Manuscripts and Realia of the Pre-Raphaelites and their Circle in the State Library of Victoria, Melbourne

Hugh Hudson

Research into the Australian connections of the Pre-Raphaelite artists and their circle has grown steadily over recent decades. The essential facts of Thomas Woolner’s trip to Victoria between 1852 and 1854, initially in the company of Edward La Trobe Bateman and Bernhard Smith, have long been known. Smith is sometimes regarded as a Pre-Raphaelite also, and the correspondence between the Smith, Woolner, and Rossetti families in the State Library of Victoria, Melbourne, was thoroughly examined by Juliette Peers in 1991. Subsequently, many historical details have been added to the literature, and conclusions drawn, notably by Peers, Caroline Clemente, Jacqueline Anne Verrocchio, Anne Neale, and Jason Edwards.

---

1 I am very grateful to Sandra Burt and Lois McEvoy, Librarians in the Australian Manuscripts Collection at the State Library of Victoria in Melbourne, and Judith Bronkhurst, Dinah Roe, the National Gallery of Victoria, and the anonymous referees, for their generous assistance in the preparation of this article.
4 Family Papers, ca. 1873–ca. 1929, Bernhard Smith 1820–1885, MS 10626, State Library of Victoria, Melbourne.
9 A. Neale: “Woolner’s Australian Romance,” Journal of Pre-Raphaelite Studies n.s. 19, Fall (2010), pp. 27–44.
Beyond the question of the direct involvement of Pre-Raphaelite artists with the Australian colonies, Angus Trumble has drawn attention to Dante Gabriel Rossetti’s fondness for Australian fauna, and discovered that John Everett Millais had a half-brother who emigrated to Victoria, where he defended the artist from attacks in the popular press. This author has investigated William Holman Hunt’s siblings who emigrated, through whom letters, drawings, and a painting by their brother also came to Victoria. As the Pre-Raphaelites and artists in their circle rose to prominence in Britain over the course of the nineteenth century, they came to be held in high regard by colonial art institutions as well as private patrons and collectors. The Art Gallery of New South Wales emerged as the first notable public collector of their paintings in the Australian colonies, a topic also investigated to an extent by this author. The 2002 exhibition Morris and Co, curated by Christopher Menz for the Art Gallery of South Australia, explored the company’s extensive private patronage in South Australia.

These long-distance private and institutional transactions were effected through exchanges of letters, as well as poems, photographs, and prints. Some of these have now found their way into public collections. The State Library of Victoria contains a small group of manuscripts and realia from the Pre-Raphaelites and their circle, some of it known to researchers, and some of it yet to appear in a scholarly publication. The holdings are distributed across different collections, and are somewhat piecemeal. Yet, by exploring their original contexts, it is possible to gain further insights into various episodes of these artists’ activities and reception.

16 Another immigrant to the Australian colonies with connections to the Pre-Raphaelite circle was Henry Charles Prinsep. He settled in the Swan River Colony, now Western Australia, in 1866 (A. C. Staples: “Prinsep, Henry Charles (Harry) (1844–1922),” *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, [http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/prinsep-henry-charles-harry-8119/text14179](http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/prinsep-henry-charles-harry-8119/text14179), published first in hardcopy 1988, accessed 3 Dec. 2017). His cousin, Valentine Cameron Prinsep, was a painter influenced by, and closely associated with, the Pre-Raphaelites. Both were also related to the Victorian photographer Julia Margaret Cameron, whose aesthetic was, in some respects, also related to that of the Pre-Raphaelites. I am grateful to one of the anonymous referees for bringing the Prinseps to my attention.
Thomas Woolner (1825–1892)

Before Woolner left Britain in 1852 on the voyage that famously inspired Madox-Brown’s painting Last of England, he penned a long poem called “Street Music, Regents Park, Dec. 1851.” In it, he conjured up a vision of his destination:

My soul was carried over lands unknown
And saw their wonders through a haze of dreams:
—
White maidens warbling dulcet nothingness;
Strong youths a-plunging deep for golden ore.

