blemish. The more important parts of the panorama are painted with pencils of the finest sable, so delicate as to make lines as fine as a hair, each of which, however, is perceptible by the eye of the spectator. Zinc-white is used instead of lead, and the oils employed are of the purest quality that can be manufactured. 37

This account may seem a bit excessive in its claims, yet we should remember that at the Colosseum opera glasses were provided for the closer inspection of the panorama of London—a measure which would hardly have been introduced if the painting could not withstand such careful scrutiny. Constable's comment on one of Reinagle's panoramas was that Reinagle "views nature minutely and cunningly, but with no greatness or breadth." 38

The question remains open, as it must. There can be no single answer about a form of painting practised by so many exponents over such a length of time. A comparison of the Barker engravings of Edinburgh (Pl. 2-7) and drawings of Paris (Pl. 33-40), separated by little more than a decade, demonstrates the changes that must have occurred throughout the panorama's history. Claims that recent years had seen considerable advances in panoramic representation were repeated at intervals throughout the nineteenth century. Hopefully this chapter has, at least, suggested some of the more constant aspects of panorama painting.
CHAPTER IX

THE PLACE OF THE PANORAMA IN NINETEENTH CENTURY ART AND SOCIETY

I

The period of the rise of the panorama was also the period of the rise of the public art exhibition and the museum. Art was being brought before the public on a larger scale than ever before and in a new way—not as decoration or symbol but as something to be valued on its own terms. The panorama was part of this general development. It was not just that art had, in the rising middle class, a new public and a new class of patrons, but that it had a much more diverse public which brought to it different levels of appreciation and sets of expectations. The simple dichotomy of "high" art and "popular" art, each with its own distinct public, was blurred; it was blurred but never forgotten. The panorama always occupied an uneasy position in that ill-defined region between art and popular entertainment.

In later accounts of the panorama it was often stated that the panorama was greeted rather coolly by the artistic community.1 There was, however, considerable acclaim for the innovation among certain members of the art world. We may remember that the president of the Royal Academy, Sir Joshua Reynolds, had, after initial scepticism, been greatly
impressed by Barker's exhibition and that James Northcote had concurred in this opinion. Benjamin West, Reynolds's successor as Royal Academy president, allowed himself to be quoted to the effect that this was the greatest improvement in the history of painting, which was extravagant praise, indeed. The acclaim in France after the panorama's introduction there in 1799 (see Appendix B), was, if anything, greater. We hear of Jacques Louis David taking his students to view a panorama and exclaiming: "Vraiment, messieurs, c'est ici qu'il faut venir pour étudier la nature." Less than a year after the opening of the first panorama in Paris, the Institut de France had established its commission on the panorama. The report presented by Leon Dufourny on September 15, 1800, concluded that "cette ingenieuse application de principes plus ingenieux" merited the interest and approbation of the Institut.

The panorama was hailed as a triumph of perspective and optics which seemed to herald further achievements in both fields. The methods employed in the creation of the panorama's illusion were seen as applicable to more conventional painting; it appeared momentarily to those overcome by the panorama's effects that a new age of verisimilitude in painting was being ushered in. Dufourny's report suggested that the lesson provided by the panorama's removal of terms of comparison should be heeded by all exhibiting artists and that the lighting techniques of the panorama could be profitably adopted by all museums and galleries. Dufourny asked:
Mais ne serait-il pas possible que cette découverte fit faire à la peinture un pas vers la perfection? N'ouvre-t-elle pas une nouvelle route pour parvenir à ce but de tous les essais de tous les efforts de l'art? ne prouve-t-elle pas déjà que les moyens fournis par les Sciences, réunis aux connaissances pratiques de l'art et aux raisonnements d'un esprit juste et calculateur peuvent encore enfant de nouveaux prodiges?5

Such official interest in the panorama did not exist in Britain, but it was seen fit to include an article on the invention in the 1801 supplement to the Encyclopaedia Britannica. This simply reproduced the specification of Barker's patent,6 but the next supplement, which came out in 1824, had a completely revised entry. The article was free from claims about the panorama's epoch-making significance or encomiums on its uncanny reproduction of the natural world. Instead it chose to view the panorama in the context of the tradition of illusionistic perspective painting, mentioning the Guilio Romano Room of the Giants at the Palazzo del Te as a precursor and providing a complex explanation of the perspective basis of the circular painting.7 If the article betrayed a certain lack of enthusiasm for the form, it at least made clear that the panorama was still to be seriously considered as art.

With the passing of the first wave of enthusiasm, the view that the panorama was a great artistic achievement or even that it was serious art at all had generally declined. Artists continued to be interested. Those famous artists-cum-diaryists, Joseph Farington and Benjamin Robert Haydon, were both repeated panorama-goers, but neither found it worthwhile mentioning much more than the fact that they had been to visit one.8 Constable enjoyed both the panorama and
diorama but said of the one that "great principles are neither expected nor looked for in this mode of describing nature" and of the other that "it is without the pale of Art because its object is deception--Claude's never was--or any other great landscape painter's." Sir George Beaumont, who had shown such interest in the panoramic format before it had been adopted for public exhibition, was of the opinion that the effect of panorama painting had been injurious to the taste of both artists and the public. In view of his earlier interest, his dislike of the exhibition may have been directed at its commercialization or the quality of its painting. On the other hand, he may have feared that its widespread popularity might undermine the authority of his beloved Claudian ideal.

Reviewers in periodicals and daily papers continued to extol the virtues of panoramas and their high standard of illusionism, but they were also forced to justify the exhibitions as art. The Repository of Arts review of Burford's Geneva in 1827 noted that its execution belongs to a department of art which is not thought very highly of by artists generally, from the mechanical dexterity and sort of knack which is considered to form so large a share of its merit. Many of the best and most studied rules of art are, however, necessary for its perfection: a considerable knowledge of perspective, much judgement of colouring, a good eye, and a correct hand, are among the indispensable requisites for the artist who attempts this pursuit.

It is only with John Ruskin that we come upon evidence of a major figure in the art world who again saw the panorama as something more than a popular amusement. Ruskin never became a spokesman for the panorama, but in
later years, long after the Leicester Square Panorama had closed, he recalled the importance that the establishment had had for him. In writing of his first view of Milan, he noted:

I had been partly prepared for this view by the admirable presentiment of it in London, a year or two before, in an exhibition, of which the vanishing has been in later life a greatly felt loss to me.--Burford's panorama in Leicester Square, which was an educational institution of the highest and purest value, and ought to have been supported by the government as one of the most beneficial school instruments in London. There I had seen, exquisitely painted, the view from the roof of Milan Cathedral, when I had no hope of ever seeing the reality, but with a joy and wonder of the deepest. 13

Some of Ruskin's comments on certain landscape painters not only indicate that he was evaluating the works of these painters on the same terms as the panoramas were commonly evaluated, but also suggest that he may even have been judging them in terms of panoramas. Ruskin spoke of Thomas Seddon's landscapes as the first to unite perfect artistical skill with topographic accuracy being directed with stern self-restraint to no other purpose than that of giving to persons who cannot travel trustworthy knowledge of the scenes which ought to be most interesting to them. Whatever degrees of truth may have been attained or attempted by previous artists have been more or less subordinate to pictorial and dramatic effect. In Mr. Seddon's works the primal object is to place the spectator, as far as art can do, in the scene represented, and to give him the perfect sensation of its reality, wholly unmodified by the artist's execution. 14

The statement about placing the spectator "in the scene represented" and giving him "the perfect sensation of its reality" could have come from any of a number of panorama reviews or advertisements. The benefit to persons unable
to travel had always been a selling point in panorama exhibitions, and was commonly seen as one of their primary functions. The panorama as a travel substitute will be treated later in the chapter.

