

Est.
1841

YORK
ST JOHN
UNIVERSITY

Windscheffel, Ruth C. (2007) Politics, Portraiture and Power: Reassessing the Public Image of William Ewart Gladstone. In: EditorsEmailORCIDKennedy, C.UNSPECIFIEDUNSPECIFIEDUNSPECIFIED, (ed.) Public Men: Masculinity and Politics in Modern Britain. Springer

Downloaded from: <https://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/6614/>

The version presented here may differ from the published version or version of record. If you intend to cite from the work you are advised to consult the publisher's version:

<https://link.springer.com/us/book/9780230007635>

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form. Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms governing individual outputs. [Institutional Repositories Policy Statement](#)

RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at
ray@yorks.ac.uk

Chapter 6

Politics, Portraiture and Power:

Reassessing the Public Image of William Ewart Gladstone

Ruth Clayton Windscheffel

Few British politicians could claim to have achieved the iconic status enjoyed by William Ewart Gladstone in the last third of the nineteenth century. Numerous commentators have discussed the growth of Gladstone's popular image during the years c. 1860-80.¹ Most of these have accounted (in varying degrees) for Gladstone's increasing popularity in terms of three factors: the development of a new brand of mass politics characterized by large crowds and popular speechmaking, the influence of the press and Gladstone's personal agency.² There are, however, a number of questions that continue to be debated: what was Gladstone's role in this popularization? Why was there an inconsistent development in the Gladstone cult? What were the differences between the 'People's William' persona and the more robust 'Grand Old Man'? There is more to be said about one of the Victorian period's most prominent public profiles, particularly if new perspectives and fresh sources are used.

Visual imagery holds great potential as a source for studying Gladstone's public image but, whilst used freely for illustrative purposes, it has received surprisingly little analysis from his historians. Since an article by Sir Thomas Wemyss Reid in 1889,³ only a lecture by Asa Briggs, published in 1998, focuses solely on imagery.⁴ The latter is restricted, however, to a narrative overview. Briggs's interest lies in the 'range of presentation of Gladstone' rather than in a critical analysis of the

imagery or in an exploration of representational techniques.⁵ This chapter seeks to do both. It examines the changing visual representations and receptions of Gladstone over his lifetime, explores the various challenges faced in representing him, and looks at how these were addressed by visual means. It also addresses another somewhat neglected theme: the gendering of these visual representations, a topic which again raises broader questions about the nature of the ‘public man’, the relationship between masculinity and the public/political realm; and the political importance of how the male form is visually rendered.

In one of the most famous Victorian images of Gladstone, Alfred Morgan’s, *One of the People - Mr Gladstone in an Omnibus* (1885; Private Collection) (Figure 1), we see a contemporary representation of Gladstone’s relationship with ‘the People’. There is no evidence that Gladstone had direct contact with Morgan or ever travelled regularly in such a position of cramped equality with the public.⁶ Rather the omnibus interior was a familiar visual environment in which the relationship between Gladstone and public could be interrogated.⁷ From Charles Dickens in *Sketches by Boz*,⁸ to Georg Simmel in 1908, writers focused on the visual and analytical opportunities offered by the nineteenth-century industrial cityscape, with its omnibuses, trains and trams, recognizing that it offered, in Simmel’s words, ‘a great preponderance of occasions to see rather than to hear people.’⁹ Victorian artists were equally attracted to representing and exploring the implications of these new spaces.

Mary Cowling regards Morgan’s painting as ‘something of an oddity’ because of its inclusion of the Prime Minister,¹⁰ suggesting Gladstone was featured simply ‘to pay tribute to the Liberal politics of the ‘People’s William’.¹¹ The image however both celebrates ‘the Grand Old Man’, who Gladstone had become by 1885, and also questions the nature of his popularity and highlights problems of political

communication. Susan Sontag suggests that modern political images ‘are attempts to contact or lay claim to another reality’ by narrowing the distance between admirer and icon.¹² In this hypothetical scene, physical distance is annihilated: Gladstone is contained with those to whom he is accountable and to whom, the title suggests, he belongs. They are a small group travelling down Piccadilly: a widow, children, a young woman and a doctor. They are middle-class travellers, comfortably off but bespeaking vulnerability and humaneness by gender, age and vocation. Gladstone’s self-contained posture, at ease with and indistinguishable from his fellow passengers by the sobriety of his dress, contrasts with the slouching male figure with monocle, ‘Piccadilly weepers’ and cockeyed top hat following in a hansom. This somewhat degenerate figure personifies ‘the classes’ against which Gladstone famously sided with ‘the masses’.¹³

Viewers of the painting also felt included in the represented encounter. The *Daily News* reported, of the painting’s exhibition in the Crystal Palace Picture Gallery in 1887, that:

Mr. A. Morgan’s painting ‘A Ride to Piccadilly-circus’ was an object of unflinching interest ... As the groups of people passed, one or another would recognise the face of the right hon. gentleman and would call his companions to look at it, so that Mr. Gladstone might be said to be holding a popular reception all through the day.¹⁴

Nevertheless the image itself is affirmative of Gladstone’s identification with ‘the People’ only to an extent. In practical terms, the image itself is not ‘popular’: it is an original oil, not immediately reproducible for the mass market. Furthermore its

composition significantly subverts the painting's title. The omnibus's interior is not crowded and contains members of a restricted class; the bowed female figure on the pavement and the man in misshapen jacket riding outside testify to a marginalized poorer public.¹⁵ Even between the occupants, significant distance is maintained. They are all silent with gaze averted from Gladstone. Either they are so familiar with him that they pay him no attention, so overawed that they cannot look at him, or they are at odds with him. The doctor is reading *The Globe*, a Conservative paper, and his questioning glance over to the widow, whose own gaze restrains her son, and the little girl's downcast eyes favour the latter two interpretations. The opportunity exists both for conversation and also for prolonged study but neither are taking place, further calling into question the title's intimations of Gladstone's popularity and the reality of democracy, and exposing the difficult nature of communication between politician and people.¹⁶

The truth is that neither the 'People's William', who had led one of the most active of first prime ministerial ministries, nor the 'Grand Old Man' of those that followed were ever wholly uncontested identities. As Colin Matthew judges, although "The People's William" had...had his popular successes' up to 1874-5 'they had not led to real warmth or popular affection'.¹⁷ Furthermore in 1885, the year of Morgan's painting, the 'G. O. M.' of popular adulation was as likely to be known as the 'M. O. G.' (Murderer of Gordon).

