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INTRODUCTION

Peter Brown well exemplifies the Board member who generously provides the proverbial “time, talent and treasure” to an art museum. As past president of the Memorial Art Gallery, Pete has played key leadership roles over the years and, perhaps, none more important to me than his chairmanship of the Search Committee that brought me to Rochester twenty-five years ago. And, for twenty-five years, I have profited from his financial expertise, analytical mind, intellectual curiosity and keen eye. Certainly the last two characteristics enabled the Gallery to acquire one of the most significant paintings in recent years, a painting that, once acquired, was immediately sought by the National Gallery of Art for its pioneering exhibition of trompe l’oeil painting. Later Pierre Rosenberg, former director of the Louvre, referred to works like Walter Goodman’s *The Printseller’s Window* as typifying the astonishing, if unheralded, works of European painting found in American museums.

Pete played an instrumental role in bringing this brilliant, if unheralded, work of art to Rochester. He, like curators Marjorie Searl and Nancy Norwood, knew that if we didn’t know the artist’s name, we certainly recognized the quality and the genius of the painting. And Pete’s interest and curiosity did not end with our successful bid. With lawyer-like discipline and professorial skill, he began a decade-long journey of research and writing. This catalog and exhibition are the results of Pete’s fascination with a relatively unknown artist who, in works such as this, touched upon greatness. At the end of Pierre Rosenberg’s commentary on *The Printseller’s Window* in his book *Only in America*, the author asks the question “Who will be the one to succeed in perfectly deciphering it?” I submit the name of Peter Ogden Brown as my answer.

Grant Holcomb

*The Mary W. and Donald R. Clark Director,*

*Memorial Art Gallery of the University of Rochester*
Walter Goodman  
British, 1838–1912  
The Printseller’s Window  
Oil on canvas, 1883  
Marion Stratton Gould Fund, 98.75
At a Sotheby’s auction in the fall of 1998 the Memorial Art Gallery purchased a painting by Walter Goodman at the highest price it had ever paid for any work. This was noteworthy because to the art world, and particularly the American art world, the artist’s name was virtually unknown, yet the painting was so compelling to director Grant Holcomb that he moved quickly to be the successful bidder on behalf of the Rochester museum.

The Printseller’s Window is a trompe l’oeil painting of a bearded merchant contemplating a terra cotta figurine, presumably for removal from or placement in an already busy display case. In addition to a collection of bric-a-brac, the printseller’s cabinet is chockablock with old books, prints, and, along the front, a string of small photographic portraits, all rendered with striking verisimilitude.

The painting likely began its life in London in 1883. On May 11 of that year London’s Jewish Chronicle noted that Mr. WALTER GOODMAN’S picture of the “Printseller” is being exhibited as a special feature at the St. James’s Gallery, King Street, St. James’s. This work, which is the most important one of the kind that has been painted by Mr. Goodman, represents the window of a printseller’s shop as seen from the street side. It has already attracted considerable attention.

Goodman subsequently exhibited the work at the 1883 Liverpool Autumn Exhibition of the Walker Art Gallery where, according to the Liverpool Mercury, “This novel and original subject is generally surrounded by a small crowd of visitors.” The price of £315 suggests that Goodman regarded it very highly, but the picture found no buyer, for we next find it listed among the exhibits of the Royal Scottish Academy in Edinburgh in 1884.

The artist’s records indicate that he presented the painting to the public many more times, the last at an exhibition entitled “19th Century Society” in 1894. From that point until it appears in a sale in 1965 its ownership history is presently unknown.

The painting is no less intriguing today than when it first appeared in London. For all the realism of its details, as a whole it dazzles the eye, engages the viewer, and seemingly begs to be deciphered. That undertaking has occupied me for nearly a decade. In the essay that follows I will set out what is presently known about Walter Goodman, describe The Printseller’s Window and the visual references it contains, and offer a possible explanation of what the artist was seeking to express in this complex and engaging image.
Julia Salaman Goodman was one of twelve siblings of a talented Anglo-Jewish family, whose ranks included a miniature painter—her sister Kate—and their brother, the distinguished musician Charles Kensington Salaman. She studied with Robert Faulkner, himself a pupil of Sir Joshua Reynolds. When her husband, Louis, became an invalid in later life, Julia was forced to support the family through her portraiture. She first exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1838 and entered the last painting in her long career there in 1901. She was a member of the Society of Woman Artists and is credited with over one thousand portraits in pastels and oils.

Walter Goodman studied with J. M. Leigh and at the Royal Academy in London, where he was admitted as a student in 1857. In 1858 he sketched the trial of Dr. Simon Bernard (for conspiracy in the assassination attempt that year on Napoleon III in Paris). This was followed by a commission to paint seven large (6’ x 4’) canvasses of Napoleon III’s 1859 Italian Campaign. He later exhibited at the British Institution, where his mother’s paintings were well known.

He resided in Edinburgh before and after traveling through Europe to Florence, where he refined his painting skills in the manner popular at that time, by copying works of old masters in the Uffizi and Pitti Palaces. In Florence he soon met a young Cuban artist, Joaquin Cuadras. The two spent three years in Italy (1861–63), before moving on together to Barcelona.

In 1864 Goodman returned briefly to Edinburgh, where he roomed with his brother, Edward John, then an associate editor of the *Edinburgh Courant*. There the artist painted a portrait of his brother’s employer, *Courant* editor Sir James Hannay, who would later be appointed British Consul to Barcelona. In that year Goodman exhibited this portrait, together with a smaller likeness of writer David Smith, at the Royal Scottish Academy. Then, after being joined in England by Cuadras, the two men set sail for the West Indies and Cuadras’s home in Santiago, Cuba, where they would spend the next few years working together as artists and, in Goodman’s case, as a somewhat controversial foreign reporter. Goodman lived by his wits, tinting *cartes-de-visite* for the locals.
Walter Goodman
“Sketches at Santiago del Cuba,” The Graphic, December 6, 1873.

Morro Castle may be seen, as well as Cachita, a Cuban girl with whom the artist was enamored. Goodman, himself, may occupy the hammock between the framing palms.
after they sat for the photographer up the street, followed by undertaking interior decorating assignments, illuminating ceilings, fabricating life-size advertising “Indians” for merchants, and even constructing a municipal triumphal arch. He painted theatrical scenery, made up stage artists, translated the famous English farce of “Box and Cox” for a Spanish production, took a Cuban mistress, “Cachita,” and was falsely arrested as a spy while innocently touring a fortress-prison in Santiago.

In about 1868, civil unrest forced Goodman and Cuadras to relocate, first to Havana, and then, early in 1870, to New York. Goodman spent some time in Manhattan working with the émigré Cuban patriotic movement in fundraising and lobbying for U.S. recognition of and intervention in his adopted country’s deteriorating political situation, but to no avail. *The Jewish Chronicle* reports that he visited Rome before returning to his family home in London in 1871. In that year, he exhibited a number of portraits. In 1873 he published an account of his years in Cuba, entitled *The Pearl of the Antilles, or An Artist in Cuba* to favorable reviews. The book was based upon a series of humorous sketches, first published in British periodicals.

At the same time a page of drawings, which Goodman had undertaken while in Santiago, was published in a British magazine, *The Graphic*. The February 1874 issue of *Cassell’s Magazine* included two further articles by Goodman, while that winter saw exhibitions of oil paintings at London’s Dudley and French Galleries. *The Jewish Chronicle* of November 6, 1874 (p. 516) reported that these works were favorably noticed in leading periodicals.

In an article entitled “Free Lectures to Jewish Working Men,” *The Jewish Chronicle* for February 5, 1875 (p. 718) describes a presentation made by Goodman to a “very large audience” at the Jews’ Infant School in London entitled “An Evening with the Cubans.” At the close of the largely humorous talk, Goodman reportedly described the circumstances of his abrupt departure from the island:
On the outbreak of the insurrection, after the expulsion of Queen Isabella from Spain, Mr. Goodman became a correspondent of the *New York Herald*, and in the capacity he wrote several letters, certain passages in which were far from complimentary to the Cubans, great indignation was aroused against the correspondent, and on discovery being made that “el Caballero Inglese” as Mr. Goodman was called, was the writer of the letter, he was obliged to leave the island in order to escape assassination.

In 1875, his mother, Julia, exhibited a portrait of her son at the Society of British Artists. The following year his father, Louis, died. Walter remained active, exhibiting a drawing, *The Language of the Face*, at The Black and White Exhibition at The Dudley Gallery and *Morning Work* at the London Annual Exhibition of Fine Arts. The *Jewish Chronicle* of June 16, 1876 (p. 170) described the latter scene as “a housemaid...cleaning a window, which the spectator is supposed to be looking through,” possibly prefiguring the unusual perspective of *The Printseller’s Window*. The reporter went on to say that “though the idea would appear to be somewhat difficult of execution, Mr. Goodman has been very successful, indeed remarkably so, as regards the flowers on the balcony outside the window.”

In 1877, two pages of drawings of Russian peasantry by Goodman appeared in the *Illustrated London News*. The first supplemented an article by *bon vivant* George Augustus Sala, who begins by recounting the comic failure of two Englishmen, “who shall remain nameless,” to view the city of St. Petersburg, Russia, by balloon. It is likely that the pair were Sala and Goodman, whose apparent close relationship is recognized by the inclusion of Sala’s photograph in *The Printseller’s Window*. Sala records his visit as having occurred in October of 1876. While Goodman was initially credited for his Russian portrayals by the *Illustrated London News*, a second page of similar drawings appeared in the November 17 issue without
In 1878 Walter Goodman scored two coups involving the new Chinese diplomatic missions to Europe. Lin Hsi Hung, Chinese Minister to the Court of Berlin, commissioned him to copy the National Gallery's *Madonna in Prayer* by Sassoferrato, reputedly the first commission given by a Chinese to an English artist. He also painted *His Excellency Kuo Ta-Jen, (Guo Song Tao) Chinese Minister to the Court of St. James* (China’s first such ambassador). The portrait was initially exhibited at the Royal Academy and later at the Walker Art Gallery in Liverpool. The Chinese Minister also commissioned a group portrait of his wife, Kuo Tai-Tai, and new son, together with their nurse. Goodman proudly noted in a later article on the subject in Sala’s Journal\(^\text{21}\) that a “large finished” preliminary “study” of the striking Kuo Tai-Tai was shown to Queen Victoria in March of 1879.

The September 17, 1880 issue of *The Jewish Chronicle* announced that MR. WALTER GOODMAN has lately taken a new Studio and Gallery at 44, Baker Street, for the display of his works, among which are portraits in oil of Mr. Wilkie Collins, which the artist has recently painted, M. Fortuny, the late well-known Spanish painter, a replica of the Chinese Ambassador, and various specimens of Mr. Goodman’s “portrait-pictures”, in black and white, executed on porcelain, paper, and other materials. Mr. Goodman invites the members of our community to inspect his productions.\(^\text{22}\)
A Goodman descendant owns a self-portrait from this year, which Walter may have undertaken, possibly from a photograph, to promote the new studio. At 42, Goodman boasts a large head of dark, curly hair, brown eyes, aquiline nose and the faintest of smiles between a slightly curled, light-brown mustache, and a soul patch—quite the Bohemian!

This may have been the economic high point in Goodman's career as an artist, for it is evident from British census records, stated residences on art show submissions, and his own writings, that Walter Goodman was supported throughout most of his life by his friends and family, from Joaquin Cuadras to his mother, Julia, and his numerous siblings. In 1877 the artist moved to Bradford, Yorkshire, and lived with his sister, Alice, for a number of years. In 1874 she had married an artist and, interestingly, photographer, Edmund Passingham, who had studio affiliations and locations in London and Brighton, including a five-year appointment with the Patent Casket Portrait Company. Alice assisted him in the photographic business and Walter, during his extended residence, was no doubt periodically called upon to lend a hand as well.

The 1881 census lists Walter as still living with the Passinghams at 31 Park View Road, Bradford. Eventually, Walter was joined by his mother, Julia, at the Passinghams’ home, which also served as a photographic studio. The influence of the Passinghams’ work and studio settings on Walter Goodman (Edmund specialized in portrait photographs and cartes-de-visite), can only be surmised. While none of the cartes that appear in the 1883 Printseller can be traced to their studio, the proximity of the painting to the artist’s period of residence with these accommodating photographers cannot be gainsaid.
Walter Goodman’s apparent inability to independently support himself on a consistent basis can be attributed in part to the willingness with which his family came to his aid. Towards the close of 1881, after suffering a “severe illness,” Walter was taken by his mother, Julia, to the seaside town of Broadstairs, to “recruit” his health. There, he renewed his acquaintance with novelist Wilkie Collins, who was recovering from an attack of the gout with which he was afflicted throughout his later life.

Goodman subsequently painted a portrait of Collins. This work, like most of Goodman’s stage and celebrity paintings, was undertaken at the artist’s request and retained by him without compensation. Frequently, following the death of a notable sitter, Goodman would offer such an earlier portrait for sale from his studio. This was the case with Queen Victoria’s hemophiliac fourth son, Prince Leopold, Duke of Albany. After the latter’s untimely death in 1884, the artist exhibited his portrait at The Guildhall Academy of Arts. The painting was later acquired by The National Hospital in Queen’s Square, London, for a new wing commemorating the unfortunate young prince (it has since disappeared). However, when Goodman offered Collins’s portrait at the Royal Society of British Artists, following the author’s death in 1889, there were no takers.

