval and military, to be displayed at places of popular, urban, entertainment, such as Vauxhall Gardens and Leicester Square in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and such entertainment thrived

¹⁴⁴ See Morris, 2011: 1-21 for a full discussion of the controversy; Stauffer also offers an alternative construction, Stauffer, 2012: 82; Felice Beato (1832-1909) is similarly thought to have disrupted photographic integrity by disinterring bodies at Secundra Bagh, Lucknow, for greater dramatic effect following the Indian Uprising of 1857.

¹⁴⁵ Goldberg, 1991: 19, 26, though Timothy O'Sullivan's photographic representations of Gettysburg were not available to the public for two years after the event.

on this new injection of material.¹⁴⁶ The panorama was particularly suited to the representation of recent or contemporary events from around the world, almost as a form of newscast, satisfying that “nineteenth-century craving for information”.¹⁴⁷ The enveloping of the spectator within an all-round, but illusory experience created a sense of “the absolute presence of reality” transforming what on a flat canvas could appear rather dull so radically as to afford members of the public what purported to be a first-hand sensation.¹⁴⁸ The panorama of war, reproducing battle action in a three hundred and sixty degree rotunda was both breath-taking and dramatic. Already in the early part of the nineteenth century, as Shaw has argued, the 1800 panorama of *The Storming of Seringapatam* (private collection, study only) by Robert Ker Porter (1777-1842) “suggested a reorientation of representations of war” in its greater concentration on the non-aristocratic soldier, which “brought audiences into an unnerving encounter with the persistent reality of death and wounding”.¹⁴⁹ The crowded nature of this canvas, however, and the distancing of the soldiers, provides for a more complex reception; one which affords the viewer simultaneously an appreciation of the splendour of the engagement alongside a more sensitive understanding of war’s devastating effects, but on a remote, not an intimate, individual scale. We are being offered a battle as it happened, with all its confusion, glamour and heroism, a scene which serves rather to encourage men

¹⁴⁶ Hyde, 1988: 17. The three hundred and sixty degree patent was granted in 1787 followed by the use of the word “panorama” in 1791.

¹⁴⁷ Hyde, 1988: 37; Jan Wolkers, visiting Panorama Mesdag in the Hague, describes the calm seaside scene before him as “overwhelming”, writing that [y]ou had the impression of a stiff sea breeze blowing hard through your hair, moist with spray” and “despite the dank reek of putty that hung about the place” said he had “never again smelled anything quite so salty”, Wolkers, 2003: 55. How much more moving would a battle be, providing just the right amount of excitement and information looked for in an era when public galleries were still in their infancy. In spite of their rooting in popular entertainment, Joshua Reynolds and Benjamin West both conceded that panoramas had merit, whilst John Ruskin wrote that the panorama in Leicester Square was “an educational institution of the highest and purest value” arguing for governmental support, Hyde, 1988: 24-28.

¹⁴⁸ Arnold, 2009: 342.

¹⁴⁹ Shaw, 2013: 29; an engraving of *The Storming of Seringapatam* by J. Vendramini after Porter is located in the National Army Museum; in fact it was not a true 360 degree panorama, but rather somewhere between a 180 and 270 degree presentation; final quotation is from Favret, 2010: 217.

to action than to warn against the consequences. What it does not do is to bring the spectator up close to the participants, to observe and to empathise with their individual pain. Nevertheless, along with dramatic representations, moving dioramas and equestrian military spectacles, the popularity of panoramas does serve to illustrate that the “theatre of war” in the Crimea was truly being transposed for a domestic audience, but one where war, as theatre, privileged entertainment over empathy, drama over horror.¹⁵⁰

The Pathos of War

Before the 1870s none of these art works significantly referenced the approach initiated by Thomas Jones Barker in his representation of the effect of battle on the individual, concentrating mainly on war as spectacle, quiet domestic scenes or on acerbic criticisms of the army command. Then in 1873, the same year as *Missing*, Laslett Pott (1837-98) exhibited his painting *On the March from Moscow* (fig.25) at the Royal Academy which profiled a group of dispirited soldiers tramping through snow, and owed much in composition to Meissonier’s more famous 1864 *Campagne de France, 1814* (fig.2).¹⁵¹ This, however, attracted little interest possibly on account of its small canvas size or possibly its failure to feature any individuality, dwelling rather on the format of the procession itself.¹⁵² It was not until Butler produced the *Roll Call* in 1874, some twenty years after the outbreak of the Crimean War, that the awful impact on the ordinary troops took centre stage, coinciding with – and perhaps initiating – a dramatic increase in battle paintings exhibited at the Royal Academy.¹⁵³

¹⁵⁰ During the Crimean campaign at least twenty-five shows referencing the war were staged in London, Bratton, 1980: 130.

¹⁵¹ See the review in *Art Journal*, June 1873, vol. XXXV: 198.

¹⁵² The *Architect*, nevertheless did refer to it as “one of the most moving pictures in the exhibition”, *Architect*, 24 May 1873: 272.

¹⁵³ Hichberger, 1988: 75 states that the number of exhibits in the period 1874-1914 tripled those in the pre-1855 period.

Butler had “long been turning the *Roll Call* in [her] mind”.¹⁵⁴ Contrary to her father’s warnings that the subject was outdated, the Crimean War, with its sharp memories, was still very much in the forefront of British thought, as evidenced by a critic of *L’Indépendance Belge* in 1876, reviewing Butler’s subsequent Crimean painting *Balaclava*

[e]t l’on se sent profondément ému de voir qu’un peuple peut, après vingt et un ans, garder encore aussi présent, aussi cuisant, le souvenir de ceux qui moururent pour sa gloire.¹⁵⁵

A.W. Kinglake’s eight volume work, *The Invasion of the Crimea: Its Origin and an Account of Its Progress down to the Death of Lord Raglan*, a lengthy and detailed account, was being published slowly over a period of twenty-four years.¹⁵⁶ This gave both public and government much to contemplate, and from 1870 Edward Cardwell, Secretary of State for War, set about his reforms in an attempt to “buy back its own army from its own officers”, urged on by Liberal member of parliament, Charles Trevelyan.¹⁵⁷ Florence Nightingale’s work, too, had continued on her return from Scutari as she set up the Nightingale Training School for nurses with money raised by public subscription and published her highly influential *Notes on Nursing*.¹⁵⁸ At the same time, John Bell (1811-95) sculpted his Crimean memorial to the Guards, sited centrally at Waterloo Place, London; Louis Desanges’ series of paintings of Victoria Cross winners had been exhibited at the Sydenham Crystal Palace in the

¹⁵⁴ Butler, 1993: 80. She writes that her father had shaken his head and averred that the Crimea was “forgotten” whilst her mother had “shivered at the idea of the snow”.

¹⁵⁵ Butler, 1993: 80; *L’Indépendance Belge*, 11 June 1876, HHG, T.E.Weller’s scrapbook: 10a “[a]nd one feels profoundly moved to see that a nation can, after twenty one years, still preserve the memory of those who died for its glory so present, so poignant”. (my translation). It is striking that here the journalist refers to the glory of war.

¹⁵⁶ From 1863-87; Butler met and “had a comparatively long talk” with Kinglake in 1874, Butler, 1993: 86.

¹⁵⁷ Lalumia, 1984: 133 citing the then Prime Minister, William Gladstone; Charles Trevelyan and his son George conducted a campaign for army reform in the late 1860s until Cardwell’s reforms became law in 1871, Lalumia, 1983: 43; Sam Beeton’s book *Our Heroes of the Victoria Cross* complemented the exhibition by Louis Desanges (1822-87) of fifty oil paintings featuring the winners of the Victoria Cross.

¹⁵⁸ This was published in 1859.

1860s and 1870s, and Alfred Tennyson, author of the influential poem *Charge of the Light Brigade*, was still poet laureate.¹⁵⁹

As a child, Butler's father, besides teaching her to shoot, swim and play billiards, had read stirring episodes from history to her as she sketched soldiers and horses.¹⁶⁰ After the rejection of her religious painting *The Magnificat* (1869-70) (Church of St Wilfrid, Ventnor, Isle of Wight) by the Royal Academy in 1871, Butler reverted to her love of military themes, musing as to why this should be, given the lack of army personnel in the Thompson family.¹⁶¹ Notwithstanding her expressed early interest in Waterloo, a subject she was to paint repeatedly on subsequent occasions, Butler, somewhat surprisingly, chose an unidentifiable scene from the Crimean War for her commission from Galloway, a roll call in winter. Her focus is on a pathetic straggle of ordinary soldiers, members of the grenadier guards, as they struggle to rally to a muster in the blood-stained snow, but are emotionally and physically unable to perform. Butler had judged the newly aroused public interest in the army to perfection, demonstrating the "essential relationship between the aesthetic character of a people's work of visual art and that nation's social, moral, and ethical character" of the instant, and the appeal of her representation was immediate.¹⁶² This was amply evidenced by the overwhelming response at the Royal Academy when a policeman was required to hold back the crowds. Huzzahs greeted the painting as it was selected for a prime position on the line by the hanging committee who threw their hats enthusiastically in the air; the Prince of Wales and the Duke of Cambridge singled it out in their speeches at the Academy banquet, and it was taken firstly to Buckingham

¹⁵⁹ Bell's statue was erected initially in 1861 at precisely the time Butler "migrated back to London", Butler, 1993: 8; Butler went to meet Tennyson in July 1876 at his invitation, Butler, 1993: 124.

¹⁶⁰ Her childhood sketchbooks are almost entirely devoted to military and equine themes.

¹⁶¹ Butler, 1993: 36, who appears to have overlooked the fact that her paternal grandfather, John Hamilton Thompson was Adjutant of the 11th Middlesex (St George's) Rifle Volunteer Corps, and it is possible that Butler may have witnessed some of the Corps' manoeuvres, Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 49.

¹⁶² Preziosi, 1992: 368, discussing the Fogg Art Museum.

Palace, then later to Windsor Castle to show to the Tsar and to the sickbed of Florence Nightingale, before being paraded around the country under the banner “*The Roll is coming*”, where thousands queued to see it.¹⁶³ Two hundred and fifty thousand carte-de-visite photographs of the artist were circulated, prints were reproduced and Butler, now known as “*Roll-Call Thompson*”, became famous overnight.¹⁶⁴

Supremely conscious of the human form in her painting, Butler at the same time recognised the psychological impact of war on the soldiers and the interface between mind and body. For her, whilst the body was the canvas upon which the physical wounds were represented, it was the opportunity which those bodies, their gestures and their facial expressions, afforded her in her psychological representations which set her apart from her contemporaries.¹⁶⁵ Seemingly situated firmly within the narrative and didactic tradition of academic history painting, she nevertheless managed to subvert that tradition by introducing a new dimension to this genre in her focus on subjects not previously represented for their heroism. By addressing current problematic issues of death and injury in an understated approach to battle, more normally infused with furious activity and colour, “the usual plunging horses”, Butler distanced herself from earlier British battle painting, dressing her soldiers in greys and blacks, with the occasional patch of red, all warlike activity spent.¹⁶⁶ Described as “an absurdly easy picture” by an unspecified fellow artist, the *Roll*

¹⁶³ Butler, 1993: 83-88, 93; Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 29. The original of the letter from J.R.Herbert of the hanging committee who proposed the round of huzzahs can still be seen in the Meynell family archives, HHG: (uncatalogued). The painting travelled inter alia to Newcastle-Upon-Tyne and to Liverpool where twenty thousand people saw it within three weeks.

¹⁶⁴ Butler, 1993: 88; Frederick Leighton, soon to be President of the Royal Academy was somewhat put out by the way the crowds, when viewing the *Roll Call*, jostled his own two paintings hung alongside and wrote to complain, RAA/Sec/82/3; Butler (known then as Thompson) was aware of this and wondered what Leighton thought of “that girl”, Butler, 1993: 90.

¹⁶⁵ It was not until 1847 that students in the Royal Academy Painting School started to paint heads from the living model so as to study expression, many years after their French equivalent, Morris, 2005: 30.

¹⁶⁶The *Athenaeum*, 17 November 1855.

Call was widely praised for “its plain manly heroic truth,” its “earnest honesty”, and the “wonderful variety in expression of the maimed and wounded men”, highlighted by their close and equal positioning to the picture plane.¹⁶⁷

The scene shows the grenadier guards lining up for the roll call, the “butcher’s bill”, after a bloody engagement.¹⁶⁸ Several soldiers are wounded; one lies dead or faint in the snow, others are missing, as the sergeant, his head bandaged, ticks off the names of the survivors. Together with the sergeant, we are led along the line to inspect the exhausted remains of the once proud regiment. The composition is essentially flat, almost in the nature of a narrative frieze, with its echoes of a timeless classicism, the signs of ongoing battle visible against the distant hills. The sky is heavy with snow, broken only by a skein of sinister birds hovering in wait for carrion, while in the immediate foreground lies the debris of battle, here an abandoned helmet, there a spent cannon-ball, flotsam and jetsam thrown up in the wreckage. The gentle rise and fall of the horizon resembles a wave linked by the gestures of the men, their hands, the inclinations of their heads, even their muskets. It is painted in sombre, subdued browns and greys as befits the mood and with scarcely a hint of regimental finery. The solitary officer, head bowed, sits mounted to the extreme left of the canvas, almost as an afterthought, and contributes little to the dynamic of the representation.

By their respective focus on working-class subjects, as with Leech, it is tempting to draw a comparison between Butler’s “dark battalion” and the 1852-63 painting *Work* by Ford Madox Brown (1821-93) in which the labourer assumes heroic proportions. Madox Brown represents his subject as “the external embodiment of manliness that the boxer had been to an earlier generation”, and where, as with Butler’s soldier, the “civilizing end” to which his “energies were

¹⁶⁷ Butler, 1993: 81; the *Times*, 2 May 1874; *Morning Post*, 7 May 1874; Usherwood, 1992: 167.

¹⁶⁸ Wilcox, 2000: 127.

directed and the all-consuming purity of his labour elevated his stature”.¹⁶⁹ Both paintings show hard-working, committed men; in Butler’s case even unto the point of death, and both show a novel reverence for previously unsung heroes. It is no coincidence, too, that Luke Fildes (1847-1927) exhibited his popular *Applicants for Admission to a Casual Ward* (fig. 26) at the Royal Academy in 1874, the same year as the *Roll Call*, showing a desolate presentation of the destitute queuing outside the workhouse in similar linear format, and which was described by a neat circularity in military terms in the *Art Journal* as a “wretched troop”.¹⁷⁰

There is nothing glorious here about this conflict in which death is seen to be banal and futile, a representation approved by the critics as well as the public and Butler was “praised for not shying away from the terrible havoc of war”.¹⁷¹ The *Art Journal* commended her restraint in allowing the “misery that is already great enough” to speak for itself, eschewing a “display of sentiment” and a “number of pathetic incidents – very “pretty” perhaps, but without the force of truth”.¹⁷² Instead of representing identifiable society individuals, these are anonymous, ordinary men, bonded by a shared experience, the older soldiers looking out for the younger, and it is their passive stoicism which elevates them to heroic status. Where the army had essentially dehumanised these men by imposing a military conformity of dress and drill, Butler invested her troops with distinctive personalities and emotions, separating her presenting subject-matter from what is actually being represented.¹⁷³ More than that, Butler had brought a magnifying lens to a distant scene, allowing the spectator minutely to examine male suffering at a time

¹⁶⁹ Celina Fox cited in Cordulack, 2003: 557.

¹⁷⁰ Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 33; Fildes’ work had first appeared in the inaugural edition of the *Graphic* on 4 December 1869 under the title *Hungry and Homeless*, accompanying an article on the 1864 Houseless Poor Act; Lalumia, too, regards the simultaneous exhibition of these two paintings as more than coincidental. Lalumia, 1984: 152.

¹⁷¹ Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 33.

¹⁷² *Art Journal*, June 1874: 163-64.

¹⁷³ See Joseph, 1986: 65-71; Fer, 1994: 27.

when women artists were expected to focus rather on a more feminine domestic narrative. Although painterly and with great attention to detail, in the *Roll Call* Butler had subverted tradition by fixing the focus on the ordinary participants, men who had previously been viewed as little more than riff-raff and who in her hands became noble, “heroes whom the islands that had given them birth knew little of, or cared little for, until here”.¹⁷⁴ This was acclaimed by public, critics and fellow artists alike as a radical departure for high art, and a departure led, of all things, by a woman. “Place aux dames!” wrote the art critic of the *Illustrated London News*

[t]his is one of the most remarkable pictures within our recollection. The subject is the very last we should expect from a female pencil, by force of imaginative sympathy the terrible havoc of war is realised with a vraisemblance that could only be expected from an eye-witness.¹⁷⁵

It was a departure for which Butler received praise for allying herself “in aims and method” to the innovative French military painters, Alphonse de Neuville (1835-85) and Detaille, with their “intense detail and their concern with the painful, mundane and apparently inglorious aspects of military life”, just at a time when history painting was not so well regarded in Britain.¹⁷⁶ That she was so successful in this is evidenced by Meissonier’s comment that “L’Angleterre n’a guère qu’un peintre militaire, c’est une femme.”¹⁷⁷ Nearer home, the public was reminded by the critic of the *Newcastle Chronicle* that “England has never had a great and powerful school

¹⁷⁴ A description of the soldiers in Butler’s painting *Inkerman*, *Catalogue of Paintings by Lady Butler*, 1877: 4.

¹⁷⁵ *ILN* 9 May 1874; see also the *Times*, 2 May 1874, the *Graphic*, May 1874 and the *Morning Post*, 7 May, 1874.

¹⁷⁶ Oldcastle, 1879: 258, who refers to Detaille and de Neuville as having recently “revolutionised military painting” by transforming military painting from “the most conventional, heartless, insincere and inhuman of arts” to “the most human, the most intensely true, the most realistic”. This lack of regard in British art persisted notwithstanding the burgeoning increase of academic entries on a military theme; see Hichberger, 1988: 82 and Morris, 2005: 105.

¹⁷⁷ Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 163, who provide the following translation, “England really has only one military painter—a woman.”

of battle painters”, contrasting the energetic representations of the French and German artists.¹⁷⁸ Butler may have eschewed their “wild roar and crash”, but she had captured the imagination and the mood of the time.¹⁷⁹ As testament to her popularity, the Fine Art Society paid £13,500 to the *Roll Call* subscription list in 1876, followed by a further £3,000 to Butler for the copyright of her 1877 painting, *Return from Inkerman*, £2,500 for *Scotland for Ever!* (1881) and £1,500 for *The Remnants of an Army: Jellalabad, January 13th, 1842* (1879).¹⁸⁰

When Butler exhibited *Balaclava* in 1876, she was too late for the Royal Academy Exhibition, and had to fall back on a private gallery at the Fine Art Society, which had the advantage of showcasing her work on its own. In the face of her own disappointment in the picture, she writes that, at the private view, “there was what may be called a sensation. Virginia Gabriel, the composer, was led out of the room by her husband in tears”.¹⁸¹ In a particularly evocative comment, the critic of the *Shields Daily News* wrote that “[i]t is not often that the smoke of battle is rolled back with so powerful a hand as to make the human sentiment visible”.¹⁸² When looking at *Balaclava*, the viewer’s eye is immediately drawn to the central standing figure of a young hussar, having lost his horse, staring straight out of the canvas (fig.27). His uniform is torn, revealing a white, but bloodied shirt, the blood staining his front cross band over his heart. In his right hand he carries his sword, bloodied at the tip and hanging limply downwards as he clenches his fist firmly round a clump of grass. This is not a figure attempting to engage the viewer; instead, he epitomises catatonic trauma, not seeing, not touching, not

¹⁷⁸ HHG, T.E.Weller’s scrapbook: 16.

¹⁷⁹ HHG, T.E.Weller’s scrapbook: 16.

¹⁸⁰ Information from the *Fine Art Society Minute Book*, cited in Springhall, 1986: 67.

¹⁸¹ Butler, 1993: 121.

¹⁸² The *Shields Daily News* 22 August 1876. This review was written during the painting’s tour of the country, when, it is said that “there has been a great competition among the principal towns of the kingdom for the honour of its first appearance in the provinces.” *Tablet*, HHG, T.E.Wellers scrapbook: 14.

hearing and not feeling.¹⁸³ Although he is surrounded in silent support by his fellow survivors of the Charge of the Light Brigade, all leaning slightly in towards him, he himself is isolated, mentally and physically. His expression is one of extreme incomprehension and shock. He is as far removed from his colleagues – and the viewer – as if he were in a nightmare, deprived of even that most basic of human comforts, touch, at the most critical of times, a time when, as Gus Sivertz recollected of a World War One bombardment, “it’s terrible to be alone”, for this is precisely when “you want to touch someone”.¹⁸⁴

Significantly, while *Balaclava* was almost universally acclaimed in the press, the *Morning Post* calling it “to our thinking, far and away the best work she has as yet produced” and the *Scarborough Gazette* praising the “still hot excitement with which the canvas almost breathes”, Pennington, himself a survivor of the Charge but now an actor and model for the central figure, was roundly criticised.¹⁸⁵ He was panned by the *Manchester Critic* for being “theatrical – not dramatic – simply ruinously obtrusive and unreal.”¹⁸⁶ Certainly, his presentation is very different to the restrained acceptance of the guards in the *Roll Call*, and as Usherwood and Spencer-Smith comment, “it was thought that he also bore disturbing signs of having suffered some kind of mental derangement in the fray”, a representation that the Victorian critics found too realistic and unacceptable for their taste.¹⁸⁷ Such comments, I suggest, indicate the level of comprehension of the Victorian audience to whom the concept of post-traumatic stress disorder was completely unknown and unimagined. Butler was offering a new insight into the military world, a world where soldiers were actually killed and suffered

¹⁸³ Similar to Don McCullin’s “one thousand yard stare” cited in Black, 2010: 26.

¹⁸⁴ A soldier’s comment after the battle at Vimy Ridge in World War One cited by Das, 2005: 83.

¹⁸⁵ HHG, T.E.Weller’s scrapbook: 7 and 22.

¹⁸⁶ Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 65; see Booth, 1981: 1-29 for a discussion of the links between the theatre and painting.

¹⁸⁷ Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 65.

agonising injuries, where their splendid uniforms were horrifyingly bloodied, and could be seen to be bloodied, their colourful pennants torn to shreds, and where their minds were disturbed. Not all were so condemnatory of Butler's central figure, however, with the *Daily Telegraph* describing him as "noteworthy" and "most powerful in conception, in attitude, in expression", and even given his mental isolation, capable of evoking compassion.¹⁸⁸

Pennington apart, praise in the press was practically universal, the *Daily Mail* commenting that the painting's "art merits are great and it has what every truly great pictorial tragedy has – a profound moral and depth of pathos not utterable in words", while the *Morning Post* lyrically referred to it as "a poem in colours [. . .] not undeserving of equal rank with the Laureate's famous ode".¹⁸⁹ In the event, Gabriel was not the only one to weep, for *Balaclava* was said to move both men and women to tears, a reaction previously provoked by the *Roll Call*, Butler recording in her autobiography that "Col. Lloyd Lindsay, of Alma fame, and his wife were wild to have *The Roll Call*. She shyly told me she had cried before the picture."¹⁹⁰ Her fellow artist, Frederick Goodall (1822-1906), clearly appreciated the emotive power of Butler's work, referring to the *Roll Call* in his own autobiography as a "most touching picture" and "the only true battle-picture that I can call to mind with a true sense of poetry in it".¹⁹¹

But while Pennington is set apart, his fellow sufferers are not and the spectator begins to see indications of a more intimate relationship between the soldiers in their distress, disrupting more conventional patterns of male behaviour and creating "an intensity of feeling which friendship never touches", an intensity produced by shared trauma, in what Sarah Cole has described as a "highly visible

¹⁸⁸ *Daily Telegraph*, 2 May 1876, which acknowledged that he was regarded by some as "melodramatic" and "far too Byronic", an attribute subsequently heralded by W.E.Henley in his poetry, Attridge, 2003: 119.

¹⁸⁹ 11 October 1876, HHG, T.E.Weller's scrapbook: 24, 7.

¹⁹⁰ Butler, 1993: 87.

¹⁹¹ Goodall, 1902: 368.

reconfiguration of male communities”.¹⁹² Just as in sporting activities where “normatively homophobic sportsmen have engaged in blatantly homoerotic activities” such as cuddling and kissing, war has fragmented that peculiarly male attribute of physical distance, of bravado, of “manliness”, by its full frontal assault on the body, leaving in its wake a novel affect of vulnerability, a vulnerability which leads to both the need for, and the ability to trust those who are neither family, nor even friends, but fellow soldiers.¹⁹³ These men are part of that “imagined community” which has been thrown together in the national interest in a “deep, horizontal comradeship” which “makes it possible [. . .] not so much to kill, as willingly to die” together.¹⁹⁴ They are at the extremity of life in the midst of war, and it is this, in what Santanu Das in his literary criticism of poetry and war has termed the “perilous intimacy of the moment” which enables them in their extremis to reach out to virtual strangers.¹⁹⁵

In an eerie precursor to Sargent’s 1919 painting *Gassed* (fig.28), a dragoon in the middle distance of the painting epitomises this urgent need to trust. His jacket stained red, and with a bloodied bandage over his eyes as if blind, he reaches forward helplessly, both hands hovering uncertainly above a fellow dragoon who is bending forward over his dying white horse (fig.29).¹⁹⁶ Slightly in front, two more dragoons stand side by side, (fig.30) one gently holding a rag over the chest wound of his fellow soldier, who places his own hand on top and whose white shirt throws the red of his blood into stark relief.¹⁹⁷ At the precise moment when touch replaces words, his

¹⁹² Cole, 2007: 7.

¹⁹³ Craik, 1994: 192.

¹⁹⁴ Anderson, 2006: 7, whose analysis is in marked contrast to Clausewitz’s remark that the purpose of the soldier is first to injure the enemy, cited in Scarry, 1985: 65; see also Bourke, 1996:1.

¹⁹⁵ Das, 2005: 7,130, citing W.A.Quinton’s unpublished memoirs.

¹⁹⁶ I have not been able to find any reference confirming that Sargent had seen *Balaclava*, but it is tempting to speculate that this is the case, as he moved to London in 1886 by which time he had already submitted some of his works to the Royal Academy; see also Das, 2005: 1-3.

¹⁹⁷ Butler, 1993: 121, where she writes how she was told that “after the stress of Inkermann a soldier had come up to his horse and leant his face against it exactly as I have the man doing.”

comrade solicitously holds his jacket over his left arm whilst his right lightly embraces the injured soldier's right shoulder.¹⁹⁸ To the front of the canvas, another hussar is sitting with a vacant, shocked expression, staring at the ground over his bloody hands, his left trouser leg ragged, while to his rear, yet another hussar, with bloodshot eyes, leans forward dramatically, one open palm outstretched, imploringly, as with the other he grasps the reins of his horse. A mounted sergeant looks on, leaning forward in his saddle, his hand open, gesturing towards the central figure almost in supplication. At first sight, he looks unharmed, but on closer examination, one boot is red and his horse's hoof is dripping blood. Another lancer, exhausted, rests his head and hands on the side of the horse, too weary to stand unaided.

Although somewhat subdued, the recurrence of red blood throughout the painting is significant, Butler's sister, writing in 1896 that

[r]ed has been praised for its nobility as the colour of life. But the true colour of life is not red. Red is the colour of violence, or of life broken open, edited and published or indeed, if red is the colour of life, it is only on condition that it is not seen. Once fully visible, red is the colour of life violated, and in the act of betrayal and waste.¹⁹⁹

It is tempting indeed to think of the sisters discussing this issue as Butler was painting *Dawn of Waterloo* between 1893 and 1895, Butler using red not just as the colour of the soldier's uniform, though she clearly enjoyed the "dazzling spectacle" of the Queen's Review at Aldershot where her "eyes positively ached with all that scarlet and gold", but also as the colour of injury, violence and death, echoing her sister's trenchant observation of the colour's ambivalent signification.²⁰⁰ In one of the very few adverse comments voiced in 1876, she had been criticised by the *Globe* for "an unnecessary amount of blood in the picture".²⁰¹ Contrasting Butler's gender and youth with the theme of her works, Tim Wilcox

¹⁹⁸ Das, 2005: 24.

¹⁹⁹ Flint, 2000:109.

²⁰⁰ Butler, 1993: 186-87.

²⁰¹ HHG, T.E.Weller's scrapbook: 7.

argues that it “was largely this disjuncture between the art and the artist – the invention of a new role by Thompson – around which her fame was constructed”.²⁰² Although Wilcox here is referring to her youth and gender, I suggest that, similarly, Butler never quite resolved the contradiction within herself between her competing feelings of compassion and almost ferocious excitement. While she actively sought to avoid the portrayal of actual conflict, Butler could not refrain from an appreciation of the erotic frisson of military display, epitomised by her comments on the battlefield at Waterloo, where “that lurid glamour glows around it” and we “see through its blood-red veil of smoke”.²⁰³

To the right of *Balaclava*'s central figure, a mounted lancer clasps the dead trumpeter to his chest, almost maternally as a *pietà* (fig.31), as he bears him tenderly home, his hands overlapping as they emphasise the tiny body in his arms. Here Butler may well have been influenced by the account of Nathaniel Steevens, a witness to the bombardment of the Russians' rifle pits, who wrote of the death of “a great pet” of the Colonel who “though wounded snatched him up in his arms and carried him off declaring ‘they shall never take my child’”, in just such an exhibition of great tenderness.²⁰⁴ The trumpeter's instrument is clearly visible, a counter-reference to the sounds of battle, now silenced. At the lancer's side, a livid white horse carries his slumped rider back, guided by a dragoon grasping the reins. To their right, a second dragoon, near collapse, is leaning back, his face wan, his eyes closed as his horse bears him up over the hill to safety, whilst behind, another, riderless, horse struggles to keep up. Slightly to the rear, and less well defined, a mounted soldier is encouraging the stragglers home, his sword in the air pointing the way. Behind him, to both right and left can be seen the weary groups of men and horses, some still negotiating their way through the “valley of death”, littered with animal and human corpses and

²⁰² Wilcox, 2000: 129.

²⁰³ Butler, 1993: 29.

²⁰⁴ Figes, 2011: 361.

punctuated by gunsmoke. In the air above, birds, possibly crows, possibly vultures, circle. At the extreme front right of the canvas lies a dead soldier, having yielded up his body as the ultimate weapon of war.²⁰⁵

Across the painting, the emphasis is on physical contact between the men, with the hand appearing as a “recurring trope”, much as it does in the memoirs of the nurses in military hospitals.²⁰⁶ These soldiers are seen not simply as victims of violence, but also, unusually, as carers of their fellow men, a role traditionally ascribed to women, in a blurring of genders, with an oblique reference to Butler’s own femininity. The obvious suffering of the men throws into sharp relief the power of war to invert social norms, just as Butler herself disrupts society’s cultural conditioning by revealing an unusual intensity of feeling in her painting, exposing a hidden world to a public audience. The unspoken question is whether the public would truly consent to war if they really understood such awful consequences, a question readily understood by the critic of the *Daily Telegraph* who felt that *Balaclava* “must extort the very highest commendations from persons of the Peace Society way of thinking”.²⁰⁷ The Peace Society concurred, as it is known to have requested Butler to use her “talents so that the false nature of the glory of war might not be stimulated”.²⁰⁸ Butler readily agreed.

The drama of *Balaclava* is emphasised by the use of dark colouring, greys, browns, rust, deep red, highlighted only by the white shirt of the injured soldier, and set against a pale sky, almost as if in ghostly silhouette. It is a precise and detailed painting and one which it is necessary to interrogate closely in order to study the individual characters whose expressions and gestures speak of their endurance.

²⁰⁵ Scarry, 1985: 83.

²⁰⁶ Das, 2005: 1, 26.

²⁰⁷ *The Daily Telegraph*, 2 May 1876.

²⁰⁸ Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 23, citing the *Morning Post*, 4 May 1875. There was some dissent, however, among the members of the Peace Society, some believing her paintings “gave éclat to war.”

The effect is to draw in the viewer in an intimate manner and to encourage empathy with the unnamed soldiers, from the post-traumatic stress syndrome of the central character, to the motherly tenderness of the mounted lancer, to the dead soldier lying on the cold earth. As the *Globe* recorded “[t]here is not a head without expression or an attitude without significance”.²⁰⁹ This is not a painting about the glory of war, of glamour or patriotism. On the contrary, by highlighting the physical gestures and expressions of the men, Butler has drawn attention to their unenviable plight. During her nursing experiences in the First World War, Mary Borden wrote that “war was a thing to be endured” and as Butler shows us, these were the soldiers who did endure, and “[y]ou can read on their heavy jowls, in their stupefied, patient hopeless eyes, how boring it is to be a hero”.²¹⁰ In this, *Balaclava* is inordinately powerful.

Clearly Butler had presented new perspectives in military art and had responded to contemporary concerns about war. But while there is empathy, it is questionable whether Butler truly encapsulated the total experience of the soldiers – the fear, the anxiety, the pain and the horror. It is one thing to be part of a “burgeoning anti-aristocratic discourse”, but quite another to step into the shoes of the troops on the front line.²¹¹ As the *Illustrated London News* had noted, Butler had neither witnessed battle action, nor ever experienced what Das has called “the unshareability of the ordeal”, never endured such privations, never felt pain such as the troops had.²¹² While the issue of pain was becoming more widely discussed in the mid-nineteenth century, especially following the use of chloroform in childbirth by Queen Victoria in 1853, this addressed the possibility of relief, rather than of the experience itself.²¹³ Even if Butler had personally suffered, such experiences are ephemeral and difficult to

²⁰⁹ HHG, T.E.Weller’s scrapbook: 7.

²¹⁰ Borden, 1929: 2.

²¹¹ Hichberger, 1988: 77.

²¹² Das, 2005: 192.

²¹³ Anaesthetic relief was available the following year in the Crimea but woefully underused on the grounds that pain was a necessary stimulant.

reproduce.²¹⁴ When ill, it is notoriously difficult to describe or precisely locate the pain felt; how much more difficult, therefore, if not impossible, to represent such pain whether in literature, music or painting.²¹⁵ For Elaine Scarry, pain is of a very peculiar quality and is beyond imagining.²¹⁶ It is, she suggests, not an event, but a condition and has no object; it simply is. It is peculiar to each individual and therefore locked away in that body as a unique experience.

Jacques Rancière, in his work, *The Future of the Image*, argues that if an event or situation is possible to imagine, then the very act of imagining renders it capable of representation.²¹⁷ Difficult though it is to put oneself in the position of another in pain, I argue, along with Rancière, that the power of imagination is such as to sufficiently bridge the gap between spectator and sufferer to facilitate, at the very least, a partial visual representation. How far that representation truly gives effect to the event, only the sufferer can say. Just as we cannot really know what another person is thinking, so we can never really know what he or she is feeling. Thus, while the presenting image of war itself, the erotic glamour and excitement of the charge, may be both “irresistible and picturesque”, notwithstanding common threads of understanding the precise nature of pain is so far beyond a shared comprehension that “even the artist [. . .] ordinarily falls silent”.²¹⁸

In a period during which her fellow battle artist, Woodville, was illustrating an autobiography expressing the view that “natives do not feel pain as we do”, Butler was the first British military painter to portray clearly a sense of the violation of the individual, and

²¹⁴ See Bolingbroke explaining the pain of banishment to his father “O who can hold a fire in his hand/By thinking of the frosty Caucasus/Or cloy the hungry edge of appetite/By bare imagination of a feast?” William Shakespeare, *King Richard the Second*, Act 1, Scene 3.

²¹⁵ See, for example Eric Lomax who writes “I was in such pain I could not begin to locate its source.” Lomax, 2014: 142.

²¹⁶ Scarry, 1985: 162.

²¹⁷ Rancière, 2003: 138.

²¹⁸ Scarry, 1985: 43, 10.

ordinary, soldiers' bodies, and a sharp awareness of their pain and distress.²¹⁹ In *Balaclava* and the *Roll Call*, (as later in *Dawn of Waterloo*) she draws compassionate attention to the soldiers' mutual interdependence in a manner which her gender may well have made more possible. Her paintings displaced the public experience of artistic representations of soldiers as romantic, "manly", and physically untouched, by these more realistic, but truly heroic and suffering troops. In Wilfrid Meynell's words for the *Art Journal* of 1898 "she has exposed the horror of the slaughter by simply centralising it; she has given to the victim of war the single personality that has its appeal to all others of the human family".²²⁰ Thus whilst it may well be impossible to render pain exactly in paint, Butler has shown that it is nevertheless possible to engender empathy, so that even if her "images cannot possibly encompass most of the reality to which they refer, they still perform a vital function".²²¹ In these early works, showcasing the conflict in the Crimea, her vision was, at the very least, surprising in privileging suffering over glamour, and in avoiding what Margaret Higonnet has termed the "seduction of battle heroics".²²²

Outwardly, with her upper middle-class life-style and privileges, Butler may be thought of as belonging to that set of late nineteenth-century artists who were "complicit with the social values of the dominant culture", but in the visual representation of her concerns, I argue that she provides an important example of how art expresses the "experience of the processes and conditions of modernisation" of contemporary life.²²³ In her empathy for the individual at a time of army reform and a move towards democratisation, her paintings articulate that sense of humanity which I suggest forms part of a trajectory, linking the artwork of the second half of the nineteenth

²¹⁹ Stewart, 1924: 106.

²²⁰ *Art Journal*, 1898: 31.

²²¹ Armstrong, 2006: 104; Sontag, 2003: 102.

²²² Higonnet, 1993: 200.

²²³ Peters Corbett and Perry, 2000: 7, 3.

century to that of the First World War. One only has to look, for example, at Kennington's *The Kensingtons at Laventie* (1916) (fig.32), to recognise a common theme in the dull expressions of the soldiers as, exhausted, they return to base. Described as a "highly democratic image" in its focus on the "bravest and best [. . .] regardless of rank", Kennington's painting can be seen as connecting to Butler's overarching concerns for the common soldier.²²⁴ The weather, as in the *Roll Call*, is wintry; there is one man collapsed or dead in the snow.²²⁵ The men are soberly dressed in dark uniform, the debris of war displayed. One soldier rests on his rifle, much as his Crimean counterpart uses his musket for support. Most are absorbed in their own thoughts. What is different is the distinct lack of physical engagement between Kennington's soldiers, a device taken up later by Sargent in his painting, *Gassed*.²²⁶

I am not arguing for a direct line of "influence" between Butler's representations of the soldier and those by artists later on in the nineteenth and into the twentieth centuries. Rather, the purpose of this chapter is to re-establish Butler's much overlooked paintings within a framework of British military art. Instead of viewing her primarily as an anomaly as a female war artist, as is frequently the case with Butler, I have reconnected her work to mid-Victorian visual cultures of war exhibited across the walls of the Royal Academy, into specially designed panoramic rotunda and the pages of the illustrated press. Her contribution was, as I have argued, a significant one and her focus on the depiction of individual pain and suffering paved the way for more graphic representations of the horrors of mechanised warfare to come.

²²⁴ Richard Slocombe, Senior Art Curator, IWM, the *Telegraph*, 30 August 2013.

²²⁵ See Black, 2013: 6 who writes that the Gallery exhibiting Kennington's work confirmed that his soldier was not dead.

²²⁶ Touch was subsequently explored by Kennington in his sculpture, *24th Infantry Division Memorial* (1924), where two of the three soldiers do hold hands.

CHAPTER TWO

THE 'BOHEMIAN WITH A BRUSH': RICHARD CATON WOODVILLE AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES²²⁷

Art has no home amongst the horrors of realism or of carnage.
The warrior needs no reminders of these.²²⁸

Following the conflict in the Crimea, Britain was not involved in another war involving a population of broadly European origin until the very end of the century, even though the British army was engaged almost continuously in Africa and Asia throughout this period. By the time of the Second Boer War in 1899, a new visual vocabulary for military painting had emerged, displacing the emphasis on the more empathetic effects of war on the soldier and his family as portrayed by Butler and some of the genre painters, and which had hitherto dominated the second half of the nineteenth century. Nor had any topographical paintings of battlefields been accepted by the Royal Academy since the 1860s, possibly as a consequence of the introduction of, and increasing reliance upon, photography for military dispositions.²²⁹ Queen Victoria, who had declared the Crimean War to be “popular beyond belief”, and Russell, in his admiration for the individual soldier, had done much to heighten the British public’s awareness and appreciation of the military.²³⁰ As the nineteenth century progressed, the reassuring role of the army, for example, following the Indian Uprising of 1857, coupled with a growing perception of the troops as Christian soldiers, further enhanced its profile; so much so, that even pacifist “Quakers were caught up in the flood of volunteers for the colours” at the outbreak of the Boer War.²³¹

²²⁷ *The Times*, 22 August 1927.

²²⁸ *Art Journal*, Christmas No.1900: 340; Carter, 1900: 30.

²²⁹ Hichberger, 1988: 97.

²³⁰ Paris, 2000: 32.

²³¹ Summers, 1976: 107, citing as her source “personal information”, alongside a reference to George F. Shee’s work, *The Briton’s First Duty*, published in 1901 in which he writes as a Quaker that “pacifism was not quite in the central trunk of our teaching, though an important part of it”.

The perceived eighteenth-century dilemma of a growing effeminacy, of a “foppishness and Frenchification” of the British male, had been countered, partially at least, by displays of military painting by such artists as John Trumbull (1756-1843) and John Singleton Copley (1738-1815) in their representations of the controlled aggression of British naval commanders during the Great Siege of Gibraltar (1779-83).²³² The officer class was no longer portrayed as the somewhat effete “toast and butter captains”, but instead exhibited that restrained and chivalrous reserve, characteristic of the “ideal” male of the latter part of the nineteenth century, while the ordinary troops “had since the Crimean War been promoted as the embodiment of Christian heroism”.²³³

This was a period, as Joanna de Groot has observed, when “manliness and empire confirmed one another, guaranteed one another, enhanced one another”, a period when military art was enjoying a greater recognition with its capacity for almost aggressive propaganda precisely as the expected easy victory of a so-called superior nation in a mere “war in a tea-cup” was catastrophically denied.²³⁴ The lack of topographical works notwithstanding, entries of battle paintings to the Royal Academy increased during the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the walls were hung with works by artists whose names have now been almost forgotten, artists such as Crofts, Charlton, Giles, Wollen and Woodville. Pre-existing notions of what constituted historical works of art were further challenged by the nature of the conflict in South Africa where the

²³² This was a decisive victory for the British towards the end of the American Revolutionary War. I am indebted to Cicely Robinson for allowing me to read her paper *Conflicts of Conduct: British Masculinity and Military Painting in the Wake of the Siege of Gibraltar* in advance of anticipated publication. It is ironic that the British believed the French to be both more effeminate and bloodthirsty at the same time.

²³³ Rogers, 2004: 241; Cunningham, 1981: 24. This does not mean that anxiety over effeminacy was completely expunged; see for example Willcock, 2013: 176 where he refers to concerns over the feminisation of the imperial body in his discussion of Valentine Prinsep’s 1880 painting *The Imperial Assemblage held at Delhi, 1 January, 1877*.

²³⁴ De Groot, 2006: 56; the second quotation is taken from Pakenham, 1992: 110, citing *The Times*, 9-10 October 1899.

enemy, with its unexpected and novel tactics, was hardly ever to be seen. No longer a war with customary panoramic scenes and glaring regimental colours, this was a conflict that soon proved to be one which war artists struggled to represent and one where they strove, nevertheless, to encapsulate the relationship of empire, manliness and contemporary ideas shaped by military exploits in any meaningful way. Their focus shifted instead to a representation of the British soldier behaving well in adversity and away from both the more pathetic and stoical acceptance of Butler's militaristic failures.

The British troops had gone off to war on a wave of enthusiasm to parallel that at the beginning of the Crimean War, the *Daily Mail* reporting that the "chorus of cheers" at departure

seemed never-ending, and at Waterloo all semblance of military order had disappeared. The police were swept aside and the men were borne, in many cases, shoulder high to the entraining platform.²³⁵

The significance of the station's name will not have gone unnoticed and the public, high on a wave of excited anticipation, expected to see early pictorial evidence of British success from the many war illustrators and artists, both at home and at the front. War correspondent Bennet Burleigh (1840-1914) expressed the widely held view in 1899 that the Boer Republic, "once the troops secured a foothold upon its spacious plains would be easily and quickly overrun" and it "was only the ignorant burghers of the remote districts" who had the temerity to "sniff in scorn at the idea of England attempting to oppose their arms".²³⁶ Whereas the Boers believed that they were fighting for their very existence as a nation, with a "fixed determination to fight to the bitter end if once we start", many of the British public agreed with the Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury, that they were in South Africa to show that they, "not the Dutch, are boss".²³⁷ Although some liberal voices, such as that of

²³⁵ Cited by Wilkinson-Latham, 1979: 250.

²³⁶ Burleigh, 1900: 5, 2.

²³⁷ *Pall Mall Gazette*, 18 December 1900; Searle, 2004: 274.

J.A.Hobson, had been raised in opposition, the general opinion followed that of Ruskin, who supported imperial expansion “in so far as it was spiritually elevating for the English”.²³⁸ The British, it was believed, were the disseminators of enlightened and morally enriching government and as long as they remained the dominant nation, all would be well both at home and abroad. As expressed by Mark Girouard in his study of chivalry, one of the consequences of imperialism had been “to imbue very large numbers of people with a religious belief in Britain as the great force for good in the world”.²³⁹ It was virtually unthinkable that Britain could be in the wrong and their so-called natural talent for ruling what Kipling called ‘lesser breeds’ carried a corresponding duty to do so, and to do so well.²⁴⁰ Major-General George Younghusband put this view succinctly when he said that “[t]here is perhaps no nation on earth which has come under British rule and guidance which has not benefited from it”.²⁴¹

On the ground in South Africa, however, the soldiers were faced with “guerilla tactics that bore no resemblance to the three-act drama of the set-piece battle”, so that any notions of the glory of war were abandoned, leaving in its place “just plain primeval killing, without redemption”.²⁴² As the British public soon came to realise, this was a war which could not have been more pictorially different from its Crimean predecessor with its fancy uniforms, bands and flags, a war laid out dramatically on a stage before an appreciative (and sometimes invited) audience in a construction, or even reconstruction, of war as theatrical presentation.²⁴³ From the British camp, the enemy in South Africa was scarcely to be sighted, dressed in dull, everyday bush clothes, relying not on face-to-face

²³⁸ Ruskin, 1998: 16; Hobson’s argument is set out in his 1901 work, *Imperialism*.

²³⁹ Girouard, 1981: 281.

²⁴⁰ Girouard, 1981: 281; Farwell, 1981: 108; taken from Kipling’s poem *Recessional*; General Wolseley told his wife that he thanked God he was not an American, which in his view would have been worse than being a “colonial”, albeit white.

²⁴¹ Farwell, 1981: 108.

²⁴² Peck, 1998: 166, and 186, quoting Rudyard Kipling; the second quotation is from Searle, 2004: 303, quoting D. MacDonald.

²⁴³ Paris, 2000: 24.

confrontation, but instead on ambushes, sieges and long-distance weaponry, an enemy using stealth and surprise, not “good honest fighting”, leaving the British soldier with “the constant puzzle of having nothing to fire at”.²⁴⁴ The Boers, it was said, were not playing fair, and were ignoring the rules of the game, “contrary to the conventions of civilised war”.²⁴⁵ It was a war the tactics for which the British army was completely unprepared, with few accurate maps and bereft of “reliable intelligence and thorough scouting”.²⁴⁶ Although British soldiers were reputed to be brave, as against an enemy of European origin, with modern weapons on the South African Veldt, their army’s tactics were comparatively ineffective. Many of the officers maintained a parade ground mentality and little, if anything, had been learned from previous experience.²⁴⁷

Nevertheless, the war continued to be extensively represented for the popular art market through the publication of innumerable battle sketches and costume studies reproduced in the illustrated press and sold by printsellers, signalling the popularity of heroic military images.²⁴⁸ It was as a result of this proliferation of visual culture that the British public was once again able to follow a remote conflict in all its graphic detail through photographs, drawings, paintings, cartoons and even film.²⁴⁹ By now battle art had moved away from the margins of the art world, owing perhaps to a wider audience for and availability of such images, and possibly also to the fluid transition between different genres of working artists, several of whom turned to illustration alongside fine art as a means of steadier income generation.²⁵⁰ The illustrated press demand for sketches from the front was buoyant, while fast moving developments in photography enabled individual soldiers to transmit their personal

²⁴⁴ Wilson, 1901: 449.

²⁴⁵ Attridge, 2003: 64; Wilson, 1901: 457.

²⁴⁶ Burleigh, 1900: 15, 87, 91.

²⁴⁷ Lee, 1985: 30.

²⁴⁸ Hichberger, 1988: 104; Paris, 2000: 19.

²⁴⁹ Hewison, 1989: 99.

²⁵⁰ Spielmann, in his article on Ernest Crofts, attributes his early lack of application to his independent means, Spielmann, 1901: 424; Harrington, 1993: 276.

images home in ever increasing numbers, thereby making them almost universally available. To complement these visual images, the war was extensively followed in the popular culture of the music-hall, that “fount of patriotism”, by offerings such as *The Absent-Minded Beggar* by Rudyard Kipling (1865-1936), illustrated by Woodville, and W.D.Cobb’s *Goodbye Dolly Gray*, with the exhilarating encouragement, “it’s time to do and dare” for all those would-be volunteers still at home.²⁵¹

This chapter will examine the visual representations of the relationship between war, military personnel and sport within the wider context of the late nineteenth century, its imperialistic propaganda and anxieties. At first sight it may appear as if the works of this period were retrogressive, relying simply on the pleasures and glorification of war, whilst ignoring its adverse effects, but I shall argue how far their formal appearance belies their continuing focus on the individual British soldier, his courage, his endurance, his manliness alongside his adherence to the spirit of imperialist Britain.²⁵² In order to explore how artists responded to the challenge of this new type of warfare, I shall examine the works of certain of those battle artists who exhibited at the Royal Academy in the late nineteenth century whilst at the same time providing the illustrated press with some of its most stirring representations of the conflict.²⁵³

In particular, it will focus on the works of Richard Caton Woodville whose prolific oeuvre continually straddled the spectrum of popular and fine art. Whilst Hichberger remarks that his “credentials as an academically trained artist were impeccable”, his approach to war art largely reflected that adopted by him in his work for the illustrated press, an approach described as his “death or glory” style, so much so that it was said that his work represented “an artist’s victory over

²⁵¹ Summerfield, 1986: 17, 36-37. These songs were also popular with the troops in the field; *Pall Mall Gazette*, 5 March 1900.

²⁵² Hichberger, 1988: 115.

²⁵³ The exception to this is Ernest Crofts who did not work for the press.

many a British defeat”.²⁵⁴ Moving seamlessly between the two genres, Woodville was both blamed and praised for his dashing execution, critics variously referring to him as “careless” and “pass[ing] little beyond the province of newspaper illustration”, an observation which, according to Joseph Kestner, could apply equally to many of his fellow battle-artists.²⁵⁵ Marion Spielmann found fault with his canvasses, which he observed, “often seem less like pictures than illustrations painted huge”.²⁵⁶ Woodville himself writes how, early on in his career, he was heavily censured by the influential critic, George Augustus Sala “who found fault with me for painting with what he called ‘slap dash’, when I was so young an artist”.²⁵⁷

There is no doubt that speed was of the essence in producing press illustrations especially after 1855 when the *Illustrated London News* no longer had a monopoly. They were also time-consuming. Drawings were produced initially by special artists, known as “Specials”, sent out to the theatre of war by the press and printsellers. Usually their works were drawn on very flimsy paper to allow for easier tracing onto the woodblocks, which were then engraved for reproduction in the press. Sometimes, for the larger, double page spreads, as many as forty wood blocks were required and were engraved by more than one artist.²⁵⁸ It was through these “Specials” and their counterparts in Britain that the popular press did much to remove war art, and especially contemporary war art, from its elevated, and constricted position as history painting, and to make it accessible to a wider audience.²⁵⁹ Military art had already largely ceased to be regarded as history painting, and from the mid-nineteenth century was increasingly being viewed as factual representations of actual current events, highlighting contemporary

²⁵⁴ Hichberger, 1988: 95; Johnson, 1978: 15; Kestner, 1995: 194.

²⁵⁵ Hichberger, 1988: 95-96; Kestner, 1995: 194.

²⁵⁶ Spielmann, 1901: 423.

²⁵⁷ Woodville, 1914: 82.

²⁵⁸ Johnson, 1978: 12.

²⁵⁹ Greenwall, 1992: 11.

issues and anxieties.²⁶⁰ This chapter will explore the artistic and cultural context within which Woodville was practising as a war artist and illustrator, paying particular attention to the presentation, and perceived tension of the loose brushwork and rough finish in his oil paintings, alongside the time pressured work made primarily for newspapers.

Imperial Representations

Woodville was the posthumous son of an American artist, though born and brought up in Britain.²⁶¹ Early in life he had spent fifteen years as a volunteer in the yeomanry, which he described as “much fun, little work”, rising to the rank of captain, and had travelled extensively, visiting the occasional theatre of war, though he never personally experienced battle.²⁶² His enthusiasm for the army led him to design the uniforms and accoutrements of the Egyptian Army for which he was awarded the Commandership of the Medjidieh.²⁶³ He was known to move with a “fast bohemian set”, as “an indefatigable rider to hounds, hunting much with the Garth, South Berkshire, the Bucks and the now disbanded Queen’s staghounds”.²⁶⁴ He accompanied Prince Albert Victor on a pig-sticking expedition into Morocco, and said of himself that he had “taken toll of all kinds of game from the elephant and the tiger to snipe and woodcock”.²⁶⁵ Indeed he was so well connected in his sporting activities that it was almost inevitable he was chosen by the big-game hunter, Major Percy Marlborough Stewart, to illustrate his memoirs *Round the World with Rod and Rifle*. He was clearly an indomitable game hunter himself, as the account given by Arthur Warren of his near

²⁶⁰ Mackenzie, 1996: 301; see Green and Seddon, 2000: 6-16.

²⁶¹ Stearn, 1986: 147; Woodville’s father was also named Richard Caton Woodville.

²⁶² Woodville, 1914: 239, 251; Warren, 1906: 295-96. Volunteering had itself become “the spectator sport in mid-Victorian Britain”, Summers, 1976: 107.

²⁶³ Warren, 1906: 296.

²⁶⁴ Stearn, 2004: 229; Warren, 1906: 295.

²⁶⁵ Warren, 1906: 295.

death exploits in the bush with a large boar testifies.²⁶⁶ Although described on his death as “the English Meissonier”, Caton Woodville is little known today.²⁶⁷ He was, however, much praised in his lifetime, not least by the monarchy, from whom he received several commissions, and by John Everett Millais (1829-96), whose son quotes his father as saying “[d]euced clever fellow that Woodville. He’d be an R.A. if I had a voice in the matter”.²⁶⁸

In spite of the popularity of his artwork at the end of the nineteenth century, however, there is a marked lack of information on Woodville’s life or work. What little there is, consists of his 1914 autobiography, *Random Recollections*, (itself a racy account), contemporary reviews in the press, half a dozen magazine articles, one limited to his sporting illustrations, entries in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* and on *Wikipedia*, as well as scant mention in books or chapters on nineteenth-century military art generally.²⁶⁹ Hichberger, for example, comments that he was “regarded as highly skilled at making ‘artist’s impressions’ of events he had not witnessed” and whose chief artistic quality was his strong moral conviction in the “righteousness of the imperial cause”, while Roger Stearn refers to him as probably the artist who is most likely to have “shaped the British public’s image of war, especially imperial war” before 1914.²⁷⁰ Usherwood and Spencer-Smith refer to Woodville as one of those artists who exploited the market for British battle paintings established by Butler, and whose

²⁶⁶ Warren, 1906: 298.

²⁶⁷ Woodville’s last major painting, *Hallowe’en 1914: Stand of the London Scottish on Messines Ridge, 31st Oct-1st Nov 1914* (1927) was, like the *Roll Call*, taken by royal command to Buckingham Palace, Stearn, 2004:230; It has been suggested that Woodville was subjected to “some degree of prejudice” for specialising in contemporary rather than historical battle pieces, Hichberger, 1988: 95; Stearn, 2004: 230 citing the obituary in the *Times* 22 August 1927.

²⁶⁸ Millais, 1899: 233, whose son commented that Woodville’s drawings in the *Illustrated London News* “were an especial joy to him”; it was Millais who also proposed Butler for associate membership of the Royal Academy.

²⁶⁹ These articles are listed in the bibliography under Compton, R, Mayhew, A. and Warren, A.; Stearn refers to Woodville’s own account as “considered unreliable”, Stearn, 2004: 229.

²⁷⁰ Hichberger, 1988: 95. Stearn, 2004: 230. .

“imaginative dramatisations of glorious victories or noble, hard-fought defeats, all treated in a realistic graphic style, catered perfectly for the jingoist appetite of the period”.²⁷¹ Kestner follows Lalumia in his critique of Woodville’s emphasis on the magnificent, defiant heroism of the soldier, even in the face of defeat or blunder, while Harrington is content to itemise Woodville’s work, with extracts from the occasional contemporary review.²⁷² Work on his sporting illustrations for Major Stewart (fig.35) can be viewed in the archives of Beverley Treasure House under the title *Artists and Adventurers*.²⁷³ His prints and illustrations can be seen reproduced in the nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century press, in particular, the *Illustrated London News* and the *Graphic*, as well as in other contemporaneous publications, such as H.W. Wilson’s *With the Flag to Pretoria* and Louis Creswicke’s *South Africa and the Transvaal War* and on postcards and magic lantern slides. His paintings are now in the collections of the National Army Museum, in various regimental museums scattered widely throughout Great Britain, or are in private collections. There are four of his works in Tate Britain, none of which is currently on display.²⁷⁴

Between 1876 and 1877, Woodville, like his fellow war artist, Crofts, and the Swiss painter, Arnold Böcklin (1827-1901), trained in Düsseldorf, before being sent out by the *Illustrated London News* at the age of twenty to accompany the Turks towards the end of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78.²⁷⁵ From this experience he developed a long association with the press, sometimes working abroad, but mostly, especially latterly, from his studio in London. His friendships included many of the “Specials”, as well as the French artist, de Neuville (1835-85) for whom, whilst in Egypt, he “made many sketches and had many photographs taken of the

²⁷¹ Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 167, 172.

²⁷² Kestner, 1995: 200; Lalumia, 1984: 147; Harrington, 1993: 176-308.

²⁷³ BTHAG: DDX 1414, 1414/1, 1414/8.

²⁷⁴ Until 2015, images of only three of the four were available.

²⁷⁵ Pott was also said to show a clear influence of the school of Düsseldorf. *Art Journal*, 1873, vol. XXXV: 198.

trenches”.²⁷⁶ Once free of the studio and able to witness a theatre of war for himself, he soon developed an interest in battle painting, moving away from his early training in religious art to a subject taken from Thomas Carlyle’s *Life of Frederick the Great* for his first Royal Academy submission in 1879, *Before Leuthen, December 3rd, 1757* (private collection). This met with general approval, the *Athenaeum* referring to “a large sense of breadth in effect, energy in the design of individual figures, and that quality which is precious in such works—a universal movement of the figures”.²⁷⁷

Although Woodville did indeed follow in the wake of Butler’s meteoric impact in the mid-1870s, both his style and approach were markedly different, as is demonstrated in his 1902 painting, *All That Was Left of Them* (fig.33).²⁷⁸ First appearing in the *Illustrated London News* under the title *Death or Glory*, this is a vibrant narrative of soldiers who are far from subdued by their experience of war, unlike Butler’s sorry-looking Dr Bryden, allegedly the sole survivor from Kabul, in *The Remnants of an Army, Jellalabad, January 13th 1842* (fig.34).²⁷⁹ Here we have men of a very different metal, men who are defiant to the end, heroic men who are fulfilling their moral obligation to the rest of humanity and to the British Empire in particular, and who are evidently proud to do so.²⁸⁰ They epitomise the view expressed by Duffield Osborne that “[w]hen we come to die, we shall die leaving *men* behind us” (my italics).²⁸¹ They are the very antithesis of Butler’s sympathetic representation of defeat in Afghanistan, which John Mackenzie has described as “clearly designed as a warning against the sacrifices of heroic

²⁷⁶ Woodville, 1914: 61.

²⁷⁷ The *Athenaeum*, 17 May 1879: 67.

²⁷⁸ Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 167.

²⁷⁹ Woodville painted two pictures with this title. The 1902 painting refers to the stand of the 17th Lancers at Modderfontein; *Death or Glory: C Squadron of the 17 Lancers at Modderfontein, 17 September 1901* appeared in the paper on 2 November 1901.

