



Project
MUSE[®]

Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.

The Periodical and the Art Market: Investigating the “Dealer-Critic System” in Victorian England

PAMELA FLETCHER AND ANNE HELMREICH

The “dealer-critic system” – Cynthia White and Harrison White’s oft-cited term describing the mutual dependence between the art market and the press – has been long recognized by scholars as a new and critically important feature of the nineteenth-century art world.¹ Sociologists White and White charted the decline of the Academy and the rise of the commercial gallery system sustained by the press, and linked these structural changes to the shift from a focus on single important canvases to a speculative market that concentrated on the value of an artist’s entire oeuvre. Art-historical inquiry, building upon White and White’s work, has largely focused on the French art world in the late nineteenth century, as scholars have mapped the emergence of modernist work and practices within this institutional framework.² Much of the groundwork for this new system, however, originated in Victorian London, which was a forerunner in the development of both the modern art market and the periodical press. In this paper, we argue that attending to the rich web of connections and intersections between the Victorian periodical press and the art market can expand and refine the definition of the dealer-critic system both in its Victorian particularities and as a more generally applicable theoretical model.³

By the 1850s, London had established its identity as a World City, a phrase denoting its position as the capital of the largest empire of the world, its teeming and diverse population, and leadership in capitalism. The art market thrived in such conditions, buoyed by new technologies such as railway and shipping networks and, later, telegraphs and telephones, and sustained largely by a new type of wealthy middle-class patron.⁴ These new audiences were served by a new business model for

selling art: the dealer-run commercial gallery, distinguished both from artist-run exhibitions and shops selling art among other items of home décor, that emerged in the 1850s and rapidly became a dominant force in the art market.⁵ By the last decades of the nineteenth century, the recognizably modern commercial gallery system had been established and London's art market was widely considered the most advanced and cosmopolitan in Europe, a fluid center for an international network of patrons and dealers.⁶

London's equally vast and dynamic periodical press played multiple functions in this economy. Periodic art criticism arose in conjunction with the annual exhibitions of the Royal Academy in the late eighteenth century and quickly proliferated across specialized art journals, literary journals, and general interest publications.⁷ As Helene Roberts, Julie Codell, and others have demonstrated, the tone and function of such art reporting evolved as the art world expanded and professionalized over the long nineteenth century.⁸ According to its own rhetoric, art criticism initially acted as a disinterested guide for would-be consumers or viewers, directing the public's attention to the best on offer in the market and educating their taste. At mid-century, art critics and editors such as Tom Taylor writing for the *Times* and Samuel Carter Hall at the *Art Journal* embraced this role of educator as part of the professionalization of the artistic field and concomitantly consolidated notions of the British School.⁹

As the art market expanded and became less centered on the Royal Academy, however, the press played an increasingly visible partisan role, with critics and journals acting as advocates for particular schools or artists, as in the case of the promotion of the PreRaphaelites by William Michael Rossetti and F. G. Stephens, who also contributed to larger aesthetic debates.¹⁰ The Whistler-Ruskin trial of 1878 sustained these tendencies by thrusting artists and critics into divergent camps.¹¹ By the 1880s and 90s, the next generation of "New Critics," such as D.S. MacColl and R.A.M. Stevenson, had become outspoken defenders of formalist art criticism and new French and French-influenced art in the face of considerable opposition by more conservative critics such as Harry Quilter and J. A. Spender. Such debates were fueled by the increasing recognition achieved by critics; signed reviews began to appear in periodicals beginning in the 1860s and, concomitantly, as Pettejohn points out, critics "began to assert autonomy from the periodical press" by publishing topical books and collections of their writings.¹² Nonetheless, some critics resisted this trend. As editor of *The Portfolio*, P. G. Hamerton tried to promote a tolerant critical perspective, arguing that "It was not part of our scheme to take up any militant position in art criticism . . . The trenchant style of art criticism

may sometimes have a temporary efficacy against a passing aberration of taste, but its right place is in the daily or weekly paper.”¹³ Hamerton’s reference to the daily and weekly papers reflects the increasing impact New Journalism and the rise of tabloid press had on art criticism, as the kind of gossipy, controversy-focused coverage that Martha Ward has called “art news” began to supplant serious art criticism in many newspapers and popular journals.¹⁴

This essay investigates two key agents in this developing network and nexus of the press and commercial spheres, the dealer/editor David Croal Thomson and the art critic Harry Quilter, and through examining their activities and rhetorical positions expands our understanding of significant, and intertwined, tensions that emerged within this system by the late nineteenth century. The first was the nature of the critic’s role. Although White and White do not imply collusion between dealers and critics (and, indeed, they suggest that most critics, at least, would not have seen themselves as part of a market-bound system), the symbiotic relationship repeatedly suggested conflicts of interest to observers.¹⁵ While critics had long been subject to pressure from artists, the dealer’s role in the circuit raised new concerns.¹⁶ The leverage that advertising purchases gave dealers over editorial content was commonly cited as a source of unfair influence. John Everett Millais, for example, complained that although dealer “X” tried to use negative press to drive down the prices he paid the artist: “whenever an engraving comes out from his firm there is always a favourable article in the papers.”¹⁷ The nature of the dealer’s interest likewise provoked skepticism. If the artist was at least acting in good faith to promote his own work, or those of personal friends, the middleman’s motivations were perceived as both less benign and less transparent.¹⁸ The power of the pen, and its potential abuses, raised a central question: should critics be advocates for particular kinds of art, which implied taking an active role in the workings of the marketplace and thus private commercial interests, or did they have a larger responsibility to the public good and civil fabric?

When advocating the benefits of the national (i.e. British) school critics might serve both functions, as Taylor did in the case of his exposition of Frith’s painting the *Railway Station* commissioned by the dealer Louis Victor Flatow.¹⁹ But as London rose in prominence as a locale for the international art trade and critics became increasingly invested in continental art practices, conflicts arose between the seemingly competing values of nationalism and cosmopolitanism, the second set of tensions this article addresses. As Lisa Tickner has summarized, this period marked the transition from “an international Salon system to one controlled by commercial galleries. The first was understood in terms of national and regional diversity, the second

was promoted by a new genealogical history of successive international “isms.”²⁰ What role did the press play in this transformation of taste and aesthetic standards? Did the increasingly partisan discourses of art criticism break down along the lines of nationalism and cosmopolitanism, or were the fault lines elsewhere?

We have chosen to investigate these questions through the form of a linked pair set of case studies. The careers of David Croal Thomson, a dealer and editor of the *Art Journal*, and Harry Quilter, a critic and artist, exemplify the stresses on the “dealer-critic” system in the 1890s. It is our hope that by offering two perspectives, two analyses of actors differently situated in the system by scholars whose own interests and perspectives also differ, we might open a window into the complexities of the relationship between the art market and the press, while also making a larger argument about the contours of that relationship as a “system” and how it functioned in Victorian Britain. These two case studies also allow us to interject personal agency and choice into a framework, the rise of the speculative art market, that has often appeared inevitable and inexorable.

The Dealer/Editor: David Croal Thomson

David Croal Thomson was born in Edinburgh, Scotland, and worked for an artist’s colourman and then a commercial gallery in Edinburgh before moving to London to take an appointment with *The Year’s Art*, a subsidiary of the *Art Journal*. Between 1881 and 1888 he was sub-editor of the *Art Journal* and in 1892 he rejoined the journal as its main editor, staying until 1902. While working as a sub-editor at the *Art Journal*, he accepted a post as the London branch manager for the Goupil Maison. At the end of 1897, he resigned his post at Goupil and became the manager and then partner with Thomas Agnew’s and Sons. In 1908 he became a partner in the French Gallery, the family firm of Harry Wallis. After another ten years, Thomson left the French Gallery to open his own firm, Barbizon House, named after the artists with whom he was most closely affiliated, and which operated until his death in 1930.²¹

Thomson’s career thus spans both sides of the dealer-critic system, and at one critical stage he occupied both positions simultaneously. His overlapping interests present a fascinating window into connections between the press and the market, and the perceived distinctions (or lack thereof) between them. The most prominent effect of his efforts as a dealer while at Goupil was the increased visibility and presence of French art in the London marketplace, specifically that of the Barbizon school, a group of French landscape painters who favored the forests

outside of Paris as subjects and whose work privileged a natural aesthetic based on close observation of color and atmosphere, and their successors the Impressionists. In utilizing the *Art Journal* in his campaign to support art that exemplified such naturalistic trends and thus often connoted Frenchness, Thomson redirected the journal away from its previous mission in support of the British native school. In sum, while adopting a tone of disinterest that cloaked his commercial perspective when conducting his business as an editor, Thomson nonetheless perceptibly shaped the journal to suit his agenda as dealer.