A related Goodman marketing technique involved the post mortem portrayal of popular figures. The Jewish Chronicle reported the exhibition of Grace Darling at Bond Street’s Signor Palladiense Gallery. Darling, who had died in 1842, was the heroic daughter of a lighthouse keeper, already well-celebrated in verse (William Wordsworth) and paint (William Bell Scott). It is not known whether the painting found a buyer.
In 1883, following a spring showing at the St. James’s Gallery in London, Goodman offered *The Printseller’s Window* at Liverpool’s Walker Art Gallery’s Autumn Exhibition. The high price (£315) did not attract a buyer, causing him to exhibit it again the following year (1884) at the Royal Scottish Academy Exhibition in Edinburgh. In that year he also entered a watercolor entitled *Longing Eyes* at the Walker Art Gallery’s Autumn Exhibition, priced at ten guineas.27 Late in 1884 the artist left London for the Cotswolds, where he spent the next five months living in the Village of Chalford and painting panoramas of the surrounding Golden Valley, his only reported effort at landscape painting.28

Goodman is credited with portraits of the then Duke of Edinburgh (Victoria’s second son, Alfred), railroad builder Sir Thomas Brassey, barrister Thomas Brassey, Jr., and the latter’s travel writer wife, Anne. His last Royal Academy submission (1888) was a portrait entitled *Mrs. Keeley in her 83rd Year*, which was recorded as having subsequently found its way to London’s Savage Club, a Bohemian social organization, in which individuals active in the theater and the arts entertained each other and their guests at dinner meetings.

Goodman was himself a member of the Savage Club, joining in 1873 and leaving in 1894.29 He was an admirer of Mary Anne Keeley and her acting family, publishing an appreciation in 1895 entitled *The Keeleys on the Stage and at Home*.30 The frontispiece is a photoengraving of his Keeley portrait (now also lost). But even the black-and-white reproduction demonstrates Goodman’s ability to strongly convey the personality of his sitter.
Walter Goodman
British, 1838–1912
Portrait of Fanny Stirling,
1886
Oil on canvas
The Art Archive/Garrick Club,
London
Walter Goodman described himself in The Keeleys as an ardent theater-goer who painted portraits of many of the stage celebrities of his time. An earlier (1884) portrait of Mrs. Keeley, and an 1886 painting of actress Fanny Stirling (a photoengraving of which also appears in The Keeleys), were purchased by a member of The Garrick Club, a West End drama-lovers’ organization, for its collection, where they have remained. Goodman explains in his book that he obtained much of the biographical information about Mary Anne Keeley during her sittings for the two portraits. Mrs. Keeley dallied as an artist herself and was a friend of painters Sir Edwin Landseer and W. P. Frith, according to Goodman, who writes of visiting Frith’s Pembridge Villas studio in her company.

From his asides we can also learn a bit about his portrait-painting technique. He used a two-foot high dais for posing his subjects, which apparently gave him the engaging “Frans Hals” perspective evident in the Keeley and Stirling portraits (the artist records that Mrs. Keeley impulsively stepped off this block a few days into her first sitting and badly damaged her ankle). Goodman implies that it took him about two weeks to paint a portrait after having made preliminary sketches and notes that, unlike many portrait painters, “I was always fond of painting the hands of my sitters.”

Goodman’s love affair with the theater dated from childhood, when his mother would take him to see the Christmas pantomimes in London. A humorous printed playbill (circa 1859) of one of the amateur theatrical plays that he and his siblings frequently produced, written, in this case, by his brother, Edward John, remains in the family. Goodman at times supplemented his income by working as a private secretary and press representative for theatrical and exhibition managers. Often at his own request, many entertainers posed for his brush, including “negro delineator” E. W. Mackney, comic Lionel Brough, dramatist Henry Pettit, Spanish comedian Don Baltasar Torrecillas, Italian actor Tomasso Salvini, and stage clown Tom Matthews.
In 1901, Goodman authored a two-part article in the *Magazine of Art* entitled “Artists Studios: As They Were and As They Are.” In the piece Goodman makes it clear that he was on familiar terms with many of the great painters of the Victorian age (at least enough to have visited several of their studios), six of whom are portrayed in *The Printseller’s Window*. In 1893, the artist published a series of twenty articles entitled “People I Have Painted” in George Sala’s short-lived *Journal*. These often amusing, anecdote-laden descriptions provide valuable identifications of and insights into what Goodman considered his more important works, most of which are now lost.
On October 10, 1888, Walter Goodman, then fifty, foreswore his Bohemian lifestyle to marry Clara Isabel Blackiston, twenty-three, the daughter of a Leicester wine merchant. On the certificate Goodman represented his age to be forty-two, eight years shy of his real age, a practice common enough in the theater, but one not likely to produce a strong marital union. The couple thereafter resided in Brighton where Clara bore Walter five children in fairly rapid succession. However, the 1901 census lists Clara as living alone as head of the household with the children in the village of Henfield, West Sussex.

Goodman may have been out of the country at the time, possibly in Podebrad, Bohemia, where he had been commissioned to paint the portraits of the former German Chancellor, Chlodwig, Prince of Hohenlohe-Schillingsfurst, and his daughter, Elisabeth. While an important and, presumably, lucrative undertaking, it appears from the record to have been one of his last. Shortly thereafter, now in his late sixties, he seems to have fallen prey to a debilitating illness, which prevented him from continuing to ply his craft and support his large family. When he exhibited the 1905 portrait of his son, Keeley, at the Royal Institute of Oil Painters in 1906, he offered it for sale at £32.10. It may well have been his last painting.

Asked to participate in the massive Exhibition of Jewish Art and Antiquities at West London’s Whitechapel Art Gallery in the Fall of 1906, he elected to show three older portraits: Mrs. Keeley [in her 83rd year] which was loaned by the Savage Club; The late Samson Lucas, loaned by the West London Synagogue; and The Cuban Mulatto Girl. In all likelihood the last is a portrait of Cachita, whom the artist romanticized in his 1873 book, The Pearl of the Antilles. If so, he had retained the painted memento in his personal collection over the intervening four decades.

Any possible satisfaction from the Whitechapel recognition was spoiled by the death of his mother, Julia, in December, following a painful illness. Walter had turned to her for shelter and support many times throughout his life. On the occasion of her ninetieth birthday he had undertaken an interview with his mother and sketched her portrait for The Jewish Chronicle (November 7, 1902, pp. 13–14). Upon her death, the newspaper reprinted the portrait, this time accompanied by Walter’s admiring obituary (January 12, 1907, p. 12).

On June 13, 1908, a carefully composed letter to the editor was published on page 25 of The Jewish Chronicle, the newspaper which had proudly reported Walter Goodman’s personal accomplishments over the past forty years, under the caption “A Case of Distress”: 

After Walter Goodman
British, 1838–1912
Julia Goodman,
illustration from The Jewish Chronicle, November 7, 1902
Sir, A gentleman well-known to the community and in art and literary circles, is much in need of pecuniary help, owing to a long illness involving surgical operations, and consequent loss of professional work, upon which he is wholly dependent for the support of his wife and family of young children. He is, therefore, compelled to ask for some outside help to enable him to get out of his present difficulties and steer clear of future ones, by resuming his work with the brush or the pen. With this in view, a small fund is being raised on his behalf, and I shall be pleased to receive contributions towards it and also to afford any private particulars of the case which may be required.

Park Walk, Henfield, Sussex.
Yours obediently,
Walter Goodman

Whether there were enough readers to matter who remembered generously the musical evenings, books, articles, and portraits is not known, but Goodman’s debilitation and destitution appear to have separated him from the young family that he had formed so late in his life. A September 2, 1908, postcard showing a view of the Village of Stoke St. Mary in nearby Somerset was sent by a gentleman named Walter Goodman from his residence in Stoke Castle, a manor house converted to apartments, where he lived near Victorian photographer, Montague Cooper.

Walter Goodman’s death on August 20, 1912, was briefly noted in *The Jewish Chronicle* (Aug. 30, 1912, p. 16), with no mention of his wife or children, only of his late mother, Julia, and his brother, Edward: “For a long time before his death he suffered from an extremely painful malady, which rendered him practically helpless.” His death certificate states that Goodman, who was a life-long smoker, died of maxial cancer at 80 Fordwych Road in Hampstead, then a London borough. His last residence is listed as 25 Priory Park Road in Willesden, also a part of England’s rapidly expanding capital city.

From academic exhibition records and the faithful *Jewish Chronicle*, we have been able to piece together a fairly complete record of Walter Goodman’s more significant artistic accomplishments over a career that covered half a century. At this writing, in addition to *The Printseller’s Window* and drawings for publications, we have also located the portraits of Mrs. Keeley and Mrs. Stirling at the Garrick Club; a study for the 1884 portrait of *Mrs. Keeley; Longing Eyes; Young Keeley*; the 1880 self-portrait; the 1902 sketch of Julia Salaman Goodman; images of Goodman’s portraits of Chinese Ambassador Kuo Ta-Jen and his wife, Kuo Tai-Tai, all owned by descendants of the artist; the National Portrait Gallery’s photographic record of Wilkie Collins’s portrait (see note 57); a cabinet still life in a private collection (see note 56); and a genre painting from Goodman’s Cuban period, *Home of the Bamboo*, also in private hands (See Acknowledgments at the beginning of this essay.)
Our view of this merchant from outside the case is partially obscured by a string bearing a dozen carte-de-visite photographs of nineteenth-century artists, mostly British, which divides the composition in two, horizontally. The open rear access panel of the display case, with the printseller behind it, occupies the upper right quadrant of the painting. The dimly lit view of his shop beyond reveals framed prints, crystal, and good furniture. A few large prints are pinned against the remaining area of the light-green flocking that covers the left rear wall of the case.

The lower half of the picture (below the carte line, so to speak), is further sectioned, horizontally, by a wooden shelf, on which are displayed a group of small decorated objects. These include (from left to right): a glass tankard with a metal handle; a gold-rimmed porcelain cann and saucer in a willow pattern; a pitcher (lekythos) in the Greek red-figure style; a framed photograph of a bearded man, with a magnifying glass leaning against the frame; a decorated green glass pitcher with a string of pearls spread in front of it and an additional carte-de-visite of a mustached man propped against it; a tall, etched, clear-glass, stemmed goblet; a dark-blue-and-white Wedgwood-style vase, with a painted miniature, in a gold, oval frame, of a gentleman in a blue coat, leaning against it; and a small, armless figure of a standing boy.
Below the shelf, the bottom of the display case is covered with a layering of large, older prints, in red and black inks, lying flat, surmounted by a random pile of smaller, fresher portrait prints in black inks. On top of these, at the center, sits a light-blue porcelain plate, decorated with red flowers, containing a selection of coins, including what appears to be either a pierced token or an Oriental coin, while to the left and right are two books open to display illustrations.

The book on the left, in the middle ground, is stretched flat to reveal an engraved oval portrait of a man, while that on the right is placed in the very front of the window. Its pages have riffled, so that the illustrated plate has turned up and cannot be easily distinguished.

Prints cover the side walls of the display as well, and the entire recess is surrounded by an illusionary, dark-wooden picture frame, rather than the outside of a shop window as one might expect. The viewer’s eye is further confused by a crimson drape which is hung just over this frame, in a dramatic manner, from upper left to right. The absence of any glass in the frame is confirmed by the presence of an additional group of dog-eared prints possibly torn from a book. They hang by a short string from a nail driven into the left side of the painted frame so that they project outward towards the viewer, and catch the light beyond the frame.

All of this depiction presently lies within a real, black-wooden frame with simple lines similar to the painted one. Connecticut dealer Peter Tillou substituted this frame for a battered gilt frame and black satin liner in 1965. As a large triple-paned window is subtly reflected in both the magnifying glass and the crystal cover of the miniature portrait, a three-dimensional over-frame may once have existed representing it, or the reflection may simply be intended to suggest that the cabinet was freestanding inside the shop.
Rapid technological advances made photography accessible to the public from about 1845 on. The carte-de-visite was introduced in the late 1850s as a kind of illustrated calling card, usually a 2 x 3½-inch portrait centered on a roughly 2½ x 4-inch card. The bottom margin had room for a reproduction of the sitter’s signature to complete this highly personalized form of introduction.

By using multiple lenses for simultaneous direct exposures or creating a glass plate negative, the photographer could readily produce duplicates. Typically fifty to one hundred copies of each carte-de-visite were made; the client took most, but the photographer retained a significant block (ten to twenty) for his stock. Pre-cut albums were manufactured to hold the cartes and Victorians would eagerly collect and display these portraits of family and friends in their drawing rooms.47

Celebrity cartes also became readily available and could be acquired from a wide range of retailers, including print shops. “Cartomania” was so widespread in England that, by 1862, there were as many as thirty-five photographers on Regent Street alone.48

Successful politicians and statesmen were eagerly sought out by photographers for sittings. Over 70,000 cartes of Prince Albert were sold within a week of his death in 1861.49 Popular artists were similarly pursued and the wise ones quickly recognized the marketing value of having their faces...
The Printseller’s Window— the longer you look, the more there is to see…

While at first glance a potpourri with no discernible order, this trompe l’oeil (French for ‘fool the eye’) painting of a printseller’s shop window is in fact quite structured, with distinct elements: photographs, prints, groupings of objects, and the dominating background presence of the printseller himself. Examining each of these components helps us to better understand what they mean independently and collectively, and to understand more about the painter and discern the message that he might have been seeking to convey.