²⁸⁰ Robinson, Gallagher and Denny, 1961: 2.

²⁸¹ Hatt, 1993: 60.

endeavours”.²⁸² This was no longer a warning that the turn-of-the-century public wanted to hear, with British troops fighting for their lives, and certainly Woodville, unlike Butler, had no aversion to portraying the heat of battle. As late as 1964, when *All That Was left of Them* was presented to the Queen’s Own Lancers Museum, it was said to be “[b]y far the most valuable presentation to be made”, and was ceremoniously handed over with a quotation from the original text accompanying the painting: “[s]uch deeds may not win battles, but such courage makes our nation”.²⁸³

All That Was Left of Them shows a central block of men facing outwards, most standing but others sheltering behind rocks for cover, as they hold off the enemy troops advancing in greater numbers from the rear. There is little expression on the men’s faces as they await their destiny, with all the outward appearance of conquering heroes, presenting a very manly, phlegmatic, stance to the outside world. These are not men who have been beaten down by their experiences in war. Rather they are offered as role models for youth, the inspirational stuff of legends, such as can be read about in tales of the wild west, of G A Henty or the adventure stories in *Boys Own Paper* and similar juvenile literature, the latter, indeed, reproducing many of Woodville’s popular images in turn.²⁸⁴ His “*Gentleman in Khaki*” (fig.36), for example, with bandaged head, legs akimbo, rifle at the ready and steely look, designed to accompany Kipling’s *The Absent-Minded Beggar*, was especially popular and could be seen everywhere in Britain, its likeness reproduced as statues, medals and prints.²⁸⁵ It was on this fertile, artistic and literary foundation that Robert Baden-Powell’s 1908 *Scouting for Boys* was able to build in

²⁸² Mackenzie, 1996: 300.

²⁸³ *White Star and Vedette*, November, 1964: 164-65.

²⁸⁴ Paris, 2000: 74; Henty had been a war correspondent in the Crimea and is said to have imported his journalistic style into his novels, Springhall, 1968: 1105. It is almost certain that such literature was read by the soldiers, reinforcing their mission to fight for the empire, James, 1973: 97.

²⁸⁵ Wilkinson-Latham, 1979: 261. This co-operation between Kipling and Woodville highlights their shared focus on the individual and, frequently, the underdog.

such a phenomenal manner, and in a mutual reinforcement of art and contemporary cultural expectations.

Set against a grey sky, slightly streaky, but lightening in the dawn, Woodville's men, clad in khaki, are silhouetted monumentally, heroically, their sculptural composition prefiguring their own celebratory memorial on death, captured in the very moment that death becomes inevitable. Light streaks across the face of the central figure, drawing attention to the chiselled cheeks of the soldier to his left and the seated soldier at his feet, in an almost photographic staging which highlights the men who pose bravely as they would wish to be remembered. These men are models for their own epitaph. The peculiar combination of the light and the upward angle from which the picture is painted, lend themselves to a three dimensional representation in either relief or in the round, aided by the stolid, earthbound stance of the soldiers, strongly anticipating the monumentality of the commandos commemorated in the Second World War Memorial at Spean Bridge. The viewer's eye is drawn to this central figure standing defiantly, bareheaded, legs akimbo, facing the front of the canvas, his right arm flung backwards and his left hand grasping a pistol pointing to the ground. Like *Gentleman in Khaki*, he epitomises the view of Canon J.H.Skrine, writing in *Religious Thought and National Service* in 1911 that "[w]ar is not murder, as some fancy; war is sacrifice [. . .] which is the soul of Christianity".²⁸⁶ Courageous in his virtue, he is effectively disarmed, presenting himself for the ultimate, Christian, surrender. These soldiers have been transformed into intrepid, Protestant, martyrs, offering up their lives for the greater good of their fellow citizens just as they reference earlier, eighteenth-century, heroic paintings, including West's *The Death of General Wolfe*, replete with Christian

²⁸⁶ Summers, 1976:120; just such a view of religious martyrdom was echoed by the Archbishop of York, Cosmo Gordon Lang in 1917 in his address to the boys of Pocklington School, when he referred to "the sublime self-sacrifice of a death in a noble cause". *The Pocklingtonian*, 1917.

iconography. Unlike Butler's Dr Bryden and her Crimean heroes, however, they glory, rather than suffer, in their defiance.

To the left of centre, Woodville places a second soldier standing at right angles, firing his rifle outwards, leaning forwards in single-minded concentration as he aims. His action is mirrored by a third soldier standing pugnaciously and aiming in the same direction. In the shadow of the second soldier, a fourth has just been shot and is falling backwards, his gun blasted out of his left hand, which is curved as if the weapon were still there. His right elbow is bent up across his chest as he disappears backwards behind the main figure, where his face is hidden, his bent legs, astride those of a fallen comrade, on the point of giving way beneath him. Squatting before the central figure a soldier, already wounded, is firing straight out of the canvas, challenging the viewer to feel what it must be like under fire, in the recognition that there is no other employment where it is a requirement to face death. It is both exciting and unnerving as the drama and horror of war collide. To the right of the central figure, another soldier, his features partly obscured by a hat, is holding his hands over his eyes in pain as he leans forward, still clutching his rifle, while by his side his comrade is firing towards the right of the painting. Although the men are bunched together *in extremis*, the overall impression is not of a static painting. Instead the aim of Woodville's composition is to present a cohesive unit working together to achieve a shared, patriotic, outcome in the face of adversity and, as such, it acquires a curiously mobile quality. The message here would be clear to its first audience; these men are heroes to be emulated, for when death comes, it will be glorious, *pro Patria mori*.²⁸⁷

Not only is their masculinity emphasised by their defiant stance; it is replicated in their pointed, virile, weaponry, firing off in all

²⁸⁷ A sentiment satirised by T H Crosland (1865-1924) in his contemporary poem, *Slain*.

directions, in what Bill Nasson has described as the “stridently masculinist iconography” fitting for traditional history paintings.²⁸⁸ Woodville, who had a great admiration for the army and all things military, trusted in the nobility of war which he strove to represent in his art, echoing Henty in his mantra that “it is our pluck and fighting powers that have made us their masters”.²⁸⁹ Working assiduously to rebut his own belief that, notwithstanding the then popularity of his work, neither the British public, nor even the army cared much for military pictures, I suggest that Woodville made every effort to emphasise the more sensational aspects of his work, regretting that “after a war such as ours in South Africa, if it had been fought by the French or the Germans, one would have seen miles of canvas covered with the brave deeds of the soldiers”.²⁹⁰

To compensate for early military disappointment, and, perhaps, because of it, British soldiers took on the role of modern day knights, of adventurers, of frontiersmen, of sportsmen, displaying their superior moral qualities as they fought against vastly unequal odds.²⁹¹ Literary scholars have investigated how this disjuncture was reflected in contemporary literature, Steve Attridge commenting on writers’ attempts to “bridge the gap” “between expectation and fulfillment” [sic] and “with rhetorical flourish”.²⁹² Poets such as Kipling and W.E.Henley (1849-1903) had already perpetuated the “healthy belligerence” of the imperial adventure story, Kipling with his music hall inspired *Barrack Room Ballads*, published in 1892, and Henley in his 1890, *Song of the Sword*.²⁹³ Henley’s poetry and essays are peppered with imagery of virility, heroism and the military, while the Tommy Atkins of the *Barrack Room Ballads* was everywhere, simultaneously denounced as a vulgar hooligan and

²⁸⁸ Nasson, 2002: 827.

²⁸⁹ Cited in Paris, 2000: 7.

²⁹⁰ Woodville, 1914: 79.

²⁹¹ In fact the number of British troops eventually needed to gain victory was vastly in excess of the numbers of their Boer opponents.

²⁹² Attridge, 2003: 46; see also Van Wyk Smith’s book, *Drummer Hodge*.

²⁹³ Attridge, 2003: 118; Henley’s poem was dedicated to his mentor, Kipling.

praised for being the gritty workhorse of the imperial forces, the rough diamond with a capacity for heroism.²⁹⁴ When news of a series of defeats reached Britain, Henley reacted with incomprehension, and his poem, *Remonstrance*, which refers initially to “[h]itch” “blunder” “new disaster”, works itself round to a paean of praise for the troops who will soon “strike, home!”²⁹⁵ As the war progressed, with it came the dawning reality of Britain’s dwindling superiority, that “final break between the ‘sporting’ self-confident attitude of the early imperial era and the growing sense of grim struggle” into the twentieth century.²⁹⁶

Although his was a very different style from that of Butler, I argue, as partial evidence of her artistic legacy, that Woodville’s *All That Was Left of Them* bore the influence of her 1875 academy entry, *Quatre Bras* (fig.37), representing an infantry square stolidly confronting a cavalry charge the day before the Battle of Waterloo. Here too, soldiers form a cohesive, close-knit and defensive unit, facing bravely out in each direction, ready to meet a larger, more powerful, force; Britain, the sturdy island nation, is confronting the world with grit and independence. True to Butler’s principles, the enemy in *Quatre Bras* is not shown, and like Woodville’s force, this regiment, too, was eventually defeated, but in a worthy manner. Moreover, Woodville has subverted military facts by portraying the British as the underdogs, whereas in reality their troops far exceeded those of their Boer opponents, much as he had done in his 1898 painting *The Charge of the 21st Lancers at Omdurman* (fig.9), in a partisan effort to elicit sympathy for the British.²⁹⁷ This is at a time when there had been growing disquiet over British army tactics as evidenced by a remark published in the *Pall Mall Gazette* in December 1900 that

²⁹⁴ See Buchanan, 1899: 774-89; Henley, 1900: 27-39.

²⁹⁵ Nutt, 1908: 136-37.

²⁹⁶ Hichberger, 1988: 114.

²⁹⁷ It is, however, the case that the initial forces despatched to South Africa were woefully inadequate as Butler’s husband, General Butler, had predicted.

it must always be remembered that the entire Boer army is mounted and that the bulk of the British army goes on foot. It seems absurd to mention such a fact; yet it is extremely dubious if the War Office has even yet quite realized it.²⁹⁸

Butler's was not the only possible model for defiant resistance. Woodville would already have been aware of several military stories of "heroic" deaths, such as Custer's last stand at Little Bighorn in 1876, widely reported and illustrated, likened to the death of General Gordon and said to be "as traumatic as the massacre by Zulus of an entire British column at Isandlwana" [sic].²⁹⁹ He would also have known the pictorial representation of that disaster in *The Last Stand of the 24th Regiment at Isandhlwana* (1885) (National Army Museum) painted by a fellow newspaper illustrator, Charles Edwin Fripp, (1854-1906) in 1879.³⁰⁰ At the same time, "the incomparable Frederic Remington" (1861-1909), whom Woodville had met during the Sioux uprising in 1891, was producing sketches of the struggles between the American Indians and the American cavalry for *Harper's Weekly*, including scenes of ambush and *The Last Stand*.³⁰¹ Even *Crimean Simpson*, Woodville's colleague at the *Illustrated London News*, was delegated to cover the Modoc Indian wars in 1873, and sent home several images including one of a small number of Indians holding a large troop of soldiers at bay.³⁰² By choosing to use this model, employed effectively by Edwin Landseer (1802-73) in his 1846 painting, *Stag at Bay*, (Royal Collection) Woodville was working with tried, tested and well-known material onto which he was able to graft his own particular heroic interpretation.

²⁹⁸ *Pall Mall Gazette*, 22 December 1900.

²⁹⁹ Johnson, 1978: 46-47.

³⁰⁰ See also the 1880 painting *The Last Gallant Stand of the 66th Regiment at Maiwand* (Royal Berkshire Regimental Museum, Salisbury) by Harry Payne (1858-1927).

³⁰¹ Johnson, 1978: 56-61.

³⁰² Johnson, 1978: 54.

Based on a real, and tragic, incident, *All That Was Left of Them* was calculated to show the British soldier at his finest; bloody but unbowed, and carrying on the best chivalric and Christian traditions of the army just as it fed the appetite of a domestic audience in Britain for this kind of imagery. As a counterweight, numerous press reports carried accounts of the devious behaviour of the Boers who had worn misappropriated British army uniforms in order to entrap their opponents. Whereas the “British officer should be a gentleman first and an officer second” and Tommy Atkins, his private, was “a bit of ‘all right’”, the “flower” of the trenches according to the *Illustrated London News*, the Boers were said to have “shifty” eyes and were not to be trusted; they were well known for not washing, for low cunning and for advertising the “usual fiction” of low casualty numbers.³⁰³ When they were not being despised for their ungentlemanly conduct, Boers were regarded as “shambling oafs who grinned vacuously and fell over their rifles”.³⁰⁴

Woodville was keen to differentiate between the qualities of the British and the Boer, and, although he never visited South Africa and worked entirely from his London studio during this period, to bring so-called Boer habits and atrocities to the attention of the British public. When the Boer Commandant-General, Piet Cronje was captured at Paardeberg, Woodville used a sketch from one of the “Specials”, Frederic Villiers, (1851-1922), to produce a drawing of the scene entitled *The Surrender of Cronje, February 27 1900* (fig.38).³⁰⁵ In this, isolated from his compatriots, Cronje presents as a large shambling figure as he faces Lord Roberts, his heavy hide whip, or sjambok, hanging at his side. Apart from his great size, the

³⁰³ Bond, 1972: 17, who cites the Duke of Cambridge; see also Lynch, 1903: 48 and Wilson, 1901: 430, 399 on the alleged characteristics of the Boers. In fact the Boer figures were almost certainly accurate; see also L.P.Austin in *ILN*, 10 November 1900.

³⁰⁴ Wilkinson-Latham, 1970:137; see also the article by George Lacy, *Some Boer Characteristics* (1900) referring to the dishonesty and dirty life-style of the Boers. The troops were lectured on these traits on board ship *en route* for the Cape, Nasson, 2000: 124.

³⁰⁵ Reproduced in Wilson, 1901: 431 from a drawing first published in *ILN*, 31 March 1900.

most noticeable feature is his full, black, shaggy beard which dominates his face, with random tufts of hair visible from behind his right ear, stretching down to the collar. His eyes, focussed on Roberts, are deep-set beneath bushy black eyebrows, so it is difficult to gauge their precise expression, but it is certainly not friendly. His clothes hang on him awkwardly as he stands with his weight slightly on his right foot so that his shoulders are not square and he appears to almost crumple from the waist. Over a jacket, buttoned only once near the top and otherwise left to hang open, he wears a creased knee-length coat in a lighter shade flapping open by his sides. His trousers, a similar shade to the jacket, are baggy, their bottoms casually rolled up to reveal scuffed walking boots. “Was this the terrible Cronje?” this “great heavy bundle of a man”, asks one eye-witness incredulously. “Was it possible that this was the man who had held back the British army at Magersfontein?”³⁰⁶

And what of Lord Roberts, his adversary, known to have been neat and small in stature? Although he is only shown in semi-profile, it is clear that his dress is immaculate and he holds his “trim figure” very straight, with shoulders back and head held high.³⁰⁷ He wears a moustache rather than a beard, and his uniform comprises well-fitting jacket with epaulettes, breeches, knee length, very highly polished boots with spurs, and a neat forage cap. His sword, with ceremonial jewelled hilt, is slung in a sheath to hang straight down by his left leg.³⁰⁸ He takes centre stage, watched by the British troops, mostly in kilts with pristine knife-edge pleats and pith helmets, standing to attention with bayonets raised. Behind them can be seen the head of a second Boer soldier cautiously observing, his face almost a replica of Cronje’s, but more watchful. To the right of the drawing, foregrounding the camp, are two officers, dressed in similar style to Roberts. Cronje is situated in enemy territory.

³⁰⁶ Wilson, 1901: 430, quoting a Mr Hands.

³⁰⁷ Wilson, 1901: 430.

³⁰⁸ Beards were not worn in the British army save by the King (and, later, Augustus John, 1878-1961).

One officer is taking notes, while the second looks on, adopting an uncharacteristically casual pose, as, arms crossed, he studies Cronje as if he were a curiosity.

In this drawing there is no movement; the situation is calm and measured, with Roberts in charge. Everyone is perfectly still, surrounding the two protagonists as if they were in a theatre, waiting for the plot to unfold. The long shadows indicate strong light, possibly early morning, with thick dark lines on those parts in shadow, and highlighting every wrinkle in the sun. As the line of soldiers recedes off to the far right of the column, faces disappear and we are left with scant impression of the men, though even those more closely delineated are impassive, with the regulation moustache.³⁰⁹ I suggest that the Boer habit of wearing a beard was something of a gift to Woodville as not only did it mask expression but it served to highlight the alleged lack of discipline and cleanliness within their troops, especially given the British army's then prohibition of beards on grounds of hygiene. This drawing is making a statement about British superiority, domestically and on the field of war, where Woodville's concern is not for vibrant action but for patriotic topicality; a need to show the British public that here, at last, is a victory to celebrate, a victory for British civilisation. Cronje has surrendered.

Warren writes that most of Woodville's black-and-white drawings were done at night, while in the obituary in the *Connoisseur* he is "said to have been somewhat too apt to leave the execution of commissions until the last possible moment".³¹⁰ Both critics agree that he was a rapid worker and I suggest that his heavy shading and reliance on type are evidence here of hasty execution. Although referring to his paintings, rather than illustrations, Spielmann deplored "the blackness of his colour", an attribute which may well

³⁰⁹ Shaving facial hair above the lip was prohibited in the British army until 1916.

³¹⁰ Warren, 1906: 299; the *Connoisseur*, vol.79, 1927: 127.

derive from his original sketches.³¹¹ According to Warren, Woodville had the capacity to become completely absorbed in his work, painting intensely, and both Warren and the *Connoisseur* refer to the absence of live models.³¹² Instead, when working on his larger paintings he would make detailed studies of each figure before assembling them on the canvas. Although the use of such sketches would suggest a more measured approach in his paintings, I argue that in his drawings he used types as a kind of artistic shorthand for the message he wished to convey. In this drawing, he presents the viewer with three separate types, respectively representing the Boer soldier, the British officer and the British private, all without any individuality, with the possible exception of the “observer” soldier to the right, and readily recognisable from his other works. For a contemporary audience this dependence on type was to be applauded as confirmed by A.C.Carter who praised Woodville for conveying “all that stolidity, eagerness, coolness and self-sacrifice incarnated in Tommy Atkins” in his work, as this “face of a British hero [. . .] happily for us as a nation [. . .] can be recognised at home in the face of the man in the street”.³¹³ As Pamela Fletcher has observed, type is only the starting point from which to develop character which in turn is dependent on the exploration of emotion.³¹⁴ In Woodville’s work, this second phase is frequently missing and signs of emotion are virtually non-existent as the players on this stage take their parts, the British with their “stiff upper lip” and smart uniforms, and the unkempt, bearded Boer, hinting at his darker, more devious, nature.

As Harrington observes, Woodville was constantly employed by both Henry Graves and Co. and the *Illustrated London News*, producing popular images of the war.³¹⁵ A second drawing soon followed, but this time drawn completely from Woodville’s

³¹¹ Spielmann, 1901: 423.

³¹² Warren, 1906: 299; the *Connoisseur*, vol.79, 1927: 127.

³¹³ Carter, 1900: 24.

³¹⁴ Fletcher, 2013: 22.

³¹⁵ Harrington, 1993: 295.

imagination. *Ordeal by Fire* (fig.39), tells a different story, and one praised by Carter for its “astonishing display of industry and gifted facility”.³¹⁶ This is a dramatic depiction of British troops under attack, the flames throwing the “doomed Guards in their khaki into high relief”, and in many ways this representation foreshadows the monumentality of *All That Was Left of Them*. The caption reads

[a]t the battle of Biddulphberg, near Senekal on May 28, the Grenadiers, under General Rundle, were holding a position on the Berg, when, possibly by the carelessness of some of the men, the dry grass was set alight, and several of the wounded were badly injured by fire before they could be removed.³¹⁷

Woodville’s central figure, like his commander-in-chief, Roberts, is dressed immaculately in his uniform, standing defiantly, as he cocks his rifle in the direction of the attack. True to type, he is erect, heroically impassive, with no apparent sign of fear, ignoring the billowing smoke and flames threatening to engulf his troops. At his feet lies an injured soldier, stretched out as he fell and hoisting himself up on his elbow. He is attended by a young grenadier, gazing up admiringly at the central inspirational figure. Immediately behind him, is another wounded soldier who, unusually, has no moustache so that his youthful face is able to reveal at least a semblance of pity as he looks down at his injured companion.³¹⁸ To his left a third soldier, closely resembling Woodville’s earlier *Gentleman in Khaki*, his head wrapped in a bloody bandage is carrying yet another casualty off to safety, past a dying soldier supported by his friend. White spots in the sky signify return fire and explosions. Whereas the earlier drawing bore the drama of anticipation, this shows the chaos of battle as it happens. The overall effect is one of urgency, the front figures silhouetted against the hazy, impressionistic background of flames, smoke and sky. Again, there is evidence of heavy shading and reliance on type in the central figure and the stoical attitude of

³¹⁶ This drawing appeared in *ILN*, 28 July 1900; Carter, 1900: 20.

³¹⁷ Wilson, 1900: 677; Carter, 1900: 20.

³¹⁸ This detail indicates his youth and an inability to grow facial hair.

the injured, though, unusually, there does seem to be an element of tender emotion, in the two young soldiers, the one without facial hair and the other caring for the wounded.

A third drawing, *The Night Charge of the 19th Hussars near Lydenberg on November 7th, 1900* (fig.40) shows Woodville in his most imaginative mode.³¹⁹ This is a work full of drama and movement. As the name indicates, there is no sun, and such light as there is, comes from the explosive gunfire illuminating the sky. Mounted British troops are shown storming across the canvas through a Boer encampment, with swords raised and pistols firing. At the extreme left of the drawing, a hussar is seen twisting in his saddle as he controls his rearing horse, while at the same time shooting steadily at a mounted Boer, riding alongside. It is clear from the way his opponent's head is flung back, that he has hit his mark. The centre of the drawing is taken up with a life and death chase between a British soldier, sword raised behind his shoulder in a manner to match Woodville's 1897 painting *The Relief of the Light Brigade, 25 October, 1854* (fig.41), and his Boer counterpart, furiously urging on his grey mount, arm raised to protect himself from the onslaught. Both horses are at full stretch and in danger of trampling over the falling body of a second Boer immediately in front, as he tumbles from his horse. Although Spielmann, in his article on Crofts, bemoans the "comparatively rare presence of "go" and *abandon*" in British military art, this is a scene "full of spirit, go and fire", which he concedes is Woodville's hallmark.³²⁰ It is without doubt, a scene of confusion as the two forces clash, and there is little attempt at – or indeed space for – characterisation of the men. The priority here is the drama, not the execution. As in other Woodville representations, it is in the horses that expressions of fear and adrenalin can be seen, as they rear up, swerve or are pursued against a black sky.

³¹⁹ *ILN*, 15 December 1900, reproduced in Creswicke, vol. vi, 1901: 104.

³²⁰ Spielmann, 1901: 421, 423.

“Patriotic in nature and prolific in output,” Woodville rarely, if ever, missed an opportunity to point out alleged bad behaviour by the enemy.³²¹ Such images were eagerly anticipated, especially at the outset of the war, with the various constituents of the public, the War Office and newspaper proprietors. Entrapment, as for example the abuse of a white flag to lure the unsuspecting British out into the open and into an ambush, was especially popular and was used to reinforce the moral inferiority of the Boers. It was simply not cricket to wear British uniforms, or to lie in wait as, for example, at the Battle of the Modder River, rather than facing up to the British in open combat, for it was widely accepted that “[g]iven a fair field, man to man, Tommy is more than a match for the Boer”.³²² Thus a straightforward drawing by Melton Prior (1845-1910) of a convoy during the Battle of Lombard’s Cop, in which an incidental shell hit a British ambulance wagon, was exaggerated by Frank Patterson (1871-1952) in the *Illustrated London News* to imply a deliberate direct hit on the injured.³²³ In similar vein, Woodville produced a so-called “juicy” Boer atrocity for the press under the title, *The Dangers of Mercy: Indian Ambulance-Bearers under Fire* (fig.42).³²⁴ Recruited by General Buller, there were approximately two thousand stretcher bearers, known as “the body-snatchers”, including eight hundred members of Natal’s Indian community who had wished to demonstrate their loyalty to the British Empire.³²⁵ Unable to fight, they were yet in the forefront of the action, and the alleged Boer “atrocity” against these men was not only an assault on humanitarian relief, but held a more sinister message, underlining the Boer

³²¹ *ILN*, 9, December 1899, under the title *Boer Tactics*, quoted in Johnson, 1978: 147.

³²² Burleigh, 1900: 44.

³²³ The original drawing was reproduced in the *ILN* on 2 December 1899, with Patterson’s version appearing a week later on 8 December 1899, Johnson, 1978: 148-49.

³²⁴ Wilson, 1901: 275.

³²⁵ Pakenham, 1992: 224-25. These ambulance-bearers were led by Mohandas Gandhi.

treatment of non-whites generally and the British government's stated concern for the political rights of the black population.³²⁶

With action pictures remaining a challenge in this conflict, artists sought hard for subjects with a lively representation. One contemporary account in sporting terms by Wilson in *With the Flag to Pretoria* has the Boers running a "neck and neck race with the Colonial troopers for the summit, but the Colonials won".³²⁷ Given that there was so little to see on the Veldt, just such a race provided much needed dramatic material for artistic representation by Godfrey Douglas Giles in his 1902 painting, *The Race for the Kopje* (fig.43). Giles had the distinct advantage of having served as an officer during previous campaigns and of working as a war illustrator in South Africa for the *Graphic*, which accorded him first-hand knowledge of the topography and conditions, but perhaps more importantly, credit for truthful representation.³²⁸ Imperial troops are clustered to the bottom centre right of the painting as they catch sight of a group of Boer riders galloping in from the distant left, making for the kopje, or small hill, in between. They look as if they have just noticed the Boers and are jumping into their saddles, straining for the advantage of the look-out position on top of the hill. A horse stands waiting, while his rider is crawling up the side of the hill on all fours, rifle in hand. The race is on. Curiously Giles has introduced a startled, khaki-coloured hare running across the front of the canvas, possibly to denote alarm, possibly referencing a sporting analogy. The execution of this painting, too, appears rushed with loose brushwork and little attempt at a subtle delineation of colour between the background of the Veldt, the animals and the men, and is very similar in style to rapidly executed press illustrations. Once again, none of the men's faces can be seen, the nearer, and anonymous,

³²⁶ *ILN*, 9 June 1900. A decision had been taken to exclude Indian forces and maintain this as a white man's war, Thompson, 2002: 13.

³²⁷ Wilson, 1901: 446.

³²⁸ Giles, like Sargent had been trained under Carolus-Duran (1837-1917), of whom Butler wrote in her autobiography "[h]e illustrates a very disagreeable present phase of French art" though with no further explanation. Butler, 1993: 102.

imperial troops facing away and the Boers too far distant for individualisation just as in much of Woodville's work. This is in stark contrast to Giles' earlier 1884 painting, *Charge at El Teb, Sudan* (Museum of the Kings Royal Hussars, Winchester), a charge at which Giles himself was present, a very busy and smoke-filled canvas where the officers are all easily identified, as a kind of "gallery of Victorian heroism" though, again, as in many of Woodville's representations, all are tight-lipped and with the most limited of outward demeanour.³²⁹

Other subjects depicted during the war were sieges, and especially their relief, illustrations of ambushes or other so-called un-gentlemanly conduct by the Boers and examples of individual heroism. Among the latter is Wollen's 1901 painting, *The Victoria Cross* (Durban Art Gallery, South Africa) showing one soldier rescuing another by hoisting him onto his horse. This shows a marked resemblance to Butler's work, and in particular her early picture, *Missing*. Both paintings represent the aftermath of a battle, where the horse of one soldier is absent; both are set in a desolate and deserted countryside, and although the wars were very different, the tone is noticeably similar in its focus on the distress of the individual in adversity.

In spite of an earlier generation's presentation of the Siege of Sebastopol in panoramic mode, by their very nature sieges did not generally provide good material for action pictures, but once relieved they took on the role of reassuring the public in Britain of a satisfactory outcome after days of heightened anxiety followed in the press. Accordingly, the painting by John Frederick Henry Bacon (1868-1914) entitled *The Relief of Ladysmith* (1900) (fig.44) is very different in character to the energy of Woodville's representations, concentrating instead on the delight of the besieged, both civilian and military, and showcasing the restrained and gentlemanly handshake

³²⁹ Kestner, 1995: 195.

between General White, the besieged, and Lord Dundonald, the rescuer. This was clearly an extremely popular image of British endurance and good behaviour and a photogravure was offered “[f]ree to purchasers of Bovril in bottles” through the agency of the *Illustrated London News*.³³⁰

During the First World War, art critic P.G.Konody was to remark

It is not without significance that in the majority of the Boer War pictures - that is to say those that were painted by eye-witnesses, and not made up from descriptive material-the artist has confined himself to depicting the South African veldt, with, perhaps, in the foreground some khaki-clad soldiers who at a distance are almost indistinguishable from the parched soil on which they tread; the actual fighting, the progress of the battle, is indicated by a few puffs of smoke over the horizon.³³¹

Frustrated by the sameness of the landscape, the lack of colour in the uniforms and the invisibility of the Boers, not to mention a string of defeats, these artists (and not just Konody’s eye-witnesses) frequently rejected truthful representations in favour of a more palatable and romantic heroism, using their imagination to create an image to which it was believed the public at home would relate. In an interesting reflection on the new art of photography, his friend Villiers described Woodville’s “wonderful rapidity” in transferring his artistic conceptions “to the canvas as faithfully and directly as the lens of the camera registers a subject”.³³² Indeed, so convincing was Woodville’s work that one Boer War veteran on seeing his 1901 painting *My Brave Irish* (Irish Rifles Regimental Museum) claimed he was “able to recognise the very rocks; and there’s the wall behind which I myself lay wounded. Painted from descriptions? Nonsense! I know better than that. The artist *must* have been there.”³³³ I suggest that this response was typical of a contemporary audience in Britain, which had persuaded itself of the truthfulness of the artist’s

³³⁰ *ILN*, 23 February 1901.

³³¹ Nevinson, 1917: 13.

³³² Hichberger, 1988: 96.

³³³ Warren, 1906: 299, who refers to the painting as *The Storming of Pieter’s Hill*.

representations, as the actual series of events in South Africa was just too unpalatable and incredible to accept.

As Harrington argues, the inclusion of the Boers in paintings and illustrations was almost obligatory in order to continue to stimulate public interest.³³⁴ Military art might have become increasingly popular in the late nineteenth century, but in their still ambivalent attitude to the army, many late-Victorians wanted images which allowed them to believe in Britain's imperial destiny without the concomitant evidence of the force, or the anguish required to achieve it.³³⁵ Just as the Boer War was beginning to show up the fault-lines in an unquestioning acceptance of imperialist supremacy, artists were themselves fighting a rear-guard action, seeking to provide reassurance that all was well at the expense of a more realistic and sympathetic representation of war.³³⁶ Those who had previously cried before Butler's *Balaclava* were now proud of their soldiers' defiant heroism in the field. Although military artists continued to focus largely on the ordinary soldier, this was not on the soldier as an individual but the soldier as a type, an embodiment of those moral and Christian virtues promoted at the turn of the century.

Muscular Christianity

Towards the end of the nineteenth century this widespread belief throughout Britain in the righteousness of the imperial cause was accompanied by an increasingly religious interpretation of war. Whereas the Duke of Wellington had famously pronounced that "a man who has nice notions about religion has no business to be a soldier", a new trend towards "muscular Christianity" was being

³³⁴ Harrington, 1993: 297.

³³⁵ Paris, 2000: 30.

³³⁶ For Kipling, however, the Boer War was a catalyst to his changing views on Empire; see Attridge, 2003: 89. An interesting comparison with the work of the Social Realists can be made in reflecting on the changes Hubert von Herkomer (1849-1914) was obliged to make to his 1878 painting *Eventide at Westminster* in order to make it more socially acceptable.

developed, linking war to mediaeval chivalry, and one where it was believed that “he who fears God most, fears man least”.³³⁷ This was not an entirely new idea, stemming as it did from the Shaftesbury ideals of politeness, selflessness and moral duty, but here extended to encompass military personnel, and given a religious endorsement.³³⁸ The earlier, eighteenth-century “politesse” was thought to compromise the masculinity of the male population and this movement was needed to reconcile military aggression with more genteel notions of chivalry.³³⁹ Edward Penny (1714-91) had already painted *The Marquis of Granby Relieving a Sick Soldier* in 1765 (fig.45), portraying him in his generosity as a man of great integrity and humanity and these attributes had, during the course of the nineteenth century, seeped into the social fabric. Soldiers were no longer just heroes; they were Christian heroes, reinforcing the strong element of duty to nation and empire promulgated by the schools and youth clubs. War, and the performance of war, became central to the experience of masculinity which had to be earned through action.³⁴⁰ Initially the preserve of the aristocracy, these ideas permeated firstly the middle classes followed by working-class young men and boys, where they became absorbed and re-codified as a kind of “invented tradition”.³⁴¹ Contemporary boys’ literature was “without exception dedicated to the imperial idea”, overlaid with a gloss of missionary zeal which drew on this Christian morality, for as Holger Hock has observed, there was a “significant overlap between Christian theology and the notion of patriotic example”.³⁴² Whereas before the Crimean War, the official policy had been to keep military chaplains to a minimum, now they were encouraged, and from 1860 had even

³³⁷ Anderson, 1971: 51, 52; Girouard, 1981: 142.

³³⁸ Klein, 1994: 53.

³³⁹ Hock, 2010: 180.

³⁴⁰ McVeigh, 2013: u/p [5].

³⁴¹ Hobsbawn, 1983: 6-11.

³⁴² Dunae, 1980: 106-108; Hock, 2010: 174.

started to wear military uniforms.³⁴³ War and religion had become mutually reaffirming as God joined the British army.³⁴⁴

As Mark Girouard has shown, “images of chivalry were absorbed into everyday life” and each young soldier became a modern day crusader as he volunteered for military duty, in the belief that he “[w]ho dies for England sleeps with God”.³⁴⁵ Their skills, nicely honed within the public school system, were ready to be used for “the protection of the weak, the advancement of all righteous causes and the subduing of the earth which God has given to the children of men”.³⁴⁶ Shored up by rousing Christian hymns, such as *Onward Christian Soldiers*, such ideas rapidly caught hold.³⁴⁷ Increasingly, representations of heroes, especially the dead, were couched in chivalric terms with knights clad in armour replacing an eighteenth-century penchant for classical figures.³⁴⁸ In the late-Victorian period military heroes became a careful cultural construct, whose stature was raised to near sainthood, following their deaths, such as Henry Havelock in 1857 and General Gordon in 1885.³⁴⁹ Both these men, killed in service, were ideal material for near idolatry, Havelock raising the siege of Lucknow after the Indian Uprising, and Gordon, resisting the Mahdi in Sudan. Had they lived, both men may well have attracted the thanks of a grateful nation; in death they were worshipped as Christian, and therefore patriotic, heroes. In his 1857 painting, *The Relief of Lucknow* (fig.46), Barker places Havelock just off centre, surrounded by British and Indian onlookers, admiring or subdued against a magnificent backdrop of Indian architecture. He is seen shaking hands with his compatriots, all dressed soberly and eschewing triumphalism, in a very restrained, urbane manner, much

³⁴³ Anderson, 1971: 62.

³⁴⁴ The Boers, too, believed they had God on their side.

³⁴⁵ Girouard, 1981: 146; Attridge, 2003: 110, citing Alfred Austin’s *Spartan Mothers*.

³⁴⁶ Girouard, 1981: 142.

³⁴⁷ Written in 1868 by Sabine Baring-Gould.

³⁴⁸ At Clifton College the Boer War memorial was of a soldier in armour with sword and shield, Girouard, 1981: 163.

³⁴⁹ Cubitt, 2007: 3.

as Dundonald at Ladysmith. As Harrington reports, this painting was immediately popular and much praised by the art press for its truthfulness.³⁵⁰ Nearly fifty years later, *General Gordon's Last Stand* (1893) (fig.47) by George William Joy (1844-1925) went further in promoting the theme of the Christian hero and martyr, imaginatively placing Gordon, one-time maverick and thorn in the flesh of the Gladstone government, at the top of the stairs, whilst the followers of the Mahdi crouch subserviently in an unholy huddle at the bottom. Joy's painting shows the moment of hesitation before the first spear is thrown, reflecting the awe inspired by Gordon's calm self-possession even at the point of certain death as he "display[ed] to the end his moral superiority over his enemies".³⁵¹ In his dramatic composition, Joy was able to exploit the exhibition of the male body to reinforce contemporary aspirations of gentlemanly behaviour.³⁵² Whatever their qualities in lifetime, in death both men were seen to embody all the chivalric virtues of a modern "gentle" knight and, as such, acted as role models for their successors.³⁵³

The Pleasure Culture of War³⁵⁴

Filled with confidence and excitement, as indeed going
to a fox-hunt, the British Army embarked for war.³⁵⁵

Whereas his eighteenth-century counterpart may well have chosen to paint a hunting scene with stags as the quarry, Woodville used his sporting background as inspiration for his scenes from military life. As Stephen Deuchar has pointed out, mere "horse-painters" were at the bottom of the artistic hierarchy in the eighteenth century, even though royalty and the landed gentry continued to be portrayed seated on their favourite mounts, and, in times of war, it was

³⁵⁰ Harrington, 1993: 171.

³⁵¹ Peck, 1998: 178, citing F.R.Wingate.

³⁵² See Ray, 2011: 24.

³⁵³ This has echoes of Chaucer's characterisation in *The Canterbury Tales* affirming its long lineage.

³⁵⁴ Dawson, 1994: 4.

³⁵⁵ Woodham-Smith, 1953: 141.

believed that sporting pursuits might be beneficial.³⁵⁶ Significantly Butler was indignant, if not a little amused, at being likened to Rosa Bonheur (1822-99), making it clear that she was no horse painter; she painted history, a sentiment endorsed by the critic of *Life*, which praised her focus on “the loftier subject of humanity”, for “[h]ers is the artist’s love - not the sportsman’s - a very different matter”.³⁵⁷ Nevertheless, by the nineteenth century, both Francis Grant (1803-78) and Landseer were professionally recognised and knighted for their sporting and animal paintings, providing a natural pathway for painters such as Woodville and Charlton, who aspired to a more elevated artistic genre.

In the text to his 1882 painting, *Saving the Guns at Maiwand* (fig.8), Woodville describes

[a]n incident in the battle of the Maiwand, Afghanistan, October 1880 when the British met with a reverse at the hands of an overwhelming army. A contingent of the Royal Horse Artillery, some badly wounded, are shown in retreat, at the same time endeavouring to the (sic) save the guns, which they ultimately succeeded in doing.³⁵⁸

He may well have added that this representation, like his later illustration of *The Night Charge of the 19th Hussars near Lydenberg*, had all the hallmarks of the hunt. Woodville’s painting is large and brimming with movement. The cavalry is pounding towards the left of the canvas in full retreat whilst fighting off their pursuers advancing from the extreme right. The central figure, mounted, is straining to his left as he concentrates on steadying his chestnut horse, the first in a linked convoy pulling the gun carriage to safety. He is dressed in khaki with a khaki pith helmet, relieved only by a white cross band stretching from the right shoulder of his jacket to just above his waist on his left side. A mottled blue bandage is wrapped round his left leg, showing stains as the blood seeps

³⁵⁶ Deuchar, 1988: 137, 166.

³⁵⁷ Letter from Butler to Alice Meynell, May 1868, HHG (uncatalogued); *Life*, 1 November 1879.

³⁵⁸ WAG: 152.

through. The injury is ignored, however, as both horse and rider drive frantically on, the horse, his forelock blowing in the wind is galloping, head held high although his wide-eyed expression hints at his fear, echoed in the adjacent riderless horse.

Behind this group, the only black mount faces the front of the canvas head on and at first sight seems to be coming straight at the viewer, such is the force of Woodville's representation, strikingly reminiscent of Butler's "greys" in her 1881 painting *Scotland Forever!* (fig.48).³⁵⁹ It is, in fact, travelling alongside, head swerving round as the rider jerks the reins high in his left hand and twists in the saddle to point the way dramatically with his sword. This soldier is wearing the uniform of an officer, again khaki, but with a broad gold band across his chest elaborately secured, a white pith helmet and immaculate white gloves. His demeanour is one of stoical grim determination as he gallantly encourages the survivors to follow him to safety.

The interest in this painting comes from this pulsating, eventful, representation, which conveys intense excitement. It exudes a vibrant electricity which privileges disaster and which is enhanced by the underlying frisson of the situation, a "dangerous enjoyment", as Patrick Hennessy writes of his own twenty-first century battle experience in Iraq.³⁶⁰ These soldiers are shown as heroes, in their attempt to rescue triumph, in the form of the guns, from the jaws of defeat. They are team players racing for the advantage, upholding the honour of their side at all costs, "salvaging the dominant fiction in the wake of defeat".³⁶¹ As in his drawings, these men, unlike Butler's, have very few individualised features. Nearly all sport

³⁵⁹ Although this was exhibited at the Egyptian Hall in Piccadilly at a time when Butler's relationship with the Fine Art Society had broken down, it is highly likely that Woodville had seen it by the time he came to paint *Saving the Guns at Maiwand* the following year.

³⁶⁰ Hennessy, 2010: 215.

³⁶¹ It was Raglan's concern to preserve the guns which led to the Charge of the Light Brigade at Balaclava; Kestner, 1995: 206.

identical moustaches, and it is once again in the features of the horses that Woodville indicates any characterisation, rather than those of the men. Woodville, the sportsman, is not concerned with the nuances of the men's emotions; rather, each soldier represents that type of hero who is grimly doing his patriotic duty for his Queen, country, empire and regiment; nothing more and nothing less.³⁶²

Nevertheless, the painting was praised by *The Times* for its “ineffaceable stamp of reality”, its “magnificent pieces of expression” and “the manner in which the clearest personality of each actor in the scene exists in true relation to its main spirit”.³⁶³ A more modern critic, considering the human costs of war, is less fulsome in his remark that, notwithstanding a defeat, the painting “still has the flamboyant militarism characteristic of colonial battle scenes of the 1880s and 1890s—so different in mood from the sober realism of most Crimean War battle painting earlier in the century”, but such criticism overlooks the effect it would have had upon a contemporary spectator, searching for evidence of the British soldiers' *sangfroid* in adversity.³⁶⁴

In terms of his style, Woodville himself writes about how he had learned from experience, perhaps to avoid the accusation of a hasty approach to his work, to use “fewer and larger figures, much broader in the brushwork and in its execution so as not to hamper the movement and to give an idea of the rush of men”.³⁶⁵ Certainly this painting is dynamic and less crowded than his Crimean paintings, where the focus was on the clash of the two armies as they met face to face, but it was not until the war in South Africa, that he really put this new technique into practice. There, in the desert with fewer

³⁶² At the time, Woodville was himself suffering from a “smashed ankle” and was painting with his “body turned to the left in an excruciatingly tiring position.” Woodville, 1914: 83.

³⁶³ Morris, 1996: 516, citing *The Times*, 3 June 1882.

³⁶⁴ Morris, 1996: 516.

³⁶⁵ Woodville, 1914: 82-83.

visible participants he avoids vast numbers of soldiers and shows with greater clarity individual action, reflecting the differing nature of the war, where large-scale set-piece battles were rarely possible. The onward rush of his earlier paintings of the Crimea, Maiwand and Omdurman are not replicated in his more monumental and static Boer War representations, which allow for a closer view of the men featured, their interaction and their striking, defiant, body language.³⁶⁶

In his choice of subject Woodville was followed by, among others, Stanley Berkeley (1855-1909), whose painting *Saving the Guns at Colenso* (York Museums Trust) represents a similar incident, not from the Anglo-Afghan War but from South Africa, and again wresting some vestige of success out of disaster, but with rather less verve.³⁶⁷ Charlton's 1893 offering, *Placing the Guns* (Royal Army Military College Sandhurst) depicting an incident from the Egyptian campaign, is as dynamic as Woodville's, though in this case the movement comes from the steep terrain down which the men, horses and guns struggle to negotiate a foothold. The overriding interest here derives from the two central soldiers, straining with tight reins to hold back four excited horses as, propelled by the weight of the carriage, they pour down the rocky incline. No enemy is visible and may well be some distance away, the subject matter affording Charlton the opportunity of displaying his skill in painting horses, rather than as any commentary on the war.

Woodville and his contemporaries were acutely aware that "Britishness" was all about what Linda Colley has described, as "public-schools, fox-hunting, a cult of military heroism and of a particular brand of manliness".³⁶⁸ They readily appreciated that

³⁶⁶ There are of course exceptions such as *The Night Charge of the 19th Hussars*.

³⁶⁷ This painting is undated, but was almost certainly painted in 1900 given that Carter refers to it as a "forceful piece of work and worthy of a place in these pages", Carter, 1900: 18.

³⁶⁸ Colley, 1994: 193.

going to war, John Bright's "gigantic system of outdoor relief for the aristocracy", just like engaging in sport, could be fun.³⁶⁹ More than that, they saw it as part of their function to perpetuate this view, for as Kestner has observed, the "role of the *male* artist qua *male*" (my italics) in this period was "fundamental to his contributing to the construction of masculinity".³⁷⁰ It had long been held in Britain that benefits to the "national character" were derived from the gentlemen's practice of

shunning the frivolous pursuits of the effeminate nobility of the continent, and following manly exercise in the fresh air [. . .] invigorating both their minds and their bodies, whilst their offspring, partaking these effects, grow up bold and vigorous, for the defence of their country, both by sea and land.³⁷¹

"Manly exercise" in this context referred to sporting activity, traditionally hunting and shooting, without which heroic, warlike endeavour was believed to be impossible. For General Wolseley "[t]he reputation of being a really good officer was then by common assent accorded to the man who brought the "manly" all round qualities of the English gentleman, of the English sportsman, to bear upon a sound knowledge of drill and a quick aptitude for its practice in the field".³⁷² Such were the attributes and aspirations nurtured in the public school system, particularly in the nineteenth century where headmasters, such as Edmund Warre at Eton, J.E.C. Weldon at Harrow and Hely Hutchinson Almond at Loretto, urged upon their pupils their duty of self-sacrifice and sense of moral superiority.³⁷³ By March 1880, *Blackwoods Magazine* had been reporting that the troops were "making the echoes ring with just such shouts as the

³⁶⁹ Summers, 1976: 108; this is still true today as evidenced by Hennessy's remark that war felt "natural" and "much fun", as if "they had turned up to the Arena on a big fight night", Hennessy, 2010: 179, 167.

³⁷⁰ Kestner, 1995: 39.

³⁷¹ Deuchar, 1988: 57, citing James Whyte in *History of the British Turf* (1840).

³⁷² Bond, 1972: 21. Wolseley was General Butler's commanding officer.

³⁷³ See Mangan, 1986: 113-39; Edward Thring of Uppingham School promoted the view that "the whole efforts of a school ought to be directed to making boys manly earnest and true", Newsome, 1961: 195.

playing fields of Harrow and Loretto know so well”.³⁷⁴ War was perceived as Homeric, sporting prowess the prerequisite and the sports field the parade ground, for just as team games, in this era of Social Darwinism with its alleged vindication of racial superiority, required courage, energy, perseverance and adherence to the rules, so indeed did combat in battle.³⁷⁵ Fox-hunting might be fun, but “man shooting is the finest sport of all” wrote Wolseley to his aunt, “the more you kill, the more you wish to kill”.³⁷⁶ “All other pleasures”, he wrote, “pale before the intense, the maddening delight of leading men into the midst of an enemy.”³⁷⁷ Baden-Powell, said to be a regular pig-sticker, agreed, rating “man-hunting” above football or indeed “any other game”.³⁷⁸ In April 1900, *The Spear* carried a vivid illustration of a British attack on Boer troops under the caption “[...] and the most excellent pig-sticking ensued for about ten minutes”, while Charlton produced a drawing entitled *O, Your Whelps Wanted Blooding*, translating his domestic hunting imagery into warlike scenes.³⁷⁹ “The characteristic act of men at war”, after all, “is not dying, it is killing” as Joanna Bourke reminds us.³⁸⁰ Learning to do just that “was part and parcel of a good education”, the tenets of which cascaded down through the classes to embrace and enhance the popular imagination and psyche through illustrated magazines, songs, literature, music halls and boys’ clubs.³⁸¹ The adventure of Britain’s “sporting wars” which could be played out like football across the plains of Africa was compelling and was no longer confined to the privileged.³⁸² It was a culture which had become embedded in the founding, growth and maintenance of the empire.³⁸³

³⁷⁴ *Blackwells Magazine*, March, 1880: 375-76.

³⁷⁵ Mangan, 1986: 120; Charles Darwin published *The Origin of Species* in 1859; see Mangan, 1986: 3.

³⁷⁶ Farwell, 1973: 76.

³⁷⁷ Langer, 1960: 89.

³⁷⁸ Attridge, 2003: 63.

³⁷⁹ Illustration by Ambrose Walton reproduced in Attridge, 2003: 105; Charlton’s drawing appears reproduced in Attridge, 2003: 126, fig.5:1.

³⁸⁰ Bourke, 1996: 1.

³⁸¹ Paris, 2000: 77.

³⁸² Langer, 1960: 82, quoting Bismarck.

³⁸³ Colley, 1994: 9.

Regardless of the emphasis on sport in nineteenth-century public schools, there remained a real fear that men were no longer masculine; that their distance from physical work had rendered them feeble and effeminate.³⁸⁴ Alarming, three out of every five recruits at the start of the Boer War had to be rejected as unfit for military service.³⁸⁵ Notwithstanding the move towards genteel masculinity highlighted by Trumbull and Copley, there remained a sense that the boundaries between male and female and heterosexual and homosexual were increasingly porous.³⁸⁶ Military paintings had the capacity to convey visually important cultural ideals surrounding the male body, especially in times of war.³⁸⁷ Thus messages of virility, honour, courage, fighting prowess and ability to bear pain effortlessly could be read from the (painless) works of many Boer War artists, and as with the popular literature and music of the time stimulated suitably military responses from Britain's youth.³⁸⁸ Professional soldiers may not have been deceived, as one Royal Army Medical Corps officer said at Ladysmith "My God! What a sight! I wish the politicians could see their handiwork", but this heartfelt reflection did not prevent young men from approaching war as a natural progression to their sporting endeavours.³⁸⁹

Nor did sport, in whatever form, appear as brutal as outright warfare, so while Kipling was condemning the British for their "bestial thirst for blood" on foreign soil, the rules of the game softened the effect back home, where the myth that Britain was not a military nation was still being perpetuated.³⁹⁰ Sport was seen as a force for social

³⁸⁴ Turner, 2011: 80.

³⁸⁵ Searle, 2004: 305, citing journalist Arnold White.

³⁸⁶ Stephenson, 2000: 134. See above at p.80.

³⁸⁷ Ray, 2012: 25.

³⁸⁸ The 1899 magazine of Pocklington School, *The Pocklingtonian*, records that "Mr Davies sang the new patriotic song, "Brothers-in-Arms" so well, that but for a group of masters clustered round the door, the whole school would doubtless have rushed out to enlist."

³⁸⁹ Hewison, 1989: 99.

³⁹⁰ Kipling, *The Light that Failed*, quoted in Paris, 2000: 48; see also Paris, 2000: 78.

change.³⁹¹ Children of all ages were encouraged to follow the pursuit by engaging in board games such as *With "Our Bobs" to Pretoria* (fig.49), where a list of the rules was followed by the patriotic exhortation "*God Save the Queen*".³⁹² The ruthless undercurrent that Britain had "largely defined itself by fighting" was subsumed by the "rightness" of the imperial cause.³⁹³ Between engagements, as in the Crimea, sport continued to be the leisure activity of choice among the troops, as if "dodging Boer shells did not afford sufficient exercise" and both officers and men participated in "polo and other athletic games".³⁹⁴ Nevertheless, the warlike intent was ever present as the refrain: "[b]y War, red War, the lands we won, we'll hold" makes clear.³⁹⁵ Even Butler's pacifist brother-in-law Wilfrid Meynell, wrote that "[s]port and battle have each a share in the aspiration, gravity and happiness of a worthy fight as an Englishman understands it".³⁹⁶

Press and Propaganda

"YOU FURNISH PAPERS. I WILL FURNISH WAR", wrote the American newspaper owner, William Hearst to his artist Remington in 1898, for "nothing sold papers like a good war", especially when accompanied by copious illustrations.³⁹⁷ This was equally true of the British public which by now was a literate and "newspaperised people".³⁹⁸ The fact that imaginative reconstructions of engagements appeared in the press gave them the stamp of authenticity, even with

³⁹¹ Watson, Weir and Friend, 2005: u/p [2-8].

³⁹² British Library: 1865.c.2; *Boer or Briton-A New War Game* also became available in 1900.

³⁹³ Colley, 1994: 9.

³⁹⁴ Burleigh, 1900: 223, 225; Wollen commented in 1900 that "the all prevailing sand was a hindrance to good play, as often a man would miss his kick owing to the clouds of dust kicked up", Wollen, 1900: 115; Burleigh commented that "the programme was as varied and interesting as that of the Royal Tournament, Islington"; see also Cunningham, 1981: 26 quoting a London Cyclist Volunteer who opined they "call it patriotism, but I think it is principally a desire for sport".

³⁹⁵ Mangan, 1986: 124, citing *The Fettesian*.

³⁹⁶ Springhall, 1986: 64.

³⁹⁷ Johnson, 1978: 6, 163.

³⁹⁸ Stearn, 1986:139, citing William Russell.

the general lack of first-hand knowledge of the scenes the artists were dramatically working up, and in a manner over which the original “Special” had no control.

Victorian periodicals had for some time devoted a great deal of space to the subject of artistic representation and at the start of the war, as part of a propaganda exercise, articles were written exhorting battle artists to respond to the challenge by producing uplifting works of art.³⁹⁹ War, it was felt, readily lent itself to the perception that art as a medium was able to transcend barriers of class with an immediacy not so available to the written word.⁴⁰⁰ By this, the periodicals had in mind a more positive approach to the conflict. Paintings in the manner of Butler’s *Balaclava* (1876) and *The Remnants of an Army*, (1879) once heralded by *Punch* as “the picture of the year”, with their emphasis on heroic failure were now criticised for being evasive in character and were no longer favoured.⁴⁰¹ Nor were the urgings of the Peace party to be taken seriously, for “[p]reachings on canvas against the strife of battle have always been in vain, and a gallery of pictures by Delacroix will not prevent a people rushing into war”.⁴⁰² According to Carter in the *Art Annual* of 1900, the conflict in South Africa revealed “the fierce naked light of war” in which there was “[n]o question of ‘art for art’s sake’”, for war was serious business.⁴⁰³ Instead artists were expected to reinforce the concept of manliness through the portrayal of war heroes, for art, alongside literature, had become a vehicle for enhancing the late-nineteenth-century male, just as the country was waking up to the idea that Britain might indeed be a military nation.⁴⁰⁴ Extolling the “indomitable coolness” of the British infantrymen as portrayed by Woodville, Carter’s conclusion to his work, notwithstanding the high rejection rate of would-be recruits, was that “[n]o one can look

³⁹⁹ Roberts, 1982: 80.

⁴⁰⁰ Brockington, 2010: 6.

⁴⁰¹ *Punch*, 24 May 1879: 229; Hichberger, 1988: 115-16.

⁴⁰² Carter, 1900: 30.

⁴⁰³ Carter, 1900: 1.

⁴⁰⁴ Mangan, 1987: 14.

through the drawings and sketches in this Annual without feeling that the fighting stock of the nation has suffered no deterioration".⁴⁰⁵

When disaster followed disaster, newspaper editorials initially viewed them as temporary, pronouncing as late as Christmas 1901 that "[w]e shall all come right in the end, never fear".⁴⁰⁶ Attention was diverted from a growing public anxiety as to Britain's decline in world domination by laying great emphasis on positive aspects, such as the apparent willingness of the dominions to come to the assistance of the "mother" country.⁴⁰⁷ At the same time, the British government received preferential treatment from the South African branch of Reuters influential press agency, so much so that it virtually "became an agent of imperial publicity".⁴⁰⁸ Similarly, artists took pains to avoid disasters unless they were able to highlight valiant behaviour, and instead looked for incidents which showed small victories, or manoeuvres with no danger to British troops. Charlton's earlier painting, *Placing the Guns* representing a routine military manoeuvre, was followed by his more patriotic, *Routed: Boers Retreating* (fig.50) in 1900 which, typically, illustrates his skill in depicting horses, as the Boers surge chaotically forward. Here was something to applaud as the nearest mounted Boer is seen turning round anxiously in his saddle to watch his pursuers, while several others are whipping their mounts in desperation to reach safety. To the right of the main figure, a white, riderless horse indicates the success of the British attack. When exhibited at the Royal Academy, Charlton was praised by the critics in the art press for his topicality, with the commentary that the Boers were "past masters in the art of making off in time to save their bacon".⁴⁰⁹ It certainly made good propaganda material at a time when every little achievement in South Africa was hailed as a victorious success. As Hichberger comments,

⁴⁰⁵ Carter, 1900: 25.

⁴⁰⁶ *Punch*, 25 December, 1901: 459.

⁴⁰⁷ Beaumont, 2000: 75.

⁴⁰⁸ Nalbach, 2003: 77; Reuters' general manager was replaced in November 1899 when it was feared he was too sympathetic to the Boers.

⁴⁰⁹ Harrington, 1993: 277.

this type of painting heralded a shift from the emphasis on the purely moral qualities of the British to a more aggressive attitude, designed to achieve success and which required no justification.⁴¹⁰

By Spring 1900, however, in some quarters of the press, enthusiasm for the war was already beginning to pall. The Boers had not received their promised “licking”; instead William Burdett-Coutts for *The Times* was sending in reports of the awful reality of war in terms which mirrored Russell’s before Sebastopol in the winter of 1855.⁴¹¹ The terrible events of “Black Week” in December 1899 had already caused many to question both the purpose and the handling of the war and with the facts of the campaign becoming increasingly apparent, the press became less vocal, *The Times* offering support to the government only if it “would get on with winning the war”.⁴¹² Similarly, whereas at the outset battle painters had been called upon to present the war in suitably positive terms, after Black Week, with its succession of disasters, it was difficult to find any topical subjects which did not reflect catastrophe.⁴¹³

By 1902, the critic of the *Art Journal* was firmly of the view that as for “the war, whether in actuality, in journalism, or in picture, we have had enough-enough, that is, save in the domain of great accomplishment. The war pictures, pure and simple, are almost a negligible quantity at the Academy.”⁴¹⁴ Those few which were reviewed included *The Victory of Paardeberg* (1902) (private collection) by J. Prinsep Beadle (1863-1947), highlighting “an incident associated with the first noteworthy triumph of British arms in South Africa” where the Boers had “succumbed to the inevitable”,

⁴¹⁰ Hichberger, 1988: 117.

⁴¹¹ Searle, 2004: 280.

⁴¹² Beaumont, 2000: 76. *The Times* carried no report on Emily Hobhouse’s findings and commended farm burnings as it was believed they would shorten the war, Beaumont, 2000: 79.

⁴¹³ Hichberger, 1988: 116, where she writes that there were no paintings exhibited after December 1899 which represented disaster, but this ignores those paintings already discussed of ‘The Last Stand’ genre.

⁴¹⁴ *Art Journal*, 1902: 206.

Victoria Cross by Wollen and *The Morning* (1902) (Bushey Museum and Art Gallery) by Lucy Kemp-Welch (1869-1958), a somewhat sentimental study of a horse by his dead rider, reminiscent of Barker's Crimean painting of Captain Nolan.