An autograph manuscript of the poem, signed and dated January 1852, is now in the Library’s Autograph Collection (Fig. 1. All items from the Library’s collection discussed in this article are listed separately at the end). A copy of the poem in the hand of William Michael Rossetti is housed in the University of British Columbia, Vancouver.17

Probably while still in Victoria, Woolner added a dedication on the cover to “Mrs. Howitt 1854,” that is, Mrs. Phebe Howitt, wife of the Melbourne doctor and philanthropist Godfrey Howitt, and mother of Edith Howitt, to whom Woolner became engaged while in Victoria.18 The manuscript was presented to the Library by Godfrey and Phebe Howitt’s great-granddaughter, Mrs. J. M. (Phoebe Tantum) Buchanan, of Kooyong Road, Toorak.19 Two shorter autograph poem manuscripts in the Library, “Song” and “O When and Where,” also have a Howitt provenance (Figs. 2 and 3). “Song” closely resembles passages of Woolner’s longer poem “My

---


18 On Woolner’s relations with the Howitt family, see: Clemente, “The Private Face of Patronage,” op. cit., especially pp. 46–59, and Clemente’s article on Woolner in this issue of AJVS.

19 The donor, Mrs. J. M. Buchanan, was Phoebe Tantum Buchanan OBE, wife of Dr. James Mayo Buchanan of Kooyong Rd, Toorak, and daughter of Mr. and Mrs. S. P. Thompson of Box Hill. According to Caroline Clemente, Mrs. S. P. Thompson was “a daughter of Robert Anderson of Barragunda, Cape Schanck, and his wife Edith Mary, only daughter of Dr. Godfrey Howitt” (“Artists in Society: A Melbourne Circle, 1850s–1880s,” Art Bulletin of Victoria 30 (1989): 44–57, p. 44).
Beautiful Lady,” and seems to have been incorporated into it, while “O When and Where” was published in the second issue of the Pre-Raphaelites’ journal, *The Germ.* These were donated separately, with a large quantity of the Howitt family’s papers, in 2008.

Woolner did not stay long in Victoria, returning to Britain to advance his career, and with it his prospects of marrying Edith. A letter from the Scottish poet, artist, and art critic, William Bell Scott, written to Woolner after his return to Britain, was also donated to the Library by Mrs. Buchanan. It welcomes Woolner back to “the old country,” expresses interest in hearing a reading of Woolner’s travel diary, mentions a letter he received from (Thomas) Carlyle, refers to his own recent book (*Poems by a Painter*, published by Smith, Elder & Co. in 1854), and laments the current popular taste in poetry and the criticism he had received in the press. He asks that William Rossetti write to him, and offers to send Gabriel Rossetti a copy of his

---


book. He closes by excusing the self-centred nature of his letter, explaining with good humour, “I have just returned from dining out and a few glasses of wine have made me more than usually egotistical.”

The Howitt Papers contain a series of letters from Phebe to her daughter Edith, which also date to the period after Woolner returned to Britain, and contain snippets about him. In three undated letters, Phebe reassured Edith that she intended to write to him, or was in the process of writing to him, and relayed extracts of his letters sent to Edith from Britain (while Edith was away from home).

Further evidence of Woolner’s continuing relationship with the Antipodes is a letter of 1863, addressed to a Mr. Wilson. It discusses Woolner’s 1862 sculpture *Brother and Sister* (also known as *Deaf and Dumb*), comments on the end of convict transportation, provides criticism of a design for an unspecified award featuring a group of animals, a wreath with ribbons, and a motto, and mentions Woolner’s “Godley,” evidently the *Statue of John Robert Godley* made for Christchurch. This would have been in the design stage at the time, before it was cast in Britain in 1865. From the contents of the letter, it can be deduced that it was addressed to Edward Wilson, owner of the Melbourne newspaper *The Argus* (the letter has been catalogued as such at the Library). He was the subject of a portrait bust in marble made by Woolner in 1868, now also in the collection of the State Library of Victoria. Wilson did write to *The Times* newspaper, as Woolner’s letter also mentions, calling for an end to convict transportation to Australia. He had returned to Britain in 1862. The description of the award in the letter matches the medals Joseph Wyon cast *circa* 1868 for the Acclimatisation Society, founded by Wilson in Melbourne in 1861.

It is not possible (or at least easy) to identify Woolner’s correspondent in a letter dated 12 October 1886, and addressed to a Mrs. Stuart. It thanks her for sending a photograph showing an example of her sculptural work and discusses her health, but little else. The letter was

---

23 Thomas Woolner: Edward Wilson, State Library of Victoria, Melbourne, acc. no: LTS 43.
25 An example of the medal, dated 1868, is housed in Museum Victoria, Melbourne (acc. no. MV Emu, 76606, NU 20066).
donated to the Library in 1924 by the Victorian bibliophile and poet, Evelyn Leigh Atkinson.\textsuperscript{26}