Whilst tracing a positive strengthening of Gladstone's popular visual identity, this chapter shows this to be based on a hard-won and continuous negotiation between contesting iconographies and assumptions. It focuses, at the outset, on the tense relationship between Gladstone's politics and his sense of intellectual vocation, explaining how negative reactions to this during his early political career endangered

the chances of him becoming and remaining popular as a public figure, notably because of the way in which such attacks drew strength from wider discourses about the desirable character of public, political masculinity. It illustrates how these tensions were expressed both by Gladstone himself and by his contemporaries, before proceeding to demonstrate how they were largely overcome. It is argued that this resolution was principally due to the initiative of Gladstone himself in both recognizing and manipulating the opportunities offered by the widening practice of photography. It is shown how Gladstone gradually took control in this new type of artistic ‘encounter’, first through necessity, then with deliberate intent. So successful was this marketing project that by the time Gladstone died, his intellectual persona, which had been unpalatable for a considerable part of his public career, was rehabilitated and popularized. Negative portrayals of the statesman were still generated (indeed, they increased in number, focus and intensity after 1885-6) but they were counterbalanced by positive imagery as never before.

The political lotus-eater

Gladstone finally ended his first ministry in January 1874 and formally announced his retirement from the Liberal leadership the following year.¹⁸ Shortly afterwards, the Tory magazine *Judy* published a cartoon entitled ‘Far From the Madding Crowd’ which pictured Gladstone in a monastic cell surrounded by theology books.¹⁹ That *Judy* judged the bookish Gladstone would become both irrelevant and weak as a political force is obvious from the caricature’s tag line: ‘The recluse of Hawarden, withdrawing from political strife, devoted himself to questions of theology and to pamphleteering. He did not do much harm at this time.’²⁰ *Punch*’s commentary on the

retirement, by John Tenniel, was less vitriolic but equally dismissive, showing Gladstone's arch-rival Benjamin Disraeli bidding him a patronizing goodbye with the words 'Sorry to lose you! I *began* with books; you're ending with them. Perhaps you're the wiser of the two.'²¹

These negative reactions were in part provoked by Gladstone's arguments for resignation. He did not conceptualize the move as retirement from work or even an exchange of political for country-estate responsibilities. 'The main point is this', Gladstone wrote in March 1875:

My prospective work is not Parliamentary. My tie will be slight to an Assembly with whose tendencies I am little in harmony at the present time: nor can I flatter myself that what is called the public, out of doors, is more sympathetic. But there is much to be done with the pen, all bearing much on high & sacred ends... By thought ... on these matters the destinies of mankind are at this time affected infinitely more than by the work of any man in Parliament.²²

This strongly suggested Gladstone contemplated a career change from practical politician to full-time intellectual who was to have minimal contact with parliament and the public. As such it appeared to confirm a number of critical observations made about Gladstone's political character and future at the outset of his prime-ministerial career, which in turn drew on deep-rooted suspicions dating from the beginning of his public life. An anonymous author, writing for *London Society* in 1869, claimed the following had been general opinion of Gladstone as a young Peelite in the late 1830s and early 1840s:

There was a kind of gentle languor and melancholy about him. He seemed a recluse, of scholarly poetic temperament. He was a political lotus-eater. His voice was called ‘the echo of a voice;’ the voice of one in whose breast all human passions were lulled. It was thought that he lacked the ‘combativity’ necessary for parliamentary conflict. It was thought that both his physique and his morale were against him.²³

Walter Bagehot observed similar weaknesses in the Gladstone of the 1860s, writing ‘Mr. Gladstone’s energy seems to be strictly intellectual. Nothing in his outward appearance indicates the iron physique that often carries inferior men through heavy tasks.’²⁴ These commentators called into question Gladstone’s physical presence as well as his intellectual proclivities and verbose literary style; the very constituency of his manliness was being challenged on the basis of visual evidence. If one examines images of Gladstone made up to the end of his first ministry, one finds visual support for such dismal prognostics.

William Bradley (1801-57), a successful Manchester portrait painter patronized by the Gladstones, painted Gladstone twice between 1838 and 1844. The first portrait (1839; Hawarden Castle) (Figure 2) combines paternal pride, gentlemanly status with intellectual romanticism. There is little to indicate Gladstone’s parliamentary calling, except perhaps the papers lying on the table. These are held down by an open book, which is an unidentifiable but convenient symbol of Gladstone’s active scholarship and establishes the painting’s intellectual priorities. The eyes of the viewer are drawn from book to the face of the pensive subject. His unawareness of the viewer lends him an air of gentility and reinforces the portrait’s

studied refinement. The pose is heavily charged with romanticism, reflecting as it does the complete introspection of the sitter.

Bradley had caught what Colin Matthew describes as Gladstone's 'highly romantic, even Utopian' conservatism of the 1830s, expressed in his church and state treatises and built upon a Coleridgean 'cultivation of the inward man'.²⁵ However Bradley's portrait sent mixed messages about the aspiring political thinker it represented.²⁶ By 1839 romanticism of this sort was outmoded, and Gladstone's pose is particularly problematic. In its self-contained timidity it differed from the poses generally used for modern male portraits,²⁷ cutting a figure contemporaries would increasingly associate with female representation in both painting and photography.²⁸ Moreover, books and reading, long associated with representations of femininity,²⁹ continued, as Kate Flint and Lene Østermark-Johansen have shown, to define nineteenth-century iconographies of femininity.³⁰ Such feminization of Gladstone's image was more blatant in caricature. Throughout his life he was caricatured as a woman, but in later cartoons his masculine features were maintained. However in John Doyle's 'The New Christmas Pantomime' (1845; John Rylands University Library), Gladstone was represented as a fully feminine Columbine, dancing with his political mentor, Sir Robert Peel.

Attempts were made to address these representational problems by those who sought to celebrate Gladstone's early parliamentary success, including Peel and the commissioners of Bradley's second portrait, Eton College. For the latter commission, (1841; Eton College) (Figure 3) Bradley maintained the same pose as the family portrait but added a heavy cloak to swell the slight frame and square the curving pose. Gladstone's face is made squarer and less delicate. Whilst the classical column was retained, all references to books and reading were removed, toning down the scholarly

emphasis; and re-centring the body as the pre-eminent marker of (public) masculinity. Although the intellectual tone of Bradley's original was suitable for a private, domestic setting, it was not viewed as entirely appropriate for a commemorative portrait of a politician.

Robert Peel's 1843 commission from John Lucas (1807-74) offers further evidence of what was seen as desirable in picturing the public man.³¹ In a letter to the artist Peel insisted on the absence of ornamentation and on the importance of modern dress, at a time when classicism remained in vogue.³² The resulting three-quarter length portrait (Figure 4) represented Gladstone dressed in black with a white necktie against a dark background. The portrait was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1844 but received little attention. *The Athenaeum* judged the artist 'capable of producing a strong and characteristic likeness, and sometimes of rendering the mind, without which the most symmetrical arrangement of features is but a mark.'³³ The portrait made no reference to Gladstone's scholarly activities. His gaze is direct and earnest, the pose more open than that used by Bradley. His left hand holds a parliamentary paper, establishing his identity to observers as yet unfamiliar with his features and also stamping upon him the priorities of his political chief – a committed servant of the electorate, open, unostentatious and unromantic. It exemplified what James Eli Adams suggests was becoming 'a norm of "manliness"' at mid-century: 'honest, straightforward speech and action, shorn of any hint of subtlety of equivocation'.³⁴ Gladstone's romantic interiority and long-windedness were clearly at odds with this model, but there is little indication that, at this stage, he saw any need to change his image. Indeed, when William Walker of London sought to make an engraving of him in the early 1840s, Gladstone directed him to use Bradley's 1839 painting as a

source.³⁵ The published mezzotint (1845; British Museum) actually exaggerated Bradley's pose and surrounded the sitter with additional accoutrements of scholarship.