This war-weariness may go some way to explain the extreme paucity of pictures showing bad behaviour by the British, notwithstanding the awful conditions in concentration camps. Exceptionally, Woodville did produce one illustration entitled *Burning the Farm of a Treacherous Burgher* (fig.51) after a sketch by Prior, which shows an armed British soldier confronting a Boer woman against a background of flames.⁴¹⁵ In spite of this much condemned practice, Woodville was keen to justify the policy of farm burning by using the image to reflect badly on so-called devious actions by the Boers as the title indicates. Thus, while the soldiers, relying on the white flag fluttering in the background, are confronted by a solitary woman, she is in defiant mode, with fist raised. In direct contrast the lead soldier has dismounted and carries his rifle harmlessly by his side, though he tacitly ignores the plumes of black smoke issuing from the rear of the farmhouse. In *With the Flag to Pretoria* this drawing is renamed *A Painful Duty*, with the accompanying caption

In the earlier part of the campaign in the Orange Free State, great leniency was shown to the Boers, even when they treacherously fired from houses flying the white flag. This dishonourable practice, however, became so prevalent that sterner measures were forced upon the British generals, and the order was given that houses used for such dastardly purposes should be burnt and their contents confiscated.⁴¹⁶

When reproduced in Attridge in 2003, the same print bears the title, *British Troops Committing Atrocities Abroad*.⁴¹⁷ Generally, however, it was left to Boer and amateur British photography to reproduce more faithfully some of the more terrible events on the ground, supported by reports from Emily Hobhouse on the conditions of

⁴¹⁵ This is reproduced in Creswicke, 1901: 128.

⁴¹⁶ Wilson, 1901: 582.

⁴¹⁷ Attridge, 2003: 93 (figure 4.1).

women and children reproduced in the *Manchester Guardian*. Unusually *Punch* cartoonists appear to have ignored such atrocities completely, restricting their criticisms to the Government's prevarication and blundering.⁴¹⁸

The Pro-Boers

During this period Butler carried on painting "through thick and thin", although it was not until after the war in 1903 that she exhibited any oil paintings on a Boer War theme.⁴¹⁹ As she herself commented in her autobiography, she liked her themes to "mature" and generally rejected the impulse shown by Woodville for topicality.⁴²⁰ *Within Sound of the Guns* (fig.52) shows a solitary dispatch rider to the front of the canvas, dramatically pursued by Boer marksmen, and who, although not engaged in face to face fighting, is clearly in danger, as his expression and body language show and there is some suggestion that this image of a solo rider was inspired by General Butler's isolated position following his forced resignation in South Africa.⁴²¹ Butler records that her painting was "admirably placed this time at Burlington House" and, having experienced the light in South Africa for herself, she expresses her satisfaction in her great improvement of tone.⁴²² Certainly in her depiction of the extremely rocky terrain, Butler's palette moves from warm reds for the sharper stones at the extreme left of the painting to a softer, smoother, greyer, landscape as the ground rises to the level of the scout. The path the rider follows is narrow, rocky and dusty, the pale dust kicked up by the horse merging into the background of

⁴¹⁸ See, for example the cartoon headed *To be well shaken*, where John Bull is seen shaking a sleeping Lord Salisbury, saying "Look here! Wake up! I want this war over. You tell me what more I can do and I'll do it." *Punch*, 2 October, 1901: 245. *The Times* blamed poor Boer hygiene for widespread disease in the camps and the *Daily Mail* held pro-Boers responsible for allowing the war to drag on so long, Beaumont, 2000: 72.

⁴¹⁹ Butler, 1993: 219.

⁴²⁰ Butler, 1993: 146.

⁴²¹ *Irish Arts Review*, winter 2013-14: 123.

⁴²² Butler, 1993: 238.

smooth domed hills, dwarfed in turn by a high peaked pale blueish mountain, dissolving into the sky. Immediately to the rear of the scout is a second, nearer, flat topped mountain sloping down to the left of the canvas, where its sharp ridge catches the peachy dawn sunlight against the blue and white shades of the sky. The summit resembles a volcano from which soft clouds billow up, ranging from white, white with a touch of yellow, taupe, grey, pinky taupe and finally dark grey off to the top right hand corner of the canvas, providing an effective foil for the scout, silhouetted against a light, but subtly warm-toned backdrop. It is almost as if Butler, by concentrating on her colour and tone, has deliberately avoided her earlier social commentary on war.

Butler's *Yeomanry Scouts on the Veldt* (1903) (fig.53) recreates the vastness of the countryside and illustrates the difficulties of this type of guerilla warfare where mounted infantry can travel miles without sight of their opponents. Here, the Boers can be seen in the distance as the British troops wheel round ready for the chase. Although the men are wearing khaki, the colouring is subtle, with warm orange-brown and green scrubland broken up by soft grey rocks and an interesting ripple effect as the men pass over the water. The figure on the extreme left pointing out the Boers is slightly unfocussed in the strong light, and prefigures the shimmering photographic effects of David Lean's 1962 desert-based film *Lawrence of Arabia*. Set against a large sky with cumulus clouds tinged with pink, grey and brown fading into a radiant white to the left of the canvas, this painting has a warmth of tone absent from the cruder paintings of Woodville and Giles, a painting where Butler privileges her palette over dramatic interest and where she continues to construct her paintings meticulously, taking care to ensure they meet her artistic standards, and they show none of the looser, hastier paintings of Woodville in particular.

Neither painting displays any anti-war imagery, nor do they adopt the “death and glory” style which had become popular with Butler’s contemporaries. Where these paintings differ from her earlier work is in the subject matter. Instead of showing the devastating effect after a military encounter, such as in *Balaclava*, she treads a very narrow line between patriotism and conflict, confining her artistic output to safe, uncontroversial subject matters where the psychological drama or urgency of her earlier works is absent or muted, a point picked up by the *Art Journal* critic who commented of the first of these paintings that “Lady Butler scarcely keeps up her reputation”.⁴²³ In *Yeomanry Scouts on the Veldt* it is impossible to see the emotional effect of the chase, while in *Within Sound of the Guns*, although there is evident tension on the scout’s face, it indicates tremor rather than trauma.

I suggest that much of the reason for this change in approach was attributable rather to Butler’s personal difficulties in reconciling her patriotic love of her country with her home circumstances, than to any change in belief.⁴²⁴ Not only was her sister firmly situated within the peace lobby, but Butler’s husband was said to be “the best abused man” in the country for his non-militaristic stance in South Africa.⁴²⁵ William Butler had already made his views on artistic subjects clear to his wife, such as in his comment on her painting *The Defence of Rorke’s Drift*, showing actual conflict, warning her that “one more picture like this and you will drive me mad”, and is believed to have influenced her choice of subject-matter on several occasions.⁴²⁶ He

⁴²³ *Art Journal*, 1903: 175.

⁴²⁴ She refers to her “consuming zeal” for painting during this period, Butler, 1993: 219.

⁴²⁵ Butler, 1911: 456. For further reading on General Butler see McCourt, 1967.

⁴²⁶ Kestner, 1995: 199, 208. William Butler clearly disapproved of Butler’s 1885 painting *After the Battle-Tel-el-Kebir* as he believed that the victory in which he was personally involved had been overwhelmingly one-sided and that “it gave the God Jingo a new start”. Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 87-88; Butler is said to have subsequently destroyed this painting. William Butler wrote his essay *A Plea for the Peasant*, criticising the British army’s practice of forced recruitment in Ireland in 1879 and it was believed to be under her husband’s influence that Butler painted her Irish themed pictures, *Evicted* (1880) and, in the year of her marriage,

was certainly a man of very strong views, and although he would not have classified himself as part of the peace campaign, his lifelong belief in the right of a free people to regulate their own affairs led him into direct conflict with Alfred Milner, Governor-General at the Cape, almost immediately after his appointment as Commander-in-Chief.⁴²⁷ Even before this, he had made no secret of his views, when he wrote in 1880 of the “manifest injustice” following the Zulu war.⁴²⁸ Once in South Africa he made it clear that war against the Boers was unnecessary and that in any event, the British army at the Cape was undermanned. Writing to Chamberlain in June 1899, Milner, who favoured war, describes “[t]he General. He is too awful” and within days he was reporting that Butler “is unfortunately quite out of sympathy with my policy” and that “cordial cooperation between us is impossible”.⁴²⁹ Butler resigned his post in August 1899 and returned to Britain, a convenient scapegoat, and as an army officer, denied the right of reply. His wife writes in melancholy mood in her autobiography of this “dark period” in their lives, “brought about by the malice of those in power there and at home”.⁴³⁰

By November 1899, the *Daily Mail* was writing that “[a]ll the world knows that Sir William showed himself-to be a pro-Boer”, while Alice Meynell writes that “insults reach poor William by post-

Listed for the *Connaught Rangers*, (1877) Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 72.

⁴²⁷ General Butler’s commanding officer, Wolseley commented that had Butler “lived in mediaeval times, he would have been the knight errant of everyone in distress”. Leslie, 51: 97. Butler’s daughter, Eileen, records that her father “set his face inflexibly against the party that was working for war” in South Africa, Gormanston, 1953: 31.

⁴²⁸ Kestner, 1995: 198-99.

⁴²⁹ Headlam, 1931: 425, 445; Milner’s diary entry for 24 June 1899 records “Butler or I will have to go.” Headlam, 1931: 510; Arthur Balfour refused to publish correspondence between Butler and the War Office, HHG, T.E.Weller’s scrapbook: 41 and it was later revealed at the public inquiry that certain pages of correspondence had been removed, R.C.Cmnd 1791: 13424.

⁴³⁰ Butler, 1993: 217. He was warned against travelling to greet the Queen in Bristol for fear of reprisals.

accusations of accepting bribes from Kruger”.⁴³¹ Interestingly, *Punch*, while failing to highlight British atrocities, similarly failed to caricature Butler, somewhat surprisingly restricting itself to the odd comment on the Pro-Boers towards the end of the war.⁴³² In spite of his subsequent vindication in the Royal Commission on the War in South Africa, it was Elizabeth Butler’s view that her husband never really recovered from the injustice he felt he had suffered, and one which she, as an intensely loyal wife, shared. I suggest that any attempt by her to produce paintings with an anti-war theme would have only compounded the widespread view that both she and her husband were pro-Boer and unpatriotic and that it was too risky for her to attempt. In that sense, her relationship became “more oppositional, less comfortable and easy with the assumptions and protocols which the institutions” she had previously worked within “existed to perpetuate”.⁴³³ Her response was to both restrict her output and to keep a low profile. It is interesting to speculate what, without such marital constraints, she would have produced during this period.⁴³⁴

At the outset of the war, it had not been easy to raise a voice in opposition to military action, and the press had enjoyed a great deal of success in its campaign to discredit the so-called “pro-Boers”. In fact, this term was something of a misnomer, as many falling within this group were not in favour of the Boers as such; rather, they were simply anti-war.⁴³⁵ They comprised a markedly disparate group of individuals and societies, with no effective leadership, but with that

⁴³¹ Cited in McCourt, 1967: 232; Meynell, 1929: 166; Davey records how he was told by Patrick Butler how his father was ridiculed in music hall shows of *What the Butler Saw*, Davey, 1978: 53 (f/n).

⁴³² See for example *Punch*, 11 December 1901: 425.

⁴³³ Peters Corbett and Perry, 2000: 8.

⁴³⁴ See Usherwood who attributes her decline to her marriage which “brought in its train the duties of child-rearing [. . .] and the requirement to travel to distant parts of the globe”, alongside the influence of her husband in her choice of subjects, Usherwood, 2004: 132.

⁴³⁵ Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, a friend of Alice and Wilfrid Meynell, expressed the view that as between the two great white thieves”, his sympathies were with the Boers, Finch, 1938: 304.

one thought in common and came generally, but not exclusively, from a liberal or pacifist intelligentsia background.⁴³⁶ The term “pro-Boer” was, I suggest, chosen deliberately for its emotive quality and became more derogatory than “pro-German” in either World War One or World War Two.⁴³⁷ Once adopted, it soon became a vehicle with which to castigate all those regarded as unpatriotic and to link them with the alleged bad behaviour of the Boers, so much so, that any expression of anti-war sentiment could place the author in physical danger.⁴³⁸ Several artists living in Britain at the time, including James McNeill Whistler (1834-1903) and Walter Crane (1845-1915), were actively pro-Boer, some creating startling pacifist images as Jo Briggs has demonstrated, while others felt obliged to keep a low profile on their trips abroad.⁴³⁹ Albert Rothenstein (1881-1953), for example, wrote to his parents from Amsterdam that “[p]atriotic feeling for the Boers runs very high here”, describing an evening at the opera, when clowns dressed up as Chamberlain and Kruger to the respective boos and cheers of the audience.⁴⁴⁰ In the month before the war, a peace rally in Trafalgar Square, later ironically referred to as “*The Battle of Trafalgar*”, had been disrupted by bricks and rotten fruit following publicised allegations from the press of treason, and it was not until June 1901 that, according to H.W.Nevinson, it was possible for supporters to “go to a pro-Boer meeting with [their] best trousers on”.⁴⁴¹ When it came to the 1900 “Khaki Election”, even in the face of obvious military setbacks, the government won on Chamberlain’s blatantly propagandist slogan that “[e]very vote given against the Government

⁴³⁶ As Dunae notes, the Baptists were the only religious organisation to oppose the war systematically.

⁴³⁷ Lowry, 2000: 3.

⁴³⁸ See for example the account in the *Friend*, 1 June 1900, vol. XL, No 22: 337. While not all Quakers were anti-war at that time, many did stand in personal danger and there are several accounts of meetings being violently broken up, Hewison, 1989: 116-17.

⁴³⁹ Briggs, 2007: 18 onwards; C.R.W.Nevinson also writes of the backlash he suffered as a child as a result of his father’s pro-Boer stance, Nevinson, 1937: 4.

⁴⁴⁰ Brockington, 2009: 316-17 who notes that Whistler was seen to be so aggressively pro-Boer that his friends feared for his safety.

⁴⁴¹ Hewison, 1989: 117; Laity, 2001: 153, 165, quoting a diary entry for H.W. Nevinson.

is a vote given to the Boers”, and voters were exhorted to choose between the Queen or President Kruger.⁴⁴²

While Woodville and most other war artists continued to promote a patriotic view of the conflict, several poets fell into the pro-Boer camp and between them produced some of the most interesting and thoughtful poetry of the period. William Watson (1858-1935) and Thomas Hardy (1840-1928) both wrote a series of critical verse, warning of the dangers of imperial ambition, while Crosland’s powerful poem *Slain* clearly anticipates the later work of Wilfred Owen.⁴⁴³ Some may have been influenced by Stephen Crane’s anti-war novel, *The Red Badge of Courage*, published after the American Civil War, whose hero subverts the romantic ideal of a soldier in a parody of war fiction.⁴⁴⁴ As the war progressed, Kipling, too, changed his outlook to the point where he came not only to apologise for failure in South Africa, but also to doubt Britain’s imperial mission in his poem *The Lesson*.⁴⁴⁵ The tone of poets, and journalists alike began to reflect the recognition of a shift in world power which laid the foundations for a more vociferous pacifist campaign in the period leading up to 1914, a movement this group of military artists was a little slower to follow.⁴⁴⁶

What can be said for these late-Victorian battle artists is that although they failed to comment critically on the progress of the war in South Africa, they were part of “a shared and developing response” to a fin-de-siècle cultural situation for which they strove to provide a new visual language.⁴⁴⁷ I suggest that the then peculiar combination of military circumstances and national anxieties led to a less psychologically insightful representation of the soldier than in Butler’s paintings of the Crimean War, but of the individual soldier

⁴⁴² Schneer, 1999: 229.

⁴⁴³ See Wyk Smith, 1978: 113 for the poem in full.

⁴⁴⁴ Pizer, 1994: 161.

⁴⁴⁵ Attridge, 2003: 88-89.

⁴⁴⁶ Brockington, 2010: 7.

⁴⁴⁷ Peters-Corbett, 2004: 16.

nevertheless, though an individual who does not evoke sympathy. Instead, he epitomises the spirit of manly adventure as he takes on the world, anticipating the wartime heroes of, in particular, the Second World War (1939-45) which, notably in films, continue to be promulgated into the twenty-first century. Whilst the artistic representations of the Boer War may, to a modern audience, smack of the taint of the adventure story, I argue that the approach of these artists fulfilled a useful transitional purpose insofar as it allowed for just that necessary element of self-delusion at the end of an era when the empire was on the verge of disintegration. The Boer War was a shock to the country, and as Britain moved forward into the twentieth century seeking to make sense of its position in the world, these images provided that small amount of reassurance which allowed for a breathing-space between self-delusion and reality at a time of national, but largely subliminal anxiety.

CHAPTER THREE

RELINQUISHING SCARLET

Alongside the artistic challenges presented by this new guerilla type of warfare, Woodville and his contemporaries had far more than an invisible enemy to deal with in the execution of their paintings. The Boers may have been dressed in dull, dark colours and for the most part hidden in trenches or behind trees, but the British soldier, too, was no longer to be seen on the field in his bright scarlet uniform. Following the disasters of the Zulu wars in the 1870s scarlet had been replaced by workaday khaki, with the more vibrant colours reserved exclusively for display. Military artists could no longer rely on the magnificent trappings of a Victorian war to enhance their paintings. Hussars, stripped of their elaborately distinctive pélasses were now virtually indistinguishable from lancers without their shakos, whilst infantry appeared to merge into cavalry.⁴⁴⁸ Although some critics, including the Royal Academy, welcomed the move away from scarlet, observing in 1880 that

[w]e have heard more than once of the impossibility of finding a satisfactory presentment of the scarlet coat of the British soldier, and it must, indeed, be allowed that the subject has been the occasion of much disastrous failure,⁴⁴⁹

most queried whether it was possible for khaki to “lend itself to the treatment of the brush” when the “varied hues of all the uniforms will be changed for one garb, worn alike by all forces from all parts of the Empire”.⁴⁵⁰ A new way of conveying the sense of battle was required, one that relied more on dynamic action, as in *Saving the Guns at Maiwand*, monumentality, as in *All That Was Left of Them*

⁴⁴⁸ Pélasses were the short swagger coats worn from one shoulder by the hussars in the nineteenth century and shakos, the tall hats of the lancers.

⁴⁴⁹ Harrington, 1993: 192 citing *The Academy*, 20 May 1880.

⁴⁵⁰ Harrington, 1993: 276. In fact, when khaki was first introduced it was anything but uniform, one commentator remarking that although at the Siege of Delhi almost all the troops were in khaki “it was of so many different shades-puce colour, slate colour, drab, etc.-that a delightful variety was exhibited”, Abler, 1999: 117.

or psychological intensity as previously used by Butler in the *Roll Call*.

At the same time photography, both amateur and professional, was on the increase. In the latter half of the nineteenth century, the Victorian public had become fascinated by this new technology, keeping abreast of the many developments.⁴⁵¹ Kodak box cameras were available for the amateur photographer from the 1880s, culminating in the popular “Brownie” in 1900, just in time for use by many of the troops in South Africa.⁴⁵² Photography was becoming a “democratic art”.⁴⁵³ A contemporary *Punch* cartoon shows a young lady handing her fiancé a camera with the injunction to send “a good view of a nice battle”, adding that if he could take a shot “just at the moment of victory, I should like it all the better”.⁴⁵⁴ The “Biograph”, or moving newsreel, a modern panorama, was introduced in 1895, promising timely reportage of contemporaneous events.⁴⁵⁵ Even more significantly for the news from South Africa, William Dickson had founded his British Biograph company in 1897 and was able to record his account of filming in the war in the first book ever published by a film cameraman, even though it was still not technically possible to film battle-scenes in action.⁴⁵⁶ These were left for re-enaction by theatres, music halls and fairgrounds.⁴⁵⁷ The military authorities, too, were becoming interested in using the camera for topographical purposes reconnaissance and checking on equipment, so as war broke out, the stage looked set for a comprehensive photographic record. Battles could no longer be

⁴⁵¹ Ruskin had experimented with daguerrotypes and believed photography to be a miraculous invention, though not capable of capturing a real likeness in nature.

⁴⁵² Lee, 1985: 6-10; as evidence of its popularity nearly 150,000 “Brownies” were sold outside America between 1900 and 1902.

⁴⁵³ Hodgson, 1974: 12; Gervais, 2010: 375.

⁴⁵⁴ Hodgson, 1974: 11.

⁴⁵⁵ Lee, 1985: 6.

⁴⁵⁶ Dickson, 1995: vi.

⁴⁵⁷ Thompson, 2002: 103; see the entertainment on offer at the Free Trade Hall, Manchester under the title ‘*The War Boerograph-Life Motioned Pictures. Actual Battle Scenes Taken under Fire*’. Harrington, 1993: 294. One theatre proprietor added drama to the scenes by firing blank cartridges.

represented by a single view and were more accurately understood through a sequence of images, and as Thierry Gervais has noted, the order on a page of such images “conferred the status of war spectator on the reader and emphasized its ongoing process” much as in a film.⁴⁵⁸ “The demand for slides connected with the war in South Africa is growing apace” wrote G.R.Baker in the *British Journal of Photography* in December 1899, urging photographers to publish their work “for the martial spirit of the country is aroused”.⁴⁵⁹

Focussing on the aesthetics of khaki and the depiction of military uniform, this chapter examines the effect of these changes on the works of Woodville and his contemporaries, how they responded to them by focussing on the dramatic or the monumental and how such changes were perceived by art critics and the general public. It considers how contrast was used wherever possible, for example in the presentation of the Sudanese in Woodville’s *The Charge of the 21st Lancers at Omdurman* as a foil to the heroism of the drably clad British soldier, and how, in turn, khaki became increasingly fashionable amongst civilian and military personnel. Against this is set an exploration of the effectiveness of photography alongside difficulties encountered in the field in terms of the natural conditions, the ubiquitous khaki sand, and the censorship imposed by Lord Kitchener which prevented many a photograph reaching Britain. While some artists felt that photography would replace their work, especially for the press, others believed that the pencil would always prevail. It is significant that more than a century later, Jules George, a war artist working in Afghanistan in 2004, echoed these sentiments, comparing the essentially ephemeral rolling footage of news, photographs and film unfavourably to the “more meditative quality” of paintings hanging in the relaxed atmosphere of a gallery “where you can really ponder what’s going on”.⁴⁶⁰

⁴⁵⁸ Gervais, 2010: 378-81.

⁴⁵⁹ Hodgson, 1974: 28.

⁴⁶⁰ George in discussion with Jenny Alexander, Assistant Curator of Fine Art, York Art Gallery on 28 July 2011.

*Gentlemen in Khaki: “a Richer Dust”*⁴⁶¹

I remember the time when I liked a red coat myself very well-and indeed so I do still at heart; and if a smart young colonel, with five or six thousand a year should want one of my girls, I shall not say nay to him, and I thought Colonel Forster looked very becoming the other night at Sir William’s in his regimentals.⁴⁶²

A constant challenge for the battle painter had always been the accurate representation of military uniform, not only in terms of the correct braiding and accoutrements, but also in respect of an accurate representation of the colour. The frisson which accompanied European armies into battle in the first half of the nineteenth century was undoubtedly enhanced by the shimmering glamour of their colourful uniforms. When visiting Paris in 1874 Butler talks of “the Empire of my childhood, with its endless variety of uniforms, its buglings, and drummings, and trumpeting, its *chic* and glitter and swagger”.⁴⁶³ On her return, she found the red coats of the British army both magnificent and “very trying” to reproduce, sometimes appearing “blackish-purple here, pale salmon colour there”, according to the changing light, ageing process and weather conditions.⁴⁶⁴ She was not the only voice to express trepidation as to the effectiveness of representing military scarlet. Detaille had told Butler that the French did not paint the British army, although he would like to, because “the red frightens us”.⁴⁶⁵ Writing in 1898, Robert de la Sizeranne commented adversely on the “violent” colours used by English painters, in particular, “the raw-red of the soldiers’ uniforms, the flaunting red of the letter-boxes, the vinous

⁴⁶¹ *The Soldier* by Rupert Brooke.

⁴⁶² Austen, 1972: 76.

⁴⁶³ Butler, 1993: 103.

⁴⁶⁴ Butler, 1993: 103.

⁴⁶⁵ Butler, 1993: 206; in the event, De Neuville did paint the British Army in their scarlet uniforms, as evidenced by his exhibit for the 1915 Guildhall Art exhibition, *Tel-el-Kebir*.

red of the shoe-blacks, the sealing-wax red of parasols and omnibus advertisements”.⁴⁶⁶

By the time of this comment the army had already turned to khaki, firstly in India, before its use became more widespread towards the end of the century with General Wolseley’s positive endorsement that “soldiers should not be clothed in tissues of glaring colour visible at great distances, and which furnish to the enemy convenient targets”.⁴⁶⁷ Though in some quarters, camouflage was regarded as unsportsmanlike and shameful, khaki was now the preferred choice for the professionals, the working soldiers whose lives were at stake.⁴⁶⁸ As weapons were becoming more effective and long range, the ability to keep out of sight of the enemy was an increasingly pressing requirement.⁴⁶⁹ What clearly made operational sense, however, brought with it new and particular visual challenges for the artist.

Initially a by-product of Indian colonial rule, whence it derived its name from the Persian word for dust, khaki was being used in conflicts against other subjects of the Empire in South Africa, emphasising the tension between imperial power and visual culture.⁴⁷⁰ By the end of the century it had become recognised as a permanent feature of British society as evidenced by the so-called “Khaki Election” of 1900 and John Burns’ condemnation of the government’s warlike stance as “khaki clad, khaki mad and khaki bad”.⁴⁷¹ One retailer even offered “khaki crackers”, the “most

⁴⁶⁶ Cited by Peters-Corbett, 2004: 33; Sizeranne attributes this in part to the effect of fog on the artists’ sensibilities which in turn acted as a foil to accentuate the brightness of the palette.

⁴⁶⁷ Moriarty, 2011: 306.

⁴⁶⁸ Lee, 1985: 30; Abler, 1999: 120, who cites Hills in reporting that ‘the new-fangled uniform positively drove the men of one regiment to drink’, so much so, that they refused to leave the barracks for shame at their appearance.

⁴⁶⁹ See Moriarty, 2011: 307.

⁴⁷⁰ Early experimentation in khaki cloth included the use of cow dung, Moriarty, 20: 307 and curry powder, Abler, 1999: 118; see also Bailkin, 2005: 197-216 for a fuller analysis of issues of colour and Empire; Barthes, 2000: 30.

⁴⁷¹ Searle, 2004: 287; *ILN*, 11 May 1901.

popular novelty of the season”, for sale at Christmas as a testament to the commodification of the new fashion.⁴⁷² Khaki uniforms with their military associations proved to have the capacity to turn young girls’ heads and had in their own way become alluring in what Catherine Moriarty has referred to as “khaki’s poetics”.⁴⁷³ Soldiers’ uniforms, however challenging for artists, were now an issue which had to be addressed. In 1902 the *Illustrated London News* was praising Bacon for showing “artistic bravery in the face of khaki which no military bravery of the enemy could surpass” in his Royal Academy entry *Your Sovereign, the Empire, this Imperial City are Satisfied* (Guildhall Art Gallery), which shows the return of the City Imperial Volunteers “in full strength” where the “upturned faces-in great concourse-are treated with as much variety as if everyone was a portrait”.⁴⁷⁴

The khaki of the Boer War was the khaki of sand and dust, that particular hue which adapted well to the conditions encountered by the army in the hot, dry climate of the South African Veldt. A dusty sand was everywhere in this theatre of war; it was both insignificant and chameleon-like, at times engulfing, absorbing, signalling danger to the lost scout or solitary survivor, at others supporting, moulding itself sculpturally around the bodies of the men as they burrowed down into it for comfort and security. It could blow fiercely, blindingly, into their faces, under their eyelids, into their ears, nostrils and hair or, when wet, cling heavily to their legs as they crossed rivers and lakes in an eerie forecast of the muddy trenches on the Western Front. Sand was infinitely mobile, both ephemeral and solid, as it made its way into all the soldiers’ bodily orifices, as they ingested its fine particles with their food and inhaled it with their breath. It seeped into their very pores and was expelled with their sweat, coating their skins with its dusty, khaki, film. Paradoxically,

⁴⁷² Thompson, 2002: 101.

⁴⁷³ Woollacott, 1994: 325-47; Moriarty, 2010: 305.

⁴⁷⁴ *ILN*, 17 May 1902. This painting is also known as *The City Imperial Volunteers in the Guildhall, London, 1900*.

as Kate Flint has demonstrated, dust was simultaneously indispensable and problematic; it was both destructive, clogging up the mechanism of firearms and photographic equipment, and preservative, as evidenced by archaeological remains.⁴⁷⁵ What seemed initially of little consequence was in fact the reverse, for, in short, it was the backdrop to their every living activity, and in death it buried them. It resonated with the biblical prophecy, “for dust though *art* and unto dust shalt thou return” for the “Lord God formed the man from the dust of the ground”; dust was the basic substance of humanity, and, as such, was shared equally by officers and men.⁴⁷⁶ As Moriarty has noted, as the bodies of the soldiers decayed in the sand, so they, in their khaki uniforms, merged into the dust in which they were submerged.⁴⁷⁷ The very texture of the sand, its materiality, its gritty, irritating, quality, was mirrored in the ropey roughness of the unrefined cloth of the soldiers’ khaki uniforms.

Like these particles of dusty sand, the “eternal khaki” was everywhere, as *Graphic* illustrator Villiers noted, complaining that “men, guns, even the business end of a lance is painted khaki-no pennant, no distinction regarding grade; all one dust hue”.⁴⁷⁸ Sand affected artists and photographers alike and in his account of filming, Dickson complained that “a furious dust storm has arisen, and it is all we can do to hold down our tent and breathe. We are suffocated, and can only fill our lungs with air by breathing through a handkerchief.”⁴⁷⁹ Writing in December 1900, Wollen commented that “[o]nly those who for two or three months were stationed at Modder River or De Aar know what sand *really* is, what it really can do, and to what depths of misery and contemplation of suicide it can

⁴⁷⁵ Flint, 2000: 40-63.

⁴⁷⁶ Genesis, 3: 19, 2:7.

⁴⁷⁷ Moriarty, 2010: 312.

⁴⁷⁸ Harrington, 1993: 277.

⁴⁷⁹ Dickson, 1995: 96.

lead a man”.⁴⁸⁰ In the same year, a cartoon in *Punch* entitled “*Echoes of War*” was showing a soldier who had caught a locust saying to his fellow trooper, “Look ‘ere Bill. This is a rummy country. ‘Ere’s the blooming butterflies in khaki!”⁴⁸¹

Wollen, in a subsequent interview for the *Regiment*, complained that “[t]he present war in South Africa has not furnished much material for war artists” for “the old stage properties and effects that made war so stirring” had disappeared, leaving in their place soldiers “in fighting garb of dull drab”.⁴⁸² No longer could the supposedly full-blooded character of the British soldier be represented by the exceptionally glamorous scarlet of earlier Victorian uniforms. Photographic equipment too was subjected to camouflage as, for example, the telephotographic apparatus of one Corporal Ford, and his bicycle, which were both painted khaki.⁴⁸³ Wearing khaki confirmed the equality of men and officers as they offered their bodies up for combat, and reinforced their patriotism through this more sober attire.⁴⁸⁴ Never mind the different qualities of the khaki worn, as long as they had the appearance of sameness, a “comfort in common threads”.⁴⁸⁵ Khaki was for the business of killing and, more important, for the avoidance of being killed.

It was clearly not easy, physically, to paint in such circumstances, and as Butler records in her autobiography it “is very trying painting in the desert on account of the wind, which blows the sand perpetually into your eyes”.⁴⁸⁶ It would also be as difficult to imagine the charge of the light brigade painted with men in khaki uniforms as it would to imagine a cavalry charge in a guerilla war. Nevertheless,

⁴⁸⁰ Wollen, 1900: 113; this chimes evocatively with the comments of soldiers in the First World War who wrote of the demoralising effect of “stagnant rivers of brown cohesive mud”, Meyer, 2009: 131-32.

⁴⁸¹ *Punch*, 14 March 1900: 190.

⁴⁸² *The Regiment*, 15 December 1902: 308.

⁴⁸³ Hodgson, 1974: 29.

⁴⁸⁴ Craik, 1994: 182.

⁴⁸⁵ Moriarty, 2011: 315.

⁴⁸⁶ Butler, 1993: 156.

this new uniform was clearly tactically useful as evidenced by Burleigh, who was told after the Battle of Elandslaagte (1899) that “it was impossible to see the khaki-clad infantry when they lay down”, though Highlanders, Butler’s “splendid troops” and “so essentially pictorial”, still “afforded the best mark” in their resplendent tartans.⁴⁸⁷ Officers, too, could be picked out easily by their Sam Browne belts and anachronistic swords until these were replaced by Baden-Powell with less romantic, but more practical, light repeating rifles.

Not everyone agreed that khaki presented insuperable challenges for the artist. Some were curious, wondering “what artistic enterprise of license (sic) can make out of the masses of the dull yellow gold of khaki”.⁴⁸⁸ It was, in fact, becoming increasingly fashionable, and an article in the *Navy and Army Illustrated* commented that a “khaki uniform is no more monotonous than are successive green fields. It will lend itself to artistic treatment”. The writer even saw positive advantages in the new colours liberating the soldier from the “stiff and half-conventional framework” of military scarlet.⁴⁸⁹ What this article did not address, however, was the problem of artistic contrast against the background of the ubiquitous sand of the Veldt.

Woodville had already tackled this issue of khaki with his 1882 painting, *Saving the Guns at Maiwand* (fig.8), where there was little colour differentiation and where the interest lay in the exhilarating drama of the painting. Even so, he had taken every opportunity of introducing contrasting visual effects such as the blue rag on a wound, a gorgeous blue and gold turban, white cross bands and different colour horses. In his 1898 picture, *The Charge of the 21st Lancers at Omdurman* (fig.9) said to be a “ready subject for his artistry”, Woodville was able to contrast dramatically the more

⁴⁸⁷ Burleigh, 1900: 38, who argued that the Highlanders “should be permitted to change their kilts for the nonce”; Butler, 1993: 78.

⁴⁸⁸ Carter, 1900: 29.

⁴⁸⁹ Harrington, 1993: 276.

restrained yellow-brown tones of the khaki uniforms by profiling the vibrant colour combinations of a mediaeval tournament. His representation of the imposing figure of the Dervish Commander-in-Chief (fig.54) shows him with full black beard mirrored in the blackish-brown of his eager horse galloping head down into the fray. He is seated on a rich red saddlecloth, his metal gauntlets with chain mail decoration glinting in the sun, as does his spectacular shiny helmet.⁴⁹⁰ His dress is a white shift, a *jibbeh*, decorated with bands of gold and squares of green with a chain mail trim and in his left hand he carries a shiny round shield, in his right, a short knife which he raises boldly across his body and over his left shoulder.⁴⁹¹ With his chin slightly upturned, he is eyeballing his opponent enthusiastically, clearly relishing the impending impact. It is evident that he is the dramatic focus of the painting and the one to which the eye is drawn, regardless of the wealth of activity across the canvas.

The bottom right hand corner of the painting is given up to a group of Sudanese infantry soldiers. All are dressed in white *jibbeh* with some coloured markings but less rich than that of their commander, with most wearing close fitting caps or turbans instead of helmets.⁴⁹² One carries a vibrant red flag with green lettering, his sword still in its sheath and his knife secured to his arm. He is followed by two other Sudanese, one bearing a large round drum. In front of the flag bearer, his companion, sporting a golden turban fastened under the chin, is crouching forward, his spear at the ready. Next to him are two others, kneeling, with guns; one firing so that we can see the flame issuing red from the barrel whilst the other is reloading from a cartridge belt. Ahead of this group, and almost under the hooves of the Sudanese commander's horse, another soldier, his contrasting

⁴⁹⁰ Johnson, 1978: 16.

⁴⁹¹ Mr Crombie, conservator at Walker Art Gallery, suggested to the author that the helmet and shield could well have derived from museum pieces as they are both unusual in design.

⁴⁹² Strachey writes that the followers of the Mahdi adopted the *jibbeh*, a shift of coarse cloth, patched with various coloured shapes as a token of austerity, Strachey, 1973: 211.

white shift torn in the fracas, is lying on his stomach, supporting himself by his left arm and pointing his sword upwards with his right.

To the left of the central group can be seen mainly British lancers in a *melée* of activity. In their uniform khaki, they provide an admirable foil for their multi-coloured and striking opponents. Like the ubiquitous black garb of the late-nineteenth-century male, the khaki worn in the desert was a “colour without colour”, a uniform which both facilitated contrast in artistic representation, and at the same time made a potent statement about the status of the wearer.⁴⁹³ These soldiers in their khaki uniform were powerful. As if to highlight this, Woodville shows one British soldier thrusting forwards energetically with his lance. Nearer the front and to the left, another soldier is riding at full tilt, his horse’s front legs stretched out almost horizontally while he lances an unfortunate Sudanese in the throat. Behind him, and to the extreme left of the painting, is a further British soldier with a spectacular moustache, fiercely shouting encouragement as he holds his lance at the ready, his horse making directly for the front of the canvas, eyes burning and forelock flying in the wind.⁴⁹⁴

I suggest that Woodville was using the colourful presence of the Sudanese commander not just as contrast here, but also to subvert military facts, portraying the lancers as the underdogs in this potentially disastrous charge in an otherwise uneven contest. In fact, Omdurman was more in the nature of a massacre by the British and there was little heroic or glorious to celebrate. The reception of the battle in Britain was muted, opinion divided between the urge to celebrate a victory and distaste at the manner of its achievement.

⁴⁹³ Harvey, 1995: 13. There are similarities too with the emphasis on white favoured by the Aesthetic movement.

⁴⁹⁴ A plan of the many personnel has helpfully been provided by the 21st Lancers Regimental Museum identifying the major players, though with the caveat that “many were nowhere near each other and details of their dress and equipment are incorrect”, WAG: 152-letter 10/2/1986, Regimental Museum to curator.

Woodville, acutely aware of the way a Victorian audience would read his painting, was very keen to highlight the worthiness of the Sudanese opponent and to use this to enhance British supremacy. Against this colourful representation of the larger than life Sudanese commander whose tradition of military endeavour is reflected in his costume, stance and equipment, Woodville is able to showcase the superior qualities of the British commander. Rather than engaging in combat, the colonel on his pure white horse is shown to the right of the painting, leading his troops from “the head, riding straight through everything without sword or revolver drawn”. He is untouchable, saintly and triumphant, like Joy’s *General Gordon*, encapsulating the very essence of the qualities Woodville sought to portray.⁴⁹⁵

Some sixteen years before Nevinson’s pronouncement that “pictures are no longer to be static; that condition has been killed by photography. They must become dynamic”, Woodville had developed a mastery of action painting in a manner reflecting the political and social atmosphere of the 1890s.⁴⁹⁶ Significantly, the broad loose brushwork and lack of definition could be seen to provide evidence of Woodville’s customary haste, and on closer examination, this painting does show signs of an unfinished piece of work, which may well indicate an over concern for topicality, for, as the *Regiment* of 11 November 1899 confirms, “[t]he war artist nowadays must be up to date with a vengeance”.⁴⁹⁷ In the current process of conservation of the *Omdurman* painting it has emerged that the action of one, at least, of the horses has been exaggerated by loose overpainting to indicate greater speed, which could support Sala’s criticism of Woodville as ‘slap dash’ even at this later stage in his career. It is, however, also possible that Woodville’s seemingly

⁴⁹⁵ Kestner, 1995: 197; writing in 1918, Strachey refers to the battle as ending “very happily-in a glorious slaughter of 20,000 Arabs, a vast addition to the British Empire, and a step in the Peerage for Sir Evelyn Baring”. Strachey, 1973: 266.

⁴⁹⁶ C.R.W.Nevinson, cited in Haycock, 2013: 88.

⁴⁹⁷ Harrington, 1993: 277. In 1900 alone, eleven of Woodville’s paintings were reproduced as photogravures by Graves and Co., Harrington, 1993: 295.

rushed technique, with his unequal distribution of paint, conversely belies a more considered approach, and one whose objective is visual spontaneity rather than speed in execution.⁴⁹⁸ One of the essential elements of battle is the utter chaos of events which even participants cannot sequentially remember. In this animated depiction of such turmoil, therefore, I suggest that Woodville deliberately heightened the effect of his composition with this more controlled energy of brushwork by which he seems to have at least partially countered the criticisms around his unduly rapid newspaper technique.

Certainly, in a period obsessed with time and “the seductive charm of speed”, the illusion of haste would be attractive and have the advantage of appearing more modern, more truthful and more naturalistic, of a painting executed *en plein air* rather than from the safety of the studio.⁴⁹⁹ It is a technique where impressionistic, separated applications of colour privilege a more linear and continuous line, Roger Fry’s “full liquid brushstroke”, capturing the immediacy of the battle experience.⁵⁰⁰ It may also be a technique better suited to warmer tones where mirages from the hot sun of the Veldt can create visual distortions. It is no coincidence that Butler, Ruskin’s so-called first pre-Raphaelite battle artist, was motivated to paint *Scotland Forever!* (fig.48) in which she uses similar energetic brushwork, and the dramatic colour contrast of scarlet uniforms against the luminous white of the “greys”, in a violent reaction to an exhibition at the “home of the ‘Aesthetes’”.⁵⁰¹ I suggest that while

⁴⁹⁸ I am indebted to Anthea Callen for this insight, Callen, 1990: 65. This possible use by Woodville of a novel nineteenth-century French technique throws up intriguing lines of further research. This observation was made in conversation between the conservator and the author during an examination of the painting.

⁴⁹⁹ Brettell, 2000: 7; see also Nead in her discussion of “rushing and loitering”, Nead, 2010: 101-106.

⁵⁰⁰ Prettejohn, 1999: 40, citing Fry in 1903.

⁵⁰¹ Callen, 1990: 22; Ruskin writing in *Academy Notes*, 1875 describing Butler’s *Quatre Bras*, Cook and Wedderburn, 1904: 138; Butler, 1993: 148 is describing how she came to paint *Scotland Forever!* It should also be noted that the controversy over “finish” was heightened during and in the wake of the Whistler v. Ruskin trial of 1877. Butler writes of her delight in her “supply of very brilliant Spanish white (blanca de plata) for those horses” in *Scotland Forever!* Butler, 1993: 151.

Woodville's drawings for the illustrated press may well justify the accusation of being 'slap dash', in his paintings, the impression of haste is considerably more calculated. It is also highly unlikely that Woodville would have allied himself with the view that such a subject-matter as the ordinary soldier warranted less care in execution.⁵⁰² Instead, I suggest that Woodville's concern here was with raising the profile of the individual soldier, emphasizing the nobility of the men through carefully constructed gestures and body language. Anxious to avoid any doubts as to Britain's imperial role, Woodville's aim was to reflect contemporary beliefs by representing the British soldiers' heroism in the face of unexpectedly heavy opposition.

With the Boers as opponents, this element of colour contrast was not available and painters faced a new challenge. Not only were the "enemy" of white European extraction, but they dressed in bush clothing, usually of dark nondescript colouring, such as to blend in with their background on those few occasions when they were at all visible. Illustrators were in demand, but on at least one occasion, as Harrington notes, were asked to make black and white drawings rather than drawings in colour, and certainly the illustrated papers covered the war extensively with monochrome renditions of work sent in by the Specials.⁵⁰³ Detaille praised the "really splendid black and white work which is being done by those who so modestly style themselves as war specials and war sketchers".⁵⁰⁴ Whilst interest in the war remained high, artists continually strove to meet the demand for pictorial representations in their different ways. Woodville continued to portray the troops in poses of challenging defiance, or gallantry as in *Just Like Bobs* (1900) (photogravure, National Army

⁵⁰² Brettell, 2000: 62, writes that "[r]ough paintings" were usually "linked with low subject matter, reinforcing the notion that crudity of surface meant crudity of subject".

⁵⁰³ Harrington, 1993: 276-77; Harrington quotes from a letter to this effect from William Ingram of the *Illustrated London News* to Allan Stewart of 11 November 1899, offering him "plenty of work".

⁵⁰⁴ Greenwall, 1992: 51.

Museum), showing Lord Roberts offering water to an injured Boer, while Charlton, produced his *Routed: Boers Retreating* in the same year, seeking to use his skill in painting horses to create a dynamic and theatrical effect.⁵⁰⁵ Contemporary art reviews of Charlton's work were positive, the *Athenaeum* referring to his "extraordinary spontaneity and singular animation" with "vehicles in all the confusion of panic" while Spielmann confirmed that he "obviously loves war, not for the sake of the battle, but for the opportunity it gave of representing horses in violent or dramatic action".⁵⁰⁶ Where previously the glamour of the soldiers' uniforms had provided the focal point of battle art, dramatic action was taking over. Nor would the rare opportunity of showing the enemy at a disadvantage have adversely affected the painting's reception.⁵⁰⁷

While there was no dearth of popular images of the war in 1900, this was not the case at the Royal Academy, causing the *Graphic* to ask its readers

[c]an it be that in these practical days, when the scarlet tunic has given way to the khaki jacket that there is not sufficient colour in warfare to make it pictorially attractive. Has the pride, pomp and circumstance of warfare vanished forever?⁵⁰⁸

The critic of the *Illustrated London News* was equally forthright, commenting, possibly with relief, on "the unpaintableness of khaki", which had

no doubt spared or deprived us, as the case maybe, of many a harrowing scene and many a hero's homecoming. A colour which is chosen to be a disguise to man and make him insignificant is naturally not one which finds its praise in the studios.⁵⁰⁹

⁵⁰⁵ Greenwall, 1992: 55. In *Just Like Bobs*, NAM: 1987-11-89, Woodville includes a mounted soldier with an exotic turban in attendance.

⁵⁰⁶ The *Athenaeum*, 26 May 1900, quoted in Hichberger, 1988: 117; Spielmann, 1901: 423.

⁵⁰⁷ Jules George, when working with the troops in Helmand Province Afghanistan in 2010, effectively meets the challenge of representing khaki against sand by outlining his figures in darker brown by way of contrast.

⁵⁰⁸ Harrington, 1993: 276-77.

⁵⁰⁹ *ILN*, 17 May 1902.

Although the *Illustrated London News* did concede that the war had “at least” introduced “khaki” for “pictorial treatment”, there was little to praise, reflecting instead that the “greatest strength and freshest ideas” as the war drew to a close were to be found in the sculpture gallery, whilst those war paintings which did appear, largely avoided conflict.⁵¹⁰

It was believed that the “spectacle of military glory showed men at their masculine best” and although this was no longer an option on the field, it was still possible to portray officers at least, in the more romantic and dashing colours of their dress uniform notwithstanding their workaday khaki.⁵¹¹ As late as 1930 Vita Sackville-West was writing of her heroine that “[s]he regretted only that the men were in ordinary evening dress; somehow she had imagined that they would all be in uniform”.⁵¹² Thus Bacon was able to include the traditional dress scarlet in his celebratory painting, *Lord Roberts and his Chief of Staff Lord Kitchener March from Bloemfontein to Pretoria, May to June 1900* (1901) (location unknown) at a time when it was believed Roberts had brought the war to an end. In doing so, Bacon was following in Sargent’s footsteps in his elegant portrait of *Colonel Ian Hamilton, CB, DSO* (1898) (fig.55), admired for its “masculine stage management and confident painterly style with British military power and colonial self-confidence”.⁵¹³ With his dramatic pose, the critic of the *Art Journal* believed that Hamilton’s portrait “might be labelled ‘Imperialism’”, noting especially “the hot reds” that were “splashed upon the muscular jaw”.⁵¹⁴ In 1902, a bust portrait of Baden-Powell (Charterhouse School) by G.F.Watts (1817-1904) was submitted to the Royal Academy “in the khaki for whose unloveliness Mr Brodrick made excuse on the score of utility at the Academy Banquet”, though the monotone was relieved by a long

⁵¹⁰ *ILN*, 17 May, 1902. It is also the case that some of the artists were still at the war front, Harrington, 1993: 280.

⁵¹¹ Roy, 2012: 27.

⁵¹² Sackville-West, 1983: 182.

⁵¹³ Stephenson, 2010: 221.

⁵¹⁴ *Art Journal*, 1899: 187.

green tie and wide brimmed felt hat with a touch of red.⁵¹⁵ Gradually, however, khaki took on its own mystique and glamour as officers in particular began to revel in the different shades, fabric and cut of their uniforms, Compton Mackenzie reporting how Colonel Benyon spoke of setting out “first in my exquisite eau de nil uniform and then in an even more exquisite uniform of café au lait”.⁵¹⁶ If not quite so picturesque, khaki was, nevertheless, becoming fashionable.

As the war progressed, disbelief in the army’s poor performance turned to disillusionment and then indifference and with it, a move away from a uniform khaki (uniform) to a resurgence in genre paintings, such as *The Soldier’s Return* (1900) (fig.56) by Marcus Stone (1840-1921), harking back to Paton’s earlier painting *Home*, but in a highly romanticised style. Both soldier and girlfriend are wearing eighteenth-century clothing which allowed Stone to abandon khaki in favour of the traditional scarlet and tricorne hat, adding to the idyllic garden setting where the girlfriend is sniffing sadly at a flower before she catches sight of her love. Rather more realistic, though anticipating what Cassandra Albinson has called “nostalgia even for the recent past”, and again set within beautiful vegetation, John Byam Shaw (1872-1919), followed this painting in 1901 with his enigmatic and elegiac painting of a single woman dressed in black against a lush green background and entitled simply *The Boer War* (fig.57).⁵¹⁷ From her attitude, the viewer is left to reconstruct her story as the likely wife, fiancée or girlfriend, mourning her dead husband or lover. Nothing is explicit and, as Tim Barringer has explored, Byam Shaw is drawing on mid-Victorian representations, such as Millais’ 1851-52 painting *Ophelia* (Tate Britain), to confront

⁵¹⁵ *Art Journal*, 1902: 206.

⁵¹⁶ Mackenzie, 1929: 129; I am grateful to Martin Watts, formerly of York Museums Trust for drawing this to my attention.

⁵¹⁷ Albinson, 2013: 79. The painting was accompanied by Christina Rossetti’s haunting words: “Last Summer green things were greener/Brambles fewer, the skies bluer”; see Trumble and Rager, 2013: 373; Mackenzie refers to Shaw’s painting as using female suffering to highlight imperial insecurity, Mackenzie, 2001: 333.

and resolve contemporary problems.⁵¹⁸ In his careful representation of an English landscape, Byam Shaw conversely references the dust of the Veldt; in his solitary woman, where the unspoken element is the absent soldier, a member of the imperial troops, fighting to preserve all that is comforting back home, whilst simultaneously reflecting a growing public unease as the war progressed.⁵¹⁹

Photography

No pen or brush has yet achieved the picture of that
Armageddon in which so many of our men *perished*.⁵²⁰

While war artists were struggling with the purpose of their art and modes of representation, photography posed yet another challenge with its potential in the popular art market at least, as it was believed that here was a way in which to record a scene with authenticity and in all its stark reality. By 1862, for example, cameras were recording “piles of bodies” after the particularly bloody *Battle of Antietam* (Library of Congress) in the American Civil War (1861-65).⁵²¹ In the face of such brutal images, words were scarcely necessary to bring home the ghastly “*Harvest of Battle*”, and in its death-like rendition, paradoxically “photography could keep the dead around forever”.⁵²² Death had become a raw spectacle in the theatre of war, displayed without regard to the sensitivities of the living. As Mathew Brady dourly commented “[d]ead men don’t move”, and consequently provided rich material for the still shot.⁵²³ Strangely, the instant a photograph had been taken carried with it a peculiar death-like quality, an “image-memory” as if the scene had been crystallised, mummified, in what Stephen Cheeke has referred to as the

⁵¹⁸ Barringer, 2001: 66.

⁵¹⁹ Barringer, 2001: 80; Byam Shaw was praised for his “noteworthy picture” by Frank Rinder in *Art Journal*, 1901: 182.

⁵²⁰ Gibbs, 1920: 387.

⁵²¹ Goldberg, 1991: 25. These photographs were taken by Alexander Gardner under the direction of Matthew Brady.

⁵²² Goldberg, 1991: 10; Faust, 2008: xvi. *Harvest of Battle* refers to the title given by Timothy O’Sullivan to one of his more famous photographs (Getty Museum) and is used by Nevinson for his 1919 painting of the First World War.

⁵²³ Faust, 2008: 110 draws attention to the importance of preserving the identities of the dead and according their bodies due respect.

“deathwards pull of the image”.⁵²⁴ Neither did the dead respond, but instead invited a closer inspection, “introducing shame into the act of looking” in a manner to match Butler’s traumatised central figure in *Balaclava*.⁵²⁵ What had started out as documentation, was developing into a kind of exciting, if forbidden, voyeurism. Moreover, as Sean Willcock has observed, the camera, like the brush, “was no innocent instrument in the imperial imaginary”, but had the potential to be an active participant in the Empire’s propaganda machinery.⁵²⁶

It is also more than a little coincidental that the terminology of this developing art was military in origin, as in camera “shots” taken when the “trigger” is pulled, and film “cuts”. Cameras, the new weapons of war, are pointed at subjects in the same manner as guns, as for instance in Woodville’s *All That Was Left of Them* (fig.33), “capturing” their images, and, especially in the early days with their long telescopic lenses, bore a striking and unnerving resemblance to the barrel of a gun. With its technological equipment, photography was not only able to reflect horror, but to emulate it.

In fact, there were no professional British war photographers in the Boer War to rival Brady or Fenton, though Harold Nicholls and Reinholt Thiele (1856-1921) were active. In particular Thiele, a German photographer living in London, produced some creditable shots for the *Graphic*, photographing both President Kruger and Lord Roberts, while the American Underwood brothers employed door-to-door salesman offering collections of war photographs for sale.⁵²⁷ Photographic development was in a state of transition between the wet collodion plates used by Fenton and a slower dry negative

⁵²⁴ Albinson, 2013: 77; Cheeke, 2008: 145; see also Sontag, 1971: 154, who refers to a photograph as a “trace”.

⁵²⁵ Nead, 2011:308; International Human Rights laws now prohibit photographic representation of the faces of the dead; Favret, 2010: 194.

⁵²⁶ Willcock, 2013: 113 and see also the section *The Combative Camera* in full, 2013: 104-14.

⁵²⁷ Lewinski, 1978: 56; Thompson, 2002: 103.

process, as yet unmastered, and although cameras were very much in evidence, many of the photographic reproductions in newspapers were of poor quality, said by the *Sphere* to be “tiresome to the eye and repugnant to the artistic scene”.⁵²⁸ As with painters and illustrators, there was the ongoing problem of the invisibility of the Boers, coupled with an inability to take live action shots, owing to the lengthy exposures required. Photographs, in spite of Nevinson’s later pronouncement to the contrary, were static, capturing a single instant, the composition of which in war the photographer had little power to arrange.⁵²⁹ The dusty sand, too, was a problem as Dickson records in his journal “[w]e have made every effort to get a photograph of the Boer position, and the effect of the shots, by means of the telephoto, but we were forced to give it up owing to the haze which made it impossible to focus properly”.⁵³⁰ Transport of heavy photographic equipment was difficult and was also affected by the environment, the inevitable sandy dust clogging the camera mechanism.⁵³¹ Mud was even worse when it came to developing the films as the necessary water had to stand for hours to allow mud to settle at the bottom before use and, even so, the final effect was sandpapery.⁵³²

Blood could not be shown in all its goriness as photography was then confined to black and white reproductions, neatly circumventing the artistic challenge of khaki whilst providing no advantage over drawings for the press. More strikingly, as Jorge Lewinski comments, Boer War photography did not convey the totality of the war experience by showing human suffering as in America and although photography in general was becoming socially aware, this did not seem to be the case in South Africa.⁵³³ Like the war artists,

⁵²⁸ Lewinski, 1978: 57; *Sphere* cited in Harrington, 1993: 275.

⁵²⁹ Galassi, 1981: 17.

⁵³⁰ Dickson, 1995: 75.

⁵³¹ Hodgson, 1974: 22.

⁵³² Hodgson, 1974: 146; this was especially true of photographs taken at the crossing of the Modder River.

⁵³³ Lewinski, 1978: 55.

professional British photographers avoided the more unpalatable facts of the war and although Dickson did record the aftermath of disasters such as Spion Kop, he chose to do so from Red Cross stations, not from the site of the engagement. In particular, there are no professional British camera shots, for example, recording dead bodies, the starvation endured by the black population in siege towns, farm burnings as recorded by Woodville or the barbed wire and concentration camps erected by Kitchener in the latter part of the war.⁵³⁴ As Gervais has established in his analysis of representations of the Crimean and the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-05 in the press, there was “a certain resistance to the new medium of photography,” in part owing to the initial need for an engraver to prepare the result for publication.⁵³⁵ Whatever the reason, these subjects were left to photographers from elsewhere and to the amateurs on the spot, raising questions as to the ownership and dissemination of national (and international) history.⁵³⁶

An album “of upwards of Three Hundred Photographic Engravings” published exclusively in Cape Town in 1901 of Boer, British and Colonial forces, was produced to redress inaccurate and imaginative representations of the conflict which “though well and ingeniously drawn” were said not to be truthful.⁵³⁷ Although it, too, avoided the sensitive issue of British atrocities, like Simpson in the Crimea, it did go some way to highlight the difficulties encountered by the British soldiers and how poorly they were served by their equipment and preparatory instructions. A photograph of guns landed from British warships came with the caption that “it became very evident that the Boers were provided with superior guns to those used by the British troops” in the early part of the war, while another, showing a group of educated and armed Boers, gave the lie to their ignorant “back-

⁵³⁴ Lewinski, 1978: 55-56.

⁵³⁵ Gervais, 2010: 371.

⁵³⁶ Coombs, 2003: 66.

⁵³⁷ *The Anglo-Boer War*, 1901: u/p [-3].

veldt” qualifications.⁵³⁸ Groups of Boers are shown riding the novel “War Cycle”, an ingenious method of scouting, dispatch riding and ambulance work on a series of linked bicycles along the railway tracks, highlighting their superior communications.⁵³⁹ Others are seen firing from a trench, which could extend “upwards of sixteen miles” and, protected as they were with barbed wire, years ahead of the First World War, evidence the difficulties the British faced in this new type of guerilla warfare.⁵⁴⁰ Photographs of Spion Kop and the deserted battle-ground of Magersfontein where nearly nine hundred British troops were killed, leave the viewer in no doubt as to the devastation faced by the troops.⁵⁴¹

As Lee has observed, the Boer War was unique in that it was the only time that British soldiers were officially allowed to take cameras to the warfront.⁵⁴² By their very personal nature, it is difficult to assess how many of their photographs survived. However, it is clear from Lee’s own substantial collection, much of it from the albums of troops from all ranks, that there were some very enthusiastic amateur photographers, whose “amazingly vivid” “snaps” bear the authenticity of the moment, much as the sketches of soldiers previously reproduced by printsellers and the press.⁵⁴³ They harness the energy and genuine curiosity of a war tourist unencumbered by the need to produce official images of “our brave fighting force”.⁵⁴⁴ Sadly, there is no attribution, or provenance for these albums, although one album seems to be the work of a member of F Company, 2nd Battalion, 5th Fusiliers.⁵⁴⁵ What is striking is that these photographs are generally not posed and the content unrestricted. Accordingly, there are images of dead soldiers, civilians

⁵³⁸ *The Anglo-Boer War*, 1901: 4, 17. The caption confirms that “many of them are educated and in easy circumstances.”

⁵³⁹ *The Anglo-Boer War*, 1901: 33.

⁵⁴⁰ *The Anglo-Boer War*, 1901: 124, 98.

⁵⁴¹ *The Anglo-Boer War*, 1901: 179, 98.

⁵⁴² NMM, Emmanuel Lee Collection, 2012-5040, though this is not to say that troops in the First World War did not ignore this prohibition against cameras.

⁵⁴³ NMM, Emmanuel Lee Collection, 2012-5040.

⁵⁴⁴ NMM, Emmanuel Lee Collection, 2012-5040.

⁵⁴⁵ This regiment is likely to consist of volunteers.

and animals, observation balloons, Boer prisoners, farm burnings, prison camps and emaciated children, not seen elsewhere.⁵⁴⁶ Interestingly, some are shots of what are termed “fake battles” but with no explanation as to how or why they came to be taken or what they represented.⁵⁴⁷ Others provide powerful evidence of the topography of the region, one photograph in particular bearing a remarkable resemblance to the scene painted by Giles in *Race for the Kopje*, and it will be remembered that Giles had himself served in the desert. Many have deteriorated over time and are both faded and curled at the edges, while, unfortunately, only some bear a date or a caption identifying their subject-matter.

Nevertheless, such photographs as were taken benefited enormously from the strong clear light of the South African Veldt, much as Butler’s Boer War paintings of the barren landscape, and were originally of excellent quality. This was true not only of the professionals, but also the many illustrators, war artists and amateur photographers amongst the troops who captured scenes of greater drama in their photographs, through the extremes of light and shade. As the war artist, George, found in similar circumstances in Afghanistan in 2010, “the inevitable haze of dust” in the heat gave “a particular clarity of light that was rich and powerful”.⁵⁴⁸ Even now, strong shadows can be seen in their images in spite of the ageing process. Whilst professional photography was generally unable to outdo painting by recording action, it was able to convey at least equally vivid scenes of camp-life and on the march, take portraits and was a critical element in the social discourse of the war, notwithstanding that many of the images reproduced in the illustrated press, were either touched up or painted over in the light of earlier criticisms of their poor reproductive quality.⁵⁴⁹ Amateur photography went that one step further by highlighting issues not generally seen in

⁵⁴⁶ Many are now reproduced for the first time in Lee’s book *To the Bitter End*.

