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The Greatest Living Critic”: Christiana Herringham and the practise of connoisseurship

Meaghan Clarke

Christina Herringham (1851–1929) was a founder and benefactor of the National Art- Collections Fund in 1903. ¹ Her career as an artist and art writer is less well known. Herringham undertook early experimentation with tempera painting alongside her translation of Cennino Cennini’s (c.1370–c.1440) treatise on painting techniques. Herringham’s meticulous approach to understanding “medieval art methods” was a catalyst for the foundation of the Society of Painters in Tempera. Her writing for the art press, most notably for the Burlington Magazine where she was on the Consultative Committee, reveals her expertise on the technical aspects of connoisseurship. This paper traces the development of Herringham’s “scientific” method and highlights her pivotal role in a series of interconnecting networks. Knowledge and understanding of techniques and materials gave her a particular authority, just at the point that art history as a discipline was developing. Herringham’s interventions point to the need for a re-evaluation of male-centred narratives about the formation of art history.
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I have recently argued that women’s involvement in connoisseurship has been relatively unexplored, although figures such as Bernard Berenson and Fry have both been given considerable scholarly attention.² This article builds on this work to investigate the historical and cultural specificity of Herringham’s contributions to the development of connoisseurship. In her expansive study, Rembrandt, Reputation and the Practice of Connoisseurship, Catherine Scallen argues that, while little studied, individual connoisseurs have had a “profound effect on the history of art as a discipline.”³ The best known connoisseur is the Italian critic Giovanni Morelli (1816–1891) who developed a method for the attribution of artworks founded on research and close observation in order to identify the “hands” of the artist, their individual style. Towards the end of the nineteenth century a younger generation of art writers emerged as part of a new professionalized practise of art criticism and connoisseurship.⁴ The connoisseur as dilettante, which had been the subject of caricature, was anathema to their redefinition of connoisseurship in terms of serious study and scholarly...
expertise. However, connoisseurship was a contentious field riven by questions of who should practice it and how it should be practiced. Many claimed their method was “scientific”, but what this meant was open to interpretation. For some scholars this meant analysing works alongside archival documents while others, notably Morelli and Berenson, focused solely on the work of art or oeuvre of an artist. Christiana Herringham’s own “scientific” method involved close study and understanding through careful reproduction of medieval methods. While this method involved meticulous analysis of individual works of art, it also drew on archival research thus incorporating competing aspects of connoisseurial practise. Today this approach would be associated with technical art history. Amongst her collaborators in this process was the artist and art writer Roger Fry, as well as a number of artists who would become identified with a tempera revival. As Caroline Elam has noted, Fry’s approach, weaving an understanding of the artist’s individual technique and use of media into his general assessment of style, was “intimately connected with his own practice as a painter and a restorer.” These new connoisseurs, Herringham and Fry included, communicated their expertise and authority through art writing.

In the period 1890–1910 art history was very much a discipline in formation. In Great Britain the development of art history and the rise of professional art criticism were twinned enterprises. Art history lacked an institutional affiliation and art journals functioned, alongside museums, as crucial spaces for its development. The turn of the century brought considerable changes in the art press, with the demise of the populist Victorian publications: the Magazine of Art and the Art Journal. Two new publications the Connoisseur and the Burlington Magazine provided alternative spaces for art writing; the focus of these journals shifted to new modes of connoisseurship and collecting. Helen Rees Leahy has emphasized the Burlington’s importance in “defining and promoting a field of cultural authority which had previously lacked an institutional base in Britain” and the establishment of “connoisseurship as a normative practice” in British art institutions. Herringham was able to contribute to the formation of art history in part through her involvement with the Burlington. One area in which Herringham’s role has been recognized is as a founder and benefactor of the National Art Collections Fund (NACF) in 1903 along with the art historians Roger Fry (1866–1934), D.S. MacColl (1859–1948) and Claude Phillips (1846–1924). Herringham’s NACF coterie was a cross-generational network of art journalists. Fry was writing for the Athenaeum and the new Burlington, while MacColl was one of the New Critics who had supported French impressionism a decade earlier, before taking up the role of critic for the Saturday Review in
1896 and editorship of the *Architectural Review* in 1901 (in 1906 he would also become Keeper of the Tate Gallery). The most senior member, Phillips, had crossed into the world of art institutions with his appointment as first Keeper of the Wallace Collection in 1897, but he had established his reputation as an art writer for the *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, the *Magazine of Art*, the *Academy*, the *Art Journal* and the *Daily Telegraph* and published scholarly volumes on Reynolds and Titian. At the first meeting of the NACF a battle emerged over the composition of its Executive Committee. The artist (and later museum director) Charles Holmes (1868–1936) later recounted how the “plucky” speech by Herringham, who protested at the exclusion of the original founders from the committee, resulted in a re-election. Andrea Geddes Poole has recently argued that the NACF offered an innovative new model of stewardship with women as full, voting members and part of its council and executive committee (including Herringham). By 1909 one quarter of the NACF membership was female. Geddes Poole sees this as a singular development, arguing that women were otherwise excluded from public stewardship and art criticism.