Gladstone's relationship with George Frederic Watts (1813-1904) shows a continuation of these problematic attitudes and tensions up to and beyond 1860. A central characteristic of this relationship was its intellectuality, which directly influenced the process of painting and the images themselves. Gladstone first sat to Watts, who he found 'very agreeable' on 14 June 1859. Watts painted two canvases from the five 1859 sittings,³⁶ the first for Hawarden and the second for the National Portrait Gallery. Over the next twenty years Gladstone recorded another eleven sittings to Watts, which varied in both congeniality and artistic production. Watts was a slow, deliberate painter who sometimes exasperated Gladstone,³⁷ but the statesman found compensation in Watts's conversation,³⁸ they shared interests in religion and the classics, and had great respect for the other's learning and insights.³⁹ Both of Watts's surviving portraits are intense, intimate and emphasize the head: Gladstone's dark eyes are accentuated, exaggerating the pallor and skeletal rendering of the face. The reception of Watts's early Gladstone portraits was muted, largely because they were exhibited twenty years after production.⁴⁰ In 1898 Claude Phillips acknowledged that Watts's 'interpretative portraiture sums up with the higher truth the noblest qualities of mankind', but regretted it represented only 'the intellectual, the emotional personality'. In contrast, he argued, 'Millais gives us the whole man with mind and body in perfect balance, with breath in his nostrils as well as speculation in his eyes', an observation which again draws our attention to a continuing unease with overt representation of intellectuality in the public man.⁴¹

‘Not less physical than intellectual’: achieving balance in representing the public man

Phillips chose Millais’s first portrait of Gladstone (1879; National Portrait Gallery), supreme in ‘its concentrated force and simplicity’, to exemplify an ideal combination of ‘watchful and untiring vigour not less physical than intellectual’.⁴² His observations formed part of a wide and long-running debate in Victorian Britain about what constituted ‘authentic’ portraiture.⁴³ Millais painted Gladstone thrice more, in 1884-5, 1885 and 1889. The second and third portraits were painted as part of a lengthy and problematic campaign by Christ Church, Oxford to obtain a likeness of their alumnus, a project which was similarly inflected by tenacious assumptions about the desirable balance of intellectual and physical characteristics in the visual imaginary of the public man.⁴⁴

The College initially commissioned Watts, but his portrait was rejected following its appearance at the 1878 Christ Church Gaudy. His daughter testified that as ‘the artist was more than usually anxious to paint the man, body, soul, and spirit’ and as a result, ‘the portrait proved to be a matter of extreme difficulty’.⁴⁵ This immediately suggests why the portrait was so unpopular with the College alumni, a reading supported by Gladstone’s daughter Mary’s complaint that she ‘couldn’t bear’ the portrait which she described in her diary as ‘a weak, peevish old man’.⁴⁶ After Watts had withdrawn, W. B. Richmond attempted, in Gladstone’s words, ‘the hard task of painting me’.⁴⁷ This portrait was universally disliked when exhibited at the Grosvenor in 1882 and also rejected.⁴⁸

After Lord Rosebery had gazumped the first of Millais’s portraits intended for the College, Christ Church eventually received the artist’s third portrait of Gladstone

(Figure 5). Iconographically there is little difference between Richmond's portrait and the two by Millais. Why then was Millais's image deemed acceptable? It was certainly not because of Gladstone's D. C. L. robes. Colin Matthew argues that these reflected 'his desire to be seen not as a politician, but as an intellectual for whom politics was a second-order concern'.⁴⁹ On the contrary, this representation of Gladstone's intellect was not tailored to his particular intellectual preoccupations; it was symbolic and standardized. When the Rosebery portrait was exhibited in the Grosvenor Gallery in 1885, a similar image was shown of Robert Browning by his son, commissioned by Balliol College, Oxford. *The Guardian's* correspondent made clear at the time that the primary symbolic function of 'the blushing robes of that degree... which has hung upon the shoulders of almost all the great laymen of England for a century past' was to indicate status, fame and power rather than intellect. He also confirmed the orthodoxy of the Millais by calling it 'counterfeit and *soidisant*', dismissing its conventional props in order to discuss the face.⁵⁰ *Punch* also drew attention to the conventionality of such iconography, caricaturing both portraits: Gladstone is depicted muttering, "I'm not myself at all," whilst his head is gripped by a vice-like posing stand, which underscores the artificiality of the representation.⁵¹

The reason Millais's third portrait was accepted above the Richmond is precisely because its intellectual iconography is weak in comparison with the emphasis on masculine, almost animalistic, power in the turned head and glaring eyes. Contemporary observers, whilst alert to the challenges of representing the multiplicities of individual character, not only privileged well-balanced depictions but were also particularly attentive to evidence of weakness, favouring powerful representations of political masculinity. In the same way Bernal Osborne's description of Gladstone in the House of Commons made a direct comparison between the

passive figure of the young Gladstone, and the older, more confident statesman: ‘We see before us the splendid savage bounding on to the floor of the house – ... the manly presence that reminds us of a chieftain’.⁵² Such exaggerated representation, which fuses the ‘manly’ with the bestial, is also seen in Harry Furniss’s sharply-angled late sketches for *Punch*, the body language of which stressed the fact that Gladstone’s physical as well as his intellectual being was engaged in the service of his country.

The attraction of such a powerful icon is enduring; even contemporary scholars have privileged its truth as political representation. Thus Colin Matthew dismisses Millais’s fourth portrait, an overtly domestic image of Gladstone and his grandson (1889; Hawarden Castle) as ‘a failure’, ignoring the fact that different commissions represent not only alternative visions of Gladstone’s manliness, but also the different sites and spaces in which images are intended to be displayed and seen.⁵³ There was no obvious displeasure in Gladstone’s letter to Millais on the completion of the fourth portrait;⁵⁴ he complimented Millais on achieving ‘the most exact and living likeness of me that you have yet produced’.⁵⁵ Nonetheless, there was, by this point, considerable dissatisfaction in Gladstone’s feeling towards artists and their practice.