⁵⁴⁷ The wording “fake battles” is taken from a caption.

⁵⁴⁸ George, 2011: 9.

⁵⁴⁹ Hodgson, 1974: 26. By this time, engraving was no longer necessary.

the illustrated press and provides a valuable record of a soldier's life and duties in South Africa. How far they were actively suppressed by Kitchener's effective censorship is a matter for conjecture. It is certain that the professionals, at least, were not universally popular as Dickson reports, referring in particular to the "virulent" opposition of an unnamed army officer who did everything he could to obstruct him.⁵⁵⁰

Especially evocative and shocking among the published photographs were those taken by an unknown Boer (significantly not British) soldier, of the British dead at Spion Kop in 1900 (fig.58) and which were flashed around the world. These were taken some ten days after the event, showing the still unburied corpses, exposed as they fell in the deep mountainous and grave-like trench, split open to display the bodies, cascading like a waterfall down the slope, curving touchingly around each other as they lay.⁵⁵¹ The very matter of fact way in which they were recorded, reverberated with an awesome attraction, revealing the "blank horror and reality of war, in opposition to its pageantry" and in opposition to the carefully crafted reconstructions by some British war artists depicting courage in adversity.⁵⁵² In confirmation of the horror, Private Fred Evans related his experience at Spion Kop of "simply walking up the hill to be murdered [. . .] fellows' arms and legs being blown off, some having their brains blown out and their blood splashing all over you".⁵⁵³ Along with photographs of the surrender of British troops, these images provided magnificent propaganda for the Boers both at home and abroad as a new weapon of war and were shamefully reinforced by their photographs of Belsen-like starvation in the British run concentration

⁵⁵⁰ Dickson, 1995: 64; this mirrors the poor reception afforded William Russell in the Crimean War.

⁵⁵¹ Lee, 1985: 100.

⁵⁵² Sontag, 2003: 47, citing Alexander Gardner, photographer in the American Civil War; see also Searle, 2004: 279.

⁵⁵³ Caption at the National Army Museum, seen 11 April 2013; I have not traced any equivalent British photographs of the devastation at Spion Kop, though there is a far less dramatic drawing of Boers tending the British wounded with water and rifling the pockets of the dead by J. Greig, reproduced in Wilson, 1900: 305.

camps (fig.59).⁵⁵⁴ The brutality of these camps was being matched by the tyranny of the Boer camera and proved to be a strong counter-image to that promoted by British war artists. In 1899, Gustave Moynier had written, somewhat prematurely, but with more than a little justification, that “[w]e now know what happens every day throughout the whole world [. . .] the descriptions given by daily journalists put, as it were, those in agony on fields of battle under the eyes of [newspaper] readers”.⁵⁵⁵ He might well have added to this comment, the “shots” of the cameramen.

In spite of the appalling, and intrusive, accuracy of which photography was capable, not everyone was convinced of its potential. Questions were raised as to both the camera’s perspective and degree of truth, Edward Hopper remarking that “the photo was always so different from the perspective the eye gives, I gave it up”.⁵⁵⁶ It was believed that photography was attempting to usurp painting’s representational qualities, and as early as the 1860s the painter and art historian, Eugène Fromentin had accused the camera of a want of imagination, leading to degeneration in painting by example.⁵⁵⁷ George Clausen (1852-1944), writing nearly fifty years later, referred to the invention of photography as having “a disturbing influence on our art”, and one which “seems destined to take the place of the picture with a story”.⁵⁵⁸ War artists themselves appreciated the challenge photography posed, though some saw it as part of a natural and complementary artistic progression, the critic Kenneth McConkey confirming that photography was an aid to art as it “underscored the primacy of vision”, while Wollen wrote in the *Friend* that

[T]he camera and the pencil can, and will, live together during a campaign, but I venture to doubt if the camera will be able to do all that its champion claims for it, and the war artist who knows his

⁵⁵⁴ *The Brunt of War* quoted by Lee, 1985: 181.

⁵⁵⁵ Cited in Sontag, 2003: 16.

⁵⁵⁶ Galassi, 1981: 18.

⁵⁵⁷ Galassi, 1981: 12; Callen, 1990: 28.

⁵⁵⁸ Clausen, 1913: 4, 325.

business, which cannot be learned in a single campaign, will come out on top. For reproducing and putting before the public scenes representing the strife and clamour of war, with its accompanying noise and confusion, the man with the Kodak cannot compete for one single moment with the individual who is using the pencil.⁵⁵⁹

As early as 1866, the *Art Journal* had been warning of the possibility that the “camera may, ere long, be found superseding the *burin* of the engraver” although on balance it felt that the market for the engraving and the photograph would not merge.⁵⁶⁰ Photography, the writer believed, would be reserved for those who were unable to afford the higher prices and better quality of the engraving. Writing about Charlton in the *Artist*, Fred Miller felt that the “work of the camera has stood in the way of artists, because it has held out false hopes and made men lean on what is after all a broken reed by trusting to the camera instead of to their own observation”, while Clausen observed that “[t]he minutely searching lens of the camera presents everything with indisputable accuracy, only *not as we see it*” (my italics) and discarded its use as an aid to painting.⁵⁶¹ Already in the Crimean War and Indian Uprising there had been doubts as to the authenticity of all the photographs taken by Fenton and Beato, and in particular their respective shots of the *Valley of the Shadow of Death* in 1855 and *Interior of Secundra Bagh, Lucknow, after the Slaughter of Two Thousand Rebels by the 93rd (Highlanders) Regiment of Foot* (National Army Museum) in 1858, where the scenes had been artificially constructed.⁵⁶² Dickson was not to be outdone and the fact that he arrived in Pretoria too late for the ceremonial raising of the flag did not prevent him filming a re-run,

⁵⁵⁹ McConkey, 2006: 23; Ralph, 1900: 379-80, quoting a letter entitled *The War Artist of Today* which is undated but probably written in 1900 or 1901. Interestingly all “Specials” are said to have had a camera, Harrington, 1993: 275.

⁵⁶⁰ Quoted in Haskins, 2012: 52; Ruskin agreed, viewing it as a mechanical device and bereft of the morality of labour, a “Phoebus of Magnesium wire”. Haskins, 2012: 57.

⁵⁶¹ Miller, 1899: 66; Clausen, 1913: 44.

⁵⁶² NAM: 1962-11-63-7.

without the crowds and without Lord Roberts, focussing on the flag to the exclusion of the recently vacated square beneath.⁵⁶³

Although hopes were high for photographic opportunities during the war, by the time peace was declared, British war photography was still in a state of transition, moving only gradually from documentation to artistic representation and leaving behind less of a record than might have been expected. Photography was still considered ephemeral, “a disposable art”, the results fading with time in a manner which, unlike the painter’s canvas, did not recommend it to posterity.⁵⁶⁴ This was in part owing to the technical difficulties experienced in the processing and it has, with some justification, been argued that it was the amateur and semi-professionals who seemed to achieve greater effect than the more experienced professional photographer.⁵⁶⁵ The topical stereoscopic photographs of Underwood and Underwood which were popular and of the instant were sold in the same way as holiday postcards, and often similarly discarded.⁵⁶⁶ Some pictures taken by the troops were also subject to the censor and films were exposed before they could reach Britain; others suffered from polluted water in the development process.

The war in South Africa had presented many differing challenges to the battle artist. Several were under pressure to provide topical images, others to show Boers behaving badly and the British troops well in a campaign where the enemy was rarely sighted; Butler was hampered by the public disapprobation of her husband’s principled stance. All had to contend with the so-called “unpaintableness of khaki” and the widespread use of photography. Nevertheless, I argue that these late-Victorian war artists, some as a result of their

⁵⁶³ Dickson, 1995: iv.

⁵⁶⁴ Hodgson, 1974: 13.

⁵⁶⁵ Lewinski, 1978: 57. This could also be accounted for by the lack of restrictions placed on the amateur who was taking photographs for his own pleasure and record.

⁵⁶⁶ A collection of these can be viewed at NMM in the Emmanuel Lee Collection, 2012-. 5040 (uncatalogued); see also Hodgson, 1974: 154.

cooperation with the “Specials”, were able to offer the public a particular view of the conflict through both their popular and academic representations. By their reliance on black and white drawings for the press and increasingly dynamic or monumental approaches to their academic works, I contend that they developed their own methods of circumventing the less glamorous elements of the new uniform, and methods which allowed them to differentiate between the khaki of the soldier at war as against the magnificence of the ornamental dress uniform. Although there was an increase in the use of photography for recording events, this in turn was hampered by cumbersome technology when taking photographs and reproducing them for publication, along with doubts as to the authenticity of these images. The absence of colour combined with the static quality of photographs palled in comparison to the dramatic and dynamic representations of the artists both on and off the field, who sought to present a new visual language compensating for the constraints of a guerrilla campaign. Woodville, for example, in the angle chosen for his painting *All That Was left of Them* showed an almost photographic awareness of the way in which he could raise the stature of the men by his upward profiling of them against the sky, a technique not employed by photographers themselves at that period. Questions had also been raised as to the durability of the photograph, many of which faded over time and were largely regarded as disposable. In the face of their continuing emphasis on the individual, non-aristocratic, soldier, however, what these battle artists failed to represent were the more disturbing, critical aspects of the war, the brutal deaths within the imperial army and, with the sole exception of Woodville’s image of farm burning, the atrocities committed against the Boers. Although in this they differed from Butler’s Crimean paintings with her emphasis on suffering, it is unfair to equate the two situations as emotions were still raw as the Boer War drew to a close while Butler was painting her Crimean scenes some twenty years after the event, during which memories had been allowed to mellow and harsh facts, absorbed. The onset of

the First World War a mere decade after the end of the Boer War provided new material for the battle artist rendering a visual re-assessment of the events in South Africa obsolete, a decade which itself was one of transition and re-adjustment, not least within the genre of battle painting.

CHAPTER FOUR

EXHIBITING WAR; EXHIBITING HISTORY

The Empire went to war in 1899 for a concept that was finished, for a cause that was lost, for a grand illusion.⁵⁶⁷

“That wretched war”, the conflict coming at the very end of the nineteenth century in South Africa, had proved devastating for the British.⁵⁶⁸ Not only had the Boers taught them “a lesson”, but the nation struggled over the number of male volunteers unfit for service.⁵⁶⁹ Nearly 450,000 imperial troops had been required to contain fewer than 90,000 Boer farmers at a cost of more than £200 million to the Treasury.⁵⁷⁰ Britain, it was said, was “not only a bully, but an inefficient one at that”.⁵⁷¹ This, alongside a growing global awareness of the increasing naval power and militarism of other countries, specifically Germany, the United States and Japan, had led to a widespread feeling of, at the very least uncertainty, and at most, extreme anxiety.⁵⁷² The prospect of a European war was not far from the thoughts of many politicians and army personnel, who had already started to consider how best this might be avoided, or if necessary, fought.⁵⁷³ While statesmen speedily negotiated alliances, the military looked anxiously to their resources. To enthusiastic audiences, Lord Roberts lectured at public schools, urging preparation for war, declaring that “if we do not take the trouble to be prepared we shall not only deserve defeat, but most certainly

⁵⁶⁷ Robinson and Gallagher, 1961: 461.

⁵⁶⁸ Pakenham, 1992: 576.

⁵⁶⁹ This refers to *The Lesson*, a poem by Kipling published in 1903, commenting on the war, which starts “We have had no end of a lesson: it will do us no end of good.” The statistics on unfitness in Manchester were even worse than in the country as a whole, Searle, 2004: 305; see also Seebom Rowntree’s work on Poverty published in London in 1901.

⁵⁷⁰ Pakenham, 1992: 572.

⁵⁷¹ Thornton, 1959: 113.

⁵⁷² Britain was not alone in this as evidenced by Margaret MacMillan’s comment that it is “striking just how many fears rippled through European society in the period before 1914”. MacMillan, 2014: 240.

⁵⁷³ For example, Baden-Powell who chose the boy scouts’ motto *Be Prepared* with impending war in mind, Girouard, 1981: 282; see also Friedberg, 1988: 135-36 and Searle, 2004: 244-48 on the mood of the period; Brockington, 2009: 9-10 who refers to “the fascination of art and literature which seemed to prophesy war” during this period, among others.

suffer it”.⁵⁷⁴ By 1905 he was warning that he “had no hesitation in stating that our armed forces, as a body, are as absolutely unfitted and unprepared for war as they were in 1899-1900”.⁵⁷⁵ In 1903, this anxiety had been expressed through the publication of *The Riddle of the Sands* by Erskine Childers, himself recently returned from the Boer War, in which a German plot against Britain was revealed in true adventure style, followed in 1913 by *When William Came* by Saki, dealing with life after conquest by Germany.⁵⁷⁶ In the wake of widespread international condemnation of its actions, Britain was feeling isolated, just as it was beginning to sense its new position on the world stage.⁵⁷⁷ King Edward VII, a well-known Francophile, was prevented by Gallic hostility from travelling to Paris until 1903, and even then initially received a decidedly cool welcome.⁵⁷⁸ Business entrepreneurs soon followed, reaching across the channel to encourage commercial exchange and cooperation, notably in the London Olympics and the Franco-British exhibition of 1908, which, as Annie Coombs has shown, cemented the *Entente Cordiale* of

⁵⁷⁴ Cited in Girouard, 1981: 282 quoting from Lord Robert’s speech at Clifton College as reported in O.F. Christie *Clifton College*.

⁵⁷⁵ Cited in Hynes, 1968: 40; the Elgin Commission took a different view, believing that Britain did have sufficient capacity even in emergency, Thompson, 2002: 202. Mark Sykes returned from the Boer War with the determination to strengthen army transport infrastructure, leading to a reserve of waggons ready to depart for France in August 1914. See in particular his correspondence with his mother in which he accuses the Government and the War Office of murdering “the Militia by stupid, brutal indifference, asinine stupidity and colossal folly” in their lack of preparations for the war in South Africa. BTH, ref: DDST, 1,2,1,29. Conversely, Sir Arthur Nicolson, Permanent Under-Secretary at the Foreign Office, expressed the view that he had never seen such a calm international situation, a view he repeated even after the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand on 28 June 1914, Bostridge, 2014: 116, 168.

⁵⁷⁶ The *Daily Mail* also serialised William Le Queux’s book *The Invasion of 1910* (1906).

⁵⁷⁷ The plot of Saki’s novel centres on the successful invasion and occupation of Britain by Germany. Not all politicians agreed with the need to build up military resources as is evidenced by Lloyd George’s view as late as 1914 that Winston Churchill was too warlike in his desire to build another four Dreadnoughts, Bostridge, 2014: 33-35.

⁵⁷⁸ Priestley, 1970: 36-44; King Edward is largely regarded as having healed the breach between France and Britain during the period leading up to the *Entente Cordiale*, a Franco-British alliance in 1904, though even he had refused to attend the Paris Exposition of 1900 following insults from the French media, MacMillan, 2014: 23.

1904, just as it reinforced a sense of, and obsession with, nationhood.⁵⁷⁹

International exhibitions played a significant role in this process with artists working to encourage cooperation, fostering cultural relations with fellow artists from France, Germany, Belgium, Holland and Italy, exemplifying the mutually beneficial relationship between nationalism and internationalism, and “in *response* to the seemingly endless preoccupation of the great powers with military strengthening”.⁵⁸⁰ In 1904 Hugh Lane organised the first ever exhibition of Irish contemporary art at the Guildhall, London, showcasing work of a distinctly nationalist flavour as the country moved towards independence.⁵⁸¹ Two years later, there were no fewer than three exhibitions of German art held in London. Frank Rinder, writing in the *Art Journal*, commented that art had “always reached out beyond mere territorial boundaries” and noting that one of these exhibitions, featuring German contemporary works and held at the Prince’s Gallery, Knightsbridge, was specifically expressed to be “in token of gratitude and good fellowship”.⁵⁸² Likewise, German classical music and opera enjoyed an upsurge of popularity in London.⁵⁸³ Britain was moving fast to heal wounds and to shore up defences.

The death of Queen Victoria in 1901, in the midst of the Boer War, brought with it a kaleidoscope of mixed emotions, both mourning the old regime and welcoming the new. In its most simplistic formulation this initially led to two opposing views, either that the new monarchy heralded a major turning point in British social and cultural life, or that it was no more than a transitional period between

⁵⁷⁹ Coombs, 1987: 153. See also Brockington, 2009: 4 who comments that “the ideology of internationalism [. . .] went hand in hand with the rise of nationalism in Europe at the turn of the nineteenth century.”

⁵⁸⁰ Akira Iriye cited in Brockington, 2009: 10.

⁵⁸¹ www.hughlane.ie accessed 26 February 2014.

⁵⁸² *Art Journal*, July, 1906: 218-20; see also Brockington, 2009: 301-309.

⁵⁸³ Bostridge, 2014: 124-25, 136.

late-Victorian traditionalism and 1920s modernism with no particular character of its own.⁵⁸⁴ In 1917 H.G.Wells likened Victoria's death to the lifting of "some compact and dignified paperweight [. . .] from people's ideas [. . .] as if at once they had begun to blow about anyhow," bringing to an end "an epoch of tremendous stabilities", while her successor was seen as merely a caretaker monarch in the period leading up to the First World War.⁵⁸⁵ In fact, as recent scholarship has shown, a complex and interconnected tapestry of conflicting values and positions began to emerge.⁵⁸⁶ This was a period of "deeply productive conflicts" – a multitude of oppositions including continuity and change, stasis and speed, modernity and modernism, degeneration and regeneration, nationalism and imperialism, fin-de-siècle traditionalism and the avant-garde, anxiety and optimism and opulence and poverty – each with its own narrative. All these contrasting elements jostled together in a socially discordant and disjunctive interplay, while at the same time often embodying a real sense of being Edwardian; a pervasive and "self-conscious awareness of living in a moment of transition".⁵⁸⁷ This was further complicated by the failure of these oppositions to sit neatly within the period between the end of the nineteenth century and the outbreak of World War One. As Amy Cruse has suggested, with the accession of Edward, "there was a general quickening of the pace, a feeling of expectancy, a gay confidence in the future", while in his Royal Academy lectures of 1904, Clausen, then President,

⁵⁸⁴ Stephenson, 2013: 1. For recent analyses and perspectives on this period see O'Neill and Hatt, *The Edwardian Sense* and Trumble and Wolk Rager, *Edwardian Opulence*.

⁵⁸⁵ H.G.Wells in *The Soul of a Bishop*, [1st ed. 1917], (London, 1933): 23.

⁵⁸⁶ As early as 1968, Samuel Hynes was describing the Edwardian period as having "a consciousness of its own separateness from what went before and what followed", Hynes, 1972: 1; see also Nead, 2010: 111-12.

⁵⁸⁷ This quotation is from Fletcher, 2013b: 99; see also Light, 1988: 153-57; Beckett and Cherry, 1987; Stevens, 1988; O'Neill and Hatt, 2010; Trumble and Wolk Rager, 2013; Fletcher, 2013a and *Visual Culture in Britain*, 2013, issue 14 generally for a discussion of this period; see also Kipling's view, cited in Nead, that the newly mechanised transport allowed one seamlessly to "slide from one century to another", nicely encapsulating the fluid quality of the Edwardian period, reaching back to the past and forward to the future, Nead, 2010: 105.

advised students that “we live in times when everything is in the melting-pot”.⁵⁸⁸

It was within this confusing maelstrom that the late-Victorian war artists continued to exhibit. Those artists who had been painting in the 1890s did not suddenly cease to do so in 1901, but continued well into the twentieth century, posing the question as to whether it was – and is – possible to identify anything distinctive about their work in the Edwardian period. What did it mean to be a battle artist at the intersection of these two centuries, and in particular how was their art to act as signifier for the shifting experiences and increasingly mechanised preoccupations of the time, especially in the light of the late war’s unpopularity? Moving into the twentieth century, these late-Victorian war artists have been – and are still – spectacularly overlooked in discussions of modernity and modernism, and their work and reputations have largely been allowed to pass unremarked into the by-waters of art history and public recognition. In this chapter I open up for closer inspection the work of this neglected cohort during this period and examine how far it can be said they contributed to the repositioning of British war art and its imagery leading up to and into the First World War. What was their impact at the dawn of the twentieth century; a century shortly to be dominated by a European war, not in the distant Empire, but on their doorstep?

A Challenging Transition

During the opening stages of the Boer War, illustrations in the press from the “Specials” at the front had been devoured by a public anxious for news, but this early momentum had been difficult to sustain as the war dragged on dismally without resolution. There was nothing heroic about block-houses, concentration camps and farm burnings. As Krebs has asserted, the atrocities of the war had

⁵⁸⁸ Cruse, 1938: 205; Clausen, 1913: 7.

“eroded the myth of imperial chivalry”, and in particular the code of the “chivalric soldier”.⁵⁸⁹ Furthermore, the intrepid, imperialistic and “manly” approach, both in style and content, adopted by many Boer War artists was problematic; the promised adventure story had not delivered concrete results and success was qualified. Already, as exemplified by Stone’s *The Return of the Soldier* in 1902, artists were turning away from representations of war itself to more tangential portrayals of military incidents, portraits or genre paintings from an earlier age, for want of suitable contemporary material and were eschewing conflict.⁵⁹⁰ As Spielmann, writing in *Cassell’s Magazine* in 1901, observed, “[r]ealistic battle-pictures are not acceptable to the ordinary gallery visitor. Unmitigated accuracy in horror painting is repellent to our people”.⁵⁹¹ Simultaneously, in architecture, a new “taste for order, symmetry and grandeur” developed as a result of a conspicuous “mood of defensive, even paranoid imperialism and exaggerated patriotism”.⁵⁹² By way of diversion from conflict, pageantry, film shows, exhibitions and department stores came to form a major part of mass entertainment, and entertainment where the crowd itself became part of the spectacle in an Edwardian version of the earlier panoramas and flâneurs of Vauxhall Gardens. Here though, the panoramas that had previously displayed contemporary battles and sieges, as for example the Siege of Sebastopol, were replaced by episodes from Roman history and Shakespearean plays alongside contemporary fantasies such as *Peter Pan*.⁵⁹³ This was a period when the Edwardians were, in Morna O’Neill’s words, “nostalgic for their own moment”, reinventing themselves as modern day classicists, just as the ground beneath was shifting and they were confronted by many and diverse

⁵⁸⁹ Krebs cited in Nasson, 2002: 816.

⁵⁹⁰ Spalding, 1986: 15; Fox makes a similar observation in relation to art towards the end of the First World War with an increasing emphasis on the pastoral, Fox, 2009: 135.

⁵⁹¹ Spielmann, 1901: 421.

⁵⁹² Stamp, 2007: 56; see also Clive Bell where he condemns excessive and unnecessary detail, Bell, 1913: 117.

⁵⁹³ Ryan, 2010: 45.

political, social, economic and cultural transformations.⁵⁹⁴ The burning question for war artists at this juncture was what and how should they be painting. Was there indeed a future for their art?

Against a background of the various artistic movements of the time, I follow Hichberger's lead in noting the influence of the artistic formulae initiated or promoted by Butler in British battle painting of the "charge", the "last stand", the "procession" or "march past" and the psychological effects of conflict, before going on to consider whether and, if so, how these images were variously adopted by her contemporaries.⁵⁹⁵ How far, for example, did such formulae contribute to artistic representation into the First World War, at a time when photography was strictly regulated at the Front and before official photographers and artists were appointed?⁵⁹⁶ I explore the interface between the portrayals by these artists of military incidents from a previous age and the works of those Edwardian artists who turned to history painting, using military and chivalric spectacle to highlight contemporary concerns. Was it indeed still possible to view military pictures as forming part of the tradition of history painting? How far did their art continue to portray soldiers as heroic sportsmen on the field of battle, displaying all the *sangfroid* of Woodville's battling troops as in *All That Was Left of Them*? or was this approach simply a thing of the past? What had happened in Britain, socially, politically, culturally and economically to bring about such a perceived change in military art and its audience between 1902 and World War One?

Notwithstanding their current neglect, it has to be remembered that these were artists who continued to exhibit at the Royal Academy,

⁵⁹⁴ O'Neill, 2010: 1, 9.

⁵⁹⁵ Hichberger, 1988: 77, 83, 91, who refers to innovation only and not promotion, although it is clear there that there were isolated examples of such formulae prior to Butler's work. She also influenced her French counterparts as can be seen in the striking similarities between Butler's *Scotland Forever!* (1881), and Detaille's 1891 painting *Vive L'Empereur!*

⁵⁹⁶ Eksteins, cited in Saunders, 2004:11; Malvern, 2004: 38.

and at other selected galleries, and who were still being given prominent space in metropolitan exhibitions to show their paintings, paintings which even into the First World War appealed to the values of a large proportion of the public. Private galleries were keen to exploit the commercial value of war art and, especially in the initial stages of the conflict, were willing to support a very catholic mix of such artworks.⁵⁹⁷ The Leicester Galleries, regarded as the pre-eminent avant-garde art dealers during the war years, were content to offer Butler solo exhibitions until at least 1917, while during the same period offering space to Nevinson, Paul Nash and Kennington, all members of the new generation of war artists.⁵⁹⁸ As Harrington, who notably has not ignored the contribution of these late-Victorians, has so cogently argued, their work needs to be considered in order to come to some understanding of contemporary attitudes to war in 1914, and not subsumed by the new body of painters emerging mainly from the Slade School of Art.⁵⁹⁹

James Fox, in his thesis on the eclecticism of art in Britain during the First World War, criticises art historians for the “privileging of modern over traditional, front line over home front and dissenting truth over prevailing opinion”.⁶⁰⁰ He challenges their consequent failure fully to explore and interpret many equally important components of the art world beyond those works now generally regarded as the genuinely artistic products of the war. Even so, he does not touch on the Great War work of Butler and refers only briefly to Woodville in his role as illustrator for the popular press. Charlton, Crofts, Giles and Wollen do not merit a mention.⁶⁰¹ The

⁵⁹⁷ Harries, 1983: 74.

⁵⁹⁸ Malvern, 2004: 37; Butler exhibited there in 1912 and 1917, Nevinson in 1916 and Nash and Kennington in 1918. Butler also exhibited in 1919 but not without some difficulty as discussed later.

⁵⁹⁹ Harrington, 1992: 46.

⁶⁰⁰ Fox, 2009: [u/p]: 1; this view is diametrically opposed to that expressed by Arnold Bennett in his work for the British War Memorials Committee (BWMC).

⁶⁰¹ Stuart Sillars similarly writes of the “bewildering volume and variety of material” in his discussion of popular and fine arts during the war and yet he too refers only to Woodville’s work for the illustrated press. No other late-Victorian battle artists are mentioned, Sillars, 1987: 12, 73, 85. Morris briefly mentions

failure of this “old guard” to remain in the public eye (and indeed, that of art historians, including those who purport to be interested in creating a non-modernist lineage) is, I argue, a consequence of the ways in which their representation of warfare failed to be meaningful to the British public in the face of a new, mechanistic warfare. As Sue Malvern has observed, a “shift from the safe and derivative work” of earlier artists “to the difficult and independent paintings of Nash and Nevinson reflects changes in the nation’s needs for differing visualisations of its experience of war”.⁶⁰² Significantly, Malvern is here comparing the work of Muirhead Bone (1876-1953) to that of Nash and Nevinson and again does not address the contribution of those late-Victorian war artists featured here.⁶⁰³ While this observation can be justified in part, it does not fully represent the feeling of the wartime public, which continued to admire works which took them away from the immediate horrors of the war by making “a stirring appeal to the emotion and the imagination”.⁶⁰⁴ Malvern herself acknowledges the public debate over who was best placed to represent the truth of war and how, and refers to the contrasting images produced by the *Graphic* as late as 1918 under the heading *The Trench from Different Points of View: The Battle of the War Artists*, in which photographs are compared with academic and modernist paintings.⁶⁰⁵ The accompanying caption makes clear that the *Graphic* is not in sympathy with the more modernist works, complaining that “[i]n consonance with the policy of the Government doing everything, private enterprise in describing the war has been abolished in favour of official

Woodville, Wollen, Butler, Giles and Crofts (but not Charlton), attributing to them a “new nationalism” as seen in a “wave of heroic battle paintings showing British colonial triumphs in the colonial wars of the late nineteenth century”, but without any analysis or critical comment, Morris, 2005: 287.

⁶⁰² Malvern, 1986: 488.

⁶⁰³ None of these artists rates a mention in Malvern’s influential work, *Modern Art, Britain and the Great War*, though she does briefly discuss the work of J.P.Beadle, (1863-1947), whose illustrations for the *Graphic*, she remarks, “looked unpersuasive”. Malvern, 2004: 44, 37.

⁶⁰⁴ Fox, 2009: 134.

⁶⁰⁵ Malvern, 2004: 37-40. The academic painting is by Beadle and shows troops waiting to go over the top; the Official war artists are represented by Nash and Nevinson.

supply”.⁶⁰⁶ It is clear from this that the debate was still live and centred on the different modes of representing the common soldier, the traditional artist taking care to represent him in mimetic detail while the more avant-garde referenced the technological face of war, and not always to public acclaim.

Exhibiting War

In 1915, nearly one year into the Great War, Butler’s paintings, *After* [sic] *Balaclava* and “*Steady the Drums and Fifes!*” were shown at a special exhibition of naval and military works at the Guildhall Art Gallery in the heart of the City of London.⁶⁰⁷ The stated object of the exhibition was “to recall to the public the heroic deeds of soldiers and sailors in the past, and in the war which is now engaging the forces of Europe”.⁶⁰⁸ It was curated by Alfred Temple, art director of the Corporation of London, who provided short descriptive and biographical notes, and benefited from loans of busts of King George and Queen Mary (c.1915) alongside a portrait of Vice-Admiral Nelson by Lemuel Abbott (1760-1802).⁶⁰⁹ The caption for Nelson read “Thou famous Man/The greatest sailor since the world began” and was accompanied by a short biography of his most notable exploits.⁶¹⁰ Amongst the naval paintings was a portrait by John Lavery (1856-1941) of *The Rt. Honourable Winston Churchill* (1915) (House of Commons), who “dealt ably with the Navy at a critical moment” alongside a work entitled *Trafalgar: The Death of Nelson* (1859-64) (Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool) by Daniel Maclise (1806-70) and the patriotic Royal Academy exhibit, *The Fleet of*

⁶⁰⁶ Malvern, 2004: 38, citing the *Graphic*, 11 May 1918.

⁶⁰⁷ Harrington, 1992: 47-48. The original proposal for this exhibition came from the art gallery committee in Manchester where it was expected the exhibition would be staged. In the event it opened in London before transferring to Sheffield.

⁶⁰⁸ Temple, A.6.6. No 69: [u/p] 7.

⁶⁰⁹ Abbot’s date of birth is uncertain and could be 1761. As he painted many likenesses of Nelson, it has not been possible to identify which painting was exhibited. The busts of the king and queen were by Alfred Drury (1856-1944) and their current location is unknown.

⁶¹⁰ Temple, A.6.6. No 69: 11.

England is her All-in-All (1910) (private collection) by A.J.W.Burgess (1879-1957).⁶¹¹ The title of this last painting, taken from the works of Alfred, Lord Tennyson, echoes the hopes and fears of imperial Britain at war; hopes that the navy would remain supreme regardless of Germany's recent spate of ship building, against fears that it might not.⁶¹² Goya's *The Duke of Wellington* (1812-14) (National Gallery) indicates the international flavour of the exhibition with many Irish, American, Australian, Spanish and French, but decidedly no German, artists, contributing to the military paintings and sculptures.⁶¹³ Care was taken to honour Britain's erstwhile enemy, France, in particular by praising its courage and heroism even in adversity.⁶¹⁴ Among the French artists, Detaille was allocated space for thirteen exhibits, far in excess of the entries by Butler, Woodville or Charlton, and chose to include the patriotic *Napoleon and his Generals* (1898) (Musée de l'Armée, Paris), recalling the centenary of the Battle of Waterloo ending the last western European War in which Britain had been engaged.⁶¹⁵ Other French artists concentrated on portraying Germany in a bad light, including Georges Rochegrosse (1859-1938) who painted *To Arms! Down with the Barbarians* (location unknown) specifically for the exhibition, while *The Invasion of the Huns* (1902) (Collection du Musée du Vieux Château à Laval) by Octave Guillonet (1872-1967) was accompanied by the words

[t]hese were the terrible Huns whose ferocity
 flamed forth against the Goths. In their invasion of
 Europe, all whom they met fell victim to their

⁶¹¹ Temple, A.6.6. No 69: 20, 51, 21. The caption for Burgess's 1910 painting, citing Sir Graham Berry, ran "who could estimate the loss involved in even a brief period of disaster to the Imperial Navy?" The fact that Burgess was Australian emphasises the imperial nature of Britain's armed forces in the conflict.

⁶¹² Tennyson ends with the words "The fleet of England is her all-in-all/Her fleet is in your hands/And in her fleet her Fate."

⁶¹³ Temple, A.6.6. No 69: 12. According to a recent biography, *The Pike*, the Italian poet Gabriele D'Annunzio described Beethoven as "Flemish" during the First World War in order to continue to listen to his work, Lucy Hughes-Hallett, London, 2013: 408; Maclise's painting *The Meeting of Wellington and Blücher after the Battle of Waterloo* is also exhibited, Temple, A.6.6 No 69: 51.

⁶¹⁴ The most poignant example of this is J.L.Gerome's *Execution of Marshal Ney* "one of the saddest episodes in history", Temple, A.6.6. No 69: 128.

⁶¹⁵ Temple, A.6.6. No 69: 34, 61. Meissonier was represented by his painting *Le Guide*, an episode in the Napoleonic Wars, Temple, A.6.6. No 69: 58.

uncivilised fury, and five distinct nations were swept
away in that whirlwind of savagery

comparing the “Germanic horde which overran Belgium last August” with the “multitudes who hurled themselves down the slopes of the Alps into an astonished Italy”, and whose “ferocious spirit and lust for destruction” were only differentiated on account of their changed weaponry.⁶¹⁶

There was no escaping this explicit reference to Germany’s invasion of Belgium and France or the destruction of such cultural icons as the cathedral in Rheims upon whose “exquisite work of architectural art [. . .] the heavy guns of the Germans have been wantonly brought to bear” and the library at Louvain the previous year.⁶¹⁷ Even more pointedly, F.H.Townsend’s famous 1914 *Punch* cartoon of *Bravo Belgium!* may well have been influenced by the 1889 painting *Un Brave* (Ile de France, Paris-Fiche Dépot), by Paul Emile Boutigny (1853-1929) with the caption “A villager single-handed is keeping a body of Germans at bay as they turn in at the far end of the street”.⁶¹⁸ The cultural exchange with Germany of the first decade of the twentieth century was giving way under the weight of nationalistic propaganda and brutal conflict.

Other paintings and sculptures were selected from a wide cross-section of battles up to and including the First World War, and did not dwell exclusively on the Napoleonic Wars or barbarism. Sargent’s portrait of *Colonel Ian Hamilton, CB, DSO*, was hung alongside *Field-Marshal Sir John French* (1908) (photogravure, National Portrait Gallery) by J. St Helier Lander (1868-1944) and Hubert Herkomer’s *Kitchener* (1890) (National Portrait Gallery). Victorian battle scenes were represented by *The Thin Red Line-Balaclava* (1881) (John Dewar and Sons, Perth), *The Battle of the*

⁶¹⁶ Temple, A.6.6. No 69: 25-26.

⁶¹⁷ Temple, A.6.6.No 69: 44.

⁶¹⁸ Temple, A.6.6. No 69: 24, 25, 27; *Punch*, 12 August 1914. This cartoon is also known as *No Thoroughfare*.

Alma (1888) (Glasgow Art Gallery and Museum) and *The Storming of the Dargai Heights* (1897) (Guildhall Art Gallery) by Robert Gibb (1845-1932), highlighting British heroic stoicism, alongside three works from Desanges' series of gallant Victoria Cross winners (1863-80) (various venues).⁶¹⁹ A group in bronze, *The Defence or a Call to Arms* (1879) (Musée Rodin, Paris) was lent by the artist, Auguste Rodin, (1840-1917) while New Sculpture was represented by a bust of *General Wolfe* (1910) (Westerham, Kent) by Francis Derwent Wood (1871-1926) referencing West's 1770 image, and *Kiss of Victory* (1878) (Minneapolis Institute of Arts) by Alfred Gilbert (1854-1934), designed to inspire confidence in a swift and successful outcome to the conflict.⁶²⁰ Focussing on more contemporary incidents, Allen Stewart (1865-1951) portrayed *The Charge of the Scots Greys at St Quentin* (1915) (private collection), taking his inspiration from the retreat from Mons and his style from Butler's *Scotland Forever!*⁶²¹ Butler's own contribution, "*Steady the Drums and Fifes!*" featured an incident from the Peninsula War in 1808. The caption, quoting Cardinal Manning, read

[t]he highest courage in a soldier is said to be standing still under fire. It is the self-command of duty in obedience to authority. [. . .]. But to stand still under fire, still and motionless, is a supreme act of the will.⁶²²

Neither this painting, nor her second exhibit, *Balaclava*, was well received. Although very different in attitude, the one showing the aftermath and the other the precursor to battle, they were both said to be "among the worst of her pictures", and were criticised for their "theatrical sentimentality".⁶²³ Ironically, and in complete contrast to the reviews she received in 1876 when *Balaclava* was said to exhibit

⁶¹⁹ Temple, A.6.6. No 69: 37, 40, 75, 76, 77. The VC winners shown included Lord Roberts, hero of the recent war in South Africa. They were originally housed in Wantage but are now in various venues including Royal Army Military College Sandhurst.

⁶²⁰ Temple, A.6.6. No 69: 51, 61.

⁶²¹ Temple, A.6.6. No 69: 31, 33.

⁶²² Temple, A.6.6. No 69:76.

⁶²³ The *Connoisseur*, August 1915: 248.

“great intelligence in the selection of her moment, and in the means she has found of indicating the peculiar elements and incidents of the charge, the retreat and the rally”, Butler was now pilloried for focussing on the exceptional, the “dazed and bewildered soldier” returning from the charge, especially as, it was stated, “the great majority were ready to do it again”.⁶²⁴ Clearly, manliness and patriotism were to be encouraged at this stage of the war at the expense of an exploration of the adverse consequences of battle, a sentiment which dismissed out of hand any merits in Butler’s work, and calls into question the curator’s selection from her oeuvre. It may well be considered that in this climate, the more stirring *Scotland Forever!* or the valiant tone of *The Defence of Rorke’s Drift* would have been more appropriate. Psychological sensitivity had been set aside in favour of dramatic action and those very qualities which had caused Butler’s earlier popularity were now being used against her, paradoxically at a time in her career when she employed them sparingly, if at all. Nevertheless, reproductions of *Balaclava*, along with the *Roll Call* and *Steady, the Drums and Fifes!* were still on view in schools and private homes as evidence of her continuing appeal with the public.⁶²⁵

The critic of the *Athenaeum* referred back to the time when Butler’s paintings “made stronger claims than at present” along with other “almost forgotten features of past Salons”.⁶²⁶ The review went on to compare the exhibits adversely to the “superior actuality of the instantaneous ‘snapshots’ with which we are flooded every morning”, describing the great majority of the exhibits as melodramatic rather than epic and where battle-painting had been “thrown back on its powers—not telling the truth, but of surpassing it in certain directions, whether in impressiveness, in cheap

⁶²⁴ *The Times*, 17 May 1876; the second quotation is from the *Connoisseur*, August 1915: 248.

⁶²⁵ Girouard, 1981: 267.

⁶²⁶ *The Athenaeum*, 26 June 1915: 576.

sensationalism or in clarity”.⁶²⁷ While it singled out Wollen’s 1914 painting *The 28th at Waterloo* (Bristol Museum and Art Gallery) and Gibb’s *Battle of the Alma* for their “hearty and spirited” presentation “giving an impression of fighting as a kind of athletic sport for sturdy men”, it recommended that “[p]robably for purposes of aesthetic enjoyment we should scarcely linger before any of these pictures very long”.⁶²⁸

The Times, too, was dismissive of the exhibition as a whole, commenting that “[o]ften one has to say the best one can for pictures that are exhibited for a charitable purpose” and along with the 1915 exhibits at the Royal Academy, artists were criticised for “seeking inspiration [. . .] at secondhand”, just as the desire for first-hand experience was growing.⁶²⁹ Indeed, the *Studio*, which appears to have ignored the Guildhall exhibition altogether, remarks of the Royal Academy hanging that there “is happily scarcely any suggestion [. . .] that everything is not as usual in the world” and there is “no hint that this country [. . .] is engaged in what is actually a struggle for existence”.⁶³⁰ The critic for the *Connoisseur* wrote that the “most striking feature” of the Guildhall exhibits “is the fine display of French art”, eclipsing that of native artists.⁶³¹ By way of explanation, the article stated that “English battles have been fought less for the defence of the soil than of the outlying wards of her far-flung Empire” adding that “her army has hitherto been a class apart from the rest of the people”.⁶³² Spielmann endorsed this approach in his critique of Crofts’ work, opining that the British “have not experienced the terrible advantage of having the horrors of a campaign brought vividly before [them] on [their] own soil” arguing that “only the nation which has felt the fangs of the war-hound in its

⁶²⁷ *The Athenaeum*, 26 June 1915: 576.

⁶²⁸ *The Athenaeum*, 26 June 1915: 577.

⁶²⁹ Harrington, 1992: 50-51, quoting *The Times*, May 1916 and Collins Baker in the *Saturday Review*, 1 May 1915.

⁶³⁰ *The Studio*, vol. 65, 1915: 25; it does however comment that it “has a right to be remembered as being above the average in general quality”.

⁶³¹ *The Connoisseur*, vol. 42, August 1915: 245.

⁶³² *The Connoisseur*, vol. 42, August 1915: 248.

flesh, and has watched the flames burning its own homesteads” could fully appreciate the “agony of international strife”.⁶³³

Amongst the British entries, the *Connoisseur* praises Woodville’s *Saving the Guns at Maiwand* for being “perhaps the most spirited picture in the exhibition” and for “the movement and action of the frantically galloping horses” whose vigour “carries conviction to the spectator”.⁶³⁴ Wollen, though singled out for praise by the *Athenaeum*, is not mentioned at all in this review, and Charlton, whose work was said to be similar to Woodville’s but “less vigorous”, and Crofts only merit a sentence each.⁶³⁵ Instead, Charlton was left to fall back on his native Newcastle for a solo exhibition in 1917.

Known as the “Laureate of the hunting-field”, Charlton was not born into an artistic family and spent several years as an apprentice in a large engineering works before being encouraged by his employers to spend one day a week on his study of painting.⁶³⁶ He was much influenced by the work of his fellow Northumbrian, the engraver Thomas Bewick, whose two surviving sisters took a great interest in his work. Like Butler and Crofts, Charlton frequently eschewed conflictual battle scenes, using his study of horses to invoke the atmosphere and the “feelings of the absent [human] protagonists”.⁶³⁷ His solo exhibition featured seven oil paintings on a war theme, five from before the First World War and two paintings from 1915 not seen at the Guildhall. Both these latter are on extremely large canvases. His *French Artillery Crossing the Flooded Aisne* (fig.60) measures 112 by 183.5 centimetres, and was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1915, eliciting the comment in the *Studio* merely that it

⁶³³ Spielmann, 1901: 421.

⁶³⁴ The *Connoisseur*, vol. 42, August 1915: 248.

⁶³⁵ The *Connoisseur*, vol. 42, August 1915: 248.

⁶³⁶ De Walton, 1906: 619.

⁶³⁷ Hichberger, 1988: 90.

is “of note”.⁶³⁸ It features retreating French cavalymen converging on a narrow, makeshift bridge over a river in full spate, waves erupting like a spouting whale as they hit the side of the bridge. The troops, in their dark blue uniform, are making their way in a downward curve from top left to middle front, massing in smaller groups as they are encouraged onwards by their fellow soldiers. The last group is pictured silhouetted against the lightening sky and it is evident from the reaction of one of the horses as it rears up that an exploding shell has been dangerously near. To their right is an abandoned gun carriage, possibly stuck in the heavy mud, whilst the riders wave to the stragglers, shells exploding around them. On the extreme right a solitary, deathly, figure stands on the brow of a hill holding his sword aloft, symbolically, as if to block escape. Nearer to the front another group is manipulating a gun carriage with difficulty down towards the river. The central, foremost group is making its way across a narrow, rickety bridge, their horses still linked together, and it is this group which is the chief interest in the painting, as it provides an opportunity for the viewer to observe closely the presentation of its constituents. As they surge forward the men give the impression of being more than a little out of control, much as in Charlton’s earlier *Placing the Guns*, as the leader battles to hold on tightly to the reins, leaning over to steady his mount, while at the same time trying to manage a second, riderless, horse alongside. It is clear he is concentrating hard, his chin pressed down on his hollowed out chest as he holds on grimly. Behind him, his fellow soldier is looking down and away from the front of the canvas, his eyes shaded by the peak of his cap. He is followed by a third soldier, crouching over his horse’s neck, again leaning away from the front; the fourth has no expression as he looks vacantly up and the face of the fifth is hidden. The horses, meanwhile, show real fear in their bloodshot eyes, pulled back ears and flaring nostrils. Careful attention has been paid to their physique with graded differentiation of a close-toned palette to highlight the musculature, with the judicial use of white to

⁶³⁸ The *Studio*, vol. 65, 1915: 26, 29.

indicate a sweaty sheen. Beneath them the river to the right of the bridge resembles a whirlpool as it crashes round a fallen tree, and is only slightly more blue-grey in colour than the slippery wet mud on the bridge and the surrounding earth.⁶³⁹

The tension in the painting is created by the danger the troops face from both the enemy to their rear and the fragile bridge before them. How are all these men on their frightened, galloping horses to manage such an insecure structure without falling off into the swirling waters beneath? Charlton has inverted Butler's device of the "charge", transforming it into a headlong retreat, much like Woodville's *Saving the Guns at Maiwand*, and coupled it with a bridge of last resort in frenetic and desperate conditions. Even given his customary reliance on horses for drama, I argue that by forcing the retreating troops over such a perilous gateway to safety, Charlton offers an insight into a greater, unknown, terror. These are frantic men, both fleeing from and hurtling to their destruction from which only good fortune is likely to save them, a cogent comment on the progress of the war which for many similarly seemed chaotic and out of control.⁶⁴⁰ Perhaps on account of its timing, this was not a popular device and it is not surprising that this painting, with its far from optimistic message, was not among those chosen for the Guildhall exhibition, in spite of its obvious dramatic energy. This was an exhibition which instead served to reinforce the solidity of London, sitting squarely in the middle of a vast Empire, encapsulated in the 1904 painting *Heart of the Empire* by Niels Möller Lund (1863-1916) (fig.61); a signal that above all here was a London both powerful and, along with her allies, worth defending from the aggressor, Germany.⁶⁴¹ In the Guildhall exhibition there was no room for despair.

⁶³⁹ I am told by the curator of the Laing Art Gallery that the painting is due for cleaning which may well make the colours more distinct.

⁶⁴⁰ This is a marked contrast to Charlton's silence on the progress of the war in South Africa.

⁶⁴¹ This painting now hangs in the Guildhall Art Gallery.

Three months before the Guildhall exhibition, in March 1915, and in marked contrast, the London Group was exhibiting at the Goupil Gallery, London, showing works by Henri Gaudier-Brzeska (1891-1915), Jacob Epstein (1880-1959), Nevinson, Wyndham-Lewis, Edward Wadsworth (1889-1949) and William Roberts (1895-1980) among others and whose critical reception was similarly unfavourable, but for very different reasons.⁶⁴² While Butler was criticised for sentimentality and Charlton for being derivative, this group was roundly censured for its unpatriotic, militaristic approach and as Malvern has commented, was “popularly associated with degeneracy and insanity”, echoing Clausen’s exhortations to his students in 1913 to refer back to painters of an earlier age and to avoid the modern “decadents”.⁶⁴³ By the time of the Guildhall exhibition critical thinking had moved swiftly on, and the Vorticists’ solitary show at the Doré Art Gallery received positive reviews acknowledging their efforts to use images of machinery to represent the volatile state of the world around them.⁶⁴⁴

In the first decade of the new century, Butler had been busy “getting up a ‘one-man-show’” to which she refers as the first of many.⁶⁴⁵ A previous attempt to exhibit in Ireland in 1904 had been frustrated by what she tantalisingly refers to an “absurd bungling in Dublin”,

⁶⁴² Malvern, 2004: 5.

⁶⁴³ When Charlton’s *Retreat from the Marne* was shown at the Royal Academy in 1915, the *Illustrated London News* wrote that “the general character of this work reminds us too closely of the battle pieces of thirty years ago: there is nothing save in detail to identify it with the New War”, *ILN* 8 May 1915, cited by Harrington, 1992: 50; for Clausen’s advice see Clausen, 1913: 327, 339; for degeneracy see Black, 2004: 3, citing Arthur Clutton-Brock, art critic of *The Times* in March 1915, who regarded such work as “debased”, and a product of German philosophy, and it is of note that Max Nordau had published his widely translated work *Degeneration* in 1892, attacking degenerate modern art. In addition, Malvern cites Claude Phillips, art critic of the *Daily Telegraph* who regarded modern art as an infection or disease, Malvern, 2004: 5; Tickner, 2000: 186 cites Charles Ricketts in his critique of “some sort of decivilising change, latent about us, which expresses itself especially in uncouth sabotage, Suffragette and post-Impressionism, Cubist and Futurist tendencies”. The same argument was reproduced in the Second World War, Powers, 2013: 155.

⁶⁴⁴ Black, 2004: 35 cites Frank Rutter, critic of the *Sunday Times*, who was especially positive.

⁶⁴⁵ Butler, 1993: 239.

resulting in her description of a “blank year for me artistically, I fear”.⁶⁴⁶ Rather than exhibiting battle paintings in oil, she began to concentrate mainly on watercolours with the occasional oil painting, including a landscape entitled *Homeward in the Afterglow: A Cistercian Shepherd in Medieval England* which, she writes, gave her “a period of the most exquisitely reposeful work”, but which was not well received when exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1908.⁶⁴⁷ Butler reflected in her autobiography that the public made it clear they did not want idylls from her, but “soldiers and horses”.⁶⁴⁸

Her paintings, however, continued to be reproduced as prints, as evidenced by her letters to her sister, firstly in August 1902 when she writes that “my drummers are to be engraved by Goupil”, and again in 1915 expressing her astonishment at “the wonderful way” in which *Halt!* had been reproduced in *Holly Leaves*.⁶⁴⁹ One painting she did send to the Academy was *Rescue of Wounded, Afghanistan* (fig.62) in 1905. Although delighted when it was well hung, she did not find a purchaser, possibly because the landscape resembled too much that of the South African Veldt, possibly because the subject-matter was insufficiently engaging or topical, but possibly also on account of the decline in demand for large-scale paintings of this sort.⁶⁵⁰ More probably, Butler was no longer approaching her work

⁶⁴⁶ Butler, 1993: 239; DA: 1164, letter Butler to her son, Dom Urban Butler, 27 March 1904 (uncatalogued), though she gives no further information with regard to the “bungling”, see Dennehy, 1909: 27-33 for an account of the attempts in 1904 to set up an exhibition in Dublin.

⁶⁴⁷ Butler, 1993: 241. This painting is also referred to as *Homeward in the Afternoon: A Cistercian Shepherd in Medieval England*; Spencer-Smith and Usherwood, 1987: 27 comment that it “received no acclaim”. In her autobiography Butler is unclear as to the date and venue of this first exhibition, although the first mention of her working towards it is in 1904. There is no record of an exhibition prior to 1912 in the National Art Library at the V & A which holds the catalogues for the other shows mentioned and it is likely that she is referring to the 1912 exhibition.

⁶⁴⁸ Butler, 1993: 241-42.

⁶⁴⁹ HHG: letter Butler to Alice Meynell, 12 August 1902 (uncatalogued); this could refer either to her watercolour *Royal Horse Artillery Halt!* (c1893) (Royal Collection) or to *Halt on a Forced March: Peninsular War, 104-105* (1892) (King’s Shropshire Light Infantry Regimental Trustees).

⁶⁵⁰ This was especially so, given her earlier disappointment in the poor hanging of *Dawn at Waterloo* in 1895, Butler, 1993: 194-95; it now hangs in the Army Staff College at Shrivenham, Wiltshire; Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987:172-73

in the manner which had first brought her to public attention and it is as if her more radical approach to the effects of war on the ordinary soldier had been permanently blunted by the recent experience of vitriolic pro-Boer attacks perpetrated on her husband, leading her to retreat onto safer, less controversial ground.⁶⁵¹ As evidence of her enduring caution, Butler confided in her sister that when Lord Roberts was due to dine at her home in September 1901 her “conversation during dinner will be studiously oblivious of the War”.⁶⁵² General Butler, meanwhile, was busy retrieving his reputation in his evidence to the enquiry on the war, and I suggest that this, combined with a lack of public interest in battle painting, could account for her more traditional treatment of soldiers by removing them from the main focus of the painting, concentrating rather on the horses, as in *The Yeomanry Scouts on the Veldt* and *Rescue of Wounded, Afghanistan*, at the expense of a more critical character study.

It is well documented that Butler had been working hard to remedy what she perceived to be her deficiencies of tone, and Millais’ remark in 1875 that she “draws better than any of us, but I wish her *tone* were better” struck deep.⁶⁵³ She was pleased with the results in her 1905 painting which highlights the back view of a horse, rearing up as his rider dismounts to assist an injured soldier lying in the path of the distant, but advancing, enemy. Here she catches the light on the horse’s mane and rear quarters so that the tail shimmers like pale salmon silk, mirrored by the grey and salmon highlights on the horse’s back. A second horse rolls over in the shadow cast by its companion’s front hooves, throwing up a cloud of sandy dust as it

attribute the lack of interest in the painting to the time delay, especially when compared with Woodville’s painting *Saving the Guns at Maiwand* over twenty years earlier.

⁶⁵¹ General Butler died in 1910. Their daughter, Eileen Gormanston in writing about her parents’ relationship refers to her mother “in whom loyalty was an outstanding quality”, Gormanston, 1953: 33.

⁶⁵² HHG: Butler to Alice Meynell, 5 September 1901 (uncatalogued).

⁶⁵³ Butler, 1993: 238; Millais made this remark after having seen her painting *Quatre Bras* at the Royal Academy.

falls. A third horse is being ridden hard by a soldier carrying away an injured colleague to safety. Notwithstanding its painterly qualities, the picture suffers from the smaller size of the figures as against the expanse of the barren landscape; Butler is distancing herself from character development by removing the opportunity. Instead, the drama of the work, much as in Woodville's *Saving the Guns at Maiwand*, emanates from the dangerous action of rescue itself and is very different in approach to her earlier emphasis on individual suffering.

Meanwhile, the *Roll Call* continued to attract public acclaim as was evident from its reception at an international exhibition in Dublin in 1907, where Alfred Temple had been appointed Honorary Director of the Gallery of Fine Arts, and whose assistance was described in the catalogue as "priceless".⁶⁵⁴ In his speech on 25 October 1907 Temple referred specifically to Edward VII who, contrary to his normal practice, had "graciously lent the famous "*Roll Call*", which, I believe, has been one of the most popular attractions of the Art Section".⁶⁵⁵ Butler makes no mention in her autobiography of *Scotland Forever!* and a photogravure of *Steady, the Drums and Fifes!* which also featured in the exhibition.⁶⁵⁶

In the period between the turn of the century and the outbreak of World War One, Butler exhibited only six paintings at the Academy, partly owing to her low profile during the Boer War and partly on account of her writing, publishing two books of her travels.⁶⁵⁷ It was

⁶⁵⁴ Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 36; Dennehy, 1909: xc. This exhibition was somewhat controversial as being more international than Irish. It was run by the owner of the *Irish Daily Independent*, William Martin Murphy, a publication appealing rather to the Catholic middle-class, of whom Butler was a member, Fanning, 2007: 24; Dennehy, 1909: 30.

⁶⁵⁵ Dennehy, 1909: 120.

⁶⁵⁶ Dennehy, 1909: xciv, cxxi; Crofts and Edwin Abbey were also represented, but Woodville, Charlton, Giles and Wollen are all absent.

⁶⁵⁷ Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 124; the two books are *Letters from the Holy Land*, written for her mother and published in 1905 and *From Sketch-Book and Diary* in 1909. Butler writes to her sister on 19 January 1910 that she was very pleased with the book review in the *Athenaeum* concluding that some "very kind friend must have written it", HHG: 19 October 1910 (uncatalogued letters).

not really until 1911 that she started to focus again on military painting, significantly, one year after the death of both her husband and her mother. It was then that she resumed preparations for her solo show, which she subsequently regarded as a “success” and a “social rendezvous for one’s friends”.⁶⁵⁸ The King had again lent the “good old *Roll-Call*”, which was placed centre stage when the exhibition opened in 1912 at the Leicester Galleries.⁶⁵⁹ Although supplemented by other military works along with drawings from her travels in Italy, Egypt and Ireland, it was clear from the review in *The Times* that it was still the *Roll Call* which appealed to the public in preference to her later paintings.⁶⁶⁰ *The Times* critic clearly approved of her work on this occasion, flatteringly likening her style to that of Rembrandt and Velasquez, a reference perhaps to her more painterly qualities, anticipating Frances Spalding’s view that the “tonal acuity found in Edwardian painting owed much to the example of Velasquez” in particular.⁶⁶¹

In the same year as the Guildhall and Vorticist exhibitions, Butler staged her next solo show, also at the Leicester Galleries, a centenary exhibition specifically to commemorate the Battle of Waterloo, “that inexhaustible battle”.⁶⁶² 1915 was a difficult year for Britain, with the war continuing past the expected return of the troops by Christmas 1914; the British Expeditionary Force had been repulsed and forced to retreat from Mons, the landings at Gallipoli had been disastrous and the casualties were already high, with no obvious end in sight, in what must have seemed a reprise of the war in South Africa. Fears of a German invasion had been heightened by the naval attacks on Scarborough and Hartlepool and the aerial attacks on the south east of England. The *Preface* to the catalogue seeks to address these fears and disappointments with a sentence from *Napoleon’s*

⁶⁵⁸ Butler, 1993: 251.

⁶⁵⁹ Butler, 1993: 251. The King in question this time was George V; the ratio of military to other works was approximately fifty-fifty.

⁶⁶⁰ Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 36, quoting *The Times*, 13 June 1912.

⁶⁶¹ Spalding, 1986: 11.

⁶⁶² Butler, 1993: 252.

Correspondence extolling the fighting spirit of the British stating that the “French, though fewer in number (than the Allied and Prussian armies), would have won the victory but for the obstinate and unconquerable bravery of the British troops which alone prevented them.”⁶⁶³ It is not surprising, therefore, that in this show the highlight was the patriotic and popular *Scotland Forever!* with its energising charge of the Scots Greys. Of the remaining twenty-five exhibits, twenty-four were watercolours and the twenty-fifth, *On the Morning of Waterloo. The Cuirassier’s Last Réveil*, (fig.63) was painted in oil. Just as Butler tentatively wondered “[w]ho will look at my ‘Waterloos’ now?”, she expressed her personal satisfaction with the light effects captured in her new painting by rising with the alarm clock at 2.30 each morning.⁶⁶⁴ She declared it to be the “best ‘show’ [she] had yet had at the Leicester Galleries”, possibly on account of the influential patronage of Queen Mary, possibly on account of a renewed licence to war artists to paint the picturesque.⁶⁶⁵ Restricted to the dull tones of khaki since the last decade of the nineteenth century, Butler was swift to revert to the technicolour of regimental dress as part of the centenary celebrations even as she was asking herself “why dress up grim war in all that splendour”.⁶⁶⁶

Against the entry for *On the Morning of Waterloo*, the catalogue includes the following quotation

One thing I shall never forget is the moment when I woke in the morning; the bells of the villages rang for Matins over that great plain; and, looking at the crops beaten down, my comrades lying asleep to right and left, the grey sky, such a vast desolation made my heart shudder [. . .] I said to myself this is Sunday, a day of rest and peace [. . .] But the roll of the drums was now beginning, a dull, sinister sound in the humid air. Towards the high road, to the left,

⁶⁶³ VAM (*Waterloo Centenary, 1815-1915: Catalogue of an Exhibition of Pictures by Lady Butler*) May/June 1915: 213: 1, citing *Napoleon’s Correspondence*, xxiv: 240.