However, recent scholarship has corrected received accounts of the emergence of art history as a masculine field by demonstrating the significance of nineteenth century women writers on both contemporary and historical art. Therefore it is not surprising that several women art writers, some already experienced in art journalism, were from the outset contributing to these new art forums. The well-known art writer Elizabeth Eastlake (1809–1893) wrote a memorial article on Morelli in 1891; here her definition of “true Connoisseurship” encompassed an intellectual mode of research requiring “conscientiousness.” As Hilary Fraser has noted, this was a quality Eastlake had highlighted in her predecessor Anna Jameson (1794–1860) and one which was not beyond the reach of female art historians. Herringham was similarly renowned for her attention to detail, but, in the decade after Eastlake’s death, she established a “scientific” expertise that combined meticulous observation, empirical research and painstaking reproduction of works of art. Herringham’s career reveals that art journalism and cultural organisations were not entirely closed to women in the late-Victorian and Edwardian period. In fact it was in 1910 that the artist and writer Walter Sickert (1860–1942) declared that Herringham was “the greatest living critic.”

“Medieval Art Methods”
Herringham’s interventions in the development of connoisseurship were inherently grounded in her artistic practise. Her early oeuvre included sketches and watercolors of flowers and landscapes, but her most exhibited works were exact copies of paintings by Early Renaissance artists. The female copyist had historical associations with the female amateur or as Ann Bermingham has demonstrated the “‘accomplished woman’—one who was a conspicuous consumer and reproducer of culture, but not a creator of it.” However, Herringham disrupted this gendering of artistic production by conjoining an artistic practise of replicating “Medieval Art Methods” with “scientific” scholarship. The figure of the “accomplished” female copyist recurred in nineteenth century literature. In the novel Little Women by Louisa May Alcott (1832–1888), Amy March, who was nicknamed “Little Raphael” by her sisters, exemplifies the stereotype of the attractive and accomplished daubing woman. But the novel also reveals another aspect of Amy’s practise when she describes a copy she has completed of a “valuable copy” of a Madonna and Child owned by her aunt: “the copy of that picture which I’ve tried to make. The woman’s face is not good—it’s too beautiful for me to draw—but the baby is done better.” Amy’s mother later gives her an engraving of the Madonna and Child as a gift, which she “pores over.”

It was this ability to undertake careful study of works of art that lead to a professional career for many women. Herringham developed a practise of sketching and copying works both in collections in London and in a wide range of other sites she visited in France and Italy. She was not alone in this; there was a long tradition of women copyists working in collections such as the Louvre and the Uffizi. At the mid-century these women artists supplied the tourist market for reproductions of works by High Renaissance artists. As Jacqueline Musacchio has demonstrated, this was exemplified by the highly successful career of the American Emma Conant Church who was commissioned to produce copies for Vassar College in the 1860s. While Herringham’s copies were not commissioned (or sold to visiting tourists), her practise was predicated on academic study where copying from antique casts and Old Masters had long been considered essential, rather than an amateur tradition of female accomplishment.