Although Edith Howitt did not ultimately marry Woolner, the family did not forget him either, as a letter of Edith’s daughter—also named Edith—shows. Datable to around 1895, it asks her future husband, S. P. (Steve) Thompson, for an article about Woolner to be sent to her. Another of her letters, dated 30 April 1928, describes Woolner’s 1853 portrait of her grandfather as a good likeness. Further evidence of the family’s continued interest in the artist is the manuscript composed by the British artist and art historian William Gaunt, also among the Howitt Papers. Gaunt was the author of the books \textit{The Pre-Raphaelite Tragedy} and \textit{The Pre-Raphaelite Dream}.\textsuperscript{27} His manuscript’s light-hearted commentary bears the title “The Church Warden was Suspicious (ART, by William Gaunt).” Judging by its tone, it appears to be the text of an article intended for the popular press, although it is not clear if it was ever published. It defends Woolner against a report of a church warden from Woolner’s home town of Hadleigh, who objected to the raising of a memorial to Woolner in his church on the grounds of an indiscretion. It had been reported that Woolner corresponded with Charles Darwin on the apparently \textit{risqué} topic of how extensively an artist’s model is affected by blushing.

\textbf{William Holman Hunt (1827–1910)}

The Holman Hunt material in the Library has been discussed briefly elsewhere,\textsuperscript{28} but merits a more detailed presentation. Like Woolner, Holman Hunt (Fig. 4) was a struggling artist in the early 1850s. Perhaps because of Woolner’s lack of success on the Victorian goldfields, Holman Hunt did not follow his friend to the Antipodes, although he did write later that Australia would be a
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\textsuperscript{26} Evelyn Leigh Atkinson was the son of the successful doctor, mining investor, and pastoralist, Harry Leigh Atkinson, and lived at the property called Ravenswood.

\textsuperscript{27} W. Gaunt: \textit{The Pre-Raphaelite Tragedy}, London 1942, and \textit{The Pre-Raphaelite Dream}, New York 1966.

\textsuperscript{28} Hudson, “A Holman Hunt Painting,” \textit{op. cit.}
suitable destination for his sister Emily.\textsuperscript{29} Holman Hunt’s father, William senior, was a
warehouseman, and married Sarah Hobman in London in 1822.\textsuperscript{30} There are differing
accounts of the number of children they had, but there seem to have been at least two sons
and five daughters.\textsuperscript{31} It has been known for some time that one brother of Holman Hunt,
Edward,\textsuperscript{32} and one sister, Maria,\textsuperscript{33} emigrated to Australia. Perhaps not coincidentally, Edward
arrived in November 1852,\textsuperscript{34} in the month following Woolner’s arrival.\textsuperscript{35} As one of the Pre-
Raphaelite Brotherhood, Woolner would have been considered almost family, a status
formalised when Woolner married a sister of Holman Hunt’s first and second wives (them-
selves sisters). Travelling on the same boat as Edward were a William and a Maria “Pegrum”
(apparently a clerk’s recording of “Peagram”), Edward’s sister and her husband.\textsuperscript{36} They
settled in South Yarra, Melbourne, and their son William junior married a Mary Elizabeth
Brazendale in Melbourne in 1882.\textsuperscript{37} It was through William and Mary Peagram’s branch of
the family that two Holman Hunt drawings, a painting, and a number of documents eventu-
ally came to Victoria, as the documents now in the Library indicate.

A hastily scribbled note on the front of an envelope of the Museum of Applied Science of
Victoria in the Library’s Autograph Collection records some unspecified material “on offer
from Mr. Clayton, brother-in-law of Mr. Peagram, Armadale,” and adds there was “more to
come.” Beside this is a further note: “N[ational] G[allery] has bought drawings from Mr.
C[layton] today 22/3/51.” The two drawings were \textit{Portrait of Emily Hunt}, by Holman Hunt

\textsuperscript{29} This was when they became estranged over a dispute concerning who should raise Holman Hunt’s son Cyril
Benoni Holman Hunt, after the death of the child’s mother, Fanny Waugh Holman Hunt, \textit{My Grandfather, op.


\textsuperscript{31} Walter Armstrong recorded two sons and five daughters in the family, without naming them (“Hunt, William
323). Diana Holman Hunt listed one brother and four sisters for William: Elizabeth Ann (b. 1823); Maria (b.
1825); Sarah (b. 1829); Edward Henry (b. 1832); and Emily (b. 1836) (\textit{My Grandfather, His Wives and Loves},
London 1969, p. 31 note 1). However, she omitted Ann (born c. 1833, according to “Funeral Notices” in \textit{The
Argus}, 30 Aug. 1928, p. 1, which gave her age at death as 95), who was recognised as William’s sister by Judith

\textsuperscript{32} J. E. Millais and W. Holman Hunt: \textit{Letters from Sir John Everett Millais, Bart., P.R.A. (1829–1896) and
Lutyens, London 1974, p. 54 note 104.