Thomson's likely mentor when he first arrived in London was Marcus Huish, who edited *The Year's Art* when Thomson worked as a sub-editor and preceded Thomson as editor of the *Art Journal* from 1881 to 1892. Huish, like Thomson, was also a dealer, serving as Director of the Fine Art Society, a competitor to Goupil, from 1879 to 1911. Huish, like Thomson, was also eager to expand the market; he was an important contributor to the popularization of Japanese prints, for example, but also attended to nurturing native artists such as watercolorist Helen Allingham.²² Huish and Thomson also adopted similar personas in that they established spheres of expertise demarcated by contributions to nascent genres of art history. Huish, for example, wrote a memoir and description of the works of print maker Charles Méryon, and Thomson did likewise for Thomas Bewick and Hablot Knight Brown "Phiz."

Sharing a mutual interest in the work of Whistler, the two editor/dealers helped to carve out a new mode of art appreciation and aesthetics, albeit not consistently or dogmatically articulated, that was nonetheless distinct at critical junctures from that of John Ruskin. Their colleague P. H. Hamerton, likewise sympathetic to the French Barbizon school and its atmospheric, poetic effects and a strong supporter of the etching revival, provided an even stronger platform than the *Art Journal* for these new directions via his journal *The Portfolio*. As Julie Codell explains, Hamerton repeatedly undermined Ruskin's "critical faith in art as a reflection of morality and socially redeeming values" and instead argued "a belief that art and its appreciation sprang from sensations."²³ Such cosmopolitanism was also discernible in *The Magazine of Art* when it was under the editorship of writer William Ernest Henley between 1881 and 1887.²⁴

But such coalescing of taste, in many ways, masks the fact that the role of art journal editor was not clearly delineated or demarcated from other professions, such as dealer and scholar, as in the case of Huish and Thomson; writer, as in the case of Henley; artist, as in the case of Hamerton; or critic, as in the case of Marion Harry Spielman, editor of *The Magazine of Art* after Henley. And, although Spielman arguably

contributed significantly to the professionalization of the role of editor in alignment with his emphasis on the professionalization of artists, he nonetheless took up seemingly contradictory positions vis-a-vis the relationship of the press to the marketplace. He, for example, used the pages of his journal to educate artists about copyright and thus defend their ability to control the reproduction of their work while concomitantly adopting the language of advertising to promote his chosen artists.²⁵ The boundaries between the media and the marketplace were obviously permeable, especially given that art journals, like art works, were essentially commodities through which both producer and middlemen hoped to make a profit. Recognition of this fact gave rise to attempts to police these porous boundaries as in, for example, Harry Quilter's art criticism or the proclamation of Cassell's, the publisher of *The Magazine of Art*, that the journal "should be governed solely by the editor, to the absolute exclusion of the influence or the counsel of the advertisement-canvasser."²⁶ But what if the editor was, in essence, an advertisement-canvasser in the guise of a commercial art dealer?

The most obvious point of connection between the art press and the commercial dealer, but rarely directly acknowledged as such, was the reproductive print which was the mainstay of both art journals, often included as "souvenir" frontispieces, and commercial dealers, who could rely on steady rate of sales throughout most of the century. Thus Thomson's role as editor of the *Art Journal* and manager of Goupil becomes even more significant when the role played by Goupil in the reproductive print trade is recognized.

Goupil was best known for a highly lucrative business in reproductive engravings and photogravures after paintings by French academic artists such as Gérôme. The firm started in 1829 in Paris primarily as a printing and publishing firm; by the mid-century it expanded internationally with a branch in New York in 1848, a London branch in 1857, and eventually branches in Berlin, Brussels, and the Hague. The firm spearheaded and rode the wave of market interest in reproductive engravings that rose by the mid-century, and its London branch was originally located at 17 Southampton Street, near the Strand and Covent Garden, an area associated with printselling and publishing. With the ebbing of the market for reproductive engravings by the close of the century, the firm faced difficulties and in 1917 the publishing house closed.

However, various Goupil partners and branch managers had been astute enough to recognize the next wave in the art market, speculation in paintings – buy low, hold on as the work increases in value, and sell high – and invested in the infrastructure necessary to support that market, namely commercial exhibition spaces. Throughout the 1870s

and 80s, the London firm greatly expanded its exhibition schedule and commitment to paintings and drawings and moved in 1884 to New Bond Street, the heart of the luxury retail market and the home of many competing firms, such as the Fine Art Society and Thomas Agnew's. Under Thomson's tenure the annual exhibition schedule at Goupil offered an eclectic mix with exhibitions of topographical or travel views as the long-standing staple. But the displays that earned Thomson the most recognition were his exhibitions of the Barbizon school, namely the works of Corot, Daubigny, Diaz, and Troyon, and Impressionism in both its French and English variants. For example, he organized the first one-person show of Monet's works in London in April 1889 and a group show of London Impressionists in December 1889 and many of the artists featured in this exhibition, such as Philip Wilson Steer, became long-standing contributors to the Goupil Gallery. The exhibition that put Thomson on the map was James McNeill Whistler's retrospective, *Nocturnes, Marines and Chevalet Pieces*, held in 1892, which Whistler called "an unprecedented success!." He continued in a letter to Thomson, "The papers keep coming in piles! and, in all details, you see what a stupendous 'event in Bond Street' it has been."²⁷

Highly visible exhibitions aside, prints continued to be the bread and butter of the Goupil firm and for Thomson's next employer, Thomas Agnew and Sons.²⁸ Prints also became central to the *Art Journal's* identity, which featured works after paintings; indeed, at the end of the century it occasionally published goupilgravures, a photographic reproductive technique invented by the Goupil firm, a perhaps not so subtle form of strategic product placement.²⁹ The *Art Journal* began in 1839, sixteen pages with one woodcut illustration, under the editorship of Samuel Carter Hall.³⁰ By 1849, steel engravings were added to the roster of images as well as a frontispiece that could act as a collectible. The journal stopped publication in 1912 in response to the same declining interest in reproductive prints that caused the demise of the Goupil publishing house. Hall, in his reminiscences, dates the prosperity of the *Art Journal* to 1849, when Robert Vernon, a wealthy tradesman who rejected the aristocratic practice of collecting large-scale old Masters in favor of small-scale genre and landscape subjects by British artists, granted Hall a concession to reproduce his pictures. This date also helps to locate when the *Art Journal* began its most fervent support of the native school, said to have begun with Hogarth and continued through artists such as William Mulready. This trend arguably hit a peak in 1861–1862 when the journal published a series on "British Artists: Their Style and Character" and featured the work of

contemporary or near contemporary British artists in reproductive engravings.

Crucially, the International Exhibition of 1862 offered the opportunity to analyze and champion the British school in the context of continental art. An essay on the British school featured in the exhibition published by the *Art Journal* reveals the ways in which art criticism rendered inseparable the self-conception of the nation and its art:

we may state that the English school, in contrast with the pictures of other nations, will be found less vaulting in ambition, less exorbitant in dimension, less emulous of the grand style of the ancient masters. But as a compensation, on the other hand, the pictures in the "British division" are truthful to nature, honest in sentiment, simple and heartfelt in subject, thoroughly earnest and independent in treatment, and as such are worthy of our people, thus serving as an index to our character, and therefore rising to the dignity and worth of a national and representative Art.³¹

In addition to exhibition reviews and reproducing works of art, the *Art Journal* offered subject-based articles as well as reporting on newsworthy art events. The general tone of the journal was didactic and omnipotent. Its rhetoric of seeming disinterest was enhanced by articles published in the 1840s and 1850s regarding "dishonorable practices in picture dealing." A particular article in October 1854, which claimed that Old Master paintings about to be sold in Birmingham were fabricated, resulted into two libel actions, one of which was dropped and the other settled in favor of the plaintiff. Although this settlement indicates that the *Art Journal* was in error, the jury ignored the plaintiff's original claim for damages in the amount of £1000 and instead stipulated 40s., suggesting that the plaintiff's accusations did not meet with an entirely sympathetic audience.³² The *Art Journal's* skepticism about the increasing role of the dealer in the art market was shared by other journals; the *Fine Arts Quarterly* described them as possessing "blunt, pushing ways."³³

The intercession of the courts and polemical articles aside, art journals played a considerable role in the market by virtue of the products they highlighted and the critics to whom they gave voice as Helene Roberts has amply evidenced.³⁴ Moreover, several of the art journals provided important data about the state of the market; both the *Portfolio* and the *Art Journal* for example, reported on auction sales and other activities in the market.³⁵ Indeed, the *Art Journal*, since its early decades, had not been afraid of weighing in on the commercial sphere as in articles on the theme of "The Mercantile Value of the Fine Arts."³⁶

In Thomson's case, the connection between the periodical press and the art market was, of course, even more direct as he simultaneously edited the *Art Journal* and managed the London Goupil house and then Agnew and Sons. Beyond the shared interest in prints, Thomson effectively linked the *Art Journal* and Goupil's merchandise through favorable exhibition reviews, biographical profiles of featured artists, and essays highlighting collections of patrons who had done business with Goupil (although never exclusively).