Herringham’s interest in copying was somewhat distinct from her predecessors: she rejected High Renaissance artists in favour of Early Renaissance ones. This move can be related in part to contemporary art practise. The latter half of the century was marked by the emergence of Pre-Raphaelitism and then Aestheticism; both movements shifted attention to these earlier artists. Herringham thus developed a specific agenda: deciphering historic techniques deployed by artists of the Early Renaissance.
Herringham’s copy work can be considered in parallel with a painting by Étienne Azambre entitled *At the Louvre* of 1894. Azambre depicts two women at work in front of Sandro Botticelli’s (ca. 1445–1510) fresco, *Venus and the Three Graces Presenting Gifts to a Young Woman*. One woman wearing a dark dress stands erect perched on a ladder in front of a large easel. She appears to be at work, deep in concentration, while another woman leans on a stool, her head resting on her hand, as she gazes intently at the painted figures on the copy. During the 1890s, and indeed much earlier, Herringham could similarly be found in museums, accompanied by a paint box, easel, ladder and brushes. In fact we can assume that Herringham did work in the Louvre, as in the Azambre painting, on a copy of Botticelli’s fresco. She exhibited her copy of Botticelli’s Louvre fresco at the Carfax Gallery in 1905.

Unfortunately Herringham’s copy of the fresco is no longer extant, but her existing works include *A Head of Saint Catherine* (Royal Holloway) and *Head of the Magdalene* (Royal Holloway) both copied from Botticelli’s Sant’ Ambrogio Altarpiece in Florence and *The Virgin and Child with Saint John and an Angel* (Workshop of Sandro Botticelli) (Royal Holloway). Botticelli, incidentally, is the artist most commonly featured in Herringham’s oeuvre, although she copied work by a number of Early Renaissance artists. The original altarpiece and the roundel were done in tempera and Herringham’s copies were similarly painted using this “Medieval Art Method.” tempera painting, was the preferred medium for Early Renaissance panels. Tempera is a particularly time-consuming and unforgiving medium. It is made up of powdered pigment combined with a binding vehicle, often egg yolk, and applied with small brush-strokes onto a white gesso ground. Unlike oil, it is quick-drying and cannot be altered once applied. Depth and shading are created by multiple layers of hatching. It has the added advantage of being very durable. Herringham began her experiments with tempera in the 1870s. Roger Fry and Mary Sargant Florence (1857–1954) recounted that John Ruskin found Herringham copying in the National Gallery and questioned why she was using tempera to copy an oil painting. Herringham corrected his mistake and alerted him to the prevalence of tempera in the Early Renaissance. Ruskin revised his previous assumptions concerning the use of tempera by Carpaccio (active 1490; d. 1525/6) and Tintoretto (c.1518–1594), as opposed to oil, in *St. Mark’s Rest*, first published in 1877.

In addition, Herringham copied a Botticelli in the private collection of Constantine Ionides (1833–1900), which he had purchased from Dante Gabriel Rossetti (1828–1882).
insert Figure 3 near here. Herringham’s copies were first shown at the Victorian Era exhibition at Earl’s Court in 1897. The label on the back of the frame reads: “yolk of egg tempera copy of the Portrait of Smeralda Bandinelli by Botticelli belonging to Mr. Constantine Ionides” and the catalogue listed the painting as “lent by Constantine Ionides Esq.” In citing the collector, Ionides, Herringham acknowledged the original source of the painting, whilst also revealing her contacts and friendship network with the elite Holland Park circle. The paintings were exhibited in the Women’s Work section in the “Applied Art Division”; this denotes the problem of categorization for “copies” of Fine Art. However, Herringham’s interest in Arts and Crafts principles meant she would likely have been less concerned with artistic categories and more interested in the overarching goals of the exhibition: the “Women’s Work” section was organised by women in order to demonstrate their success in the fine and decorative arts. It was a British-based complement to the Women’s Building at the Chicago Columbian exhibition four years earlier. Herringham’s exhibition of her work in the Victorian Era exhibition demonstrated not only her engagement with the exhibition’s ethos, but also her interest in disseminating her own facility with tempera. In carefully labelling her own work “yolk of egg tempera” Herringham was making a case for a recipe for tempera found in historical texts.

