

2018

Smitten by the Casual Glance of a Pair of Sparking Eyes

Sharon Kong
Chapman University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/vocesnovae>

Recommended Citation

Kong, Sharon (2018) "Smitten by the Casual Glance of a Pair of Sparking Eyes," *Voces Novae*: Vol. 5 , Article 3.
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/vocesnovae/vol5/iss1/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Chapman University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Voces Novae by an authorized editor of Chapman University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact laughtin@chapman.edu.

Voces Novae: Chapman University Historical Review, Vol 4, No 1 (2013)

[HOME](#) [ABOUT](#) [USER HOME](#) [SEARCH](#) [CURRENT](#) [ARCHIVES](#) [PHI ALPHA THETA](#)

[Home](#) > [Vol 4, No 1 \(2013\)](#) > [Kong](#)

Smitten by the Casual Glance of a Pair of Sparking Eyes

Sharon Kong

Drowned, O Where?...

But long it could not be,

Til that her garments heavy with drink

Pulled the poor wench to her melodious lay

To muddy death. - Hamlet Act IV, Scene VII

She lay in the river, peaceful, restful, hands limply clutching at peonies and poppies, the flowers of death. Her infamous coppery hair flows behind her, crowning her in death. Ophelia, as modeled by Elizabeth Siddal, is forever a part of the character's canon in popular iconography. Siddal, therefore, has also become entrenched in the repertoire of art historians. But who was the model behind the character? Who gave the face to the name? Beyond Siddal's ability to provide a physical manifestation for the alluring Shakespearean character, she unintentionally fell in line with another iconic canon of historiography: the New Woman.

Elizabeth Eleanor Siddal (1839-1862) was mostly forgotten woman of the early Victorian Era in Great Britain. She is often only remembered by art historians as a model for the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, a British avant-garde art movement of the mid-19th century, and as the enigmatic wife of artist Dante Gabriel Rossetti. During Siddal's time, the Royal Academy of Art was the dominant educator of artists in 19th century Britain. The curriculum of the Academy was extremely precise, even formulaic, which, in turn, produced paintings that were inflexible in their aesthetics. In 1848, a group of artists sought to break from the conventions of the Academy and restore the realist elements of art prior to Raphael Santi.^[1] This young group, famously headed by Dante Gabriel Rossetti, William Holman Hunt, John Everett Millais, and William Michael Rossetti, were called the Pre-Raphaelites and were the first British avant-garde movement. Siddal sat for such painters of Pre-Raphaelite Movement as John Everett Millais and Walter Deverell, as well as her husband, Rossetti. She was regarded as a striking, though somehow flawed beauty, not the traditional model of beauty during her time. Apart from her model reputation and her eventual marriage to Rossetti, Siddal was responsible for a rather large repertoire of paintings, sketches, and poetry created as a product of her tutelage with Rossetti and a short but meaningful stint at the Sheffield School of Art. However, the tragic end of her life overshadowed the accomplishments Siddal achieved in her craft. Her works of art and poetry are, now, mostly neglected. Though some of her art remains on display in various museums across Britain and they carry a small notoriety following her name, Siddal's reputation and personal bouts with the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, especially with her husband, continue to entrench the tragic muse persona. As this muse, it is believed that her sole purpose and the main focus of her life lies in the role of feeding Rossetti's genius at the expense of her emotional stability, health, and sanity.

Most modern scholarship and contemporary commentaries have concentrated largely on the artists for which Siddal sat, and for which she was a kind of ethereal but dispensable muse. However, the public life that Siddal herself publicized and encouraged to circulate suggested something beyond her ability to model. Whether observed in the professionalism of her work or in the manner in which she dressed, Siddal's personal contributions, that she chose to circulate, deviated from the societal norm of the time. Embodying characteristics

Sharon Kong

beyond the contemporary viewpoint of women Siddal, herself, did not contribute her personal afflictions nor did she wish to advertise them to the public. The sad state of her physical and mental health was not meant to lend itself to her public image, but rather, the constant gossiping, plentiful personal correspondence, and urban folklore inextricably intertwined itself with Siddal's life, so that in modernity it is nearly impossible to distinguish her personal contributions and her personal life. While her private endeavors and afflictions did fall in line with her muse reputation and would therefore postulate her subservience to men, her public professionalism displayed a woman outside typical Victorian conventions. Her personal life was the more colorful and alluring of the Siddal narratives, but in her public persona, Siddal can be seen as prefiguring the so-called New Woman of the late 19th century, as an accidental feminist before her time.

Towards the close of the 19th century, a social phenomenon occurred surrounding women who deviated from the societal norm of the time. She was the antithesis of the traditional Victorian woman, an explicit rejection of the cult of domesticity which encouraged women to remain within the parameters of the home and proper standards to public socializing. The "New Woman," as first defined by writer and public speaker, Sarah Grand, in 1894 became a cultural icon of the fin de siècle that significantly impacted society.^[2] Grand sought to challenge and redefine the gender roles that defined the time. She amusingly pointed out the characteristics of the New Woman, noting the male reaction to the novel phenomenon. "We shall be afflicted with short hair, coarse skins, unsymmetrical figures, loud voices, tastelessness in dress, and an unattractive appearance and character generally, and then he will not love us this is one of the most amusing of his threats..."^[3]

The New Woman was "Amazonian" and "mannish"^[4] both in her choice of hairstyle (cropped very short like a young boy's) and her clothing (trousers that allowed for better movement in sports like bicycle riding). Purging long hair and long skirts and wearing "unsexed" styles of clothing afforded these women with mobility. Their bodies were not constrained by corsets or covered by skirts suggesting a not only literal freedom but a metaphysical one that gave women the power to determine how they wanted to look and what they could put on their bodies. The earliest publicized image of these newly clad women was deemed the "Gibson Girl."^[5] Named for artist Charles Gibson, the Gibson Girl's newly revealing bodies offered freedom, control, and above all flirtatiousness. This suggestion of recently discovered sexuality was the most shocking of reactions in relation to women's dress at this point in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Images of the Gibson Girl were sensual and suggestive, placing the loose skirt and shirtwaist on view. These fashions directly clashed with the generation before who sported heavy petticoats, constricting corsets, and opulent ornaments. Paralleling growing popularity with Marxist and Socialist ideologies regarding classlessness and egalitarian societies, the Gibson Girl's dress was class neutral; meaning the wearer of the apparel could be of the working class or the aristocratic class or the middle class.