Thomson's tenure at the *Art Journal* began with a recalibration of the journal, announced in a circular of 1893. The editor assured readers that "no violent change is under contemplation, but a serious effort will be made to put THE ART JOURNAL more in touch with all the recent developments of Art and of artistic expression," a shift in direction that neatly matched Thomson's own agenda as an art dealer. It also rendered the *Art Journal* more competitive with its rival *The Magazine of Art*, which William Ernest Henley had transformed into a more cosmopolitan vehicle during his tenure, appointing many of the new critics that Thomson now sought out, such as R. A. M. Stevenson and Frederick Wedmore, and also helped to position the *Art Journal* to fill the void created by the demise of *The Portfolio* in 1893. In addition to the greater emphasis on contemporary developments in art, the *Art Journal* promised to feature artists of "foreign Schools" as well as "Artists of Great Britain." In selecting images for reproduction, "it will not be forgotten that the great tendency of modern Art is towards Impressionism and breadth of treatment."³⁷ Interest in French art of recent decades was readily manifested in, for example, essays devoted to the Barbizon School and Gustave Caillebotte's bequest to the French state, which featured a number of Impressionist paintings, as well as reviews of contemporary artists such as Edgar Degas by French critic Théodore Duret.³⁸

Indeed, Thomson's support of the "new," perhaps most concretely manifested in his willingness to exhibit the British Impressionists,³⁹ was repeatedly mitigated by his rhetoric of persuasion, perhaps most obviously seen in his treatment of Jean Baptiste Corot. In an essay on the painter he authored for the *Magazine of Art* he rooted the Barbizon school artist's "protest against the older and conventional treatment of landscape" in British practice of a generation earlier, namely that of Constable, thus mollifying Corot's associations of both Frenchness and radicalness. In this same article, he insisted that Corot "is now one of the painters whose works are most popular in England, Scotland, and America, as well as in France," a claim repeated in the catalogue that accompanied the artist's exhibition at the Goupil Gallery in 1889 and one destined to reassure potential purchasers.⁴⁰

In his early-twentieth-century treatment of the artist, Thomson promoted the artist's work to those seeking "something which soothes and quietens his harassed mind; which renders with charm the varying moods of Nature; and something especially which conveys a sense of repose and rest."⁴¹ The reader, as potential patron, is provided easily understood frameworks, the cross fertilization of national schools, fashions in the art market, and nature as the antithesis to the corrupting urban sphere, through which to consume this art.

Thomson's editorial correspondence never betrays any recognition of conflict of interest in his conjoined roles as editor and art dealer. For example, he hired author and New Critic Frederick Wedmore to write a column, "My Few Things" about the critic's personal artistic preferences, which tended towards those artists featured in the Goupil exhibitions, and the two plotted together to promote each other's projects. In a letter of October 1893, Wedmore wrote to Thomson:

I did manage to wedge in such a paragraph, with my own wording, in today's *Standard* you see; and I will do it too for next Saturday's *Academy*. I can't well announce my own articles – "My Few Things" – but you know exactly the scope of them and I shd. be much obliged by your taking what means suggest themselves to you to make them public in advance.⁴²

In the same year, Thomson worked assiduously to find someone to write for the *Art Journal* about Whistler's portfolio of photographic reproductions and prints after the works in the Goupil retrospective; the portfolio, along with some of the original works of art, was still for sale at Goupil a year after the exhibition. Thomson discussed the project with Charles Whibly, Elizabeth Pennell, and finally settled on D. S. Maccoll, part of the New Critic circle.⁴³ In a letter to Whistler, Thomson informed the artist of the upcoming article and stated explicitly "This ought to help the sale very much."⁴⁴

MacColl's article, although devoted largely to investigating Whistler's art within a theory of art and decoration devised by Walter Crane, was nonetheless framed by a context that consolidated art criticism and the market. The essay opened with a parable drawn from the city of Garth (standing in for Philistine critics opposed to Whistler) that likened Whistler's recent triumphs over doubting critics via his retrospective exhibition to a skirmish against pasteboard and sawdust concluded by the "wily vanquished" inviting in the conquering enemy to accolades. Moore thus warns Whistler that "a victory over the Philistines, indeed, is nothing to be proud of; their applause is as unmeaning as the hooting." Such lofty advice is grounded by the concluding paragraph

that blatantly refers to marketing Whistler's portfolio and justifies Thomson's assurance to the artist:

It remains to commend to the lovers of good painting Messrs. Goupil's souvenir of the Whistler exhibition, the immediate occasion of this article. These twenty-four photographs, of which our seven illustrations form part, convey in a remarkable degree, not only the arrangement and tone of the originals, but also the expressiveness and charm of the handling of the paint.⁴⁵

In turn, Thomson cultivated D. S. MacColl by featuring the critic's paintings upon the occasion of the opening of the new Goupil Galleries in 5 Regent Street in 1895.

Not every artist represented by Thomson appreciated his overt promotional efforts. George Clausen, who had trained in the French *en plein-air* method and whose work was frequently compared with that of Bastien-Lepage, for example, wrote to Thomson in 1895 complaining about an article that had just appeared in the *Art Journal*:

Thank you for your letter & permission to use reproductions. I wish though, that you had asked me and I think you might, as you know I am a little sensitive about this matter of "advertisement." While I am glad and very proud to have recognition from artists and intelligent people – and I think no exception can be taken to an article to an art magazine on this occasion.—I confess I do not like [like crossed out] covet the honor of sharing – with the latest murderer, mountebank, or divorcee – for a few days, the gossip of "the town" – The papers all asked me for my photo – some for a few dates of past works etc. This I gave as I suppose to some extent I am common property now.⁴⁶

In this letter, Clausen draws a distinction between art magazines and newspapers as a means of promoting his career, largely based on presumed audience and the context of the news. Art magazines targeted, in his mind, "artists and intelligent people," a desired audience; newspapers, by contrast, aimed at the larger public and used sensational tactics. Although Clausen claimed not to be antagonistic to the public, he did object to appearing side by side with what he perceived as inflammatory or melodramatic news items. Indeed, Clausen's correspondence with Thomson indicates a general unease with the increasingly close ties between the press and the art world, arguably necessitated by the need to promote and differentiate work in a crowded marketplace, but nonetheless leaving Clausen disheartened about the need to not only produce paintings for exhibition but also related news copy.⁴⁷

The increasing attention paid to artist biography in the pages of the *Art Journal*, the perhaps inevitable result of the Romantic fascination with the individual and the growing modern belief that art was a direct personal expression, is of pace with larger nineteenth-century developments in art writing that also benefited the art market. Indeed, as Julie Codell has noted, a “dominant” and distinctive theme within Victorian “popular serialized biographies” was “market value as a measure of artistic worth.”⁴⁸ While Thomson rarely explicitly discussed an artist’s material success, he nonetheless discretely orchestrated it through his judiciously placed press notices and well-timed exhibitions. For example, Thomson organized important early one-person exhibitions devoted to A. D. Peppercorn, a British artist whose work partook of the aesthetics of Corot and French Impressionism, and then published notices about the artist while editor of the *Art Journal*.⁴⁹