The Printseller

John Ruskin with Magnifying Glass

George Sala with Pearls
before the public. After the popular exhibition of her military painting _The Roll Call_ at the Royal Academy, Elizabeth Thompson (later Lady Butler), submitted to such a sitting. However, she subsequently claimed that “The idea of my portraits being published in the shop windows was repugnant to me.” Other recognized Victorian painters, like William Frith and Holman Hunt, were less concerned, distributing _cartes_ of themselves to their admirers and using sitters’ _cartes_ to better capture their likenesses.

The introduction of the larger-format “cabinet” size portrait photograph, exemplified by the image of John Ruskin in our painting, brought an end to the brief era of Cartomania. Viewed in this light, Goodman’s portrayal of his contemporaries through their earlier _cartes_ may itself be a commentary on the transience of fame.

_The Printseller’s Window_ contains a dozen _cartes_, suspended by clips from a string. Of these, only the outermost bear signatures, and they represent two of the four non-British artists portrayed, namely, Mariano Fortuny y Marsal, a Spaniard, on the extreme left, and the man who some still consider to be Hungary’s greatest painter, Mihály von Munkácsy, on the right.

Armed only with these clues, the knowledgeable Victorian viewer was clearly being challenged by Goodman to identify the remaining personalities and prints. At our distance in time, the identities of the artists must be revealed by comparison to other photographic representations found in _cartes_, larger cabinet portraits, and less formal poses. From left to right, following Fortuny y Marsal (1838–1874), we find the French book illustrator Gustave Doré (1832–
1883); the English artists William Powell Frith (1819–1909), John Everett Millais (1829–1896), and Thomas Webster (1800–1886); the French animaliste Rosa Bonheur (1822–1899); the English painter and sculptor Frederick Leighton (1830–1896); the reluctant sitter Elizabeth Thompson (Lady Butler, 1846–1933); the neo-Classicist painter Lawrence Alma-Tadema (1836–1912); engraver Thomas Landseer (1795–1880); the sculptor W. Calder Marshall (1813–1894); and the aforementioned Hungarian, Mihály von Munkácsy (1844–1900). Two additional photographs stand in isolation on the shelf below, the English watercolorist and critic John Ruskin (1819–1900), and George Augustus Sala (1828–1895), the English raconteur and critic and Goodman’s fellow Savage Club member. To Sala’s right the oval miniature portrait of a man wearing a blue coat, the cut of which places it much earlier in the century, has been rendered too vaguely to enable the identification of a sitter. As such, it may simply represent a commentary by Goodman on the passing of miniature portrait painting, which was extinguished as an art form by the advent of the carte.
Many of the other graphic images depicted in *The Printseller’s Window* are rendered in sufficient detail to suggest that the artist intended recognition by the informed viewer. Franklin Kelly, Senior Curator at Washington’s National Gallery of Art, has identified some of these. The first is a print in the upper left corner of Carlo Dolci’s *Santa Cecilia* (Gemäldegalerie, Alte Meister, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden), depicting the patron saint of music seated in profile with her hands on a keyboard. Below this image is a print reproducing Peter Paul Rubens’s well-known portrait of his sons, *Albert and Nicholaas* (Prince of Liechtenstein collection, Vaduz). Above the open sliding panel is the bottom edge of a wider engraving of a horse-race meeting, mostly obscured by the crimson drape. At the lower right of that print are a hare and tortoise, the latter on his hind legs, apparently engaged in dialogue. (Despite such a provocative clue, this engraving has thus far eluded identification of its source.)

As the printseller himself is the only living subject represented in the painting, the artist depicts him as a much more tangible and important figure, appearing at the receding focal point of the work, a luminous connoisseur of second-hand goods. While almost every hair in his beard is in place, his reading glasses are foggy and his clothing is dark and anonymous. It seems unlikely, amidst so much realism, that the printseller is not a real person, and an abundance of printsellers in London would have provided opportunities to find an authentic model. However, given Walter Goodman’s extensive experience in painting portraits from photographs and his economic instinct for posthumously offering such portraits to the market, as well as the graphic identification game which the painting in one aspect represents, a recently deceased, recognizable figure whose work could be easily connected by the public to the theme of the painting would also be a logical candidate. The London National Portrait Gallery’s archival photograph of Goodman’s posthumous portrait of novelist and social critic Wilkie Collins depicts a similarly bearded and bespectacled figure, likely from the same period, but Collins’s forehead is far more bulbous and his beard darker and better trimmed.  

A more tantalizing possibility as a portrait match (as Walter Goodman’s grandson, Raymond Goodman, has suggested) is Charles Darwin. The case, though entirely circumstantial, is nevertheless intriguing. Darwin, born in 1809, died on April 19, 1882, just over a year before  The Printseller’s Window was first exhibited at London’s St. James’s Gallery in May, 1883. The great naturalist and anthropologist was accorded a state funeral and buried in Westminster Abbey, one of
only five non-royals so honored in nineteenth-century Britain. One of the last portrait photographs of Darwin was taken around 1880 at the studios of Elliott & Fry, just a few doors down from Goodman’s own Baker Street location. These photographers also published, with Goodman’s permission, cabinet-sized photographs and autotype prints of his portrait of Chinese Ambassador Kuo Ta-Jen, as noted in the *Chronicle* on May 2, 1879, and were also responsible for many of the cartes-de-visite of artists that were copied by Goodman in the display of the printseller’s wares. The photograph of Darwin above, a copy of which can be found in the library of Cambridge University, portrays a man of the same age as the printseller, with nearly identical features: full white beard and mustache, puffy white hair at the temples, domed, wrinkled, fully exposed forehead, prominent eyebrows and orbital ridges, slightly bulbous nose, and stern facial countenance. He is wearing a similarly nondescript black suit coat and lacks only glasses to complete the favorable comparison.
Closer public scrutiny, in turn, required a high level of technical skill on the artist’s part. By offering his audience a work containing such a conjunction of popular artists and prints, Walter Goodman is inviting such examination and participation in an intriguing game of both recent celebrity and old master identification.

In *The Printseller’s Window* Walter Goodman proves his mastery of the art of portraiture and still life in a dazzling demonstration of illusionism and trompe l’œil painting. Despite the clutter of representational images and decorative objects, the viewer is drawn through the intriguing depths of the display to the controlling presence of the printseller himself. While at first glance a *pot-pourri*, the trompe l’œil painting is in fact quite structured, with distinct elements: the line of contemporary artists’ photographs; the separated portraits of the two critics, Ruskin and Sala; the modern prints of old master works; the grouping of objects, most of which symbolize *vanitas* (vanity and transience); and the dominating background presence of the printseller himself.

By examining each of these elements separately we may better understand their overall relationship in the painting and the message that the artist could be seeking to convey to his audience about images and image makers.
The Choice of the Trompe L’oeil Technique

American painters including William Harnett (1848–1892), John Haberle (1856–1933), and John Peto (1854–1907) enjoy most of the credit for the revival of trompe l’oeil painting, which began in the 1870s. On Goodman’s side of the Atlantic, in 1881, John Lavery (1856–1941), a Glaswegian portrait painter who began his career as a photographer’s assistant and was later knighted, produced An Artist at His Easel, realistically depicting a painter surrounded by some of his favorite objects.

Goodman’s direct influences for trompe l’oeil painting are more likely a combination of his classical training, which exposed him to still life painting, his love of the theater with its staged effects, and the contemporary British art scene, where artists from history painters to Pre-Raphaelites were painting with great realism, often influenced and assisted by the development of photography.

Interestingly, in his “People I Have Painted” essay on Fortuny, Goodman describes a favorite haunt in Florence that he frequented in the early 1860s, the Café Michael Angelo in the Strada Nuova, as having the whitewashed walls of one room decorated, by some of the artists who frequented it, with “well hung” pictures:

I should, however, explain that those mural decorations were not actually suspended from the walls, but painted al fresco, direct upon them, including the frames, picture-cord, nails, and projected shadows formed by those objects, all of which were so accurately represented as to appear from a distance like the real thing.

Add to this acknowledgment the fact that Goodman, whose life and career constantly crossed paths with photographers and who at times made his living tinting cartes and painting posthumous portraits from photographs, became very interested in the new medium, its abilities, and limitations. We know that as early 1876, he experimented in Morning Work with a likely trompe l’oeil view through a window that a maid is cleaning. The 1882 A Kitchen Cabinet also demonstrated his abil-
ity to fool the eye, but here only through an otherwise conventional still life. It was The Printseller’s Window, in the words of The Jewish Chronicle, written at the time of the painting’s initial showing in May of 1883, that was “the most important one of the kind painted by Mr. Goodman.” Indeed, at least one contemporary critic commented on Goodman’s tour de force in a review of The Printseller’s Window, “These photographs are so real that one has to touch them to prove that his eyes are made the fools of his other senses.”

Painting “to fool the eye,” or mimesis, has been practiced since antiquity, when, despite awkward conventions with most subjects, animals and fowl were often depicted with deceptive naturalism. Imitative painting reached a zenith in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Dutch still life, but to create a greater illusion, mimetic painters would often frame their work to merge it into the environment. In decorating architectural frescoes, artists worked both within existing spaces and mouldings or blended in their own deceptive framing.

The two tools which we have available to us to discover such illusions, the stereoscopic spacing between our eyes and our ability to swivel our heads to test the reality of shadows and depths, are least effective when we can view the artist’s representation only from a discreet distance. The painter of illusion has a greater challenge knowing that the viewer will be able to closely approach his work. Everyday objects in carefully framed and controlled environments constituted one of the most effective vehicles for deception by easel painters. Depictions of collections of objects in cabinets are thus not unusual in this genre. In The Printseller’s Window Goodman makes a further demonstration of his virtuosity by introducing the upper portion of a human figure placing an
object inside the cabinet from the rear. The well-stocked shelves offer both their owner and the viewer a bit of a dilemma: perhaps something will have to be removed to make room for the new piece, disturbing the carefully created composition.

The figure of the printseller, although at some distance from the more advanced plane occupied by the string of *cartes-de-visite*, is depicted with equal clarity, but in a dramatically reduced scale. As our eye bounces between these images and the dark frame surrounding them, a tremendous false perception of depth is created. Is, then, the juxtaposition of the various photographic and printed images, the objects and the carefully studied portrait of the printseller himself, simply a demonstration by the artist of the range of his technical skill? Or is there more to this than meets the eye?

**THE INCLUSION OF PHOTOGRAPHS OF CONTEMPORARY ARTISTS**

Most of the artists whose *cartes* are captured on the string are Goodman’s close contemporaries and, although they did not invite him to join their prestigious societies, he clearly admired them (in the sense that the selection of their *cartes* has to represent something of an homage), and probably knew most of them to varying degrees.

Fortuny y Marsal spent his career working in Italy, and Goodman got to know the painter while living in Florence. In an essay on the artist in his “People I Have Painted” series, Goodman describes sketch-
ing Fortuny, unawares, in profile on the table top of a Florence café. He writes that “Much later on, my unconscious sitter figured conspicuously in a rather large composition which I afterward produced” — presumably *The Printseller’s Window*, and possibly Goodman’s only published reference to the work.

Goodman praises Fortuny in his “Artists’ Studios” article as “the great Spanish painter, aquarellist and etcher,” quotes a statement made by him to the author “in his native language,” and describes his studio in Rome. Fortuny was an antiquarian collector who filled his studio with his acquisitions, some of which he used as references in his paintings. In the late 1860s he painted several versions of collecting transactions in paintings titled *The Print Collector* and *The Tapestry Seller.*

As for the other contemporary artists Goodman recognizes in *The Printseller’s Window*: It was Alma-Tadema’s trip to Italy in 1863 that turned his historical painting focus from the medieval to the classical world and, if Goodman did not meet him there, it is clear from the article that he visited Alma-Tadema’s neoclassical London residence. In *The Printseller’s Window* Goodman’s tantalizing view past the printseller into the back of his shop is reminiscent of Sir Lawrence Alma-Tadema’s similar depictions of Pompeian vendors. Alma-Tadema’s 1875 *The Sculpture Gallery* in the collection of the Memorial Art Gallery is such a work and also of this period.

Goodman describes John Everett Millais in “Artists’ Studios” as being “undoubtedly counted among the geniuses of the nineteenth century,” and goes on to describe his last painting room, adding that “he had many.” And in commenting on Lord Leighton’s studio, he writes: “[W]ho that has visited his handsome abode in Holland Park Road will ever forget that entrance hall with its splendid Moorish vestibule….”
Goodman probably knew his fellow illustrator, Gustave Doré, from that artist’s time in London or Goodman’s own travels in Europe (he is said to have exhibited in Paris), as well as the early French feminist and animal painter, Rosa Bonheur. Bonheur, along with Thomas Webster, receives mention in Goodman’s article. The artist shared Savage Club membership, art, theatrical and literary interests and, in all likelihood, a close personal friendship with Savage Club founding member, George Sala.