Gladstone and the artists

Gladstone continued to give conventional sittings to artists,⁵⁶ but he found the process exhausting and constraining, and increasingly expressed irritation at the controlling conditions involved.⁵⁷ Consequently, Gladstone deliberately changed the terms under which he allowed artists to paint him. His daughter Mary asserted that this was a sudden decision motivated by unhappiness with Watts’s final portrait.⁵⁸ Although, by the later 1870s, one can detect mounting mutual dissatisfaction with the lengthy,

intellectualized sittings so previously enjoyed,⁵⁹ it is clear that Gladstone evolved his new technique gradually. Thus on 11 September 1877 he recorded, ‘Mr Roden came, with his remarkable portrait of me.’ Instead of giving a conventional sitting, Gladstone ‘worked peaceably’ while Roden ‘prosecuted his task’.⁶⁰ Gladstone increasingly sponsored such naturalistic representations,⁶¹ which was pioneering.⁶² Moreover he clearly recognized the unconventional nature of what he was doing and how his relationship with artists was changing. Thus he described giving ‘quasi sittings’ to John McLure Hamilton (1853-1936) and J. T. Thaddeus, and noted in 1893 that ‘Prince T[roubetskoi] came to paint’ but clearly was not allowed to interfere.⁶³ The novelty of Gladstone’s approach was also fully appreciated by artists themselves and was especially well-attested by Hamilton:

Mr. Gladstone would spend his time in reading and writing ... and I could catch him as I found him. He was to do his work and I mine, without considering one the other... Here was a new aspect of portraiture... From that day to this I have set my face steadily against the formal staring portrait, and, whenever it has been possible, have painted men at home ... always avoiding anything like studio lights and effects.

Hamilton’s series is dominated by Gladstone’s work in his library, where he represented Gladstone reading and writing in numerous drawings and three portraits (1890, Musée d’Orsay; 1892, Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts; c. 1896, Hawarden Castle). Hamilton emphasized ‘the contrast of great power and extreme simplicity’ which both ‘inspired and invigorated’ his work, but, unlike Watts, he sought not to represent such contrast in the sitter’s face. His images’ power lay in the

opportunity they afforded viewers to gaze on the apparently unconscious, private behaviour of a public man. Hamilton himself encouraged the public's appetite for privileged insights by asserting that Gladstone lived 'in two spheres, a public and a private, the former for and with the people, the other in and for his family'. His representations gained their potency by apparently straddling the boundaries between these spheres and offering a wider public exclusive access to a private, family world where the sitter remained 'absolutely unconscious' of the presence of both artist and public.⁶⁴

How unconscious was Gladstone of the artist? Reading and writing signal detachment and withdrawal just as they had done in Bradley's 1839 painting, but Hamilton suspected Gladstone was 'always conscious of what transpired around him without in the least appearing to be'.⁶⁵ In this he was supported by Frank Hill, editor of the *Daily News*, and Harry Furniss, who spent many hours observing Gladstone in the course of his political activities. Hill described Gladstone's behaviour in parliament as follows:

For more than sixty years, Mr. Gladstone has spent the greatest part of his waking hours in the view and hearing of the world. He lives in the presence of the public as under the eye of his Great Taskmaster, which never slumbers nor sleeps. His demeanour in the House of Commons, his gestures and changes of his posture and play of countenance, though not addressed to the lookers-on ... are yet shaped, and informed and controlled by the consciousness of hundreds of watchful eyes and commenting tongues.⁶⁶

This studied naturalness is exactly what we can see Gladstone cultivating when in the presence of later artists.

These changes in Gladstone's representation, especially considering his complicity in the process and his image's more favourable reception, require further explanation. The centrality of the politicization and visualization of Gladstone's private life during the late 1870s has been well attested by Eugenio Biagini and others. But an over-concentration on the popular marketing of Gladstone's physical leisure activity has involved a consequent neglect of the way this important representation interacted with and influenced other iconographies, especially those associated with his private mental pursuits. Examination of visual evidence, particularly the photographic, sheds new light on Gladstone's growing understanding of representative power, and how a complex interplay of representations worked to galvanize his popularity.

Gladstone and the photographers

Gladstone first recorded sitting for a photograph on 28 July 1851, to 'Mr Claudet the Daguerrotypist'.⁶⁷ He was very alert to the changes in photographic technology,⁶⁸ and almost from the first was concerned about the quality of his photographs. In 1856 he sat to John Edwin Mayall (?-1867), the fashionable Regent Street photographer, but noted the session yielded 'little fruit'.⁶⁹

Gladstone had always appreciated the significance of his encounters with artists, keeping careful records of sittings.⁷⁰ He became equally scrupulous in noting where and with whom he was photographed and also on how such images were disseminated. A breezy memorandum to his private secretary Edward Hamilton, dated

18 May 1883, shows how Gladstone kept a check on representations in a range of media: ‘W[illiam] H[enry] G[ladstone] ... says there is a very shameful print of me with [Charles] Bradlaugh & [Annie] Besant in a St James’s Street window’, he wrote, adding, ‘– I should like to have a copy.’ In the same memorandum, he asked Hamilton whether he had heard ‘Anything about the Cannes Photographs?’ that were presumably more flattering.⁷¹ From an early point, Gladstone attempted to control both the distribution of and the market for his photographic image. In September 1864, during a family holiday in Penmaenmawr, Gladstone ‘sat to the photographer’ only ‘on condition that he *sells* at not over 6d’.⁷² In 1876 Gladstone recorded ‘Walk with Mr Webb: saw Broughton Church. We were all photographed. I took a written engagement as to my *carte de visite*.’⁷³ Similarly, at Hawarden in 1887, Gladstone engaged in ‘woodcraft with WHG’ and ‘sat to Birmingham Photographers who undertake to sell at 3d and upwards’.⁷⁴ By securing their cheapness, Gladstone thus ensured his photographs were available to the widest possible popular audience. Gladstone himself circulated his photograph amongst admirers. For example, James W. Gladstone of Biggar recorded, in a letter of 1858, ‘that you had been pleased to present me with a Print of yourself’.⁷⁵

In the majority of the above cases, Gladstone was being photographed at an ostensibly private moment: whilst at home or on holiday. These were not studio photographs and the names of the photographers were not mentioned (probably because they were not known professionals or were part of a sightseeing group.)⁷⁶ Unlike the relationship between sitter and professional photographer, usually conducted in a studio and following definite conventions, encounters like these were frequently spontaneous and potentially unpredictable. A conventional right to exercise control did not exist between the photographer and the photographed in such fluid

situations and we see Gladstone, in these examples, extending the amount of control he is able to wield. This practice is crucial in explaining his changed attitude to artists.