The emphasis on biography also extended to patrons, held up as potential models for patterns of collecting. Wealthy collectors featured in the pages of the *Art Journal* during Thomson’s tenure included Frederick Leyland, who commissioned Whistler’s Peacock room; John Day, another Whistler collector; Henry Tate, whose collection became the mainstay of the new national museum; PreRaphaelite collector James Leathart; and George McCulloch, a Scotsman who made a fortune in Australia and purchased over 300 contemporary French and British paintings.⁵⁰ When Leathart’s collection came on the market, Goupil handled the sale and when McCulloch’s collection was auctioned the accompanying catalogue was published by Virtue and Co., which also published the *Art Journal*; indeed, Goupil frequently used Virtue and Company to print catalogues for their exhibitions. In some cases Thomson was able to synthesize championing new criticism, continental art, and patrons in the pages of the *Art Journal*, as in a series of articles on John Day’s collection of French Barbizon and Dutch Hague school paintings, described in detail by R. A. M. Stevenson.⁵¹

Thomson’s most overt collapsing of his roles of editor and dealer was the decision to publish a profile of the Goupil gallery in a special supplement to the *Art Journal* in 1895. In adulatory tones, the gallery is characterized as famous and prestigious, and its leading contribution described as “introducing to favour in this country the works of the finest Continental Schools.”⁵² Such explicit support of a commercial gallery is a clear reversal of the *Art Journal*’s cautions of the 1840s against the fraudulent practices of dealers, whom they regarded with suspicion. Such explicit support of French and Dutch art was also a reversal of its mid-century programme to promote the native

British school. In hindsight it lays bare a central paradox in the British art world, the claim for commercial detachment in the face of practices that proved otherwise. The heart of this paradox was the Royal Academy, founded to celebrate the achievements of the British school, and which repeatedly claimed economic disinterest while critics referred to its exhibitions as great shops.⁵³ The project to support exclusively British art and to remain aloof from the marketplace had clearly failed by the time of Thomson's editorship of the *Art Journal*.

But there were still reflexes of the old patriotic mode in the turn-of-the-century *Art Journal* as evidenced by critics' repeated insistence that Barbizon and French Impressionist painting was the inevitable result of the importation of John Constable's *Haywain* to France in 1824. Such gestures, however, like Thomson's occasional inclusion of critics and artists who opposed Impressionism in the *Art Journal*, were merely grace notes to the larger chord being struck by the increasing cosmopolitanism of the London art market. The press and the art market were finally catching up to London's title of World City.

Thomson's appointment as editor came at a decisive moment in the history of art criticism, when declaration of personal taste became increasingly accepted, to the point that the exhibition could be described as a messianic conversion experience. Critics thus gained greater visibility and professional expertise but the change also created opportunities for what might be regarded as conflicts of interests. The perception of many New Critics promoted by Thomson that they were waging a battle against Philistine forces perhaps excused or even mandated, in their minds, close cooperation with the dealer or dealer/editor to ensure that their desired aesthetic aim was achieved, but such cooperation quickly led to a backlash, epitomized in the career of conservative critic Harry Quilter.

The Critic: Harry Quilter

Harry Quilter was perhaps the quintessential Victorian "Philistine." Posterity knows him best as 'Arry, the object of James McNeill Whistler's relentless mockery, described at the Aesthetic Grosvenor Gallery as "an amazing 'arrangement' in strong mustard-and-cress, with bird's-eye belcher of Reckitt's blue," staring uncomprehendingly at the pictures on view, and ruining the aesthetic effect of the display.⁵⁴ Quilter's place in histories of Victorian art is almost always shaped by this view of him as a Philistine, blinded by prejudice and nationalist sentiment to the aesthetic value of modern (French) painting. It must be admitted that Quilter bears a good deal of blame for this, as he seems to have vehemently defended the losing side of every debate

he ever entered: he was anti-Whistler, anti-William Morris, anti-Oscar Wilde, anti-Edgar Degas, and anti-feminist. And yet Quilter spoke to and for a sizable portion of the Victorian art public: he was the art critic for the *Spectator* from 1876 to 1887 and *The Times* from 1880 to 1881, the editor of his own journal, the *Universal Review*, in the late 1880s, and until his death in 1907 a frequent contributor to many of the most prominent Victorian periodicals, including the *Cornhill*, the *Contemporary Review*, the *Fortnightly Review*, the *National Review*, *Fraser's*, and the *Nineteenth Century*. Taken as a whole, his art criticism adds up to a coherent aesthetic ideology, a sort of Ruskinian Neo-Platonism, that defended the British school against the influence of modern French art such as that shown at Goupil. One of his strongest weapons in this war was his self-consciousness about the interlocking relations between the periodical press and the art market. His perspective on such matters is especially rich because although he is primarily known as a critic, he also inhabited the roles of exhibiting artist and editor at various points in his career and, unlike Thomson, wrote quite frankly of the different pressures and interests of each role.

Quilter's aesthetic criteria are essentially based on those of John Ruskin, valuing art for its sincerity, evidence of work, and moral purpose. In his article "The Apologia of Art," published in the *Cornhill* in 1879, the year after the infamous Ruskin-Whistler trial, Quilter laid out the basic tenets of his aesthetic: art is "one of the greatest influences in the world for good," and its influence lies not in the sensuous appeal of a luxury good or fashionable commodity (as the Aesthetes would have it) but "in the appeal it makes to our whole being, physical, mental, and spiritual."⁵⁵ Indeed, art should be evaluated on how successfully it transcends the material: "its rank is determined, as is that of man himself, by the extent to which it can subdue its lower elements in the service of the highest qualities."⁵⁶ Artists are those who have "spiritual insight" into this universal humanity, and this insight can only be expressed through originality: those who imitate others can only mimic the outward material forms of art, not its essence. Originality for Quilter means something like sincerity rather than novelty, a distinction that has real significance for his evaluation of contemporary art, and for his impact on a marketplace in transition between the profitability of reproductive engravings and the newly emergent speculative market in originals.

It is also worth noting that for Quilter, this ideal of sincerity is directly linked to a commitment to national schools; the artist's character is shaped by the national character, and the Nature he knows best is the physical terrain of his homeland. Accordingly, Quilter

dismissed the Academic tradition, the realistic painting of modern life and the Impressionists alike as merely imitative of external (material) effect. Instead he favored the British landscape tradition of David Cox, John Constable, and the Idyllic School of Frederick Walker and George Pinwell, in which Nature is imbued with human feeling. In writings from the 1870s to the early 1900s, Quilter defended this tradition, and attacked foreign (mostly French) art and influence, becoming one of most high-profile opponents of Impressionist painting in Britain. Such arguments were the context for Thomson's promotion of modern French art as derived from the British school of landscape, and Thomson's reliance on that convoluted appeal to national pride is a testimony to the continued power of that discourse.

While Quilter's basic aesthetic commitments remained consistent, the tenor of his attacks became increasingly vehement over the years, as French and other foreign art became increasingly popular, and as the very contours of the art world underwent massive structural change. As the Goupil Gallery's history makes clear, the last decades of the nineteenth century witnessed explosive growth in the contemporary art market, as commercial galleries spread rapidly across London's West End. Many of these galleries were premised on a cosmopolitan appeal, operating under names such as the French Gallery, the Continental Gallery, the Belgian Gallery, and the Japanese Gallery, and many more featured the work of artists from around the world. As dealers and commercial spaces vied to attract audiences and differentiate themselves from one another (and from national schools), they helped shape new, more fragmented publics for art, and supported the emergence of new aesthetic values of originality (in the sense of novelty) and cosmopolitanism.