Given the ongoing contentious relationship in the nineteenth century between photography and painting, it is fair to say that the “use” of photography to depict the artists in *The Printseller’s Window*, and the views taken of this practice by the detached critics depicted on the shelf below, are meaningful. The development of photography not only was a threat to the livelihood of artists, but it also allowed artists to market themselves through the popularly traded *cartes-de-visite*. It enabled them, using *cartes* and cameras themselves, to capture poses and settings to enhance their own painting. We have already noted that Walter Goodman was familiar with photography, coloring *cartes-de-visite* to make spending money in Cuba and living for extended periods with relatives who were professional portrait photographers. In *The Keeleys* he describes painting a posthumous portrait of Mrs. Keeley’s daughter, Louise (Mrs. Montague Williams, Q.C.) which “was begun in my studio from various photographs and coloured miniatures….”

Fortuny, too, employed the *camera obscura* in painting and spoke enthusiastically of the benefits of photography in his correspondence, using the camera, at the least, to document some of his works and his busy studio. Most of the artists on Goodman’s “line” are known to have at some time relied on photography in their work and the others may have, according to the publications of Jeremy Maas, who was a *carte* collector and wrote extensively on this subject. He takes particular note of William Powell Frith, who used no less than sixty-two different *cartes-de-visite* to capture the individual likenesses of the guests attending the marriage of the Prince and Princess of Wales, the subject of a painting exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1865. Frith’s well-pop-
ulated representations of *Life at the Seaside: Ramsgate Sands* (1854), *Derby Day* (1858), and the *Railway Station* (1862) also could not have been painted without the use of photographs, not only for individual portraiture, but for overall composition. John Everett Millais, as well as other Pre-Raphaelites, according to Maas, utilized photographs to assist in their quest for “truth to nature.” Alma-Tadema posed boys in tunics in front of Greek and Roman ruins for the camera during his classical trips, and, upon his return to his London studio, used not only the architecture, but the models to recreate “the glory that was…” Ulrich Pohlman writes in *Alma-Tadema and Photography*:

As comprehensive research has... shown, numerous painters, draughtsmen and sculptors collected photographs, among them the Pre-Raphaelite artists Ford Madox Brown, Dante Gabriel Rosetti, William Holman Hunt and John Everett Millais, all of whom had recourse to them as studies for their painting. Millais is reputed to have said that “all artists use photographs now.”

As the century progressed, however, some artists became less convinced than Millais of the benefits of photography. Walter Sickert wrote an article in 1893 entitled “Is the Camera the Friend or Foe of Art?” in which he concluded that painters who worked from photographs were “mapping rather than drawing, and were thereby weakening their powers of observation and expression.” He went on to urge that paintings made from photographs should be so described in dealers’ catalogues. Another painter, William Richmond, reported rumors that some portrait painters now were painting directly over photographic images. The 2002 Eakins retrospective in Philadelphia graphically demonstrated the nineteenth-century American artist’s use of projected photographic images to compose his canvases.

**The Presence of Art Critics John Ruskin and George Sala**

What did the contemporary critics make of all this? John Ruskin, an artist himself, was initially suspicious of photography, but then began to experiment with it. While he did not care for his own carte portraits (“I dislike my face on entirely simple and certain laws, because it is bad in colour and form”) he allowed himself to be photographed frequently (over twenty different images survive, according to Maas). The image of Ruskin that Goodman included in *The Printseller’s Window* was taken by Elliott & Fry in the larger cabinet format that had become popular around 1864.
Ruskin, of course, played a significant role in the development of the Pre-Raphaelite movement, not only as a critic, but also as a champion and dealer. He was particularly close to Dante Gabriel Rossetti and John Everett Millais (the latter marrying Ruskin’s discarded first wife in 1855). He hailed Lady Butler as “The Pallas of Pall Mall” and described her 1875 painting of *The 28th Regiment at Quatre Bras* as “Amazon’s Work” and “the first fine Pre-Raphaelite picture of battle that we have had.” And Ruskin’s judgment of Millais was “whether he is good one year, or bad, he is always the most powerful of them all.”

In *Modern Painters* Ruskin poses and answers the question: “Why does a photograph always look clear and sharp—not at all like a Turner?” The answer, according to this great admirer of J. M. Turner, was:

> Photographs never look entirely clear and sharp; but because clearness is supposed a merit of them, they are usually taken from very clearly marked and un-Turnerian subjects....Photography either exaggerates shadows, or loses detail in the lights, and in many ways which I do not here pause to explain, misses certain of the utmost subtleties of natural effect (which are often the things that Turner has chiefly aimed at), while it renders subtleties of form which no human hand could achieve.

If John Ruskin was somewhat ambivalent about the role of photography in art, he left no doubt regarding his opinion of *trompe l’oeil* painting and painters. “Ideas of imitation,” which he defined
as “the immediate and present perception that something produced by art is not what it seems to be,” are “contemptible,” because experience of them is “very like a strictly sensual pleasure, . . . precludes the spectator from enjoying inherent beauty in the subject,” and because “no ideas of power are associated with them.” To illustrate this position, he famously observed that “We can ‘paint a cat or fiddle so that they look as if we could take them up,’ but we cannot imitate the ocean or the Alps.”

Ruskin compared any artist who would indulge in such mimicry to a “juggler” whose attempt “nearly to deceive” creates a “pleasurable surprise” in the viewer. The “power of deceptive imitation in painting,” he wrote, “requires no more for its attainment than a true eye, a steady hand, and moderate industry—qualities which in no degree separate the imitative artist from a watchmaker, a pin-maker, or any other neat-handed artificer.”

Thus, for Ruskin, truthful art is that which invites the viewer to ignore the medium. A work, such as a Turner seascape, can be entirely different from the subject, and still be truthful because it tells the viewer more about the subject than a work of photorealistic accuracy.

When, in 1877, James McNeil Whistler asked £200 for his Nocturne in Black and Gold, John Ruskin wrote a letter to the journal Fors Clavigera, protesting that the painter was a “coxcomb” with the “Cockney impudence” to ask “two hundred guineas for flinging a pot of paint in the public’s face.” Whistler sued Ruskin for defamation and, although winning the resulting trial in 1878, was awarded only one farthing in damages.

Ruskin’s outspoken criticism and his defense of his statement at the trial were both based upon what the critic perceived to be a necessary direct relationship between the amount of effort expended by an artist and the price he was entitled to for his work. Printseller subject William Powell Frith, along with painter Edward Burne-Jones, both favorites of Ruskin, testified to this effort on behalf of the critic, but were unable to persuade the jury.

It is a little difficult to understand how Ruskin, given his passionate admiration of the pre-Impressionistic style of J. M. Turner, could be so critical of Whistler’s style, going so far even as to hold the latter artist’s working-class origins against him. While this slur may well have resonated with the aspiring Walter Goodman, it certainly did not discourage him from attempting to convey his ideas to the public through his own preferred style of realism. And Goodman must have felt that the work that went into as complex a painting as The Printseller’s Window fully justified the painting’s £315 asking price under Ruskin’s journeyman approach to pricing.
Fully acquainted with portrait photography and knowing how dependent many artists had become on it—including a number of those acclaimed by Ruskin—Goodman placed the critic’s own photograph in a rustic frame appropriate to the man whose respected enjoinder was: “[Go] to nature in all singleness of heart…rejecting nothing, selecting nothing, and scorning nothing.” In his 1853 Edinburgh lectures, Ruskin had defended the Pre-Raphaelites from charges that they used photography to realize their exacting details.

It is evident that by the 1880s, Goodman knew most of the artists depicted in The Printseller’s Window personally, frequented their studios, and, presumably, was familiar with the reliance that many of them had on photography. The magnifying glass propped up against John Ruskin’s portrait is not accidental. It is a challenge to the critic of mimesis to deny the truths offered in The Printseller’s Window. The most obvious of these is the undeniable influence the development of photography was having on nineteenth-century artists. But, much more importantly, while Ruskin’s condemnation of trompe l’oeil painting was fundamental to his entire critical view, Goodman appears to have recognized the resulting dichotomy: the viewer cannot concentrate on the content of a painting and on its materiality at the same time. Fooling the eye is a subjective accomplishment, which Goodman executes successfully at several levels in The Printseller’s Window. But when the viewer discovers the illusions, concentration shifts to the materials manipulated to achieve it. While Ruskin dismisses such optical manipulation as mere mental pleasure, the artist in fact is forcing the viewer to try reconciling the illusion of realism with its inherent impossibility, thus turning the passive viewer into an active, self-aware critic. This is a process that was to undergo many fruitful permutations in modern art.

Sharing the printseller’s shelf with Ruskin is George Augustus Sala, identified from the pho-
tographic portrait published with his December 14, 1895, obituary in the *Illustrated London News*. The connection between Goodman and Sala is our strongest documented linkage, albeit it is still somewhat circumstantial.

According to a semi-biographical “appreciation” published in *The Illustrated Review* on March 27, 1873, Sala was born in London in 1826, the son of an Italian father and a West Indian mother (she was from British Guiana, actually). He began by contributing anonymous critiques to the publication *Household Words*, which were inevitably mistaken as coming from the pen of Charles Dickens. Dickens responded by taking an interest in Sala, encouraging him to write for another of his own periodicals, *Temple Bar*. Dickens, interestingly, directed his personal pen against the Pre-Raphaelites, drawing defensive responses from Ruskin (for Dickens it took the talents of an Edwin Landseer, as painter, sculptor, and engraver, to meet his artistic criteria).

Sala, like Goodman, then, came from a background outside the “Domesday” bloodlines of English society. His mother was an actress who participated, along with Wilkie Collins and the Keeleys, in some of Dickens’s amateur theatricals. Like Goodman, he loved the theater and was at one time an artist and scene painter. He covered the American Civil War for the *Daily Telegraph* at the same time that Goodman was a stringer for the *New York Herald* in Havana. And Sala wrote travelogues, like Goodman’s (for instance, *The Life and Adventures of George Augustus Sala*, 1895), and the even more presumptuous *Things I Have Seen and People I Have Known*, 1894. Sala, who owned a very large personal library, was known for his ability to discourse at great length on any subject. He was satirized in the British humor magazine *Punch* (August 27, 1881, p. 94), with his initials, G.A.S., heavily emphasized. In *The Printseller’s Window* Goodman has mischievously draped the *vanitas* string of pearls around his friend’s carte.

In addition to being a columnist and humorist, cookbook author and actor, Sala held forth as an illustration and art critic, having written a notable appreciation of Hogarth for the *Corn Hill* magazine in 1860. Unlike Ruskin, he was in all likelihood a close friend of Goodman’s, the two giving each other support in the challenging second tier of the British art world. In 1893 Goodman contributed a curiously anonymous series of articles, entitled “People I Have Painted,” to
George Sala’s last and ill-fated publishing venture, *Sala’s Journal*, in what could only have been an act of mutual friendship and support. Two years later the critic was dead.

Sala was one of the Savage Club’s founders in 1857 and its first Honorary Secretary. He contributed to “The Savage Club Papers” in 1867–68, some numbers of which were illustrated by Gustave Doré. Goodman’s own membership in the Savage Club, as well as his modest publishing career, may be attributable to Sala, who took an early interest in Club recruitment. Sala may have met Walter Goodman through the artist’s brother, Edward John, who, as previously noted, was a sub-editor of the *Daily Telegraph*, for which both George and Walter wrote throughout their careers, and another active Savage Club member. Several of the biographical dictionaries of artists mention that Goodman’s 1888 *Portrait of Mrs. Keeley in Her 83rd Year* was hung at the Savage Club after its Royal Academy exhibition and popular composer Henry Russell ended up donating his Goodman portrait to the club in 1891. While none of the other subjects of *The Printseller’s Window* were members, several are known to have been guests (see note 29). Another Goodman portrait subject, Wilkie Collins, was a member, along with such luminaries as Cruikshank, Dickens, and Rossetti. At the very least, Sala shares space on the shelf with the great John Ruskin, although merely as an unmounted *carte*, rather than the framed cabinet portrait that sets apart the dominant art critic of the Victorian age.

**THE REPRESENTATION AND POPULARIZATION OF OLD MASTERS THROUGH CONTEMPORARY REPRODUCTIONS**

Goodman lived at a time when the effects of the Industrial Revolution were reshaping English cultural life and aesthetic experience. The popularization of photography was accompanied by advances in printing and three-dimensional reproductive techniques. Wage-earners could decorate their residences with copies of works by the old masters and painted porcelain inspired by classical figures and vases. Goodman fills *The Printseller’s Window* with these products of the new age of industry.

While Goodman carefully chooses manufactured goods that imitate the singular forms used by earlier Dutch still life painters to represent *vanitas*, the prints after old master paintings have no such association. They instead represent a timeless quality; the fact that they have been chosen for widespread commercial distribution underscores the popularly recognized genius of their creators. For Goodman as well, these works by such talented artists as Rubens and Van Dyke have survived the test of time.

Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723–1792), a copy of whose *Self-Portrait in the Style of Rembrandt* lies in the foreground of the pile at the bottom of the printseller’s case, taught Robert Faulkner, with whom Goodman’s mother, Julia, later studied. Reynolds, who became the Royal Academy’s first presi-
dent, famously instructed his students to study the great masters. Goodman was trained at the Academy at a time when Reynolds’s advice was still respected.