\textsuperscript{33} Holman Hunt, \textit{My Grandfather, op. cit.}, p. 252 note 8.

\textsuperscript{34} An Edward H. Hunt arrived in Victoria on the \textit{Dinapore} in November 1852, aged 21 (Public Record Office

\textsuperscript{35} M. J. Tipping: “Woolner, Thomas (1825–1892),” \textit{Australian Dictionary of Biography}, National Centre of
Biography, Australian National University, http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/woolner-thomas-4887/text8177,

\textsuperscript{36} Public Record Office Victoria, \textit{op. cit.}, search by “Pegrum.” Maria “Pegrum” was listed as aged 26, the
approximate age of Maria Peagram, the artist’s sister, in 1852. Diana Holman Hunt related how Maria met Bill
Peagram in London (\textit{My Grandfather, op. cit.} p. 44).

\textsuperscript{37} Their golden wedding anniversary was announced in the \textit{Argus}, 15 April 1932, p. 1.
(of his sister), and Portrait of Cyril Benoni Holman Hunt, executed jointly by Holman Hunt and his second wife Edith (of his son by his first wife Fanny). Among the items housed with the envelope is the business card of L. H. Clayton of 31 Eumeralla Rd, Caulfield. It was annotated to read: “Presented by Mrs. L. H. Clayton and family 21.5 1951.” This was Elsie Maud Clayton. In January of that year she and her brother Herbert Holman Peagram became executors to the estate of their late mother Mary Elizabeth Peagram. Thus, the provenance of the Holman Hunt drawings sold to the Gallery and the documents donated to the Library can probably be traced to the widow of a nephew of the artist.

Clues suggesting how and when this material might have come into her possession are contained in another document in the Library. A letter of 1928 from the Manager of the Trustees and Executors and Agency Company Limited of Melbourne, Mr. V. G. Watson, is addressed to a “Mr. Wm Peagram.” It informs him that a Mrs. A. Thurman had passed away, leaving a painting of “the head of a small child” in her estate. It was said to have been painted by William Holman Hunt at the age of fifteen and brought to Australia by Peagram’s son a few years earlier. It was not specifically bequeathed, and Watson asked whether Peagram senior might like to have it.

William and Mary Peagram and their two youngest children Henry (aged 22) and Garnet (aged 15) had visited England in 1923. There they made contact with their Holman Hunt family. A letter dated 29 December 1923 in the Library, from H. L. Holman Hunt (the artist’s son Hilary Lushington) to William Peagram, apologises for not having been able to do anything for him during the visit, due to the short notice. However, William and Mary might well have met with their son Horace Herbert (Lewis) Peagram. He had gone to live with Emily, the artist’s sister, at 39 Glenelg Road in Brixton, London. She died a widow in December


40 Published in: J. Bronkhurst: A Catalogue Raisonné, op. cit., cat. no. 33.


42 For the identification of Horace Herbert as William and Mary Peagram’s son, see: Argus: “Deaths,” 11 July 1946, p. 2.
Probate was granted to Horace Peagram on 18 January 1922. His brother, Herbert Holman, was bequeathed £300. Horace, however, received £1,000, as well as the residue of her estate. This possibly included the painting, the two drawings, and the documents.

Clearly, some of the Holman Hunt-related documents in the Library did come from Emily Hunt, since three are addressed to her: a letter from Millais, one from Charles Aitken, and one from Holman Hunt, discussing his purchase of a piano for her. She had had artistic aspirations also. The letter from Millais, dated 30 March 1854, invites her to his home for tea with his mother, and asks her to bring her drawings, which he had promised William he would look at. William had, in turn, promised his father on his death-bed that he would look after his sister and supervise her artistic career. It is plausible that Emily was the source of the two drawings now in the National Gallery of Victoria also. One is a depiction of her, and she might well have wished for a drawing of William’s son, over whose welfare they had fallen out. She certainly owned some portraits in oil by her brother. The letter from Charles Aitken, Director of the National Gallery, British Art (now “Tate”), is dated 24 April 1917, and is addressed to Mrs. Wyman (Emily had married a Mr. Wyman) and acknowledges her proposed gift in 1917 of certain portraits. The Tate did receive two early Holman Hunt portraits from Emily in 1917: Portrait of John Hunt and Portrait of John Key.