Gladstone had two distinct ways of conducting and describing his relationship with photographers, which have enormous implications for our understanding of his self-presentation as a public man. There was a clear difference between his style and tone when referring to well-known studio professionals and those ‘others’ operating on the boundaries of both the profession and of the public sphere. Studio photographers, such as Mayall and Elliot & Fry, were usually named and Gladstone often characterized himself as a passive artist’s model in relation to them, much as he did when describing his sittings with painters.⁷⁷ Thus he ‘sat (stood) to Messrs. Maull & Polybank [of Piccadilly] in a vapour bath of 92° & upwards’, complained that he was forced to sit to Mayall ‘without end’, was ‘sent by Lord A.[cton] to Mr Fergus photographer: able but most exacting’, and kept by Eveleen Myers ‘over an hour in the chair’.⁷⁸ By contrast, his references to unscheduled photographs taken by unauthorized individuals displayed a heightened vigilance, mirroring that unease generated by the gathering momentum of his popular campaigns.

The central issue here was one of contested control; one which was exhibited clearly in Gladstone’s description of the photographic process itself. Up to about 1876 he habitually records having *sat* for a photograph. In 1876 he first refers to *being* photographed and the phrase subsequently recurs frequently. Thus on 6 August 1877 he recorded, ‘worked with W[illy]. on the big ash: when we were photographed’.⁷⁹ In this type of encounter Gladstone was both active and independent subject and yet the potentially powerless object. It was this discomfiting anomaly which prompted a much more dynamic engagement by Gladstone in the process of image-making and

suggested the means by which non-staged but fully controlled publicity might be achieved.

It was this direct, public and complex negotiation of control and power that cartoonists and others picked up on in their representations. Subsequent readings have often overemphasized the extent to which contemporaries simply criticized Gladstone's enthusiastic self-publicity,⁸⁰ whereas such images equally critiqued the transgression and surveillance of private space as well as manipulation of the public. Harry Furniss's cartoon 'The Amateur Photographic Pest', (Figure 6) published in *Punch* on 4 October 1890, depicts multiple scenes in which these disturbing undertones are present. Private boundaries are wilfully and embarrassingly infringed: a sleeping man is photographed between his splayed legs, lenses pry into the windows of private houses to the chagrin of their owners (one such carries a blunderbuss). Several scenes feature vulnerable groups – children, unchaperoned women, the poor and elderly – being threatened, ogled and manipulated by predominantly male photographers. They swarm everywhere, balancing on ladders, hiding in trees and floating in balloons. In the top-left corner, Gladstone marches, axe in hand, followed by attendant photographers. He is not presented encouraging them (in fact he walks so quickly that most are running and one has fallen over); neither is he the only celebrity (Tennyson is also presented declaiming). In a context in which the political significance of public and private behaviour and space has shifted radically; a milieu in which both men and women are potentially powerless, it is suggestive that Gladstone is represented here wresting control by exhibiting traits of an independent, unconcerned and hegemonic masculinity.

There was widespread awareness of the value of photographic representation in the political arena. Images could be excellent publicity vehicles for the aware

politician as their sales were ‘effective barometers of popular approval’.⁸¹

Photographs explicitly seeking to represent the political Gladstone began to appear in 1861-2, the time from which Gladstone’s transformation of popularity is frequently dated. Moreover the conjunction between Gladstone’s extra-parliamentary speeches and photography became increasingly obvious at around this time. On 7 October 1862 Gladstone was in Newcastle to deliver what would be a controversial speech on the American South and recorded that ‘Downie the Photographer also laid hands on me.’⁸² On subsequent political visits, trips to a local photographer became an essential part of the itinerary, highlighting the way in which photography was linked with mass politics, particularly in regional, urban environments. The increasing smoothness with which photography was incorporated into Gladstone’s political machine is well illustrated by the following example. In 1881 he was photographed in Hawarden before a planned visit to Leeds, so that the resulting commemorative prints could be available in conjunction with his visit. The significance of this was not lost on the media. *Punch* published a cartoon ‘Quite a little holiday’ on 15 October 1881 depicting Gladstone, apparently gardening at home, squirting his political opponents with ‘facts’ from his water sprinkler labelled ‘Leeds’. Gladstone had merely noted ‘Photographed for Leeds’ in his diary:⁸³ the photographer was, in a sense, irrelevant.⁸⁴ It was a professionally produced visual message for the people and politicians of the Yorkshire city, just as powerful as one of Gladstone’s speeches. His image, on workshop and house walls, would be there long after he had moved along the campaign trail, reinforcing his political message.

Evidence for the extent to which Gladstone’s image was received and used by his popular admirers in such ways is limited and multifaceted, but examples of it do exist. Gladstone’s image was hung in working-class homes: D. Cunllo Davies, a

Nonconformist Minister from Blaina recorded: ‘Here and there one finds a picture of Gladstone, John Bright, or Spurgeon. These hang on the wall because the Welshman has a very decided view in matters political, a one-sided hero worship, and a deep place in his heart for religion and its leaders.’⁸⁵

The fact that it also hung on workshop walls is testified to by a photograph taken c. 1885 by H. Wilkinson of Scarborough showing Yorkshire tanners at work; a picture of Gladstone is just discernible on the wall behind them.⁸⁶ It is not, of course, straightforward to deduce from such instances what functions such images or pieces of memorabilia fulfilled for those who owned them; direct evidence for this is even rarer. However, one good example from 1877 offers a fascinating glimpse. On 4 August, a party of 1400 Bolton trippers visited Hawarden, an occasion Gladstone described as follows: ‘We were nearly killed with kindness. I began with W[illey]. the cutting of a tree; and had to speak to them, but not on politics.’⁸⁷ The *Times* reported ‘the very splinters which flew from his axe were picked up and treasured as relics’.⁸⁸ This was no exaggerated claim. William Houghton of 2, Gladstone Place, Farnworth, near Bolton wrote to Gladstone on 3 October 1877 to tell him how he and his family treated the wood chip that they had secured:

I carried it home as a treasure. I have decorated it and put it under a glass shade, and put a card in front of it to commemorate the work of that day. Scores of people come to my home to look at it, bothe [*sic*] Liberals and Tories, and I must say their [*sic*] is not one that has not praised it to the greatest extent. I shall keep it as an heir loom during my life time, and I hope my children will do the same.⁸⁹

Houghton's account underlines the popularity of the representation of Gladstone as woodcutter, which is the key to explaining the process by which his image was reinvented. This imagery drew on a long tradition of radical discourse,⁹⁰ but had also been used specifically by Thomas Carlyle. In his lecture 'The Hero as Divinity', he wrote

Among the Northland sovereigns ... I find some who got the title *Wood-cutter*; Forest-felling Kings. Much lies in that... I suppose the right good fighter was oftenest also the right good forest-feller, – the right good improver, discernor, doer and worker in every kind; for true valour, different enough from ferocity, is the basis of all.⁹¹