Three years after his comment on Seddon's landscapes, Ruskin, in his *Academy Notes* for 1859, made similar claims for John Brett's painting of Val d'Aosta. Here the relation to the panorama is even more explicit. His concluding comment about the unpleasantness of the location in reality seems a direct echo of sentiments expressed in numerous panorama encomiums:

For the first time in history, we have by help of art, the power of visiting a place, reasoning about it, and knowing it, just as if we were there, except only that we cannot stir from our place, nor look behind us. For the rest, standing before this picture is just as good as standing on that spot in Val d'Aosta, so far as gaining of knowledge is concerned; and perhaps in some degree pleasanter, for it would be very hot on that rock today, and there would probably be a disagreeable smell of juniper plants growing on the slopes above.¹⁵

In claiming (somewhat awkwardly) that Seddon and Brett had both been "first" in successfully transporting the viewer through art to distant places, Ruskin, if he was writing with the panorama in mind, had evidently excluded the panorama from the realm of art. However much Ruskin may have appreciated the experience and knowledge provided by the panorama, he seems, like Constable, to have considered it beyond the pale of art. In attacking two artists, who were not panoramists, Ruskin referred to them as "merely vulgar and stupid panorama painters." Although he went on to add that "the real old Burford's work was worth a million
of them," the use of "panorama painter" as a term of abuse indicates a rather low opinion of the form in general.

The relegation of the panorama to the status of a second-class art was undoubtedly the result of a number of factors. It is unlikely that the variety of panoramas and similar exhibitions were all "exquisitely painted." Some artists and critics may have disapproved of their commercialism or objected to the employment of devices other than painting. Some may have felt that the form promoted a mechanical, inartistic response to nature. One of the greatest handicaps to the full acceptance of the panorama as art must have been its ephemeralness.

Again a statement of Ruskin, this time from his pamphlet Pre-Raphaelitism of 1851, mirrors the objectives of panoramists. Ruskin saw the artist's duty as

the faithful representation of all objects of historical interest, or of natural beauty existent at the period; representation such as might at once aid the advance of the sciences and keep faithful record of every monument of past ages which was likely to be swept away in the approaching era of revolutionary change.17

It could have been the programme for the Barker-Burford establishments, but for the fact that the panorama was not a permanent record. The documentary value of these huge paintings would indeed have been considerable, had they been preserved rather than painted out or worn out after their round of exhibiting. Just a few years before Ruskin's statement in Pre-Raphaelitism, one of the panoramists, the American, John Rowson Smith, had recognized this documentary value of his work. In the printed description to his panorama of the Mississippi, he noted:
In America the country itself is ever on the change, and in another half-century those who view this portrait of the Mississippi will not be able to recognize one twentieth part of its details. . . . How much might be gathered of ancient manners and of history, had our ancestors bequeathed to us works of a similar description. Their sketches of scenery which have come down to us are too incomplete to give us a notion of the then existing peculiarities of the country; and it would be well were this panorama of the Mississippi to prove the precursor of other works on an equal scale.

We do find some suggestions that panoramas should be preserved and that panorama establishments be maintained on a more secure and permanent footing. Ruskin expressed the wish that the Leicester Square establishment could have been carried on as a government-supported educational institution. A similar proposal was made about Girtin's Eidometropolis shortly after the artist's death. The Evening Herald ran an article which suggested that the Eidometropolis might be fitted up to form an elegant object in a nobleman's or gentleman's park; it would be novel, and would furnish its owner with an opportunity of seeing London though in the country, and would be fortunately gratifying to his visitors from the endless variety it contains. The antiquary in a few years would see what London was, and mark the great alterations that are about to take place, particularly at London Bridge. It has often been pointed out to the Government the want of a National repository of the Arts, similar to the Louvre in France; this, we think, would make a proper object, and might be worthy their attention.

The equation of art with some degree of permanence—an equation which has only really been challenged by some avant-garde movements of the twentieth century—kept the panorama on the outside of serious art.

If the panorama, after its initial acclaim, lost much of its prestige in the art world, a glance at the names of those responsible for panoramas and dioramas makes clear that
there was no barrier between serious artists and panorama painters. Henry Aston Barker and Robert Ker Porter had both been Royal Academy students. Ker Porter exhibited at the Royal Academy, as did the Burfords, father and son, John Thomas Serres, John Augustus Atkinson, John Knox, Edmund Thomas Farris, Charles Marshall, Henry Courtney Selous, William Telbin, Thomas and William Grieve, William Roxby Beverley, Philip Phillips, and Henry Warren all painted panoramas or dioramas, and all exhibited (some extensively) at the Royal Academy. Ramsay Richard Reinagle, Clarkson Stanfield, David Roberts, and William Daniell were Academicians. Daguerre and Bouton were both exhibitors at the Salon of the Académie des Beaux-Arts. James Fahey was secretary, and Henry Warren and Louis Haghe were both presidents of the New Watercolour Society.

Artists like Roberts and Stanfield were truly popular, known to the public through the easel paintings on show at the annual Royal Academy exhibitions, through theatrical scenery, through dioramas, and through book illustrations. It was largely through their dioramas and moving panoramas both within and without the theatre that Roberts and Stanfield initially gained their considerable reputations. Such widespread popularity, with its basis to such an extent in the production of popular amusements, inevitably seemed suspect in artistic circles. We find evidence of a critical backlash against Roberts and Stanfield, aimed at their more popular productions. A reviewer of the 1830 Royal Academy exhibition chastised Stanfield:
You cannot serve two masters—the god who presides over easel-pictures, and the mammon of scene-painting. The latter is profitable, and Mr. S. has well deserved his reward, for he has distinguished himself in this line in an extraordinary manner; but it has incapacitated him, in many essentials, to fulfill the nicer and more scientific duties of the higher branch. For exhibition to the multitude, this may not be felt; as we have no doubt that the town were nearly, though not quite, as much pleased with his Mount St. Michael at the Academy, as they were with some of his scenes in the pantomime at Drury Lane. The merit partakes of the same character; and, well advised as to his reputation, he will abandon either the one or the other.²⁰

In 1859 a critic in The Times condemned Roberts's paintings for "the slovenly slap-dash of their execution" and then commented that "Mr. Roberts has won a great reputation, by virtue of which he may think himself enthroned above criticism."²¹

Stanfield and Roberts both must have agreed that they could not ultimately serve two masters and in the course of their careers largely abandoned dioramas and scene-painting in order to devote themselves more fully to the more respectable production of easel paintings. It is true that for most of the artists named above the excursion into panorama painting was brief; their work on such exhibitions was on the very periphery rather than at the centre of their art. There were, however, in the generation following Stanfield and Roberts, several artists, such as Charles Marshall and William Telbin, whose sizable contemporary reputations were based on a considerable body of popular pictorial entertainments as well as achievements in "the higher branch."

Whatever opinion painters may have entertained of the panorama, they could not have remained oblivious to it. Conversely the panorama could not have existed free from the
ongoing influence of conventional forms of art. Consequently we see reflected in the panorama and diorama many of the major trends of nineteenth century art.