It can be argued that Herringham’s practise of tempera painting informed her scholarship directly. Her translation of The Book of the Art of Cennino Cennini (Il libro dell’arte) was published two years after the Victorian Era exhibition in 1899. Cennini’s fourteenth century treatise is a comprehensive technical manual with a full explanation of tempera. Herringham was one of several women who undertook the translation of art historical scholarship. Caroline Palmer has highlighted the dominance of women in translation and contended that this was in part due to their knowledge of modern languages, rather than the Classics, which enabled them access to foreign texts and Continental cultural networks. Cennini had already been translated by Mary Merrifield (1804–1889) in 1844, but further manuscripts had emerged, necessitating more translations. Herringham and Merrifield were similar in their focus on the science of artistic production. Science in this context was understood in relation to the chemical processes of artistic production or what is now termed technical art history. However, while Merrifield’s work had been connected to the revival of fresco painting, Herringham’s interest became directly linked with tempera. Herringham’s edition included personal commentary and several chapters based on her own experiences: “Notes on Medieval Art Methods.” These had nine different sections including:
“that Italian tempera was yolk-of-egg painting”; “explanation of the tempera-painting of the ‘trattato’”; “fresco and its resemblance to tempera”; “early oil-painting”; “grounds and size”; “gilding”; and “on early varnishes.” She demonstrated her scholarly authority by discussing texts ranging from the eighth century Lucca MS (Cathedral Library, Lucca) to modern scholarship. Her personal library attests to this research: in addition to Merrifield’s translation she possessed earlier volumes on glass and encaustic as well as thirteen volumes by Ruskin. Herringham quoted rather than critiqued Ruskin in the notes to her edition, but she gave clear indications of her own experimentation and authority on the medium. For example: “Evidence is against not for Sir Charles Eastlake’s … conjectures that these qualities were obtained by the addition of something to make the egg dry slowly. I imagine he was probably thinking especially of Filippo Lippi’s Annunciation” (Newnham College, Cambridge, which she had herself copied and exhibited.).

In the section on “grounds and size” she provided specific instructions for priming a panel with gesso: “Gradually throw the gesso grosso into a basin of warm size standing in a warm-water bath, and stir it smooth with a spoon—metal or wooden—till it is a perfectly smooth thickish cream. Apply it on the sized panel with a worn varnishing brush of bristles.” She went on to discuss an example in the National Gallery that was on a canvas surface rather than panel:

[T]here are not many tempera pictures on canvas, that is, painted throughout in tempera. The Nativity, by Botticelli, shows the grain of a fine twilled linen all over the surface, especially in the gold background to the angels in the upper part, and is marvelously fresh.

As the analysis suggests Herringham had examined the Nativity painting in considerable detail; she may have experimented with replicating its unusual surface in her own copy of the work. The addition of the commentary emphasized that she was doing more than simply translating Cennini; instead the text was the source for an experimental mode of inquiry. Her experiments with methods associated with painting in tempera were part of a longer history of scientific interest in technique in Britain. Herringham’s interest in the properties of Early Renaissance paintings was connected to a wider concern with the (im)permanence of British art. The Houses of Parliament and the Pre-Raphaelite Oxford Union were examples of earlier unsuccessful experiments in mural painting. As Hannah Spooner notes there was a continued scientific concern about the durability of contemporary Victorian painting in
relation to early Renaissance examples. Students at the South Kensington School were required to be familiar with Merrifield, in order that they could understand recipes and techniques that had been proven to be long-lasting. Several contemporary artists were enthusiastic about the possibilities that tempera offered, and Herringham’s concern with the technical aspects of tempera was to have an impact beyond historical expertise on the Early Renaissance.

**Modern Paintings in Tempera**

Herringham’s translation and “Notes on Medieval Art Methods” helped to inform and bring together a dispersed group of contemporary artists who were similarly interested in tempera work. The group coalesced in 1901 around an exhibition entitled *Modern Paintings in Tempera* held at Leighton House. The Birmingham artist Joseph Southall and Herringham were amongst the participants. Herringham showed ten pieces including those that had been in the Victorian Era exhibition. The exhibition was followed in November 1901 by the formation of a Society of Painters in Tempera. The objective of the society was “the improvement in the art of painting in tempera by the interchange of the knowledge and experience of the members.” The society made clear the primacy of knowledge and experience of painting in tempera, and its debt to Herringham who was the driving force behind the society along with Southall. Abbie Sprague has suggested that it was Herringham’s volume on Cennini that propelled the revival of tempera into the next century. One interesting aspect of the society was its gender balance, other women artists included Marianne Stokes, Margaret Gere and Sargant Florence. The members would meet in one another’s studios and delivered a series of informal papers detailing various aspects of tempera techniques. Herringham’s paper continued the collection-based study she had begun in her translation with an essay entitled, “Methods of Tempera as exemplified in a few pictures in the National Gallery.” Here she considered several works by artists such as Giovanni Bellini (active c. 1459; d. 1516), Botticelli and Piero della Francesca (c. 1415/20 – 1492), making comparisons with works by Jan Van Eyck (active 1422; d. 1441) and Memling (active 1465; d. 1494, and asserting that certain National Gallery pictures such as *The Combat*...
of Love and Chastity (now attributed to Gherardo di Giovanni del Fora (1444/5 –1497) and Botticelli’s Nativity had been incorrectly catalogued as oil.46