John Ruskin, in sharp contrast, repeatedly derided Reynolds’s enjoiner to follow convention in art, dismissing the old masters as “prodigals, and foolish prodigals in art,” because “they lavish their whole means to get one truth, and leave themselves powerless, when they should seize a thousand.”

Copies of old master paintings were not the only images available for mass consumption. Most, if not all, of the artists represented on the carte line augmented their incomes through the sale of printed reproductions of their work. As well, they provided illustrations for periodicals and other publications, including Bibles (Doré) and books of poetry (Millais). Because printed materials were so cheaply and easily produced, they were consumed by a public eager for mass-produced visual goods that previously were only available to the wealthier classes.

**THE VANITAS OBJECTS**

Much of the imagery in *The Printseller’s Window* deliberately calls to mind Dutch still life painting of the preceding two centuries. These carefully crafted compilations of objects, food, and flowers were painted for wealthy patrons to hang in their parlors and dining rooms, to be admired by guests and visitors. To temper the impression of such hedonistic displays, Dutch painters included objects and wasting organisms symbolizing vanity (*vanitas*) and death (*memento mori*).

Goodman crams the printseller’s display case with books, coins, pearls and crystal, all of which were considered to be futile and transient possessions by Dutch still life painters. The examples that Goodman has chosen to include all appear, like the surrounding old master prints, to be products
of nineteenth-century reproductive technology. In combining such surrendered material goods with the shopworn photographic calling cards of some contemporary lions of the European art scene, several of whom had already ceased to roar (Marsal and the Landseers were long in their graves by 1883 and Doré would die in that year), Goodman is reminding his audience that artistic fame and fortune can also be both selective and transient.

*The Printseller’s Window* particularly calls to mind seventeenth-century Dutch painter David Bailly’s 1651 *Self Portrait With Vanitas Objects* (Leiden). In this remarkable picture, the sixty-seven-year-old artist renders himself as a much younger man who, nevertheless, holds a smaller portrait at his present age, creating an enigmatic time warp. This depiction in turn rests on a table covered with the material symbols of vanity (*vanitas*) and mortality (*momento mori*), including versions of almost every three-dimensional object that later appears in *The Printseller’s*
Prints are hung on the wall behind the artist and a drape partially covers the upper right-hand corner of the painting. In both Bailly’s and Goodman’s paintings the drape may well be an homage to Pliny the Elder’s account (*Natural History*, Book XXXV) of a competition between two renowned *trompe l’oeil* painters, Parrhasius and Zeuxis. After proudly watching birds swoop down to try to eat the painted grapes in his entry, Zeuxis asked someone to remove the drape from his competitor’s painting, only to find that it, too, was faux!

Goodman was to have his own Parrhasius and Zeuxis moment, as recorded in one of his scrapbook clippings, when a reporter, after viewing what the ever-resourceful painter had now retitled *The Venetian Printseller* in order to display his masterpiece in a similarly-themed show at London’s Olympia exhibition hall, accused the painter of having stuck real *cartes-de-visite* to his canvas! Hoist figuratively by his own (*trompe l’oeil*) petard, the anguished painter demanded a correction, which was duly acknowledged by the March 28, 1892, *London Evening News*:

> Our description of the exhibits referred to Mr. Goodman’s picture as “eccentric,” and stated that it represented a printseller’s window “garnished with real photographs of celebrities fastened onto canvas.” The artist reproachfully pointed out that the photographs are not real, and are not fastened on the canvas, but are painted by him with his own good brush. A second and closer look at the picture, he said, would show that to impute reality to the photographs was a grave injustice. He is quite right.

THE INTER-RELATIONSHIP OF THE FOREGOING ELEMENTS

In *The Printseller’s Window* conventional portrait painter Walter Goodman has ambitiously chosen to create, for public exhibition, a far more complex subject, juxtaposing photographs of successful, contemporary artists against modern prints of old master works, together with the images of two very active critics and objects symbolizing vanity. This cabinet-sized world of photographic and mechanical reproductions is rendered as a *trompe l’oeil* still life, overseen by the printseller. Goodman, as an emerging but largely unrecognized artist, appears to be questioning the lasting effects of contemporary criticism, represented by John Ruskin and George Sala, in the face of some higher power, here symbolized by the printseller himself. Goodman’s work challenges Ruskin’s critical values in many respects, from the use of the *trompe l’oeil* painting technique and the prominence given to photography, to the avoidance of representing anything from nature in favor of modern products of manufacturing and technology (even the “naturalistic” frame surrounding the critic’s cabinet-sized photograph appears to be an industrial product). If Ruskin was put out by Whistler’s audacity in asking £200 for *Nocturne in Black and Gold*, Goodman’s pricing of *The Printseller’s Window* at £315 was truly challenging.
The only living person on Goodman’s partially curtained stage is the printseller, seen considering the deployment of a small clay figure. Ultimately he will be the determiner of what is included in the display window. If the painting is an allegory, he represents the ultimately popular determination of what works of art and artists will finally be revered. If the printseller is based upon a real person, perhaps the late Charles Darwin, the public would have recognized him for his theory of natural selection.92

Offering a portrait of a recently deceased celebrity, often based upon a lifetime photograph was, as we have seen, one of the many ways in which Walter Goodman sought to make a living. The combination of such a portrait with images of artists, art works and bric-a-brac in a retail setting, was unique and bound to be provocative for a Victorian viewing audience. We must suspect that the artist’s decision not to exhibit The Printseller’s Window at the Royal Academy, but instead to offer it first at a local gallery and later at popular exhibitions in Liverpool and Edinburgh, where it produced considerable public interest, suggests that he did not expect a warm reception of the painting by the art establishment. It was clearly one thing to compose paintings discreetly from photographs and quite another to bluntly feature photographic mimicry of distinguished artists, critics, and, possibly, a scientist as social commentary.93

This would perhaps explain the most dismissive criticism that has come to light with respect to the painting. An anonymous critic for The Times of London, writing a review of the June 1883 show offered by the art dealer, J. P. Mendoza, at his King Street (St. James’s Gallery) location, caustically observed that

> It contains the usual number of popular English pictures, including Mr. Frith’s well-known series, “The Road to Ruin,” and a picture of a printseller’s window on which the artist, Mr. Walter Goodman, has lavished an extraordinary amount of misplaced talent.94

The artist displayed considerable fortitude in carrying The Printseller’s Window forward to the shows in Liverpool and Edinburgh in the face of this kind of critical reception. At Liverpool’s Walker Art Gallery, the painting was initially hung in a stairwell by the show’s organizers. An angry Goodman demanded and received a better spot in one of the main galleries. As we have already noted, The Jewish Chronicle reported that the public flocked to the painting in its new location.
Perhaps Walter Goodman is saying to us, Yes, photography is a technical development that cannot be disregarded, and artists and the general public (through reproductions) can benefit from it, but (and Ruskin would have to agree with at least this much) a great artist can still paint a more persuasive work and capture a better likeness than any photographer. Moreover, he can arrest and fool the eye, to take it wherever he wants it to go. And for those who would criticize such devices as distractions from the truth, the Goodman view is offered (with the benefit of a magnifying glass if need be). The inclusion of a shelf-full of traditional vanitas objects reminds us that artistic and critical accomplishment, like everything else in the world, is, at best, transient, such that the technological debate becomes insignificant in the overall scheme of life.

Behind this little world of photorealism stands its creator, the printseller, who, god-like, scrutinizes a small clay figurine. Art is said to imitate life, and survival and success in life, according to Charles Darwin, is dependent on a process of natural selection, based upon profitable variation. In the world of art the process of selection is largely controlled by the art critic, whom the artist only challenges at considerable personal and professional risk. Viewed in this light, The Printseller’s Window, standing alone as evidence of Walter Goodman’s ability as a painter, has to be counted not only as one of the great works of nineteenth-century illusionism, but also of critical artistic commentary.\(^5\)
**APPENDIX**

**KNOWN WORKS BY WALTER GOODMAN**

The information contained in this initial catalogue raisonné has been derived from published sources, including Goodman’s “People I Have Painted” series in Sala’s Journal (1893), contemporary press clippings preserved in the artist’s scrapbook, and exhibition records and artists’ encyclopedias. The chronology of Walter Goodman’s work is based upon the year painted, when known, or the first printed reference to the work, and occasionally based on inferences suggested from the record. Mediums and original offering prices have been included when known. It is the author’s hope that individuals with additional information will come forward to expand upon this—of necessity—incomplete listing. The most current listing of works is maintained in the Wikipedia article about the artist.

**I. WORKS ON CANVAS AND PAPER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Exhibited</th>
<th>Present Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td><em>Doctoring the Cane</em> o/c, 10 guineas</td>
<td>The Liverpool Academy, British Institution, Royal Scottish Academy</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td><em>Trial of Dr. Simon Bernard in the assassination attempt of Napoleon III</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Seven oil paintings (6’ x 4’) of Napoleon III’s 1859 Italian Campaign (the last two canvases were perforated for rear illumination):</td>
<td>Privately shown by the artist before transfer to an exhibition in Odessa, Ukraine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. <em>Battle of Montebello, with the 84th reg’t, led by Col. Cambriels and Gen. Forey, attacking the Austrians</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <em>Attack and Capture of the Bridge at Magenta by Gen. Vinoy</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. <em>Napoleon III at Solferino</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. <em>Bivouac of the French troops at Alessandra</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. <em>Napoleon III Visiting the Wounded in Hospital</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. <em>Reception of the Emperor and Count Cavour at Genoa</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. <em>Peace rejoicings at Milan</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td><em>Bible Stories</em> o/c, 10 Guineas</td>
<td>British Institution</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td><em>Interior of the Cathedral of San Lorenzo, Genoa, o/c</em></td>
<td>Royal Scottish Academy, Liverpool Society of Fine Arts (1862)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>EXHIBITED</td>
<td>PRESENT LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Il Monte della Croce</td>
<td>Liverpool Society of Fine Arts</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Miniato, Florence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>James Hannay, Esq., o/c</td>
<td>Royal Scottish Academy</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>David Smith, o/c</td>
<td>Royal Scottish Academy</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Royal Scottish Academy</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864–1869</td>
<td>Pancho Roblejo, o/c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864–1869</td>
<td>Joaquin Cuadras, o/c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864–1869</td>
<td>Don Baltasar Torrecillas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24 distemper sketches of the performer in different costumes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864–1869</td>
<td>The Late Daughter of Don Magin of Santiago, Cuba</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864–1869</td>
<td>The Late Don Pancho Aguerra y Matos of Santiago, Cuba</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864–1869</td>
<td>Sabrina de la Torre</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Brassey, crayon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Thomas Brassey, Esq., crayon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Lady Anne Brassey, crayon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>The Brassey Children, crayon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Mr. Serjeant Simon, MP, o/c</td>
<td>Royal Oak Hotel, Dewsbury, Yorkshire</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Evelyn, Daughter of G. J. Reid, Esq. of Tunbridge Wells, o/c</td>
<td>Royal Academy</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Master Nicholls (retained photo record)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Mr. N. Birkenruth (retained photo record)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Mrs. N. Birkenruth (retained photo record)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Young Castile, o/c</td>
<td>Dudley Gallery</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Voices of the Sea, o/c</td>
<td>French Gallery, Pall Mall</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Morning Work or Cleaning Windows, o/c</td>
<td>London Annual Exhibition of Fine Arts Dudley Gallery</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>The Language of the Face, drawing</td>
<td>Dudley Gallery Black &amp; White Exposition</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>A Factory Girl, o/c</td>
<td>Dudley Gallery</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Madonna In Prayer (copy of the painting by Sassoferrato), o/c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Exhibited</td>
<td>Present Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td><em>His Excellency Kuo Tai-Jen, the Chinese Minister of the Court of St. James</em>, o/c</td>
<td>Royal Academy, Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool (1879)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td><em>A Chinese Lady of Rank</em> (Kuo Tai-Tai— the wife of Kuo Tai-Jen—with her new son, Ying-Sung, and the child’s nurse), o/c</td>
<td>Windsor Castle, Saloon of the Folly Theatre</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td><em>Self-Portrait</em>, o/c</td>
<td><em><strong><strong>Royal Academy, Guildhall Academy of the Arts (1884)</strong></strong></em></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manchester Institution (1884)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marlborough House (1884)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Hospital, Queens Square (1884)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td><em>HRH Prince Leopold, Duke of Albany</em> (8th child of Queen Victoria), o/c</td>
<td><em><strong><strong>Royal Academy, Guildhall Academy of the Arts (1884)</strong></strong></em></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manchester Institution (1884)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marlborough House (1884)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Hospital, Queens Square (1884)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td><em>A Kitchen Cabinet</em></td>
<td><em><strong><strong>Walter Goodman’s The Printseller’s Window: Solving A Painter’s Puzzle</strong></strong></em></td>
<td>Private collection, Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Memorial Art Gallery of the University of Rochester, New York, USA (2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before 1883</td>
<td><em>Home of the Bamboo</em> (presented to a patron at Christmas and likely painted during the artist’s Cuban years), o/c</td>
<td><em><strong><strong>Walter Goodman’s The Printseller’s Window: Solving A Painter’s Puzzle</strong></strong></em></td>
<td>Private collection, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Memorial Art Gallery of the University of Rochester, New York, USA (2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td><em>The Printseller’s Window</em>, o/c £315</td>
<td><em><strong><strong>St. James’s Gallery, Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool</strong></strong></em></td>
<td>Memorial Art Gallery of the University of Rochester, Rochester, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Scottish Academy, Edinburgh (1884)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burlington Gallery, Bond Street (1884)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Folkestone Art Treasures Exhibition (1886)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh Academy of Arts (c. 1886)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goodman’s Studio at 88, King’s Road, Brighton (1891)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>British and Foreign Art Galleries Section, Earl’s Court (1891)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Venice in London Exhibition, Olympia (1891)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>EXHIBITED</td>
<td>PRESENT LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Fresh and Pure or Pure and Undefiled</td>
<td>St. James’s Gallery, London</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Candidate for the Front Row or First at the Gallery Door</td>
<td>St. James’s Gallery, London</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Andrew Halliday, drawing</td>
<td>Savage Club, London</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Idle Dreams</td>
<td>City of London Society of Artists</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>In Possession</td>
<td>City of London Society of Artists</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Longing Eyes, w/c</td>
<td>Walker Art Gallery Liverpool</td>
<td>Private Collection, England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Study for “Mrs. Keeley at Four Score Years,” o/c</td>
<td>Private Collection, England</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Mrs. Alfred Mellon, o/c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Exhibited</td>
<td>Present Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884–85</td>
<td>The Golden Valley (First landscape of Chalford Valley)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884–85</td>
<td>The Golden Valley (Second landscape of Chalford Valley)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884–85</td>
<td>Mr. G. Holloway, drawing</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Untitled (painting of 2-year-old baby in stage production “My Sweetheart”)</td>
<td>Sent to California after completion</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Fanny Stirling, o/c</td>
<td>Presented to the Garrick Club (1886)</td>
<td>Garrick Club, London, England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Signor Paladiense Gallery, London (1887)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hennah and Kent’s Studio, London (1887)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>The Late Mr. Wilkie Collins at the age of 56, o/c, £45</td>
<td>Royal Society of British Artists (1890)</td>
<td>Unknown (photograph in the National Portrait Gallery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Folkestone Art Treasures Exhibition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1887</td>
<td>Louise Keeley (Mrs. Montague) Williams, Q.C. (posthumous portrait), o/c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Grace Darling, o/c</td>
<td>Signor Paladiense Gallery, London</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Mrs. Keeley in her 83rd Year (illustrated in The Keeleys)</td>
<td>Royal Academy</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Savage Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exhibition of Jewish Art and Antiquities, Whitechapel Gallery, London (1906)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Mr. Henry Russell in his 77th Year, o/c, £42</td>
<td>Royal Institute of Oil Painters Presented to the Savage Club (1890)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Amy Sedgwick, pastels</td>
<td>The Grafton Galleries (1897) (Formerly, Garrick Club, London)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Mr. Lionel Brough, o/c</td>
<td>Royal Institute of Oil Painters</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Benvenuto Barovier</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1901</td>
<td>Prince Hohenlohe, o/c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1901</td>
<td>Elisabeth, Daughter of Prince Hohenlohe, o/c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Julia Salaman Goodman on her 90th Birthday, crayon on paper</td>
<td></td>
<td>Private Collection, England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>EXHIBITED</td>
<td>PRESENT LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Young Keeley (Goodman), o/c £31.10</td>
<td>Royal Institute of Oil Painters</td>
<td>Private Collection England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca.1906</td>
<td>The Late Mr. Samson Lucas, o/c (likely painted earlier)</td>
<td>West London Synagogue Whitechapel Art Gallery</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>The Cuban Mulatto Girl, o/c (likely painted 1864–69)</td>
<td>Whitechapel Art Gallery</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Works of Unknown Date**