To what extent was the experience of the panorama reflected in contemporary easel paintings? As we have seen (Chapter IV) the creation and public exhibition of canvases on a vast scale (vast in terms of normal easel paintings, if not in terms of panoramas) may well owe much to the example of the panoramas and the taste for grandiose display fostered by such exhibitions. In terms of composition, however, pictures with a pronounced horizontal emphasis presenting extended views do not appear to have been particularly popular with nineteenth century landscape artists. Girtin and Loshak have claimed that, following Girtin, landscape views in this format essentially disappeared. While this seems an overstatement, there is little doubt that with the coming to an end of the topographical tradition of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, such extended views became proportionately less frequent. The panoramic format does seem to have been adopted by battle painters. The paintings of the Battle of Waterloo by Sir William Allen are markedly similar to panorama representations.

If the panorama experience did not lead to any widespread adoption by artists of panoramic compositions, the unselective nature of a three hundred and sixty degree painted view may well have played some part in promoting greater compositional freedom. In this sense the panorama had a role in that struggle for freshness of vision which
was a dominant concern in nineteenth century art. Gombrich has shown that this attempt to escape the schemata of art was largely chimerical. New schemata were simply substituted for the old. For the nineteenth century artist the panorama was one possible source of new schemata.

Related to the desire for freshness of vision was another overriding concern of nineteenth century art—the rendering of visual reality. This is particularly evident in the fundamental importance attached to the treatment of light and atmosphere. We find the concern with light expressed in different ways by Turner, Constable, the Pre-Raphaelites, and the Impressionists. Bringing the reality of light into painting was central to the whole idea behind the panorama and diorama. In these exhibitions the end was achieved by the manipulation of actual daylight or lamplight or gaslight. The solutions to the problems of the representation of atmosphere were mechanical or theatrical rather than painterly. A difference in emphasis between the panorama and diorama suggests a further analogy with the artists just mentioned. Constable and the Pre-Raphaelites, each in their way, were concerned with the corporeal reality of things. So, too, was the panorama, whereas the diorama was more orientated towards atmosphere—closer to the preoccupations of the Impressionists.

In choice and treatment of subject matter, the panorama and "serious" art shared considerable common ground, as in the taste for exoticism, particularly for exotic subjects given a detailed, matter-of-fact treatment. In its consistent
contemporaneity, as in its concern with the city, the panorama reflected a popular taste for what, had it appeared in high art, would have seemed shockingly Realist. But, of course, any indication of the social consciousness associated with Realism as an artistic or literary movement was absent from the panorama. The panorama representation of the city was unavoidably forthright, yet it remained comfortably detached.

Since the panorama was aimed at a broader audience than the select number of "art-lovers," it was freed from many of the conventions of high art. Consequently it could in some aspects be revolutionary without attracting the succès de scandale which so often accompanied revolutionary art. On the other hand, its dependence on popular taste substituted another set of conventions based on what was safe and readily comprehensible to the public. The panorama's revolutionary nature was offset by its reactionary one.

II

In considering the relationship of the panorama and the public, we must first establish just what public we are concerned with. Answers to the question of who went to the panorama are a bit difficult to come by but would suggest that panorama-going was an essentially middle class phenomenon and that the panorama's public became broader as the nineteenth century progressed.

Initially the panorama was not brought forward as a middle class entertainment. Like the Eidophusikon before it, the panorama seems to have been aimed at a select body
of connoisseurs. Robert Barker's earliest advertisements, as well as his initial admission charge of three shillings, indicate that he sought an audience from the upper classes.

While it is impossible to trace in any detail the change in the panorama's patronage, a few signposts do exist. Quite early the Barker advertisements ceased to be addressed to "the nobility and gentry," that formula being replaced by "the public." Robert Barker, having lowered his admission price to two shillings while still exhibiting in Edinburgh in 1788, further reduced his price to one shilling shortly after his arrival in London. The one shilling admission remained the standard charge for all similar exhibitions throughout the nineteenth century. When the discriminatory price ranges (three shillings in the boxes; two in the amphitheatre) were introduced in the Regent's Park Diorama, there was protest. By mid-century references were being made to the exhibitions' effects on "the middle and humbler classes," and it was assumed that these were the classes at which such exhibitions were aimed.

Of course the nature of those exhibitions like the Leicester Square Panorama and the Regent's Park Diorama in which daylight was utilized limited the opportunities for members of the working public to attend. We learn that the audience at the Kineorama on the afternoon when it burned consisted only of ladies. The special attention which the newspapers gave to such exhibitions at the holidays must indicate something of the pattern of attendance which developed.

In opposition to the image of serious-minded middle class panorama-goers, intent on self-improvement, there was the body
of visitors known in the press as "fashionable loungers," who frequented the exhibitions in the proper season. Like the Royal Academy exhibitions, the panorama and diorama remained to some extent fashionable entertainments and nobility and particularly royalty set the fashions. Although objections might be raised to barriers to equality in the viewing area of the Diorama, the patronage of royalty and the nobility placed an important stamp of approval on an exhibition. 26

In describing the appeal of panoramas and similar exhibitions, critics upheld the distinction between the art-loving few and the vulgar mass. We find the two levels of appreciation, which we have already met in the reaction to the introduction of mechanical effects, in the review of the Stereorama of 1860:

While the real waterfall, and the smoking chimneys, and the revolving waterwheels, and the other stereoscopic objects, still or in motion, will no doubt charm the simple, and make the uninitiated wonder . . . yet it is to the pictorial treatment of the plain surfaces that the attention of the art-loving public will be chiefly attracted. 27

Even accepting the critic's simplistic dichotomy for convenience, we are at a loss in assigning proportions to the "initiated" and "uninitiated" segments of the audience or in attempting to relate such a distinction to social classes.

How many people attended the panorama? In the absence of attendance records, we have only scattered statements of questionable accuracy which appeared in advertisements to guide us. It was claimed that, in a year of exhibiting, the view of the Interior of St. Peter's at the Cosmorama had been
seen by "upwards of sixty thousand persons, one-third of whom have seen it many times over." This was ten thousand more than the attendance claimed for Martin's Belshazzar's Feast in the same season. In 1845 it was stated that over a million people had visited the Colosseum since its opening approximately fifteen years earlier. At mid-century the diorama of the Overland Mail to India was supposed to have had a half million visitors during its two year run. At the same time Brees, whose other claims about his panoramas at times seem extravagant, reported that his New Zealand had been seen by over a million visitors in two years. These last figures can be compared with the recorded attendance of 6,201,856 at the Great Exhibition. In 1890 Philippoteaux's Niagara, after two and three-quarter years of exhibiting in London, had been visited by one million, two hundred thousand.

Popularity must largely be gauged by the continuing proliferation of panoramas. Of course we have no guarantees that all exhibitions were well-attended; indeed, we have evidence in a number of cases that they were not. At times, as with the boom at mid-century, we may well suspect a glut in the market for such entertainments. Although we know from the accounts of holiday entertainments that, at these special times of the year, great crowds flocked to the exhibitions, we do not know how this compared with general attendance during the rest of the year. Nonetheless if panoramas had not sustained a general popularity, panorama-exhibiting would never have reached the proportions that it did.
The panorama struck a responsive chord in the nineteenth century. It satisfied, or at least helped to satisfy, that increasing appetite for visual information, mentioned in connection with the mid-century panorama boom (Chapter VI). Like so much else in the nineteenth century, this demand for visual information was the outcome of various developments spawned by the Industrial Revolution. A revolution in travel had either made the world smaller or the individual's vistas larger. The growth of the middle class and the related spread of literacy and burgeoning newspaper industry meant that many more people were aware of a greater number of happenings over a larger area of the globe. It is not surprising that people should desire visual images of the world of which they were becoming aware through the printed word.