It is no surprise that Gladstone marked this passage in his copy of Carlyle's lectures.⁹² By choosing tree felling as the form of recreational labour in which to engage, Gladstone was directly associating himself with the Carlylean idealization of the worker. He was also involved in visualizing this representation. Two days after Houghton's visit, Gladstone and Willy once again 'were photographed' wood-cutting. The resulting images explicitly reveal the process of negotiation being played out between Gladstone and the image makers.⁹³ One of these photographs (1877; NPG) was definitely taken by Bolton photographer William Currey, who may have been connected with the trippers. The other two photographs (1877; Flintshire Record Office) were clearly taken on the same occasion. One shows Gladstone and Willy either side of a huge tree (Figure 7). They have been caught off guard by the photographer: Willy's head is out of focus and Gladstone obviously displays the stump of his left index finger, which was invariably concealed;⁹⁴ both stare accusingly

at the camera. The locus of power clearly lies with the photographer who captured such a naked moment. However, despite this, Gladstone permitted the photographer at least two more exposures, for which he sat down amongst the woodchips. He deliberately posed: displaying the axe prominently, hiding his mutilation and averting his gaze (Figure 8). By such a negotiated compromise, Gladstone succeeded in wresting to himself a significant element of control over these images: an important realignment considering how such representations, as Jeff Hearn has observed, take ‘power from the photograph to the image,’ on commencing ‘circulation in the public domain’.⁹⁵ Houghton noted how ‘pleased’ he and his wife were ‘to see a man in your capacity strip off his clothes down to the waiste [*sic*]’ and ‘going to work as a woodman’.⁹⁶ Such a representation had obvious political and topical resonances: the vigorous man of the people, simultaneously cutting out the dead wood of a corrupt administration and exhibiting physical prowess. What has been scarcely documented however is the way in which, firstly, the techniques of dealing with free-ranging photographers influenced his later treatment of other artists and, secondly, how the power and symbolism of the woodsman impacted on other representations of Gladstone.

It was as a result of his tense renegotiation of boundaries with photographers that Gladstone, from 1877, increasingly applied the same tactic with established artists: refusing formal sittings and insisting that they painted him ‘at work’.⁹⁷ This practice, and the integration of the woodsman iconography, are both brilliantly illustrated in two works by Sydney Prior Hall (1842-1922).

There are a substantial number of Hall’s paintings and sketches of Gladstone extant. Many of them were produced as a result of his illustrative work for *The Graphic* around 1892 and primarily show Gladstone in parliament. Hall’s process of

observing and representing Gladstone was, like that of increasing numbers of photographers, opportunistic. Many sketches seeking to capture the active Gladstone, who literally would now rarely sit still, were necessarily swiftly executed and remained unfinished. In one of Hall's finished paintings (NPG; n.d.) (Figure 9), Gladstone is represented privately reading in the Temple of Peace, his study in Hawarden Castle. Nothing could seem farther from the active woodsman than this reclining figure. However if we look at a fascinating watercolour study for this painting (NPG; n.d.), we see a remarkable reinterpretation of the scene (Figure 10). The central figure is still Gladstone reclining and reading, but instead of the besuited gentleman we are presented with the labouring woodcutter in shirt sleeves, displaying a brawny forearm reminiscent of the labourers in Ford Madox Brown's *Work* (1852-65; Manchester City Art Gallery). Something of this figure's litheness is also present in the finished portrait, especially in the impressionistic brushwork which defines the thighs, but the study remains unique in its explicit blending of two distinct iconographies. As such it manifestly signifies the changing representation and reception of this complex figure, crucially as much determined by the politician's adapted behaviour towards the artist as by his assiduous promotion of his wood-chopping.

It is testimony to the popular success of the scholar-woodcutter persona that, following Gladstone's death in May 1898, he was immediately laid in state in his study in Hawarden Castle, surrounded by both his books and his axes, and displayed to the workers who identified him as their champion.

There he lay on an extemporized bier, with his scarlet doctoral robes about him, ... the thin hands clasped upon his breast in token that his work was done....

Many came long distances, especially from the north, to get a glimpse of the face of him of whom they had heard so much and by whom they had been so greatly benefited. So all day long the crowd surged in and out, silent and awe-struck, until the shades of evening fell, when the last group passed lingeringly away, casting a final farewell look at the white, still face...⁹⁸

Not only is the reader united with the woodcutter, but the generic doctor of civil law is also importantly personalized and authenticated by being placed in Gladstone's own library, a site of real work rather than a mark of honorific status.

It is important to note this did not represent an unassailable triumph for Gladstone in representational terms. As Alfred Morgan's painting suggested at the outset, Gladstone's popularity continued to be contested even at the height of his popularity. The particular negative strand of commentary that so diametrically opposed Gladstone's political and intellectual concerns, never completely disappeared. Even after Gladstone had re-committed himself to public politics, criticism of him was still regularly articulated through visual references to his reading or scholarly retirement on occasions when he appeared reluctant actively to involve himself in matters of public interest. For example, during 1884, an unconcerned Gladstone was repeatedly shown being confronted in his library by pressing political problems: on one occasion these were personified by the figure of a fearsome Boer.⁹⁹ However, these attempts proved less and less effective, especially when Gladstone's supporters ceased to be on the defensive about the scholarly aspect of his persona and,

following his lead, integrated it fully into a representation of a different, 'truer' more 'authentic' kind of political figure who transcended ordinary party politics and, somewhat colossus-like, towered over the majority of Victorian public men.

Gladstone's image had come along way since it had been mocked by Walter Bagehot and other fashionable men of letters, who had concentrated their attacks on Gladstone's verbose literary style and unmanly passivity. They had predicted that both of these disadvantages would prevent Gladstone succeeding in politics despite his other obvious accomplishments, as overemphasis on such weaknesses distorted the ideal balance between physical and intellectual capabilities desirable in the represented public man. Such critics had, firstly, underestimated the facility of the visual to support, and in many ways to exceed, the power of the word in late nineteenth-century British political culture. Secondly, not only had they misjudged the tenacity of alternative models of masculinity, but they had also been insensitive to the possibility that audiences might change their estimations of those models.¹⁰⁰ Finally, they had also critically underrated Gladstone's own ability to realize (albeit gradually) his own capacity to appreciate, manipulate and re-present aspects of his public image.

¹ See especially, E. F. Biagini, *Liberty, Retrenchment and Reform: Popular Liberalism in the Age of Gladstone, 1860-1880* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 379-425; D. A. Hamer, 'Gladstone: the Making of a Political Myth', *Victorian Studies* XXII (Autumn 1978), 29-50; Christopher Harvie, 'Gladstonianism, the Provinces and Popular Political Culture, 1860-1906', in R. Bellamy (ed.), *Victorian Liberalism: Nineteenth-Century Political Thought and Practice* (London: Routledge, 1990), pp. 152-174; Patrick Joyce, *Visions of the People: Industrial England and the Question of Class 1848 - 1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 49-50, 51-2; Jon Lawrence, *Speaking for the People: Party, Language and Popular Politics in England, 1867 - 1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 64, 172, 180-1, 195-6; Joseph S. Meisel, *Public Speech and the Culture of Public Life in the Age of Gladstone* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), pp. 264, 272; Ann Pottinger Saab, *Reluctant Icon: Gladstone, Bulgaria, and the Working Classes, 1856-1878* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), pp. 64, 97, 110, 119, 124-5, 154, 179, 199-200.