In the face of these changes, Quilter set himself up as a defender of the national school, and the commercial nature of how most modern French art was introduced to British audiences had much to do with his resistance. While the Royal Academy did feature small numbers of foreign artists in their annual exhibitions, it was primarily dealers and commercial spaces that brought Continental art to London and created a market for it. Both Andrew Heywood and Anne Anderson, in their studies of Quilter's fierce opposition to Aestheticism (most famously in his essay "The Gospel of Intensity"), note that Quilter's negative reaction was largely in response to the practical effects of the fashion for Aesthetic commodities as opposed to the ideals of its leading spokesmen and artists.⁵⁷ Similarly, Quilter's opposition to modern French art seems to be based, at least in part, on his concern about the commodification of the art market, in particular the practices of advertising, such as sandwich boards, elaborate catalogues, posters, and

most especially the increasingly symbiotic relations between commercial galleries and the periodical press.⁵⁸

Quilter explores this theme at great length in two substantial articles from the mid-1890s: “Apologia Pro Arte Meâ,” in the *New Review* in 1894 and “The Relation of Criticism to Production in Art” in the *National Review* in 1895. While he was no longer a regular art critic by this point (in fact, he was running a boarding school), he was still a regular contributor to various journals. These particular articles seem to have been inspired by two recent experiences. In 1893, Quilter had become involved in the controversy over the exhibition of Degas’s painting *L’Absinthe*, which generated a long and very public debate over the aesthetic standards on which a work should be judged and the role of the art critic, pitting New Critics MacColl, Moore, and Stevenson against the self-described Philistines J. A. Spender and Harry Quilter.⁵⁹ In the following year he experienced such issues in an even more personal way, when his one-man show at the Dudley Gallery resulted in a wildly heterogeneous critical response:

The Scotsman discovered that I was inspired by Mr Whistler (Heaven save the mark!); *The Standard* discovered in me a disciple of the *plein air* school; *The Westminster Gazette* suggested the New English Art Club; *The Telegraph* “Stott of Oldham”; *The Graphic* found that my work recalled “Van Goyen”: *Black and White* was reminded by it of David Cox; and one glorious paper boldly asserted that I had tried to paint according to the canons of Holman Hunt, Walter Sickert, Richard Wane, Claude Monet, E. Bretnall [probably *Brewtnall*], Theodore Rousel [probably *Rowsell*], Aumonier and Rossetti.⁶⁰

Such different, even contradictory, assessments of the same work, Quilter concludes, proved that art criticism was not fulfilling its proper function; “Dear readers, this is not a joke . . . This is the deliberate, conscientious, cultured opinion of your art teachers – men who tell you day by day what you should, aesthetically speaking, eat, drink, and avoid.”⁶¹

Motivated by these two events, Quilter writes to address what he sees as the paradox of the contemporary art market: more and more people claim to be interested in art and yet the basic skills of workmanship and craft have decayed to the point that “there is scarcely a single article sold in London shops which is not in one or other of its aspects a fraud and a sham.”⁶² What accounts for this situation? Quilter blames the influence of the market, in the form of the picture dealer and the press, and in particular the collusion between two that led to blurring the

distinction between review and publicity, a concern shared, somewhat ironically, with Clausen. Quilter explained:

It must not be forgotten that the great medium for the distribution of advertisements is the same as the great medium for the distribution of criticism – *i.e.* the Press; and in a department of industry which exercises so many workers *as* that of art, the proprietors of a paper cannot afford, or think they cannot afford, to offend those whose advertisements are a continual source of profit.⁶³

As a result, “critics are forced, or at all events tempted, to bestow upon the exhibition, for instance, of large picture dealers . . . an amount of praise and attention which are frequently very undeserved,” while ignoring “artists and exhibitions which are not directly connected with advertisement,” thus implying a connection between the announcements by dealers, frame makers, colourmen, and others that littered the front and back matter of art periodicals and exhibition reviews.⁶⁴ Quilter here explicitly identifies a “dealer-critic” system, but makes the crucial addition of the editor and the advertising pages as the financial intermediaries between the parties. While he does not provide documentation of a widespread practice, he backs up this assertion with a personal account of having direct editorial pressure to write a better review brought to bear on him when he was an art critic for “a great paper,” presumably *The Times*, and notes that such pressures on critics have only increased since then.⁶⁵ But even if critics are not actually forced to toe the line, he adds, they can be tempted to partiality by many means. Critics are poorly paid, and there are many ways in which the “moneyed dealer . . . can make the critic’s path pleasant,” including providing him with the ideas and evaluations that make up his “review.”⁶⁶

Even more insidious, perhaps, in Quilter’s schema, is the fashion-driven New Journalism, which rewards novelty and “good copy” over truth, makes appeal to the greatest numbers of readers its highest value, and privileges partisan opinion over objective evaluation by introducing the signed review.⁶⁷ The issue of anonymous versus signed reviews had been debated throughout the century, with the practice of signed reviews becoming more common in the 1860s, with the founding of the *Fortnightly Review* upon that principle.⁶⁸ By the 1870s, Prettejohn states, professional art criticism could be distinguished from generalist criticism because the “names and credentials” of the professionals “were known in public” whereas the generalists “remained anonymous.”⁶⁹ Quilter acknowledges that there are advantages to the new system, but

argues that the major disadvantage is that “the critic is not conditioned by the importance of his periodical, by the necessity of not committing it to partial or indefensible statements.”⁷⁰ Released from this editorial responsibility, critics are free to write what they please, and the focus on sensational or entertaining content means that editors are likely judge these contributions on their “literary-plus-journalistic value” rather than the content or accuracy of their aesthetic judgments.⁷¹

This loss of fair-minded reviewing is a disaster for art, according to Quilter, because the critic is, or should be, the only disinterested party in the circuit of production and consumption, “placed between the picture-buyer and the picture-producer for the express purpose of gauging the artistic value of the latter’s achievement and interpreting its meaning to the world at large.”⁷² As the case of dealer-editor Thomson makes clear, of course, the critic’s impartiality may have been compromised from the moment of his hire. But whatever the pressure brought to bear, Quilter argues that the corruption of disinterested criticism leads to the acceptance of a false standard of aesthetic value, one driven by the logic of fashion, rather than that of quality. This is bad for viewers, who never develop any real taste, because it is “impossible for the general reader,” that is, the reader unaware of the specific connections between editors and advertisers, to tell the difference between genuine criticism and dealer-sponsored criticism.⁷³ But it is especially bad for artists; if an artist happens to catch the public’s fancy, he gets stuck in a rut: “when a painter to-day makes a hit, as the phrase is, with a certain subject, the pressure brought to bear upon him by the Press, the art patron, and to a greater degree still, the picture-dealer, practically forces him to a repetition *usque ad nauseam* of the same matter.”⁷⁴ Quilter is, in effect, arguing here against the speculative market’s focus on artists’ “careers” rather than individual “canvases,” to borrow the words of White and White. Rather than seeing this move as one that offers painters more control over their careers as White and White do, he sees it as a trap:

if Mr. Henry Moore were to abandon seascapes and paint a landscape or an interior, nine people out of ten would fail to recognize his work; ninety-nine out of a hundred would refuse to admire it. No dealer would offer him more than half price for the picture, and the critics . . . would lament his backsliding.⁷⁵

Artists have become brand names, identified with specific subjects and styles and unable to advance or change. Even worse, some artists don’t ever develop their own ideas, but paint solely for the market, aiming at the fashion of the day, at present “the new-Gallic school of painting” which appeals to journalists because “it was novel, it was

foreign, it was enlightened.”⁷⁶ The result has been the destruction of the British artistic tradition, as artists learn “You must, if you would appear in the decent drawing rooms of Art, give crude English oak a lick of the best French polish, or at least of its American imitators.”⁷⁷

References to the dealer-critic system operate as a rhetorical device in these and other of Quilter’s writings, serving two polemical purposes. First, by revealing the inner workings of the system, he establishes his own credentials as a critic dedicated to the truth, and his own freedom from such pressures. Indeed, Quilter’s anecdote regarding pressure he faced from an editor who wanted him to write a better review of an engraving sent to the editorial office concludes with the critic unable to persuade his editor to change his practices, but with “permission to give up that portion of my work.”⁷⁸ In other words, Quilter suggests, such influences are still at work, but he is not subject to them. This is part of a larger strategy of self-conscious “Philistinism” adopted by Quilter and other conservative critics of the era (and one that is still familiar today): the loud and vehement insistence on the speaker’s refusal to be influenced by fashion and daring to speak the truth, or “common sense,” known to ordinary folk.

It also gives him an explanation for the popularity of Impressionist art, which, despite critical opposition like his, had steadily made inroads upon British taste and artistic practice, accepted even at the Royal Academy.⁷⁹ By blaming dealers and the press for the popularity of modern French art, Quilter aligns it with fashion and commercial culture, the opposites of true art in his scheme. Notably, Clausen also lamented the increasing association of Impressionism with “advertising” but in his case he pointed the finger at his exhibiting venue, the artists’ run society The New English Art Club, and turned to his dealer for solace.⁸⁰ That two participants in the same milieu could offer such different diagnoses of the perceived symptoms underscores the strategic nature of Quilter’s critique of the dealer-press nexus. Quilter challenged the new styles and modes of criticism on precisely those grounds on which modern art and critics claim to distinguish themselves from the Philistines: individual taste and adherence to aesthetics over convention. In Quilter’s terms, “taste” becomes not a sign of distinction but a fickle and changeable fashion, ironically both “personal” and dictated by the fluctuations of an always changing consumer economy.