Herringham wrote the catalogue essay for the second tempera exhibition at the Carfax Gallery in 1905, positioning the revival in relation to her own scholarship on Cennini. She commented on Rossetti’s attempt to copy Botticelli’s ‘Smeralda Bandinelli’ [f' insert Figure 5 near here [/f']:

This method is peculiarly suited for some lovely transparent effects of light over dark, as the filmy white veils of Italian madonnas. Rossetti tried to copy in oil the white muslin dress over red velvet of the portrait of Emeralda Baldinelli[sic], which at one time belonged to him and is now in the Ionides bequest at South Kensington, but he said he could not get the effect. It is easy and legitimate in tempera.47

Here Herringham was not backward about elevating her own success with copying the “filmy” white drapery. Gail Weinberg has since traced Rossetti’s ownership of the Botticelli painting and the influence of it on his own work.48 In the catalogue for the V&A exhibition Botticelli Reimagined Mark Evans highlights the significance of the Portrait of a Lady known as Smeralda Bandinelli and analyses its chequered history of attribution prior to and after its arrival in the Victoria and Albert Museum collection.49 Herringham must have been aware that Bernard Berenson had raised doubts about its attribution in 1899, including it as part of a group by another artist he called “Amico di Sandro”, because both volumes where he repeated this claim were in her library.50 However, she did not articulate this concern perhaps because of her close ties to the Ionides family. (One of the Ionides daughters, Helen “Lallie” Ionides (1871–1967), exhibited with the Society of Painters in Tempera.) Or it may have been simply that she disagreed with Berenson; certainly she had examined the painting more closely than he and her repeated exhibition of her own painting as a “copy of Botticelli” ignored Berenson’s opinion on it. Technical examination of the Ionides Botticelli by conservators Nicola Costaras and Claire Richardson reveals materials and techniques consistent with Botticelli.51

In the Society of Painters in Tempera catalogue Herringham also returned to her own technical interest in egg as a vehicle for pigment. She was explicit about the possibilities for achieving color with tempera: “the blue of the ultramarines, the fire of the vermilion, the fresh vividness of mountain green. This cannot be done to at all the same extent with colours tempered with oil without an unpleasant garishness.”52 Detailed analysis of color was
something that Herringham repeatedly revisited – this was probably in part because it was something photography could not reveal accurately, but also because it was inherent to her arguments about what tempera could achieve. This positioned Herringham as both professional “modern” artist and scholar vital to the expanded art historical interest in tempera and Botticelli.

Connoisseurship and the Burlington

Herringham’s publication of Cennini’s manual established her expertise on issues of medium and technique. These matters were integral to contemporary art writing and connoisseurship, so it is perhaps not surprising that she soon became involved in the development of the art press. A 1902 Architectural Review article on the history of oil painting was followed by involvement in the Burlington. Herringham served on its Consultative Committee and Mary Lago cites a telling letter from her cousin the art writer and collector Robert Witt (1872–1952) who was also involved in the formation of the NACF. Witt criticised Herringham’s unwelcome (but successful) interventions in the NACF debate: “They [Herringham and friends] must be stopped. Let them restrict themselves to the Burlington.” Witt wanted to block Herringham’s participation in the NACF committee. Herringham, then, belonged to a group of art experts with professional rather than titled links to the art world. This argument in fact also reveals much about the early history of the Burlington. For Witt it seemed, Herringham was more than simply a benefactor, she had an intellectual and political agenda that was allied with the journal. Although the Burlington is generally associated with key male figures, women were crucial members of the Burlington network during this early period of its history.