² That is, Biagini, *Liberty, Retrenchment and Reform*, pp. 380-2.

³ T. Wemyss Reid, 'Mr. Gladstone and His Portraits', *Magazine of Art* (January 1889), 82-88.

⁴ Asa Briggs, 'Victorian Images of Gladstone', in P. J. Jagger (ed.), *Gladstone* (London: Hambledon, 1998), pp. 33-50.

⁵ Briggs, 'Victorian Images', p. 40.

⁶ Gladstone recalled travelling by omnibus in old age but gave no indication of when or how often. There are no references to it in his diaries.

-
- ⁷ Morgan's painting was one of several to follow William Maw Egley's *Omnibus Life in London* (1859; Tate Britain).
- ⁸ Charles Dickens, *Sketches by Boz: Illustrative of Every-day Life and Every-day People* (Philadelphia, 1841), pp. 79-86.
- ⁹ Georg Simmel, 'Sociology of the Senses: Visual Interaction', in R. E. Park and E. W. Burgess (eds), *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969), pp. 360-1.
- ¹⁰ Mary Cowling, *Victorian Figurative Painting: Domestic Life and the Contemporary Social Scene* (London: Andreas Papadakis, 2000), p. 106. See also Christopher Wood, *Victorian Panorama: Paintings of Victorian Life* (London: Faber and Faber Ltd, 1976), pp. 217-18.
- ¹¹ Cowling, *Victorian Figurative Painting*, p. 110.
- ¹² Susan Sontag, 'In Plato's Cave', in P. Alperson (ed.), *The Philosophy of the Visual Arts* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), p. 285.
- ¹³ See W. E. Gladstone, *Speeches on the Irish Question in 1886* (Edinburgh: 1886), p. 292.
- ¹⁴ *Daily News*, 2 August 1887.
- ¹⁵ It has been asserted that the occupants are Morgan, his wife, children and cousin. Wood, *Victorian Painting*, p. 256.
- ¹⁶ For discussion of the problems of political 'representation', see Lawrence, *Speaking for the People*, pp. 3-5, 48, 61-9, 151-2, 236, 258-67.
- ¹⁷ H. C. G. Matthew, *Gladstone 1809-1898* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), p. 287.

-
- ¹⁸ British Library, Gladstone Papers, Additional MS (hereafter BL, GP, Add. MS) 44762, fol. 162: W. E. Gladstone, 'Memorandum read to late Colleagues', 14 January 1875.
- ¹⁹ The internal references relate to pamphlets hostile to Roman Catholicism and excessive Anglican ritualism that Gladstone published after the 1874 defeat. See W. E. Gladstone, *Rome and the Newest Fashions in Religion: Three Tracts* (London: 1875).
- ²⁰ 'Far From the Madding Crowd', *Judy*, 27 January 1875.
- ²¹ 'Good-Bye!', *Punch*, 30 January 1875.
- ²² Quoted in Matthew, *Gladstone*, p. 259.
- ²³ 'F. A.', 'William Ewart Gladstone: A Study of Character', *London Society* XV (February 1869), 98-9.
- ²⁴ Walter Bagehot, *Biographical Studies* (London: Longmans, 1914), p. 116.
- ²⁵ Matthew, *Gladstone*, p. 45; W. E. Gladstone, *The State in Its Relations with the Church*, 4th edn, Revised and Enlarged, 2 vols (London: 1841), vol. I, ch. 1, section 26, p. 25.
- ²⁶ W. H. Cubley's portrait for the Newark Conservatives (1841; Newark Museum) exhibits similar tensions.
- ²⁷ See Robin Simon, *The Portrait in Britain and America: with a Biographical Dictionary of Portrait Painters 1680-1914* (Boston, MA: G. K. Hall, 1987), chapter 2.
- ²⁸ Audrey Linkman, *The Victorians: Photographic Portraits* (London: Tauris Parke Books, 1993), p. 46.

-
- ²⁹ See Catherine King, 'Made in Her Image: Women, Portraiture and Gender in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', in G. Perry (ed.) *Gender and Art* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999), p. 42.
- ³⁰ Kate Flint, *The Woman Reader 1837-1914* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993); Lene Østermark-Johansen, 'The Matchless Beauty of Widowhood: Vittoria Colonna's Reputation in Nineteenth-Century England', *Art History* XXII (June 1999), 270-294.
- ³¹ Peel built a 'Statesmen's Gallery' at Drayton Manor to house his portraits of colleagues and eminent contemporaries. See H. C. G. Matthew, 'Portraits of Men: Millais and Victorian Public Life', in P. Funnell and M. Warner (eds), *Millais: Portraits* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 1999), p. 143.
- ³² BL, Add. MS 40536, fol. 138: Sir Robert Peel to John Lucas, 18 November 1843.
- ³³ *The Athenaeum*, 1 June 1844.
- ³⁴ James Eli Adams, *Dandies and Desert Saints: Styles of Victorian Masculinity* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995), p. 14.
- ³⁵ Flintshire Record Office, Glynne-Gladstone MS (hereafter FRO, GG MS) 339: W. Walker to John Gladstone, 15 July 1842.
- ³⁶ M. R. D Foot and H. C. G. Matthew (eds), *The Gladstone Diaries. With Prime Ministerial Correspondence*, 14 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968-96) (hereafter *GD*), 14, 16, 23 June 1859, 15 and 17 August 1859.
- ³⁷ *GD*, 1 June 1878 and 20 July 1874.
- ³⁸ *GD*, 16 May 1876.
- ³⁹ FRO, GG MS 3018: G. F. Watts to W. E. Gladstone, 15 July 1865.
- ⁴⁰ See *The Guardian* [the weekly Anglican newspaper], 14 May 1879 and 11 January 1882.

-
- ⁴¹ Claude Phillips, 'Millais's Works at Burlington House', *Nineteenth Century* XLIII (March 1898), 385, quoted in Peter Funnell, 'Millais's Reputation and the Practice of Portraiture', in Funnell and Warner, *Millais*, p. 27.
- ⁴² Phillips, 'Millais's Works at Burlington House', 385, quoted in Funnell and Warner, *Millais*, p. 27.
- ⁴³ See Paul Barlow, 'Facing the Past and Present: the National Portrait Gallery and the Search for 'Authentic' Portraiture', in Joanna Woodall, (ed.), *Portraiture: Facing the Subject* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), pp. 219-38.
- ⁴⁴ For a detailed account, see Matthew, 'Portraits of Men'; Matthew, *Gladstone*, p. 519 ff.
- ⁴⁵ M. S. Watts, *George Frederic Watts: The Annals of an Artist's Life*, 3 vols (London: Macmillan, 1912), vol. I, p. 306. Watts subsequently painted out the face.
- ⁴⁶ Lucy Masterman, (ed.), *Mary Gladstone (Mrs. Drew) Her Diaries and Letters* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd, 1930), p. 143: 5 November 1878.
- ⁴⁷ *GD*, 16 February 1882.
- ⁴⁸ *The Guardian*, 10 May 1882.
- ⁴⁹ Matthew, 'Portraits of Men', p. 155.
- ⁵⁰ *The Guardian*, 13 May 1885.
- ⁵¹ 'Grosvenor Gallery Gems', *Punch*, 9 May 1885. See also, 'Grist to the Millais', *Punch*, 9 January 1886.
- ⁵² 'F. A.', 'Gladstone: A Study', 105.
- ⁵³ Matthew, 'Portraits of Men', p. 156.