But the implications of this critique go beyond the merely tactical. Quilter’s opposition to Impressionist art was, in part, an anti-commercial critique, aimed at the very values of originality and newness that become such important markers of modern aesthetic success. Linking the success of new foreign styles to the New Journalism, with its interest in the new and the topical, as well as to the

new form of the commercial gallery, situated in shopping districts of the West End, and based on an economy of rapidly changing exhibitions designed to draw the casual shopper's attention, Quilter takes aim not only at foreign influence, but at the very heart of the new field of cultural production, and the aesthetic values it supported. Opposition to French art and its influence was not always or only an act of provincialism or lack of taste; the increasingly cosmopolitan and unabashedly commercial art institutions that brought such work to public attention in Britain conditioned at least some of the critical resistance to such forms.

'Arry, in turn, became a figure of fun in the writings of Whistler, George Moore, and, later, Clive Bell not simply because he was an easy target, but because he was useful for their rhetorical claims.⁸¹ The *New Critics*, too, used charges of partiality and personal bias as weapons against the conservative critic. Whistler's sartorial critique of Quilter as an "amazing 'arrangement' in strong mustard-and-cess," was driven even further by George Moore, who at the height of the debate over *L'Absinthe* in 1893, wrote, "The Philistine is universal, 'Arry is local. The Philistine is the genus; 'Arry is the species . . . The Philistine is often dapper, neat, retiring; 'Arry is always in loud checks, jingling his shekels."⁸² 'Arry becomes the very embodiment of the lack of taste, signified by his lower-middle-class clothing, the dropped "H" of his name, and his jingling Jewish "shekels." The cloak of objectivity, it would seem, was no longer available to any one, and criticism became a contest of personal taste and its accompanying signifiers.

Conclusion

These episodes in the history of criticism and the art market offer several insights into an emergent, but still contested system of cooperation between different, yet closely related, agents in the system of production and circulation that characterized the London art world at the end of the nineteenth century. First, they point to some of the specific forms connections between the press and the market could take: personal and professional networks of friendship, the financial pressures of advertising and circulation on editorial content, and the fluidity of roles in the not yet fully professionalized art market, which meant that a single individual might be both dealer and editor, critic and artist. Secondly, it demonstrates that this system of cooperation was crucial to the reconfiguration of the London-based art market to encompass a broader range of goods; more specifically, the inclusion of progressive continental art within the strategies of validation,

approbation, and taste making that had been initially developed to cohere and encourage the concept of a British school but were now further refined and strengthened to promote the work of Whistler, the Impressionists, and other related artists with evident ties to France. While this system of cooperation had a demonstrable effect in terms of reshaping the market, Quilter's criticism reveals points of resistance against both the new goods flowing through London and the means by which these came to be valued. Yet, Quilter's reaction notwithstanding, these links between press and commercial sphere underscore the tightly knit nature of London's cultural scene (a point reiterated by such phenomenon as gentlemen's clubs and the social rituals of tea and visiting hours) and, moreover, indicate a contrast from Paris, where, according to David Galenson and Robert Jensen's revisionist critique of White and White, "artists, not dealers, . . . proved to be the true entrepreneurs of an emerging systems of multiple salons."⁸³ In the London context discussed here, no one figure or type emerges as the sole catalyst. Moreover, the rise of dealers showing contemporary art and the frequency by which such exhibitions were reviewed by critics demonstrates that the changes Galenson and Jensen situate in the early 1870s in Paris were fairly complete in London by this date. Indeed, the French Impressionist painters were well aware of the London system and, as Petra Chu has demonstrated, willingly sought it out in hopes of financial reward.

Thirdly, this study of two actors, Thomson and Quilter, in that London-based system, embedded in an international network, reveals that both were cognizant of the potential of such connections between press and market, both within and without. Thomson used them to promote the artists he represented, while Quilter deplored the effects of such machinations, but both men were clearly consciously aware of the system *as* a system. Their differing judgments on the ethics and effects of that system were, perhaps, the result of their different positions, both structurally and aesthetically. As a proponent of and dealer in new forms of art, Thomson saw the press as an opportunity for the goods from France he had access to via Goupil; as a defender of the British school and a generalist critic, Quilter saw the increasingly partisan criticism and the connections between the press and the market as a threat. Both were, of course, correct.

One of the most notable features of this emergent dealer-critic system, then, was the increasing importance of individual credibility, of claiming the high ground of distinction and discernment, for dealers, artists, and critics. This reminds us that the rise of the dealer-critic system was the product of human action and interaction, rather than the inescapable rise of commercial forces. But the increased focus on named

individuals was also a structural change. The heightened value placed on originality and the fracturing of the national public into niche markets during this period meant that “personal taste” became the surest guide to aesthetic quality. As Pierre Bourdieu describes the logic of this new cultural field of production:

For the author, the critic, the art dealer, the publisher or the theatre manager, the only legitimate accumulation consists in making a name for oneself, a known, recognized name, a capital of consecration implying a power to consecrate objects (with a trademark or signature) or persons (through publication, exhibition, etc.) and therefore to give value.⁸⁴

Signed reviews by “brand name” critics thus became one of the marketplace’s primary means of consecration. But in these early moments of the field’s construction, before the importance of credentials and rules for avoiding “conflict of interest” were fully codified, this system also left critics vulnerable to charges of partiality or even economic complicity. As an article entitled “On Sectarianism in Criticism” in *The Studio* in 1913 complained:

Each faction of art workers attaches to itself a kind of tame reporter who is told to advertise its particular dogmas and to abuse the creed of every other faction, and no faction cares whether its pet critic is ignorant or not so long as he is sufficiently obsequious.⁸⁵

The use of religious language, sectarianism, dogma, and creed, is revealing. Art is becoming a matter of faith, with each faction seemingly blinded by conviction from perceiving how their actions were driven by self interest, each proclaiming to be the true believers. If Quilter perhaps proclaimed more strenuously than Thomson, they both worked determinedly toward their goals. And if they ever recognized themselves as self-interested commercial actors rather than true prophets, they worked to counter such perceptions with strategies of invisibility that cloaked the close financial relationships between writers and dealers. Decrying the “dealer-critic” system was one such tactic, allowing for the possibility of a rhetoric of objectivity, paradoxically avowed from the position of the named and recognized individual embedded in an interwoven system of art writing and art market. Championing true taste was another, asserted as authentic, select, and unadulterated while yet carefully crafted and marketed, and thus fully ensconced in a financial, as well as rhetorical, system of values.

NOTES

1. Harrison White and Cynthia White, *Canvases and Careers: Institutional Change in the French Painting World* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965; reprint, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992).
2. Albert Boime, "Entrepreneurial Patronage in Nineteenth Century France," in *Enterprise and Entrepreneurs in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century France*, ed. Edward Carter et al (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976), 331–50; Nicholas Green, "Dealing in Temperaments: Economic Transformation of the Artistic Field in France during the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century," *Art History* 10 (March 1987): 59–78; Martha Ward, "Impressionist Installations and Private Exhibitions," *Art Bulletin* 73 (1991): 592–622; Robert Jensen, *Marketing Modernism in Fin-de-Siècle Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994); and Patricia Mainardi, *The End of the Salon: Art and the State in the Early Third Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
3. Our arguments contribute to the ongoing revision of White and White's essential premises, most recently engaged in by David Galenson and Robert Jensen, "Careers and Canvases: The Rise of the Market for Modern Art in Nineteenth-Century Paris," *Current Issues in 19th-Century Art, Van Gogh Studies I* (Zwolle: Waanders Publishers and Amsterdam: Van Gogh Museum, 2007): 137–166.
4. Dianne Sachko Macleod, *Art and the Victorian Middle Class: Money and the Making of Cultural Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 1.
5. Pamela M. Fletcher, "Creating the French Gallery: Ernest Gambart and the Rise of the Commercial Gallery in Mid-Victorian London," *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide* 6/1 (Spring 2007). <http://www.19thc-artworldwide.org/>.
6. Petra ten-Doesschate Chu, "The Lu(c)re of London: French Artists and Art Dealers in the British Capital, 1859–1914," in *Monet's London: Artists' Reflections on the Thames 1859–1914* (St Petersburg, Florida: Museum of Fine Arts, 2005), 39–54.
7. George Landow, "There Began to be a Great Talking about the Fine Arts," *The Art and Mind of Victorian England*, ed. Josef L. Altholz (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1976), 122–45, 188–92; Trevor Fawcett and Clive Phillpot, eds. *The Art Press: Two Centuries of Art Magazines*, Art Documents, no. 1 (London: The Art Book Company, 1976); Helene Roberts, "Exhibition and Review: The Periodical Press and the Victorian Art Exhibition System," *The Victorian Periodical Press: Samplings and*