Operating within the Burlington circle, Herringham did exert her authority in print. In one piece she reviewed a recent publication on the history of oil painting by Charles Dalbon. After a lengthy discussion of various scholarly and “alchemical” sources absent from the book she declared: “Let us hope that his forthcoming work on technique will be more scientific.” Herringham was again positioning herself as a “scientific” scholar of technique, which Dalbon lacked in his understanding of historical “alchemical” texts. Herringham’s methodology involved careful analysis and experimentation with recipes and materials. She debated the author’s assertions concerning the recipe for varnish, arguing that
there was probably diversity and experimentation in varnish, citing the contrast between the glassy surface and fracture of Hubert van Eyck’s thicker medium and the limpid thinner medium of Jan van Eyck, before correcting Dalbon’s factual mistakes on both van Eyck and Cennini. In so doing Herringham emphasized that her own research was underpinned by an empiricism which Dalbon also lacked. Therefore she was able to specify: the death-date of van Eyck, the debtor’s prison records in Florence (Cennini was never there) and the correct dating of the Lucca MS (c.800 AD).

She soon became embroiled in an early Burlington debate about a portrait of Albrecht Dürer the elder (DATES) by his son Albrecht Dürer (DATES), a painting which had belonged to Louisa MacKenzie, Lady Ashburton (1827-1903). It was acquired for the nation in 1904 for the reported sum of £10,000. In an article entitled “The history of our new Dürer” for the Burlington, the journal’s co-Editor Holmes asserted that his “summary of the facts” concerning the painting “must not be regarded as reflecting in any way the views of the Consultative Committee of the Burlington.” (reference needed here) The debate concerning the piece was whether it was, like the other three known versions, a copy of a lost original—or in fact the original by Dürer. [f] insert Figure 6 near here [/f] Part of the discussion revolved around the ground of the comparison pieces. The Ashburton version appeared to be on parchment and Holmes attempted to cite authorities on the authenticity of the parchment in order to bolster his case. It was here that Herringham featured:

Mr. Herbert Horne informs me that there is no known instance of an Italian panel picture on a parchment ground earlier than 1550. Mrs. Herringham (who considers that there may be thin gesso ground under the Dürer picture) is equally definite on his point. 62

The footnote is revealing for several reasons. Firstly, it suggests that the article does in fact reflect the views of the Consultative Committee or at least some of its members. Secondly, it indicates that Herringham was amongst the “experts” responsible for a close inspection of the painting. Thirdly, her expertise on materials and technique makes her an authority worthy of quoting in order to give validity to the painting as the original Dürer. What followed was a heated discussion in the correspondence pages of the journal. Herringham was one of several respondents to the article wherein she denied having made the assertion and refuted her support of the attribution. 63 Herringham stated that she had “no reason” to think that parchment was used as groundwork for the picture and elaborated on surface damage to the
face that had been caused by a restorer. Although Herringham did not entirely dismiss Holmes’s argument concerning its attribution, she left the “possibility” (italics her own) of it being the original open to speculation, her response undermined his authority in making such an attribution and revealed fractures in the Consultative Committee. Rees Leahy highlights the significance of the Dürer debate in demonstrating the rifts forming between differing factions at the Burlington; Fry (who of course was already Herringham’s collaborator in the NACF) doubted the attribution and was unhappy with the publication of the article. It also reveals the involvement of Herringham in these early disputes as both “expert” called in to bolster a National Gallery purchase by a Burlington author and fellow member of its Consultative Committee and as one who asserted her own “scholarly authority” distancing herself from the paintings authenticity. Recently, Susan Foister has concluded that the National Gallery painting is one of a number of copies after a lost original.

In another piece Herringham wrote of a collection of eighteenth century portraits by Reynolds and Raeburn that recently been on the market:

If picture-collectors would realise how easy it is to detect modern repaints and restorations, £4000 would not have been paid at Christie’s recently for Lord Tweedmouth’s Simplicity, formerly by Joshua Reynolds, now not, except for the general design and a portion of the hand; nor £6000 for Raeburn’s portrait partially by himself, the rest, the larger part, by an unknown nineteenth century or perhaps-twentieth-century sign-painter. Lady Raeburn’s portrait has been handled with more suavity than is customary among sign-painters, but it is nevertheless largely repainted.