- **Alfred, Duke of Edinburgh, o/c** Unknown
- **Benvenuto Salviati, o/c** Unknown
- **Don Baltasar Torrecillas, o/c** Unknown
- **E. W. Mockney, o/c** Unknown
- **Henry Pettit, o/c** Unknown
- **Sir Thomas Sowler, o/c** Unknown
- **Lady Sowler, o/c** Unknown
- **Miss Mabel Sowler, o/c** Unknown
- **George McFarren** Unknown
- **Fortuny y Marsal** Unknown
- **Julia Goodman and several untitled portraits of women and children retained in family collections** Unknown
### 2. Illustrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Sketches at Santiago del Cuba, <em>The Graphic</em>, December 6, v.8, no.210, p.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Tomasso Salvino (engraving for the cover of <em>Pictorial World</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td><em>The Language of the Face</em> (an engraving of the drawing was published in one of the English periodicals, according to the <em>Jewish Chronicle</em>, June 23, 1876, p.188)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Above illustration retitled “God is Taking Care of Me” for <em>The Three Brown Boys &amp; Other Happy Children</em>, by Ellen Haile (New York: Cassell &amp; Co.), with Kate Greenaway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td><em>Mrs. Keeley at Fourscore</em>, Drawing for the Pall Mall Gazette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Illustrations for <em>Little Ramblers and Other Stories</em> (London: Cassell &amp; Co.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td><em>Julia Salaman Goodman</em>, in an interview in <em>The Jewish Chronicle</em> on the occasion of her 90th birthday, November 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td><em>Julia Salaman Goodman</em>, <em>Booklovers Magazine</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. BOOKS AND SHORT STORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title and Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td><em>The Pearl of the Antilles or An Artist in Cuba</em> (London: H. S. King &amp; Co.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td><em>The Keeleys on the Stage and at Home</em> (London: Bentley &amp; Son)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date unknown</td>
<td>“Romance of the Rubber.” <em>Manchester Courier</em>, 17-installment series</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. ARTICLES AND MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title and Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>“A Cigarette Manufacturer at Havana” <em>London Society Magazine</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>“Saved From a Wreck” <em>Cassell’s Magazine</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>“Cuba Without a Master” <em>Cassell’s Magazine</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>“Art Behind the Curtain” <em>Theatre Magazine</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>“An Englishman on the Spanish Stage” <em>Theatre Magazine</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Translation of popular stage play “Box and Cox” into Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>“People I Have Painted” <em>Sola’s Journal</em> (February–July)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>“Artists’ Studios–As They Were and as They Are” <em>Magazine of Art</em>, pp. 357–62, 397–402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>“Julia Goodman”–interview on her 90th birthday <em>The Jewish Chronicle</em> (Nov. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>“Julia Goodman”–Obituary <em>The Jewish Chronicle</em> (Jan. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>“Drapery Figures” <em>The Strand Magazine</em> (December), p. 742</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes


1 The Printseller’s Window is the title given to a print of the MAG painting that survives in the collection of a Goodman descendant. This collection also includes a scrapbook of press clippings saved by the artist (located by Steve Merry in 2009), which refer to the painting alternatively as The Printseller (the title used by Walter Goodman in early exhibition submissions and by the Daily Telegraph, April 2, 1883), Printseller (The Photographic News, May 11, 1883), and A Printseller’s Window in the Strand (North-Western Gazette, May 12, 1883). Goodman’s preference for The Printseller’s Window is indicated not only by the title he gave to the print at a later date, but also by the caption that he placed on a list of exhibition locations for the painting during his lifetime.

2 Ironically, this painting by Briton Walter Goodman was included in a Sotheby’s American Paintings auction (December 3, 1998). About that year’s auctions, one journalist commented: “Most of the still lifes in the auction did well but one in particular was noteworthy, lot 99, The Printseller’s Window by Walter Goodman, a relative unknown who was born in 1823 [...]. This large oil [sold for] a well justified price for a masterpiece that is the equal of the best of William Harnett (1848–1892), John Peto (1854–1907) and John Haberle (1856–1933), the three great American titans of trompe l’oeil.” Carter B. Horsley, “American Paintings Auctions Fall 1998 (Sotheby’s),” http://www.thecityreview.com/amptf98.html (accessed May 25, 2009).

3 The Jewish Chronicle (London), May 11, 1883, p. 17.

4 Quoted in The Jewish Chronicle, November 2, 1883, p. 12.


6 Provenance: Tillou Gallery, Litchfield, Connecticut, 1965; Norman Flayderman, New Milford, Connecticut by 1969; Bruce Gimelson, Garrison, New York; Alexander Gallery, New York; Mascio Corporation, Taylor, Michigan 1986; Sotheby’s New York, Dec. 3, 1998, no. 99—purchased by The Memorial Art Gallery. In a brief January 2006 interview, Connecticut art dealer Peter Tillou advised me that his acquisition records for this and other items in his collection have been lost. His memory is that he acquired the painting from a family in this country.

I learned of the Liverpool Exhibition of The Printseller’s Window from Alex Kidson, Curator of British Art at the Walker Art Gallery in Liverpool by an e-mail dated March 5, 2002. This was “a large, open send-in show, selected by jury modeled on the lines of London’s Royal Academy Summer Exhibition.” The records of the show indicate that in the Fall of 1883 Goodman lived at 13 Lancaster Road, Westbourne Park, London W., which we know from exhibition records of his mother; Julia Salaman’s work, was also her address at the time. In 1884 he moved to 21 Blenheim Crescent, Notting Hill, London W. In that year he submitted a watercolor, Longing Eyes, to the Liverpool Autumn Exhibition and priced it at ten guineas, a value which is more typical of his recorded exhibition prices.

The artist’s record of his exhibitions of The Printseller’s Window, retained by the family, includes, in addition to those previously described; a Graphic Society “soirée” in London (by request) and, following Edinburgh, but undated, the Folkestone Art Treasures Exhibition, the Earl’s Court British and Foreign art galleries section, and at the Olympia, “Venice in London.”
Italian Picture Galleries. A scrapbook clipping from the October 10, 1885 issue of Society gives a clue as to why Goodman retained The Printseller’s Window and continued to exhibit it at every opportunity. After noting that the work “is to be reproduced shortly by the etching needle,” the writer asks: “But why does not Mr. Walter Goodman have his other work, the portrait of Mrs. Keeley (both then being together on display at the Burlington Gallery in Bond Street), translated into photogravure or, still better, autogravure? It surely merits and would secure popularity.” In 1888 Goodman exhibited The Printseller’s Window in a studio leased at 88 Kings Road in Brighton (next door to that of his brother-in-law Edmund Passingham), as reported in the Brighton Gazette, March 29, 1888. In order to get the painting into the 1892 Venetian art show at Olympia, contemporary news clippings indicate that he retitled the work The Venetian Printseller. It is likely that Goodman used these public offerings to sell the print which he had made of the painting, thereby not only providing a much needed source of personal income, but also pursuing the reprographic form of lasting fame, which the painting’s collectible old master prints imply.

7 The 1851 British national census shows Walter (age 12) living at 3 Mabledon Place (corner of Euston Rd.), St. Pancras, with his mother (38), father (39), and siblings: Edward John (14), Constance (11), Arthur (9), Robert (6), Alice (3), and Miriam (1). The Unison union building now occupies this site, directly opposite the British Library.

8 The Jewish Chronicle, October 17, 1873, p. 483.

9 Evelyn, Daughter of G. J. Reid, Esq. of Tunbridge Wells, at the Royal Academy and Mr. Serjeant Simon, M.P. at the Royal Oak Hotel in Dewsbury, Yorkshire.

10 The Saturday Review, 20: 486, cites an article in the Saturday Review indicating that a dispute had arisen between Goodman and Antonio Gallenga, who had simultaneously published a political study of the 1869 Cuban Revolution under the same title.

11 Henry S. King & Co. of London published The Pearl of the Antilles, which Goodman dedicated to Cuban artist, Joaquin Cuadras, who was also a Goodman portrait subject. According to The Pearl’s end pages, The Spectator described Goodman’s narrative as: “A good-sized volume, delightfully vivid and picturesque,” and the Pall Mall Gazette said “He writes very lightly and pleasantly and brightens his pages with a good deal of humor.” However, John Foster Kirk, in his Supplement to Allibone’s Critical Dictionary of English Literature and British and American Authors, vol. 1 (London: J.B.Lippincott, 1892), 686, cites an article in the Saturday Review indicating that a dispute had arisen between Goodman and Antonio Gallenga, who had simultaneously published a political study of the 1869 Cuban Revolution under the same title.