- Soundings*, ed. Joanne Shattock and Michael Wolff (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1982), 79–107.
8. Roberts, “Exhibition and Review;” Julie Codell, “*The Century Guild Hobby Horse*, 1884–1894,” *Victorian Periodicals Review* 16:2 (Summer 1983): 43–53; Leila Rumbagh Greiman, “William Ernest Henley and *The Magazine of Art*,” *Victorian Periodicals Review* 16:2 (Summer 1983): 53–64; Julie Codell, “Moderate Praise: The Contribution to Art Criticism of *The Portfolio*,” *Victorian Periodicals Review* 20 (1987): 83–93; Julie Codell, “Marion Harry Spielmann and the Role of the Press in the Professionalization of Artists,” *Victorian Periodicals Review* 22 (1989): 7–15; Julie Codell, “The Artist’s Cause at Heart: Marion Harry Spielmann and the Late Victorian Art World,” *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 71 (1989): 139–63; Julie Codell, “*The Fine Arts Quarterly* and Art Politics in the 1860s,” *Victorian Periodicals Review* 23 (Fall 1990): 91–97; Julie Codell, “The Aura of Mechanical Reproduction: Victorian Art and the Press,” *Victorian Periodicals Review* 24:1 (Spring 1991): 4–10; Debra Mancoff, “Samuel Carter Hall: Publisher as Promoter of the High Arts,” *Victorian Periodicals Review* 24:1 (Spring 1991): 11–21.
 9. Shearer West, “Tom Taylor, William Powell Frith, and the British School,” *Victorian Studies* 33:2 (Winter 1990): 307–326; Mancoff, “Samuel Carter Hall;” Elizabeth Prettejohn, “Aesthetic Value and the Professionalization of Victorian Art Criticism 1837–78,” *Journal of Victorian Culture* 2 (Spring 1997): 71–94.
 10. Dianne Sachko Macleod, “F. G. Stephens, Pre-Raphaelite Critic and Art Historian,” *Burlington Magazine* 128 (1986): 398–406. Julie L’Enfant, *William Rossetti’s Art Criticism: The Search for Truth in Victorian Art* (Landham, MD: University Press of America, 1998).
 11. For more on the trial, see Linda Merrill, *A Pot of Paint: Aesthetics on Trial in Whistler v. Ruskin* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992).
 12. Prettejohn, 78.
 13. P. G. Hamerton, *The Portfolio* XXI (1890): 2; quoted in Codell, “Moderate Praise,” 84.
 14. Martha Ward, “From Art Criticism to Art News: Journalistic Reviewing in Late-Nineteenth-Century Paris,” in *Art Criticism and Its Institutions in Nineteenth Century France*, ed. Michael R. Orwicz (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), 162–181. On the impact of New Journalism on Spielmann’s criticism, see Codell, “Marion Harry Spielmann and the Role of the Press.”
 15. White and White, *Canvases and Careers*, 96; Helene Roberts, “Exhibition and Review,” 87.

16. On the influence artists had on critics, see: Macleod, "F. G. Stephens;" and Codell, "The Artist's Cause at Heart."
17. Millais felt the sting more personally in 1859 when, having deliberately set his prices too high for dealers in an attempt to retain the entire profit from his pictures, he was left without defenders against hostile criticism, belatedly realizing that "When I sold my works to the dealers they were my friends, and counteracted this artistic detraction." Quoted in John Guille Millais, *The Life and Letters of Sir John Everett Millais* (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1899), 1: 304, 341; quoted in Jeremy Maas, *Gambart: Prince of the Victorian Art World* (London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1975), 124.
18. Kate Flint, *The Victorians and Visual Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 185–88; Fletcher.
19. Shearer West explains that in the pamphlet that Taylor wrote regarding the *Railway Station*, he justified the large sum that Frith received for the work because of his "Liberal belief in such independent ventures. As a commission from a dealer, shown in a private gallery, the *Railway Station*, could be seen to be offering a direct challenge to the tyrannical stronghold of the Royal Academy, whose annual exhibition was running at the same time. Taylor's enthusiasm for the market forces increasingly dominating British art was part of his oft-repeated belief that the new middle-class businessmen of the North of England, by purchasing and commissioning modern British art, were making works of the British School more desirable and marketable." West, 316.
20. Lisa Tickner, "English Modernism in the Cultural Field," in *English Art 1860–1914: Modern Artists and Identity*, ed. David Peters Corbett and Lara Perry (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 25–6.
21. For an expanded analysis of Thomson's career and his role in shaping late Victorian taste, see, Anne Helmreich, "The Art Dealer and Taste: The Case of David Croal Thomson and the Goupil Gallery, 1885–1897," *Visual Culture in Britain* 6:2 (2005): 31–49.
22. For the latter, see, Anne Helmreich, "The Marketing of Helen Allingham: The English Cottage and National Identity," in *Gendering Landscape Art*, eds. Steven Adams and Anna Gruetzner Robins (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 45–60. Huish contributed to S. Bing's journal *Artistic Japan* and also published *Is Japanese Art Extinct* (1888) and *Japan and its Art* (1889).
23. Julie Codell, "Moderate Praise."
24. Greiman, 57.
25. Julie Codell, "Marion Harry Spielmann and the Role of the Press," 7, 9, 13, 14.
26. Greiman, 54.

27. James McNeill Whistler to David Croal Thomson, 5 April 1892 [?], Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Pennell-Whistler Collection, LC2/1765-6, from *The Correspondence of James McNeill Whistler, 1855-1903*, edited by Margaret F. MacDonald, Patricia de Montfort and Nigel Thorp; including *The Correspondence of Anna McNeill Whistler, 1855-1880*, edited by Georgia Toutziari, accessed online via <http://www.whistler.arts.gla.ac.uk/correspondence>.
28. Thomas Agnew and Sons originally championed contemporary English pictures but by the 1870s anticipated the growing market interest among extremely wealthy collectors, such as E.C. Guinness, for Old Masters and eighteenth-century English paintings. Records of the Printsellers Association reveal the significant role played by both Agnew's and Goupil in the print market; William Agnew, for example, served as president of the Print Sellers Association and Thomson served on its committee.
29. See, for example, "The Revolutionist's Bride, Paris," from the painting by F. H. Kaemmerer (Goupilgravure by Boussod, Valadon & Co.), *Art Journal* n.s. 56 (1894), and "The Morning after the Fête," from the painting by Ludwig Knaus (Goupilgravure by Boussod, Valadon & Co.), *Art Journal* n.s. 57 (1895).
30. For more on the *Art Journal*, see the forthcoming study by Katherine Haskins, tentatively titled "Making Art News: The Art Journal and the Periodical Press in Great Britain" as well as Mancoff and George Landow, "The Art Journal, 1850-1880: Antiquarians, the Medieval Revival, and the Reception of Pre-Raphaelitism," *The Pre-Raphaelite Review* 2 (1979): 71-76. For more on the importance of reproductive prints for the Victorian art press, see Julie Codell, "The Aura of Mechanical Reproduction" and Martha Tedeschi, "How Prints Work: Reproductions, Originals and their Markets in England, 1840-1900" (Ph.D. diss., Northwestern University, 1994).
31. "International Exhibition, 1862, Pictures of the British School," *The Art Journal* n.s. 1 (1862): 152.
32. *The Art Journal* (London: Virtue and Co., 1906), 13-14.
33. Julie Codell, "The *Fine Arts Quarterly Review* and Art Politics in the 1860s," 92.
34. Helene Roberts, "Exhibition and Review: The Periodical Press and the Victorian Art Exhibition System," 80.
35. Codell notes that this reporting notwithstanding, "*The Portfolio* discounted commercial success as a criterion of worth." Codell, "Moderate Praise," 91.
36. Mancoff, 18.
37. "The Art Journal," 1893, printed announcement, Goupil Gallery Scrapbook, Tate Archive, 739.1.
38. Jean Bernac, "The Caillebotte Bequest to the Luxembourg," *Art Journal* n.s. 57 (1895): 230-232, 208-210, 358-361; "The Barbizon School," *Art Journal*