In 1913, the most famous of New Woman images, the "flapper," revealed more of the New Woman. More skin was exposed, clothing was looser, and women were thinner and flat-chested. Taking a cue from celebrity "it" girls like Clara Bow and Bessie Smith, the flapper version of the New Woman reveled in leisure found in drinking, smoking, and dancing that shattered any semblance of Old World propriety. The flapper, active from 1913 throughout the 1920s, provided the most extreme departure from Victorian values and was the most prominent example of New Woman ideals manifested in clothing and fashion. Despite being condemned by the generation past, New Women, such as the flapper, found peer acceptance which proved to be enough approval to participate in said activities which included participating in a larger consumer culture of make-up application and hair bobbing.^[6] This shows the New Woman's distaste for the traditional but also her free and liberated attitude. While in the previous century the ultimate standard of living lay within the approval of the elder generation, this generation departed from needing said elder approval and thus afforded themselves control of their own happiness.^[7]

Additionally, a key characteristic of the New Woman was entrenched in her economic freedom. Specifically, she accepted and even sought employment outside the home. Even though many women sought external employment, large numbers found work as domestic servants in other households. Others, sought employment in skilled and semi-skilled industries, though these occupations provided little to no union protection or privilege. In the workforce, women had minimal power at all. However, a source of income apart from parents and family offered empowerment to working women.^[8] Wage earners could now live separate from family, creating not only a physical space for women to exercise their own will and power but also an allegiance to oneself as obligations to the family became less of a concern. An independent salary allowed the New Woman to be self-sufficient and to control her own destiny. The freedom to attend to an external occupation whilst making her own salary put the New Woman in a place of self-sufficiency and independence. It must be conceded, however, that the middle to upper class New Woman tended to romanticize the working class woman as a female who had the mobility and economic freedom to create her own destiny, despite the constant hardships prevalent in a non-unionized workplace.^[9] Grand asserted that despite the aversion to the qualities of the New Woman from men, the New Woman would maintain her characteristics, indicating that she did have control over herself.^[10] Now was the time for women to claim their independence, supported by none other than Pre-Raphaelite forefather, John Ruskin. "We have been reproached by Ruskin for shutting ourselves up behind park palings and garden walls, regardless of the waste of the world that moans in misery without, that has been too much our attitude; but the day of our acquiescence is over!"^[11]

In terms of sexual freedom, the New Woman believed women were capable of experiencing the same passion and sexuality that a man could. It was not necessary to put a bridle on women's sexual freedoms merely because she belonged to the female gender. For the New Woman, it no longer was a question of staying within the parameters of traditional "love-making" and courting, but experiencing and practicing revolutionary means to achieve sexuality. Grand partially blamed the female naiveté regarding sexuality, stating that it attributed to the confinement of women sexually and did not allow them to fully reach their potential of freedom. But once that freedom was recognized, it allowed women to be in control of their own bodies and will to be sexually active. Therefore, women were no longer merely just sexual icons or objects which insinuated control and suppression over them, but rather women controlled their own sexuality and sexual desires, taking the control and power away from men and putting it into the hands of women.^[12] Though the New Woman held this new found sexuality in high regard, it in no way defined their life; sexuality was an aspect of their lives but was no longer the sole determinant of their lives. The New Woman had it in her own agency to determine the importance or unimportance of sexuality or even what was deemed sexual at all. Grand condemned the power of men over women stating, "Of old, if a woman ventured to be at all unconventional, man was allowed to slander her with no imputation that she must be abandoned and he really believed because liberty meant license."^[13] The New Woman and Grand took this liberty off the hands of those slandering men and controlling families and gave the license to themselves to be self-determinant. The New Woman therefore established the move toward a more modern paradigm of gender equality by creating an ambiguous identity that shifted away from traditional Victorian standards of womanhood. Siddal, throughout her lifetime, would publicly embody these characteristics, though unintentionally. Her tragic muse persona and legacy are derived predominantly from her personal life and an era that was not yet ready for such a social catalyst.

Scholarship surrounding Siddal has taken a feminist turn in recent decades, deviating from scholarship prior to the 1980s that depicted Siddal in the artistic shadow of Dante Gabriel Rossetti. She is seen by early biographers as a celebrity model. Violet Hunt, author of *The Wife of Rossetti: Her Life and Death*, written in 1932, wrote about Siddal's life, especially her death as a sensationalist melodrama. Hunt was a British author with a personal connection to the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood; her father was Alfred William Hunt, friend of Rossetti and also associated with the Brotherhood. The tragedy of Siddal's death, which Hunt claimed to be a suicide, contributed to the popular belief that Siddal's ill health was a product of a theatrical, dramatic woman.^[14] Hunt's inclusions in

Sharon Kong

the book, which often times deviated from Siddal completely, relied heavily on the gossip she would overhear concerning Siddal's behavior or afflictions at the time. Her biography, therefore, was built largely on sensationalist hearsay and did not rely on substantial evidence. Rather, Hunt's work was a conglomeration of creative mumblings and murmurings regarding Siddal, which only garnered credibility and legitimacy out of Hunt's personal relationship with Siddal. Georgina Burnes-Jones, a contemporary of Siddal's and wife of Rossetti's confidante, Edward Burnes-Jones, wrote in her memoirs of Siddal's ill health. In Burnes-Jones' memoirs she often characterizes Siddal as "poor creature" and "tragic," possessing a "soft wildness."^[15] Since Burnes-Jones had witnessed Siddal's downfall, her insanity was taken as fact, and dominated the literature about Siddal her following her death. Nearly twenty years after Hunt and Burnes-Jones, Ida Proctor published an article addressing the identity and definition of the muse. While commending Siddal for her efforts in pursuing art and poetry, Proctor deemed Siddal's work as amateurish and daintily made.^[16] Proctor, though an early acknowledger of Siddal's talents as an artist and writer, still mostly characterized Siddal as a frail muse.

These sensationalist accounts of Siddal's life, like Violet Hunt's early biography, contributed to later fictitious renditions of Siddal that further entrenched the muse archetype into the model's legacy. In 1975, Siddal's life was featured in the British Broadcasting Company's mini-series, *The Love School: The Brotherhood*. Though it capitalized on the histrionics of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood's world, *The Love School* did not deviate from traditional scholarship on Siddal.^[17] This was not surprising, however, as there was no scholarship at the time that could have suggested anything other than how the show portrayed Siddal.

Scholarship decades later began evolving in towards a more progressive yet still allusive depiction of Siddal. Elizabeth Savage's 1978 novel, *Willowwood*, received incredibly mixed review pertaining to her depiction of both the artists Rossetti and Siddal. Typically a writer of American West novels, Savage's departure from the genre left scholarly readers something much to be desired. The *Christian Science Monitor* reviewed *Willowwood* as a "wild invention," and asked "why bother" with this book. Savage's portrayal of Siddal was as such: Siddal was a woman driven by her own desires and needs, a genius in her own right and a woman who was "only afraid of not living her own life."^[18] However, in similar context of this paper, Siddal fell into the identity of Rossetti's "Blessed Damozel" in order to conform into their romantic relationship, relinquishing her own artistic and professional ambitions. Savage's novel and altogether avant-garde proposal sparked a new wave of feminism pertaining to women in the art world and later fed further assertions that Rossetti's work were often based on Siddal's original ideas. Culturally, Siddal was used in Savage's novel not just as a dramatic figure but as a critique of women in writing and the arts. This marked the start of Siddal's melodramatic persona transforming into a more feminist counterpart.