The panorama supplied a substitute for travel and a supplement to the newspaper. As a writer in the Repository of Arts expressed it: "What between steam-boats and panoramic exhibitions, we are every day not only informed of, but actually brought into contact with remote objects."34

When in 1844 a news publication married printed word to visual image in the form of The Illustrated London News, the panorama had already been providing a pictorial documentation of current events and places of interest for over half a century. The Illustrated London News introduced itself with a bow to the panorama. In an address to readers in the first number it stated that its goal was "to keep continually before the eye of the world a living and moving
panorama of all its actions and influences."35 As a present to its subscribers, it published a panoramic engraving of London which it entitled the "Colosseum Print."36 In subsequent years subscribers were presented with other panoramic prints.

From the time of the comment in Woodfall's Register in 1789 about the possibility of the Royal Family gaining knowledge of foreign lands through the panorama (Chapter II), such exhibitions had been celebrated as substitutes for travel. The panorama provided not some pale reflection of a distant scene but an almost palpable sense of its reality. Indeed not a few writers attempted to convince their readers that the illusion was preferable to the reality. According to a Times critic:

There are aspects of soil and climate which ... in great panoramas such as those of Mr. Burford, are conveyed to the mind with a completeness and truthfulness not always to be gained from a visit to the scene itself.37

Selous's panorama of Naples was stated to be "even more pleasant to look upon in Leicester Square, than is the reality with all its abominations of tyranny, licentiousness, poverty, and dirt."38

The circumvention of the miseries of travel through the means of the panorama became a common theme. An article in Blackwood's Magazine in 1824 developed this idea at length:

Panoramas are among the happiest contrivances for saving time and expense in this age of contrivances. What cost a couple of hundred pounds and half a year a century ago, now costs a shilling and a quarter of an hour ... . The affair is settled in a summary manner. The mountain or the sea, the
classic vale or the ancient city, is transported to
us on the wings of the wind. . . . If we have not
the waters of the Lake of Geneva, and the bricks
and mortar of the little Greek town, tangible by
our hands, we have them tangible by the eye—the
fullest impression that could be purchased, by
our being parched, passported, plundered, starved,
and stenchfed, for 1200 miles east and by south,
could not be fuller than the work of Messrs.
Parker’s [sic] and Burford’s brushes. The scene
is absolutely alive, vivid, and true; we feel all
but the breeze, and hear all but the dashing of the
wave. 39

In 1850 Charles Dickens’s journal, Household Words,
carried an article entitled, "Some Account of an Extra-
ordinary Traveller." It chronicled the adventures of a
Mr. Booley, a retired bank clerk who, at the age of sixty-
five, had set out on a remarkable series of journeys which
carried him to all parts of the globe. At the conclusion
of the article, Booley revealed the true nature of his
travels:

"It is very gratifying to me," said he, "to have seen
so much at my time of life, and to have acquired a
knowledge of the countries I have visited, which I
could not have derived from books alone. When I was
a boy, such travelling would have been impossible, as
the gigantic-moving-panorama or diorama mode of con-
veyance, which I have principally adopted (all my
modes of conveyance have been pictorial), had then
not been attempted." 40

The educational value of the panorama, recognized from
the outset, had become, by the time of Booley’s travels at
mid-century, its fundamental merit. The nouns "panorama" and
"diorama" were commonly joined with the adjective "instructive."
The producers of the diorama of Our Native Land felt it neces-
sary to inform the public that their scenes "do not so much
instruct the spectators, the principle of such exhibitions
having hitherto been that of making people see upon canvas
what they would have little chance of beholding in reality";
the scenes of Our Native Land, "if they do not teach, they answer another purpose by appealing to a national sentiment." The majority of the exhibitions did teach, and their middle class audiences were aware that never before had people in their position been as knowledgeable about the outside world. As Mr. Booley expressed it:

"It is a delightful characteristic of these times, that new and cheap means are continually being devised, for conveying the results of actual experience, to those who are unable to obtain such experiences for themselves; and to bring them within the reach of the people—emphatically of the people; for it is they at large who are addressed in these endeavours, and not exclusive audiences. Hence," said Mr. Booley, "even if I see a run on an idea, like the panorama one, it awakens no ill-humour within me, but gives me pleasant thoughts. Some of the best results of actual travel are suggested by such means to those whose lot it is to stay at home. New worlds open out to them, beyond their little worlds, and widen their range of reflection, information, sympathy, and interest. The more man knows of man, the better for the common brotherhood among us all."  

As a consequence of this attitude towards the panorama, the panoramist came to be regarded as a public benefactor. In 1830 The Morning Chronicle attributed to Robert Burford "the merit of having contributed as much to the instruction and amusement of his countrymen as, with few exceptions, any man of his day." The American panoramist, John Rowson Smith, commented on his own high calling:

The love of travel is inherent in mankind, but the occupations of life preclude its gratification. He, therefore, who by means of panoramic exhibitions makes travellers of those who would otherwise tarry at home, is no ordinary benefactor to his fellow creatures.

Of course, the panoramists did all they could to enhance this image by emphasizing the great expense, difficulties, and personal danger which they had undergone in
bringing their views before the public. The 1816 advertisement of a painting of Jerusalem (not in this case an actual panorama), taken from drawings made on the spot, is representative of the hazards panoramists faced:

Those who are aware of the danger of such an enterprise, will best appreciate the value of these authentic drawings: the Turks, those fanatic masters of the Holy Land, esteem the city sacred, and any attempt of this kind, if unhappily detected, would have been instantly punished, according to their laws, with a cruel and ignominious death.  

While the peril may here be exaggerated, H. A. Barker had faced certain difficulties in obtaining permission to take views of Constantinople sixteen years earlier and had been accompanied by a janissary on his sketching expeditions. He had had to cut short one such expedition to the Hippodrome, when a group of old women, outraged by the sacrilege of his activity, disrupted his view-taking.  

Robert Burford, during his extensive travels in search of panorama subjects, had suffered a number of inconveniences, including being snowbound for forty-eight hours while taking his view of the Bernese Alps; being locked in the Karlskirche for the night while taking his view of Vienna; having to spend days in an isolated cabin high in the Alps, waiting upon sufficiently clear weather to complete his sketches of Mount Blanc; and being apprehended as a trespasser while taking his view of Salzburg. Actually Burford was rescued from the Karlskirche by a passerby, and, instead of being prosecuted for trespassing, when he explained the nature of his business, was given the keys to the property so that he could pursue the work at his own convenience. It seems
that in the need to dramatize his experiences as a panoramaist, Burford had to resort to rather unexciting incidents.