- n.s. 58 (April 1896): 120; Théodore Duret, "Degas," *Art Journal* n.s. 56 (1894): 204–208. An article on "The Barbizon School" that appeared in the *Art Journal* in April 1896 demonstrates the subtle promotion of Goupil embedded in such reportage. The article ostensibly appeared to be an overview of recent lectures and exhibitions featuring this school; yet, nestled at the heart of the article was an accolade devoted to a recent exhibition "Twenty Masterpieces of the Barbizon School of Painters," held at Goupil and described as a "score of masterpieces, the choicest specimens."
39. Walter Sickert described this exhibition as "the timeliest & most effective blow in favor of the form of work which we all have at heart." David Croal Thomson Papers, Getty Research Institute Research Library, Special Collections and Visual Resources, Accession no. 910126
 40. David Croal Thomson, "The Barbizon School, Jean Baptiste Corot," *Magazine of Art* 11 (1888): 182; David Croal Thomson, "J. B. C. Corot," (London: The Goupil Gallery, February and March 1889), 4. Thomson generally recycled his articles on the Barbizon artists as prefatory essays for the Goupil Gallery exhibition catalogues for these painters.
 41. David Croal Thomson, *Corot* (London, Paris, New York: The Studio, n.d. [1914]), 3.
 42. David Croal Thomson Papers, Getty Research Institute Research Library, Special Collections and Visual Resources, Accession no. 910126.
 43. *Ibid.*
 44. David Croal Thomson to James McNeill Whistler, 23 January 1893, Glasgow University Library, MS Whistler T114, <http://www.whistler.arts.gla.ac.uk/correspondence>.
 45. D. S. MacColl, "Mr. Whistler's Paintings in Oil," *The Art Journal* n.s. 55 (1893): 89, 93.
 46. Letter from George Clausen to David Croal Thomson, 31 January 1895, Sir George Clausen Correspondence, Pressmark 86 YY 19, National Art Library, Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
 47. For more on the volume of art production in late nineteenth-century London, see, Julie Codell, "Artists' Professional Societies: Production, Consumption and Aesthetics," *Towards a Modern Art World*, ed. Brian Allen (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995), 169–187.
 48. Julie Codell, *The Victorian Artist, Artists' Lifewritings in Britain, ca. 1870–1910* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 10–11.
 49. James Little's essay on Peppercorn's career, published in 1896, pointed, not incidentally, to the exhibitions at Goupil for bringing to the public's attention "the work of a master; of an independent thinker and worker." James Stanley Little, "A. D. Peppercorn," *The Art Journal* n.s. 58 (July 1896): 202.

50. Highlighting these individuals helped to feed the perception that the *Art Journal* catered to the “wealthier classes,” a point of view articulated by the founders of the *Magazine of Art* who positioned their journal as aimed at “the mass of the public.” Greiman, 54.
51. R. A. M. Stevenson, “Sir John Day’s Pictures,” *The Art Journal* n.s. 55 (1893): 261–265; 309.
52. “The Goupil Galleries in London,” *Art Annual* (1895).
53. David Solkin, ed. *Art on the Line: The Royal Academy Exhibitions at Somerset House* (New Haven: published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art and the Courtauld Institute Gallery by Yale University Press, 2001).
54. James Abbott McNeill Whistler, *The Gentle Art of Making Enemies* (New York: John W. Lovell Co, 1890), 72.
55. Harry Quilter, “The Apologia of Art,” *The Cornhill Magazine* (1879), reprinted in *Opinions on Men, Women and Things* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1909), 179, 181.
56. Harry Quilter, “The Apologia of Art,” 181.
57. Andrew Heywood, “The Gospel of Intensity: ‘Arry, William Morris and the Aesthetic Movement,” *The Journal of the William Morris Society* 13:3 (Fall 1999): 14–25; Anne Anderson, “‘Doing As We Like’: Grant Allen, Harry Quilter, and Aesthetic Dogma,” *Journal of Design History* 18:4 (2005): 335–55.
58. These strategies, for example, were used with respect to Whistler’s retrospective at the Goupil Gallery.
59. Ronald Pickvance, “*L’Absinthe* in England,” *Apollo* n.s. 77:15 (1963), 395–8; Kate Flint, “The Philistine and the New: J. A. Spender on Art and Morality,” in *Papers for the Millions: The New Journalism in Britain, c. 1850–1914*, ed. Joel Wiener (New York: Greenwood Press, 1988), 211–24.
60. Harry Quilter, “Apologia Pro Arte Meâ; Being a Comment on Some Contemporary Criticisms,” *The New Review* (1894), reprinted in *Opinions on Men, Women and Things* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1909), 278.
61. Quilter, “Apologia Pro Arte Meâ,” 279.
62. Harry Quilter, “The Relation of Criticism to Production in Art,” *The National Review* (1895), reprinted in *Opinions on Men, Women and Things* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1909), 243.
63. Quilter, “The Relation of Criticism,” 245.
64. Quilter, “The Relation of Criticism,” 245.
65. As editor of the *Universal Review*, Quilter experienced these pressures first hand, and attributed the financial failure of the journal to his lack of experience with and accommodation of the norms of advertising: “I had found it hard enough in earlier days to ask editors for work, but the idea of going round, hat in hand, to ask for advertisements, and of constructing my journal from the point of view of the advertising tradesman, seemed

- (and seems) quite out of the question." Harry Quilter, "The Universal Review, A Chapter in an Unfinished Biography," *Opinions on Men, Women and Things* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1909), 395.
66. Harry Quilter, "The Relation of Criticism," 247.
 67. Harry Quilter, "A Review of Reviewing," *Literature* (1901), reprinted in *Opinions on Men, Women and Things* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1909), 118.
 68. Mary Ruth Hiller, "The Identification of Authors: The Great Victorian Enigma," *Victorian Periodicals: A Guide to Research*, ed. J. Don Vann and Rosemary T. VanArsdel (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1978), 126.
 69. Prettejohn, 79.
 70. Quilter, "A Review of Reviewing," 118.
 71. *Ibid.*
 72. Quilter, "Apologia Pro Arte Meâ," 287
 73. Quilter, "The Relation of Criticism," 246.
 74. Quilter, "Apologia Pro Arte Meâ," 284
 75. *Ibid.*, 284-5.
 76. Quilter, "The Relation of Criticism," 249
 77. Quilter, "Apologia Pro Arte Meâ," 296
 78. Quilter, "The Relation of Criticism," 246
 79. Anne Helmreich, "John Singer Sargent, *Carnation, Lily, Lily, Rose*, and the Condition of Modernism in England, 1887," *Victorian Studies* 45:3 (Spring 2003): 433-55.
 80. George Clausen to David Croal Thomson, 8 June 1890, "I don't know if it will interest you to know that I've left the new English Art Club. Impressionism and advertising seem to go together – too much so for me- I don't see why I shd show [show crossed out] continue to share the responsibility for proceedings of wh I don't approve. I've protested against it to no effect. – It takes a long time to cut one's wisdom teeth!" Sir George Clausen Correspondence, National Art Library, Victoria & Albert, MSL 1991/4, 86.YY.19.
 81. Whistler, *The Gentle Art of Making Enemies*, 72-3, 113-14, 121-23; George Moore, "The New Art Criticism," *The Speaker*, 25 March 1893, 341-2; Clive Bell, *Art* (1914), reprinted in Kate Flint, *The Impressionists in England: The Critical Heritage* (London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984), 238.
 82. George Moore, "The New Art Criticism," *The Speaker*, 25 March 1893, 341.
 83. Galenson and Jensen, 148, 160.
 84. Pierre Bourdieu, "The Production of Belief: Contribution to an Economy of Symbolic Goods," *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, ed. Randal Johnson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 75
 85. "The Lay Figure: On Sectarianism in Criticism," *The Studio*, April 1913, 258.