A More recent preeminent Pre-Raphaelite scholar, Jan Marsh, has attempted to revitalize Siddal's life, not as a complete tragic episode, but rather, as a woman who contributed greatly to the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. In *The Pre-Raphaelite Sisterhood* she has argued that many of the women associated with the artists of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood had the autonomy and power to pursue their own artistic lives.^[19] Marsh contended that Siddal, especially, had her own conscious artistic identity.^[20] In an obituary Marsh quoted from the *Sheffield Telegraph*, she claimed that Siddal considered herself an artist even before she met Rossetti; Marsh asserted that Siddal was not just a projection of Pre-Raphaelite fantasies, but an artist herself. Yet, Marsh still acknowledged that there is very little information of Siddal independent of Rossetti; her identity is sensational in that it affected the artist, and therein lies her historical merit. Marsh stated that any study conducted concerning Siddal's life will always potentially be overshadowed by the story about her.^[21] Lucinda Hawksley reached much the same conclusion though she explored the myth of Siddal's humble origins. Before Hawksley, it was commonly accepted, even during Siddal's time, that she came from the slums. It may have contributed to Siddal's romantic, "damsel in distress" nature and thus her flawed origin story may never have been negated as a result.^[22] Her supposed low-borne status aided in making her existence mythical, and therefore further entrenched an already widely accepted reputation associated with drama, illness, and sadness. Hawksley asserted that Rossetti, born to Italian immigrant

28 Voces Novae, Vol 4, No 1 (2013)

parents, was not much higher born, if at all, than Siddal. Dispelling this chasm in social inequality allowed Siddal to be regarded with fewer mystiques and more objectivity.^[23]

In 1988, Griselda Pollock and Deborah Cherry focused on a "semiotic" Siddal, describing how the image of Siddal as a signal of wider meaning could contribute to further scholarship. The symbol of Siddal was inextricably linked with romance and sexual inclination especially as the portrayed by the Pre-Raphaelites. Again, Siddal was recognized as the inspiration of Rossetti's art - his muse - and thus her reputation maintained as the fuel for Rossetti's genius.^[24] Siddal was acknowledged as being an essential part of the Pre-Raphaelite aesthetic and was placed as a central member of the Pre-Raphaelite circle but still only in her capacity as a muse and model.

In 2009, the BBC returned to the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood again in the mini-series *The Desperate Romantics*. Criticized as being a too sensationalized account of the Brotherhood, the program was nevertheless praised for its portrayal of Siddal, who in the series appeared spirited rather than sickly or tragic.^[25] This particular depiction fell more in line with the modern analysis of Siddal's life, regarding her less as a "Damozele" and more as a woman atypical for the age, though it maintained aspects of her tragic muse persona. It showed that Siddal's legacy, though not completely overshadowed by Rossetti, remained closely tied to the drama of her life with that artist. While Siddal has been called independent, as exhibited by the replication of her in *Desperate Romantics* and possibly a feminist, as postulated by Marsh, the model of the New Woman, and the gender theory that follows those implications, have yet to be applied to her life.

A clear distinction between Siddal's personal and public personas must be made, however. Siddal's public persona entailed a public reputation to which she actively contributed. By producing artwork, poetry, and operating on a professional level, Siddal added to her public persona herself and consciously conferred upon her own reputation the image of a revolutionary woman who was, contemporarily regarded, as strange and affecting, and yet modern. Her personal persona was not a product of her intentional reputation building, but rather was an accidental by-product of gossip and slander. Siddal, herself, did not advertise her fragile relationships or waning health; these issues which would mold her tragic muse identity, were created, perpetuated, and maintained outside of her control. Therefore, while in her known private life she was less of a model for the New Woman, her public persona pointed toward embodying these modern characteristics.

On the 15th of July in the year 1829, Elizabeth Eleanor Siddall, who would later drop the last 'l' in an attempt to sophisticate her given name, was born to parents Charles Crook and Elizabeth Evans Siddall in Hatton Garden, London. Her parents laid claim to a "minor ancestral hall" in Derbyshire, and thus were the filers of numerous lawsuits in pursuit to reclaim their rightful inheritance. All through her life, the younger Elizabeth Siddal was under the impression that she may, one day, inherit the Crossdaggers, the inn that had taken over the previous property in Derbyshire.^[26] Under the illusion all throughout her life that her family had merely fallen from grace, Siddal strove to display a genteel upbringing, lessons her parents were sure to instill in all the Siddall children. "They were taught general lessons about how to behave in public - to eat correctly, to have gracious manners, to converse intellectually, to sit to stand ..."^[27] While her childhood was geared toward the inheritance, Siddal would not see the wealth of the land in her lifetime. Instead, the manners she acquired from home schooling would later serve to impress the artists she encountered. Many of these artists believed Siddal was of slum origins, and thusly they were surprised and pleased by her genteel behavior. As William Rossetti, Siddal's brother-in-law, wrote in 1903, "Elizabeth received an ordinary education, conformable to her condition in life," insinuating Siddal's low class birth.^[28] Aside from his endeavors to settle the inheritance, Charles Siddall owned and operated a cutlery making business which he moved from Hatton Garden to the borough of Southward in London after his daughter's birth. Here, Elizabeth Siddal's younger siblings, Mary, Clara, James, and Henry were born. As a child, Siddal was said to have a particular love for poetry, driven by her discovery of Alfred Lord Tennyson's work printed on a newspaper

Sharon Kong

that had wrapped the family butter. According to popular myth, this is when Siddal became inspired to be a creative poet herself.

Aligning themselves with the social critic, John Ruskin, the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood claimed a vague objective to defy the conventions of the Royal Academy. Some of these Academy principles included: pyramidal composition of figures, the use of opposing sides of clear light and dark composition, and shadow and tone dominating over color.[29] The Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, shortened to the PRB in the artists' signatures, emphasized precise replications of the subject in an almost photographic manner. Particularly, the artists emphasized the subjects in the immediate foreground which typically would be blurred in order to focus attention on the main subject of the painting. In order to reconcile their stark realism with aesthetic pleasure, the Brotherhood inserted typological symbolism, using schemes found in contemporary poetry.[30] Typological symbolism was a popular method of artistry in Victorian Britain. Essentially, it served as a biblical interpretation from Christians that God had placed impressions and foreshadows of Christ on the people of the New Testament. In Victorian literature, typological symbolism allowed for intensely evocative imagery. These additional elements furthered the divide between the PRB and the traditional curriculum of the Royal Academy.

The models used by the PRB artists were often as avant-garde as the art itself. The women featured in the Brotherhood's paintings were not beautiful by Victorian standards, rather were chosen to model because of they were flawed in some way. Siddal, herself, epitomized the strange, almost mythical aesthetic of the PRB. Siddal's red hair and pale visage that bordered on the sickly did not conform to Victorian ideas of beauty. The occupation of modeling itself was of "dubious repute" and because often the occupation involved nudity, no traditionally beautiful woman would degrade herself to that level. So, popular Pre-Raphaelite models were not traditional beauties. Typically, the Brotherhood utilized the image of the "Fallen Woman" in their art that not only indicated prostitution but insinuated sex, sensuality, and desire. Siddal was not the only model to exhibit these characteristics, though she was one of the most famous. Rossetti's mistress after Siddal's death, Jane Morris, was seen as the femme-fatale heiress apparent to Siddal. Morris, like Siddal, had a beauty atypical of contemporary conventions. She had a long jaw, an unusual large mouth, and steeply angled cheekbones. Rossetti adored Morris's features; always emphasizing her large eyes which he claimed was the model's "spiritual being" and the mouth which undoubtedly suggested sensuality.[31] Despite popular aversion to Siddal and Morris's features, the Brotherhood continually painted these women because they provided that "other world" aesthetic that the artists were working so diligently to achieve. This only made the chasm between the PRB and the Academy even wider.