One genuinely dramatic incident occurred during Hornor's view-taking from atop St. Paul's. Hornor related in his prospectus that it had been a summer of rather volatile weather conditions and that "scarcely a day passed without derangement of some part of the scaffolding or machinery connected with it." During a particularly severe squall, Hornor's observatory was torn from its fastenings and almost swept from its platform with the artist inside. 48

While the panorama was widely praised for its educational value, it also received recognition, particularly in the early years, as an instrument of propaganda. During the Napoleonic period, the celebration of British arms was an important source of panorama subjects, and the effects of such panoramic representations on the public's patriotic feelings were appreciated. According to H. A. Barker, when Nelson met him in Palermo, Nelson expressed his indebtedness to Barker for "keeping up the fame of his victory in the Battle of the Nile for a year longer than it would have lasted in the public estimation." 49 It was in France, however, that the propaganda potential of such exhibitions was most fully recognized. After seeing in 1810 a panorama of his meeting with Alexander I at Tilsit three years earlier, Napoleon ordered the architect Céléri to design eight rotundas to be built in the Champs-Élysées. Each was to contain a representation of one of his great victories. After exhibition in Paris they were to tour the principal
cities of the Empire. The events of 1812, however, prevented the realization of his project. 50

Considering the influence which popular exhibitions like the panorama could exercise, it would be interesting to know more of the political orientation of the panoramas and the outside influences that were brought to bear on the choice of subjects. It would seem that in general British panoramists were conservative, at least in the sense of avoiding what might be politically controversial subject matter. While newsworthy events were the stock-in-trade of the panoramas, we find in London no representations of the Continental revolutions of 1830 or 1848. Again the French seem to have had a greater taste for mixing politics and panoramic representation. In 1889 the French government prohibited the opening of a panorama called Tout Paris because General Boulanger was prominently presented in the scene while President Carnot was left in the background. 51

We have considered the extent of the panorama experience in terms of who went to the panoramas; now we must consider it in the sense of how deeply the panorama left its mark on the sensibilities of the period. Because of their size and illusion, the images presented in the panorama in all likelihood firmly impressed themselves on the minds of the viewers. To those who would never see the real locations, the panorama image must have been something of a surrogate reality, against which other representations, either verbal or pictorial, would be weighed. To those who would later visit the sites represented, the panorama image would have
provided a framework for the visual experience of the reality. Even though his memory of the panorama image was somewhat faulty, Ruskin made it quite clear that his view of Milan was affected by his prior experience of the panorama. To those who had already visited the sites or experienced the events, the panorama, if we can believe the anecdotes, brought back the reality. We hear of the Duke of Wellington growing more and more excited as he viewed Barker's panorama of Sobraon and straining against the barriers of the viewing platform.\(^{52}\)

The effect of the news media in influencing the world view of their audience has become a modern commonplace. We are very much aware of the tendency to equate the amount of coverage given an event with the true significance of that event. A similar process was undoubtedly at work in the panorama. We have a hint of this in the tribute paid to Robert Burford in his obituary in \textit{The Times}:

\begin{quote}
Year after year he remained the pictorial illustrator of his times, and an event of public interest seemed scarcely to have received its due acknowledgment until the spot where it had occurred had formed the subject of one of his beautiful panoramas.\(^{53}\)
\end{quote}

The very form of the panorama image suggested a new mode of viewing one's environment. As Claudian composition influenced the eighteenth century connoisseurs' response to nature, so may the panorama have influenced a far greater proportion of the population. Robert Southey, visiting the entrance to the Caledonian Canal in 1819, wrote of the scene in terms of what a panorama painted from that point would include.\(^{54}\) Walter Scott wrote of the view from the Calton
Bill--which had provided the viewpoint for the very first panorama--as "an unrivalled panorama." The difficulty in assessing the adoption of a panoramic mode of vision is that the panorama was originally an attempt to bring painting closer to the actual nature of seeing than it had ever been before. To what extent statements like those of Southey and Scott reflect a real change in viewing habits, and to what extent the panorama simply provided a convenient label for a visual experience people had always had, we can never fully know.

The word "panorama" did enjoy a vogue perhaps greater than that of the exhibition which it designated. Certainly the word has gained a permanence which the exhibition never did. We must ask to what extent this vogue was related to and to what extent independent of the popularity of the exhibition. The word captured the public imagination, and it is only reasonable to assume that this reflects the response to the exhibition. As early as 1792 the panorama--here referring literally to the form of painted exhibition--was employed as a framework for political satire. By 1801 the name, if not actually the principle of the exhibition, had made its way into the theatre (see Chapter IV). Figurative usage of the word was not long in following. Again in 1801 a publication appeared bearing the title, *The Political Panorama*. Mrs. Mary Sterndale's *The Panorama of Youth* was published in 1806, and in 1812 J. Smith's *The Panorama of Science and Art* appeared. By 1806 the periodical, *Literary Panorama*, was being published.
Two main streams of figurative usage developed from the two forms of panorama exhibitions. From the original three hundred and sixty degree exhibition derived the sense of an unbroken view of a surrounding region, as in Scott's comment on the view from Calton Hill. The meaning was transferred from the comprehensive survey of a location in a three hundred and sixty degree painting to a comprehensive survey of any subject—the sense in which it appears in the titles named above. From the moving panorama came the sense of a continuous passing scene. In Maria Edgeworth's novel, Patroonage, of 1814 (just four years after Marshall's moving panorama first appeared in London), a character showed his knowledge by "his rapid panorama of foreign countries."\(^5\)

Once the word had been used in a figurative sense, did subsequent usage refer to the exhibition or simply to the figurative sense? The latter has certainly been the case in the twentieth century, when the word is so frequently used, while the exhibition which gave birth to the name is largely forgotten. In the nineteenth century some writers made a distinction between real-and painted panoramas which suggests that the word was beginning to be associated more with a general form of visual experience rather than a particular type of exhibition. However such a circumstance can occur only after a word is already in such common usage that it will not perplex readers. Only when the use of "panorama" to refer to a survey of a subject gained wide currency could it stand on its own, independent of the concept of the exhibition. Thus we must assume that for much of the nineteenth
century, at least, the use of the word was dependent on the author's familiarity with the exhibitions and his assumption that his readers would share this familiarity.

In spite of fluctuations of taste throughout the nineteenth century, there can be little doubt that the panoramas and dioramas enjoyed a tremendous popularity and that few other varieties of art could possibly have been known to a wider public. Therefore it is somewhat puzzling that success stories are so infrequent in the history of panorama painting in London. H. A. Barker's success with his panorama of Waterloo enabled him to retire. John Banvard, a backwoods American artist, became an international celebrity after taking his panorama of the Mississippi to Europe. Crowds flocked to the diorama of the Overland Mail to India and forty years later flocked in even greater numbers to the panorama of Niagara. On the other hand, the Leicester Square establishment was slow in realizing a profit, and the Reinagle-T. E. Barker venture in the Strand was apparently not profitable. Girtin's Eidometropolis, it seems, was not a success. Daguerre's Diorama in Paris was far from the financial success it was believed to be at the time, and it seems unlikely that its London counterpart fared significantly better. The chequered history of the Colosseum included the financial ruin of several of its proprietors.

The real success story of the panorama lay not in the amassing of personal fortunes nor in the creation of great and lasting works of art. The panorama's true success lay in the creation of a new public for the work of art and a
new conception of what a work of art should be. Its progeny is the cinema; but the only lasting reminder of its impact is the frequency with which we employ its name today.
APPENDIX A

THE PANORAMA IN EDINBURGH

Throughout the history of the panorama in London, the exchange of panoramas between London and provincial centres remained conspicuous. The Preface to the first number of The Art-Union, which appeared in 1839, noted:

For some time past, a more general taste for works of Art has been gaining ground in this country; and consequently, a more general wish to become acquainted with all topics connected with the important and interesting subject. A few years ago "Exhibitions" were limited to the metropolis; they are now held, annually, in all the prominent provincial cities and towns of the kingdom.

The exhibitions referred to were those of conventional paintings, sponsored by the various local art institutions and societies which came into being in the first four decades of the century; however, the panorama and diorama also played their part in the spread of a taste for art, bringing a form of art before provincial audiences years before annual exhibitions were instituted in many cities.

While a full account of panorama activity throughout Britain cannot be provided here, a survey of panorama exhibiting in one provincial centre may serve to typify what was going on outside London and to provide a useful perspective for viewing the history of the panorama in the capital. The city which, while it may be taken as representative, also
holds a special interest as regards the panorama is the
birthplace of that exhibition—Edinburgh.