12 Wagner, Rudolph G. “The Shenbao in Crisis: The International Environment and the Conflict Between Guo Song Tao and The Shenbao,” Late Imperial China 20 (1999): 107–43. Goodman, in one account, became part of a modest defamation incident by allegedly relating to a London newspaper how Ambassador Ku (Guo) insisted upon having both of his ears depicted in the portrait because otherwise “people will think I have been disgraced and that one has been cut off.” While publicly the Ambassador dismissed the report as an attempt at satire, he privately pursued his British secretary, one McCartney, and Goodman for an explanation, though both denied making the remark. According to Goodman, Kuo tried to return the portrait to him, at the same time asking for his money back. “I gave his Excellency to understand and I am glad to say with success—that if it was against the customs of his country for a mandarin to have his portrait painted, it was not less at variance with the rigid rules of the outer barbarian to return money;” Walter Goodman, “People I Have Painted,” Sala’s Journal 3 (March 4, 1893): 200.
and composer, Charles Kensington Goodman, as well as his own residence during this period at 21 Blenheim Crescent, Notting Hill and his mother’s home at 13 Lancaster Road, Westbourne Park, with a direct connection on the Underground (Hammersmith & City Line). London portrait photographers Elliott & Fry had their studio at 55 Baker Street. They were responsible for two of the images that Goodman copied in the *The Printseller’s Window*, namely the carte photograph of Alma-Tadema and the cabinet picture of John Ruskin; they also published, with the artist’s permission, a cabinet-sized photograph of the Chinese Ambassador, Kuo Ta-Jen (*The Jewish Chronicle*, May 2, 1879, p. 5). The comprehensive photographic collection of the late Jeremy Maas contains exact matches for Goodman’s images of Thomas Webster (Cat. No. 263), photographers Fradelle & Marshall; Lady Butler (reversed) (Cat. No. 22), Fradelle & Marshall; Sir Lawrence Alma-Tadema (Cat. No. 2), Elliott & Fry; and John Ruskin (Cat. No. 4590), Elliott & Fry. The collection also contains a pose of Rosa Bonheur (Cat. No. 8), Disdéri & Co., Paris, from the same sitting as the pose used by Goodman. Catalogue references are to Sotheby’s London auction catalogue for the sale of the collection on July 1, 2004. An article in the *Glasgow News* (June 7, 1883) offered an identification of the photographic subjects in *The Printseller’s Window*, consistent with this research.

24 Ibid., 2 (Feb. 25, 1893): 186.
25 See n. 57 below.
26 *The Jewish Chronicle*, June 10, 1887, p. 5.
27 It appears that *Longing Eyes* was retained by the artist, as a watercolor portrait of this description is in the collection of a family member.
28 As described in press clippings in Goodman’s scrapbook from the *Stroud News*, October 24, 1884, and the *Stroud Journal*, November 8, 1884.
29 I am indebted to Peter D. Bond, Savage Club archivist, for this information, based upon incomplete club records, as well as for pointing out George Sala’s involvement with the Club as a founding member (e-mail, March 20, 2002). Bond observed that, of the other individuals commemorated in *The Printseller’s Window*, while none were members, at least two had connections. Gustave Doré contributed some illustrations to the publication *The Savage Club Papers* of 1867/68 (for which Sala wrote articles). William Powell Frith is depicted in an engraving of a Club dinner honoring Gladstone on June 14, 1879, seated near the British Prime Minister. And then Sir Frederick Leighton is known to have been a guest at the Club’s twenty-fifth anniversary dinner on February 11, 1882. Walter Goodman’s brother, Edward John, was also a club member and one-time secretary. Goodman was elected to the Savage Club on February 8, 1873, and chaired five Saturday night house dinners between January 8, 1881 and June 25, 1887. In 1883 the artist donated a drawing of club president Andrew Halliday to a club fund-raising event. He was not re-elected to the General Committee on February 20, 1887, receiving only fourteen votes. His name disappears from the members’ list in 1894. The Club archives contain a May 16, 1896, letter from Goodman seeking a month’s renewed entrance privileges in connection with a planned benefit. The request was denied, suggesting that he had been expelled from the Club for misconduct, either in or out of the Club, since according to Bond, members so terminated were not allowed to return, even as guests.
30 The book was published by Richard Bentley & Son, London, in 1895, in conjunction with Mrs. Keeley’s ninetieth birthday celebration, for which Goodman served as both secretary and treasurer. The artist’s grandson, Raymond John Goodman, still has letters of reply to the invitation and other correspondence from the London world of drama and the arts, including Edwin Landseer, John Millais, Wilkie Collins, Arthur Sullivan and John Ruskin. Raymond Goodman suggests that, from remarks contained in the letters, the ever-resourceful artist was trying at the same time to find a buyer for the “Academy” portrait of Mrs. Keeley (1888), which eventually went to the Savage Club.
31 Goodman was, in his own words, “experienced as a playgoer and limner of faces” (*The Keeleys on the Stage and at Home*, 51). He also refers to his “Sadlers Wells days,” and notes, after getting a chance to tour backstage at The Prince of Wales’s Theatre on the night of January 16, 1884, that “altogether the dream of my boyhood to go behind the scenes and know the players personally was, both abroad [referring to his theatrical work in Spain and Cuba] and at home, now sufficiently realized” (51). Earlier, *The Jewish Chronicle* (May 13, 1859) had described the twenty-one-year-old Goodman as a “scene painter” in reporting his appearance, along with several of his siblings, in an amateur production staged at the Baker Street home of his uncle, composer Charles Kensington Salaman.
32 *The Keeleys on the Stage and at Home*, 268.
33 Ibid., 63. Goodman’s first portrait of Mrs. Keeley and the companion painting of Mrs. Stirling are still in the Garrick Club Collection. Both are three-quarter length portraits and Mrs. Keeley has recently been restored. Art historian and cata-
45 In a January 2006 interview, Peter Tillou told me of his decision to replace the frame, observing that the black satin liner.

44 Some of the press clippings in Goodman’s scrapbook (see note 1) describe these as older “Bartolozzi” prints. Francesco

43 Goodman wrote of his fondness for Cuban cigars in The Pearl of the Antilles, and published an article in 1872 in the London Society Magazine describing a Havana cigarette manufacturing factory (the magazine’s number and volume are unknown). Goodman’s death was reported to the authorities on August 21, 1912, by his son, Joaquin, who gave his own address as: The Brambles, Chorley Wood, in Hertfordshire. Walter Goodman was buried in London’s Hampstead Cemetery, Plot F8, 56 on August 24, 1912, according to Borough Council records.

42 The postcard was recently posted on the Village of Stoke St. Mary website: http://www.stokestmary.net/ssmpic3.htm (accessed May 25, 2009). Walter Goodman’s residence may be seen in the postcard’s image. It should be noted that it remains unconfirmed that the sender is the same Walter Goodman as the subject of this essay.

41 In his obituary of Julia, Goodman says that he painted “a good portrait” of his mother on her ninetieth birthday remains in the possession of the family.

40 For on-line access to the text of the Whitechapel show’s 1906 catalogue, go to: http://www.archive.org/details/exhibitionofhwa00britmich.

39 The children were Walter Russell (1891), Joaquin (1892), Reginald (1893), Julia (1894), and Keeley (1897). We can speculate on the sources of these names. Walter Goodman does not appear to have had or used a middle name, but bestowed “Walter Russell” on his first-born, the “Russell” coming from his admiration for the father and son composers, Henry and Landon Russell. “Joaquin” was, in all likelihood, named for Cuban artist Joaquin Cuadras, to whom Goodman dedicated his book The Pearl of the Antilles: “In remembrance of our long and uninterrupted friendship at home and abroad.” “Julia” was, of course, his mother’s name and “Keeley” offers further evidence of his affection for Mary Anne Keeley and her acting family. The source of “Reginald” is at present, a mystery.

38 The marriage certificate is still in the possession of the Goodman family.

37 Later Goodman portraits that were exhibited at the Royal Institute included Henry Russell in his 77th Year (1889), composer of “Cheer, Boys, Cheer” described by Goodman, along with many others, in “People I Have Painted.” A few years after painting the father’s portrait, Goodman collaborated with Henry Russell’s composer son, Landon, in 1897, to write a Spanish love song entitled “I Do Not Understand,” which he performed at The Prince of Wales Club (The Jewish Chronicle, March 9, 1894, 10).

36 Sala’s Journal [n. v.] (February 11–July 1, 1893).


34 As related in contemporary press clippings retained in Goodman’s scrapbook, in the summer of 1892 he was appointed manager of the press department for the International Horticultural Exhibition at Earls Court, which included the presentation of Buffalo Bill’s Wild West Show. An undated cutting from the Norfolk Daily Standard describes how the artist brought Buffalo Bill Cody, together with members of his entourage, including American Indians, to participate in an evening of entertainment at the Savage Club.

33 loguer Marcus Risdell notes that a pastel portrait by Goodman of actress Amy Sedgwick (1830–1897), which was presented to the Club in 1898 by her husband, was apparently deaccessioned in 1969, without a record of the purchaser: Risdell told me, in an e-mail communication dated August 13, 2003, however, that Walter Goodman’s theatrical aspirations may have reached a greater level of achievement, to judge from the mention of a Walter Goodman (artist) on a program for an evening at the Criterion Theatre in 1896, now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. The Keeley and Stirling portraits, he reports, were presented to the club in 1886 by one Spencer Bruton, a stockbroker, who had been put up for membership in 1880 by John Everett Millais.

32 1889), composer of the Spanish love song entitled “Cheer, Boys, Cheer” described by Goodman, along with many others, in “People I Have Painted.” A few years after painting the father’s portrait, Goodman collaborated with Henry Russell’s composer son, Landon, in 1897, to write a Spanish love song entitled “I Do Not Understand,” which he performed at The Prince of Wales Club (The Jewish Chronicle, March 9, 1894, 10).

31 Goodman wrote of his fondness for Cuban cigars in The Pearl of the Antilles, and published an article in 1872 in the London Society Magazine describing a Havana cigarette manufacturing factory (the magazine’s number and volume are unknown). Goodman’s death was reported to the authorities on August 21, 1912, by his son, Joaquin, who gave his own address as: The Brambles, Chorley Wood, in Hertfordshire. Walter Goodman was buried in London’s Hampstead Cemetery, Plot F8, 56 on August 24, 1912, according to Borough Council records.

30 Some of the press clippings in Goodman’s scrapbook (see note 1) describe these as older “Bartolozzi” prints. Francesco Bartolozzi (1727–1815) was an Italian engraver who developed a stipple tone engraving process, particularly effective in reproducing works originally undertaken in red chalk.

29 In a January 2006 interview, Peter Tillou told me of his decision to replace the frame, observing that the black satin liner.

28 As related in contemporary press clippings retained in Goodman’s scrapbook, in the summer of 1892 he was appointed manager of the press department for the International Horticultural Exhibition at Earls Court, which included the presentation of Buffalo Bill’s Wild West Show. An undated cutting from the Norfolk Daily Standard describes how the artist brought Buffalo Bill Cody, together with members of his entourage, including American Indians, to participate in an evening of entertainment at the Savage Club.

27 Later Goodman portraits that were exhibited at the Royal Institute included Henry Russell in his 77th Year (1889), composer of “Cheer, Boys, Cheer” described by Goodman, along with many others, in “People I Have Painted.” A few years after painting the father’s portrait, Goodman collaborated with Henry Russell’s composer son, Landon, in 1897, to write a Spanish love song entitled “I Do Not Understand,” which he performed at The Prince of Wales Club (The Jewish Chronicle, March 9, 1894, 10).

26 Sala’s Journal [n. v.] (February 11–July 1, 1893).


24 Henry Russell in his 77th Year (1889), composer of the Spanish love song entitled “Cheer, Boys, Cheer” described by Goodman, along with many others, in “People I Have Painted.” A few years after painting the father’s portrait, Goodman collaborated with Henry Russell’s composer son, Landon, in 1897, to write a Spanish love song entitled “I Do Not Understand,” which he performed at The Prince of Wales Club (The Jewish Chronicle, March 9, 1894, 10).

23 The marriage certificate is still in the possession of the Goodman family.

22 The children were Walter Russell (1891), Joaquin (1892), Reginald (1893), Julia (1894), and Keeley (1897). We can speculate on the sources of these names. Walter Goodman does not appear to have had or used a middle name, but bestowed “Walter Russell” on his first-born, the “Russell” coming from his admiration for the father and son composers, Henry and Landon Russell. “Joaquin” was, in all likelihood, named for Cuban artist Joaquin Cuadras, to whom Goodman dedicated his book The Pearl of the Antilles: “In remembrance of our long and uninterrupted friendship at home and abroad.” “Julia” was, of course, his mother’s name and “Keeley” offers further evidence of his affection for Mary Anne Keeley and her acting family. The source of “Reginald” is at present, a mystery.

21 Goodman wrote of his fondness for Cuban cigars in The Pearl of the Antilles, and published an article in 1872 in the London Society Magazine describing a Havana cigarette manufacturing factory (the magazine’s number and volume are unknown). Goodman’s death was reported to the authorities on August 21, 1912, by his son, Joaquin, who gave his own address as: The Brambles, Chorley Wood, in Hertfordshire. Walter Goodman was buried in London’s Hampstead Cemetery, Plot F8, 56 on August 24, 1912, according to Borough Council records.

20 Some of the press clippings in Goodman’s scrapbook (see note 1) describe these as older “Bartolozzi” prints. Francesco Bartolozzi (1727–1815) was an Italian engraver who developed a stipple tone engraving process, particularly effective in reproducing works originally undertaken in red chalk.

19 In a January 2006 interview, Peter Tillou told me of his decision to replace the frame, observing that the black satin liner accounted for the absence of any stretcher marks on the canvas, suggesting that this was the artist’s original arrangement. The canvas currently lacks its tacking edge, however, and could have been cut down or originally framed in a different manner. A note on the back of Goodman’s trompe l’oeil painting A Kitchen Cabinet is entitled “Artist’s Directions for hanging this painting in a favorable position.” These instructions include the statement that: “This picture would show to best advantage as a centerpiece for a (cabinet) or other article of furniture” and go on to indicate that the work is al-
ready framed in glass. Such directions strongly suggest that Goodman framed some of his trompe l’oeil works in glass to extend the illusion. These might well include The Printseller’s Window and Morning Work.