Contemporaries of the Brotherhood found them to be strange and even off-putting. The aesthetic was so starkly different from the Academy that it was either viewed as comical or unattractive. In an art critique featured in the *Eclectic Review* in January of 1856, the writer commented on their "strange quaintness, stiffness, and gratuitous deformity [...] the grotesque, commonplace, and ridiculous"[32] was apparent. The violent, almost retching reaction to the Pre-Raphaelites may possibly suggest that nothing so different or far removed had been exposed to the Victorian public so widely. The Brotherhood's work served as continual fodder for the public to dissect and review. An *Art Journal* Reviewer in 1850 wrote that "the cultural device of art's duty is to instruct and delight, certainly not to disgust." [33] It was not just the content of the paintings and its depictions that disturbed audiences but rather the starkly real renderings of illness, pain, and suffering. The graphic interpretations of taboo subjects in the PRB's paintings were much too extreme and shocking for critics and the public alike.[34]

The link between the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood and the term avant-garde was first made by Heather Lynne Seagroatt in her 1999 book *Stunners: Pre-Raphaelite Sensationalism 1848-1973*. Seagroatt suggested that much of the PRB's aesthetic was influenced by Victorian sensationalism. Sensationalism was a literary phenomenon describing a genre of novels popular in the mid-19th century. There were aimed at a mass market. Seagroatt asserted the reception of the PRB's first sensationalist paintings, once the Brotherhood gained the reputation of

the avant-garde, it only encouraged the further production of sensationalist, and even more shocking materials the public craved. After all, the artists were looking to make a living from their work. For instance, Dante Gabriel Rossetti's painting entitled *Ecce Ancilla Domini!*, or "The Annunciation" diverged from any prior depictions of the holy St. Mary, the Blessed Virgin. Typically, the Virgin was painted as a truly devout woman, contemplating her role in Christ's crusade on earth. In some depictions, she is grateful for this mission of carrying the son of Christ. But in Rossetti's work, he tackled a new perception of the Virgin Mary. In his rendition, the Virgin is cowering away from the angel messenger and frightened at the prospective of pregnancy as well as the loss of her childhood.^[35] This depiction was revolutionary in that it humanized someone associated with the divine. Abigail Newman wrote on Rossetti's innovative interpretation of the Virgin as a child adolescent "laden with the burden" of an enormous task. The young Virgin Mary is slouched against the wall, cowering in the shadow of the angel. Suggesting a traditional pillar of divinity to be a part of any mortal character was far beyond the realm of normality, and thus was far removed from any typical Victorian art.^[36] The avant-garde rendition of the Virgin Mary followed the pattern of Victorian Sensationalism; depicting traditional subjects out of the norm caused incredible mass publicity for Rossetti. Albeit, not all of the reception was positive, but perhaps the Brotherhood was a believer of the modern affirmation, "there's no such thing as bad publicity."

William Allingham, an excise officer in Donegal, was the first to be "smitten by the casual glance of a pair of sparking eyes."^[37] Allingham alerted artist Walter Deverell of the Siddal's existence. Deverell, an unofficial member of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, was accompanying his mother to a shop near Leicester Square, in Cranbourne Alley, when he laid eyes on the woman Allingham had encountered earlier. Siddal was a milliner's assistant working in the back room of the shop. Deverell was so taken by her beauty that he urged his mother to organize an introduction, as was standard for the time, so that she could sit for him as a model for the character Viola in his adaptation of Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night*. Deverell's depictions of her would forever change the young woman's life.^[38] "By Jove! She's like a queen, magnificently tall, with a lovely figure, a stately neck, and a face of the most delicate and finished modeling: the flow of surface from the temples over the cheek is exactly like the carving of a Phidean goddess ..."^[39] In 1849, she became Viola for Deverell, and in 1850, Elizabeth was featured in William Holman Hunt's *Converted British Family Sheltering a Christian Missionary*. The image that would solidify Siddal's reputation in the Pre-Raphaelite art world was Sir John Everett Millais' *Ophelia*, completed in 1852.^[40]

Millais' rendition of the famous character from *Hamlet* is regarded as one of the most accurate representations of Siddal and contributes today to the enduring legacy and interest in her by art historians.^[41] In the same year Siddal sat for Deverell's *Twelfth Night*, she also met another young artist, Dante Gabriel Rossetti. From 1849 to 1852, Siddal sat for a number of the Pre-Raphaelite brothers and was featured as a lead character in many of their paintings. "For a brief while the group assimilated her with the same indifferent enthusiasm as if she had been a sister, an aunt or the wife of a half-brother. She sat for them all."^[42] However, by 1852, she was sitting exclusively for Rossetti.

As early as 1852 Siddal exhibited her own creative intentions. An enigma and reserved in her personal endeavors, Siddal's desire to draw seemed random and unfounded. At the age of twenty, Siddal was a youth of very little outward emotion to anyone other than her suspected lover, Rossetti.^[43] William Rossetti, the brother of Dante Gabriel, knew very little of Siddal's personal character or her previous experience in art, therefore he could not understand Siddal's sudden interest to paint.^[44] The works that Siddal later produced, William Rossetti claimed, was the byproduct of the tutelage solely offered by Dante Rossetti.

Typically, Victorian portraits of women featured them either as fictional characters in a pose associated with them or sitting in repose. The Pre-Raphaelite artists painted Siddal no differently. Siddal, consistently, was drawn in terms of her waning health and fragile frame or her wanton, seductive features. When painted as the former, Siddal was depicted in the style common to Victorian portraits; sitting subtly reclined, with an expression of silent

Sharon Kong

exhaustion on her face. This image of her as an invalid became highly circulated and publicized due to Rossetti's countless interpretations of the weak, meek Siddal. Siddal's paintings and drawings of herself, however, contradicted Rossetti's portraits. She saw herself as an artist, embodying the same creative rigor and passion as Rossetti or any other Pre-Raphaelite Brother. Her sketches observed herself constantly preoccupied with a task, whether it was painting or spinning. Her works rarely found herself in a position of relaxation. She interpreted herself as a woman of industry and artistic professionalism.

Siddal's 1853 drawing depicting Alfred Lord Tennyson's *The Lady Shalott*, provided the clearest commentary on her work. In the poem, Tennyson writes of how Lady Shalott is working at her loom when, at the sudden appearance of the dashing Sir Lancelot, she is shocked, ultimately destroying her works, shattering a mirror, and thus bringing upon herself the curse of superstition. Siddal painted Lady Shalott while still at her spinning wheel, undistracted by the apparition of Lancelot.