For a period of eight years following Robert Barker's
departure for London in 1788 with his view of Edinburgh,
the Scottish capital did not see another panorama. Instead
there were exhibitions of transparent paintings on glass
and polygraphic pictures, an equestrian circus with enter-
tainments "interspersed with transparencies, cascades, and
waterfalls," Sieur Herman Boaz's "Philosophical, Mathematical
& Magical Amusements," and two seasons of the Eidophusikon.

On December 12, 1796, the panorama returned to
Edinburgh. In a large, temporary building erected for the
purpose opposite Robert Adam's New College, R. Dodd's "Grand
and Improved Panorama" of the burning of His Majesty's ship,
the Boyne, fresh from London, opened to public view. The
proprietor was a Mr. Parker, an Edinburgh entrepreneur and
equestrian performer, who followed the exhibition of Dodd's
painting with a panorama of London, painted in Edinburgh by
"Mr. Nasmyth and Mr. Couper." The "Mr. Nasmyth" was undoubt-
edly that founding figure of Scottish landscape painting,
Alexander Nasmyth, who was noted for his productions in the
related branch of theatrical scene-painting; "Mr. Couper" was probably Richard Cooper, the Edinburgh-born landscape
painter and son of the noted engraver. The view, which
covered 3,500 square feet of canvas, was said to have been
taken from the top of the ruins of the Albion Mills, although it seems likely that the artists simply copied the
Barker engravings of the scene which had been published in
1792. London was apparently popular, for, although it closed sometime late in the year, it opened again in 1800 and was brought back once more in 1812.

A "panorama with motion" appeared in the city in 1800. Its artist and place of origin were not recorded, although it had previously been exhibited in Liverpool and Manchester and would go on to Glasgow. It opened at Martin's Large Auction Room on South Bridge on March 25, with a depiction of the Battle of the Nile—not in the form of the moving panorama that Peter Marshall would introduce, but apparently similar to the Naumachia, which was presenting the same subject at this time in London. Nile closed in May, to be replaced by Lord Duncan's Victory at Camperdown. A Battle of Copenhagen and another Battle of the Nile were exhibiting in 1802. Between Camperdown and Copenhagen, a panorama of Norwich by an unnamed artist appeared at the establishment, and the Nile was followed in 1803 by a panorama of Edinburgh, again by an unnamed artist.

In the building opposite the New College, Parker continued to bring forward panoramas which had been successful in London. Ker Porter's Seringapatam appeared in 1801, Arnold's Battle of Alexandria in 1802, and De Maria's Paris in 1803. For the exhibition of Ker Porter's Battle of Agincourt in 1808, Parker erected a new building in Drummond Street.

With the rise of panorama exhibiting in Edinburgh and the number of London panoramas which were being brought up to the city, it seems somewhat strange that Barker panoramas
did not appear in Edinburgh very often. In 1802 a panorama building was opened in Barker's name in Leith Walk. The view of Ramsgate, which had been shown in the upper circle at Leicester Square, was exhibited there the first year, and the panorama of Constantinople from the Tower of Leander, also from the upper circle, was shown the following year. After that the establishment seems to have closed.

Although many panoramas were imported from London, Edinburgh was by no means wholly dependent on London for panoramic entertainment. The Nasmyth and Cooper panorama, even if it relied on the Barker engravings, was still a local product. During the first two decades of the nineteenth century, a number of panoramas by Scottish artists appeared in Edinburgh, some of which were later taken to London.

On June 19, 1809, John Knox's Glasgow opened in a large wooden building at the north end of the Mound, on the site later occupied by the Royal Institution (now the Royal Scottish Academy). A Grand Panoramic Painting of the View from Ben Lomond opened in the building in 1811. Presumably this was by Knox as well, and the pair of his paintings of the subject in the Glasgow Art Gallery may well form a small-scale replica of this panorama. Further panoramas by Knox, depicting Dublin and Gibraltar, were presented in the building on the Mound in 1812 and 1814. George Sander's Leith panorama, which, like Knox's Glasgow, later appeared at Wigley's Great Room in London, was also exhibiting in the same building in 1814.
A second building was erected on the Mound in 1811 to accommodate a moving panorama of the Thames by the Edinburgh drawing master, Patrick Gibson, who had evidently been inspired by Marshall's moving panorama of the Clyde, which had been exhibited in 1809 in a building on Princes Street. Gibson followed his Thames with another moving panorama of London sights, which he exhibited in 1812, and three years later he opened a moving panorama of St. Helena in rooms on Princes Street.

In yet another large, temporary, wooden rotunda--this one located in York Place--a circular panorama of Waterloo on 1,685 square feet of canvas exhibited from November, 1815, to July, 1816. It was the work of James Howe, a Scottish animal painter, who had travelled to the battlefield himself and collected information from both British and foreign officers who had taken part in the engagement. Howe's panorama opened in Edinburgh several months before any panorama of the subject appeared in London.

Barker panoramas returned to Edinburgh in 1818, when they were again shown in Leith Walk. This time, however, they were T. E. Barker panoramas from the Strand, although they were advertised as H. A. Barker productions from Leicester Square. The proprietor was Mr. Parker, but by 1821 the panoramas in Leith Walk had been taken over by the Marshall family, who had, in the past three years, established themselves with their peristrephic panoramas in a "Large New Pavilion" on the site where the Knox panoramas had been shown. The Leith Walk Panorama continued to
exhibit under Marshall management for only a few years, after which Barker and Burford circular panoramas were absorbed into the programme schedule of the Marshall Rotunda on the Mound, alternating with peristrephic panoramas. In the early 1820s the rotunda was moved further up the Mound to make way for the building of the Royal Institution.

There were Marshall establishments in Glasgow and other British cities, but the family seems to have been based in Edinburgh, where Peter Marshall, the originator of the peristrephic panorama, died in 1826. After his death the concern was carried on by other members of the family for twenty-four more years. From about 1821 until almost 1850, when the last panorama in their rotunda closed and the building was torn down, the Marshalls held sway over panorama exhibiting in Edinburgh.

Their only real competitor was the Diorama which opened in Lothian Road in 1827 and exhibited paintings from the Regent's Park Diorama in London up to the year 1841. The other infrequent competition was not as long-lasting. A second rotunda opened on the Mound in July, 1830, with the Burford panorama of Rio de Janeiro. Like the Marshalls the proprietor of this rotunda followed the circular panorama with a moving one, which presented Bonaparte in Egypt, and was the work of a scene-painter, H. Hillyard, from Edinburgh's Theatre Royal. The new rotunda does not seem to have lasted into the following year. Just over a decade later another building was
erected on the Mound to house W. Gordon's Aeronauticon and British Dioramas. The Aeronauticon—a moving panorama presenting a balloon ascension—was painted by Gordon from sketches by Thomas Grieve; the dioramas were the work of William Telbin.20 The Marshalls, however, anticipated Gordon by opening their own Aeronautikon several months before he did, and Gordon seems to have withstood the competition for little over a year.

While Edinburgh experienced nothing like London's mid-century panorama boom, the years around 1850 did mark a change in the city's panorama activity. The Marshall family ceased to be a factor and, after a period of sampling the exhibitions which had been so popular in London, Edinburgh settled down to a routine of visits from the large touring companies of Gompertz, the Hamiltons, and the Pooles.