Thus, a tentative provenance for the documents and drawings in question could be given as: Emily Hunt; bequeathed to her great-nephew Horace Herbert (Lewis) Peagram; his gift to his mother Mary Elizabeth Peagram; her executors, being her son Herbert Holman Peagram and daughter Elsie Maud Clayton; the drawings bought from Elsie Maud Clayton’s husband, L.

---

43 Diana Holman Hunt gave her year of death as 1920 (My Grandfather, op. cit p. 252 note 8), while Judith Bronkhurst gave it as 1921 (personal communications, 19 and 27 Sept. 2010).

44 There are among the Holman Hunt-related papers, in addition, an unaddressed envelope dated 1885, containing thirteen cut-out signatures of Holman Hunt, as well as one of Robert Braithwaite Martineau (a pupil of William Holman Hunt), a note asking for admission for a young woman of the Hunt family to see a picture at the German Gallery at 108 New Bond Street, a signed carte-de-visite of William Holman Hunt (see Fig. 4 in this article), and a printed letter regarding changes to the dates of an exhibition at the Colosseum in Glasgow, with a map of central London drawn on the back showing the location of “Seddon Esqre Bond St.” In 1854 Holman Hunt met fellow artist Thomas Seddon in the Levant on an artistic trip. Thomas was the son of the cabinet maker Thomas Seddon, whose premises in 1854 were at 67 New Bond St (A. Heal: The London Furniture Makers, from the Restoration to the Victorian Era, 1660–1840, London 1973 p. 161).

45 Amor, William Holman Hunt: The True Pre-Raphaelite, op. cit., p. 151. A watercolour by Emily, executed with assistance from William, was sold at Bonham’s, London in 2012: Jealous Jessie, signed and dated “Emily Hunt/1861” (lower left), and inscribed “No 1. Jealous Jessie./Miss Emily Hunt/Tor Villa/Campden Hill/Kensington - W.” on a label attached to the reverse (Auction 19923, 19th Century Paintings, Drawings and Watercolours, 11 July 2012).

H. Clayton, by the National Gallery of Victoria on 22 March 1951; and the documents donated to the Library by her family on 21 May 1951.

And what of the painting? Returning to the nineteenth century, on 23 November 1857, a Miss Annie Hunt, aged 23, arrived in Victoria on the *Sydenham*. On 10 January 1860, a notice appeared in *The Argus* (Melbourne) for a wedding between Miss Ann Hunt, “fourth daughter of W[illia]m Hunt Esq. of London,” and a Mr. William Thurman. It seems Annie (alternatively “Ann”) was another of William Holman Hunt’s sisters. Nineteenth-century newspaper notices record Mr. W. G. and Mrs. A. Thurman living in the small town of Coleraine, west of Melbourne, in Victoria. Horace Peagram might have given the painting to his great aunt, and either delivered the painting himself or delivered it through one of his brothers, around 1923.

In the 1980s, the fate of the painting was investigated by Holman Hunt’s granddaughter and biographer, the late Diana Holman Hunt. In her 2005 *catalogue raisonné* for the artist, Judith Bronkhurst reported the contents of a letter written in 1980 to Diana Holman Hunt by an Australian descendent of the family, informing her that the painting had been destroyed. Nevertheless, she was able to identify it as Holman Hunt’s lost painting *Hark!*. Bronkhurst observed that the description of the painting in Australia as “the head of a small child” fitted the descriptions of *Hark!* better than any other known work. It was described in a letter of the artist as “a portrait of a little girl with a watch at her ear.” Hunt’s biographer Alfred Charles Gissing described it as a depiction of his little sister. Diana Holman Hunt and Judith Bronkhurst, in turn, suggested Emily was the likely sitter. The work was exhibited at the Royal Academy in London in 1846, but was returned to Hunt unsold. If the subject of *Hark!* was Emily, as has been suspected, this might weigh in favour of her having owned it, and of her having left it to her Australian relations, as it is argued here was most likely the case with the drawing of her.