⁶⁶⁴ Butler, 1993: 258.

⁶⁶⁵ Butler, 1993: 258, 253.

⁶⁶⁶ Butler, 1993: 256.

they were beating the 'Assembly'; the trumpets of the Cavalry were sounding '*le Réveil*'.⁶⁶⁷

This elegiac description of “the uncertain hour before the morning”, could equally apply to her 1893-95 painting, *Dawn of Waterloo*, suggesting that the intention behind this new work was similar in its focus on the nervous tension before battle.⁶⁶⁸ In fact, the paintings are very different. Whereas in the earlier painting she concentrated on the expressions of the men as they awoke on the dawn of battle, here Butler has restricted her vision to the four horsemen sounding the réveille in the early morning light, resonating with appropriately apocalyptic images. All four, centrally placed, are mounted on splendid white horses reminiscent of the brilliant greys in *Scotland Forever!* They catch the light as it falls on them gradually as the sun rises across the canvas, from right to left so that the horse on the left is mostly in shade, while his companion on the right is bathed in light.⁶⁶⁹ The soldiers, dressed in blue with red epaulettes, white jacket fronts and elaborate blue and gilt helmets, are sounding their trumpets, watched from the distance by a single mounted officer. Signs of camp fires can just be seen behind him. The absence of other activity creates a somewhat eerie sensation of calm before the battle. The narrative of this morning scene, as the horses seem to emerge from an impressionistic mist, conveys a very different emphasis to that of its predecessor by avoiding a more intimate examination of the men’s faces and body language. Unusually, Butler did not use live models for this painting, writing of her preparations “I had modelled a little grey horse and a man, and set them up on my balcony, facing in the right direction, and there I waited with palette spread, for the dawn.”⁶⁷⁰ Instead of dwelling on

⁶⁶⁷ VAM, (*Waterloo Centenary, 1815-1915: Catalogue of an Exhibition of Pictures by Lady Butler*) May/June 1915: 7; the quotation is from *Waterloo* by Erchmann-Chatrian.

⁶⁶⁸ T.S.Eliot, *Little Gidding*.

⁶⁶⁹ Butler explains in her autobiography how she had to work quickly as “the first ray of sunrise would spoil all” and so had to restrict herself to “all-important dabs”, Butler, 1993: 252.

⁶⁷⁰ Butler, 1993: 252.

the mixed emotions of the waking men so strongly emphasised in the earlier painting, with their “fine Irish faces”, this painting privileges the rousing call of the *réveille*. It is designed to stir the blood before gallant action as the trumpeters are profiled against the horizon and, I suggest, aptly underlines the patriotic fervour which celebration of the centenary of Waterloo was intended to inspire.⁶⁷¹

The exhibition as a whole was reviewed, not unsympathetically, by the *Sketch*, professing that “the failure of the Royal Academy to produce any battle-pieces looking like war as the modern soldier knows it renders the re-appreciation of Lady Butler’s work all the keener”.⁶⁷² This may, as Hichberger suggests, indicate Butler’s renewed popularity at the start of World War One, but I argue is equally indicative of the difficulties for artists, especially in the early days of the war, in finding suitable material.⁶⁷³ Not only were artists not sent out in an official capacity until 1916, but even when they did go, it was often difficult to send back work representing war in the manner for which they had been commissioned. Muirhead Bone, for example, whose remit was to draw ruins, initially found nothing but mud.⁶⁷⁴ Those artists who were able to experience the war zone before 1916 did so by virtue of their status as soldiers or medical personnel and the like. Even so, they were confronted with the dilemma of either providing a historical document or making a good picture, and as Alan Powers has observed very few were able to do both.⁶⁷⁵ That the *Sketch* was able to comment on Butler’s work in a positive way is likely to reflect as much the nationalistic propaganda the exhibition was designed to promote as the quality of the works on display, denoting a clear difference between her reception in this Waterloo themed exhibition and the more eclectic Guildhall show, which also featured paintings from the Crimea and Peninsular Wars.

⁶⁷¹ Butler, 1993: 184.

⁶⁷² Cited in Harrington, 1993: 306-308.

⁶⁷³ Hichberger, 1988: 106.

⁶⁷⁴ Harries, 1983:10.

⁶⁷⁵ Powers, 2013: 155.

During this centenary year there were many attempts, both popular in the form of posters and in the illustrated press as well as in academic paintings, to capitalise on patriotic sentiment in aid of the war effort especially in the run up to the introduction of conscription in 1916.

Scotland Forever! was listed in the catalogue accompanied by two stirring quotations. The first from Siborne's *History of the Waterloo Campaign* reads

As the Scots Greys passed through and mingled with the Highlanders, the enthusiasm of both corps was extraordinary. They mutually cheered. Scotland Forever! was their war shout [. . .] without pausing for a moment to reform, those of the Greys who had forced their way through [. . .] the mass (of French Infantry) rushed boldly onward against the leading supporting column of Marcognet's right brigade.

The second is from the last survivor of the charge, Sergeant-Major Dickson, who recalled that “[i]t was a grand sight to see the long line of giant grey horses dashing along with flowing manes and heads down” with the “men, in their red coats and tall bearskins” who “were cheering loudly and the trumpets were sounding the charge”.⁶⁷⁶ Butler wrote to her sister that the “Private View was a brilliant success” with “hardly place to move in the crush”, concluding that “‘Scotland for Ever’ [sic] pounds its way, as it were, through the delicate watercolours”.⁶⁷⁷ The popularity of this image was reinforced the same year when it was reproduced in a German New Year card, wishing the troops a safe and speedy return home, and with Prussian troops replacing the Scots Greys.⁶⁷⁸ Even in the twenty-first century, references to Waterloo are not without their resonance and it is certain that the bi-centenary similarly will not

⁶⁷⁶ VAM, (*Waterloo Centenary, 1815-1915: Catalogue of an Exhibition of Pictures by Lady Butler*) May/June 1915: 213: 5.

⁶⁷⁷ HHG: Butler to Alice Meynell, 30 May 1915 (uncatalogued).

⁶⁷⁸ Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 83; the Prussians and British were allies at Waterloo.

pass by unnoticed regardless of simultaneous commemorations of the First World War.⁶⁷⁹

Butler had not been able to travel out to the Front and her opportunities for representing modern warfare were restricted to her imagination, limited photography, second-hand reportage and personal observation from her visits to her “soldier son” Patrick in the New Forest before he left for France.⁶⁸⁰ It is clear that she quickly grasped the new nature of this war and as early as September 1914 was writing in her diary that “here we are pouring soldiers into the great jaws of death in hundreds of thousands, and sending poor human flesh and blood to face the new ‘scientific’ warfare”.⁶⁸¹ Accustomed as she was to spending time with soldiers throughout her married life, she observed the difference in the men’s bearing in their “quiet seriousness quite new to me. They are going to look death straight in the face”.⁶⁸²

Butler continued to exhibit at the Leicester Galleries, until 1919.⁶⁸³ After her “Waterloo” exhibition she had promised to “turn all [her] attention to this stupendous war”.⁶⁸⁴ Her first “khaki” show, *Glimpses of the Great War* in 1917, carried a personal apologia for painting war pictures in which she invited her audience to consider the proposition “[m]ay not the sensitive painter, who shrinks from too near an approach, share, after all, the truer insight?”⁶⁸⁵ It is

⁶⁷⁹ Nelson, too, was popular as evidenced by Fred Roe’s painting *The Toast of Britain*, used as a print by Wright’s Coal Tar Soap, in which Benjamin West is seen toasting Nelson at a Royal Academy banquet, Harrington, 1992: 47. For the commemoration of Waterloo, see *Bonaparte and the British* at the British Museum in 2015; Bonaparte’s enduring fascination is evident by his placing above Shakespeare in a poll conducted by the *Guardian* in January 2014, *Guardian*, 1 February 2014.

⁶⁸⁰ Patrick, her eldest son was A.D.C. to General Capper, 7th Division. It was his idea that she should see an army under war conditions, Butler, 1993: 253.

⁶⁸¹ Butler, 1993: 253; she repeats these sentiments in a letter to her sister, HHG: 26 September 1914 (uncatalogued).

⁶⁸² Butler, 1993: 254; this resonates with Keegan in his discussion of how Sandhurst recruits come face to face with the prospect of war, Keegan, 2004: 18.

⁶⁸³ Malvern, 2004: 37.

⁶⁸⁴ Butler, 1993: 258.

⁶⁸⁵ VAM (*Glimpses of the Great War*) May/June 1917: 242: 3.

evident here that she recognised her handicap in not personally experiencing war, just as she reflected on the possibility that distance from the scene might give her an equal, if not greater, emotional understanding. Her exhibition, although opening “with most *satisfactory éclat*”, *fell short of this promise, including as it did several posed portraits of winners of the Victoria Cross and her 1897 painting, *Steady, the Drums and Fifes!* previously exhibited at the Guildhall, which, in its rich red regimental colours, could hardly be described as a “khaki” exhibit.*⁶⁸⁶ In any event, none of these captured the sense of the Western Front and they did little to encourage public interest in her work.

Two watercolours which did show scenes from World War One were *The London Irish at Loos* (1916) (fig.64), depicting a charge as in *Scotland Forever!* but by the infantry rather than the cavalry, and the processional *Eyes Right* (1916), both paintings representing soldiers in khaki dress.⁶⁸⁷ The first refers to an episode when the London Irish kicked a football across No Man’s Land into the German lines, and appears to have been commissioned for a book by Wilfred Meynell according to a letter from Butler.⁶⁸⁸ The painting shows the men, rifles in hand, rushing forward courageously, striding over their injured colleagues towards an invisible enemy, but exhibits little of Butler’s earlier emphasis on the traumatic nature of war. Rather, these soldiers are caught up in the moment, their adrenalin driving them on with little thought for the consequences of their action, fed on the traditional view that war encapsulated glory, honour and charges. The pounding horses of *Scotland Forever!* are substituted by the onward rush of the men as they follow their leader, arm aloft as he dribbles the football towards the enemy lines, Butler adopting, and adapting, her own formula of the charge. As in *On the Morning*

⁶⁸⁶ Butler, 1993: 259.

⁶⁸⁷ According to Michael Lee, *Eyes Right* was painted in aid of the Red Cross; see also *Country Life* 18 January 1979 cited in HHG: T.E.Weller’s scrapbook: 155.

⁶⁸⁸ Butler writes that she would be “delighted to do the footballer for your very promising book-but it must be in watercolour”, HHG: letter, Butler to Wilfred Meynell, 22 February 1916 (uncatalogued).

of *Waterloo* and her Boer war paintings, Butler pays great attention to her technique, and in particular the way the light is refracted through the rain, with the use of soft greys, blue, white and pink. It is currently exhibited in the regimental museum of the London Irish in Camberwell with the caption

Only at a point on the right there was some confusion and a little irregularity. Were the men wavering? No fear! The boys on the right were dribbling the elusive football towards the German trench.⁶⁸⁹

Like Woodville's earlier twentieth century paintings on Napoleonic themes this painting is small, measuring thirty centimetres by twenty-five centimetres and may reflect Butler's awareness of the increasingly domestic market alongside her own declining popularity as much as its future literary destination.

Eyes Right (fig.65) is a more familiar example of her oeuvre as it depicts a weary and injured group of men marching past a wayside crucifix in advance of the field ambulance. As they do so, they look up to the image of the crucified Christ for sustenance. Although situated after the battle, like the *Roll Call* and *Return from Inkerman*, this portrayal lacks the psychological intensity of her early career, mainly on account of the distance of the figures from the viewer as in *Rescue of Wounded* and may owe its composition to the popular reproduction in the 1914 *Graphic* Christmas edition of *The Great Sacrifice* by James Clark (1858-1943), where a dead soldier and a dreamlike crucified Christ are juxtaposed.⁶⁹⁰

That *Eyes Right* enjoyed some popularity is reflected in its reproduction as a photogravure published by George Pulman and Sons Limited and the Leicester Galleries, who clearly believed Butler still to carry commercial interest.⁶⁹¹ Certainly, she was topical

⁶⁸⁹ Citing *The Great Push* by Patrick MacGill published in 1916.

⁶⁹⁰ The original of this painting was bought by Queen Mary but was widely reproduced in churches and elsewhere.

⁶⁹¹ Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 146.

in her choice of subjects during this period for she writes how one painting *The Avengers* (date and location unknown) “was done under the impulse of great indignation, for Nurse Cavell had been executed”.⁶⁹² Probably the most dramatic of her exhibits was *The Dorset Yeomanry at Agagia, 26th Feb.1916* (1917) (Dorset County Council) a large oil painting, commissioned by Colonel Goodden and presented to the county of Dorset by Lord Portman.⁶⁹³ Unusually this charge features more of the enemy than the British troops in their “flowing *burnouses*, which helped the movement” and who she represented, “rather reluctantly”, posing at their machine guns.⁶⁹⁴ In her autobiography Butler explains that, like Giles in his 1884 painting, *Charge at El Teb, Sudan*, she had striven to represent individual officers for the benefit of the regiment, and that

[o]ne of the most difficult things in painting a war subject is the having to introduce, as often happens, portraits of particular characters in the drama. Their own mothers would not know the men in the heat, dust, and excitement of a charge, or with the haggard pallor on them of a night watch. In the Dorset charge all the officers were portraits.⁶⁹⁵

As with her 1879 commission from Queen Victoria, *The Defence of Rorke’s Drift* (fig.14), I suggest that this painting suffers from Butler’s anxiety to meet her patron’s instructions to show conflict and to privilege named officers over naturalistic presentations of soldiers during a battle.

Her final solo exhibition at the Leicester Galleries in 1919, *Some Records of the World War*, required the assistance of her brother-in-law, Wilfred Meynell, Butler complaining that “Mr Phillips” was “treating [her] in the most inexplicable manner”.⁶⁹⁶ Already in 1916, Leicester Galleries had been hosting very different types of exhibitions, including a solo exhibition by Nevinson and in 1918

⁶⁹² Butler, 1993: 259.

⁶⁹³ Butler, 1993: 259-60.

⁶⁹⁴ Butler, 1993: 260.

⁶⁹⁵ Butler, 1993: 260.

⁶⁹⁶ HHG: letter Butler to Wilfred Meynell, 30 August 1918 (uncatalogued).

paintings by Nash and Kennington, and were moving away from the type of works exhibited by Butler. None of these artists appeared to be in sympathy with her approach to representations of the Great War which, as Meynell's necessary intervention shows, was becoming marginalised in a venue where she had been exhibiting since before the outbreak of war.

As Fox has noted, the Leicester and Goupil galleries were already withdrawing financial support from their less commercially attractive artists during the course of the war, relying more on group exhibitions than solo artists for maximum interest.⁶⁹⁷ Butler's latest exhibition coincided with the Royal Academy's showing of *The Nation's War Paintings* in which she took no part, but instead featured the work of artists such as Wyndham Lewis, Nash and Roberts, though singularly not Nevinson, all by then official war artists and, as such, not only accepted, but promoted by the establishment.⁶⁹⁸ Butler's catalogue this time contained no preface, the artist remaining silent in the hope that the paintings would speak for themselves. As before, there is an emphasis on portraits of military personnel, several sketches and marches, such as the post war narrative watercolour entitled *Back to his Land* (1919) (Manchester City Art Galleries) accompanied by a prosaic caption taken from an officer's letter describing that "[o]ur marches were long and heavy [. . .]. One evening we passed a pathetic old peasant ploughing his desolate field. The Grenadiers gave him a cheer but he seemed too dazed to understand".⁶⁹⁹ Hampered by her lack of direct personal observation, Butler was, however, assisted in her watercolour *The Charge of the Warwickshire and Worcester Yeomanry at Huj, 8th November 1917* (Warwickshire Yeomanry

⁶⁹⁷ Fox, 2009: 108.

⁶⁹⁸ Bennett comments (rather triumphantly) that "not one RA did I descry at the private view", Bennett, 1919: 347; Nevinson complained that his *Harvest of Battle* was omitted from the Royal Academy Summer Exhibition, and was "hidden away in one of the smaller rooms" in the British war art exhibition later that year, Nevinson, 1937: 123.

⁶⁹⁹ VAM (*Glimpses of the Great War*) May/June 1919: 276: 6.

Trust) – a particularly bloody engagement and likened to the Charge of the Light Brigade at Balaclava – by a detailed description from a participant.⁷⁰⁰ As usual, there is little evidence of the enemy, the painting dwelling on the cavalry as they come to the rescue of their colleagues, but the representation lacks originality, having neither the verve of *Scotland Forever!* nor the insight of *Balaclava*.

At the age of seventy-four, Butler's last entry to the Royal Academy came in 1920 with *In the Retreat from Mons: the Royal Horse Guards*, a return to her 'after the event' theme, showing the withdrawal of the wounded troops from the battle front along a pot-holed route marked with the debris of conflict. Abandoned gun carriages, saddles and equipment are scattered across the canvas past dead and dying horses. Mounted troops lead riderless horses accompanied by the odd infantry soldier. Notwithstanding their obvious injuries, however, these men do not appear dejected as in *Balaclava* and *Return to Inkerman* but instead look forward in a spirit of sober stoicism as they make their way back to safety. In 1921, Butler found a purchaser for this work in the Durban Art Gallery and it is tempting to speculate that her short stay in South Africa, or possibly an Irish connection through Hugh Lane, may have raised her profile and consequent interest in her work at the Cape.⁷⁰¹ Six years later she painted a smaller version (fig.66) in which she altered the formation, expanding the tight grouping of the earlier canvas. Art historians have argued that this led to a loss of immediacy in impact, but I suggest that it is no less powerful as a result and that the looser arrangement of the troops reflects the more disjointed nature of their retreat.⁷⁰² It remained unsold in Butler's lifetime, and in a letter from her son Patrick to his brother Dom

⁷⁰⁰ Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 149.

⁷⁰¹ It is of note that Edwin Lutyens was commissioned to design the art gallery in Johannesburg after the Boer War, highlighting the artistic connection between Britain and the then South African colony; it is also significant that in the year of the Dublin exhibition where Butler exhibited, Hugh Lane was busy with the establishment of Dublin's Municipal Art gallery, Gregory, 1973:78.

⁷⁰² Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 152.

Urban Butler the year after her death it is clear that the family had been trying unsuccessfully to sell this smaller painting to the “Blues”. Patrick writes that he is aware that “in darling Mom’s pictures there seem touches that regiments don’t like [. . .]. They are so stupidly particular sometimes” and speculates that in this case the touch was “[t]hat man with (I think) his arm in a sling”.⁷⁰³ In the event, Patrick presented the painting to the Royal Hospital for Pensioners, Chelsea, where it remains today.⁷⁰⁴

Exhibiting History

The Boer War stretched an old narrative to the limits and cracks in it reached through an Edwardian twilight to 1914⁷⁰⁵

Reflecting on the challenge facing late-Victorian war artists at the turn of the century, it is fair to say that it was not easy to be a battle painter when there was no popular contemporary war to represent. After the treaty of Vereeniging in May 1902, Britain was not directly involved in military conflict until the outbreak of war in August 1914 and the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-05 attracted little attention in Britain.⁷⁰⁶ None of the artists, such as Woodville, Crofts, Giles, Butler, Wollen or Charlton, chose incidents from this conflict to paint. Instead they drew inspiration from much earlier historical subjects including the English Civil War and the perennially popular Waterloo. In 1904, Woodville painted *Scotland Yet! On to Victory*, featuring a charge of the Scots Greys at Waterloo (Royal Scots Dragoon Guards) and *At the Trumpet’s Call* (private collection) which portrayed the battle of Marston Moor of 1644, but neither

⁷⁰³ DA correspondence Patrick Butler to Urban Butler dated 10 February 1934: 1164 (uncatalogued). He writes that he asked for 150 guineas but would have taken less, a massive reduction from the prices Butler was receiving in the 1870s, for example, £2000 for *Listed for the Connaught Rangers* evidenced by the agreement of 28 October 1878, BAM: Elizabeth Butler file, (uncatalogued).

⁷⁰⁴ It is not on view but is hung in the dining-room of the commandant; Patrick Butler also donated an oil painting, *Wounded Guardsman, Crimea* to the National Army Museum (ref: 6311-194-1) and *Within Sound of the Guns* to the Army Staff College, while his brother, Dom Urban Butler, presented *Yeomanry Scouts on the Veldt* to Downside Abbey.

⁷⁰⁵ Attridge, 2003: 188.

⁷⁰⁶ This lack of interest obtained in spite of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902.

painting was exhibited at the Royal Academy. Two years later, he produced a painting in watercolour and pencil, heightened with white, entitled *General Wolfe Climbing the Heights of Abraham on the Morning of the Battle of Quebec*, (fig.67) following West and anticipating Derwent Wood by some four years.⁷⁰⁷ Significantly smaller in size than his earlier canvases, this evokes a very different mood and has echoes of Butler's earlier *Dawn of Waterloo*, with its subdued lighting, as the troops mount the heights before battle. The dramatic coastline and sheer drop to the creek below emphasise the daring of Wolfe's planned assault as the soldiers scramble up the cliff, grasping at clumps of vegetation for lack of firmer footholds. One holds a flaming torch to light the way for his fellow soldiers, while at the bottom of the cliff can be seen four rowing boats on their way to discharge yet more troops. On the opposite side of the narrow creek is another steep incline and through the gap can be seen the war ships as they ferry the troops to battle.

On the top of the cliff stands Wolfe, hat in hand, with the moon shining on his immaculate wig and forehead picked out in strong white paint. Standing with his hand on the pommel of his sword, right foot forward on a gentle mound, left leg firmly planted on the lower ground, it is evident that he is in command of himself, the situation and his troops. He inclines his head to face the front of the canvas as he listens to his fellow officer, his expression serious, but calm and confident. He is every inch the model soldier in his shiny high leather boots, tight breeches and pristine buttoned jacket and, like Joy's Gordon, appears almost saintly, even Christlike, on the eve of death, as he references West's more famous representation of the dying hero. To the right of Wolfe, and, at a suitably lower level, stands his colleague, deferentially looking up to his general, and beyond to the troops streaming off to the battlefield. Like Wolfe, he is beautifully dressed; like Wolfe, he is motionless, exuding earnest

⁷⁰⁷ Derwent Wood's sculpture was unveiled in 1911, IWM, War Memorial Archive online: 62175, accessed 22 April 2014.

concentration in a manner very unlike Woodville's more defiant heroes of the Boer War. Neither can be said to be types, but are individually and carefully drawn, to call attention to their sensitive and intelligent characters. These are men of destiny, and one, at least, we know will shortly be sacrificed to his calling, in a deliberate fusion of religion and nationalism. There is no sense of Woodville having rushed to complete this picture. Rather, we see a very measured painting, which matches the danger and gravitas of the situation, and one which privileges calm and careful planning over derring-do. This is a work which invites the viewer to empathise with the soldiers and to consider how it must feel to be at risk of death and where survival is, to a large part, a matter of chance; a work which offers the opportunity for reflection in the very pause before action, at the height of the drama and where time appears to stand still in this pre-dawn moment. Rather than portraying Wolfe mortally wounded, Woodville has chosen to capture that intense moment before the battle when soldiers become fully alive to their own mortality, that very instant to which Tolstoy referred in his letter to his brother from the Crimea. "There we all were," he wrote "as always on the eve of a battle [. . .] pretending not to think of the following day", but all "at the bottom of our hearts" feeling "a slight pang (and not even slight, but pronounced) at the thought of the assault".⁷⁰⁸ I suggest that this change in Woodville's approach signifies the lack of urgency to produce battle paintings after the end of the Boer War and one which enabled Woodville to develop a more contemplative presentation. It is fitting in that it allows for an expansiveness through which the full weight of Wolfe's heroism and sacrifice can be appreciated in a manner echoing that of West, even with its smaller size and different materials. Just as the war in South Africa had "shifted the normal paradigm of imperial conflict", so war artists were left to consider the effect of this unsatisfactory victory on public imagination, adjusting their own approach to accommodate it.⁷⁰⁹ Here Woodville

⁷⁰⁸ Tolstoy cited by Figes, 2011: 184.

⁷⁰⁹ Briggs, 2007: 5.

follows Butler both by rejecting conflict and by allowing himself the luxury of dwelling on his more painterly techniques in a manner previously denied – or deliberately avoided by – him when working for the illustrated press; a style more suited to the quasi-religious solemnity his picture explores. The reduced size of his work, I suggest, reinforces the experimental nature of this new style, and is in keeping with new and shifting market conditions.

To the front of the canvas, Woodville shows a number of ordinary soldiers, one in a light coloured uniform bearing a large drum on his back and looking up admiringly towards Wolfe from a crouching posture reminiscent of the Sudanese troops in *The Charge of the 21st Lancers at Omdurman*. In a further reference to West's painting, a Native American chief with full headdress stands to the left of Wolfe, holding one arm across his chest, his weapon firmly pointing down, as if to welcome Wolfe openly as a saviour to his country. In choosing to represent Wolfe, in this period leading up to the First World War, Woodville has selected a seminal historical episode of immense cultural significance, confident that in doing so his representation would be seen within a shared visual culture, and one where his audience would be aware that the death of the hero is imminent.⁷¹⁰ At the same time, he has injected just that interstitial element of nationalistic unease for the future which characterised the first decades of the new century.

As in West's painting, Wolfe is surrounded by his faithful followers and although situated slightly off centre, there is no doubt that he is the key interest. There is no sign of enemy troops in Woodville's representation and in West's, they are in the far distance, privileging the drama around the main figure. It is significant that at a time when confidence in the armed forces was bruised, Woodville felt the need to reassert British supremacy by reverting to an incident which

⁷¹⁰ See Perry, 2012: 734-36 for a discussion of historical art references between genres.

heralded Britain's definitive victory over France in Canada. Significantly, too, whereas West was in the forefront of history painters choosing their subject-matter from contemporary events, Woodville was profiling a one hundred and fifty year old hero.⁷¹¹

It was not long, however, before Woodville renewed his focus on the Napoleonic Wars with no fewer than thirteen representations of this period between 1900 and 1914. It is clear that he harboured a deep admiration for the French Emperor with titles such as *Poniatowski's Last Charge at Leipzig*, (1912) (fig.68) *Napoleon Crossing the Bridge to Lobau Island*, (1912) (fig.69) *Napoleon Conferring the Légion D'Honneur on a Russian General, 1804* (1912) (private collection) and *Marshall Ney at the Battle of Eylau*, (1913) (fig.70) all of which may indicate his disillusionment with British commanders during the Boer War and before, even to the exclusion of Wellington, notwithstanding the centenary of the battle was fast approaching, affording war artists an opportunity of showcasing their skills. When asked to contribute to the Guildhall Anniversary Exhibition in 1915, however, of the three Woodville paintings on display, only one, *Napoleon Crossing the Bridge to Lobau Island*, made any reference to the Napoleonic Wars.⁷¹²

It was with these wars that Woodville reverted to his previous rapid style, as exemplified in *Poniatowski's Last Charge*, where the eponymous hero virtually leaps out of the canvas on his sweating horse, thrusting his way forward, sword held straight out in front of him. Dressed in the most gorgeous costume with white gloves, silver braiding round his shoulders over a blue jacket with scarlet front, a silver helmet with the initial *N* inscribed on the front, topped by an elaborate red shako, silver plume and tassels, Poniatowski himself is consummately theatrical, with his large sandy moustache and fierce

⁷¹¹ Mackenzie, 1999: 274.

⁷¹² Temple, A.6.6.No 69 where the catalogue refers to the painting as *Napoleon Crossing to the Island of Lobau*.

glaring eyes. He is shown here as a man of action with no time for reflection, and in a representation which has just that quality which Woodville so astutely honed for his work in the illustrated press. Similarly, the rapid brush strokes are loosely worked and make for an unfinished appearance, with Poniatowski almost a caricature of himself. Coincidentally, one year prior to this painting, an article appeared in the press under the heading 'The Making of the 'Illustrated London News'. How the Paper is Produced each Week' explaining that at times of exceptional pressure, "there is not a moment's delay between the completion of each drawing and its dispatch to the block-makers for reproduction", "for speed is then more than ever important and is the thing most sought".⁷¹³ To accompany the article is a photograph of the artists in the studio (fig.71), featuring Woodville proudly "standing in the centre [. . .] at the easle" [sic].⁷¹⁴ A decade after peace was declared in South Africa, artists as illustrators are once again being placed under pressure to produce, notwithstanding the absence of war, obliging them to fall back on history and their own imagination.

Napoleon Crossing the Bridge to Lobau Island (1912) (fig.69) is very different in style and has much in common with Meissonier's more sombre procession, *1814: Campagne de France*.⁷¹⁵ As in this earlier painting, Napoleon is shown leading his troops, but this time across a cleverly constructed bridge of rafts pointing the French to victory over the Austrians. He is followed by his command staff all appearing relaxed as they turn to talk among themselves, watched by the infantry as they pass by. The officers, as usual, are dressed decoratively while Napoleon wears his characteristic sombre grey greatcoat. Just as in the Meissonier painting, there is no dramatic charge, and in fact no enemy troops, and has all the appearance of a gentle hack in pleasant wooded landscape, and with oblique

⁷¹³ *ILN*, 2 September 1911.

⁷¹⁴ *ILN*, 2 September 1911.

⁷¹⁵ This similarity was noted by the critic of the *Connoisseur* in a review of the 1915 exhibition at the Guildhall, *Connoisseur*, August 1915: 245.

references to Butler's device of the "march past". Woodville is relying on the viewers' knowledge of Napoleon's tactical skill in his tribute to an admired hero rather than on any overt indication of military brilliance.

Less hasty than his portrayal of Poniatowski, but still with Woodville's hallmark of dashing heroes, Marshal Ney leads his troops forward with *élan* as he arrives late in the day to support Napoleon, at what proved to be a pyrrhic victory and the first sign of fallibility in the *Grande Armée*. As in his earlier painting, *Saving the Guns at Maiwand*, Woodville has adapted Butler's "charge" formula to chime with his sense of the dramatic in this 1913 painting, *Marshal Ney at the Battle of Eylau* (fig.70). Once again, prominence is given to the exotic uniforms, depicted in great detail. Ney is wearing a broad cummerbund which appears to shimmer with genuine gold as it floats behind him in the wind. He is seated on the most elaborate saddlecloth of crimson red with gold trim as his horse charges forward, riding over a dead soldier lying face down, half covered in snow. To the bottom left of the painting is a signature exploding shell; to the bottom right, another dead soldier, dressed in green, his rich golden headpiece with red pom-pom tassels lying at his side. Interestingly, Woodville has shown greater characterisation in both Ney and his older, white-haired companion than in his Boer War pictures. As in the painting of Wolfe, neither are his usual types, Ney throwing his head back determinedly as he exhorts his men to follow, while the veteran's face shows signs of duty combined with an element of weary resignation, exemplifying the boredom and exhaustion as well as the excitement of battle. In the run-up to World War One, Woodville has, unusually, allowed his skills space to develop, to delve beneath the surface of his earlier typography so as to show a depth of character and experience previously rarely pursued. It is also possible that Woodville saw in the smaller canvas the opportunity for experimentation, without prejudice to his

submissions to the Royal Academy, where he continued to exhibit until his death in 1927.

These last three paintings are on extremely small canvases of approximately thirty-five by twenty-five centimetres, smaller still than the picture of General Wolfe, and in this are atypical of Woodville's earlier work. *Saving the Guns at Maiwand* for example measures 148.6cms by 199.40cms, and *The Charge of the 21st Lancers at Omdurman*, 153.4cms by 245.8cms. These later works resemble genre rather than the history paintings more commonly aspired to in military pictures, and is another indication of the distancing of battle painters from this more elevated form. It is difficult to account for certain for this change in practice other than to suggest that Woodville was doubtful of securing a sale given what he perceived to be a lack of interest in either military art in general, or in more historical subjects, or possibly he was using them as preliminary works for larger-scale paintings which never came to fruition.

It is certainly indicative of thrift and experimentation in a fluctuating market, which was beginning to focus on a more middle-class clientèle, whose homes afforded smaller spaces in which to hang paintings, while aristocratic, landed families were starting to sell their collections overseas. As David Thompson of Goupil Gallery wrote to Whistler in the 1890s, “[t]hings are very bad in London and they will not be better for some time yet until this Baring business altogether disappears”.⁷¹⁶ Referring to large narrative paintings such as those by Butler, the critic, George Moore, opined that the new art-buying public wanted works that were “pleasant and agreeable”, that would “fit their rooms and match their furniture”.⁷¹⁷ Popular art reviews in newspapers, tabloids and mass market periodicals were

⁷¹⁶ Helmreich, 2005: 34; the Baring Brothers bank had crashed after Argentina had defaulted on its loans.

⁷¹⁷ Helmreich, 2005: 40.

designed to appeal to the “gallery-going middle-class” while their shopping experience at department stores such as the newly established Selfridges became as much social and cultural as economic.⁷¹⁸ Harrods, in its advertising literature, likened a visit to the store to the opportunity of viewing a masterpiece in oil or watercolour, as if shopping and art appreciation were interchangeable, encouraging shoppers to craft their identities around newly acquired works of art.⁷¹⁹ Butler’s sister, Alice Meynell, wrote in 1890 that “women have normally had more influence on the state of the picture market than would appear from the names of the buyers and sellers”, and with an increase in the intimate spaces for such art to be exhibited, their influence grew.⁷²⁰ Citing Mica Nava, Erika Rappaport comments that in this period “female consumers were central to the working of the consumer economy and culture and that theirs was a major, if overlooked narrative of modernity”.⁷²¹ As art became more domesticated and available, together with soft furnishings, it became part of the décor. This did not meet with universal approval and in his critique of the new market, Fry was dismissive of a lazy and undemanding public, which chose works that were “restful and charming” as representing “pictures to live with”, rather than more challenging works of art.⁷²² It was this new domestic market, I suggest, that Woodville was aiming for between 1902 and 1914 as an alternative to large-scale Academy works, using familiar subjects and pleasant rural settings, and a clientèle he had previously served in his work for the illustrated press.⁷²³

Woodville’s contemporary, Ernest Crofts, one of the very few military artists of the late nineteenth century to become a member of the Royal Academy, rarely ventured into the realm of current events

⁷¹⁸ Fletcher, 2005: 161 who notes that Selfridges was opened in 1909 and exhibited that year’s rejected entries to the Royal Academy exhibition.

⁷¹⁹ Fletcher, 2005: 162.

⁷²⁰ Meynell cited in Clarke, 2005: 140.

⁷²¹ Rappaport, 2001: 28.

⁷²² Fletcher, 2005: 159; Helmreich, 2005: 40.

⁷²³ Fletcher, 2005: 159.

and concentrated largely on the English Civil War, producing nostalgic views of both Roundheads and Cavaliers. His paintings bore titles such as *Oliver Cromwell at the Storming of Basing House* (Leeds City Art Gallery), completed in 1900 even while the Boer War was still being fought. This was soon followed by *The Surrender of Donnington Castle* (1903) (private collection), *Roundhead Patrol* (1905) (private collection), *The Funeral of Charles I, St. George's Chapel, Windsor* (1907) (Bristol Museum and Art Gallery) and *The Surrender of the City of York to the Roundheads* (1908).⁷²⁴ Trained partly in England, and, like Woodville, partly in Düsseldorf, Crofts was in Germany at the time of the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, and was able to follow the war at close hand, though, not being an official war correspondent, was not always allowed to see the actual fighting, and only able to witness the scene of devastation the day after the battle.⁷²⁵ He first exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1874, the year of the *Roll Call*, with a painting from his recent experience, *A Retreat: An Episode in the French-German War* (private collection), echoing Butler's 1873 entry *Missing*.⁷²⁶ As with Butler, Crofts tended to avoid "the hammer and tongs of war" and is praised by Spielmann for his "skilful composition, his facile drawing", "his refined treatment" and "his spirited representation of soldiers and soldiering rather than of fights and fighting".⁷²⁷ Unlike Butler, however, the similarity did not extend to emotional representation, for in many of Crofts' works, the soldiers are facing away from the viewer or are too far away for their demeanour to be studied, his interest lying rather in subject matter,

⁷²⁴ Crofts was elected a Royal Academician and was subsequently, like Jones, appointed Keeper. The other late-Victorian war artist to become RA was Andrew Gow (1848-1920) who similarly chose his topics from the seventeenth century and Napoleonic Wars.

⁷²⁵ Spielmann, 1901: 424; this is true of his first experience at the Battle of Gravelotte, but although he was able to witness both the battle of Saarbrücken and Borny he made no contemporary sketches of either.

⁷²⁶ Spielmann, 1901: 424; in fact his first entry in 1873 was hung, then taken down and returned the following day.

⁷²⁷ Spielmann, 1901: 426; Spielmann similarly praises Butler's early days, regretting that "after a year or two the promise was not fulfilled." Spielmann, 1901: 423.

looking backwards with some longing to historical scenes, precisely at the point of a new century.⁷²⁸

Crofts' *Roundhead Patrol* (fig.72), for instance, depicts a very orderly mounted procession, another "march past", moving towards the front of the canvas. Without the title, the scene could almost be mistaken for a gentle afternoon excursion and there is little hint of the stress of war, somewhat akin to Woodville's *Napoleon Crossing the Bridge to Lobau*. The two leading horsemen are chatting with each other as they walk their horses down a country lane between leafless winter trees, followed by their troops. The one indication of the seriousness of their purpose is the body armour worn by some, though even here that of the front rider is obscured by his cloak. This is an army at ease.

His 1908 painting, *The Surrender of the City of York to the Roundheads* (fig.73) is similar in style. Once again a stately procession of mounted soldiers is featured moving towards the front of the canvas. This time it is situated firmly within its historical context as the troops pass out of the city walls against the backdrop of York Minster. They acknowledge the crowds, interspersed with armed and controlling soldiers, who respond with raised hats. In the background, signs of the devastation of the city can be seen in the smoke rising up from behind the walls, but there is no sense of agitation amongst the local population. These subjects were not a new departure for Crofts, who had been attracted by historical scenes throughout his career but, though praised by Lewis Lusk in 1904 for his "telling study of '*Prince Rupert and his Staff at Marston Moor*'" (Ipswich Museum and Art Gallery), had little of contemporary interest.⁷²⁹ Crofts did not survive to see the outbreak of war in 1914.

⁷²⁸ See for example, *To the Rescue: an Episode from the Civil War*, (1896) (Royal Academy) *Napoleon's Last Grand Attack at Waterloo* (1895) (private collection) and *The Morning of the Battle of Waterloo* (1876) (Mappin Art Gallery, Sheffield).

⁷²⁹ Lusk, 1904: 182.

Meanwhile Charlton continued to exhibit regularly at the Royal Academy until his death in 1917 and, like Giles, was employed by the *Graphic*, supplying the paper with many illustrations of horses, sporting and battle scenes and historical subjects. Wollen reverted to the rich soil of the Napoleonic Wars featuring subjects ranging from Austerlitz to Waterloo as late as 1914, and though he had been sent out by the *Sphere* to cover the events of the Boer War and continued to exhibit battle scenes from the First World War, he features little in contemporary reviews.

Notwithstanding Hichberger's remarks on the upsurge of battle paintings at the start of the twentieth century, it was very much a niche market, for outside the world of the exhibitions, interest in such art was at a low ebb and restricted to fellow artists, their friends and hangers-on.⁷³⁰ As Harrington has observed, this was a world of "minor academic pictures and occasional print royalties", far removed from the cultural heart of the nation.⁷³¹ "We have to forgo the hope of surprises" wrote the critic of the *Manchester Guardian* in 1915 in respect of the Royal Academy entries, for "pleasure must come from the repetition of things that have pleased us before".⁷³² Ironically, just as the civilian population was relieved to put the South African War and its consequences behind them, the market for war art amongst military personnel was not helped by their distraction following events in Europe. Accordingly even regimental commissions had dried up almost completely, Butler's painting for Colonel Goodden an exception. The perception developed that battle artists, too, were weary of war, their work becoming repetitive and derivative, producing what the British War Memorials Committee described in 1917 as "the colourless, academic reconstruction from descriptive material, which has brought the art of the battle painter into discredit".⁷³³

⁷³⁰ Hichberger, 1988: 118.

⁷³¹ Harrington, 1993: 301.

⁷³² Cited in Harrington, 1992: 51.

⁷³³ Cited in Malvern, 2004: 76.

I suggest however that this was a perception which did not take into account the frustrations experienced by the older battle artists in their inability to find novel material for their works, and in particular, to experience war at first hand and to use that experience to inform their artistic representations. The *Illustrated London News*, summed up the problem rather neatly in 1915 complaining that the restrictions on their artists' movements meant that the "war is held at rather more than arm's length by the painters; and the painters, so far have been held at rather more than arm's length by the war".⁷³⁴ As a result, it continued, "[i]n no case has the easel been set up within sight of the trenches and only in one or two cases do you receive so much as an impression of actuality".⁷³⁵ This applied equally to "Specials" used to travelling to the seat of war, while artists sketching in Britain, especially near the south and east coasts, were objects of suspicion. Even such celebrities as Augustus John and Lavery were arrested whilst drawing.⁷³⁶ William Rothenstein is said to have "implored" his friend Colonel Replington of *The Times* to plead with the War Office to allow artists to travel to the Front.⁷³⁷ "The average artist", as Kenneth Clark wrote in the Second World War, "will probably want to go to the Front not simply out of curiosity or bravado but because he may there discover some of the emotional stimulus on a grand scale which is inevitably lacking from his everyday work".⁷³⁸ None of these late-Victorian war artists was given the opportunity of that experience.

Consequently, although the first few years of the 1914-18 War had inspired work by Charlton, Woodville and Wollen, mostly for the illustrated press, this was based on imagination, using historic battles as their models. Notwithstanding the restrictions on movement, the

⁷³⁴ *ILN*, 8 May 1915 in an article *The War and the Academy*.

⁷³⁵ *ILN*, 8 May 1915.

⁷³⁶ John in Galway and Lavery by the Firth of Forth, Fox, 2009: 39.

⁷³⁷ Cited in Harries, 1983: 4.

⁷³⁸ Cited in Harries, 1983: 3.

press was nevertheless keen to represent the war visually for those at home. It had, after all, continued to engage with events overseas into the twentieth century and both the *Illustrated London News* and *The Graphic* sent artists and photographers to cover the Russo-Japanese War of 1904 in spite of a general lack of interest, and were determined to provide the public with news and visual images.⁷³⁹ The *Graphic* advertised urgently for war pictures from men or officers at the Front, while the *Illustrated London News* engaged various artists to produce military scenes in their photogravure series *Great War Deeds*, Woodville producing pictures such as his stirring illustration, *The Winning of the First VC awarded to a Territorial: an Heroic Exploit on Hill 60*.⁷⁴⁰ Villiers, a veteran “Special” who together with Prior “helped to both reflect and shape the popular vision of the Empire at war” was overlooked by the British press but, exceptionally, managed to send back some of the only drawings from the front in the first two years of the war at the request of the French and at a time when other civilian artists and photographers were unable to get anywhere near the action.⁷⁴¹ Nevertheless, as the war progressed, there was a growing feeling, as expressed by Clive Bell, that in the light of photographic advances narrative pictures were “becoming otiose”; had perhaps military painting no longer anywhere to go?⁷⁴²

⁷³⁹ Of the very few paintings resulting from this war, Villiers exhibited *Sap and Shell* in 1905 at Henry Graves and Co. and Henry Seppings Wright (1850-1937) *A Shell Storm at Port Arthur* at the Royal Academy in 1907, but neither attracted great interest.

⁷⁴⁰ Harrington, 1986: 46-47; *ILN*, 17 July 1915; this was an especially personal subject for Woodville given his commission in the National Reserve.

⁷⁴¹ Quotation cited in Springhall, 1986: 54; see Harrington for Villiers’ activities, 1993: 304; Villiers was praised by the *ILN*, 3 July 1915 for his skill and devotion in providing the public with pictures “from the fighting-line”.

⁷⁴² Bell, 1913: 18.

Contemporary History Paintings and Public Entertainment

It would leave a wrong impression to indicate that the general public was becoming any less militant than in 1899.⁷⁴³ Indeed, the humiliations of the war in South Africa had given an impetus to militancy such that it has been viewed as possibly the defining characteristic of the age.⁷⁴⁴ This was true not just in relation to armed combat between nations, but seeped into the realms of social and political action as in the campaigns of the Suffragettes, Labour Party and Irish Nationalists. Basing her design on Walter Crane's female warrior, *Britomart* in 1900 (Bibliothèque des Arts Decoratifs, Paris), Caroline Watts produced one of the seminal emblems of the Women's Suffrage movement for a demonstration in Manchester in 1908, followed by Sylvia Pankhurst's 1912 designs, using motifs from banners used at the Peterloo Massacre of 1819 in her twentieth-century crusade.⁷⁴⁵ There was no doubt that such images were calculated both to inspire participants and to warn spectators of their warlike, but righteous, intent. Concepts of chivalry were being transferred from the soldier and the imperialist to the radical female protester.⁷⁴⁶ Woodville's heroic colonel in *The Charge of the 21st Lancers* had become a combative Suffragette, evoking concepts of martyrdom (as in *All That Was Left of Them*), sacrifice (as in the *Roll Call*) and chivalric honour (as in *Just Like Bobs*).⁷⁴⁷ Nor, in the face of its unsatisfactory outcome, had the Boer War killed imperialism. Rather, imperialism, or at the very least a love of the empire with Britain at its heart, was being renegotiated through renewed notions of chivalry, pageant and spectacle. Memorials to those killed in the Boer War included soldiers dressed in knightly armour, as at Clifton

⁷⁴³ However, Hichberger, as reported in Harrington, suggests that following the Boer War "Englishmen were reticent about war and nationalism", Hichberger, 1987: 117; Harrington, 1993: 301.

⁷⁴⁴ Nicholson, 1979: 157.

⁷⁴⁵ O'Neill, 2008: 114.

⁷⁴⁶ Hart, 2013: 113.

⁷⁴⁷ Hart, 2013: 113.

College.⁷⁴⁸ With the passage of time, even the Boer War began to be viewed as a “gentleman’s war”, and one which afforded “a very pleasant time for a young fellow” who could indulge in his love of sport, while harbouring a romantic yearning for the glory and excitement of war.⁷⁴⁹

Artists, too, were attracted by these picturesque notions. As Shelley Cordulack has demonstrated, Victorian artists had been able to adapt classical mythology to their works of social criticism.⁷⁵⁰ Just so, their successors in the first decades of the twentieth century adapted historical as well as mythological subjects to address modern concerns in a manner which played into this enthusiasm for chivalry and related pageantry.⁷⁵¹ Ignoring the rejection of the narrative in art by Whistler and his followers, artists such as Edwin Austin Abbey (1852-1911) used traditional scenes from Shakespeare’s historical plays to arrive at new interpretations relevant to a contemporary audience, forcing that audience to engage in the drama and its moral consequences, as for example in Abbey’s large canvas of *The Play Scene in Hamlet* (1897) (fig.74). Just as Hamlet and Horatio are focussing on the reaction of the King, so too are the viewers who are invited to take sides in this pivotal scene, emphasising the two-way process of art and theatre.⁷⁵² Essentially a spectacle, a drama and a moral issue, war offered a particularly apposite subject for history paintings, but this had been tempered by the humiliation of the Boer War, resulting in a less overtly militant approach to battle art. As the established war artists retreated onto the safer ground of earlier, less controversial conflicts such as the Napoleonic and English Civil wars, so too, but with different intent, did Edwardian history painters, adopting crusading images as the boundaries between

⁷⁴⁸ Girouard, 1981: 171; there were two proposals for the form of this memorial, one featuring a soldier in khaki, the other a knight in armour and it was the latter that prevailed.

⁷⁴⁹ Pakenham, 1979: 571; Girouard, 1981: 282.

⁷⁵⁰ Cordulack, 2003: 535-83.

⁷⁵¹ Hart, 2013: 111.

⁷⁵² Hart, 2013: 109.

historical figures and contemporary social and political campaigners merged. Historical, and specifically Shakespearean, iconography had the advantage of making war seem attractive and romantic while retaining the capacity to formulate cogent modern arguments. As an example of contemporary meaning in history painting, consider Abbey's *The Penance of Eleanor, Duchess of Gloucester* (1900) (Carnegie Museum of Art, Pittsburgh). Here Imogen Hart has drawn attention to the manner in which Eleanor is shamed through public spectacle as she is exhibited in the streets before a crowd of men in a scene from Shakespeare's *Henry VI, Part 2*, much as Suffragettes were vilified for their high profile demonstrations in their campaign for the vote.⁷⁵³ Similarly, Lady Anne in *Richard, Duke of Gloucester, and the Lady Anne* (1896) (Yale University Art Gallery) is subjected to the critical gaze of the crowd as she is dragged along unceremoniously by her future husband. Paradoxically, it was the ostensibly non-military subjects which had become more conflictual. The experience of soldiers in action, the bodily crush and confusion had been replaced by the massed spectator crowd censoriously passing judgment on moral issues, and I suggest it would not be too fanciful to regard this criticism as an oblique reference to the conduct of the war in South Africa. In 1901, Byam Shaw had highlighted the pain of loss experienced by the women left behind to grieve in his painting, *The Boer War*, allowing the "powerful contrast between the myth and reality to speak for itself," a myth many had accepted in 1899 only to feel the private and collective agony of bereavement.⁷⁵⁴

When, after the war, the Royal Commission on the War in South Africa was being set up, Britain was paying off Boer debts, alongside its own heavy financial outlay, and Milner was busy importing his highly unpopular Chinese labour, it was clear there were awkward questions to be asked. But these were not questions that traditional

⁷⁵³ Hart, 2013: 116.

⁷⁵⁴ Quotation cited in Cordulack, 2003: 540; see also Barringer, 2000: 66 who refers to Byam Shaw engaging "with key social and ideological issues of his era".

war artists were asking; indeed their critical silence was deafening. Noted for her sympathy to the cause of women, whilst not an active suffragist, Butler made no artistic comment, for example, on the plight of women and children in the concentration camps or farm burnings, as she had previously with her painting *Evicted*.⁷⁵⁵ This is somewhat surprising, given that as Krebs has pointed out the “Great British Public could agonise about the death rates and the conditions in the camps without being seen to criticise the generals, the soldiers or the Government’s war policy”.⁷⁵⁶ Instead, it was Abbey’s 1901 illustration of the trial of Anne Hutchinson in seventeenth-century America (fig.75) which provided a far more trenchant comment on the progress of the war. Abbey portrays an erect, principled Anne Hutchinson, hemmed in by her hunched-up, seated male prosecutors, as they call her to account for her so-called heretical views, and in the full expectation that her trial will lead to censure and punishment. By the time of Abbey’s work, Hutchinson had become revered as one of America’s pioneers of religious freedom, her moral courage in upholding her beliefs becoming her lasting legacy. This was produced at a time when the war had turned sour, the views of the peace lobby were becoming more acceptable and Emily Hobhouse was writing her eye-witness accounts. “What kind of man was John Bull” asked Irish MP John Dillon, “that he had to lock up women as a threat to his military?”⁷⁵⁷ The notion that Britain could be regarded as upholding the rights of the downtrodden was severely dented and in need of urgent repair. In choosing a scene from seventeenth-century America, home of liberty and the Pilgrim Fathers, whose descendants were themselves denying religious freedom to their citizens, Abbey was drawing out unnerving analogies with much of the politics behind the war in South Africa, where self-interest had taken precedence over the rights of the native African population and

⁷⁵⁵ Butler was recorded in 1897 as a supporter of women’s suffrage, Cherry, 1993: 93; on the subject of women and concentration camps, see Krebs, 1992: 38-56.

⁷⁵⁶ Krebs, 1992: 42; not everyone was of this mind, but it is clear that the balance of public opinion had shifted from the earlier pro-war stance.

⁷⁵⁷ Cited in Krebs, 1992: 46.

where Boer women and children were dying in their thousands in the camps.

By contrast, Crofts' more gentle outdoor paintings of the civil war in England do not advance a moral argument and, as has been shown, verge on the pastoral. Indeed, nowhere in the Boer War works of any of the late-Victorian war artists, with the possible exception of Woodville's drawing of a (by him, fully justified) farm burning, is there any hint of criticism as to how the war had been waged, as these artists shifted their focus to less challenging issues. For Butler, her time in South Africa had been a peculiarly painful experience, which I suggest diverted her from dwelling on a social critique of the campaign, however mild, or its effects. None of these other war artists was known for social commentaries on war, concentrating rather on the excitement and manly attributes of the men.⁷⁵⁸ With the shift in public support for the war, they took the opportunity to reinvigorate their genre by returning to earlier, more popular campaigns, made even more so by the passage of time, rather than adapting their styles to address the more problematic aspects of contemporary politics within warfare.

A large section of the public meanwhile, in its heightened fascination with nationalism, similarly retreated enthusiastically into the comforting realm of historical pageant, crowding together *en masse* as a kind of bulwark against the antipathy of the rest of the world and revelling in their reinforced ideas of nationhood. As Deborah Sugg Ryan has shown, these pageants, too, avoided controversial episodes from recent history, choosing instead scenes from Roman times until the eighteenth century, re-enacting battles of particular significance in the country's emergence as an international force.⁷⁵⁹ The pageant was immensely popular with the newly leisured classes, which had

⁷⁵⁸ Charlton did comment on the plight of horses, for example, in *Abandoned* (1904) (location unknown), but not on that of humans.

⁷⁵⁹ Ryan, 2010: 56.

not only the opportunity to watch, but to participate in these highly visual productions, adapting from history paintings the model of the tableau, enhanced by new and emerging photographic technologies. Unlike battle painting, however, this was an invented tradition which was not only fashionable but flexible and, along with the concept of chivalry, was quickly adopted by radical groups, such as the Suffragettes, for their own political ends, reaching out to a mass audience in a way that had rarely been seen since the parading of the *Roll Call* around the country in the 1870s.

With this upsurge in nationalism, portraits continued to be popular, not only with the landed aristocracy, but also with the middle-class and *nouveau-riche*, many choosing to be painted in regimental finery. Men as well as women, in Tickner's words were making "spectacles" of themselves, frequently choosing to be portrayed in full dress uniform, endorsing an enduring love of military splendour and display.⁷⁶⁰ 1899 had seen a retrospective exhibition of Van Dyck at the Royal Academy, while Sargent continued to exhibit his society portraits throughout the Edwardian period. Of these, the portrait of Sir Frank Swettenham in 1904, (fig.76) in his immaculate, decorated, white uniform exudes imperial arrogance as he lounges elegantly against an exotic carpet, and epitomises the very essence of privileged luxury and power, emphasising that "spectatorial lust" which Coombs refers to as a "most serious factor in imperialism".⁷⁶¹ The severity of line in the 1898 portrait of Colonel Hamilton has been replaced by an altogether more relaxed figure, confident in his appearance and social position, Hamilton's slightly anxious tilt of head by a direct, almost supercilious gaze. Society portrait painters played into press criticism and public nostalgia by reworking old and accepted themes, while introducing a new elegant gloss reflecting the Janus-like experience of the pre-war decades of the twentieth century. This confident presentation, however, belied a more

⁷⁶⁰ Tickner, 1987: 81, referring here to the Suffragette campaign.

⁷⁶¹ Coombs, 1987: 152.

complex and conflicted Britain and one which, with the events of 1914, was about to implode.

CHAPTER FIVE

“MANDARISM” VERSUS MODERNISM

If art be in truth the noble and inspiring thing our foremost statesmen annually assure us it is, it should be in service in time of war as well as in time of peace.⁷⁶²

With the outbreak of the First World War, the late-Victorian battle artists immediately found themselves at a disadvantage. Already they had been referred to by the *Athenaeum* as “old crocks”, left behind as the younger artists rushed to war, and as such initially the only artists able to exhibit as “official”.⁷⁶³ By the time of the first committee appointment in 1916, Butler was nearly 70 years of age, Charlton 69, Woodville, Wollen and Giles all 60 and all were identified with works traditionally exhibited at the Royal Academy, works which were condemned for being “second hand” and futile.⁷⁶⁴ As Frank Rutter, writing in 1933 observed, “you did not speak of the Royal Academy if you pretended to be interested in modern art”.⁷⁶⁵ Younger male artists had been able to enlist. Paul and John Nash (1893-1946) and Charles Jagger (1885-1934) had chosen the Artists’ Rifles, and were joined by Lavery, the 58 year old society portrait painter, (who, however, was soon given medical advice to return to painting at home in view of his so-called advanced years).⁷⁶⁶ Other artists served with the Royal Army Medical Corps or the Red Cross, as for example, Nevinson, Stanley Spencer (1891-1959) and his brother Gilbert (1892-1979), or were employed in camouflage or topographical work.⁷⁶⁷

⁷⁶² Letter from William Rothenstein to the *Times*, 19 February 1916, cited in Harries, 1983: 4.

⁷⁶³ The *Athenaeum*, 5 December 1914, cited in Harrington, 1992: 47.

⁷⁶⁴ Harrington, 1992: 50, citing a review by Collins Baker of the 1915 Royal Academy exhibition.

⁷⁶⁵ Cited in Stevens, 1988: 12.

⁷⁶⁶ Harries, 1983: 2, though this did not prevent his recruitment by the BWMC.

⁷⁶⁷ Solomon Solomon (1860-1927) was commissioned to camouflage tanks; Edward Wadsworth (1889-1949) (who also enlisted for the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve) designed camouflage for shipping.

When the decision was made in 1918 by the British War Memorials Committee to commemorate the war visually, it was specified that only art painted by those who had witnessed the particular incident would be accepted.⁷⁶⁸ There was to be no commissioning of retrospective battle pictures; instead all art, it was declared, should be of the moment, and would constitute a “national collection of war pictures by artists of great ability”.⁷⁶⁹ This was a policy said to be rigidly adhered to and as late as 1936 Butler’s painting described as *Saving the Guns at Loos* was declined by the art section of the Imperial War Museum on the grounds that “it does not come within the scope of the Museum’s collection, which is devoted to works painted by eye-witnesses”.⁷⁷⁰ Artists who did not have personal experience of *this* war would not be considered, and many would not be given the opportunity of acquiring that experience, even given, in some cases, their very earnest wish to do so. What did it mean in any event to paint from personal experience? Did it mean actual engagement in combat, like Nash and Kennington? or was mere observation sufficient? If so, did it suffice to witness a dressing-station as in the case of Sargent or did it require the more intimate knowledge gained through caring for the wounded as with Spencer and Nevinson?

This chapter will explore the way in which the official war artist schemes operated, largely to the exclusion of existing battle artists, choosing rather to promote those allied with the new, the untried and the more avant-garde. It will look at how the BWMC formulated and applied their criteria for inclusion within the scheme. It will examine the way in which those who were rejected or ignored were dealt with and assess their failure to survive artistic recognition beyond 1918

⁷⁶⁸ This was later renamed the Pictorial Propaganda Committee before being placed under the control of the Imperial War Museum. The commissioned paintings were subsequently exhibited at the Royal Academy as *The Nation’s War Paintings* in 1919-20, Malvern, 2004: 69-71.

⁷⁶⁹ Minutes BWMC, 2 March 1918, citing Lord Beaverbrook, Malvern, 2004: 210.

⁷⁷⁰ IWM: ART/WAI/172/2 (B), letter 5 February 1936 to M.Roche, jeweller, and probably refers to *The London Irish at Loos*.

alongside more modernist works, and in the absence of such super stardom as that enjoyed by Sargent. It will then consider the ways in which official policy was modified when convenient and raise issues affecting the legacy of those battle artists who were-and are still-ignored into the twenty-first century. In particular it will trace the development of Butler's humanitarian approach, and whether this was adopted and developed by the younger generation of war artists in a trajectory linking battle art of the 1870s to that of the twentieth century, before ending with a close comparison of Sargent's official war painting *Gassed* and Butler's *Roll Call* and *Balaclava*.

The "Alleged Miracle" of World War One Official War Artist Schemes⁷⁷¹

From the early days of the war, much official propaganda had been dealt with covertly by a department known as Wellington House, which under its director, Charles Masterman, recognised the impact of visual propaganda.⁷⁷² In the absence of sufficient suitable photographic images, it was decided to use artists to capture scenes which could be reproduced through publications such as the *War Pictorial*, calendars, cigarette cards and similar widely circulated ephemera.⁷⁷³ In 1916, Bone became the first commissioned artist, followed by others who were generally dependant on personal recommendation.⁷⁷⁴ Nevinson had already made his mark in this new war with *Returning to the Trenches* (1914) (National Gallery of Canada) and *La Mitrailleuse* (1915) (fig.77) as had Kennington with his large scale painting on glass, *The Kensingtons at Laventie*. On the back of favourable reviews, both were recruited.