In 1849 the Risley and Smith panorama of the Mississippi opened at the Waterloo Rooms, followed in the next year by Banvard's Mississippi. The Marshalls catered to the taste for Americana engendered by these panoramas by exhibiting at their rotunda during its last two years of existence, Hudson's Great American Panorama of the River St. Lawrence and a Grand Historical Moving Picture of the Valley of the Hudson. A number of the moving panoramas and dioramas which had opened in London in the wake of the Smith and Banvard paintings also made their way to Edinburgh; Brees's New Zealand, one of Albert Smith's dioramic lectures, Life and Scenes in British India, and Charles Marshall's A Tour through Europe all appeared in Edinburgh in 1851. Phillips's
Hindustan appeared in 1854, and the Bartlett Holy Land, painted by Beverley, straggled up to Edinburgh in 1861.

Gompertz made his first appearance in Edinburgh in 1856 with his Colossal Panorama Illustrating the War with Russia. From that year until 1874, when the last of his panoramas to visit Edinburgh exhibited "all the Principal Incidents of the Marriage of the Duke of Edinburgh and the Grand Duchess Marie in the Imperial Chapel of the Winter Palace at St. Petersburg," seven different Gompertz exhibitions appeared in the city. The year of Gompertz's last panorama was also the year in which a Poole and Young panorama first visited the city. Another of their panoramas opened in 1876, but after that there was a gap of eight years before a Poole production again appeared in Edinburgh; a similar gap occurred between 1889 and 1898. More regular in their visits to the city were the Hamiltons, whose excursions appeared every few years from 1858 until 1895.

While these touring companies provided the mainstay of Edinburgh's panorama activity from the late 1850s to the end of the century, their panoramas were by no means the only ones to appear in the city. Of the others that exhibited in Edinburgh, some, like those of Washington Friend and Hardy Gillard, had already been seen in London, but there were a number of exhibitions that had never appeared there.

Although the panoramas might be different from those seen in London, the subject matter remained largely the
same. The Franco-Prussian War was treated in Wilberforce and Parry's moving panorama. America provided the subjects not only for the Friend and Gillard panoramas but also for another panorama by John Banvard. His *Life and Scenes in America* appeared in Edinburgh in 1876 but, strangely, considering the popularity of his earlier *Mississippi*, not in London. Four years later Edinburgh was given the opportunity to see yet more of the United States in W. H. Edwards's *America, or Life and Scenes in the Far West*.

Scottish subjects were, naturally, as popular in Edinburgh as in London. Birrell and Lamb's *Royal Diorama of Scotland*, painted by Thomas Dudgeon, ran for a month in the autumn of 1869. Birrell and Lamb later separated, Lamb taking the *Royal Diorama of Scotland* to London in 1873, and Birrell exhibiting his own *Grand Diorama of Scotland* in Edinburgh in 1872 and 1887 and in London in 1873. Not seen in London was McLaren's *Diorama of Scotland*, painted from drawings by the Scottish landscape painter, Sam Bough, and exhibited in Edinburgh in 1870. Morris and Adams's *New Grand Diorama of Scotland* and *Scottish Concert Company* appeared in 1884 before appearing in London.

After the close of the Marshall Rotunda in 1850, Edinburgh, like London from the 1860s to the 1880s, had no permanent establishment for pictorial entertainment. Unlike London there was no revival of the circular panorama in Edinburgh in the 1880s. Those vast paintings which were brought to London for exhibition were unsuitable for touring. No hall in Edinburgh could have contained them. Of course
earlier in the century, temporary buildings had been erected to house circular panoramas, but the mammoth panoramas of the 1880s would have required structures far larger than those which had sufficed for the panoramas of the early decades of the century.

For Edinburgh the 1880s simply continued the gradual decline in the number of panoramas to visit the city. At the close of the century, Poole Myrioramæ still appeared in Edinburgh, but even within the Poole entertainments, the panorama had been overshadowed by the cinématograph.
APPENDIX B

THE PANORAMA OUTSIDE BRITAIN

I

Within a few years of its appearance in London, the panorama began to spread beyond Britain. Both on the Continent and in America, Barker panoramas were imported and imitated and improved upon. Temporary rotundas and permanent establishments appeared in New York, Paris, Berlin, Vienna, and a number of other cities. By the first decade of the nineteenth century, the panorama had established itself as an international phenomenon. In France, Germany, America, and elsewhere, native artists were producing original panoramas for their home audiences, and later sending these works abroad. It was within this international context that panorama exhibiting in London developed, and the importance of figures like Daguerre, Banvard, and Philippoteaux in the story of the panorama in London makes it clear that the London situation cannot be fully understood in isolation.

Unfortunately information on the panorama outside Britain is patchy, at times confused, and in some instances utterly wrong. Until more work has been done on the subject, any survey must of necessity suffer from gaps and imbalances. This sketch, however incomplete, should provide
a context for the panorama in London and indicate some­thing of the extent of panorama painting and exhibiting in international terms.

II

The first panorama outside Britain appeared in New York in 1795, just two years after the Barkers had opened their Leicester Square Rotunda. Although it had been pro­duced in America, this panorama had close ties with England. Its subject was London; its artist was William Winstanley, an English painter who had emigrated to America; and it was based on the engravings of the Barker view of London. ¹ Two years later Winstanley's London was again shown in New York, as was another of his panoramas, which could not have been reproduced from a Barker prototype, as it presented Charleston, South Carolina. ²

During the first two decades of the nineteenth cen­tury, a variety of panoramas were exhibited in New York. Some, like the panorama of New York which appeared in 1808 or the panorama of Boston which was showing in 1811, were American productions, but panoramas which had been exhibited in London were also imported—like Robert Ker Porter's Battle of Alexandria, which was exhibited on Broadway in 1804. ³ At such a distance from their source confusion could arise; a panorama of Paris said to be by Porter was shown on Broadway in 1812, although Porter never seems to have executed a pan­orama of the subject. ⁴ In 1808 an exhibitor named Stollen­werck opened a "moving panorama" which seems to have been
an exhibition like the Eidophusikon rather than the Marshall peristrephic panorama, which it pre-dated by a year.  

The first permanent panorama rotunda in America was erected in New York in 1818 by the noted American historical painter, John Vanderlyn. Vanderlyn's intention was to establish a national gallery of art; he hoped to attract the untutored American public by means of the spectacle of the panorama and then gradually introduce them to those higher branches of art to which his other paintings belonged. Vanderlyn's own panorama of Versailles opened in the summer of 1819, the fourth panorama to be shown at his rotunda. Vanderlyn had made the sketches for the painting when at Versailles in 1814, and had brought the sketches back to the United States, together with a French artist named Jenner to help in the execution of the panorama. The painting occupied a circle one hundred and sixty-five feet in circumference and twelve feet high. On one side stretched the garden facade of the palace; opposite lay the vista over the gardens toward the Grand Canal. To Vanderlyn's great disappointment—his panorama was a commercial failure. The New York public's interest in art did not even encompass a panorama of Versailles, which they may have found too regular and formal. In spite of the failure of Versailles, other panoramas continued to be exhibited until 1829, when the rotunda was taken over by the city and turned into a Court of Sessions.
Nine years later a second permanent panorama rotunda was established in New York by the English architect and traveller, Frederick Catherwood. Catherwood had provided Robert Burford with the drawings from which the Leicester Square panoramas of Jerusalem, Thebes, and Baalbec were painted. After the exhibition of Jerusalem in London in 1836, Catherwood bought the painting and took it to New York, where he opened a rotunda on Broadway in 1838 with the Jerusalem on view. As it had come from the large circle in Leicester Square, Jerusalem was considerably larger than the panoramas which had been exhibited in Vanderlyn's rotunda. Once again size seems to have been the important factor, and Catherwood prospered. Late in 1838 he returned to London to purchase for his rotunda copies of Burford's Niagara, Lima, Thebes and Baalbec. Catherwood's enterprise continued to flourish until 1842, when the building and all its contents were destroyed by fire.