The focus of Siddal's drawing is not on her reaction to Lancelot, but instead on her work which emphasizes her dedication to her craft, and suggests a certain degree of artisan's professionalism.^[45] William Holman Hunt, another member of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, would paint the same poem decades later. His interpretation, however, differed greatly from Siddal's; Hunt painted the downfall of Lady Shalott, focusing on her unfortunate ending.

It is possible that Siddal is depicting herself as Lady Shalott, and in so doing, tried to convey the possibility that women could be artists too. If one were to replace Lady Shalott with Elizabeth Siddal, also replacing the loom with a canvas, the drawing would depict a revolutionary character and persona.^[46] Siddal questioned traditional Victorian gender boundaries by creating a simple assertion regarding female depiction in art. Siddal, maybe, was providing a commentary on the place of the professional female in mid-19th century Britain. Tennyson, himself, criticized Hunt's choice to interpret the excerpt the way he did and was bothered that the artist chose to depict, specifically, the harried downfall of the Lady. Though Siddal's version may not have held any truer to the lines of the poem than Hunt's rendition, her drawing spoke much more than just the story of Lady Shalott, but rather suggested that both the Lady and Siddal were to be regarded as professional female artists, with an emphasis on the professional. However, her model origins and later consumptive life dominated her story, pushing her artistic profession to the periphery.^[47]

Rossetti did, however, depict Siddal as a hardy artist on the rare occasion. The 1853 drawing entitled, *Gabriel Rossetti Sitting With Elizabeth Siddal*, shows an enthralled Siddal, deeply concentrated and impassioned, sketching Rossetti. Rossetti, in turn, contemplates Siddal, clearly regarding her as a serious artist on equal standing as himself.^[48] This contradiction to Rossetti's other work shows Siddal's, and potentially Rossetti's, internal belief that she was on the same level as the men in the movement. She wished to be regarded publically as an artist, establishing herself in an occupation separate from her lover and soon to be husband, Rossetti. Creating such a public reputation, unconstrained by a reputation revolving around society, reflected the attitudes of the New Woman in regards to freedom from the rigid, courtly etiquette of decades before.

Siddal's occupation and economic independence derived from her beloved artwork and poetry. John Ruskin, a painter of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, agreed to become Siddal's patron, paying her £150 annually for her paintings and sketches. This amount surpassed the income of most male artists at the time. In fact, Siddal could have possibly made more money than her future husband. In a letter to his brother, Rossetti writes, "I therefore apologize duly for not meeting you, and going on to see Ruskin, whom I saw this morning, and who is going to settle £150 a year immediately on -!!! This is no joke, but fact."^[49] Her work, within the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, was received as equal to those of the male counterparts. Ruskin, Siddal's patron, wrote exuberantly about her art. In an 1855 letter from Rossetti to Allingham, the artist wrote, "About a week ago, Ruskin saw and bought on the spot every scrap of designs hitherto produced by Miss Siddal. He declared that they were far better

than mine, or almost anyone's, and seemed quite wild with delight at getting them. . . ." [50] Interestingly enough, in 1857, Siddal began to pursue a formal education in art at the Sheffield School of Art. In the same year Siddal attended the school, her works were exhibited alongside the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. She was the first and only woman to do this. [51] Unfortunately, Siddal's health severely limited her ability to pursue her artistic endeavors or enjoy the fruits of her labor. Though she had her own stipend and received payment for any additional works, her income was largely controlled by Rossetti since her illnesses and constant afflictions left her unfit to control her own assets.

Siddal was, untypically for a Victorian Woman, very much a public person. She definitely had a public persona, perpetuated by the images of her in paintings. Both her art and her appearance were fodder for public comment. A female admirer once remarked that her "eyes were a kind of luminous golden brown agate-colour, slender, elegant figure...beautiful deep-red hair that fell in soft heavy wings..." [52] Women responded well to Rossetti's less formal and ostentatious renderings of Siddal. These adaptations were appealing. Bessie Parkes remarked on Siddal's physicality in these representations. While critical of Rossetti's inability to convey Siddal's personality of "dry wit," she did praise the "unworldly simplicity and purity of aspect" of Siddal in Rossetti's work. [53] Others found her too seductive and even almost satanic. A male critic commented that, "her pale face, abundant red hair and long thin limbs were strange and affecting, never beautiful in my eyes." [54] Members of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood were just as divided in regards to Siddal's beauty or lack thereof. While painters and poets like Deverell, Hunt, Millais, and Rossetti found Siddal an extraordinarily haunting model, not every member of the Brotherhood shared the same fascination. These members often mimicked those who found Siddal unattractive. William Rossetti, Dante Rossetti's brother and later Siddal's brother-in-law, provided two starkly different descriptions and opinions on Siddal's beauty. William did not believe she was beautiful enough in Deverell's *Twelfth Night*. [55] Perhaps William's opinions was shadowed by his personal disdain for Siddal for usurping her brother's affections, or maybe it was her blazing red hair that carried a "wanton connotation" which violently clashed with William's somewhat conventional Victorian outlook on beauty; whatever the reason, as a "professional," William found Siddal unfit for modeling and unfit for the acclaim she reached afterwards. In strict contrast, in William Rossetti's later life, he commented on Elizabeth's striking beauty as a model. In a 1903 recollection of her, William referred to Siddal as "truly a beautiful girl; tall, with a stately throat and fine carriage, pink and white complexion, and massive straight coppery- golden hair. Her large greenish-blue eyes, large-lidded, were peculiarly noticeable." [56] There was no formally stated reason as to why William changed his opinions surrounding the most famous Pre-Raphaelite model. A possible explanation could be the radically different interpretation of beauty seen between the early Victorian era and the end of the same era, or it could have been to reconcile his conscious with his sister-in-law. Regardless, William provided an interesting insight into the converse of Deverell and Dante Rossetti. In the years leading up to Siddal's marriage to Rossetti, she informally lived with the artist, frequenting his studio unchaperoned as well. She had famously and perhaps notoriously for the time, cohabited with Rossetti prior to their marriage. Siddal experienced a kind of sexual freedom in her unusual co-habitation with Rossetti, who, for the majority of their courtship, was not married. Siddal and Rossetti did not keep their personal associations secret; in fact, the couple would alert friends and family to times when the other was in their personal homes. For instance Rossetti wrote to brother William in 1853: "...Lizzie ...is at Blackfriars while I am away ...I have told her to keep the doors locked, and she will probably sleep there ..." [57] While Siddal's extended stays at Rossetti's Blackfriar's studio was deemed unusual, her permanent living arrangements with Rossetti prior to their marriage and even engagement was far beyond the realm of Victorian propriety. A man and woman, not married, nor related, living together, was beyond all taboos of 19th century Britain. Though it seems minor, Siddal living with Rossetti was a sort of sexual freedom that the New Woman sought to achieve. While her relationship to Rossetti was indeed an area of her personal life, the widely known co-habitation lent itself to her recognized public persona and contributed to her bohemian reputation.