46 The section in Goodman’s scrapbook (see note 1) containing press clippings relating to The Printseller’s Window contains one notice from the Brighton Gazette (May 17, 1883) stating that:

The painter…has spared no pains in rendering every portion of his picture as realistic as possible, even to the frame-work, which represents the window-sill of a shop front.

While this may refer only to the trompe l’oeil frame that is a part of the painting, there is further evidence in another clipping from the Glasgow News (June 7, 1883), that elements may no longer be present in our painting or that it is in fact a slightly different version of the original subject. After describing the objects in the painting, the writer stated that:

upon a trade ticket is inscribed, “Old and Modern Masters: a large assortment within.”

This label might serve as a subtitle to the picture, which is thoroughly representative of old and modern art.

47 Audrey Linkman quotes Julie Bonaparte, cousin of Napoleon III, as writing in her diary on September 13, 1856, “Now it’s ready for your friends and to have their images constantly at hand.” (The Victorians: Photographic Portraits [London & New York: Taurus Parke Books, 1993], 61–2). Linkman also notes that the brevity of photographic sittings led critics to question whether a subject’s personality could be captured in the same way a portrait painter could.(41) The author notes, however, that the clients of photographer Antoine-Samuel Adam-Salomon (d. 1881) were likened in his hands to “the modeling clay and almost as submissive and plastic”(39).


49 Ibid., 10


51 Maas, Victorian Art World, 11–12.


54 One of the press clippings found in Walter Goodman’s scrapbook (see note 1), from The Glasgow News, June 7, 1883, demonstrates the anonymous correspondent’s ability to identify, in addition to Marsal and Munkácsy, the remaining ten artists depicted. Both this individual and Malcolm Warner identified the third artist from the right as engraver Thomas Landseer (1795–1880). Goodman placed this clipping in his scrapbook without comment. However, the choice of Thomas Landseer, a relatively obscure and uncommunicative engraver (who specialized in reproductions of paintings by his much more distinguished, but almost identical, brother Edwin), is inconsistent with the more notable artists whose
cartes Goodman has chosen to depict, and may itself be a statement about fame. Alternatively, it is possible that Good-
man mistook the cartes, believing it to be an image of Thomas.

The Glasgow News writer also describes certain of the prints as being by Rubens, Van Dyke, and Dolce [sic]. He states that the images at the bottom of the cabinet include portraits of Reynolds and Wilkie, presumably referring, in the latter case, to Scottish history painter David Wilkie. In an article written for The Jewish Chronicle (November 7, 1902, p. 13), commemorating his mother Julia’s ninetieth birthday, Goodman cited a single dance (at age eighteen) with Wilkie as one of the highlights of her memories.

Interestingly, in describing the second (Academy) portrait of the revered Mrs. Keeley, Goodman points out that her birthday fell on November 22, St. Cecilia’s Day, St. Cecilia being the patron saint of music (Sala's Journal 7 [April 1, 1893]: 367).

Sybille Ebert-Schifferer et al., Deceptions and Illusions, Five Centuries of Trompe l’Oeil Painting, exh. Cat. (Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 2002). The Printseller’s Window was included in the exhibition (October 13, 2002–March 2, 2003). (See Franklin Kelly’s identification of these subjects on p. 286 of the exhibition catalog). Kelly also located the trompe l'oeil painting by Goodman in a private collection, A Kitchen Cabinet, portraying a kitchen cupboard filled with bowls and utensils.

Some time after 1897, Goodman responded to an appeal from London’s National Portrait Gallery, as a result of which a photographic record and physical description of his portrait of Wilkie Collins were made for the institution. The painting is recorded in the Gallery’s “Descriptions of Portraits” inventory, CCXLVIII J, no. 22, as bearing a reverse inscription describing it as “The Late Mr. Wilkie Collins at the age of 56 by Walter Goodman, 44 Richmond Road Shepards Bush W.” The painting itself is described as being torn and still in the possession of the artist (no dimensions are given). Collins was fifty-six in 1880, the year before he and Goodman recuperated together at Broadstairs. A letter from Walter Goodman’s cousin Oswald John Simon to The Jewish Chronicle, dated January 23, 1891, claims that Goodman was the only portrait artist whom Collins ever sat for (although Millais did a painting of Collins as a young man, now in London’s National Gallery). Simon further states that Goodman subsequently exhibited the likeness at the Royal Society of British Artists. Goodman’s scrapbook of press clippings suggests that the Collins portrait, together with The Printseller’s Window, were fixtures in his commercial studios well into the 1890s. According to a series of news clippings from Goodman’s scrapbook, in 1891 the artist concocted a proposal to sell the Collins portrait, together with a painting of the actress Mrs. Alfred Mellon (Sarah Jane Woolgar) to the Garrick Club, with half the proceeds to be donated to a fund for impoverished playwright Robert Reece, but to no avail.

Suggested to me by Raymond Goodman in an e-mail dated January 5, 2009.


Maas, Victorian Art World, 9.

Paula Gillett, The Victorian Painter’s World (Gloucester, Eng.: Allan Sutton, 1990), 93.

Maas, Victorian Art World, 9.

Ulrich Pohlmann, “Alma-Tadema: Art and Photography,” Sir Lawrence Alma-Tadema, exh. cat. (New York: Rizzoli, 1997), 116. Pohlmann wrote that Alma-Tadema maintained a vast photographic archive that contained work by a wide range of photographers, including thirty “living images” by Gugliemo Pluschow that included “youthful models dressed in pseudo-
ancient robes posing as musicians and ‘celebrants’, as the original inscription on the cardboard sheets in Alma-Tadema’s collection put it.” Alma-Tadema’s photo archive is housed at the Birmingham University Library in England.
Ibid, 111.

72 Gillett, Victorian Painter’s World, 51.

73 Ibid.

74 Maas, Victorian Art World, 176.

75 See n. 22

76 Christopher Wood, Dictionary of Victorian Painters (Suffolk: Antique Collector’s Club, 1971), 76.

77 Ibid., 102.


80 Ibid., 18.

81 Ibid., 20. A clipping in Goodman’s scrapbook (see n. 1) from the Peterborough Standard (June 1, 1883), in describing the painting, offers such “Ruskinesque” criticism:

The artist has here given us a printseller’s shop seen from the street, a realistic delusion, if we may so express it—so completely the painter cheated the spectator by his cunning reproduction of rare old prints and books, with photographs of eminent celebrities of the day…(emphasis added)

But it goes on to both praise and chastise the artist not only for the great technical skill but also a perfect imitative quality which we hope to see exercised in a some what more exalted vein in future efforts.


85 Walter Goodman quotes “Mr. Sala’s” tribute upon the death of Mrs. Keeley’s son-in-law, playwright Albert Smith, in The Keeleys (p. 232) and notes (p. 340) that Sala’s brother, Wynn, played with Mrs. Keeley in Smith’s play The Alhambra:

Dickens fell out with Sala in 1857, after Sala arranged for the resale of articles commissioned by Dickens for Household Words without first obtaining his permission (George Sala, The Life and Adventures of George Augustus Sala [New York: Scribner’s Sons, 1895], 309).

86 Sala was a spendthrift and his two resignations from the Savage Club, according to Peter Bond, may be attributable to his being constantly in arrears in meeting the annual subscriptions required of members. While Sala’s services for the Daily Telegraph and books earned him a good living, he was constantly in financial trouble. This culminated in 1892, when he moved to Brighton and started his own periodical, Sala’s Journal. Failure of the venture the next year left him deeply in debt and he was forced to sell his personal library (13,000 volumes). He died in Brighton December 8, 1895. Encyclopaedia Britannica, 10th ed., s.v. “Sala, George.”

87 According to Peter Bond, Sala’s final resignation from the Savage Club occurred in this year. Henry Russell’s gift of his portrait to the club was reported in a June 19, 1891 clipping from the Daily Telegraph retained in Goodman’s scrapbook.

88 Edward John Goodman was not only a newspaper editor, but also a novelist, travel writer, and playwright. His 1873 comedy, Seeing the World, received favorable reviews on the provincial circuit according to The Jewish Chronicle of December 26, 1873. In 1896 he partnered with Louis N. Parker to write Love in Idleness, a Comedy in Three Acts. Walter Goodman was a frequent contributor to his brother’s newspaper, the Daily Telegraph. Edward outlived Walter, dying in October 1921.

89 According to Peter Bond, Sala’s final resignation from the Savage Club occurred in this year. Henry Russell’s gift of his portrait to the club was reported in a June 19, 1891 clipping from the Daily Telegraph retained in Goodman’s scrapbook.

90 Joshua Reynolds, Seven Discourses on Art [1901] (Whitefish, Montana: Kessinger Publishing, 2004), 8. In his inaugural lecture, Reynolds said: “I would chiefly recommend an implicit obedience to the rules of art, as established by the great masters, should be exacted from YOUNG students.”

91 Ruskin, Modern Painters, vol. 1, 143.
Charles Darwin set out his theory of natural selection in *On the Origin of Species* (1859) and thereafter applied his theory more specifically in a series of publications including *The Descent of Man* (1871). John Ruskin was at the same time urging artists to go directly to nature rather than study the paintings of the past. Central to Ruskin’s thesis was his belief that natural shapes were inherently the highest form of aesthetic expression. While he acknowledged that “There is no possibility of explaining the system of life in this world, on any principle of conqueringly Divine benevolence” (*Love’s Meinie*, vol. 1 [1881], 159), he saw Darwin’s theory of sexual selection (that, for example, a flower’s form and odor determined its ability to attract beneficially pollinating insects, rather than being simply the product of an overriding aesthetic quality of nature), as a fundamental challenge to his own views.

Darwin and Ruskin did meet several times over a thirty-year period, beginning in 1837 shortly after Darwin returned from his *Beagle* voyage. See Jonathan Smith, *Charles Darwin and Victorian Visual Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 303n61. While there is no reason to believe that the two men did not respect each other, Darwin’s ability to get under Ruskin’s skin, particularly as the naturalist published his later studies of specific species adaptations, was evident in some of the critic’s private correspondence and public lectures. In 1873, two years after the publication of Darwin’s *Descent of Man*, Ruskin launched a series of Oxford programs on English and Greek birds, collected and published in 1881 as *Love’s Meinie*. In his opening address on “The Robin,” Ruskin, when he came to describe the form of the bird’s feathers, could not resist satirizing the views of his presumed rival:

In fact, I have no doubt the Darwinian theory on the subject is that the feathers of the bird once all stuck up erect, like the bristles of a brush, and have only been blown flat by continual flying.

Nay, we might even sufficiently represent the general manner of conclusion in the Darwinian system by the statement that if you fasten a hairbrush to a mill-wheel, with the handle forward, so as to develop itself into a neck by moving always in the same direction, and with continual hearing of a steam-whistle, after a certain number of revolutions the hairbrush will fall in love with the whistle, they will marry, lay an egg, and the produce will be a nightingale. (*Love’s Meinie*, vol. 1, 30)

Whether or not influenced by Goodman, other British illusionist painters ran into similar criticism, while in the American school, members were often accused of forgery, owing to their fondness for precisely depicting currency and postage stamps.

Art critic Pierre Rosenberg has included *The Printseller’s Window* in *Only in America: One Hundred Paintings in American Museums Unmatched in European Collections* (Milan: Skira, 2006), 188–89. He describes the work as “A highly skilled trompe l’oeil, a tribute to photography and the art of reproduction, it intrigues, seeks to hold your attention and inspire curiosity. Who will be the one to succeed in deciphering it?”
CHECKLIST
of paintings in Walter Goodman’s The Printseller’s Window: Solving a Painter’s Puzzle, on view at the
Memorial Art Gallery of the University of Rochester from August 14–November 8, 2009

Paintings by Walter Goodman
(British, 1838–1912):

The Printseller’s Window
Oil on canvas, 1883
52 ½ x 44 ¾”
Memorial Art Gallery of the University of Rochester, 98.75

A Kitchen Cabinet
Oil on canvas, 1882
31 ½ x 21 ½”
Collection of Max and Heidi Berry

Self-portrait
Oil on canvas, 1880
19 ½ x 15 ¾”
Collection of Raymond John Goodman

Home of the Bamboo
Oil on canvas, before 1883
17 11/16 x 12 ½”
Collection of Steven Merry

Paintings by other artists from the collection of the Memorial Art Gallery

Jans Davidsz. de Heem
Dutch, 1606–ca. 1684
Still Life, ca. 1654
Oil on panel
14 ½ x 18”
Marion Stratton Gould Fund, 49.63

Helen Searle Pattison
American, 1830–1884
Still Life with Goblet and Fruit, 1871
Oil on canvas
17 x 15 ½”
Virginia Jeffrey Smith Fund and Marion Stratton Gould Fund, 2009.5

Sir Lawrence Alma-Tadema
British (born Holland), 1836–1912
The Sculpture Gallery, 1875
Oil on panel
30 ¼ x 23 ¾”
Marion Stratton Gould Fund, 89.45

John Haberle
American, 1856–1933
Torn in Transit, 1888–89
Oil on canvas
14 x 12 ½”
Marion Stratton Gould Fund, 65.6