-
- ⁵⁴ J. G. Millais, *The Life and Letters of Sir John Everett Millais, President of the Royal Academy*, 2 vols (London: 1899), vol. II, p. 156.
- ⁵⁵ Millais, *Millais*, vol. II, p. 208: W. E. Gladstone to J. E. Millais, 25 July 1889.
- ⁵⁶ For example, to Frank Holl in 1887-8. Penelope Gladstone, *Portrait of a Family: The Gladstones 1839-1889* (Kendal: Titus Wilson & Son Ltd, 1989), p. 171.
- ⁵⁷ *GD*, 4 November 1887.
- ⁵⁸ Quoted in J. McClure Hamilton, *Men I Have Painted: With a Foreword by Mrs Drew* (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1921), pp. 7-8.
- ⁵⁹ *GD*, 13 June 1876 and Watts, *Watts*, vol. I, pp. 305-6.
- ⁶⁰ W. T. Roden (1817-92). The portrait is now in Birmingham City Art Gallery.
- ⁶¹ See also, for example, *GD*, 12 September 1877, 6 March 1886, and Masterman, (ed.), *Mary Gladstone*, p. 401.
- ⁶² See David Piper, *The English Face*, ed. by M. Rogers (London: National Portrait Gallery, 1978), p. 216.
- ⁶³ *GD*, 3 September 1890; 7, 10 November 1893 and 14 July 1893.
- ⁶⁴ Hamilton, *Men I Have Painted*, pp. 44, 47-8, 60, 47-8.
- ⁶⁵ Hamilton, *Men I Have Painted*, p. 47.
- ⁶⁶ Harry Furniss, *Some Victorian Men* (London: John Lane, 1924), p. 225. (Chapter 9 was written by Frank Hill.) Note Glynne Wickham's observation that MPs had 'to be both *heard* and *seen* to be possessed of a dynamic and theatrical personality.' Glynne Wickham, 'Gladstone, Oratory and the Theatre', in Jagger, *Gladstone*, pp. 1-32 at p. 10.

⁶⁷ The photograph, with others of the Great Exhibition commissioners, was engraved in the *Illustrated London News*, 18 October 1851.

⁶⁸ When he sat for Claudet again, ‘for [a] Stereoscope likeness’, Gladstone noted the change of technology and judged the Stereoscope ‘a truly wonderful device’. *GD*, 13 August 1853. For similar examples, see *GD*, 29 November 1862 and 22 May 1866 ff.

⁶⁹ *GD*, 19 April 1856.

⁷⁰ See FRO, GG MS 1980.

⁷¹ BL, GP, Add. MS 48607B, fol. 163. Quoted at *GD*, 18 May 1883.

⁷² *GD*, 22 September 1864.

⁷³ *GD*, 18 August 1876.

⁷⁴ *GD*, 13 October 1887. The scene was repeated the following day.

⁷⁵ FRO, GG MS 696: J. W. Gladstone to W. E. Gladstone, 21 July 1858. Gladstone recorded writing to John Wyld Gladstone, a very distant relative, three days before. *GD*, 19 July 1858.

⁷⁶ Gladstone subsequently applied his condition of cheap sale to studio photographers, see, for example, *GD*, 16 July 1867.

⁷⁷ For example, *GD*, 11 September 1874.

⁷⁸ *GD*, 3 August 1857, 24 June 1869, 16 December 1889 and 25 April 1890.

⁷⁹ *GD*, 6 August 1877. See also: *GD*, 28 November 1879, 22 December 1880, 21 March 1881 and 22 September 1884.

⁸⁰ For a useful discussion, see Biagini, *Liberty, Retrenchment and Reform*, p. 398.

⁸¹ Linkman, *Victorians*, p. 67.

⁸² *GD*, 7 October 1861.

-
- ⁸³ *GD*, 13 December 1881. The National Portrait Gallery preserves a print.
- ⁸⁴ Thomas Fall of Baker Street.
- ⁸⁵ D. Cunllo Davies, 'Art in Welsh Homes', *Wales* II (1895), 223, quoted in Peter Lord, *The Visual Culture of Wales: Industrial Society* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1998), p. 121.
- ⁸⁶ Reproduced in Asa Briggs with Archie Mills, *A Victorian Portrait* (London: Cassell, 1989), pp. 76-7.
- ⁸⁷ *GD*, 4 August 1877.
- ⁸⁸ *Times*, 6 August 1877.
- ⁸⁹ FRO, GG MS 702: William Houghton to W. E. Gladstone, 3 October 1877.
- ⁹⁰ See Biagini, *Liberty, Retrenchment and Reform*, p. 397; Hamer, 'Political Myth', 39-40.
- ⁹¹ Thomas Carlyle, *On Heroes, Hero-Worship and the Heroic in History* (London: 1841), pp. 52-3.
- ⁹² With a single line indicating 'notice'. Gladstone used a consistent annotation system to which his own key survives. See Ruth Clayton, 'W. E. Gladstone: an annotation key', *Notes & Queries* CCXLVI (June 2001), 140-3.
- ⁹³ *GD*, 6 August 1877.
- ⁹⁴ Gladstone had shot off his finger in a shooting accident. *GD*, 13 September 1842.
- ⁹⁵ Jeff Hearn, *Men in the Public Eye: the Construction and Deconstruction of Public Men and Public Patriarchies* (London: Routledge, 1992), p. 188.
- ⁹⁶ FRO, GG MS 702: William Houghton to W. E. Gladstone, 3 October 1877.
- ⁹⁷ *GD*, 11 September 1877 ff.

-
- ⁹⁸ T. Archer and A. T. Story, *William Ewart Gladstone and his Contemporaries: Seventy Years of Social and Political Progress*, Revised and Extended Memorial edn, 4 vols (1899), vol. IV, pp. 461-2.
- ⁹⁹ ‘A Terrible Threat!’, *Punch*, 11 October 1884. See also *Punch*, 10 November 1884 and 16 September 1893.
- ¹⁰⁰ See Shearer West, *Portraiture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 161.