Sharon Kong

Further, the New Woman's control of her own body was perpetuated in dress and fashion. Siddal's fashions and styles of clothing were unique and reflected this power. Not only did Siddal have the self-determination to cohabitate prematurely with Rossetti, she afforded herself the liberty and license to choose a style of clothing that did not coincide with the constrictive dress of Victorian Britain. Siddal chose to forgo the socially accepted corset and bushels of fabric, but rather wore loose fitting gowns, reminiscent of night gowns. Her hair was rarely seen in the up do popular amongst the "proper" female members of society, but rather, her hair remained loosely draped down her back, beginning a distinctive style of Pre-Raphaelite dress. Much like the Gibson Girl of the 1910s, Siddal opted for garments that held freedom and thus she became an icon much like both the Gibson Girl and Flapper that represented unconventional, atypical freedom.

Siddal, though a model, painter, and authoress, who had achieved recognition in the public domain, did not always abide by what Sarah Grand would deem the answer to the "Woman Question." It must be recognized that Siddal was not attempting to consciously create a feminist movement but rather her actions suggested she disagreed with many Victorian values. Her public reputation focused on her professionalism and power over her body. The rest of her public reputation was not consciously built by Siddal but was a byproduct of her personal life and the fascination that surrounded it. Her life, therefore, did embody the elements of the "tragic muse" paralleling the dramatic storyline of *Hamlet's* Ophelia. Much like the character that made her famous, Siddal's personal life was riddled with a series of unfortunate events which later overshadowed her professional achievements. "Guggums" as Siddal was called by Rossetti, had potential in both poetry and painting, but that potential manifested itself in subpar efforts of elementary nature. [58]

After an incident revolving around Siddal's modeling job as Ophelia in 1852, her health became a prominent issue in her reputation and in all of her subsequent relationships. Whilst modeling for Millais' now famed painting, the system of heaters placed under the cold bath of water in which Siddal was floating to pose burnt out. With hours left of painting, Siddal remained quiet and did not alert Millais of her discomfort. Later after falling ill, Siddal's father attempted to sue the artist and his family for damages to his daughter's health. Her health would remain a part of her persona, through unintentionally, until her death. It dominated much of what was written about her in correspondences she and her husband had with friends and family. [59] " ...The constantly failing state of her health is a terrible anxiety indeed ...but I still hope for the best." [60]

By 1860, Siddal's health had lessened her ability to paint, but not to write. In the last years of her life, Siddal produced a number of poems that reflected on and even anticipated her death. In the same year, Siddal and Rossetti were married. In Siddal's personal life, she was less fully a perfect example of the New Woman than her public persona would suggest. She was much more dependent on the approbation of Rossetti than Grand would have allowed in her definition. In Siddal's poem *Love and Hate*, she says, "Great love I bore thee: now great hate, sits grimly in its place." [61] Her happiness and, sometimes she felt, social acceptance, were dependent on her husband. Her poetry from 1860 until her death provided dramatic and volatile commentaries on her life, especially reflecting on her relationship with husband, Rossetti. Rossetti, infamous for acquiring mistresses throughout his career, was the barometer for Siddal's health and sanity. Marriage could have been the cure all to Siddal's illnesses, since much of her health relied so heavily on her husband's actions. If he had respected their marriage and not coveted about with various models and women, her emotional being, which usually affected her physical being, could have been vastly improved. But, her disorders usually manifested itself as a protest against Rossetti as a result of some argument of another leading to a deepening depression. [62] Siddal's constant fear of Rossetti's returning to his former mistresses and later muses created a culture of illness around her, meaning that she constantly and conveniently fell ill when she suspected her husband of infidelity. Her illness soon became a means to keep Rossetti geographically close to her. As her depression grew worse, and her illness worsened, the medicine prescribed for her actually worked against her health. Her treatment of choice, laudanum, a mixture of opium and alcohol, worked as a pain killer, a "cure all" medication prescribed generously by physicians. The poisonous and

addictive nature of the mixture was not yet a concern to doctors prescribing it, and Siddal, for the remainder of her life would fall victim time and time again to laudanum's soothing effects.^[63]

Coincidentally, Siddal's health drastically improved whilst honeymooning in Paris in the latter half of 1860. She became pregnant. Siddal's pregnancy marked, what she believed to be, a complete end to any sort of possible extra-marital affairs on her husband's part. Notably happier and healthier, Siddal reveled in legal married life and her pregnancy, and even entertained company, most often poet Algernon Swinburne.^[64] At the start of 1861, as Siddal and Rossetti prepared for the new child, Siddal once more fell ill, and apparently so did her unborn child. In April, despite a normal pregnancy up until that point, Siddal miscarried. This was unsurprising given her prior medical history. The depression subsequently would only contribute to her persona as the pitied invalid. Rossetti wrote, "Lizzie has just been delivered a dead child" and "My dear wife has just given birth to a still-born child."^[65] Siddal was profoundly affected by the still-born baby, her mental illness suffering as a result. Her emotional state bordered on derangement, noted by such actions as quieting guests at home in case the baby would wake from the noise. The cradle was obviously empty.^[66] This illustrates Siddal's desire to achieve the ultimate goal of a Victorian convention, motherhood, and her inability to do so propelled her into a depression that could not be cured.

Her art and poetry at this point of her life, right before her tragic death, reflected this. As she wrote in *Lord Shall I Come to Thee*, "Hallow Hearts are ever near me, Soulless eyes have ceased to cheer me: Lord may I come to thee?"^[67] Siddal implored in the poem shortly after her child's death for death to take her. Months later she would write, "Then sit down meekly at my side And watch my young life flee; Then solemn peace of holy death Come quickly unto thee."^[68] On February 10, 1862 Siddal turned to her laudanum bottle for an unknown reason; it may have been out of a lingering depression regarding her unborn child or possibly that Rossetti was meeting a model and mistress; regardless, when Rossetti returned home the night of the 10th, Siddal appeared to be sleeping. She could not be roused. According to popular myth, there was a suicide note pinned to her front, asking Rossetti to take care of her mentally retarded younger brother, but the true contents of the note and whether or not it explicitly stated she had a wish to die is unknown. The note was destroyed by Rossetti and, brother, William. On February 11, 1862 Elizabeth Siddal, at 32 years of age, was pronounced dead as a result of a laudanum overdose. She was pregnant again. Her personal life, mental illness, and generally unfaithful husband hindered her ability to fully reach her potential in her art and poetry. Siddal's dependence on drugs overshadowed her public persona and made it difficult for people to recall the stunning woman in Rossetti's paintings; rather, they saw the sickly woman with every-changing temperaments. The tragedy of her life made it difficult for Siddal's legacy to be rooted in professionalism, and thus became the famous melodrama.