⁷⁷¹ Bennett, 1919: 347.

⁷⁷² Malvern, 2004: 17-35.

⁷⁷³ Harries, 1983: 7; this was a monthly magazine with a circulation of approximately 750,000 copies worldwide, 110,000 in English, Malvern, 2004: 72.

⁷⁷⁴ For example, Francis Dodd, who was Bone's brother-in-law, James McBey, recommended by Campbell Dodgson, Keeper of Prints and Drawings at the British Museum, Lavery, portrait painter to the Royal Family in 1913 and married to an influential second wife; see Harries for further details of the Official War Artists.

Alongside the disadvantage of her age, Butler had the additional drawback of being a woman. This is not to say that all women were excluded from war art work. Arnold Bennett, an influential member of the BWMC, was given the task of compiling a list of subjects for paintings on the Home Front.⁷⁷⁵ When the committee was considering which artists should be invited to produce works for posterity, Bennett was concerned to include works which were not exclusively military in theme and which would offer opportunities for the involvement of women and those reluctant to travel abroad. Kemp-Welch, for example, already known for her paintings of horses in the Boer War, was commissioned by the Women's Work Sub-Committee to paint a picture of the Remount Camp in Swindon in 1919, while Anna Airey (1882-1964) was commissioned by both the Imperial War Museum's Ministry of Munitions Sub-Committee and the Women's Work Sub-Committee as well as the BWMC between 1918 and 1919.⁷⁷⁶ Her paintings, though subsequently rejected, were to represent "typical scenes" in four munitions factories.⁷⁷⁷ In addition, in 1915 as part of a national propaganda initiative, a recruitment poster was produced entitled *Forward! Forward to Victory, ENLIST NOW!* (National Army Museum) depicting a thrusting cavalry officer head on, and closely based on Kemp-Welch's painting of the same name. It is not difficult to see significant similarities in this poster and Butler's *Scotland Forever!* even down to the title's exclamation mark. Contrary to the policy of direct observation of a painting's subject-matter, photography was also used to assist women artists by giving them truthful

⁷⁷⁵ Harries, 1983: 87; Beaverbrook had taken as his model the Canadian War Memorial Fund.

⁷⁷⁶ Lucy Kemp-Welch was commissioned by Lady Norman of the Women's Work Sub-Committee, IWM: ART/WAI/037/5. Under pressure from Lady Norman, chair of the Women's Work Sub-Committee, Kemp-Welch also offered her Royal Academy Painting, *The Straw-Ride: Russley Park Remount Depot* to the new museum when it remained unsold following the academy exhibition, IWM: ART/WAI/1037/5, 16 August 1920. Her 1917 painting, *Forward the Guns*, was purchased during the war by the Tate, Palmer, 2011: 12.

⁷⁷⁷ Palmer, 2011: 81.

information.⁷⁷⁸ No women, however, were required or even invited to travel abroad, although Olive Mudie-Cooke (1890-1925), who went out as a nurse, was commissioned to provide representations of the work of the Red Cross in France.⁷⁷⁹ Her watercolour, *Burnt Out Tank* (1917) (fig.78), offers a dramatic representation of a wrecked tank, perched perilously on the edge of an incline, and bears a remarkable resemblance to *Tanks* (1916) (Imperial War Museum), a popular and much-reproduced charcoal drawing by Bone, acknowledging the new technological face of combat.⁷⁸⁰

There is no record of Butler ever having offered her services to the committee, although she had travelled with her son Patrick to the New Forest to “see an army under war conditions and have priceless opportunities of studying ‘the real thing’”.⁷⁸¹ As she watched the men prepare for war she describes her mixed feelings, at one moment discussing the “notes of the cheery pipes and fifes” and the “beautiful sight” the Gordons made, especially as a breeze “blew the khaki aprons aside and the revealed tartan kilts gave a welcome bit of colour” which “touched up the drab most effectively”, the next writing of “doomed legions” as “shadow-like [they] moved to and fro”.⁷⁸² Leaving Lyndhurst, she reflected that the experience would “ever remain with [her] in a halo of physical and spiritual sunshine seen through a mist of sadness”.⁷⁸³

Both Woodville and Giles are known to have asked for permission to travel to the Front to paint. Woodville was particularly energetic in promoting himself, writing in 1918 firstly to Lord Beaverbrook and then to Alfred Yockney, who, with Bone, was responsible for the list

⁷⁷⁸ Deepwell, 2008: 15, who names both Isobel Codrington and Norah Neilson-Gray as having received this form of assistance.

⁷⁷⁹ Palmer, 2011: 83; Bone did suggest the names of several women artists, including Gwen John, Dora Carrington and Gwen Raverat, but none of these names was taken up by the BWMC, Harries, 1983: 90.

⁷⁸⁰ Harries, 1983: 78.

⁷⁸¹ Butler, 1993: 253.

⁷⁸² Butler, 1993: 254, 256.

⁷⁸³ Butler, 1993: 258.

of subjects to be represented on the Western Front.⁷⁸⁴ Woodville's pleading letter to Yockney makes it clear that he is desperate to be allowed to travel to the war zone

I have heard from Mr E Goddard, the editor of the Illustrated London News, yesterday that he put in an application for me to go to France. It is absolute cruelty to deprive me from visiting and spending a while with an army fighting there, a privilege granted to others, considering that I have devoted a life time in depicting on papers and canvas these deeds of our glorious soldiers of the past and present. I don't care in what capacity you send me there, either as a soldier or civilian, I naturally would prefer the first. I am a British subject by descent and birth and served for twenty-three years and held commissions in the Yeomanry and Engineer Volunteers my last appointment being in the [Torrington troops in the] Royal North Devon Hussars in which I commanded my Torrington troop. I speak French and German thoroughly having resided for years in both these Country's (sic), having also travelled extensively in the East, India and European Turkey, my first campaign being in that country. I also sketch, draw and paint a little. Trusting that you may earn my lasting gratitude in obtaining a chance for me to see our men at the front before this War finishes, so that I can gain local colour as a battle painter.⁷⁸⁵

The reply was not positive. Woodville's letter was considered at a committee meeting after which he was told that "it was not found possible for you to be placed on the limited list of artists at work for the Ministry. You will understand that there are a great many difficulties in the way".⁷⁸⁶ No indication of the difficulties is recorded, and, even with Goddard's support, the minutes of the committee meeting state simply that his "application was negated". Instead Woodville was advised that "[w]ith your other qualifications it might be possible, perhaps, for the War Office to utilize your services".⁷⁸⁷ Woodville, in his letter to Beaverbrook, had already

⁷⁸⁴ IWM: ART/WAI/483/11: 127-28, 123-25; see also Harries, 1983: 87.

⁷⁸⁵ IWM: ART/WAI/483/11: 123-25; Woodville's father was in fact American. In his letter to Beaverbrook, Woodville had written that it was "his greatest wish to be able to go to the front and see the realities of this war", IWM: ART/WAI/483/11: 127.

⁷⁸⁶ IWM: ART/WAI/483/11: 122.

⁷⁸⁷ IWM: First World War Artists Archive: 493/12, minutes 6 November 1918; IWM: ART/WAI/483/11, letter of 7 November 1918.

explained how it had been the War Office which had initially referred him on.⁷⁸⁸

Giles fared no better. In a memo it is recorded that “Major G.D.Giles called today. He is anxious to be employed by us as an artist at the Front-if possible for the duration of the war. He would be quite willing to work under our usual conditions for artists.” Attached to the memo are particulars of his career as listed in *Who’s Who*, outlining his education at public school and Sandhurst, and service in the army from 1875 in India, Afghanistan and Egypt. Although like Sargent, Giles had studied under Carolus-Duran, and, unlike Sargent, had experienced service on the front line as an army officer, this response, too, was not encouraging.⁷⁸⁹ He was told bluntly that “there is no prospect at present that we shall be able to have the advantage of your services in this way”.⁷⁹⁰ Slightly more hopeful was the comment that Giles’ “name has been placed on our list of artists who wish to be employed by the Government and we will of course let you know when any opportunity arises”.⁷⁹¹ No such contact was ever made.⁷⁹²

Given the description by M. and S. Harries of the “extraordinarily catholic” lists produced by Bone and the unbiased approach of the Committee, which “chose virtually every school” from which to draw their artists, how are we to account for the omission of these proven battle artists, some of whom are virtually throwing

⁷⁸⁸ IWM: ART/WAI/483/11:126.

⁷⁸⁹ Carolus-Duran was much praised and criticised for painting directly onto canvas, overlooking “drawing for tone and color” (sic), a characteristic helpful to those war artists who also produced work for the illustrated press according to Julian Alden Weir, cited in Fairbrother, 1994: 13.

⁷⁹⁰ IWM: ART/WAI/483/11, undated; after the Boer War Giles appears to have stopped exhibiting publicly.

⁷⁹¹ IWM: ART/WAI/483/11, letter 6 April 1918.

⁷⁹² Malvern records that Giles, described as “war correspondent” was rejected by the Ministry, but omits any reference to Woodville, Malvern, 2004: 191. There is no record that Wollen offered his services or was approached by the committee though he continued to paint. See p.228 for a twentieth-century curatorial view of his work.

themselves at Yockney's feet?⁷⁹³ Neither Woodville nor Giles could be accused of not wishing to travel out to the Front, and both had previously seen service either as reservist or professional soldier. Although most of the male and female "artists who received women's section commissions were drawn from academic circles" there is similarly no evidence of Butler having been approached to produce a painting from the Home Front.⁷⁹⁴ One possible explanation is the emphasis the sub-committee placed on the portrayal of women, especially carrying out traditional male roles, but also frequently as nurses, whereas Butler was known mainly, though not exclusively, for her depiction of men in or near the theatre of war and not of women in supporting roles on the domestic front.⁷⁹⁵ While the BWMC made it clear they would not accept retrospective battle paintings, on the evidence of her sketches of troops in the New Forest, she would have been equally as well qualified as Kemp-Welch, and had already indicated her intention to put all her "attention and energy to this stupendous war".⁷⁹⁶

Nor in spite of Bennett's strongly held view that the "reactionary mass of RA and ARA muck" should be disqualified, were those exhibiting at the Royal Academy excluded.⁷⁹⁷ In a letter to Thomas Bodkin, Director of the National Gallery of Ireland, he wrote that he had "succeeded in turning down all RA painters, except Clausen" adding "[s]ome feat, believe me! Yes, I have turned down even the inevitable Brangwyn."⁷⁹⁸ Nevertheless, Sargent was commissioned to paint what Malvern has referred to as a "supersize" picture, while

⁷⁹³ Harries, 1983: 88.

⁷⁹⁴ Deepwell, 2008: 20; Lavery, apparently, received the largest portion of the women's section budget.

⁷⁹⁵ Deepwell, 2008: 14; for example, Butler's self-portrait, *Evicted*, and *To the Front: French Cavalry leaving a Breton City on the Declaration of War* (1888-89) (private collection).

⁷⁹⁶ Butler also "went daily to watch the troops drilling in the parks" on her return to London, Butler, 1983: 258-59.

⁷⁹⁷ Harries, 1983: 88.

⁷⁹⁸ Cited in Horner, 2014: 29; Frank Brangwyn (1867-19) was nevertheless heavily involved in war posters and was selected by P.G.Konody to work for the Canadian War Memorials Fund, Horner, 2014: 6.

Charles Sims (1873-1928), along with Clausen, was invited to contribute a “Uccello”-sized painting for a proposed memorial gallery, all three, well-known members of the Royal Academy.⁷⁹⁹ At the same time, members of the New English Art Club (NEAC), Post-Impressionists and Fauvists together with students and staff from the Slade, were considered, albeit most had never previously painted war subjects.⁸⁰⁰ Although M. and S. Harries consider how intriguing it would be to know more about those artists who were not selected, the names they mention belong to the Bloomsbury and Camden Town sets, namely, Fry and Sickert, and there is no reference to the artists under discussion here.⁸⁰¹ Age may well have been a contributing factor, but it cannot be said to have been definitive, looking at those artists selected to provide works for the “art memorial” suggested by Robert Ross. Under this scheme invitations were handed out to Clausen, then 66, Sargent, 62, Philip Wilson Steer (1860-1942), 58 and Henry Tonks (1862-1937), 56.⁸⁰² These are remarkably close to the ages of Woodville, Wollen and Giles in particular, born 1856 and 1857 respectively.

One possible explanation for their omission is that the names of these late-Victorian battle artists were perceived to be so inextricably linked with their earlier failure to paint from reality and to rely strongly on their imagination, however carefully based on personal research, that the committee found it inconceivable to think of them in any other way. As Malvern has observed, their work was seen as populist and lacking in authenticity, especially when viewed alongside the work of the more avant-garde.⁸⁰³ Woodville was known for dramatising sketches sent in from “Specials” in his work for the illustrated press, while Butler, though well-travelled, had commented that if she had ever personally seen an actual battlefield,

⁷⁹⁹ Malvern, 2004: 178-79.

⁸⁰⁰ Harries, 1983: 88.

⁸⁰¹ Harries, 1983: 89-90; in relation to Fry, they quote the committee minutes, “[t]he attainments of Mr Fry were discussed but no recommendations were made”.

⁸⁰² See Harries, 1983: 91-93 for further details of the memorial scheme.

⁸⁰³ Malvern, 2004: 86.

her career as a military painter would have come to an end.⁸⁰⁴ These artists may have withdrawn temporarily from contemporary issues following the Boer War but in doing so they were in sympathy with the vast majority of the British public. I suggest these are hardly sufficient reasons for their exclusion, especially given the willingness of Woodville and Giles to obtain first-hand experience, the committee's awareness that Giles was a British Army officer, and Butler's period with the army at the outset of the war, for it is clear that the committee had it in its power to bypass these difficulties should it have so chosen. It is also not the case that selection by the BWMC guaranteed purchase, for the committee was not slow to reject paintings they felt fell short of their required standard.⁸⁰⁵

Ironically, as Brian Jones has cogently demonstrated as recently as 2007, official artists, too, were not immune from working up paintings from photography rather than relying on personal observation as inspiration for their work, though whether this was widely known at the time is uncertain.⁸⁰⁶ In particular, Jones draws attention to the correspondence between Nevinson's 1915 painting *La Mitrailleuse* and an article in the *Sphere* dated 20 November 1915, entitled 'Trenches: The Disappearance of the Old French Cap', appropriately illustrated with four images of the new style of uniform, one with the caption "A French Maxim Gun Detachment in Action near Souchez". He points out that the date of the article indicates strongly that Nevinson would have had it in mind as he created his painting, citing this as "a clear example of Nevinson patching over his visual memory with the most current press imagery".⁸⁰⁷ Jones also draws attention to the similarity between *La Mitrailleuse* and Sickert's painting, *The Soldiers of King Alfred the Ready* (1914) (Sheffield City Art Gallery), remarking on the "skilful

⁸⁰⁴ The *Times*, 4 October 1933.

⁸⁰⁵ For example, Anna Airey and, surprisingly, given Bennett's comments, Brangwyn, Malvern, 2004: 187, 183.

⁸⁰⁶ Jones, 2007: 134-81.

⁸⁰⁷ Jones, 2007: 142.

synthesis of tabloid newspaper shots of the “Armoured Man” with a photo-by-proxy source in Sickert”.⁸⁰⁸ On this analysis, Nevinson’s work falls far short of the requirement for it to be drawn from personal experience. Although Jones only refers in his article to Nevinson, similar observations have been made of work by both John and Sargent, giving rise to speculation of a wider practice.⁸⁰⁹ It should not be overlooked that Butler, too, would have had access to press reports to inform her work, added to which she took care to obtain reportage from eye-witnesses to events at the Front.⁸¹⁰

One aspect of the Great War which was new in military campaigns was the dependence on technology and the early recognition that cavalry was less than useless against machine guns and, later, tanks. Whatever the inspiration, Nevinson had already highlighted the new tenor of war in 1915 with *La Mitrailleuse*, in its sharp-edged representation of a rapid firing volley gun manned by robotic operatives, and by 1918 very few official artists were exhibiting paintings featuring horses in the thick of battle. Such as there were, generally confined themselves to representing horses as transport for ammunition or the wounded, as in Spencer’s *Travoys Arriving with Wounded at a Dressing-Station at Smol, Macedonia, September, 1916* (fig.79), or highlighting the adverse effects of war on the animal, as in *A Case of Mustard-Gas Poisoning* (1914-18) (Imperial War Museum) by Edwin Noble (1876-1941), replacing the dramatic cavalry charges of the nineteenth century.⁸¹¹ Nevertheless, both Kemp-Welch and Alfred Munnings (1878-1959), who was approached by the BWMC to produce a series of cavalry paintings along the lines of the one he had painted for the Canadian memorial

⁸⁰⁸ Jones, 2007: 142.

⁸⁰⁹ Harries, 1983: 96-97, who show that John’s only war painting, *Fraternity* (1918) (Imperial War Museum) was copied from a photograph in the *Daily Mail*, entitled “A Fag after a Fight”; see also Fox, 2009: 126.

⁸¹⁰ Harris and Nochlin write that “one suspects the possible use of photographs” in Butler’s work but without providing any evidence, Harris and Nochlin, 1976: 249.

⁸¹¹ William Roberts also represented horses in his painting, ‘*Feeds Round*’: *Stable-time in the Wagon-lines, France* (1922) (Imperial War Museum) again showing horses away from the Front.

scheme, were commissioned, though in the event injury prevented Munnings from delivering.⁸¹² Neither artist could be described as being especially innovative in their “khaki-clad versions of hunt meetings”.⁸¹³ What is clear from this, is that horse painters as such were not on the Committee’s exclusion list.

By the time the Committee was considering the artistic legacy of the war, it was evident that set-piece battles, such as at *Quatre Bras*, *Waterloo* or *Balaclava* were irrelevant. The experiences of the soldiers at the Front told stories of the extreme conditions they had to endure. 1917 was the year of the Third Battle of Ypres (Passchendaele) when for the whole of August the rain fell continuously leaving in its wake “a curious kind of sucking mud” so “tenacious” that the Highlanders were obliged to abandon their kilts on account of the additional weight in the pleats.⁸¹⁴ Although the cavalry was used throughout the war, the method of deployment changed as heavy gun fire, tanks and mud intervened. Just as they had adapted to the use of khaki, battle painters again had to adapt to these new circumstances. Woodville and Butler too, continued to paint scenes from the First World War, Butler for her solo exhibitions and Woodville for the illustrated press. In addition Woodville painted works in oil such as *Return to Mons* (fig.80), a restrained work completed after the Armistice, and reminiscent of the *Roll Call* in its flat, horizontal composition.⁸¹⁵ Far from his earlier focus on the drama of war, memories of death and privation are evoked here by his use of sombre colouring, even in the moment of triumphal re-entry. Interestingly, though, as has already been seen from the use of Butler’s *Scotland Forever!*, German artists appear to have continued to produce posters with images of cavalry charges throughout the war, from a depiction of Crown Prince William

⁸¹² Harries, 1983: 102; one canvas which Munnings did offer the committee in 1919 was rejected, Malvern, 2004: 190.

⁸¹³ Peters Corbett, 1997: 193, in his description of the work of Munnings.

⁸¹⁴ Podcast 31, IWM: WW1 Lives, accessed 14/1/14.

⁸¹⁵ This painting is also known as *Re-entry into Mons* and *Entry of the 5th Lancers into Mons*.

leading the charge in 1914 for *Der Deutsche Kriegsbilderbogen* to a poster advertising an exhibition of war loot in 1917 featuring a single cavalry officer of the Death's Head Hussars.⁸¹⁶

Butler and the Politics of Inclusion

In some way every picture or piece of sculpture representing an incident of warfare may be regarded as a war memorial provided it belongs to the time with which it deals and expresses the spirit of that time.⁸¹⁷

Given the inclusion of horse painters, older artists, women artists and those who remained at home, this omission of these late-Victorian battle artists calls into question the so-called catholic nature of the selection process. The *Graphic*, for one, did not see it that way, arguing that “[i]n the matter of pictorial artists, they have been ‘officially’ chosen from what may be called the esoteric schools, or, at any rate, from the ranks of artists who appeal mainly to art connoisseurs”.⁸¹⁸ Rather than relying on the perception of these official artists, the *Graphic* produced its own analysis, highlighting the different modes of representation from photography, through representational work to the more avant-garde, implying that each had its place in the ‘Battle of the War Artists’.⁸¹⁹ Public perception and taste and the views of the BWMC, as the article demonstrates, were not united, and the paper distanced itself from the last of these categories. As for photography, a reporter for the *Graphic* recorded that he “saw the devil’s work with [his] own eyes. It was far beyond the reach of a camera.”⁸²⁰

Writing for the *New Statesman*, Arnold Bennett confirmed the committee’s “total absence of prejudice against youth”, “total absence of prejudice in favour of age” and “total absence of

⁸¹⁶ IWM: ART/IWM/PST: 1402; IWM: ART/IWM/PST: 5297.

⁸¹⁷ Konody, 1919: 6.

⁸¹⁸ The *Graphic*, 11 May 1918, cited by Malvern, 2004: 39.

⁸¹⁹ The title of the article’s heading.

⁸²⁰ The *Graphic*, 31 October 1914: 620 cited in Fox, 2009: 121.

prejudice in favour of success” together with a “somewhat strong “down” on mandarism in any form”.⁸²¹ Instead, he reported, in a rather cavalier manner, echoing Konody’s “relentless war against all academic conventions”, that the committee was “on velvet”, that “its members had nothing to lose” and that it “quite blithely gave important commissions to untried boys”, robustly situating the committee in the camp of male youth against female age, avant-garde against traditional, rejecting a more all-embracing approach, characteristic of the Edwardian era.⁸²²

I suggest that the greatest impediment to the inclusion of the “old guard” in the official war artists’ schemes was their image either as elderly and stale mandarins, or as ‘mere’ illustrators, together with a belief by the committee in their incapacity to adapt. In *A Survey of the Work of the Official War Artists and Others*, William Orpen, (1878-1931) himself selected by the committee, wrote that “the failure of the older artists to grapple with the situation [of a new technological war] was neither surprising nor shameful. They did not possess the requisite experience.” Orpen intimated that age precluded them, although several, as we have seen, were desperate for that experience only to have it denied, while their ages were not that dissimilar from some of those artists selected.⁸²³ Reference was made approvingly and without irony to the appointment of Lavery, born in 1857, who was “enlisted, so to speak, for ‘home service’ and able to paint without crossing the seas”. Orpen selected for especial praise Nevinson and Kennington as being “truer to the spirit of the time”, Nevinson for highlighting “the pain and the suffering, and above all, the relative insignificance of the individual pawn in this mighty war-game” and Kennington for his “stately presentation of human

⁸²¹ Bennett, 1919: 348.

⁸²² Konody, 1917: 14 for first quotation; other quotations are from Bennett, 1919: 348 whose approach differed markedly from that adopted in the Second World War, with its “preference for artists from a middle ground, neither too influenced by European Modernism nor too conservative”, Powers, 2013: 153-5, citing Kenneth Clarke.

⁸²³ Orpen, 1930? [sic]: 610, 627-28.

endurance, of the quiet heroism of the rank and file”.⁸²⁴ Kennington’s *The Kensingtons at Laventie* was, in his view, striking for representing “the deadliest enemy”, “the piercing cold, which seems to pervade the whole picture”. At no time did he acknowledge any correspondence between either of these artists and Butler’s earlier paintings, in particular the desolate snowy scene of the *Roll Call* referring rather to the “outworn conventions of the older artists”, whilst omitting any analysis of their works.⁸²⁵

There is no indication that the committee ever considered advising this cohort of battle painters how they could comply with its artistic requirements and all responses to queries were brief in the extreme. Moreover, in its determination to represent the war faithfully, the committee failed to consider the more basic issue as to where the truth lay, and to ask whether, as with beauty, it might not lie in the eye of the beholder.⁸²⁶ Far from being eclectic, the committee, in this sense at least, was prescriptive, ignoring the longevity of many of the images inspired by Butler and taken up by her contemporaries. I would suggest that this view still obtains, for as recently as July 2014 a new exhibition of war art at the Imperial War Museum (London) featured *The Second Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire Light Infantry Defeating the Prussian Guard at Nonne Bosschen* (1915) (The Royal Green Jackets Rifles Museum, Winchester) by Wollen with the dismissive caption, “this apparent realism and his meticulous attention to detail lent a spurious authenticity to his work and affirmed the traditional values to which he ascribed.”⁸²⁷ The

⁸²⁴ Orpen, 1930? [sic]: 620.

⁸²⁵ Orpen, 1930? (sic): 622. He also praises Henry Lamb (1883-1960), for his work *Advanced Dressing Station on the Struma, 1916* (1921) (Manchester City Galleries) showing the “boredom and dreariness of the men who are waiting for unutterable things to happen” again omitting any reference to Butler’s *Dawn of Waterloo* with its mixed emotions before battle, Orpen, 1930? [sic]: 629.

⁸²⁶ This has already been touched upon in chapter two (p.105) under a consideration of Woodville’s paintings, one of which an ex-soldier swore coincided exactly with his own experiences.

⁸²⁷ ‘Truth and Memory: British Art of the First World War’, July 2014 to March 2015 ignoring the fact that Wollen is here depicting an event which took place on 11 November 1914 in the very early days of the war.

century which had started with an increase of battle-themed exhibits at the Royal Academy was, even before the end of the First World War, already proving to be a difficult arena for these late-Victorian battle painters as they increasingly struggled to exhibit their works and obtain commissions, leading many of them to concentrate more on their drawings for the press in preference to their more academic works. In order to develop these issues further, this next section will consider Sargent's *Gassed* alongside Butler's paintings, the *Roll Call* and *Balaclava*.

Sargent's "Gassed"

In his article 'On War Memorials' in 1919 Konody wrote that the "tactical" battle picture had been replaced by a "changed mental attitude" whereby the modern war painter was "no longer concerned with hero worship and the glorification of the victorious army leader", arguing that his "pictures form not so much a war memorial as a plea for universal peace".⁸²⁸ Modern warfare, he continued, was concerned with the visually "dingy and drab", concentrating rather on the sufferings of the common soldier.⁸²⁹ In writing this, Konody, like Orpen, appears to have completely overlooked the radical approach of Butler in the 1870s to 1890s, when she was being praised for highlighting the plight of the common troops, for avoiding the glorification of war and being courted by the Peace Society.⁸³⁰ Instead, he singled out Goya and Vassily Vereschtschagin (1842-1904), Butler's Russian contemporary, whose "heart went out to the obedient pawns in the great war game".⁸³¹ Ironically, in 1874, Butler, notwithstanding her emphasis on individual suffering, had been praised for her "thoroughly English" depiction of war with "no

⁸²⁸ Konody, 1919: 13-14.

⁸²⁹ Konody, 1919: 13.

⁸³⁰ Meynell, 1898: 31. In this Konody was followed by CRW Nevinson who claimed to be "the first artist to paint war pictures without pageantry, without glory, and without the over-coloured heroic that had made up the tradition of all war paintings up to this time". Nevinson, 1937: 87-88.

⁸³¹ Konody, 1919: 14.

French theatrical glory, no Russian piling-up of horrors”.⁸³² For someone concerned with a nation’s autobiography through art, and of “the wars that play so dominant a part on the history of the nations”, Konody’s omission is striking.⁸³³ In this section I aim to show how this “changed mental attitude” had already found its way into British battle art well before the First World War.

In Jongwoo Jeremy Kim’s analysis of *Gassed*, he traces similarities in the work of Pieter Brueghel the Elder’s “sightless fools” in *Der Blinden* (fig.81) painted in 1568, arguing that although Sargent did not paint a pit for the soldiers to fall into like the blind men represented by Brueghel, (1525-69), “no viewer could escape the crushing realization that the old world order collapsed along with the heroism of the Empire”.⁸³⁴ Just as Charlton’s horsemen are out of control, charging towards their destruction as they attempt to cross the flooded Aisne, Kim suggests that Sargent’s representation of loss of vision is a peculiarly apt criticism on the progress of the war. *Der Blinden* does indeed show a procession, or perhaps, progress, of blind men, but they are fewer in number (only six), wear no bandages and they are not soldiers or obviously victims of war. Brueghel’s painting, rather, is a social commentary on life in the Netherlands at a time when incapacity led to great impoverishment of life. The cartoonist Michael Rowson, in his essay on Otto Dix’s series *Der Krieg* (1924) (National Gallery of Australia), made the same comparison between *Gassed* and *Der Blinden*, with no reference to Butler, but instead referencing Burne-Jones’ languid processions of women, while Elaine Kilmurray and Richard Ormond follow Richard Dormant’s suggestion that Auguste Rodin’s *Burghers of Calais* (1889) (Musée Rodin, Paris) was a source of inspiration.⁸³⁵

⁸³² The *Spectator*, 9 May 1874.

⁸³³ Konody, 1919: 5; Konody is basing his analysis on Ruskin’s statement that “[g]reat nations write their autobiographies in three manuscripts”, the most important of which is the book of art.

⁸³⁴ Kim, 2012: 142.

⁸³⁵ Broadcast on Radio Three on 25 June 2014 at 10.45 pm in ‘The Essay: Minds at War-Der Krieg’, as part of the BBC’s World War One commemorations;

Similarly, Shaw overlooks Butler, writing that “a century would pass” following such works as the 1821 *Illustrations of the Great Operations of Surgery* (Army Services Medical Museum and Wellcome Library, London) of Charles Bell (1774-1842) “before official war artists of the order of John Singer Sargent and Henry Tonks would present such scenes to the gallery-going public”.⁸³⁶ While Tonks and Bell share many similarities in their clinical approach to injuries, it is more difficult to see how Sargent’s painting relates to the medical works of either.

Butler’s *Roll Call* is in many ways far nearer to *Gassed* than either Brueghel or Rodin, even though it merits no mention by Kim, Rowson or Shaw, in spite of the similar format and although I have found no reference to Sargent viewing the *Roll Call* I suggest it is highly likely that he did. In both representations we see ordinary soldiers who have experienced trauma and injury, linked to each other across the canvas in what Das has referred to as a “tactile continuum”.⁸³⁷ They are all dressed soberly, Butler’s guards in black, Sargent’s troops in khaki. Each painting features a principal figure, Butler’s sergeant taking the count of dead and injured, Sargent’s orderly guiding them to the dressing station. Both use a horizontal composition, akin to a classical frieze. Both show the dead, injured and dying. But there the similarity ends, for I argue that of the two, Butler’s painting is the more uncompromising, nearer to Konody’s identification of the “dingy and drab”. It is altogether darker in tone, with the opaque black of the greatcoats, as against the light, yellowish khaki chosen by Sargent. Her soldiers are propping each other up in a desolate snowy landscape with vultures circling overhead. For them there is no comfort of a dressing station or the promise of life ahead as indicated in Sargent’s background football match. These are men who are many miles and many weeks from

Kilmurray and Ormond, 1998: 265, who also mention Lord Leighton’s *Daphnephoria* (1874-76) (Lady Lever Art Gallery, Liverpool).

⁸³⁶ Shaw, 2013: 183; like Tonks, Bell was both a surgeon and an artist.

⁸³⁷ Das, 2008: 1.

home, facing starvation, disease and cold in addition to the prospect of further military engagement. They clearly show both psychological and physical injury, some barely able to stand unaided, others wearing slings or bandages on their limbs and heads, one face down in the snow.

Balaclava goes further, with its graphic and full frontal presentation of post-traumatic stress syndrome, bloodied hands, faces, chests, horses, coupled with complete mental and physical exhaustion, linked across the canvas by the supporting hands of fellow soldiers. Compare this with E.M.Forster's account of Sargent's "golden-haired Apollos" seen in profile only and "with bandages over their eyes," against a background which as Malvern comments is "suffused in the warm glow of sunset" completing "the myth of redemption".⁸³⁸ These gassed men all form a line of upright, well-fed soldiers, unmarked save for their cleanly bandaged eyes; the action of one of the soldiers raising his leg to mount the duckboard imputes the motion of a dance, referencing classical figures around an urn, emphasising the frieze-like quality of Sargent's format.

Das opens his book *Touch and Intimacy in First World War Literature* with a telling description of *Gassed* where the "pinkish glow of the setting sun [. . .] holds the soldiers, and stills them in our minds in a moment of numbed serenity".⁸³⁹ Although Sargent had witnessed the "chokings and coughing of gassed men, which was a nightmare", Das observes that, notwithstanding clear references to Brueghel's "more macabre" representation, "such horrors are largely absent in the painting", which exudes a more peaceful, dreamlike quality.⁸⁴⁰ In their place are "emollient contours", "blond and

⁸³⁸ E.M.Forster in his 1925 essay 'Me, Them and You', cited in Fairbrother, 1994: 140; Malvern, 2004: 105.

⁸³⁹ Das, 2008: 4.

⁸⁴⁰ Das, 2008: 3-4, citing Sargent's letter to Isabella Stewart Gardner; see also Gough, 2010: 199 (f/n 78).

athletic” men and a “strangely tranquil” sky.⁸⁴¹ As Trevor Fairbrother has commented, although Sargent illustrated suffering and compassion, he “chose a spectacle that would satisfy his pictorial needs”, and there is no suggestion in his work of the ugly effects of gassing, such as inflammation, pus, blisters, severe burns, coughing, choking or genital mutilation, the total emasculated experience referred to by C.E.Montague in *British Artists at the Front*.⁸⁴² Instead, Sargent privileged the sensuous shared experience of a masculine community, with what Das has referred to as the “homoerotic undertones of war” familiar to a society artist who “often did nude studies of working-class men for pleasure”.⁸⁴³ His procession avoids the physical and psychological examination of the *Roll Call* through its oblique format and pristine facial bandaging. As early as 1901, the *Athenaeum* was referring to Sargent’s “indifference, even in paint to the manner of expression”, and here it is neatly sidestepped altogether.⁸⁴⁴ Vera Brittain, writing to her mother from France, described gas victims quite differently as “poor things all burnt and all blistered all over with great suppurating blisters, with blind eyes [. . .] all sticky and stuck together and always fighting for breath”.⁸⁴⁵ In Kim’s analysis, *Gassed* was not intended to be a faithful picture of the effects of war; instead, in his ironic choice of golden yellow and soft pastels, and the jarring juxtaposition of a football match, Sargent is said to have inverted truth to produce an “easy contentment” among the wounded, each one of them neatly and well dressed.⁸⁴⁶

When considering *Gassed*, Malvern, too, makes comparisons, not with Brueghel, but with the traditional layout or “stock” adopted by

⁸⁴¹ Das, 2008: 3-4.

⁸⁴² Fairbrother, 1994: 131; one soldier does lean away from the front as if to vomit; Montague et al, vol. 111(1918), “[o]ne does not see with the eyes alone, but with the brains and nerves too”, cited in Fox, 2009: 122.

⁸⁴³ Das, 2008: 4; see also Michael Hatt’s essay ‘Uranian Imperialism: Boys and Empire in Edwardian England’, 2007: 153-68.

⁸⁴⁴ The *Athenaeum*, 8 June, 1901: 732.

⁸⁴⁵ Brittain, 1933: 395, letter 5 December 1917.

⁸⁴⁶ Kim, 2012: 142-47.

Christopher Prendergast in his analysis of *La Bataille d'Eylau*, (1808) (The Louvre, Paris) by Antoine-Jean Gros (1771-1835), in which he refers to the foreground (sufferers), middle-ground (redeemer) and distance (salvation).⁸⁴⁷ Following this, she argues that Sargent has offered a picture of salvation through suffering, a picture which betokens heroism and the reassurance of recovery. I depart from both Kim and Malvern in that although it is certainly the case that the soldiers are bathed in a golden light, they show little sign of suffering.⁸⁴⁸ I suggest, rather, that Sargent is content to use a traditional mimetic formula here, verging on the classical, to represent war, a formula which signals the pity of war but not the horror, the pain or mutilation.⁸⁴⁹ Prior to 1918, he had little personal experience of war, less in fact than Butler, and such as he had, derived from his portraits of military men (and others) in their regimentals, followed by his short excursion to France in July 1918 with Tonks.⁸⁵⁰ Among his other war work, his watercolour *A Crashed Airplane* (1918) (fig.82) makes scant reference to conflict in the middle of what might be construed as a peaceful harvest scene, against a background of distant posts suggestive of grave-markers, and is less ominous in its oblique reference to war than Simpson's 1857 *Summer in the Crimea* (fig.19).

There is no doubt, though, that Sargent did witness men suffering from a gas attack, an image which presented itself to him as appropriate for representation of war, abandoning his original brief to highlight Anglo-American cooperation for this "harrowing sight, a

⁸⁴⁷ Malvern, 2004: 105; Malvern's analysis is also considered by Kim who, he writes, underestimates the significance of loss of vision, Kim, 2012: 148.

⁸⁴⁸ Kim argues that the soldiers were at peace as they were already dead and represent symbols of the lost Empire, Kim, 2012: 144.

⁸⁴⁹ Das, 2008: 5, comments that Sargent "distils the pity of war into a moment of blindness and touch".

⁸⁵⁰ Sargent was accorded privileged status, staying with Earl Haig before joining the Guards Division, Das, 2008: 3.

field full of gassed and blindfolded men.”⁸⁵¹ Sargent’s companion, Tonks, elaborated the scene in his letter to Yockney

Gassed cases kept coming in lead along in parties of about six just as Sargent has depicted them, by an orderly. They sat or lay down on the grass, there must have been several hundred, evidently suffering a great deal, chiefly, I fancy, from their eyes which were covered up by a piece of lint.⁸⁵²

Rowson comments that it is hard to imagine that such a painting could have been produced by the losing side in the conflict.⁸⁵³ The effect is too gentle, dreamlike and forgiving. What I am suggesting is that it was only on his return at the end of hostilities in the comfort of his studio, that Sargent reworked his idea using models for soldiers, much in the same way as with his portraiture, and which enabled him to aestheticise his experiences.⁸⁵⁴ According to Fox, like Nevinson and John, Sargent, too, was aided by photography, supplementing his personal experience of the dressing station, and in the process making it more publicly accessible.⁸⁵⁵

While the BWMC had clearly been keen to enlist Sargent as an official war artist, to the extent of obtaining prime ministerial encouragement to contribute “to a series of immortal works”, their motivation was two-fold.⁸⁵⁶ In a letter dated February 1917, Tonks was told of “a scheme of pictorial propaganda” and asked for his cooperation.⁸⁵⁷ By March 1919, the press was reporting that *Gassed*, too, was originally intended for propaganda purposes in foreign countries, but that the armistice was declared before it could be

⁸⁵¹ Bone to Yockney, 5 November 1918, IWM: ART/WAI/312, ART DOC 1; Sargent writing to Evans Charteris on 11 September 1918, cited by Gough, 2010: 199; as recently as 2014, Paul Moorhouse, curator of Twentieth Century Portraits at the National Portrait Gallery was describing *Gassed* in similar terms as “this harrowing image”, Moorhouse, 2014: 140.

⁸⁵² Letter Tonks to Yockney, 19 March 1920, IWM: ART/312.

⁸⁵³ Broadcast at 10.45 pm on 25 June 2014 on Radio Three as part of the BBC’s World War One commemorations.

⁸⁵⁴ See Malvern, 2004: 107 and Fairbrother, 1994: 131 for further discussion on Sargent and his technique.

⁸⁵⁵ Fox, 2009: 126.

⁸⁵⁶ Gough, 2010: 198 and f/n 74.

⁸⁵⁷ Letter, 20 February 1917, Yockney to Tonks, IWM: ART/WAI/312. ART DOC 1.

used.⁸⁵⁸ Nevertheless, such a brief may well have influenced Sargent in his manner of presenting allied troops, by side-stepping the more horrific. As Malvern has observed, the BWMC was “drawing up a canon of significant artists” who would do justice to the “scope and depth of British art” at this momentous point in history.⁸⁵⁹ The concern was that Sargent in particular would produce a painting signifying the grandeur of both the war and their scheme of commemoration.⁸⁶⁰ That a committee concerned with eye-witness observation should also consider the element of grandeur in war might seem strange and at odds with Konody’s expressed views and I argue that it was more concerned with engaging an artist of Sargent’s stature than with exhibiting a “changed mental attitude”.⁸⁶¹ Yockney wrote in a memo “that Mr Sargent is a very distinguished man and everything possible should be done for him”.⁸⁶² Much had been invested in his recruitment, and unlike both John and Orpen, he had delivered on his commission. It is unthinkable that his contribution would be rejected. Nevertheless, Sargent, for all his “fizz and crackle”, though prepared to be immortalised through a supersize war scene, was sufficiently mindful both of the public reaction at home and abroad, presenting soldiers in such a way as to suggest the effects of war without the graphic detail, “horror conveyed without contortion or grimace”.⁸⁶³ In this it seems he accurately predicted the response, Virginia Woolf approvingly writing that with *Gassed* Sargent had “at last pricked some nerve of protest, or perhaps of humanity”.⁸⁶⁴ In the light of the more abrasive

⁸⁵⁸ Unidentified press cutting, 29 March 1919, IWM: ART/WAI/312, ART DOC 1.

⁸⁵⁹ Malvern, 2004: 106.

⁸⁶⁰ Malvern, 2004: 106.

⁸⁶¹ An example perhaps of what Sickert had termed “Sargentolatry” cited in Harrison, 1994: 30.

⁸⁶² Memo, 11 June 1918, IWM: ART/WAI/312.ART Doc 1 (JSS correspondence).

⁸⁶³ *The Athenaeum*, 27 April, 1901: 537; Kim, 2012: 147.

⁸⁶⁴ Virginia Woolf writing in *The Fleeting Portrait*, cited in Das, 2008:3; Bird also cites instances of similar reactions including the account in the *Daily News* of 10 September, 1920 of a young girl who fainted before the painting, Bird, 1980: 48. The universal praise received by Sargent for this painting was tempered only by Konody’s observation that the men appeared “as though they were returning from a picnic” which he found “singularly unconvincing”. However he retracted this

works of Nash, Nevinson, Lewis and Roberts, this may seem an unexpected comment, but serves to reinforce the views expressed by the *Graphic* in their article lending their approval to a more traditional approach in the battle of the war artists.

Bird draws attention to the different treatment accorded *Gassed* to that suffered by Nevinson's *The Harvest of Battle* (fig.83), both paintings "lauded for their 'realism'".⁸⁶⁵ While both had been officially commissioned for the projected Hall of Remembrance, it was Sargent's painting which was exhibited in the Royal Academy's 1919 Summer Exhibition; Nevinson's was excluded, much against the artist's wishes. Yockney wrote in response to Nevinson's complaint that there "were reasons of state for this exception to the rule".⁸⁶⁶ These reasons were not amplified. Sargent, it would seem, was receiving special treatment at the expense of his fellow war artists, and I should like to suggest that along with his celebrity status, this owed much to the committee's attempt to offer the public the more acceptable face of war at a time when sections of the press were condemning the collection for failing to portray "the crowning victories of our forces, their heroism and endurance".⁸⁶⁷

Butler, by contrast, did not avoid "the terrible havoc of war", as she offered her own interpretation of the horror of battle and its consequences.⁸⁶⁸ As contemporary reviews of the *Roll Call* demonstrate, Butler made "no attempt to gloss over stern realities to make a pretty picture", for her representation of the aftermath of war was described as "almost too painful in its reality", and we see in her work the ravages of conflict etched on the faces and bodies of the

comment following a letter from a serving officer in the *Observer*, cited in Bird, 1980: 51.

⁸⁶⁵ Bird, 1980: 42-49; Bird comments that this highlights the elasticity of the term 'realism'.

⁸⁶⁶ Cited in Bird, 1980: 43.

⁸⁶⁷ Reginald Grundy in the *Connoisseur*, cited in Bird, 1980: 45.

⁸⁶⁸ *ILN*, 9 May 1874.

soldiers.⁸⁶⁹ Bird argues that the values and beliefs current in pre-1914 society were governed by a “dominant ideological discourse” which limited opposition and a climate “resistant to the construction of an alternative signifying practice” within representations of war.⁸⁷⁰ I suggest that this is too restrictive and does not take into account Butler’s novel approach to her art. I do not go so far as to infer that she was able to convey accurately the total experience of war. For someone who had never participated in a battle, that would be virtually impossible as Keegan has testified. Rather, I argue that her work significantly altered how both artists and public regarded the psychological and physical effects of war in a way which continues to resonate. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century Butler was complimented for her truthfulness and, her paintings were deemed “an eloquent argument for peace” and as late as 1905, Holman Hunt was writing that the *Roll Call* “touched the nation’s heart as few pictures have ever done”.⁸⁷¹ Both Butler and Sargent enjoyed immense popularity in their time; Sargent’s popularity, though, has proved far the more enduring, with *Gassed* representing one of the seminal works of the First World War, and still well-known into the twenty-first century.⁸⁷² Given Butler’s unflinching approach to war and its effects upon the ranks, the question now is why her painting is no longer similarly appreciated. One possible explanation is that Butler’s subject-matter was already dated by the first decades of the twentieth century and enthusiasm for her as a new young, female, talent had long passed. More likely, though, is the fact that Sargent’s painting was heralded as the masterpiece of the First World War and held centre stage at a new gallery in a specially constructed museum, while the *Roll Call* remained in private, in royal, hands, deprived of the ‘oxygen of publicity’. The

⁸⁶⁹ *Morning Post* 7 May 1874, *ILN*, 9 May 1874.

⁸⁷⁰ Bird, 1980: 42.

⁸⁷¹ *Catholic News*, 24 June 1893; Hunt, cited in Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 36.

⁸⁷² For example it was reported that she “is so much the rage just now that it is well-nigh treason to speak of her works otherwise than in terms of highest eulogy”, the *Hour*, 15 March 1875.

occasional showing of the painting as part of an exhibition up to 1912 did little to remedy this situation.⁸⁷³

Regardless of this eclipse, does the *Roll Call* show that Butler had anything to contribute to modernity in this new era and beyond? How do we assess her legacy? In his discussion of the inter-relationship between modernism and modernity in Britain, Peters Corbett argues that in the first part of the twentieth century all artistic styles are concerned with modernity; formal modernism in his analysis is too narrow a definition and even “non-modernist works” are part of this dialogue, opening up the debate to a consideration of the relevance and even influence of the more traditional artist.⁸⁷⁴ Furthermore, modernism itself was multi-faceted, a “heterogeneous response to a shared experience”, and inherently unstable and wide-ranging, while Williams suggests the pursuit of an “alternative tradition taken from the neglected works left in the wide margin”.⁸⁷⁵ It is firmly within these wide margins that I suggest Butler and her contemporaries are now situated.

In the same way that French art was said to have influenced British battle painting, it was believed by many that modernity had been the province of French and French-influenced artists, with British artists trailing dismally behind. Harrison writes in 1981 that there was “no English contribution to this movement which a foreign observer would have regarded as central”.⁸⁷⁶ On the contrary, Peters Corbett suggests, in one form or another, British painting formed part of the genesis of modernity as far back as the middle of the nineteenth century as it strove to relate art more closely to “lived experience”, a

⁸⁷³ It was not until 1987 that there was a comprehensive exhibition of her works, and it does not appear that the *Roll Call* was exhibited at all between 1912 and 1987, though I understand that Butler’s *Remnants of the Army* is to be on display at Tate Britain in November 2015 as part of a forthcoming exhibition on *Britain’s Artists and Empire*.

⁸⁷⁴ Peters Corbett, 1997: 14. He is followed in this view by Tickner, 2000: 190 (f/n 33), though she departs from him in referring to British, rather than English art, Tickner, 2000: 192 (f/n 49).

⁸⁷⁵ Tickner, 2000: 184; Williams, 1989a: 35.

⁸⁷⁶ Tickner, 2000: 192, citing Harrison.

movement within which the traditionalists were also capable of influence.⁸⁷⁷ Butler was clearly not without her followers, both within the more restricted world of late-Victorian battle artists, and in the work of those who comfortably straddled the Victorian and Edwardian worlds, into and beyond the First World War. Her ability to delve into the social conscience of the British nation in her representation of the pain and suffering experienced by the army was unique in the latter half of the nineteenth century, and anticipated Konody by more than forty years. Further, Butler was able to portray the ordinary soldier in a matter of fact way which spoke to an individual heroism unmatched in Sargent's more celebrated *Gassed*, and I suggest her contribution to modernism is supported by this sympathetic focus on the rank and file. Drawing on the French military painters for inspiration, she nevertheless managed to portray "military life from a thoroughly English" point of view, introducing a new and vigorous element into British battle painting and one which did not flinch "from exposing the real loathsomeness of war".⁸⁷⁸ At the same time, she injected a vitality that is exemplified in the fluidity and format of the *Roll Call*, and which is both innovative and powerful. Nor did Butler neglect the mundane realities of actual engagement. In 1915, the critic of the *Connoisseur*, echoing Ruskin's criticism of Millais's *News from Home* (1856-57) (The Walters Art Museum, Baltimore), wrote that "[i]n far too many of the pictures, the artists fail to remember that a hard fought battle cannot fail to leave its traces on the clothes and persons of the combatants".⁸⁷⁹ Looking at *Balaclava*, with its bloodied survivors and the dishevelled guards of the *Roll Call*, it is evident that this was a message Butler understood. It is less easy to say the same of Sargent's pristine procession.

⁸⁷⁷ Peters Corbett, 2004: 5-8; Tickner confirms this in her view that Modernism is "a range of cultural practices". Tickner, 2000: 184.

⁸⁷⁸ Cited in Tickner, 2000: 186; *ILN*, 29 April 1876.

⁸⁷⁹ The *Connoisseur*, August 1915: 245; for Ruskin's comment, see Harrington, 1993: 154.

CONCLUSION

Lady Butler's painting, *The Remnants of an Army*, showing assistant surgeon, William Brydon, his skull shattered by an Afghan sword, his pony near death, apparently the only survivor of a terrible massacre, stumbling towards safety is one of the best known of all Victorian images.⁸⁸⁰

A Question of Legacy

Notwithstanding her apparent neglect in the opening decades of the twentieth century, Butler's work continues to appeal to writers, historians (but not art historians) and military personnel, often, but not exclusively, when considering illustrations for their own works on the late nineteenth century. In 1993, in her essay on women artists, Beryl Bainbridge was describing Butler's *Inkerman* as "extremely realistic and superbly grouped" with "none of the static quality of a photograph" and "as full of movement as the chorus line in ballet", in a neat reversal of Nevinson's belief that it was photography that would force painting to be dynamic.⁸⁸¹ Bainbridge was even more appreciative of *The Remnants of an Army*, whose "mood" she found "faultless", writing that "I soon found I could sway my way to Jellalabad on a dying nag", praising the way that "the meandering stagger of the wretched beast echoes the curve of the dusty track to safety".⁸⁸² This same image of Dr Brydon making his solitary way to Jellalabad from Kabul is used by William Darymple in his acclaimed *Return of the King: the Battle for Afghanistan*, with the caption "Lady Butler's famous oil", which he describes, along with Wollen's *The Last Stand of the 44th at Gundamuck, 1842* (fig.84) as "one of the era's most famous images".⁸⁸³ Similarly, Peter Hopkirk describes how Dr Brydon

⁸⁸⁰ *The Times*, 8 February 2014-Huon Mallalieu 'Family Archive Offers Insight into Campaign Disasters'.

⁸⁸¹ Bainbridge, 1993: 2; Haycock, 2013: 88; Nevinson conversely writes in his autobiography that "[p]hotographic art had never appealed" to him, Nevinson, 1937: 43.

⁸⁸² Bainbridge, 1993: 5.

⁸⁸³ Darymple, 2014: 489, the illustration is shown between 376 and 377; he also uses the outline of Butler's Dr. Brydon on his horse as illustration for chapter eight, *The Wail of Bugles*, Dalrymple, 2014: 355.

became “the subject of one of the most celebrated paintings of Victorian times-Lady Butler’s *Remnants of an Army*”, hinting at an almost symbiotic relationship between subject and painter in the nineteenth-century public mind.⁸⁸⁴ The military historian, Richard Holmes, chose probably her best known image, *Scotland Forever!* for the cover of his 2001 publication, *Redcoat: The British Soldier in the Age of Horse and Musket*.⁸⁸⁵ It is this image, too, which was used as German propaganda with suitably altered uniforms and headgear during the First World War, and anecdotally, is widely recognised, even if not always attributed. In the run-up to the bi-centenary of Waterloo a review of new histories of the battle in the *Guardian* (fig.85) featured an untitled, unattributed image from *Quatre Bras*.⁸⁸⁶ Towards the end of the nineteenth century, Queen Victoria’s daughter, Princess Louise, having ready access to the original, is known to have painted a copy of the *Roll Call* in oil.⁸⁸⁷ Even one of Butler’s more unpopular paintings, *Evicted*, has not been overlooked, and was used by Cecil Woodham-Smith for the dust-cover of his book *The Great Famine: Ireland 1845-9*, a tribute of which both Butler and her husband would have been proud.⁸⁸⁸

It is clear that Butler enjoyed considerable success in the nineteenth century in both academic circles and with the general public. As the century drew to an end, prints of her works were still widespread notwithstanding her declining profile and near exclusion from art historical consideration. The National Army Museum catalogue, for example, endorses her one-time cultural capital by holding records of

⁸⁸⁴ Hopkirk, 2006: 268 who does not mention Wollen by name and the painting of Gundamuck is reproduced between pages 294 and 295 without attribution.

⁸⁸⁵ A photo-engraving of this painting was regarded by a friend of Butler’s second son as “one of his most treasured possessions”, DA. Correspondence, Edmund O’Connor to Dom Urban Butler on 14 March 1932: 1164, (uncatalogued).

⁸⁸⁶ John Pemble in the *Guardian*, 29 November 2014 under the heading *As its Bicentenary Approaches, a Bloody Battle and its Consequences are Newly Appraised*.

⁸⁸⁷ Meynell, 1898: 7; Patrick Comerford chose *Balaclava* for his ‘Art for Lent’ talk in the Radio 4 series broadcast on 15 March 2014 as this “portrays in a blunt way the horrors and sufferings of war and the plight of the common soldier on the front line”.

⁸⁸⁸ Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 95.

reproductions of the *Roll Call* and *Scotland Forever!* in 1882, *Quatre Bras* and *Tel el Kebir* in 1888, *Steady, the Drums and Fifes!* in 1897 and *Floreat Etona!* and *Halt on a Forced March* in 1898.⁸⁸⁹ The *Roll Call* lithograph and *Quatre Bras* line engraving by Richard Josey after Butler were both produced by the Fine Art Society, even after the severance of the relationship between artist and gallery in 1881.⁸⁹⁰ Into the twentieth century reproductions remained buoyant with *Inkerman* in 1909, *Listed for the Connaught Rangers*, 1911, *Eyes Right* in 1916, the *Dorset Yeomanry at Agagia* in 1917, and *Scotland Forever!* in 1980.⁸⁹¹ Butler herself records seeing a copy of the *Roll Call* in Funchal, Madeira in 1899 on her way to the Cape.⁸⁹² When the National Army Museum mounted an exhibition to coincide with the staging of Michael Morpurgo's *Warhorse* in 2012, it was Butler's drawings of horses which were chosen for display.⁸⁹³ As Usherwood and Spencer-Smith have observed "there is no doubt that Butler's reputation and popularity were enhanced by the widespread sale of reproductions of her work", which along with her *carte-de-visites* with the sub-title "Painter of the *Roll Call*", kept her name and image in the public eye, a popular enhancement which ironically may well have damaged her legacy in the longer term.⁸⁹⁴

Butler was not alone in this seriality of her works. Her contemporaries, too, are well represented in the National Army

⁸⁸⁹ NAM: 5602-497-479; NAM: 5602-420; NAM: Artists Catalogue under Butler, unreferenced; NAM: 7209-2; NAM: 5602-421; NAM: Bks, 25411.

⁸⁹⁰ The Fine Art Society had sued Butler over her painting *Scotland Forever!* as it considered that she had broken an agreement either in relation to its showing or reproduction, Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 43, citing the Fine Art Society MS Minute Book, 12 March 1881. (This appears to now be lost or destroyed). Butler refers to this rupture obliquely in her autobiography "[t]here was a law suit in question and there let the matter rest", Butler, 1993: 151. Nevertheless, it has been noted that the Fine Art Society, which gained its financial security through handling Butler's works insisted in 1877 that she refrain from exhibiting at the Royal Academy for two years, Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 41, 43.

⁸⁹¹ NAM: 7407-89-2; NAM: 6409-25; NAM: 7406-24; NAM: 7406-13; NAM: 8207-39; *Holly Leaves* also reproduced *Balaclava* on 25 November, 1911.

⁸⁹² Butler, 1909: 96.

⁸⁹³ Personal observation.

⁸⁹⁴ Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: 41; Butler writes how one of her aunts "passing along a street in Chelsea, was astonished to see her niece on a costermonger's barrow amongst some bananas!" Butler, 1993: 92.

Museum, with numerous reproductions of works by Charlton, Crofts, Giles, Wollen and Woodville throughout the second half of the nineteenth century and into the second decade of the twentieth, in what Perry has referred to as a “repetitive visual image”.⁸⁹⁵ Several are taken from newspaper illustrations, others were distributed through art galleries, printsellers and book publications.⁸⁹⁶ In the twenty-first century reproductions of the works of all these artists continue to be available on the internet through specialist fine art suppliers. Regimental museums and regional galleries holding their paintings display them with pride and affection, though they are singularly absent or removed from show in major London galleries, particularly the national art galleries, the Tate currently holding four paintings by Woodville and one by Butler in store.⁸⁹⁷ Butler’s *Within Sound of the Guns* adorns the office of the Commandant at the Army Staff College, Shrivenham, who was keen to have further information on the painting, while Woodville’s painting *All That was Left of Them* is equally well thought of in its home in the Queens Own Lancers and Yeomanry Museum, Nottinghamshire. Butler’s *The London Irish at Loos* is displayed prominently in the tiny regimental museum in Camberwell above the very football featured.⁸⁹⁸ In 2013, *Listed for the Connaught Rangers* (1878) (Bury Art Gallery) journeyed from Bury to China for a twelve month exhibition tour, *Toward Modernity: Three Centuries of British Art*, organised in partnership with the Greater Manchester Museums

⁸⁹⁵ Lara Perry is using this term in respect of cartes de visites, but her argument in respect of the seriality of these likenesses is equally apposite here, Perry, 2012: 730.

⁸⁹⁶ See NAM: Artists Catalogue under individual names.

⁸⁹⁷ Woodville’s *General Wolfe Climbing the Heights of Abraham on the Morning of the Battle of at Quebec*, *Poniatowski’s Last Charge*, *Napoleon Crossing the Bridge at Lobau* and *Marshal Ney at the Battle of Eylau* are all in store at Tate Britain, and Butler’s self-portrait at the National Portrait Gallery; *The Remnants of the Army* has been either in store at the Tate or on show in a provincial museum for the past decade, though it is due to be exhibited at Tate Britain in November 2015. None of these artists is represented in the National Gallery.

⁸⁹⁸ I am told by Captain Nigel Wilkinson that when he joined the London Irish Rifles in 1955 there was a flourishing museum and this painting was “in pride of place over the fireplace in the Officer’s Mess”. He continues, that he does not “know why such an important work should be overlooked when the Accession Books were compiled”.

Group, signalling the curators' positioning of Butler's work within a narrative of artistic modernity. On its return this painting featured on the cover of the art museum's booklet in Bury. Exceptionally, *The Last Stand of the 44th at Gundamuck, 1842* by Wollen and Butler's *The Remnants of an Army* are to be included in a national exhibition at Tate Britain entitled *Artists and Empire* from November 2015.⁸⁹⁹

So, why, with all these indications of longevity, were Butler and her contemporaries losing popularity towards the end of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth and twenty-first? Why is it that artists such as Wollen and Woodville, who helped to shape and record a contemporary British view of imperial endeavour, have been so marginalised? How could an artist hailed by *Punch* as "R.A.- ie 'Really Admirable'", and "Art's Joan of Arc" in 1879, and an artist, described by Usherwood and Spencer-Smith as winning "a popularity and critical success which no other British woman painter has ever approached", disappear from the wider public awareness so completely within a few short decades?⁹⁰⁰ How is it that Joanna Kerton, a twenty-first century artist could exclaim of the only female artist to be collected by Henry Tate, "[t]he woman who once outsold Rembrandt and you keep her in storage".⁹⁰¹

On her death in 1933, *The Times* obituary recorded that Butler had "led the revival of modern military painting in England" while acknowledging that her death "awakened but a passing thrill in the art world of today".⁹⁰² Was this less than enthusiastic assessment of

⁸⁹⁹ Information received from Ian Hook, Keeper of the Essex Regiment Museum.