Herringham’s tone in her discussion of the Raeburn is remarkable in its mocking reference to a twentieth-century “sign-painter.” It suggests that she had considerable confidence in her own views about attribution and over-painting. She also questioned the authenticity of another Reynolds portrait of the Countess of Bellamont. Buyers were instructed to examine with a “fairly strong hand-lens” the surface of retouched pictures looking for cracks and evidence of opaque rather than semi-transparent oil paint. Here she appeared to be giving the readers of the Burlington advice on how to make their own “technical” judgements about condition in the sale room. For Herringham and several of her colleagues it was this sort of “scientific” analysis that was lacking in attributions made by other “experts.” Recent scholarship has turned our attention to the modern art market. Anne Helmreich and Pamela
Fletcher highlight the role of the art press as one of the primary mechanisms by which the value of art objects was established. The *Burlington*, while espousing disinterested scholarship, was operating within a network of institutions, collectors and dealers. Barbara Pezzini sees the early *Burlington* and the *Connoisseur* as part of a hybrid milieu where professional roles concerning the study and the commerce of art were not fully defined. Herringham’s evaluations of works of art were not aloof from these interconnections; she was familiar with not only institutions, such as the National Gallery, but also dealers and collectors (including her extended family). The hybrid nature of this milieu may have in part enabled Herringham to operate across diverse networks whilst defining her own role as expert.

“Our Disappearing Heritage”

For Herringham the question of authenticity overlapped with heritage and conservation. Herringham travelled extensively, studying not only tempera paintings but also architecture, and wrote about the sites she had visited. Architecture had provided the physical contexts for Early Renaissance frescoes and altarpieces that she had already explored, but it was also crucial to wider debates around restoration and conservation. As with her study of “Medieval Art Methods” she attempted to combine meticulous observation with artistic practise and took issue with attempts at restoration of heritage sites and works. Several of her extant sketches indicate time spent in France and Italy. Moreover her library attests to this interest with significant number of contemporary volumes on architecture by British and Italian scholars. In 1905 Herringham waded into contemporary debates about heritage. She responded in the *Burlington* to a *Times* article on the proposed restoration of *St. Mark’s* in Venice with an extended critique of how “coming generations had been robbed of their heritage” through destructive restoration projects in France and Italy. The *Times* articles described plans for among other things removing iron supports and flattening paving. Together with the well-known architect Reginald Blomfield (1856–1942), Herringham wrote in to protest. Herringham’s responses continued debates that had already been associated with John Ruskin and William Morris. However, it also reflected Herringham’s longstanding interest in the matter and her artistic practise. Her response to the plans alluded to restoration work she had encountered on a recent trip:
In one sense it reads like the beginning of destruction, or more correctly like its continuation. It is two or three years since I saw St. Mark’s. The mosaics of the vaults were then under treatment by the modern workman. It is not possible for a mere traveller to say exactly what was being done. At first sight it seemed to be merely cleaning. … Closer examination seemed to show that the tesserae of the figure-groups had been reset, with the results that the faces had lost their human look and had become wooden, and the lines of the draperies had lost their expressiveness and grace.

At that time the easternmost division of the vaulting remained intact and was a delight and a standard of comparison. The gold tesserae of the back-ground were apparently reset, too, for in the untouched parts the lines of tesserae gradually left the parallel, grouping themselves sympathetically round the contours of the figures, forming cloud-like halos; but this is not so in those parts where the gold has lost its force and become gilding.  

While on the one hand Herringham begins with a more self-effacing tone than in her analyses of specific paintings, suggesting she is “a mere traveller”, on the other hand she rapidly returns to the problem of restoration. Herringham questioned whether the “cleaning” of the mosaics in the vaults had resulted in the re-setting of tesserae and implied that the proper techniques for producing gold-glass were not used. In fact Herringham’s expertise in the use of gold seems to have been limited to tempera painting and frames, as opposed to glass (she wrote about gilding and collaborated with members of the Society of Painters in Tempera). However, Cennini included a chapter on mosaic and several volumes in her library attest to an interest in the Byzantine revival of the late-nineteenth century: Robert Weir Schultz’s study of the monastery of Saint Luke of Stiris, in Phocis included a section on mosaic technique. Moreover, Herringham had an awareness of materials and “closer inspection” was her familiar mode of study; in so doing she was attempting to distinguish between new and old mosaic production and made a parallel with her own technical analysis of art objects. As she wrote, “It is perfectly possible to secure foundations and maintain fabric without tampering with sculpture and mosaic, just as it is possible to reback a picture without repainting its surface.”