Her death, feared to be a suicide during an inquest days after it had occurred, spurred even more speculation on the nature of her illness. The pitied, sad "dove-like" image of Siddal was now more prominent than ever, as it was a common rumor that Siddal was spurred to take her own life because of her mistreatment by her husband. She was a woman doomed in shallow marriage, where her love was rarely reciprocated, and only kept in her husband's inner circle to provide inspiration for deeper poetry that his younger muses could not provide. This is the imagery of Siddal's life that is most often remembered, possibly because it is dramatic and theatrical. Audiences and critics, as well as posterity, tend to remember the tragic and cathartic. While these events did much to shape the story of Siddal's life, it in no way should define her legacy. Rather, her professional work and the nature of her personal achievements should be her enduring memory. On Siddal's death in 1862, Rossetti dramatically buried a tome of his collected works, with his deceased lover. It was, as claimed by Rossetti, the only copy of all of his poetry, notes, and writings in existence, and therefore should lay with his wife of whom many of his writings were about. Seven years later, Rossetti, with his flair for the histrionic, had Siddal's body exhumed in order to retrieve them. It is rumored that Siddal's body had not decayed in the years that had passed and that her famous red and flowing hair

Sharon Kong

lacked neither luster nor body. Events surrounding the exhumation sparked a renewed interest in both Siddal's life and death. [69]

Despite her enduring reputation in the art world as the tragic muse who sparked Rossetti's genius, Siddal's works in art and poetry as well as elements of her public persona perpetuated by her work as a model, shaped a legacy independent of the cult of domesticity typical of an early Victorian woman. While Sarah Grand severely disapproved of Siddal's emotional dependence on Rossetti, she would most certainly condone Siddal's artistic occupation and subtle critiques on women in the art world. Siddal, as the only woman to have ever exhibited her art alongside the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, provided an unintentional model and pre-figure to the New Woman. The New Woman, in dress, occupation, and personal license exhibited qualities of freedom and represented a power shift from the greater society to the woman herself. With this newfound power, the New Woman had it within her own capability to determine what would be prevalent and relevant in her life. The loud fascination of her interestingly tragic, yet irrelevant personal life created the famous "tragic muse" archetype. Siddal was atypical in a time not yet ready for her, but her ideals of female living and working would finally come to fruition with the revolutionary New Woman of the later Victorian era.

[1] George Landlow, "The Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood: An Introduction," *The Victorian Web: Literature, History, and Culture in the Age of Victoria*, <http://www.victorianweb.org/paintings/prb/1.html> (accessed March 12, 2013).

[2] The Victorian Web, "The New Woman," *Gender*, <http://www.victorianweb.org/gender/diniejko1.html>

[3] Sarah Grand, "The New Aspect of the Woman Question," *The North American Review* Vol. 158, No. 448 (March 1894) 273.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Oregon State University, "The New Woman: Image and Lifestyle," *Clash of Cultures in the 1910s and 1920s*, <http://ehistory.osu.edu/osu/mmh/clash/newwoman/Image%20and%20Lifestyle-page1.htm>

[6] Oregon State University, "The New Woman: The Flapper," *Clash of Cultures in the 1910s and 1920s*, <http://ehistory.osu.edu/osu/mmh/clash/newwoman/Subnarratives/the%20flapper.htm>

[7] Estelle Freedman, "The New Woman: Changing Views of Women in the 1920s," *Journal of American History* Vol. 61, No. 2 (September 1974), 373.

As William E. Leuchtenberg writes, "The new woman wanted the same freedom of movement that men had and the same economic and political rights. By the end of the 1920s she had come a long way. Before the war, a lady did not set foot in a saloon; after the war she entered a speakeasy as thoughtlessly as she would go into a train station ... In the business and political worlds, women competed with men; in marriage, they moved toward a contractual role ... sexual independence was merely the most sensationalist aspect of the generally altered status of women."

[8] Oregon State University, "The New Woman: Work, Education, Reform," *Clash of Cultures in the 1910s and 1920s*, <http://ehistory.osu.edu/osu/mmh/clash/newwoman/workeducationreform-page1.htm>

[9] City University New York, "Key Tenants of the New Feminism: Economic and Sexual Freedom," *The New Woman*, <http://www.library.csi.cuny.edu/dept/history/lavender/386/newwoman.html>

[10] Kim Vassiliadis Ibid.

[11] Grand, "The New ...," 274.

[12] Hager, Lisa, "A Community of Women: Woman's Agency and Sexuality in George Egerton's *Keynotes and Discords*," *Nineteenth Century Gender Studies* Vol. 2, Number 2 (Summer 2006) 2. (<http://www.ncgsjournal.com/issue22/hager.htm>) accessed April 19, 2013.

[13] Grand 273.

[14] Violet Hunt, *The Wife of Rossetti: Her Life and Death* (Charleston, South Carolina: Nabu Press, 2001) 303.

[15] Georgina Burnes-Jones, *Memorials of Edward Burnes 1869-1898* (London: MacMillan Publishing, 1904), 222.

[16] Ida Proctor, "Elizabeth Siddal: A Ghost of an Idea" 1950.

[17] The British Broadcasting Company, "The Love School: The Brotherhood," 1975.

[18] Elizabeth Savage, *Willowwood* (New York City: Little Brown Publishing Company, 1978) 41.