⁹⁰⁰ *Punch*, 24 May 1879: 229, commenting on the exhibition of *The Remnants of the Army* at the Royal Academy; 1879 was also the year of her unsuccessful bid for election to the Royal Academy; Usherwood and Spencer-Smith, 1987: back cover; Ellen Clayton dedicates her 1876 work *English Female Artists* to Butler "in testimony of admiration for her genius", Clayton, 1876: frontispiece [u/p]; see also Usherwood, 2004: 131.

⁹⁰¹ Broadcast as part of the series, *The Story of Women and Art* by Amanda Vickery on BBC 2, 23 May 2014; Butler wrote that she rejoiced "to know that [her] best works are nearly all in public galleries or in the keeping of [her] Sovereign", Butler, 1909: 142.

⁹⁰² *The Times*, 3 October 1933.

her career because she was not allied to any particular group of artists? Was it on account of her immense popular appeal, approaching stardom, enhanced by the unnerving collision of femininity and war, or perhaps because she was dismissed – along with her contemporaries – as part of that stale tradition of academic artists increasingly side-lined at the beginning of the twentieth century, and without an acknowledgment of her continuing influence?⁹⁰³ Is it, in fact, a function of military painting to be overlooked in a nation obsessed with the idea that it is peace-loving, unless such art fulfils another explicit function, such as the portraiture of significant personnel or the recording of traumatic events still within the collective public memory? The centenary events around Britain in the years 2014-18 are testament to the nation's urge to commemorate the First World War in a manner not accorded the Crimean War, the Boer War, or even Waterloo, in spite of the forthcoming bi-centenary. How far can this be accounted for by the increasing experience in the twentieth century of a mechanised and industrialised warfare? Did this experience bring with it the aesthetic failure of military painting – and of realist military painting in particular – which could fully meet these new conditions of war?

At the time of Butler's one and only retrospective in 1987, held at the National Army Museum, exhibiting many works never before seen in public, John Russell Taylor felt that her "relative neglect" was likely to be a function of Butler's gender, while acknowledging a distinct distancing by the feminist movement "largely because of some obscure feeling that she was not really a woman artist, but chose, in her subject matter and attitudes to play on the wrong side".⁹⁰⁴ By electing to paint military scenes, using her "masculine forcefulness" and single-mindedness, it is said, Butler had eschewed her more

⁹⁰³ Wilfred Meynell noted in 1898 that the "mere fact that the painter was not a man, but that her subject was the soldier, touched the popular heart: so unexpected in English art was the association of the soldier and the woman", Meynell: 1898: 6.

⁹⁰⁴ *The Times*, 2 June 1987; the exhibition also travelled to Leeds Art Gallery.

feminine sensibilities in order to succeed in a male dominated art world and presented as an honorary male, even though it was her gender which finally prevented her from becoming a Royal Academician in the 1879 election.⁹⁰⁵ Taylor found this attitude to be unfair, as it failed to identify that many of her best works are “depictions of disastrous aftermaths to heroic but wrong-headed engagements”.⁹⁰⁶ Her emphasis on the emotional and physical suffering behind a militaristic front seems to have been overlooked, and calls into question larger issues around the politics of gender, taste and inclusion. Although her large canvases of the field of battle have been classified as history painting, Butler never really fitted squarely within this category. She never, for example, chose mythological scenes or scenes from distant history as did Crofts, and rarely chose biblical scenes but rather, used a military setting for her humanitarian approach, subtly changing the direction of military painting as she did so, pushing at the boundaries of empathy.⁹⁰⁷ Although Shaw has pointed to the way Turner’s *The Field of Waterloo* subverted eighteenth-century military art in its “unflinching portrayal of the aftermath of war in all its ghastliness”, in “stark contrast to the glorification of heroes”, this relates more to the novel inclusion of women seen among a mass of male bodies on the field of battle rather than Butler’s intense focus on individual male suffering.⁹⁰⁸ Whereas Turner represents horror in the indiscriminate piling up of the dead and injured, Butler presents the viewer with a close-up of their injuries, both physical and psychological.

⁹⁰⁵ Harris and Nochlin, 1976: 53; Nunn, 1995: 65 records that members were defined as “men of fair moral character”.

⁹⁰⁶ *The Times*, 2 June 1987; Marina Vaizey writing in the *Sunday Times* on 17 May 1987 called the exhibition “sensational”, in spite of the absence of follow-up.

⁹⁰⁷ It was not always necessary, however, to take subjects from the distant historical past to qualify as a history painting as demonstrated by West in his *Death of General Wolfe* eleven years after the event, Morris, 2005: 7-9; Butler did paint the occasional religious picture, for example, *The Magnificat*, her first entry to the Royal Academy, which was rejected.

⁹⁰⁸ Shaw, 2013: 35; caption for the painting on display at Tate Britain, January 2015.

As Patrizia Di Bello has commented, recent “scholarship has not been particularly enthusiastic” about Butler’s paintings, whilst Markovits reflects on “[h]ow slight a cultural footprint” the *Roll Call* seems to have left behind, in spite of its celebrity status for a full quarter century.⁹⁰⁹ William Feaver, who first encountered Butler in *The Wonder Book of Empire*, writes that she had “lost her touch” by the time she and her husband retired to Ireland in 1905, commenting that others such as Crofts had overtaken her “in terms of historicity, while younger generations had more advanced ideas of realism”.⁹¹⁰ In her analysis of the work of women artists, Pamela Gerrish Nunn suggests that Butler’s decline in popularity “emphasises the public acceptance of a more traditionally feminine style”, by which she infers, more domestic, commenting that Butler’s “bourgeois realism” was not as fashionable, while Di Bello notes that her paintings “revelling in the spectacle of male bodies and painted in an unstinting realism rooted in academic training do not fit well in modernist art histories”.⁹¹¹ Conversely, Nochlin, having bypassed Butler completely in her book *Women, Art and Power*, together with Ann Harris in *Women Artists, 1550-1950*, curiously refers to her “popular notoriety”, arguing that she was “one of those striking anomalies among nineteenth-century women artists, a woman for whom being female was in many ways an advantage”.⁹¹²

In their different articulations, Taylor, Markovits, Feaver, Nunn, Di Bello, Harris and Nochlin highlight the contradictions surrounding Butler’s legacy. Given her chosen genre, she had placed herself outside the tradition of nineteenth-century women artists, showing none of “woman’s weakness”, yet at the same time, brought to her art a more feminine sensibility of suffering.⁹¹³ Nor was it was simply

⁹⁰⁹ Di Bello, 2011: 242; Markovits, 2009: 212.

⁹¹⁰ William Feaver, reviewing Butler’s 1987 retrospective in the *Observer*, May 1987, HHG, T.E.Weller’s scrapbook: 109.

⁹¹¹ Nunn, 1987: 220; Di Bello, 2011: 242.

⁹¹² Harris and Nochlin, 1976: 53, 58; Butler’s year of birth is given incorrectly as 1850. She was born in 1846.

⁹¹³ *The Times*, 2 May 1874.

her gender which led to such differing assessments, but rather, I suggest, her perceived and problematic popularity alongside her individuality as a painter, pursuing her “authentically autonomous projects”.⁹¹⁴ As Martin Myrone has recently examined in relation to the work of John Martin (1789-1854), such a meteoric rise as he and Butler enjoyed could lead to critical dismissal alongside charges of blatant crowd-pleasing.⁹¹⁵ In Butler’s case this was complicated by the initial positive reaction to her gender and choice of subject-matter by the critics, tempered by warnings that her success was likely to be short-lived.⁹¹⁶

Educated with unusual freedom to be independent-minded, Butler painted in her own style, joining neither the Pre-Raphaelite School, nor the Impressionists, nor the Post-Impressionists, and certainly not the more avant-garde, and was difficult to pigeon-hole. It was so much easier to cast her, along with those contemporaries considered here, in the role of imperialist, rather than to look at the paintings themselves for signs of her individualistic approach.⁹¹⁷ Although she was trained in the academic tradition of history painting, and was influenced by the French style of battle art, her instincts were rather for innovation; perhaps not so much radical, militant or threatening, as clear-sighted and expressive; a quiet revolutionary who did not break with the past, but, rather, moulded it to achieve her own end.⁹¹⁸

⁹¹⁴ Williams, 1989c: 53.

⁹¹⁵ Butler, however, was respected by Ruskin, who referred to her painting *Quatre Bras* as “Amazon’s work”, whereas he had dismissed Martin’s work as “merely a common manufacture”, Cook and Wedderburn, 1904: 138; Myrone, 2011: 13 citing Ruskin in Cook and Wedderburn, 1903-12, vol. 10: 222; interestingly both Martin and Butler exhibited at the popular Egyptian Hall in Piccadilly, Martin with his one-man show in 1822 and Butler, in 1881 with *Scotland Forever!*

⁹¹⁶ *Art Journal*, 1875, vol. xiv: 220, referred to “those who prophesied a speedy collapse the moment she ventured on the exhibition of a second picture”.

⁹¹⁷ This approach also ignores the reception of her paintings towards the end of the nineteenth century.

⁹¹⁸ Her attitude towards women’s suffrage reflects her ambivalence. Although she did sign a petition in favour in 1897, she avoided what Cherry has termed the feminist “taint of deviancy” and was aghast at her sister’s decision to march in support, as evidenced by her letter to Alice Meynell before the event, Cherry, 2000: 144, 57; HHG. Letter Butler to Alice Meynell, 11 July 1910 (uncatalogued).

Notwithstanding her continuing reputation amongst military personnel, however, her perceived and misplaced link with empire as highlighted by Feaver has, I argue, obscured the way in which a majority twenty-first century audience receives her visual and still uncomfortable representations, dismissively placing them firmly within an establishment tradition.

Bainbridge dismissed the argument that Butler “helped provide the popular support for the imperial adventures of the military heroes of the Victorian age” with her forthright exclamation “[w]hat rubbish!” She denies that Butler was a jingoist, “but simply someone who could wield a brush and whose childhood imagination had been fired by war”.⁹¹⁹ Here I depart from Bainbridge in suggesting that Butler’s childhood imagination had been fired by soldiers and horses, rather than by the act of war itself, which she deliberately avoided wherever possible. I would further argue that far from supporting the warlike adventures of the very end of the nineteenth century, Butler was increasingly marginalised by the more overtly imperialistic images of her contemporaries which she rejected. One has only to read her writings in *From Sketch-Book and Diary* in which she eulogises over a South African “[f]airyland direct from nature”, which for her was disrupted by a descending “war cloud” which “burst in blood and fire [. . .] and deepened the sense of melancholy with which [she would] ever think of that far-away land”, to sense a profound regret for the forthcoming conflict.⁹²⁰ Instead it was her contemporaries who took up the challenge to represent and promote the imperial adventure, often adapting her formulae in the process and eclipsing Butler’s more empathetic presentation of the troops. In the aftermath of an unpopular war they in turn were bypassed in favour of a younger generation, with no history of its own, willing and able to take on the challenge of a new and unprecedented technological warfare.

⁹¹⁹ Bainbridge, 1993: 6.

⁹²⁰ Butler, 1909: 107, 120.

What has been overlooked, however, is the lasting, if subtle, influence of all these earlier artists on this younger generation and well into the twentieth century. All had moved away from the more topographical paintings to an emphasis on particular incidents; all had largely avoided aristocratic portraiture to concentrate more closely on the common soldier and individual heroism, much in the same way as, for example, Kennington's *The Kensingtons at Laventie*, ““one picture of the war’ according to a contemporary review, which did not espouse sentimentality”, Sargent in *Gassed* and Nevinson in *A Group of Soldiers* (1917) (Imperial War Museum).⁹²¹ Malvern's description of Kennington's painting refers to the “obviously serving soldiers” who are “evidently battle-worn” and where each figure can be identified, and where “[r]ather than glorifying or romanticising war, it stressed the deprivations” of the troops.⁹²² In this, it clearly resembled Wollen's *The Last Stand of the 44th* and Butler's *Roll Call*, in the latter even to the inclusion of a soldier lying exhausted, injured or dead in the snow, beside his abandoned weapon.

Well-known Vorticists, too, such as Lewis in *A Battery Shelled* (1917) (Imperial War Museum) and Roberts in *A Shell Dump* (1918-19) (Imperial War Museum) – both paintings commissioned by the BWMC – were using figurative, if slightly stylised representations in their war paintings.⁹²³ In his review in the *Athenaeum* R.H. Wilenski identified two categories of World War One artists, those tortured by war, that is to say those who sought active service at the Front, and the rest.⁹²⁴ Amongst the former he singles out John and Paul Nash, Stanley and Gilbert Spencer, Lewis and Roberts writing that there is “no question of their permanent value as records of the effects of the

⁹²¹ *The Times*, 20 May 1916, cited in Harrington, 1992: 54; aristocratic portraiture was in fact left largely to Sargent. According to Yockney, the War Office was “horrified” by this painting by Nevinson, as it showed “evidence of British degeneration”, letter to Masterman, 4 December 1917, cited in Black, 2007: 119.

⁹²² Malvern, 2004: 11.

⁹²³ Malvern, 2004: 96; both were Uccello-sized memorial project paintings.

⁹²⁴ *Athenaeum*, 19 December 1919: 1375.

war” and praising their “intense intellectual and spiritual emotion, translated into and expressed in terms of pictorial rhythm”.⁹²⁵ I suggest that it is equally true to say of the works of this late-Victorian cohort that they too constitute valuable and lasting records of the effects of war, both contemporary and historic. Looking more closely at, for example, *Balaclava*, the *Roll Call*, *Inkerman* and *Dawn of Waterloo*, it is difficult to escape their “intense intellectual and spiritual emotion” and their “pictorial rhythm”. Similarly, Woodville’s *All That Was Left of Them* and Wollen’s *Last Stand of the 44th* represent fully both the heroics and the exhausted desperation of war. Dalrymple writes evocatively as recently as 2013 of Wollen’s depiction of “a group of ragged but doggedly determined soldiers on the hilltop of Gandamak (sic) standing encircled behind a thin line of bayonets, as the Pashtun tribesmen close in”.⁹²⁶

The criticism voiced that these earlier artists did not personally observe the action is, I argue, not sufficient reason for ignoring their work, especially in the light of evidence of photographic assistance in the works of at least Nevinson, John and Sargent discussed in chapter five, which could well be equated with the use of “Specials” in the field. Nor is it reasonable to expect the late-Victorians to paint conflict as it was in the Great War with all its technological horrors, hitherto completely unknown. Paul Valéry, writing in 1931, endorses this view with his statement that from the end of the Edwardian reign life had changed so radically that we “must expect great innovations to transform the entire technique of the arts, thereby affecting artistic invention itself and perhaps even bringing about an amazing change in our very notion of art”.⁹²⁷ As Harrington has observed of this group “[t]heir demise was due wholly to the official war pictures which did manage to capture the war in all its attendant horrors created by twentieth-century mechanisation and machinery”.⁹²⁸

⁹²⁵ *Athenaeum*, 19 December 1919: 1375.

⁹²⁶ Dalrymple, 2014: 489, who uses the alternative spelling of Gandamak.

⁹²⁷ Cited in Benjamin, 1999: 242.

⁹²⁸ Harrington, 1993: 306.

Nevertheless, their paintings in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were representative of the effects of – and contemporary responses to – war as it was then and in some cases, into the present day. I suggest that these images deserve to be considered afresh for the messages they seek to convey, messages which are still relevant and form part of the history of British battle painting. No-one who has looked at the face of the central survivor of the Charge of the Light Brigade in *Balaclava* can doubt that it shows the effects of post-traumatic stress disorder, a phenomenon unrecognised until well into the twentieth century

What could well be said is that the “old guard” failed to provide a social commentary on the Boer War as it drew to a close, but this was a failure largely shared with the general public as they moved into the twentieth century. Nor did they dwell on issues of race or gender. Not only did they “seem to lack sympathy with our Empire battles in which blacks are the foe”, they ignored altogether the positive contribution of different racial groups within the imperial army.⁹²⁹ Apart from her self-portrait Butler produced only one significant painting of a woman in *Evicted*, and her representation of Zulus in *The Defence of Rorke’s Drift* was not repeated, possibly on account of her difficulties in seeing her models, but more likely following her husband’s adverse remarks.⁹³⁰ Woodville’s approach was more complex as he did profile Sudanese warriors, as for example in *The Charge of the 21st Lancers at Omdurman*, but more for reasons of colour contrast against the dust of the desert and to enhance the heroism of the British soldiers in their khaki. Imperial soldiers from African and Asian racial groups fighting alongside white British troops are notably absent from his works.⁹³¹ Although Woodville did feature Indian ambulance workers in South Africa this

⁹²⁹ Spielmann, 1901:422.

⁹³⁰ She did, however, profile Bengali troops in her 1873 watercolour, *10th Bengal Lancers Tent-Pegging*.

⁹³¹ See, for example, *Caught in the Act*, a drawing reproduced in *With Flag to Pretoria*, showing a British soldier interrupting a Boer flogging a semi-naked African strapped to the wheel of a wagon, Wilson, 1902: 762.

was in a subservient role and in order to highlight bad Boer behaviour whilst hinting at their disregard of the rights of the native African and Indian communities said to be upheld by the British. Where he and his fellow battle-painters depicted Boers this was to differentiate the moral qualities of the British soldier and the so-called slovenly habits and deceitful character of their (white) opponents, both male and female, alongside their abuse of the native population.⁹³² None of this should negate the validity of the work that had gone before, for “even the most illiterate could look at a Woodville or a Lady Butler picture and the forms would be immediately recognisable” as a portrayal of war, and, mostly, I suggest, of the damage inflicted in combat.⁹³³

It has to be remembered, too, that it was Sargent, the society portrait painter, rather than Nevinson, the Futurist, who was revered for his war art both then and now. Moreover, when compared with Sargent, it is Butler who represented the more searing and empathetic account of suffering, notwithstanding her reliance on second-hand reportage. As Benjamin comments, those images of the past which are not recognised as concerns of the present are vulnerable to extinction, even though their influence continues, and unless we “actively inherit the past” we are in danger of selling short the future.⁹³⁴ The question has to be asked as to why the demand of the British public for written history and specifically military history of this period is vibrant when this visual military culture is so marginalised? I am not suggesting that the World War One official artists did not break new ground; rather that they did so as part of a continuum of battle painting, and in a manner which embraced the new style of warfare to which they were exposed, for as Williams points out “it has become increasingly necessary to notice how relatively far back the most important period of modern art now appears to be”.⁹³⁵ It is

⁹³² Race was not an issue addressed by the First World War official artists either.

⁹³³ Harrington, 1993: 309.

⁹³⁴ Benjamin cited in Cherry, 2000: 8; Barnes, 2014: 9.

⁹³⁵ Williams, 1989b: 37.

significant that the BWMC for instance referred to Uccello-size paintings in their commissions, referencing fifteenth-century Italian art, whilst failing to acknowledge the contribution of home-grown battle artists, several of whom were active and willing to contribute to the war effort.⁹³⁶

Those Neglected Works⁹³⁷

“The composite experience of all the ages is part of each one of us”⁹³⁸

In his 1987 essay, *When was Modernism?* Williams addresses the divisive characteristics of a received view of modernism. He urges a break out from the “non-historical fixity of *post*-modernism”, calling for an alternative tradition in which these “neglected works” can be reassessed, a phrase into which many of these paintings and artists fall or are consigned. I argue that these late-Victorian battle painters are victims of a “selective tradition”, a tradition which in its anxiety to be progressive, focussed on the new and sometimes marginal whilst ignoring the work of these artists, for as Ryan reminds us, “popular modernism and English traditionalism are frequent bedfellows”.⁹³⁹ At the end of the nineteenth century, Wilfrid Meynell wrote of his sister-in-law’s work that “Lady Butler has done for the soldier in Art what Mr Rudyard Kipling has done for him in Literature-she has taken the individual, separated him, seen him close, and let the world see him.”⁹⁴⁰ With her more painterly, academic technique, Butler may well have eschewed modernism, and would certainly have dissociated herself from the avant-garde, but there is little doubt that she embraced modernity in her subject matter and representation, even if this was a modernity which “never quite

⁹³⁶ Uccello’s *The Battle of San Romano* (1438-40) (National Gallery, London) measures 182cm by 317cm.

⁹³⁷ Williams, 1989a: 35.

⁹³⁸ Walter Pater writing in 1868, cited in Prettejohn, 2012: 2.

⁹³⁹ Ryan, citing Bill Schwarz, 2007: 65.

⁹⁴⁰ Meynell, 1898: 31.

seemed able to break free from the imprint” of the past.⁹⁴¹ Her contemporaries within this cohort, specifically Woodville, may not always have followed her in technique, their styles often being subject to rapidity of execution, and were closer to a more impressionistic finish whilst shying away from Butler’s confrontational portrayal of pain and psychological damage. Nevertheless, their representations of a soldier’s experiences, within the context of changing views on empire, did much to expose modern conditions within the army and society as a whole, and as Peters Corbett and Perry have indicated, the “formal appearance” of these works is of less significance than their connections to their historical and cultural context.⁹⁴²

In this thesis I have argued that the works of these artists not only represented contemporary values but, further, laid down markers for their successors in form, both academic and popular, and content. The fact that these markers are rarely now acknowledged should not diminish their value either for a modern audience or the art historian in researching this period. Writing of the politics of the avant-garde, Williams stresses the need to look behind a particular genre to “the turbulent succession of artistic movements and cultural formations which compose the real history of Modernism”.⁹⁴³ In other words, we should not be seduced by the outward appearance of innovation and iconoclasm, but instead assess each individual or group on its own merit, considering their respective innovative practices and ideas, as it is only then that we can judge their value. Along with Tickner, I argue for a fresh look at the canon of modernist works through which to view, or review, these paintings for there is “more than one kind of modernism (and modernity) at stake”.⁹⁴⁴

⁹⁴¹ Schwarz, 1987: 147.

⁹⁴² Peters Corbett and Perry, 2000: 2.

⁹⁴³ Williams 1989c: 50.

⁹⁴⁴ Tickner, 2000: 184.

Battle art, as a genre, presents as a complex conundrum when considering its place within modernity. Nor is it securely situated within the genre of history painting, but crosses the boundaries between popular and academic art. Not only is the outward appearance of the paintings traditional (though as I have argued this should not of itself exclude such works of art from modernity), but the subject-matter, too, is inherently traditional and firmly rooted within the establishment whilst, perversely, it is also perceived to be “un-British”. With the onset of the First World War, cavalry engagements common in nineteenth-century battles were virtually obsolete and associated with imperialism, leading to the dismissal of many of those paintings in which they were represented, along with their artists. Whilst this may have been understandable in the turbulent first part of the twentieth century, I would argue that with the passage of time it would now be appropriate to address more fully the contribution of these battle paintings and painters within the wider history and development of modernity. Comparisons between works in the late nineteenth century and those commissioned in World War One have already been drawn here. Much twenty-first century battle art similarly privileges the figurative, as opposed to an emphasis on technological warfare, indicating the part of these late-nineteenth-century artists within a continuing tradition. I suggest that there is more research to be done in terms of the place of this cohort in both popular and academic art, in particular given the ambivalent attitude of the British towards military painting generally, as evidenced by the many such works of art currently in store. Given the increase of war art exhibited in the Royal Academy at the end of the nineteenth century, at what point precisely did their representations of warfare cease to be meaningful to the British public? Was it a gradual process of attrition, or did it occur as the result of a particular event, such as the unpopular ending to the Boer War?

As indicated in the introduction, I have used Butler as a connecting thread throughout, not to profile her work exclusively, but rather as a case study when considering that of her contemporaries about whom far less is known and, in spite of their popularity in the nineteenth century, little studied.⁹⁴⁵ I would argue that more research into the work of all these artists is needed, their techniques, the influence of their work for the illustrated press, their networks and their legacies and in Butler's case, her place within a feminist art history. Woodville in particular was well regarded by his fellow artists and in much demand by the illustrated press until the first decade of the twentieth century, whilst Crofts was recognised by the Royal Academy. While Butler and her battle art contemporaries may well be representative of their time, this does not mean their work does not transcend the boundaries of the nineteenth century in their focus on the common soldier, his heroism, his courage and his suffering, a focus which continues to be highlighted in war art and photography well into the twenty-first century. This is an emphasis which was undoubtedly new in the second half of the nineteenth century and it may not be going too far to suggest that the all-embracing policy of the Imperial, now Commonwealth, War Graves Commission, of equality in death grew out of this novel appreciation of the rank and file as individuals worthy of celebration.⁹⁴⁶

⁹⁴⁵ Apart from Butler and the 1917 local exhibition of Charlton's works, I am not aware of any retrospective of any of these artists.

⁹⁴⁶ It may be no coincidence that it was William Burdett-Coutts who had reported on the war in South Africa for *The Times* who delivered the deciding speech in the House of Commons debating the form of secular and universal headstone in British military cemeteries.

ABBREVIATIONS

BTHAG-Beverley Treasure House and Art Gallery

BL-British Library

BWMC-British War Memorials Committee

DA-Downside Abbey (Dom Urban papers)

FAS-Fine Art Society

HHG-Humphrey's Homestead, Greatham, Sussex (Meynell archives)

ILN-Illustrated London News

IWM-Imperial War Museum

LAG-Leeds City Art Gallery

NAM-National Army Museum Archives

NMM-National Media Museum, Bradford

RAA-Royal Academy Archives

RC-Royal Collection

RCWSA-Royal Commission on the War in South Africa

BTH-Treasure House, Beverley (Stewart Papers/Strickland Constable Papers)

VAM-Victoria and Albert Museum-National Art Library

WAG-Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool

YMT-York Museums Trust

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Newspapers and Periodicals

Art Annual - (1898-1900)

Art Journal - (1856-1903)

Athenaeum - (1875-1915)

Blast I and II - (1914-15)

Connoisseur - (1915-27)

Friend – (1899-1902)

History Workshop Journal - (1976-94)

Illustrated London News - (1853-1918)

Illustrated London Times - (1855-1860)

Illustrated Naval and Military Magazine - (1880-90)

Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History - (1991-2008)

Journal of Visual Culture in Britain - (2005)

Military Illustrated - (1988-96)

Morning Post - (1874-75)

Oxford Art Journal - (1983-2009)

Punch - (1866-1914)

The Times - (1874-1933)

Victorian Studies - (1971-83)

Unpublished Sources

Beverley Treasure House and Art Gallery (BTHAG)-Stewart papers
on loan from Burnby Hall, Pocklington, East Yorkshire.

Bury Art Museum (BAM)-Elizabeth Butler paper file (*Listing for the
Connaught Rangers*).

Downside Abbey (DA)-papers of Dom Urban Butler.

Ferens Art Gallery, Hull (FAG)-Elizabeth Butler paper file
(*The Return from Inkerman*).

Humphrey's Homestead, Greatham (HHG)-Meynell Papers:
T.E.Weller's scrapbook

Imperial War Museum (IWM)-correspondence and minutes in First
World War Artists Archive.

Leeds Art Gallery (LAG)-Elizabeth Butler paper file (*Scotland
Forever!*)

Manchester City Art Gallery (MCAG)-Elizabeth Butler paper file
(*Balaclava*)..

National Army Museum Archives (NAM)-sketchbooks of Elizabeth Butler; papers on Butler collected by Major R W J Smith; indices of reproductions of the works of all artists featured; numerous articles.

National Media Museum, Bradford (NMM)-photographic collection of Emmanuel Lee.

Queen's Royal Lancers Museum, Thoresby (QRL)-Richard Caton Woodville paper file (*All That Was Left of Them*).

Royal Academy Archives (RAA)-Dictionary of Artists and their Works in the Summer Exhibitions from 1873 to 1922; Minute Book 1879; Miscellaneous correspondence.

Royal Collection (RC)-Paper files on Elizabeth Butler (*Calling the Roll after an Engagement, Crimea*) and Joseph Noel Paton (*Home*).

Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool (WAG)-Richard Caton Woodville paper files (*Saving the Guns at Maiwand* and *The Charge of the 21st Lancers at Ondurman*).

Published Sources

Abler, T.S. *Hinterland Warriors and Military Dress: European Empires and Exotic Uniforms* (Oxford and New York, 1999).

Adam, C. 'Futurism and the British Avant-Garde' in *Blasting the Future: Vorticism in Britain 1910-1920* exh. cat. Estorick Collection of Modern Italian Art (London, 2004), 9-17.

- Adler, K. and Pointon, M. (eds), *The Body Imaged: the Human Form and Visual Culture since the Renaissance* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Albinson, A.C. 'Maximum Exposure: Modernizing the Grand Manner Portrait for the Edwardian Age' in A. Trumble and A.W.Rager (eds) *Edwardian Opulence: British Art at the Dawn of the Twentieth Century* exh.cat. Yale Center for British Art (New Haven, 2013), 77-97.
- Altick, R.D. *Punch: the Lively Youth of a British Institution 1841-1851* (Ohio, 1997).
- Anderson, B. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London, 1983).
- Anderson, O. 'The Growth of Christian Militarism in Mid-Victorian Britain' in *English Historical Review*, vol. 86, no. 338, (1971), 46-72.
- Angell, N. *The Great Illusion: a Study of the Relation of Military Power to National Advantage* [1st ed. 1909] (London, 1913).
- Armstrong, K. *A Short History of Myth* 2nd ed (2005, London, 2006).
- Atterbury, P. 'Steam and Speed: Industry, Transport and Communications' in J.M. Mackenzie (ed.). *The Victorian Vision: Inventing New Britain* (London, 2001), 147-71.
- Attridge, S. *Nationalism, Imperialism and Identity in Late Victorian Culture. Civil and Military Worlds* (Basingstoke, 2003).
- Austen, J. *Pride and Prejudice* [1st ed.1813] (London, 1972).

- Badeni, J. *The Slender Tree: A Life of Alice Meynell* (Padstow, 1981).
- Bailkin, J. 'Indian Yellow: Making and Breaking the Imperial Palette' in *Journal of Material Culture*, vol. 10, (2005), 197-216.
- Bainbridge, B. 'The Remnants of an Army (1879) by Elizabeth Thompson (Lady Butler)' in J. Collins and E. Lindner (eds) *Writing on the Wall: Women Writers on Women Artists*, (London, 1993), 1-6.
- Bal, M. 'Dead Flesh or the Smell of Painting' in N. Bryson, M.A.Holly and K. Moxey (eds) *Visual Culture Images and Interpretations* (Middletown, Connecticut, 1994), 365-83.
- Bal, M. 'Reading the Gaze: The Construction of Gender in 'Rembrandt'' in S. Melville and B. Readings (eds) *Vision and Textuality* (Basingstoke and London, 1995), 147-73.
- Bal, M. *Looking in; the Art of Viewing* (Amsterdam, 2001).
- Ballantyne, T. and Burton, A. (eds) *Bodies, Empires and World History* (Durham, NC, 2005).
- Bann, S. *The Clothing of Clio: A Study of the Representation of History in Nineteenth-Century Britain and France* (Cambridge, 1984).
- Bann, S. *The True Vine: On Visual Representation and the Western Tradition* (Cambridge, 1989).
- Barlow, P. 'The Death of History Painting in Nineteenth-Century Art?' in *Visual Culture in Britain*, vol. 6, no. 1 (2005), 1-4.

Barnes, J. 'The Madsen Commissions' in *Finding the Value: Contemporary Artists Explore Aspects of the Madsen Collection* exh.cat. York Museums Trust (York, 2014), 8-9.

Barnett, C. *Britain and her Army 1509-1970, a Military, Political and Social Survey* (Harmondsworth, 1974).

Barringer, T.J. 'Not a "Modern" as the Word is now Understood? Byam Shaw, Imperialism and the Poetics of Professional Society' in D. Peters Corbett and L. Perry (eds) *English Art 1860-1914: Modern Artists and Identity*, 2nd ed. (2000, Manchester and New Jersey, 2001), 64-83.

Barringer, T.J. *Men at Work. Art and Labour in Victorian Britain* (New Haven and London, 2005).

Barringer, T.J. 'A White Atlantic? The Idea of American Art in Nineteenth-Century Britain' in *Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century* vol. no. 9, (2009), 1-26.

Barringer, T.J., Quilley, G and Fordham, D. (eds) *Art and the British Empire* (Manchester and New York, 2007).

Barringer, T.J. "'There's the Life for a Man Like Me": Rural Life and Labor in Edwardian Life and Music' in *Edwardian Opulence: British Art at the Dawn of the Twentieth Century* exh.cat. Yale Center for British Art (New Haven 2013), 133-57.

Barthes, R. (trans.) *Camera Lucida* [1st ed. 1980] (London, 2000).

Baxandall, M. *Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures* (New Haven and London, 1985).

- Baxandall, M. *Words for Pictures: Seven Papers on Renaissance Art and Criticism* (New Haven, 2003).
- Beaumont, J. 'The Times at War, 1899-1902' in D. Lowry (ed.). *The South African War Reappraised* (Manchester, 2000), 67-83.
- Beck, H. *Victorian Engravings* (London, 1973).
- Beckett, J. and Cherry, D. (eds) *The Edwardian Era* exh. cat. Barbican Art Gallery (London, 1987).
- Bell, C. *Art* (London, 1914).
- Bell, D. 'From Ancient to Modern in Victorian Imperial Thought' in *History Journal*, vol. 49, no.3, (September 2006), 735-59.
- Bell, D. (ed.). *Victorian Visions of Global Order: Empire and International Relations in Nineteenth-Century Political Thought* (Cambridge, 2007).
- Bell, D. 'The Victorian Idea of a Global State' in D. Bell (ed.). *Victorian Visions of Global Order* (Cambridge, 2007), 159-85.
- Bell, Q. *Victorian Artists* (London, 1967).
- Bending, L. *The Representation of Bodily Pain in Late Nineteenth-Century English Culture* (Oxford, 2000).
- Benjamin, W. (trans.) *Illuminations* [1st ed. 1955] (London, 1999).
- Bennett, A. 'Officialism and War-Painting' in *New Statesman* (20 December 1919), 347-48.

Bentley, N. (ed.). *Russell's Despatches from the Crimea* (London, 1970).

Benyon, J. 'Intermediate' Imperialism and the Test of Empire: Milner's 'Eccentric' High Commission in South Africa' in D. Lowry (ed.). *The South African War Reappraised* (Manchester, 2000), 84-103.

Besant, W. 'Is it the Voice of the Hooligan?' in *Contemporary Review*, vol. LXXVII, (January 1900), 27-39.

Betterton, R. 'Women Artists, Modernity and Suffrage Cultures in Britain and Germany 1890-1920' in K. Deepwell (ed.). *Women Artists and Modernism* (Manchester and New York, 1998), 18-35.

Billing, V. *The Panorama of the Battle of Trafalgar Painted by W.L.Wyllie RA Marine Artist (1851-1931)* (Portsmouth, 2002).

Bird, J. 'Representing the Great War' in *Block* vol. 3, (1980), 41-52.

Black, J. *The Sculpture of Eric Kennington* (Much Hadham, Aldershot and Burlington Vt., 2002).

Black, J. 'Taking Heaven by Violence: Futurism and Vorticism as Seen by the British Press c.1912-20' in J. Black, C. Adams, M.J.K.Walsh and J.Wood (eds) *Blasting the Future: Vorticism in Britain 1910-1920* exh.cat. Estorick Collection of Modern Italian Art (London, 2004), 29-39.

Black, J. 'Beauty, Rhythm, Strength: C.R.W.Nevinson as a Printmaker, ca.1916-32' in M.J.K.Walsh (ed.). *A Dilemma of*

English Modernism: Visual and Verbal Politics in the Life and Work of C.R.W.Nevinson (1889-1946) (Cranbury, New Jersey, 2007), 115-33.

Black, J. “‘Broken Warriors, Tortured Souls’”: Constructions of Physical and Psychological Trauma in British Art of the First World War Art of Eric Kennington, William Orpen and C.R.W.Nevinson, c.1916-1919’, paper delivered to 7th Cultural Intersections International Colloquium, Edward James Foundation, West Dean, Chichester, entitled *Exploring the Edge of Trauma* (May 2012, unpublished).

Black, J. ‘A Horrible Fascination: Propaganda, Reality and the Image of the Dead in British Official War Art c.1917-1919’, paper delivered to 11th Annual Cultural Studies Association Conference, Columbia College, Chicago, entitled *Beyond Disciplinarity: Interventions in Cultural Studies and the Arts* (May 2013, unpublished).

Blackburn, H. (ed.). *Academy Notes 1875-1879* (London, 1875-79).

Blanch, M.D. ‘British Society and the War’ in P. Warwick (ed.). *The South African War: the Anglo-Boer War 1899-1902* (Harlow, 1980), 210-38.

Boehmer, E. (ed.). *Empire Writing: an Anthology of Colonial Literature 1870-1918* (Oxford and New York, 1998).

Boehmer, E. (ed.). *Scouting for Boys* 2nd ed. (2004, Oxford, 2005).

Bond, B. (ed.). *Victorian Military Campaigns* (London, 1967).

Bond, B. ‘The South African War, 1880-1’ in B. Bond (ed.). *Victorian Military Campaigns* (London, 1967), 199-240.

- Bond, B. *The Victorian Army and the Staff College, 1854-1914* (London, 1972).
- Bond, B. 'Recruiting the Victorian Army, 1870-92' in *Victorian Studies* vol. v, (1972), 331-38.
- Bonehill, J. and Quilley, G. (eds) *Conflicting Visions: War and Visual Culture in Britain and France c. 1700-1830* (Aldershot, 2005).
- Boos, F.S. 'Dystopian Violence: William Morris and the Nineteenth-Century Peace Movement' in *Journal of Pre-Raphaelite Studies*, vol. 14, (2005), 15-35.
- Booth, M.R. *Victorian Spectacular Theatre, 1850-1910* (Boston, London and Henley, 1981).
- Borden, M. *Forbidden Zone* (London, 1929).
- Bostridge, M. *The Fateful Year: England 1914* (London, 2014).
- Bourke, J. *Dismembering the Male* (London, 1996).
- Bourke, J. *An Intimate History of Killing: Face-to-Face Killing in Twentieth-Century Warfare* (London, 1999).
- Bourke, J. *Fear: A Cultural History* 2nd ed. (2005, London 2006).
- Bradley, I. *The Optimists: Themes and Personalities in Victorian Liberalism* (London, 1980).
- Bratton, J.S. 'Theatre of War: the Crimea on the London Stage 1854-5' in D. Bradby, L. James and B. Sharratt (eds) *Performance*

and Politics in Popular Drama: Aspects of Popular Entertainment in Theatre, Film and Television 1800-1976 (Cambridge, 1980), 119-37.

Braudy, L. *From Chivalry to Terrorism: War and the Changing Nature of Masculinity* 2nd ed. (2004, New York, 2005).

Breward, C. 'Sartorial Spectacle: Clothing and Masculine Identities in the Imperial City, 1860-1914' in F.Driver and D.Gilbert (eds) *Imperial Cities: Landscape, Display and Identity* (Manchester, 1999), 238-53.

Briggs, J. 'Imperial Analogies: Global Events, Local Visual Culture, 1899-1901' (PhD thesis, University of Yale 2007).

Brock, C. *George Bellows* exh.cat. National Gallery of Art, Washington, Metropolitan Museum of Art and Royal Academy of Arts, (New York and London, 2013).

Brockington, G. (ed.). *Internationalism and the Arts in Britain and Europe at the Fin de Siècle* (Oxford, 2009).

Brockington, G. *Above the Battlefield. Modernism and the Peace Movement in Britain 1900-1918* (New Haven, 2010).

Brooks, D. *The Age of Upheaval: Edwardian Politics, 1899-1914* (Manchester, 1995).

Buchanan, R. 'The Voice of "The Hooligan"' in *Contemporary Review*, vol. LXXV1, (December 1899), 774-89.

Buchloh, B.H.D., Guilbaut, S., and Solkin, D. (eds) *Modernism and Modernity: The Vancouver Conference Papers* 2nd ed. (1983, Halifax, Nova Scotia, 2004).

- Bullen, J.B. (ed.). *Post-Impressionists in England* (London and New York, 1988).
- Burke, P. 'Is there a Cultural History of the Emotions?' in P. Gouk and H. Hills (eds) *Representing Emotions: New Connections on the Histories of Art, Music and Medicine* (Aldershot and Burlington, Vt., 2005), 35-47.
- Burleigh, B. *The Natal Campaign* (London, 1900).
- Burton, A. 'Who Needs the Nation? Interrogating 'British' History' in C. Hall (ed.). *Cultures of Empire: A Reader: Colonizers in Britain and the Empire in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Manchester, 2000), 137-53.
- Burton, A. (ed.). *Politics and Empire in Victorian Britain: A Reader* (New York and Basingstoke, 2001).
- Burton, A. 'New Narratives of Imperial Politics in the Nineteenth Century' in C. Hall and S.O.Rose (eds) *At Home with the Empire: Metropolitan Culture and the Imperial World* (Cambridge, 2006), 212-30.
- Butler, E. *Letters from the Holy Land* (London, 1903).
- Butler, E. *Glimpses of the Great War, an Exhibition of Pictures*, exh.cat. Leicester Galleries (London, 1917).
- Butler, E. *From Sketchbook and Diary* (London, 1909).
- Butler, E. *An Autobiography* 2nd ed. (1923, Sevenoaks, 1993).

- Butler, J. *Precarious Life: the Powers of Mourning and Violence* 2nd ed. (2004, London, 2006).
- Butler, J. *Frames of War: When is Life Grievable?* (London, 2009).
- Butler, W. *From Naboth's Vineyard* (London, 1907).
- Butler, W. *An Autobiography*, (London, 1911).
- Cain, P. 'British Radicalism, the South African Crisis, and the Origins of the Theory of Financial Imperialism' in D. Omissi and A. Thompson (eds) *The Impact of the South African War* (Basingstoke, 2002), 173-93.
- Cain, P. 'Radicalism, Gladstone, and the Liberal Critique of Disraeli 'Imperialism'' in D. Bell (ed.). *Victorian Visions of Global Order* (Cambridge, 2007), 215-38.
- Calthorpe, S.J.G. *Letters from Headquarters: or, the Realities of the War in the Crimea. With a Portrait of Lord Raglan and Plans by an Officer of the Staff*, 2 vols. (London, 1856).
- Campbell, C.F. *Letters from Camp* (London, 1894).
- Campbell Orr, C. (ed.). *Women in the Victorian Art World* (Manchester, 1995).
- Canning, J. 'The Military Art of Richard Caton Woodville' in *Military Illustrated*, vol. 13, (June/July 1988), 37-39.
- Carden-Coyne, A. *Reconstructing the Body: Classicism, Modernism, and the First World War* (Oxford, 2009).

- Carter, A.C.R, 'The Work of War Artists in South Africa' in *Art Journal*, (London, December, 1900), 1-32.
- Caruth, C. (ed.). *Trauma: Explorations in Memory* (Baltimore and London, 1995).
- Catalogue of Paintings by Lady Butler* (exh.cat. Fine Art Society, London, 1877).
- Catalogue of the Loan Exhibition of Works by John Charlton* (exh.cat. Laing Art Gallery and Museum, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1917).
- Chamberlain, J. 'The True Conception of Empire (1897)' in E. Boehmer (ed.). *Empire Writing: an Anthology of Colonial Literature 1870-1918* (Oxford and New York, 1998), 212-15.
- Chambers, E. 'Redefining History Painting in the Academy. The Summer Composition Competition at the Slade School of Fine Art, 1898-1922' in *Journal of Visual Culture in Britain*, vol. 6, issue 1, (2005), 79-100.
- Chapman, C. *Russell of the Times: War Despatches and Diaries* (London, 1984).
- Chadwick, W. 'The Fine Art of Gentling: Horses, Women and Rosa Bonheur in Victorian England' in K. Adler and M. Pointon (eds), *The Body Imaged: the Human Form and Visual Culture since the Renaissance* (Cambridge, 1993), 89-107.
- Cheeke, S. *Writing for Art: The Aesthetics of Ekphrasis* (Manchester, 2008).

- Cherry, D. *Painting Women: Victorian Women Artists* (London, 1993).
- Cherry, D. 'Women Artists and the Politics of Feminism 1850-1900' in C. Campbell Orr (ed.). *Women in the Victorian Art World* 2nd ed. (1995, Manchester, 1996), 49-69.
- Cherry, D. *Beyond the Frame: Feminism and Visual Culture, Britain 1850-1900* (London, 2000).
- Cherry, D. (ed.). *Art: History: Visual: Culture* (Malden, Oxford and Carlton, 2005).
- Cherry, D. and Helland, J. (eds) *Local/Global: Women Artists in the Nineteenth Century* (Aldershot and Burlington, 2006).
- Chesney, G. *The Battle of Dorking* [1st ed. 1871] (Oxford, 1997).
- Childers, E. *The Riddle of the Sands: a Record of Secret Service* [1st ed. 1903] (London, 1945).
- Claeys, G. 'The 'Left' and the Critique of Empire c. 1865-1900' in D. Bell (ed.). *Victorian Visions of Global Order* (Cambridge, 2007), 239-66.
- Clarke, M. 'Bribery with Sherry' and 'the Influence of Weak Tea': Women Critics as Arbiters of Taste in the Late-Victorian and Edwardian Press' in *Journal of Visual Culture in Britain*, vol. 6, issue 2, (2005), 139-55.
- Clausen, G. *On Painting: Sixteen Lectures Delivered to the Students of the Royal Academy of Arts* (London, 1913).
- Clayton, E. *English Female Artists*, 2 vols. (London, 1876).

Codell, J. (ed.). *Imperial Co-Histories: National Identities and the British and Colonial Press* (Cranbury, London and Ontario, 2003).

Codell, J. 'Imperial Masculinity, Mimicry and the New Woman in *Rhodes of Africa*' in T. Barringer, G. Quilley and D. Fordham (eds) *Art and the British Empire* (Manchester and New York, 2007), 254-66.

Codell, J. (ed.). *Transculturation in British Art, 1770-1930* (Farnham and Burlington, 2012).

Codell, J. 'The Art of Transculturation' in J. Codell (ed.). *Transculturation in British Art, 1770-1930* (Farnham and Burlington, 2012), 1-17.

Cole, S. *Modernism, Male Friendship, and the First World War* 2nd ed. (2003, Cambridge, 2007).

Colley, L. *Britons. Forging the Nation 1707-1837* 2nd ed. (1992, London, 1994).

Colls, R. and Dodd, P. (eds) *Englishness Politics and Culture 1880-1920* (Beckenham and Surry Hills, NSW, 1986).

Comment, B. *The Panorama* (London, 1999).

Compton, R. 'A Chat with Caton Woodville' in *The Idler*, vol. x, no. vi, (January, 1897), 758-75.

Conan Doyle, A. *The Great Boer War* (London, Edinburgh, Dublin and New York, 1903).

- Cook, E.T. and Wedderburn, A. (eds), *Ruskin's Complete Works* vol. xiv (London, 1904).
- Coombs, A. 'The Franco-British Exhibition: Packaging Empire in Edwardian England' in J. Beckett and D. Cherry (eds) *The Edwardian Era* exh.cat. Barbican Art Gallery (London, 1987), 152-66.
- Coombs, A. *History after Apartheid: Visual Culture and Public Memory in a Democratic South Africa* (Durham and London, 2003).
- Cooper, S.A. *Patriotic Patriotism: Waging War on War in Europe 1815-1914* (New York, 1991).
- Cooper, S.F. 'Technology, Tradition and the Dilemmas of Design' in J.M.Mackenzie (ed.). *The Victorian Vision: Inventing New Britain* (London, 2001), 187-21.
- Cordulack, S. 'Victorian Caricature and Classicism: Picturing the London Water Crisis' in *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, vol. 9, no.4, (Spring, 2003), 535-83.
- Cork, R. *Vorticism* (London, 1976).
- Cork, R. 'From "Art Quake" to "Pure Visual Music": Roger Fry and Modern British Art, 1910-1916' in C. Green (ed.). *Art Made Modern: Roger Fry's Vision of Art* exh.cat. The Courtauld Gallery, (London, 1999), 57-72.
- Craik, J. *The Face of Fashion: Cultural Studies in Fashion* (London and New York, 1994).

- Crary, J. *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century* [1st ed.1990] (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1998).
- Creswicke, L. *South Africa and the Transvaal War*, vols. i to iv (Edinburgh, 1900).
- Creswicke, L. *South Africa and the Transvaal War*, vols. v to vi (London, 1901).
- Crichton-Stuart, E. *A Tale of Two Sisters* (unpublished, 1987).
- Crownshaw, R., Kilby, J. and Rowland, A. (eds) *The Future of Memory* (New York, and London, 2010).
- Cruse, A. *After the Victorians* (London, 1938).
- Cubitt, G. (ed.). *Imagining Nations* (Manchester, 1998).
- Cubitt, G. *History and Memory* (Manchester, 2007).
- Cubitt, G. and Warren, A. (eds) *Heroic Reputations and Exemplary Lives* (Manchester, 2000).
- Cuneo, P. (ed.). *Artful Armies, Beautiful Battles: Art and Warfare in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden, Boston and Cologne, 2002).
- Cunningham, H. 'Jingoism in 1877-78' in *Victorian Studies*, vol. xiv, (1971), 429-53.
- Cunningham, H. 'The Language of Patriotism, 1750-1914' in *History Workshop Journal* vol. 12, (1981), 8-33.

- Czisznik, M. 'Commemorating Trafalgar: Public Celebration and National Identity' in D. Cannadine (ed.). *Trafalgar in History: A Battle and its Afterlife* (Basingstoke, 2006), 139-54.
- Dalrymple, W. *Return of a King: the Battle for Afghanistan* 2nd ed. (2013, London, 2014).
- Darwin, J. 'Afterword: the Imprint of the War' in D. Omissi and A. Thompson (eds) *The Impact of the South African War* (Basingstoke, 2002), 289-302.
- Darwin, J. *The Empire Project: the Rise and Fall of the British World System, 1830-1970* (Cambridge, 2009).
- Das, S. *Touch and Intimacy in First World War Literature* (Cambridge, 2005).
- Davey, A. *The British Pro-Boers 1877-1902* (Cape Town, 1978).
- Davidoff, L. and Hall, C. 'The Architecture of Public and Private Life: English Middle-Class Society in a Provincial Town 1780-1850' in D. Fraser and A. Sutcliffe (eds) *The Pursuit of Urban History* (London, 1983), 327-45.
- Dawson, G. *Soldier Heroes: Adventure, Empire and the Imagining of Masculinities* (London, 1994).
- De Bolla, P. 'The Visibility of Visuality: Vauxhall Gardens and the Siting of the Viewer' in S. Melville and B. Readings (eds) *Vision and Textuality* (Basingstoke and London, 1995), 282-95.

- De Groot, J. ‘What Should they Know of England who only England Know?’ Kipling on the Boundaries of Gender, Art and Empire’ in G. Cubitt (ed.). *Imagining Nations* (Manchester, 1998), 173-89.
- De Groot, J. ‘Sex’ and ‘Race’: The Construction of Language and Image in the Nineteenth Century’ in C. Hall (ed.). *Cultures of Empire: A Reader: Colonisers in Britain and the Empire in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Manchester, 2000), 37-60.
- De Walton, J. ‘John Charlton and his Work’ in *Cassell’s Magazine* (1906), 619-29.
- Deepwell, K. (ed.). *Women Artists and Modernism* (Manchester and New York, 1998).
- Deepwell, K. ‘Women War Artists of World War One’ in K. E. Brown (ed.). *Women’s Contributions to Visual Culture, 1918-1939* (Aldershot, 2008), 11-36.
- Deuchar, S. *Sporting Art in Eighteenth-Century England: A Social and Political History* (New Haven and London, 1988).
- Dennehy, W.F. (ed.). *Record: The Irish International Exhibition* exh.cat. (Dublin, 1907).
- Di Bello, P. ‘Elizabeth Thompson and ‘Patsy’ Cornwallis West as Carte-de-Visites Celebrities’ in *History of Photography*, vol. 35, no.3, (August 2011), 240-49.
- Di Bello, P. and Koureas, G. (eds) *Art, History and the Senses: 1830 to the Present* (Farnham, 2010).

- Dickson, W.K-L. *Biography in Battle: its Story in the South African War Related with Personal Experiences* [1st ed. 1901, London] (1995, Madison, Teaneck).
- Didi-Huberman, G. (trans.) *Images in Spite of All* 2nd ed. (2003, Chicago and London, 2008).
- Dodd, S.M. 'Art Education for Women in the 1860s: a Decade of Debate' in C. Campbell Orr (ed.). *Women in the Victorian Art World* 2nd ed. (1995, Manchester, 1996), 187-200.
- Driver, F. 'In Search of the Imperial Map: Walter Crane and the Image of Empire' in *History Workshop Journal* vol. 69 (1), (2010), 146-57.
- Dudink, S., Hagemann, K. and Tosh, J. (eds) *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern History* (Manchester, 2004).
- Dunae, P. 'Boys' Literature and the Idea of Empire, 1870-1914' in *Victorian Studies*, vol. xxiv, (1973), 105-21.
- Eagleton, T. *The Ideology of the Aesthetic* (Oxford, 1990).
- Eaton, N. *Colour, Art and Empire: Visual Culture and the Nomadism of Representation* (London, 1974).
- Ebbatson, R. *An Imaginary England: Nation, Landscape and Literature, 1840-1920* (Aldershot, 2005).
- Eisenman, S.F. *The Abu Ghraib Effect* (London, 2007).
- Eldridge, C.C. *Victorian Imperialism* (London, 1978).

- Elizabeth Butler: the Roll Call and other Paintings* (exh.cat. Leicester Galleries, London, 1912).
- Elkins, J. *On Pictures and the Words that Failed Them* (Cambridge, 1998).
- Elshtain, J.B. *Women and War* (Brighton, 1987).
- Elsner, J. 'Art History as Ekphrasis' in *Art History*, vol. 33, issue 1, (February 2010), 10-27.
- Enloe, C. *Does Khaki become You? The Militarization of Women's Lives* 2nd ed. (1983, London, 1988).
- Esher, R. *Journals and Letters of Reginald, Viscount Esher, vol. 1, 1807-1903* (London, 1934).
- Eyre-Todd, G. (ed.). *Autobiography of William Simpson, R.I. (Crimean Simpson)* (London, 1903).
- Fairbrother, T. *John Singer Sargent* (New York, 1994).
- Falls, C. (ed.). *A Diary of the Crimea by George Palmer Evelyn* (London, 1954).
- Falls, C. 'The Army' in S. Nowell-Smith (ed.). *Edwardian England 1910-1914* (London, New York and Toronto, 1964), 517-44.
- Farr, D. *English Art: 1870-1940* (Oxford, 1978).
- Farwell, B. *Queen Victoria's Little Wars* (London, 1973).
- Farwell, B. *The Great Boer War* 2nd ed. (1976, London, 1977).

- Farwell, B. *For Queen and Country* (London, 1981).
- Faust, D.G. *This Republic of Suffering* (New York, 2008).
- Favret, M. *War at a Distance: Romanticism and the Making of Modern Wartime* (Princeton and Oxford, 2010).
- Feldman, J. 'Victorian Bric-a-Brac' in *Modernism/Modernity*, vol. 8, issue 3, (2001), 453-70.
- Fer, B. 'Invisible Pictures: Visual Representation and Language' in F. Frascina, N. Blake, B. Fer, T. Garb and C. Harrison (eds) *Modernity and Modernism: French Painting in the Nineteenth Century* 2nd ed. (1993, New Haven and London, 1994), 15-21.
- Ferguson, N. *The Pity of War* 2nd ed. (1998, London, 1999).
- Figes, O. *Natashas's Dance: A Cultural History of Russia* (London, 2002).
- Figes, O. *Crimea* 2nd ed. (2010, London, 2011).
- Finch, E. *Wilfrid Scawen Blunt 1840-1922* (London, 1938).
- Finkelstein, D. 'Imperial Self-Representation: Constructions of Empire' in *Blackwood's Magazine, 1880-1900* in J. Codell (ed.). *Imperial Co-Histories: National Identities and the British and Colonial Press* (Cranbury, London and Ontario, 2003), 95-108.
- Fletcher, J.S. *The Making of Matthias* (London and New York, 1898).

- Fletcher, P.M. *Narrating Modernity. The British Problem Picture, 1895-1914* (Aldershot 2003).
- Fletcher, P.M. 'Consuming Modern Art: Metaphors of Gender, Commerce and Value in Late-Victorian and Edwardian Art Criticism' in *Visual Culture in Britain*, vol. 2, (2005), 157-70.
- Fletcher, P.M. 'Narrative Painting and Visual Gossip at the Early Twentieth Century Royal Academy' in *Oxford Art Journal*, vol. 32, no.2, (June 2009), 243-62.
- Fletcher, P.M. 'Human Character and Character-Reading at the Edwardian Royal Academy' in *Visual Culture in Britain*, vol. 14, issue 1, (2013), 21-35.
- Fletcher, P.M. 'Victorians and Moderns' in A. Trumble and A.W.Rager (eds) *Edwardian Opulence: British Art at the Dawn of the Twentieth Century* exh.cat. Yale Center for British Art (New Haven 2013), 99-107.
- Flint, K. 'Moral Judgment and the Language of English Art Criticism, 1870-1910' in *Oxford Art Journal*, vol. 6, issue 2, (1983), 59-66.
- Flint, K. *The Victorians and the Visual Imagination* (Cambridge, 2000).
- Foden, G. *Ladysmith* (London, 1999).
- Fowler, D.P. 'Narrate and Describe: the Problem of Ekphrasis' in *Journal of Roman Studies*, vol. 81, (1991), 25-35.
- Fox, J. 'Business Unusual: Art in Britain during the First World War, 1914-1918' (PhD thesis, University of Cambridge 2009).

Franey, L.E. *Victorian Travel Writing and Imperial Violence: British Writing on Africa 1855-1902* (Houndsville, 2003).

Frantzen, A.J. *Bloody Good: Chivalry, Sacrifice, and the Great War* (Chicago and London, 2004).

Frascina, F. and Harrison, C. (eds) *Modern Art and Modernism: A Critical Anthology* 4th ed. (1982, London and Toronto, 1987).

Fredeman, W.E. *Pre-Raphaelitism: A Bibliocritical Study* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965).

Fried, M. *Realism, Writing, and Disfiguration: On Thomas Eakins and Stephen Crane* (Chicago, 1987).

Friedberg, A.L. *The Weary Titan: Britain and the Experience of Relative Decline, 1895-1905* (New Jersey, 1988).

Galassi, P. *Before Photography: Painting and the Invention of Photography* exh.cat. Museum of Modern Art (New York, 1981).

Gallie, W.B. *Philosophers of Peace and War: Kant, Clausewitz, Marx, Engels and Tolstoy* (Cambridge, 1978).

Garb, T. *Sisters of the Brush: Women's Artistic Culture in Late Nineteenth-Century Paris* (New Haven and London, 1994).

Gartlan, L. "'Bronzed and Muscular Bodies': Jinrikshas, Tattooed Bodies, and Yokohama Tourist Photography' in J. Codell (ed.). *Transculturation in British Art, 1770-1930* (Farnham and Burlington, 2012), 93-110.

Gernsheim, H. and Gernsheim, A. *Roger Fenton: Photographer of the Crimean War: His Photographs and his Letters from the Crimea* (London, 1954).

Gervais, T. (trans.) 'Witness to War: The Uses of Photography in the Illustrated Press, 1855-1904' in *Journal of Visual Culture* vol. 9 issue 3, (2010), 370-84.

Gibbs, P. *Realities of War* (London, 1920).

Girouard, M. *The Return to Camelot, Chivalry and the English Gentleman* (New Haven and London, 1981).

Glimpses of the Great War: an Exhibition of Pictures by Lady Butler (exh.cat. Leicester Galleries, London, 1917).

Goldman, B. 'Realist Iconography: Intent and Criticism' in *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* vol. 18, no 2, (December 1959), 183-92.

Goldberg, V. *The Power of Photography: How Photographs Changed our Lives* (London and New York, 1991).

Goodall, F. *The Reminiscences of Frederick Goodall, R.A. with Two Portraits* (London and Newcastle, 1902).

Goodwin, S.W. and Bronfen, E. (eds) *Death and Representation* (Baltimore, 1993).

Gormanston, E. *A Little Kept* (London and New York, 1953).

Gouk, P., and Hills, H. (eds) *Representing Emotions: New Connections in the Histories of Art, Music and Medicine* (Aldershot and Burlington, Vt, 2005).