---

47 Public Record Office Victoria, *op. cit.*, search by “Annie” and “Hunt.”
53 According to a note written by Gladys Holman Hunt (the artist’s daughter) on the back of Hunt’s *Self-Portrait* now in the Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery, *Hark!* was scraped down and overpainted with the *Self-Portrait*. However, this cannot have been the case, since the *Self-Portrait* is initialled by the artist and dated 1845, while *Hark!* was exhibited in the following year.
At the end of her life, Annie Thurman lived in a house at 313 Moorabool Street, Geelong, in Victoria. According to a descendent, who has recently discussed the matter with their family, a painting was indeed seen there which fits the description of the missing *Hark!*. It was said to have shown a young girl holding what was believed to be a shell to her ear, and it was thought to depict the artist’s sister Maria.\(^{54}\) In all likelihood this was *Hark!*. Annie Thurman’s death was announced in *The Argus* (Melbourne) in 1928, where it was indicated that she was survived by daughters Mrs. A. Alexander and Mrs. Amy B. Lloyd.\(^{55}\) Records exist for seven children, including a son bearing the name William Holman Hunt, reflecting the family’s pride in their artist relative.\(^{56}\) The suggestion that the painting was destroyed could not be verified by the descendent, and it seems, given the careful efforts to find a home for it after Annie Thurman’s death, described above, that it was just as likely lost trace of.

**John Millais (1829–1896)**

As well as the letter to Emily Hunt, further Millais material is contained in the Library’s Autograph Collection, concerning Eliezer Levi Montefiore’s efforts to purchase a work by the artist for the Art Gallery of New South Wales. Montefiore’s papers were donated to the Library by his daughter Caroline in 1929. In his capacity as Trustee, Montefiore visited London in 1884, there making contact with artists and art collectors. The watercolourist and friend of the Pre-Raphaelites, Joseph Jopling, wrote to Montefiore on 12 January 1884: “I understand that you wish to procure, if possible, a good example of Millais’ work for deposit in the National Gallery, now in course of formation in Sydney, New South Wales.” Jopling then enthusiastically offered a life-size, three-quarter length portrait of

---

\(^{54}\) A descendent of Annie Thurman, personal communication, 15 Sept. 2010.


“a very beautiful woman, called ‘the tea-rose,’” which had been painted in 1879. He also offered to show works by Landseer, Opie, Kate Bischoff, Gill Barnett, and Rossetti. There can be little doubt that the Millais painting in question was a portrait of Jopling’s wife, Louise Jane Jopling (Née Goode, Later Rowe), now in the National Portrait Gallery, London. It is life-size, three-quarter length, depicts a beautiful woman, and was painted in 1879. Jopling’s coyness in naming her is conceivably due to propriety. The portrait had been a gift from Millais to the Joplings’ son, who was Millais’ godson.57 Jopling wrote to Montefiore two days later, to put a price of 1,000 guineas on the picture. After another two days, Jopling wrote again, to say he had informed Holman Hunt of Montefiore’s visit to England, and had been given permission to take Montefiore to Holman Hunt’s studio.

It seems Montefiore took up the offer, for on 31 January Holman Hunt wrote to Montefiore returning a photograph of himself, now signed, and expressing his hope that Montefiore might one day come back when the studio was less crowded with canvases. No work of Holman Hunt was acquired for the Gallery in Montefiore’s lifetime, although one can only speculate as to why.

It does seem, though, that Montefiore had set his mind on acquiring a Millais, for a note written by the artist on 6 February 1884 arranges a time for an unidentified man—probably Montefiore, since the letter came from his papers—to visit the artist’s studio. At the top and on the reverse of the note are further notes in pencil with prices of works by various artists, although none clearly relates to Millais. Nevertheless, there is an indication that Montefiore investigated what a fair price for a work by Millais would be. A letter from the British MP and collector of Old Master and Pre-Raphaelite art, Joseph Ruston,58 to the Managing Director of the Fine Arts Society, Marcus Bourne Huish, of 31 May 1885, which also came from Montefiore’s papers, reads: “Had ‘the Captive’ been offered to me last year for anything under £2,000 I think I should then have tried to buy it.” The Art Gallery of New South Wales purchased The Captive59 (Fig. 5) from the Fine Arts Society for £1,750 on 3 June of the same year.

57 J. Rosenfeld: “118 Louise Jopling 1879,” in A. Smith and J. Rosenfeld eds, with contributions by H. Birchall: exh. cat. Millais, London (Tate Britain), Amsterdam (Van Gogh Museum), Fukuoka (Kitakyushu Municipal Museum of Art), and Tokyo (Bunkamura Museum of Art) 2007, p. 204.
The purchase was considered a coup at the Gallery, judging by the publicity it received, and the pride of place the painting was given for at least two months upon its arrival in Sydney. So successful was Montefiore’s trip to London—probably at his own expense—that his fellow Trustees wrote on 6 June 1884 to thank him for his efforts in acquiring works for the Gallery and promoting the institution.