Herringham was a member of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings and her brother-in-law, the architect Thackeray Turner (1853–1937), was Secretary for the Society. In her library was a 1903 technical report prepared for the Society which tackled the debate concerning restoration versus repair or conservation, arguing that restoration was in
fact a form of forgery. The report gave detailed recommendations on various aspects of building conservation such as for medieval architecture, wall paintings and stained glass.  

While the treatise did not make reference to specific examples, it did make reference to the rest of Europe as well as Britain. Herringham would return to these debates the following year with an anonymous piece in the *Women’s Tribune* entitled “Architecture: Our Disappearing Heritage” that critiqued attempts at ‘renovation’ in Venice, Ravenna and Chartres. She argued for a more holistic understanding of architecture, noting the historical interconnectedness of building and painting guilds in the Early Renaissance, adding:

There is an art which is more especially than any other the Art of the People, namely, architecture, or the art of building. At least the outsides of all buildings, and the insides of many, are, for the enjoyment of all, and it behoves us to remember this before it is too late.”

Here Herringham sustained her argument with direct reference to Morris’s 1879 Birmingham lecture on “Art of the People.” The cross-class accessibility of architecture was further justification of the need for conservation. Moreover, she was calling for a transnational re-evaluation of historic sites, foregrounding a collective responsibility for global heritage. For Herringham artistic practise overlapped with transnational concerns about heritage and historical objects. This was linked to a dual interest in the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings and the technical decisions involved in conserving works of art. Herringham used the authority she had garnered as a technical expert on “Medieval Art Methods” to exert public pressure on international heritage projects in the wider press.

**Epilogue**

Christiana Herringham’s work can be considered as a later example of the involvement of women in the development of technical art historical scholarship. Her work, directly and indirectly, returns to questions raised by Maria Callcott (1785–1842) and Merrifield in the first half the nineteenth-century concerning technical aspects of early Renaissance art and the “science” of analysing paintings. As with these early writers Herringham’s career indicates the importance of translation and travel, but also the creation of copies as a method of study. Herringham’s tempera paintings, when viewed alongside her art writing, reveal a great deal about her working method and interest in “scientific” analysis of painting technique. This
continued to resonate in 1910 when Sickert would label her the “greatest living critic” in a belated, but rave, review of her “powerful” and “virile” Cennini translation. Sickert directed contemporary students to Herringham’s careful study and artistic expertise: “We have in it the double authority that is conferred by study combined with, and illuminated by, ability.”

For Sickert it was fundamental that art writers were practitioners themselves; Herringham fulfilled this criterion. Moreover, Herringham’s return to craftsmanship epitomized Sickert’s self-definition as a “craftsman-writer” in 1910. During the preceding decade Herringham alongside other members of the Society of Painters in Tempera had created a public forum for promoting the “modern” revival of historical techniques. The press, particularly the outlet of the Burlington, provided another space in which she was able to communicate expertise on a variety of issues. The press also reveals the significance of her role in the Burlington network. She was cited by colleagues and intervened with technical analyses of paintings and their attribution; her critical assertions concerned works recently acquired for the National Gallery and private collections. Herringham’s work also signals interest in the preservation of what is now labelled “global heritage”, something that would come to the fore with her subsequent trips to India in 1909–1910 and 1910–1911 where she sought to reproduce the Ajanta paintings. One thread that runs throughout her working life was the inclusion of women as creators and mediators of culture. Herringham’s husband later donated an embroidered bedcover to the Victoria and Albert Museum in her memory, but her true legacy is in her expertise and critical authority, the respect for the skills that she had acquired and therefore the tacit recognition of the role of a woman as a connoisseur which was the starting point of this essay.
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