- Gouma-Peterson, T. and Mathews, P. 'The Feminist Critique of Art History' *Art Bulletin* vol. 69, no 3, (September 1981), 326-57.
- Gough, P. *A Terrible Beauty: British Artists in the First World War* (Bristol, 2010).
- Gourevitch, P. and Morris, E. *Standard Operating Procedure: A War Story* 2nd ed. (2008, London and New York, 2009).
- Graves & Co. *Dictionary of Artists and their Work in the Summer Exhibitions of the Royal Academy of Arts, 1905-1970* vol. 1 A-D 2nd ed. (1973, London, 1985).
- Gray, A. (ed.). *The Edwardians Secrets and Desires* exh.cat. National Gallery of Australia, (Canberra, 2004).
- Green, C. (ed.). *Art Made Modern: Roger Fry's Vision of Art* exh.cat. Courtauld Gallery (London, 1999).
- Green, D. and Seddon, P. (eds) *History Painting Reassessed: the Representation of History in Contemporary Art* (Manchester, 2000).
- Greenberg, C. 'Modernist Painting' in F. Francina, and C. Harrison (eds) *Modern Art and Modernism: a Critical Anthology* 4th ed. (1982, New York and Toronto, 1987), 5-10.
- Greenwall, R. *Artists and Illustrators of the Anglo-Boer War* (Vlaeberg, 1992).
- Greer, G. *The Obstacle Race: the Fortunes of Women Painters and their Work* (London, 1979).

- Gregory, A. *Sir Hugh Lane: His Life and Legacy* (Gerrards Cross, 1973).
- Grosvenor, B. *Art History Blog*.
- Guilbaut, S. 'The Relevance of Modernism' in B.H.D. Buchloh, S. Guilbaut and D.Solkin (eds), *Modernism and Modernity: The Vancouver Conference Papers* 2nd ed. (1983, Halifax, Nova Scotia, 2004), xi-xvii.
- Hall, C. and Rose, S.O. (eds) *At Home with Peace: Metropolitan Culture and the Imperial World* (Cambridge, 2006).
- Hall, D. (ed.). *Muscular Christianity: Embodying the Victorian Age* (Cambridge, 1994).
- Hampton, M. 'The Press, Patriotism and Public Discussion: C.P.Scott, the Manchester Guardian and the Boer War, 1899-1902' in *Historical Journal*, 44, vol. 1, (2001), 177-97.
- Hancher, M. 'Urgent Private Affairs: Millais's Peace Concluded, 1856' in *Burlington Magazine*, vol. 133, (August 1991), 499-506.
- Harries, M. and Harries, S. *The War Artists, British Official War Art of the Twentieth Century* (London, 1983).
- Harries-Jenkins, G. *The Army in Victorian Society* (Hull, 1993).
- Harrington, P. 'The Defence of Kars: Paintings by William Simpson and Thomas Jones Barker' in *Journal for the Society of Army Historical Research*, vol. xix, no 277, (Spring 1991), 22-28.

- Harrington, P. 'Early Paintings of the Great War' in *Imperial War Museum Review*, vol. 7, (1992), 46-54.
- Harrington, P. *British Artists and War: The Face of Battle in Paintings and Prints, 1700-1914* (London, 1993).
- Harrington, P. 'Painting the Empire: the Art of John Charlton' in *Military Illustrated*, vol. 101, (1996), 12-13.
- Harris, A.S. and Nochlin, L. (eds) *Women Artists: 1550-1950*, exh.cat. County Museum of Art (Los Angeles, 1976).
- Harris, A. "'We are Making a New World': Art, Youth and War' in *Nash, Nevinson, Spencer, Gertler, Carrington, Bomberg: A Crisis of Brilliance 1908-1922* exh.cat. Dulwich Picture Gallery (London, 2013), 42-51.
- Harris, J. *Private Lives, Public Spirit: Britain 1870-1914* 2nd ed. (1993, London, 1994).
- Harrison, C. *English Art and Modernism, 1900-1939* [1st ed. 1981] (New Haven and London, 1994).
- Harrison, C. 'Modernism' in Nelson and Schiff (eds) *Critical Terms for Art History* 2nd ed. (1996, Chicago and London, 2003), 188-201.
- Harvey, E. (ed.). *Sensible Flesh: On Touch in Early Modern Culture* (Philadelphia, 2003).
- Harvey, J. *Men in Black* (London, 1995).
- Hart, I. 'History Painting, Spectacle and Performance' in A. Trumble and A.W.Rager (eds) *Edwardian Opulence: British Art at the*

Dawn of the Twentieth Century exh.cat. Yale Center for British Art (New Haven, 2013), 109-23.

Haskins, K. *The Art Journal and Fine Art Publishing in Victorian England, 1850-1880* (Farnham and Burlington, Vt, 2012).

Hatt, M. 'Muscles, Morals, Mind: the Male Body in Thomas Eakins' Salutary' in K. Adler and M. Pointon (eds), *The Body Imaged: the Human Form and Visual Culture since the Renaissance* (Cambridge, 1993), 57-69.

Hatt, M. 'Uranian Imperialism: Boys and Empire in Edwardian England' in T. Barringer, G. Quilley and D. Fordham (eds) *Art and the British Empire* (Manchester and New York, 2007), 153-68.

Haycock, D.B. 'A Crisis of Brilliance' in *Nash, Nevinson, Spencer, Gertler, Carrington, Bomberg: A Crisis of Brilliance 1908-1922* exh.cat. Dulwich Picture Gallery (London, 2013), 12-33.

Headlam, C. (ed.). *The Milner Papers (South Africa) 1897-1899* (London, Toronto, Melbourne and Sydney, 1931).

Heilmann, A. and Llewellyn, M. *Neo-Victorianism: the Victorians in the Twenty-First Century, 1999-2009* (Basingstoke, 2010).

Helly, D.O. and Callaway, H. 'Constructing South Africa in the British Press, 1890-92: The *Pall Mall Gazette*, the *Daily Graphic*, and *The Times*' in J. Codell (ed.). *Imperial Co-Histories: National Identities and the British and Colonial Press* (Cranbury, London and Ontario, 2003), 125-44.

Helmreich, A. 'Dynamic Networks of Circulation and Exchange in

Edwardian Art' in *Visual Culture in Britain*, vol. 14, issue 1 (2013), 36-54.

Hennessy, P. *The Junior Officers' Reading Club: Killing Time and Fighting Wars* 2nd ed. (2009, London, 2010).

Hewison, H.H. *Hedge of Wild Almonds: South Africa, the 'Pro-Boers' and the Quaker Conscience* (London and New Hampshire, 1989).

Hewison, R. (ed.). *Ruskin's Artists: Studies in the Victorian Visual Economy* (Aldershot, 2000).

Hibbert, C. *The Destruction of Lord Raglan: A Tragedy of the Crimean War 1854-55* (London, 1961).

Hichberger, J.W.M. 'Democratising Glory? The Victoria Cross Paintings of Louis Desanges' in *Oxford Art Journal* vol. 7, no. 2 (1984), 42-51.

Hichberger, J.W.M. *Images of the Army: The Military in British Art, 1815-1914* (Manchester, 1988).

Higonnet, M. 'War, Women and Death' in S.W.Goodwin and E.Bronfen (eds) *Death and Representation* (Baltimore, 1993), 192-209.

Hirsch, P. *Barbara Leigh Smith Bodichon: Feminist, Artist and Rebel: a Biography* 2nd ed. (1998, London, 1999).

Hobhouse, E. *The Brunt of the War and Where it Fell* (London, 1902).

- Hobsbawm, E.J. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* 2nd ed. (1990, Cambridge, 1992).
- Hobsbawm, E. *The Age of Empire 1875-1914* [1st ed. 1987] (London 1996).
- Hobson, J.A. *The Psychology of Jingoism* (London, 1901).
- Hodgson, P. *Early War Photographs* (Reading, 1974).
- Hodgson, P. *The War Illustrators* (London, 1977).
- Holly, M.A. *Past Looking: Historical Imagination and the Rhetoric of the Image* (New York and London, 1996).
- Holly, M.A. 'The Author Replies' in *Art Bulletin* vol. 89, no. 1, (2007), 40-44.
- Holmes, R. *Redcoat: The British Soldier in the Age of Horse and Musket* (London, 2001).
- Holt, Y. *British Artists and the Modernist Landscape* (Aldershot, 2003).
- Hoock, H. *Empires of the Imagination, Politics, War and the Arts in the British World* (London, 2010).
- Hoock, H. (ed.). *History, Commemoration, and National Preoccupation: Trafalgar 1805-2005* (Oxford, 2007).
- Hopkirk, P. *The Great Game: On Secret Service in High Asia* 2nd ed. (1990, London, 2006).

- Hoppen, K.T. *The Mid-Victorian Generation: 1846-1886* (Oxford, 1998).
- Horner, L. *Brangwyn at War!* (Cambridge and Uppingham, 2014).
- Howard, M. *War and the Liberal Conscience* (London, 1978).
- Hunt, H. *Pre-Raphaelitism and the Pre-Raphael Brotherhood*, 2 vols. (London, 1905).
- Hussey, M. (ed.). *Virginia Woolf and War: Fiction, Reality and Myth* 2nd ed. (1991, Syracuse, 1992).
- Hutchinson, S.C. *The History of the Royal Academy 1768-1968* (London, 1968).
- Hyde, R. *Panoromania*. exh. cat. Barbican Art Gallery (London, 1988).
- Hynes, S. *The Edwardian Turn of Mind* (New Jersey and London, 1968).
- Jagger, N. 'The Complexity of Nature in Pre-Raphaelite Ideals' in P. Hardwick and M. Hewitt (eds) *The Pre-Raphaelite Ideal*, (Leeds, 2004), 31-42.
- James, L. 'Tom Brown's Imperialist Sons' in *Victorian Studies* vol. xviii, (1973), 89-99.
- Johnson, P. *Front Line Artists* (London, 1978).
- Jones, B. 'Denying the "Foe-to-Graphic": C.R.W.Nevinson and Photography' in M. K. Walsh (ed.). *A Dilemma of English Modernism: Visual and Verbal Politics in the Life and Work*

of C.R.W.Nevinson (1889-1946) (Cranbury, New Jersey, 2007), 134-81.

Joseph, N. *Uniforms and Nonuniforms: Communication through Clothing* (Westport, Ct., New York and London, 1986).

Keegan, J. *The Face of Battle: a Study of Agincourt, Waterloo and the Somme* [1st ed. 1976] (London, 2004).

Keller, U. *The Ultimate Spectacle: A Visual History of the Crimean War* (Amsterdam, 2001).

Kelly, C. (ed.). *Mrs Duberley's War: Journal and Letters from the Crimea, 1854-6*, (Oxford, 2007).

Kestner, J. *Masculinities in Victorian Painting* (Aldershot and Vermont, 1995).

Kilmurray, E. and Ormond, R. (eds) *John Singer Sargent* exh.cat. Tate Gallery (London, 1998).

Kim, J.J. *Painted Men in Britain, 1868-1918: Royal Academicians and Masculinities* (Farnham and Burlington, VT, 2012).

King, R. *The Judgement of Paris: The Revolutionary Decade That Gave the World Impressionism* 2nd ed. (2006, London, 2007).

Kinglake, A.W. *The Invasion of the Crimea: its Origins and an Account of its Progress Down to the Death of Lord Raglan*, 8 vols. (Edinburgh, 1863-87).

Kipling, R. *Barrack Room Ballads and Other Verses* (London, 1892).

- Kipling, R. *The Light that Failed* (London, 1909).
- Kirby, M. *Futurist Performance* 2nd ed. (1971, New York, 1986).
- Knightley, P. *The First Casualty: The War Correspondent as Hero and Myth-maker from the Crimea to Iraq* (Baltimore, 2004).
- Konody, P.G. (ed.). *Modern War Paintings by C.R.W.Nevinson* (London, 1917).
- Konody, P.G. 'On War memorials' in *Art and War:-Canadian War Memorials-Colour Magazine (Special Edition)* (London, 1919), 5-16.
- Koss, S. *The Pro-Boers: The Anatomy of an Antiwar Movement* (Chicago, 1973).
- Koureas, G. *Memory, Masculinity and National Identity in British Visual Culture, 1914-1930* (Aldershot, 2007).
- Krebs, P.M. 'The Last of the Gentlemen's Wars': Women in the Boer War Concentration Camp Controversy' in *History Workshop Journal*, no. 33, (Spring, 1992), 38-56.
- Krebs, P.M. *Gender, Race and the Writing of Empire* (Cambridge, 1999).
- Lacy, G. 'Some Boer Characteristics' in *North American Review* vol. 170, no 518, (January, 1900), 43-53.
- Laffin, J. *Tommy Atkins: The Story of the English Soldier* 2nd ed. (1966, Stroud, 2003).
- Laity, P. *The British Peace Movement 1870-1914* (Oxford, 2001).

- Laity, P. 'The British Peace Movement and the War' in D. Omissi and A. Thompson (eds) *The Impact of the South African War* (Basingstoke, 2002), 138-56.
- Lalumia, M.P. 'Realism and Anti-Aristocratic Sentiment in Victorian Depictions of the Crimean War' (PhD. thesis, University of Yale, 1981).
- Lalumia, M.P. 'Lady Elizabeth Butler in the 1870s' in *Woman's Art Journal* vol. 4 no 1, (1983), 9-14.
- Lalumia, M.P. 'Realism and Anti-Aristocratic Sentiment in Victorian Depictions of the Crimean War' in *Victorian Studies* vol. xxvii, no 1, (Autumn 1983), 25-51.
- Lalumia, M.P. *Realism and Politics in Victorian Art of the Crimean War* (Michigan, 1984).
- Lambert, A and Badsey, S. *War Correspondents-The Crimean War* (London, 1994).
- Lambert, A. 'The Nineteenth-Century Legacy' in D. Cannadine (ed.). *Trafalgar in History: A Battle and its Afterlife* (Basingstoke, 2006), 155-74.
- Lambourne, L. *Victorian Painting* (London, 1999).
- Langer, W.L. *The Diplomacy of Imperialism, 1890-1902* 2nd ed. (1935, New York, 1960).
- Laver, J. *Dandies* (London, 1968).

Lavery, B. *Empire of the Seas: the Remarkable Story of how the Navy Forged the Modern World* 2nd ed. (2009, London, 2012).

Lee, E. *To the Bitter End: A Photographic History of the Boer War 1899-1902* (Harmondsworth, 1985).

Leslie, G.D. *The Inner Life of the Royal Academy* (London, 1914).

Leslie, S. *Salutation to Five* (London, 1951).

Lewinski, J. *The Camera at War: War Photography from 1848 to the Present Day* (London, 1978).

Lewis-Stempel, J. *The Autobiography of the British Soldier from Agincourt to Basra in his own Words* (Chatham, 2007).

Light, A. 'Don't Dilly-Dally on the Way! Politics and Pleasure' in J. Beckett and D. Cherry (eds) *The Edwardian Era* exh. cat. Barbican Art Gallery (London, 1987), 158-62.

Lloyd, C. *The Queen's Pictures-Royal Collectors through the Centuries* (London, 1991).

Lomax, E. *The Railway Man* 2nd ed. (1995, London, 2014)

Longford, E. *A Pilgrimage of Passion: the Life of Wilfrid Scawen Blunt* (London, 1979).

Lowry, D. (ed.). *The South African War Reappraised* (Manchester, 2000).

Lowry, D. 'The World's no Bigger than a Kraal': the South African War and International Opinion in the First Age of

- 'Globalization'' in D. Omissi and A. Thompson (eds) *The Impact of the South African War* (Basingstoke, 2002), 268-88.
- Lusk, L. 'The Royal Academy Exhibition of 1904' in *Art Journal* (June 1904), 177-90.
- Lynch, G. *The Impressions of a War Correspondent* (London, 1903).
- McAleer, J. 'The Eye of the Artist': Thomas Baines, the Eighth Cape Frontier War, and the Representation of Warfare' in *Journal of War and Culture Studies* vol. 7, issue 4, (2014), 303-19.
- McCourt, E. *Remember Butler: the Story of Sir William Butler* (London 1967).
- McDermott, J. 'The Revolution in British Military Thinking from the Boer War to the Moroccan Crisis' in P. Kennedy (ed.). *The War Plans of the Great Powers 1880-1914* (London, 1979), 99-117.
- McClintock, A. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York and London, 1995).
- McConkey, K. *Edwardian Portraits: Images of an Age of Opulence* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1987).
- McConkey, K. *The New English: a History of the New English Art Club* (London, 2006).

McVeigh, S. 'There's Place and Means for Every Man Alive' in *All's Well That Ends Well* RSC Programme (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 2013), [u/p 3-6].

Maas, J. *Victorian Painters* 2nd ed. (1979, London, 1988).

Mackenzie, J.M. *Propaganda and Empire: the Manipulation of British Public Opinion, 1880-1960* [1st ed. 1984] (Manchester, 1988).

Mackenzie, J.M. *Orientalism: History, Theory and the Arts* (Manchester, 1995).

Mackenzie, J.M. 'Empire and Metropolitan Cultures' in A. Porter (ed.). *The Oxford History of the British Empire: The Nineteenth Century* vol. 3, (Oxford, 1999), 270-93.

Mackenzie, J.M. (ed.). *The Victorian Vision: Inventing New Britain* (London, 2001).

Mackenzie, J.M. 'Empire and the Global Gaze' in J.M.Mackenzie (ed.). *The Victorian Vision: Inventing New Britain* (London, 2001), 241-47.

Mackenzie, J.M. '“Comfort” and Conviction: A Response to Bernard Porter' in *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, vol. 36: 4, (2008), 659-68.

Mackenzie, J.M. (ed.). *European Empires and the People: Popular Responses to Imperialism in France, Britain, the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany and Italy* (Manchester, 2011).

- Mackenzie, J.M. 'Passion or Indifference? Popular Imperialism in Britain: Continuities and Discontinuities over Two Centuries' in J.M. Mackenzie (ed.). *European Empires and the People: Popular Responses to Imperialism in France, Britain, the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany and Italy* (Manchester, 2011), 57-89.
- MacMillan, M. *The War That Ended Peace: How Europe Abandoned Peace for the First World War* 2nd ed. (2013, London, 2014).
- Mallinson, A. *The Making of the British Army: From the English Civil War to the War on Terror* 2nd ed. (2009, London, 2011).
- Malvern, S. 'War As It Is' in *Art History*, vol. 9, no.4, (1986), 487-515.
- Malvern, S. *Modern Art, Britain and the Great War* (New Haven and London, 2004).
- Mangan, J.A. 'The Grit of our Forefathers: Invented Traditions, Propaganda and Imperialism' in J.M.Mackenzie (ed.). *Imperialism and Popular Culture* (Manchester, 1986), 113-39.
- Mangan, J.A. and Walvin, J. (eds.). *Manliness and Morality: Middle-class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940* (Manchester, 1987).
- Mantena, K. 'The Crisis of Liberal Imperialism' in D. Bell (ed.). *Victorian Visions of Global Order* (Cambridge, 2007), 113-35.

- Markovits, S. *The Crimean War in the British Imagination* (Cambridge, 2009).
- Marks, H.S. *Pen and Pencil Sketches*, vol. 1, (London, 1894).
- Marsh, J. and Nunn, P.G. *Women Artists and the Pre-Raphaelite Movement* (London, 1989).
- Marsh, J. 'Art, Ambition and Sisterhood in the 1850s' in C. Campbell Orr (ed.). *Women in the Victorian Art World* 2nd ed. (1995, Manchester, 1996), 33-48.
- Marsh, J. 'Votes for Women and Chastity for Men: Gender, Health, Medicine and Sexuality' in J.M.Mackenzie (ed.). *The Victorian Vision: Inventing New Britain* (London, 2001), 97-123.
- Martin, M.W. *Futurist Art and Theory 1909-1915* 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1968, New York, 1978).
- Martin, M. *Images at War: Illustrated Periodicals and Constructed Nations* (Toronto, Buffalo, London, 2005).
- Mawson, M.H. (ed.). *Eyewitness in the Crimea: The Crimean War Letters (1854-56) of Lt Col George Frederick Dallas* (London, 2001).
- Mayer, D. 'The World on Fire. . .Pyrodramas at Belle Vue Gardens, Manchester, c.1850-1950' in J.M.Mackenzie (ed.). *Popular Imperialism and the Military: 1850-1950* (New York and Manchester, 1992), 179-97.

- Mayhew, A. 'Battle Painters of the Nineteenth Century: Richard Caton Woodville' in *Illustrated Naval and Military Magazine*, vol. 1, (July–December 1884), 50-54.
- Mellar, P.R. 'The British Blockhouse System in the Anglo-Boer War' (MA thesis, University of York, 2011).
- Melville, S. and Readings, B. (eds) *Vision and Textuality* (Basingstoke, 1995).
- Mercer, P. *Give them a Volley and Charge! The Battle of Inkermann, 1854* 2nd ed. (1998, Stroud, 2008).
- Merleau-Ponty (trans.) *The World of Perception* [1sted. 1948] (Abingdon, 2010).
- Meynell, A. *The Colour of Life and Other Essays on Things Seen and Heard* (London, 1896).
- Meynell, A. *The Poems of Alice Meynell* (London, 1923).
- Meynell, V. *Francis Thompson and Wilfrid Meynell, a Memoir* (London, 1952).
- Meynell, V. *Alice Meynell; a Memoir* (London, 1929).
- Meynell, W. 'The Life and Work of Lady Butler' in *Art Annual* vol. 15, (1898), 1-32.
- Millais, J.G. (ed.). *The Life and Letters of Sir John Everett Millais: President of the Royal Academy*, vol. II, (London, 1899).

- Millar, D. 'Royal Patronage and Influence' in J.M.Mackenzie (ed.). *The Victorian Vision: Inventing New Britain* (London, 2001), 27-49.
- Millar, O. *The Queen's Pictures* (London, 1977).
- Miller, F. 'Studies by John Charlton. Painter of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee Picture, Royal Academy 1899' in *Artist: an Illustrated Monthly Record of Art, Crafts and Industries* vol. 25 (1899), 58-71.
- Millett, K. 'The Debate over Women: Ruskin vs. Mill' in M. Vicinus (ed.). *Suffer and be Still: Women in the Victorian Age* (Bloomington and London, 1972), 121-39.
- Mitchell, C. 'Benjamin West's "Death of General Wolfe" and the Popular History Piece' in *Journal of the Courtauld and Warburg Institute*, vol. 7, (1944), 20-33.
- Mitchell, K. *History and Cultural Memory in Neo-Victorian Fiction: Victorian Afterimages* (Basingstoke, 2010).
- Mitchell, W.J.T. *Picture Theory* (Chicago, 1994).
- Mitchell, W.J.T. *What do Pictures Want? The Lives and Loves of Images* (London and Chicago, 2005).
- Monks, S. 'Turner Goes Dutch' in D. Solkin (ed.). *Turner and the Masters* exh.cat. Tate Britain (London, 2009), 73-85.
- Moorhouse, P. (ed.). *The Great War in Portraits* exh.cat. National Portrait Gallery, (London, 2014).

- Moriarty, C. “Remnants of Patriotism”: The Commemorative Representation of the Greatcoat after the First World War’ in *Oxford Art Journal* vol. 27 (3), (2004), 291-309.
- Moriarty, C. ‘Dust to Dust: a Particular History of Khaki’ in *Textile: The Journal of Cloth and Culture* vol. 8, Issue 3, (2010) 304-20.
- Morris, D.R. *The Washing of the Spears* (London, 1966).
- Morris, E. *Victorian and Edwardian Paintings in the Walker Art Gallery and at Sudley House: British Artists Born after 1810 but before 1861* (London, 1996).
- Morris, E. *French Art in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (New Haven and London, 2005).
- Morris, E. *Believing is Seeing: (Observations on the Mysteries of Photography)* (London and New York, 2011).
- Moscoso, J. (trans.) *Pain: A Cultural History* (London, 2012).
- Munro, H.H. (Saki) *When William Came* [1st ed.1913] (Oxford, 1997).
- Myrone, M. ‘John Martin: Art, Taste and the Spectacle of Culture’ in M. Myrone (ed.). *John Martin: Apocalypse* exh.cat. Tate Britain, (London 2011-12), 11-21.
- Nalbach, A. “The Software of Empire”: Telegraphic News Agencies and Imperial Publicity, 1865-1914’ in J. Codell (ed.). *Imperial Co-Histories: National Identities and the British and Colonial Press* (Cranbury, London and Ontario, 2003), 68-94.

- Nash, D. 'Taming the God of Battles: Secular and Moral Critiques of the South African War' in G. Cuthbertson, A. Grundlingh and M-L. Suttie (eds) *Writing a Wider War: Rethinking Gender, Race, and Identity in the South African War, 1899-1902* (Athens, Ohio, 2002), 266-86.
- Nasson, B. 'The South African War/Anglo-Boer War 1899-1902 and Political Memory in South Africa' in T.G.Ashplant, G. Dawson and M. Roper (eds) *The Politics of War Memory and Commemoration* (London, 2000), 111-27.
- Nasson, B. 'Waging Total War in South Africa: Some Centenary Writings on the Anglo-Boer War, 1899-1902' in *Journal of Military History*, vol. 66, no.3, (July 2002), 813-28.
- Nasson, W. 'Tommy Atkins in South Africa' in P. Warwick (ed.). *The South African War: the Anglo-Boer War 1899-1902* (Harlow, 1980), 292-314.
- Nead, L. *Victorian Babylon: People, Streets and Images in Nineteenth-Century London* 2nd ed. (2000, New Haven and London, 2003).
- Nead, L. *The Haunted Gallery: Painting, Photography, Film c.1900* (New Haven and London, 2007).
- Nead, L. 'The Age of the "Hurrygraph": Motion, Space, and the Visual Image, ca. 1900' in M.O'Neill and M.Hatt (eds) *The Edwardian Sense: Art, Design and Performance in Britain, 1901-1910* (New Haven and London, 2010), 99-113.

Nead, L. 'Striking(?) the Punch: Boxing, Violence and the Photographic Image' in *Journal of Visual Culture*, vol. 10, no 3, (December 2011), 305-23.

Nevinson, C.R.W. *Paint and Prejudice* (London, 1937).

Newsome, D. *Godliness and Good Learning: Four Studies on a Victorian Ideal* (London 1961).

Nicholson, C. 'Edwardian England and the Coming of the First World War' in A. O'Day (ed.). *The Edwardian Age: Conflict and Stability 1900-1914* (London, Basingstoke and Hamden, Connecticut, 1979), 144-68.

Nochlin, L. (ed.). *Realism and Tradition in Art 1848-1900 (Sources and Documents in the History of Art)* (Englewood Cliffs, 1966).

Nochlin, L. 'Gustave Courbet's Meeting: A Portrait of the Artist as a Wandering Jew' in *Art Bulletin* vol. 49, no.3 (September 1967), 209-22.

Nochlin, L. *Realism* [1st ed.1971] (Harmondsworth, 1990).

Nochlin, L. *Women, Art and Power and Other Essays* 2nd ed. (1989, London, 1994).

Nochlin, L. *The Body in Pieces: the Fragment as a Metaphor of Modernity* (London, 1994).

Nochlin, L. *Bathers, Bodies, Beauty: the Visceral Eye* (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 2006).

- Nowell-Smith, S. *Edwardian England 1910-1914* (London, New York and Toronto, 1964).
- Nunn, P.G. (ed.). *Canvassing: Recollections by Six Victorian Women Artists* (London, 1986).
- Nunn, P.G. *Victorian Women Artists* (London, 1987).
- Nunn, P.G. *Problem Pictures: Men and Women in Victorian Paintings* (Aldershot, 1995).
- Nunn, P.G. 'Critically Speaking' in C. Campbell Orr (ed.). *Women in the Victorian Art World* 2nd ed. (1995, Manchester, 1996), 107-24.
- Nunn, P.G. 'The "Woman Question": Ruskin and the Female Artist' in R.Hewison (ed.). *Ruskin's Artists. Studies in the Victorian Visual Economy* (Aldershot, 2000), 167-83.
- Nutt, D. (ed.). *The Works of W.E.Henley*, vol. 11, (London, 1908).
- O'Day, A. (ed.). *The Edwardian Age: Conflict and Stability 1900-1914* (London, Basingstoke and Hamden, Connecticut, 1979).
- Oettermann, S. *The Panorama: History of a Mass Medium* (New York, 1977).
- Ogborn, M. *Spaces of Modernity: London's Geographies 1680-1780* (New York, 1988).
- Oldcastle, J. 'Our Living Artists. Elizabeth Butler (Née Thompson)' in *Magazine of Art* (January 1879), 257-62.

- Oleksijczuk, D.B. *The First Panoramas: Visions of British Imperialism* (Minneapolis, 2011).
- Omissi, D. and Thompson, A. (eds) *The Impact of the South African War* (Basingstoke, 2002).
- O'Neill, M. and Hatt, M. (eds) *The Edwardian Sense, Art, Design and Performance in Britain, 1901-1910* (New Haven and London, 2010).
- Orpen, W. *The Outline of Art* (London, 1930?).
- Orr, C.C. (ed.). *Women in the Victorian Art World* (Manchester, 1995).
- Pakenham, T. *The Boer War* [1st ed. 1979] (London, 1992).
- Paris, M. *Warrior Nation: Images of War in British Popular Culture, 1850-2000* (London, 2000).
- Pearce, E. (ed.). *The Diaries of Charles Greville* (London, 2005).
- Peck, J. *War, the Army and Victorian Literature* (Basingstoke, 1998).
- Peckham, M. *Victorian Revolutionaries, Speculations on Some Heroes of a Culture Crisis* (New York, 1970).
- Pennington, W.H. *Sea, Camp and Stage* (London and Bristol, 1906)
- Perez-Réverte, A. (trans.) *The Painter of Battles* (London, 2006).
- Perry, G. 'Women Artists, 'Masculine' Art and the Royal Academy of Art' in G. Perry (ed.). *Gender and Art* (New Haven and London, 1999), 90-107.

Perry, L. 'Looking Like a Woman: Gender and Modernity in the Nineteenth-Century National Portrait Gallery' in D. Peters Corbett and L. Perry (eds) *English Art 1860-1914: Modern Artists and Identity*, 2nd ed. (2000, Manchester and New Jersey, 2001), 116-32.

Peters Corbett, D. *The Modernity of English Art* (Manchester, 1997).

Peters Corbett, D. *The World in Paint: Modern Art and Visuality in England, 1848-1914* (Manchester, 2004).

Peters Corbett, D. 'Laurence Binyon and the Aesthetic of Modern Art' in *Visual Culture in Britain* vol. 6. issue 1 (2005), 101-19.

Peters Corbett, D. and Perry, L. (eds) *English Art 1860-1914: Modern Artists and Identity* 2nd ed. (2000, Manchester and New Jersey, 2001).

Pinker, S. *The Better Angels of our Nature: The Decline of Violence in History and its Causes* (London, 2011).

Pinkney, T. (ed.). *The Politics of Modernism* (London and New York, 1989).

Pizer, D. (ed.). *The Red Badge of Courage* (S.Crane) [1st ed. 1895] (New York, 1994).

Plax, J.A. 'Seventeenth-Century French Images of Warfare' in P. Cuneo (ed.). *Artful Armies, Beautiful Battles: Art and Warfare in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden, Boston and Cologne, 2002), 131-55.

- Pointon, M. 'Materializing Mourning: Hair, Jewellery and the Body' in *Material Memories: Design and Evocation* (Oxford and New York, 1999), 39-57.
- Pointon, M. 'A Woman Weeps: Hogarth's *Sigismunda* (1759) and the Aesthetics of Excess' in P. Gouk and H. Hills (eds) *Representing Emotions: New Connections on the Histories of Art, Music and Medicine* (Aldershot and Burlington, Vt., 2005), 155-72.
- Pollock, G. *Vision and Difference: Feminism, Femininity and the Histories of Art* 2nd ed. (1988, London, 2003).
- Pollock, G. 'Art, Art School and Culture' in *The Block Reader in Visual Culture* (London and New York, 1996), 50-67.
- Pollock, G. 'Beholding Art History: Vision, Place and Power' in S. Melville and B. Readings (eds) *Vision and Textuality* (Basingstoke and London, 1995), 38-66.
- Pollock, G. *Differencing the Canon:-Feminist Desire and the Writing of Art's Histories* (London and New York, 1999).
- Porter, A. 'British Imperial Policy and South Africa 1895-9' in P. Warwick (ed.). *The South African War: the Anglo-Boer War 1899-1902* (Harlow, 1980), 37-56.
- Porter, A. (ed.). *The Oxford History of the British Empire: The Nineteenth Century* vol. 3, (Oxford, 1999).
- Porter, A. 'The South African War and Imperial Britain: a Question of Significance?' in G. Cuthbertson, A. Grundlingh and M-L. Suttie (eds) *Writing a Wider War: Rethinking Gender, Race,*

and Identity in the South African War, 1899-1902 (Athens, Ohio, 2002), 287-302.

Porter, B. 'The Pro-Boers in Britain' in P. Warwick (ed.). *The South African War: the Anglo-Boer War 1899-1902* (Harlow, 1980), 239-57.

Porter, B. *The Absent-Minded Imperialists: Empire, Material Culture and the Museum* (Oxford and New York, 2004).

Porter, B. 'Further Thoughts on Imperial Absent-Mindedness' in *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* vol. 36: 1, (2008), 101-17.

Powell, D. *The Edwardian Crisis: Britain, 1901-1914* (London and New York, 1996).

Powers, A. *Eric Ravilious: Artist and Designer* (Farnham, 2013).

Prettejohn, E. 'Out of the Nineteenth Century: Roger Fry's Early Art Criticism, 1900-1906' in C. Green (ed.). *Art Made Modern: Roger Fry's Vision of Art* exh.cat. Courtauld Gallery, (London, 1999), 31-44.

Prettejohn, E. 'The Modernism of Frederick Leighton' in D. Peters Corbett and L. Perry (eds) *English Art 1860-1914: Modern Artists and Identity*, 2nd ed. (2000, Manchester and New Jersey, 2001), 31-44.

Prettejohn, E. *The Modernity of Ancient Sculpture: Greek Sculpture and Modern Art from Winckelmann to Picasso* (London and New York, 2012).

Preziosi, D. 'The Question of Art History' in *Critical Inquiry* vol. 18 no 2, (1992), 363-86.

Preziosi, D. *The Art of Art History; A Critical Anthology* [1st ed. 1998] (Oxford, 2009).

Price, R.N. *An Imperial War and the British Working Class: Working-Class Attitudes and Reactions to the Boer War 1899-1902* (London, 1972).

Price, R.N. 'Society, Status and Jingoism: the Social Roots of Lower Middle Class Patriotism, 1870-1900' in G Crossick (ed.). *The Lower Middle Class in Britain, 1870-1914* (London, 1977), 89-112.

Priestley, J.B. *The Edwardians* (London, 1970).

Prior, M. *Campaigns of a War Correspondent* (London, 1912).

Pultz, J. *Photography and the Body* (London, 1995).

Punter, D. *Modernity* (Basingstoke and New York, 2007).

Quilley, G. '“All Ocean is her Own”: the Image of the Sea and the Identity of the Maritime Nation in Eighteenth-Century British Art' in G. Cubitt (ed.). *Imagining Nations* (Manchester, 1998), 132-52.

Quilley, G. (ed.). *Art for the Nation: The Oil Paintings Collections of the National Maritime Museum* (London, 2006).

Quilley, G. 'The Battle of the Pictures: Painting the History of Trafalgar' in D. Cannadine (ed.). *Trafalgar in History: A Battle and its Afterlife* (Basingstoke, 2006), 121-38.

- Quilley, G. *Empire to Nation: Art, History and the Visualization of Maritime Britain 1768-1829* (New Haven, 2011).
- Ralph, J. *War's Brighter Side: the Story of the Friend Newspaper* (London, 1900).
- Rancière, J. (trans.) *The Future of the Image* (Paris, 2003).
- Rappaport, E. D. 'Travelling in the Lady Guides' London: Consumption, Modernity and the *Fin-de-Siècle* Metropolis' in (eds) M. Daunt and B Rieger *Meanings of Modernity: Britain from the Late-Victorian Era to World War II* (Oxford and New York, 2001), 25-43.
- Rappaport, H. *No Place for Ladies: the Untold Story of Women in the Crimean War* (London, 2007).
- Ray, R. 'Baron of Bengal: Robert Clive and the Birth of an Imperial Image' in J. Codell (ed.). *Transculturation in British Art, 1770-1930* (Farnham and Burlington, 2012), 21-38.
- Read, H. *Contemporary British Art* [1st ed. 1951] (Harmondsworth, 1964).
- Rendall, J. (ed.). *Equal or Different: Women's Politics 1800-1914* (Oxford, 1987).
- Richards, J. 'Boy's Own Empire: Feature Films and Imperialism in the 1930s' in J.M. Mackenzie (ed.). *Imperialism and Popular Culture* (Manchester, 1986), 140-64.

- Richards, T. *The Commodity Culture of Victorian England: Advertising and Spectacle, 1851-1914* 2nd ed. (1990, London and New York, 1991).
- Roberts, H. 'War Photographers: a Special Breed?' in A.W. Tucker, W. Michels and N. Zelt (eds) *War/Photography: Images of Armed Conflict and its Aftermath* exh. cat. Museum of Fine Arts, (Houston, 2012), 8-15.
- Roberts, H.E. 'Exhibition and Review: the Periodical Press and the Victorian Art Exhibition System' in J. Shattock and M. Wolff (eds) *The Victorian Periodical Press: Samplings and Soundings* (Leicester and Toronto, 1982), 79-107.
- Roberts, M.L. *Disruptive Acts: the New Woman in Fin-de-Siècle France* (Chicago and London, 2002).
- Robinson, C. *Conflicts of Conduct: British Masculinity and Military Painting in the Wake of the Siege of Gibraltar* (unpublished paper, 2014).
- Robinson, R., Gallagher, J. and Denny, A. *Africa and the Victorians* (London, 1961).
- Rodaway, P. *Sensuous Geographies: Body, Sense and Place* (London, 1994).
- Rogers, N. 'Brave Wolfe: the Making of a Hero' in K. Wilson (ed.). *A New Imperial History: Culture, Identity and Modernity in Britain and the Empire, 1660-1840* (Cambridge, 2004), 239-59.
- Roper, M. and Tosh, J. (eds) *Manful Assertions; Masculinities in Britain since 1800* (London, 1991).

- Roper, M. 'Maternal Relations: Moral Manliness and Emotional Survival in Letters Home during the First World War' in S. Dudink, K. Hagermann and J. Tosh (eds) *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern History* (Manchester, 2004), 295-315.
- Rosen, D. 'The Volcano and the Cathedral: Muscular Christianity and the Origins of Primal Manliness' in D. Hall (ed.). *Muscular Christianity: Embodying the Victorian Age* (Cambridge, 1994), 17-44.
- Rosenberg, I. *Poems by Isaac Rosenberg* (London, 1922).
- Rous, A. 'The Politics and Propaganda of Commemoration in Crimean War Monuments, 1850-1916' (MA dissertation, York 2012).
- Roy, R. 'Baron of Bengal, Robert Clive and the Birth of an Imperial Image' in J. Codell, (ed.). *Transculturation in British Art, 1770-1930* (Farnham and Burlington, 2012), 21-38.
- Royle, T. *War Report; the War Correspondents View of Battle from the Crimea to the Falklands* (Worcester, 1987).
- Royle, T. *Crimea. The Great Crimean War 1854-1856* 2nd ed. (1999, London, 2000).
- Rubinstein, D. *Faithful to Ourselves and the Outside World: York Quakers in the Twentieth Century* (York, 2000).
- Ruetter, A.U. (trans). *Peace Women: 1905-2003* ([S.I.], Ruffer+Rub, 2004).

- Ruskin, J. *The Crown of Wild Olive* 3rd ed. (1866, London, 1889).
- Ruskin, J. 'Conclusion to Inaugural Lecture (1870)' in E.Boehmer (ed.). *Empire Writing: an Anthology of Colonial Literature 1870-1918* (Oxford and New York, 1998), 16-20.
- Russell, J. 'Art' in S. Nowell-Smith (ed.). *Edwardian England 1901-1914* (London, New York and Toronto, 1964), 327-50.
- Russell, W.H. *The Great War with Russia* (London, 1895).
- Rutherford, A. (ed.). *Rudyard Kipling War Stories and Poems* (Oxford and New York, 1990).
- Ryan, J. 'Images and Impressions: Printing, Reproduction and Photography' in J.M.Mackenzie (ed.). *The Victorian Vision: Inventing New Britain* (London, 2001), 215-39.
- Ryan, D.S. 'Spectacle, the Public, and the Crowd: Exhibitions and Pageants in 1908' in M.O'Neill and M.Hatt (eds) *The Edwardian Sense: Art, Design and Performance in Britain, 1901-1910* (New Haven and London, 2010), 43-71.
- Sackville-West, V. *The Edwardians* [1st ed. 1930] (London, 1983).
- Said, E.W. *Orientalism* (London, 1978).
- Said, E.W. *Culture and Imperialism* (London, 1994).
- Sandler, I. and Newman, A. (eds) *Defining Modern Art: Selected Writings of Alfred H. Barr, Jr* (New York, 1986).
- Saunders, C., Maude, U. and Macnaughton, J. (eds) *The Body and the Arts* (Basingstoke, 2009).

Scarry, E. *The Body in Pain: the Making and Unmaking of the World* (New York, 1985).

Schleifer, R. 'Afterword: Walter Benjamin and the Crisis of Representation: Multiplicity, Meaning and Aesthetic Death' in S.W.Goodwin and E.Bronfen (eds) *Death and Representation* (Baltimore, 1993), 312-33.

Schneer, J. 'Anti-Imperial London: the Pan-African Conference of 1900' in F. Driver and D. Gilbert (eds) *Imperial Cities: Landscape, Display and Identity* (Manchester, 1999), 254-67.

Schneer, J. *London 1900: the Imperial Metropolis* (New Haven and London, 1999).

Schwarz, V.R. and Przyblyski, J.M. (eds) *The Nineteenth-Century Visual Culture Reader* (New York and Abingdon, Oxford, 2004).

Searle, G. 'National Efficiency' and the 'Lessons' of the War' in D.Omissi and A. Thompson (eds) *The Impact of the South African War* (Basingstoke, 2002), 194-211.

Searle, G. *A New England? Peace and War 1886-1918* (Oxford, 2004).

Seeley, J.R. *Expansion of England* (London, 1883).

Shannon, B. *The Cut of his Coat: Men, Dress and Consumer Culture in Britain, 1860-1914* (Athens, Ohio, 2006).

Shattock, J. and Wolff, M. (eds) *The Victorian Periodical Press: Samplings and Soundings* (Leicester and Toronto, 1982).

- Shaw, P. *Suffering and Sentiment in Romantic Military Art* (Farnham and Burlington, Vt., 2013).
- Sillars, S. *Art and Survival in First World War Britain* (Basingstoke and London, 1987).
- Slaley, A. and Newall, C. (eds) *Pre-Raphaelite Vision: Truth to Nature* exh.cat. Tate Britain, (London, 2004).
- Sloane, J.C. *French Painting Between the Past and the Present: Artists, Critics and Traditions, from 1848 to 1870* (Princeton, 1951).
- Smith, A. *Watercolour* exh.cat. Tate Britain, (London, 2011).
- Smith, I.R. 'A Century of Controversy over Origins' in D. Lowry (ed.). *The South African War Reappraised* (Manchester, 2000), 23-49.
- Smith, L. *Voices against War: A Century of Protest* 2nd ed. (2009, Edinburgh and London, 2010).
- Solkin, D. *Painting for Money: The Visual Arts and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven and London, 1993).
- Solkin, D. 'Competing with Contemporaries' in D. Solkin (ed.). *Turner and the Masters* exh.cat. Tate Britain (London, 2009), 185-205.
- Some Records of the World War* (exh.cat. Leicester Galleries, London, 1919).

- Sontag, S. *On Photography* [1st ed. 1973] (New York, 1989).
- Sontag, S. *Regarding the Pain of Others* (Harmondsworth, 2003).
- Spalding, F. *British Art since 1900* (London, 1986).
- Spalding, F. 'A Crisis of Belonging' in *Nash, Nevinson, Spencer, Gertler, Carrington, Bomberg: A Crisis of Brilliance 1908-1922* exh.cat. Dulwich Picture Gallery, (London, 2013), 34-41.
- Spielmann, M.H. 'Battle Painting and Mr Ernest Crofts' in *Cassell's Magazine*, (1901), 421-29.
- Spiers, E.M. *The Victorian Soldier in Africa* (Manchester and New York, 2004).
- Spies, S.P. 'Women and the War' in P.Warwick (ed.). *The South African War: the Anglo-Boer War 1899-1902* (Harlow, 1980), 161-85.
- Smulders, S. 'Feminism, Pacifism and the Ethics of War: The Politics and Poetics of Alice Meynell's War Verse' in *English Literature in Transition 1880-1920* vol. 36:2, (1993), 159-77.
- Springhall, J.O. 'Rise and Fall of Henty's Empire' in *Times Literary Supplement* (3 October 1968), 1105-06.
- Springhall, J.O. *Youth, Empire and Society: British Youth Movements, 1883-1940* (London, 1977).
- Springhall, J.O. "'Up Guards and at them!'" British Imperialism and Popular Art, 1880-1914' in J.M.Mackenzie (ed.).

Imperialism and Popular Culture (Manchester, 1986), 49-72.

Stainton, L. *Nature into Art: English Landscape Watercolours* exh.cat. Cleveland Museum of Art (Cleveland and London, 1991).

Stamp, G. *The Memorial to the Missing of the Somme* 2nd ed. (2006, London, 2007).

Stauffer, J. 'The "Terrible Reality" of the First Living-Room Wars' in A.W.Tucker, W. Michels and N.Zelt (eds) *War/Photography: Images of Armed Conflict and its Aftermath* exh. cat. Museum of Fine Arts, (Houston, 2012), 80-91.

Stead, W.T. *Shall I Slay my Brother Boer? An Appeal to the Conscience of Britain* (London, 1899).

Stead, W.T. *How Britain Goes to War* (London, 1903).

Stearn, R.T. 'War Correspondents and Colonial War, c.1870-1900' in J.M.Mackenzie (ed.). *Imperialism and Popular Culture* (Manchester, 1986), 139-61.

Stearn. R.T. 'Richard Caton Woodville (1856-1927)' in H.C.G.Matthew and B. Harrison (eds) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: in Association with the British Academy: from the Earliest Times to the Year 2000* vol. 60, (Oxford, 2004), 229-30.

Steiner, Z.S. *Britain and the Origins of the First World War* (London and Basingstoke, 1977).

- Steevens, G.W. *From Capetown to Ladysmith* (Edinburgh and London, 1900).
- Stephenson, A. 'Refashioning Modern Masculinity: Whistler, Aestheticism and National Identity' in D. Peters Corbett and L. Perry (eds) *English Art 1860-1914: Modern Artists and Identity*, 2nd ed. (2000, Manchester and New Jersey, 2001), 133-49.
- Stephenson, A. 'Edwardian Cosmopolitanism ca.1901-1912' in M. O'Neill and M. Hatt (eds) *The Edwardian Sense, Art Design and Performance in Britain, 1901-1910* (New Haven and London, 2010), 251-84.
- Stephenson, A. "'Wonderful Pieces of Stage Management": Reviewing Masculine Fashioning, Race and Imperialism in John Singer Sargent's British Portraits, c. 1897-1914' in J. Codell, (ed.). *Transculturation in British Art, 1770-1930* (Farnham and Burlington, 2012), 221-41.
- Stephenson, A. 'Introduction: Edwardian Art and its Legacies' in *Visual Culture in Britain*, vol. 14, issue 1 (2013), 1-20.
- Stewart, P.M. *Round the World with Rod and Rifle* (London, 1924).
- Strachey, L. *Eminent Victorians* [1st ed. 1918] (Harmondsworth, 1973).
- Strong, R. *And When did you Last See your Father? The Victorian Painter and British History* (London, 1978).
- Summerfield, A. 'Patriotism and Empire. Music-Hall Entertainment 1870-1914' in J.M. Mackenzie (ed.). *Imperialism and Popular Culture* (Manchester, 1986), 17-48.

Summers, A. 'Militarism in Britain before the Great War' in *History Workshop Journal* vol. 2, (1976), 104-23.

Sussman, H. *Victorian Masculinities: Manhood and Masculine Poetics in Early Victorian Literature and Art* (Cambridge, 1995).

Tate, T. (ed.). *Women, Men and the Great War: an Anthology of Stories* (Manchester, 1995).

Tate, T. *Modernism, History and the First World War* (Manchester, 1998).

Taylor, M. 'Imperium et Libertas? Rethinking the Radical Critique of Imperialism during the Nineteenth Century' in *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, vol. 19, (1991) 1-23.

Temple, A.G. *Corporation of London Guildhall Art Gallery Catalogue of Naval and Military Works, 1915*, exh.cat, Guildhall, (London 1915).

The Anglo-Boer War, 1899-1900, An Album of Upwards of Three Hundred Photographic Engravings. A Picture Record of the Movements of the British, Colonial and Boer Forces engaged in the Conflict (Cape Town, 1901).

The Public Catalogue Foundation. *Oil Paintings in Public Ownership in Hampshire* (London, 2007).

Thomas, D. *Battle Art: Images of War* (New York, 1977).

Thompson, A. 'Publicity, Philanthropy and Commemoration: British Society and the War' in D. Omissi and A. Thompson (eds)

The Impact of the South African War (Basingstoke, 2002), 99-123.

Thompson, A. *Empire Strikes Back? The Impact of Imperialism on Britain from the Mid-Nineteenth Century*, 2nd ed. (1968, Harlow, 2005).

Thornton, A.P. *The Imperial Idea and its Enemies: a Study in British Power* (London and New York, 1959).

Tickner, L. *The Spectacle of Women: Imagery of the Suffrage Campaign, 1907-14* (London, 1987).

Tickner, L. *Modern Life and Modern Subjects: British Art in the Early Twentieth Century* (New Haven and London, 2000).

Tickner, L. 'English Modernism in the Cultural Field' in D. Peters Corbett and L. Perry (eds) *English Art 1860-1914: Modern Artists and Identity*, 2nd ed. (2000, Manchester and New Jersey, 2001), 13-30.

Tickner, L. 'Messing About in Boats: E.J.Gregory's *Boulter's Lock: Sunday Afternoon* (RA 1897)' in *Oxford Art Journal* vol. 25 no 2 (2002), 1-28.

Tillyard, S.K. *The Impact of Modernism 1900-1920: Early Modernism and the Arts and Crafts Movement in Edwardian England* (London and New York, 1988).

Tosh, J. 'What should Historians do with Masculinity? Reflections on Nineteenth-Century Britain' in *History Workshop Journal* vol. 38, (1994), 179-212.

Travers, T.H.E. 'Technology, Tactics and Morale: Jean de Bloch, the Boer War and British Identity Theory' in *Journal of Modern History* vol. 51, (June 1979), 264-86.

Treuherz, J. *Victorian Painting* (London, 1993).

Treuherz, J. *Hard Times. Social Realism in Victorian Art* (London, 1987).

Trodd, C. 'Before History Painting: Enclosed Experience and the Emergent Body in the Work of G.F.Watts' in *Visual Culture in Britain*, vol. 6, issue 1 (2005), 37-57.

Trumble, A. and Rager, A.W. (eds) *Edwardian Opulence: British Art at the Dawn of the Twentieth Century* exh.cat. Yale Center for British Art (New Haven, 2013).

Trumble, A. 'The Soldier, the King, and the Proconsul: an Edwardian Processional' in A. Trumble and A.W.Rager (eds) *Edwardian Opulence: British Art at the Dawn of the Twentieth Century* exh.cat. Yale Center for British Art (New Haven, 2013), 11-37.

Tucker, A.W. 'Introduction' in A.W. Tucker, W. Michels and N. Zelt (eds) *War/Photography: Images of Armed Conflict and its Aftermath* exh. cat. The Museum of Fine Arts, (Houston, 2012), 2-7.

Turner, S.V. '“Spiritual Rhythm” and “Material Things”: Art, Cultural Networks and Modernity in Britain, c. 1900-1914' (PhD thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art, 2008).

Turner, S.V. 'Intimacy and Distance: Physicality, Race and Paint in Eddy's *The Wrestlers*' in S. Burnage, M. Hallett and L.

Turner (eds) *William Etty, Art and Controversy* exh.cat. (York Art Gallery, 2011), 75-89.

Usherwood, P. 'Officer Material: Representations of Leadership in Late Nineteenth-Century British Battle Painting' in J.M.Mackenzie (ed.). *Popular Imperialism and the Military: 1850-1950* (New York and Manchester, 1992), 162-78.

Usherwood, P. 'Elizabeth Thompson Butler. A Case of Tokenism' in *Woman's Art Journal* vol. 11, no.2 (1990-91), 14-18.

Usherwood, P. 'Butler, Elizabeth Southerden, Lady Butler (1846-1933)' in H.C.G.Matthew and B.Harrison (eds) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: in Association with the British Academy: from the Earliest Times to the Year 2000* vol. 9, (Oxford, 2004), 131-32.

Usherwood, P. and Spencer-Smith, J. *Lady Butler, Battle Artist 1846-1933*.exh.cat. National Army Museum (London, 1987).

Vadillo, A.P. *Women Poets and Urban Aestheticism: Passengers of Modernity* (Basingstoke, 2005).

Van Alphen, E. 'Touching Death' in S.W.Goodwin and E.Bronfen (eds) *Death and Representation* (Baltimore, 1993), 29-50.

Vance, N. *The Sinews of the Spirit: The Ideal of Christian Manliness in Victorian Literature and Religious Thought* (Cambridge, 1985).

Van Wyk Smith, M. *Drummer Hodge: The Poetry of the Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902)* (Oxford, 1978).

- Van Wyk Smith, M. 'The Poetry of the War' in P. Warwick (ed.).
The South African War: the Anglo-Boer War 1899-1902
(Harlow, 1980), 292-317.
- Van Straten, R. (trans.) *An Introduction to Iconography* (Yverdon,
1994).
- Vicinus, M. (ed.). *Suffer and Be Still* (Bloomington and London,
1972).
- Vicinus, M. and Nergaard, D. (eds) *Ever Yours, Florence
Nightingale-Selected Letters* (London, 1989).
- Villiers, F. *His Five Decades of Adventure*, vol. 1, (London, 1921).
- Waites, B. *A Class Society at War: England 1914-1918* (Leamington
Spa, 1987).
- Walton, S. *Imagining Soldiers and Fathers in the Mid-Victorian Era:
Charlotte Yonge's Models of Manliness* (Farnham, 2010).
- Walsh, M.K. *C.R.W. Nevinson: this Cult of Violence* (New Haven and
London, 2002).
- Walsh, M.K. 'The Eminent English Futurist' C.R.W. Nevinson and
English Futurism in Peace and War' in *Blasting the Future:
Vorticism in Britain 1910-1920* exh.cat. Estorick Collection
of Modern Italian Art (London, 2004), 19-27.
- Walsh, M.K. (ed.). *A Dilemma of English Modernism: Visual and
Verbal Politics in the Life and Work of C.R.W. Nevinson
(1889-1946)* (Cranbury, New Jersey, 2007).

- Walvin, J. 'Symbols of Moral Superiority: Slavery, Sport and the Changing World Order, 1800-1950' in (eds) J.A.Mangan and J. Walvin *Manliness and Morality: Middle-Class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940* (Manchester, 1987), 242-60.
- Warner, M. *The Victorians. British Painting 1837-1901* exh.cat. National Gallery of Art (Washington, 1997).
- Warner, P. (ed.). *The Fields of War. A Young Cavalryman's Crimea Campaign* (London, 1977).
- Warren, A. 'Richard Caton Woodville-War Artist and War Correspondent' in *Captain* vol. xv, no 88, (1906), 290-99.
- Warren, A. 'Popular Manliness: Baden-Powell, Scouting and the Development of Manly Character' in J.A.Mangan, and J.Walvin, (eds) *Manliness and Morality Middle-class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940* (Manchester, 1987), 199-219.
- Waterloo Centenary, 1815-1915: Catalogue of an Exhibition of Pictures by Lady Butler* (exh.cat. Leicester Galleries, London, 1915).
- Watson, N.J., Weir, S. and Friend, S. 'The Development of Muscular Christianity in Victorian Britain and Beyond' in *Journal of Religion and Society* vol. 7, (2005), 1-22.
- Wees, W.C. *Vorticism and the English Avant-Garde* (Manchester and Toronto, 1972).
- Weisberg, G.P. *The Realist Tradition French Painting and Drawing, 1830-1900* exh.cat. (Cleveland Museum in Art, 1981).

- Wetzel, D. *A Duel of Giants: Bismarck, Napoleon III, and the Origins of the Franco-Prussian War* (Wisconsin, 2001).
- White, H. *Metahistory: the Historical Imagery in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore, 1973).
- White, H. *Figural Realism, Studies in the Mimesis Effect* (Baltimore, 1999).
- Wilcox, T. 'Painting and Public, Print and Profit. Lady Butler's Painting Balaclava and its Dissemination' in S. Popple and V. Toulmin (eds) *Visual Delights; Essays on the Popular and Projected Image in the Nineteenth Century* (Trowbridge, 2000), 127-34.
- Wilkinson-Latham, R.J. 'The Defence of Rorke's Drift. A Painting in the Royal Collection' in *International Society of Military Collectors* vol. 55, (1970), 6-8.
- Wilkinson-Latham, R.J. *From our Special Correspondent-Victorian War Correspondents and their Campaigns* (London, 1979).
- Willan, B. 'The Siege of Mafeking' in P. Warwick (ed.). *The South African War: the Anglo-Boer War 1899-1902* (Harlow, 1980), 139-60.
- Willcock, S. 'The Aesthetics of Imperial Crisis: Image Making and Intervention in British India, c. 1857-1919' (PhD thesis, University of York, 2013).
- Williams, R. *Culture and Society 1780-1950* [1st ed.] (1958 Harmondsworth, 1961).

- Williams, R. 'When was Modernism' in T. Pinkney (ed.). *The Politics of Modernism* (London and New York, 1989), 31-35.
- Williams, R. 'Metropolitan Perceptions and the Emergence of Modernism' in T. Pinkney (ed.). *The Politics of Modernism* (London and New York, 1989), 37-48.
- Williams, R. 'The Politics of the Avant-garde' in T. Pinkney (ed.). *The Politics of Modernism* (London and New York, 1989), 49-63.
- Williams, R. 'The Metropolis and the Emergence of Modernism' in P. Brooker (ed.). *Modernism/Postmodernism* (Harlow, 1992), 82-94.
- Wilson, H.W. *With Flag to Pretoria: a History of the Boer War 1899-1900*, vol. I, (London, 1900).
- Wilson, H.W. *With Flag to Pretoria: a History of the Boer War 1899-1900*, vol. 11, (London, 1901).
- Wolff, J. *The Social Production of Art* 2nd ed. (1981, Basingstoke and London, 1993).
- Wollen, W.B. 'Christmas at the Front. A Reminiscence of Christmas at Modder River' in *Cassell's Magazine*, December issue (London, 1900), 112-15.
- Woodham-Smith, C. *The Reason Why* 2nd ed. (1953, London, 1956).
- Woolf, V. *A Room of One's Own* [1st ed. 1929] (London, 2000).
- Wright, P. *Tank: The Progress of a Monstrous War Machine* (London, 2000).

Wyndham Lewis, P. (ed.). *Blast 1* [1st ed. 1914] (Berkeley, CA., 2009).

Wyndham Lewis, P. (ed.). *Blast: War Number* [1st ed. 1915] (Santa Barbara, CA., 1981).

Yeldham, C. *Women Artists in Nineteenth-Century France and England*, 2 vols. (New York, 1984).

Young, J.E. *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meanings* (New Haven, 1993).

Zakreski, P. *Representing Female Artistic Labour, 1848-1890* (Aldershot, 2006).

Websites

<http://www.hughlane.ie>: Dublin City Gallery, The Hugh Lane (accessed 26 February 2014).

<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/32209>: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (Butler and Caton Woodville) (accessed 19 January 2011).

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard_Caton_Woodville Wikipedia entry on Richard Caton Woodville (accessed 6 September 2010).

<https://www.iwm.org.uk> Podcast 31 IWM lives (accessed 14 January 2014).

www.nam.ac.uk (accessed 9 April 2015)-catalogue of holdings in National Army Museum.