**Edward Burne-Jones (1833–1898)**

Although Burne-Jones was not a member of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, his connections with their later activities are so numerous and close that it is legitimate to include him here. The Library has a letter of his, which was forwarded by the Trustees, Executors and Agency Co. in June 1909, and which is short enough to quote in full:

[in the top left corner, in pencil, in a later hand: “To Sir William Agnew”]

May 14th 1895

My dear Friend

The smaller “Wheel of Fortune” which Mr. Benson had was the first I began of the subject. It was drawn in & the head painted some few years before I began it on a larger scale—the one now in the possession of Mr. Balfour—but I finished it after the big picture—not however touching the head. I cannot clearly recall the dates but I think it was painted about 1870. This I could find out for you if needful.

I will see to the signature of Flora early next week.

Always yours sincerely

E Burne-Jones

The Trustees, Executors and Agency Co. was responsible for administering the Felton Bequest’s funds, through which Burne-Jones’s oil painting *The Wheel of Fortune* (Fig. 6) was acquired for the National Gallery of Victoria in 1909, on the advice of the Bequest’s advisor, Frank Gibson. The Public Library and National Gallery of Victoria were at this time separ-

---

ate parts of the same institution, which is how the letter came to the Library following the acquisition.

Two versions of The Wheel of Fortune in oil are known: that in Melbourne, and a larger one now in the Musée d’Orsay, Paris. Thus, the smaller one in Melbourne, had, according to the letter, belonged to a Mr. Benson. He was identified by Annette Dixon (without noting her source) when she gave the work’s provenance as: “R. H. Benson, A. Wood, Felton Bequest 1909 (acc. No. 381/2).” Further, she wrote: “This is the smaller of two versions in oil. It was begun before but completed after the second, which was exhibited at the Grosvenor Gallery in 1883 (private collection, France).”

The Robert H. and Evelyn Benson collection of Old Master paintings was bought en bloc by Duveen Bros, Inc., in 1927 for an enormous sum. An indication of its very high quality was the presence in the collection of Giorgione’s Holy Family, now in the National Gallery of Art, Washington. The other version of The Wheel of Fortune passed through the Balfour and de Noailles families, before being acquired by the Musées nationaux of France in 1980.

Burne-Jones’s concurrent production of multiple versions of a composition in his studio follows a practice that dates at least to the Renaissance. Indeed, Christopher Wood has observed of Burne-Jones that “His idea was to run a kind of Renaissance studio, with him and the assistants working simultaneously on a great many projects. Burne-Jones’s output was therefore huge, and historians will be kept busy for many years debating just how much of his work is by assistants.” In this case, the Library’s letter points to the fully autograph status of the Melbourne version—although it seems no author has ever in fact questioned that the painting was fully executed by Burne-Jones himself.

for Lillie Langtry sitting for the figure of Fortune; Benson et al. op. cit., p. 120; and S. Wildman: “52. The Wheel of Fortune,” in S. Wildman and J. Christian eds, op. cit., pp. 153–55: “The picture was conceived and begun in 1875...” Wildman noted five other versions in various media including “a smaller oil of 1885” in the National Gallery of Victoria.


Similarly, Burne-Jones produced a number of versions of the *Flora*. The version referred to in this letter may be the one in gouache and gold paint on paper, which was sold by the British dealer Peter Nahum at the Leicester Galleries in 1989, with a provenance including Thomas Agnew and Sons, London. A signature, however, was not reported in the sale catalogue.  

---

Fig. 6. Edward Burne-Jones. 
*The Wheel of Fortune*. 1871–85. 
Oil on canvas. 151.4 x 72.5cm. 
National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne, 
Felton Bequest, 1909 (381/2). 
Photo: National Gallery of Victoria.

---

William Morris (1834–1896)

Another artist intimately connected with the late activities of the Pre-Raphaelites is William Morris. A small group of items connected with Morris’s Kelmscott Press and Socialist League activities was donated to the Melbourne Public Library by Dorothy Walker, together with two items from the Chiswick Press, which had published some of Morris’s early designs. Dorothy was the daughter of the engraver and printer Emery Walker. He was a close friend of Morris, and had assisted him in setting up the Kelmscott Press. He was also Branch Secretary of the Hammersmith Branch of the Socialist League when Morris was Treasurer. Another Felton Bequest advisor, Sydney Cockerell, delivered these and other gifts from Dorothy Walker and himself on a visit to Melbourne in 1938. On this occasion, Shane Carmody notes, Dorothy Walker included printers’ proofs of border designs for Kelmscott Press along with her gift to the Library of a valuable fifteenth-century volume from her father’s collection. Cockerell had been Morris’s secretary, and in that role was closely involved with the Kelmscott Press.