- [19] Jan Marsh, *The Pre-Raphaelite Sisterhood* (Northampton, MA: Interlink Publishing Group, 1995) 359.
- [20] Jan Marsh, *The Legend of Elizabeth Siddal* (London: Quartet Books, 1989), 19.
- [21] Lila H Gold, "A Study of the Dichotomous Roles of Elizabeth Eleanor Siddal and Jane Burden Morris, Two Victorian Women Associated With the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood" (MA diss., California State University, Dominguez Hills, 2005) 4.
- [22] Lucinda Hawksley, interview by Stephanie Pina, London, United Kingdom, October 9, 2007.
- [23] Hawksley, "Tragedy ..." 20.
- [24] Griselda Pollack and Deborah Cherry, "Women as a Sign in Pre-Raphaelite Literature: A Study of the Presentations of Elizabeth Siddal," (1988) 96.
- [25] The British Broadcasting Company, "Desperate Romantics," 2009.
- [26] Lucinda Hawksley, *Tragedy of a Pre-Raphaelite Supermodel* (London: Andre Deutsche Company, 2004) 14.
- [27] Ibid.
- [28] Willaim Michael Rossetti, "Dante and Elizabeth Siddal," *The Burlington Magazine* Ed. 1 (May 1903), 273.
- [29] Ibid.
- [30] Ibid.
- [31] Rachel Barnes, "Dante Gabriel Rossetti: Prosperpine 1873-7, Tate Gallery" in *Pre-Raphaelites and Their World* (London: Tate Gallery Publishing, 1998), 50.
- [32] "The English Pre-Raphaelites," *Eclectic Review*, 11 January 1856, 6-9.
- [33] "The Royal Academy," *Art Journal*, 12 (1850), 175.
- [34] Susan P. Casteras, "Pre-Raphaelite Challenges to Victorian Beauty," *Huntington Library Quarterly* Vol. 55 No. 1 (Winter 1992), 17.
- [35] Frances Fowle, "Dante Gabriel Rossetti: Ecce Ancilla Domini! (The Annunciation) 1849-1850." Tate Britain, <http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/rossetti-ecce-ancilla-domini-the-annunciation-n01210/text-summary> (accessed March 14, 2013).
- [36] Abigail Newman "Drastic Innovations on a Traditional Theme: Rossetti's *Ecce Ancilla Domini*," *The Victorian Web: Literature, History, and Culture in the Age of Victoria*, <http://www.victorianweb.org/painting/dgr/paintings/newman4.html> (accessed March 14, 2013).
- [37] William Gaunt, *A Pre-Raphaelite Tragedy* (London: Jonathan Cape and Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1942) 86.
- [38] Walter Deverell was never a full-fledged member of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. He held a position as assistant master at the Government School of Design which could have been jeopardized if he had been a part of a group that claimed themselves outside of the Royal Academy. Additionally, it is rumored that Deverell and Siddal actually held romantic tendencies for one another, first by Siddal's romance with Dante Gabriel Rossetti and second by Deverell's premature death in 1854.
- [39] William Holman Hunt on Walter Deverell's Discovery of Elizabeth Siddal to the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, 1849, Collection of Pre-Raphaelite and the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, University of Virginia.
- [40] Siddal famously posed for this portrait whilst floating in a tub of water, heated by lamps under the basin. Midway through painting, the lamps went out, cutting the heat to the tub. Siddal continued to sit for the painting without alerting Millais. Upon completion of the painting, she contracted pneumonia and a mentality for illness that she never recovered from. Her father attempted to garner financial gain from Siddal's illness by suing the artist, Millais for damages. Siddal's father demanded a sum of £50 pounds, but settled for an unknown lower amount.
- [41] Lawrence R. Siddall, "The Sad Short Life of Elizabeth Siddal: Pre-Raphaelite Model and Artist," *The Pre-Raphaelite Society Review* (Autumn 2002), 2.
- [42] Gaunt, *Pre-Raphaelite*, 86.
- [43] Biographies and articles written prior to the 1970s has Siddal's age recorded at 18 at the time of her discovery. However, with the discovery of Siddal's birth certificate stating her year of birth to be 1829 instead of 1832, it put her age at 20 when she met Walter Deverell. Most contemporaries were under the impression she was much younger than she actually was.
- [44] Elaine Shefer, "Lady Shalott," *Woman's Art Journal* Vol. 9, No. 1 (Spring-Summer, 1998), 22.
- [45] Adele Uphaus, "Elizabeth Siddal: Creator and Created," *Exploring Elizabeth Siddal*, Elizabeth Siddal.com, <http://lizziesiddal.com/portal/elizabeth-siddal-creator-and-created-by-adele-uphaus/> (accessed September 30, 2012).

Sharon Kong

[46] Elaine Shefer, "Birds, Cages and Women in Victorian and Pre-Raphaelite Art," *American University Studies: Ser. 20, Fine Arts*; Vol 12. (1990), 103.

[47] Jan Marsh, "Imagining Elizabeth Siddal," *History Workshop Journal* No. 25 (1988), 72.

[48] Andrzej Diniejko, "The New Woman Fiction," *The Victorian Web: Literature, History, and Culture in the Age of Victoria*, <http://www.victorianweb.org/gender/diniejko1.html#grand> (accessed February 8, 2013).

[49] Exploring Elizabeth Siddal, "Letter to brother William about Lizzy's Patronage," *Mentions of Lizzie in Rossetti's Letters to His Family*, <http://lizziesiddal.com/portal/mentions-of-lizzie-in-rossettis-letters-to-his-family/3/>

[50] Derrik Leon, *Ruskin: The Great Victorian* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Limited, 1949) 216.

[51] Laurel Bradley, "Elizabeth Siddal and the Pre-Raphaelite Circle," *Art Institute of Chicago Museum Studies* Vol. 18 No. 2, *British Art: Recent Acquisitions and Discoveries at the Art Institute* (1992), 145.

Siddal exhibited alongside the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood in 1857 in a private exhibition held at Russell Place, London. In 1858, Siddal's work would be shipped overseas to be exhibited in the exhibition of British Art held in America.

[52] Siddal, "Sad ..." 2.

[53] Siddal, "Sad ..." 3.

[54] Ibid.

[55] Ibid.

[56] William Michael Rossetti, "Dante Rossetti and Elizabeth Siddal," *The Burlington Magazine* Ed. 1 (May 1903), 273.

[57] Exploring ..., "Letter from ...," *Mentions of Lizzie in Rossetti's Letters to His Family* <http://lizziesiddal.com/portal/letter-from-rossetti-to-his-brother-while-his-pupil-uses-his-studio/>

[58] Bradley, "Elizabeth ...", 145.

[59] Hawksley, Lucinda, *Lizzie Siddal: Face of the Pre-Raphaelites* (New York City: Walker & Company, 2006), 69.

[60] William Michael Rossetti, *Dante Gabriel Rossetti: His Family Letters With a Memoir Vol. 2* (New York City: AMS Press, 1970) 99.

[61] Elizabeth Eleanor Siddal, "Love and Hate," *ArtMagick Illustrated Poetry Collection*, <http://www.artmagick.com/poetry/poem.aspx?id=11322&name=love-and-hate>

[62] Hawksley, *Lizzie*, 70.

Siddal's afflictions, today, have been diagnosed as a combination of depression and possibly an eating disorder, like anorexia or bulimia. Her rapid loss of weight and pale, sickly skin would have been seen as consumptive, but is common in eating disorder conditions.

[63] Sam O.L. Potter, "Opium," *A Compend of Materia Medica, Therapeutics, and Prescription Writing (1902)* Laudanum was used plentifully in various patent medications to induce sleep, relieve pain, support the immune system, etc. It was prescribed for a great array of ailments including but not limited to cardiac disease, the common cold, and fever. Previous to the 20th, the addictive qualities of the drug were not widely known, and neither were the dangers affectively monitored.

[64] Hawksley, *Lizzie*, 174.

Algernon Swinburne was an English playwright, critic, and novelist included in the close knit Pre-Raphaelite circle. In his later years, he was nominate for a Nobel Prize in Literature, but during the mid-19th century, Swinburne was an active writer who was often entertained by Rossetti and Siddal after their introduction in Oxford.

[65] Dante Gabriel Rossetti, *Dante Gabriel Rossetti: His Family Letters with a Memoir Vol. 2* (New York: AMS Press) 300.

[66] Burnes-Jones, "Memorials ..." 222.

[67] Elizabeth Eleanor Siddal, "Love May I Come to Thee?" *ArtMagick Illustrated Poetry Collection*, www.artmagick.com/poetry.aspx?id=11324&name=lord-may-i-come?

[68] Elizabeth Eleanor Siddal, "In an Artist's Studio," *The Life and Work of Elizabeth Siddal*, www.eighthsquare.com/esiddal.html

[69] William Bell Scott, *Autobiographical Notes* (New York: Harpers and Brothers, Co, 1892)

Scott largely blamed Rossetti's bachelor tendencies for Siddal's early death. His constant habit of leaving her to entertain his friends and working late at the studio led to Siddal's constant anxieties as she was "little accustomed to domestic life." Her anxieties and neurosis led to a further dependence on large quantities of laudanum.