The Kelmscott Press material that Cockerell delivered includes a catalogue and prospectus of the Press (1893), eleven sheets with proof prints of wood engravings, or electrotype copies thereof, made after designs by Morris for border decorations (1893–c.1896), and four sheets with proof prints of wood engravings, or electrotype copies thereof, made after designs by Morris for decorated initials (1896). There is one sheet with a proof of a William H. Hooper wood engraving, made after a design by Edward Burne-Jones. A Christian Boy Singing a Hymn in the Jewish Quarter of a City in Asia (Fig. 7) is an illustration for “The Prioress’s Tale” from Geoffrey Chaucer’s The Canterbury Tales, and was made for the Kelmscott Press’s The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer: Now Newly Imprinted, published in 1896.

68 See: W. Blunt: Cockerell: Sydney Carlyle Cockerell, Friend of Ruskin and William Morris and Director of the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, London 1964; for Cockerell’s involvement with the Kelmscott Press, pp. 58–66, 78, 80, 100, 323, and 350–51; for his relationship with Emery Walker, in many places, but especially pp. 78–84; and for Cockerell’s visit to Melbourne, pp. 275–81. Blunt noted that “Cockerell had systematically been retrieving discarded proof sheets of every kind; these fruits of his ‘pious regard for history in the making’ and ‘instinct for the preservation of the significant and the beautiful,’ together with preservation copies of Kelmscott books from Morris, and other Morrisiana, fetched a very large sum when they came to be sold at Sotheby’s in December 1956” (p. 64).
Further, there are two cheques dated 16 July 1894 and 9 October 1894, and made out by Morris to T. J. Cobden-Sanderson, who had established the Doves bindery at Hammersmith in the previous year. It was Cobden-Sanderson who gave the Arts and Crafts movement its name. There are also two copies of *Psephisma tes voules kai tou demou ton Athenaiôn*, a four-page sample of Robert Proctor’s “Otter” Greek type capitals, printed for him by the Chiswick Press in 1903. It bears an illustration designed by F. G. Sabey on the cover, showing an otter and Proctor’s monogram and coat of arms. The title is transliterated from Greek, the text of a decree concerning Chalcis that was promulgated in 446–45 B.C.

The Socialist League material given to the Library includes a Hammersmith Branch membership dues record card designed by Morris, apparently signed by him and Walker. There is also a copy of a letter of 27 November 1890, seemingly signed and dated by Emery Walker. It is addressed to the Secretary of the East London Branch and explains the reasons for the separation of the Hammersmith branch from the League. Further, there is a series of printed pamphlets relating to the Socialist League’s activities.

Such archival materials, notwithstanding their fragmentary nature, can add detail and depth to our understanding of the Antipodean activities of the Pre-Raphaelite artists and artists in their circle, as well as private and institutional collecting practices in the Australian colonies. Further, they can suggest new avenues for research. Woolner’s poetry is well known, yet in view of recent criticism of his descriptions of Indigenous Australians and other subjects of
British imperialism in his diary,\(^6^9\) it may be apposite to investigate the somewhat misogynistic tenor of passages of “Street Music, Regents Park, Dec. 1851.” The fate of Holman Hunt’s lost painting *Hark!* might be revealed with continued research into the Peagram family. The moderately Orientalist depiction of Millais’ *The Captive* might be considered in light of Eliezer Levi Montefiore’s Jewish identity. Burne-Jones’s studio practice might be investigated further, to determine how he divided the execution of paintings between himself and his assistants. Finally, aspects of Morris’s working methods might be revealed through an analysis of the function of his proof prints, in particular, whether changes were ever made to the matrices following the making of the proofs. Hopefully, the descriptions of the State Library of Victoria’s holdings relating to the Pre-Raphaelites provided in this article will allow knowledge of the Pre-Raphaelites to grow in these or other, unforeseen ways.

Dr. Hugh Hudson is Assistant Professor in the Graduate Institute of Art History at National Taiwan Normal University, and has previously taught at The University of Melbourne, La Trobe University, Hunan University of Technology, and Hubei Polytechnic University. His research spans subjects in art history, visual culture, museology, and art conservation.
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