Although the Vanderlyn and Catherwood rotundas have focused attention on New York as a centre of panorama exhibiting, it was by no means the only American city to enjoy such activity. Vanderlyn himself exhibited his Versailles in Philadelphia and attempted to establish another rotunda in New Orleans. Characteristically Vanderlyn again misjudged his audience, and was no more successful in these two cities than he had been in New York. Vanderlyn's lack of success should not be taken as indicative of a general absence of interest in such exhibitions; by the 1830s even
the young cities of the developing American West were host to a considerable variety of panorama establishments. It was not only in the cities that the public had the opportunity of seeing panoramas. As in Britain the development of the moving panorama facilitated the touring of panoramas, for which any town hall could serve as an auditorium. The ease of presentation, together with the lesser demands of production (in the moving panorama the artist of limited ability could avoid those problems of perspective and distortion that he would have to face in creating a circular panorama), caused American artists to take this particular form of the panorama to their hearts. It was even claimed that the moving panorama was an American invention. Such panoramas, painted by local artists for local audiences, proliferated throughout the United States.

Typical of this activity was the work of Marcus Mote, a Quaker artist of Lebanon, Ohio, who in the years 1853 and 1854 created four panoramas, which were exhibited in a number of small Ohio towns. The titles of Mote's panoramas were Uncle Tom's Cabin, Paradise Lost and Regained, The Course of Creation, and The Progress of Intemperance. Religious and moralistic subjects were much more popular with American panoramists and audiences than they were with their British counterparts. One of the major American moving panoramas presented the Pilgrim's Progress, in a series of scenes by some of America's foremost painters, including Frederick Edwin Church. The quality of local productions like Mote's can seldom have been very high. While they were undoubtedly important
in the dissemination of a rudimentary appreciation of art, they would scarcely seem to have had any international significance, but for the fact that the mammoth moving panoramas like Banvard's Mississippi—which had such an impact on panorama exhibiting in Britain and enjoyed great success throughout Europe—were a direct outgrowth of such local activity.

In addition to the Banvard and J. R. Smith panoramas of the Mississippi, there were panoramas on the subject by Henry Lewis, Samuel Stockwell, Leon Pomarede, and Samuel Hudson, all completed in the late 1840s. After appearing in the cities along the great river itself, these panoramas were taken on tour to the Eastern cities, and in the case of Lewis's picture, on to Europe, in the wake of Banvard and Smith. These Mississippi panoramas were part of the American panorama boom which pre-dated and contributed directly to the boom in London. The Boston correspondent of a Midwestern newspaper recorded the extent of panorama exhibiting in that city, but stated baldly what we may well suspect of the panorama boom in London—that a great number of the exhibitions were commercial and popular failures:

Ever since the advent of Banvard, this city has been literally over-run with panoramas. I cannot enumerate them all, but there is [sic] always two or more open at the same time. With the exception of "Eayne's Panorama of a Voyage to Europe," all have lost money. Two Mexican Panoramas were failures, "Champney's Rhine," the "Shores of the Mediterranean," a "Voyage to California," the "Creation and Deluge," "Ireland and her Shores," "A walk through the Garden of Eden," are anything but successful. Some of them are "up the spout," and some "laid by" for the present. The panorama rage, however, is still high. The Panorama of the "River St. Lawrence and Falls of Niagara," and another called "American scenery, embracing all
that is grand and wonderful in America," also, "Stockwell's colossal Panorama of the Mississippi River," are yet in full blast. "Skirving's overland journey to California" was opened October 1st. "The sketches are by Col. Fremont, &c., (so announced,) and exhibits his late disastrous trip over the mountains, etc."!\(^3\)

The extent and nature of panorama painting and exhibiting in America in the second half of the century are almost a complete blank, and it has been assumed that, with the coming of the American Civil War, the taste for panorama entertainments died out; however, in 1888 The Illustrated London News, greeting the arrival of Paul Philippoteaux's Cyclorama of Niagara from America, noted that, in contrast to their decline in Britain, panoramas had been flourishing in the United States.\(^24\) We do know that the panoramas of London by Day and Paris by Night from the Colosseum were exhibiting in New York in 1874,\(^25\) and that in the 1880s Paul Philippoteaux's Cycloramas were being shown in a number of American cities.

Claims have been made that the panorama was a particularly American form of art, reflecting a mode of vision which was the natural response to the American landscape.\(^26\) According to this reasoning, if the panorama had not existed, the American artist would have had to invent it. Yet if the claims for the "Americanness" of the panorama tend towards extravagance, certain American artists do seem to have felt a particular affinity for the panorama, and its influence on nineteenth century landscape painting is perhaps more readily evident in America than in any European country. Both in scale and effect, the vast, popular canvases of Frederick Edwin Church and Albert Bierstadt demonstrated their
allegiance to the panorama. In 1864 the American critic, James Jackson Jarves, related an anecdote about a man who mistook Bierstadt's Rocky Mountains for a panorama, "and after waiting a while asked when the thing was going to move." Jarves's comment was that the man "was a more sagacious critic than he knew himself to be."  

III

It was an American who was responsible for the introduction of the panorama into France. Robert Fulton had come to England from America in 1793 to study under his fellow countryman, Benjamin West. There he had become acquainted with Barker's establishment, and when he went on to Paris in 1796, he took the idea of the panorama with him. In Paris he joined with the American businessman, Joel Barlow, in a plan for establishing a rotunda in the city, obtaining a "brevet d'importation" in April, 1799, which authorized Fulton to exploit the panorama in France for a period of ten years; however, Fulton had become more interested in engineering than art, and in December, to finance his experiments in building a submarine, he sold his rights to another American expatriate, James W. Thayer. Under Thayer's management two rotundas, each forty-six feet in diameter, were erected on the boulevard Montmartre, on either side of a street which is still known as the Passage des Panoramas. A "Vue de Paris" painted by four French artists—Jean Mouchet, Denis Fontaine, Pierre Prévost, and Constant Bourgeois—opened in one of the rotundas and was joined shortly by the
Evacuation de Toulon par les Anglais en 1793 in the other, painted by Pierre Prévost and Constant Bourgeois.  

Prévost soon became the principal panorama painter in the French capital. In 1807 he entered into a partnership with Thayer to erect a new, larger rotunda (over one hundred feet in diameter) on the boulevard des Capucines. Prévost supplied the new rotunda with a series of popular panoramas, including L'entrevue de Tilsitt, en 1807 (which appeared in 1810), Vue de la ville d'Anvers (1812), Vue de Londres (1816), Jerusalem (1819), and Athènes (1821). He died in 1823, in the midst of painting a panorama of Constantinople. The work was completed by his brother and a pupil who together went on to paint another panorama depicting Rio de Janeiro; however, these works failed to attract the public as the works of Pierre Prévost had, and the rotunda was demolished. The two small rotundas on the boulevard Montmartre continued exhibiting panoramas until 1831 when they too were torn down.  

By the time of Prévost's death, the panorama was facing considerable competition from an invention of two of Prévost's former assistants, Jacques Louis Mandé Daguerre and Charles Marie Bouton. This was the diorama (see Chapter IV), which created a great sensation when it opened in the rue Sanson in 1822. How long this popular success was sustained is uncertain. Although stories grew up of the diorama's tremendous financial success, by the 1830s the establishment was running at a loss, and calls for a government subsidy appeared in the press. On the other hand after the Diorama in the rue Sanson was destroyed by fire in 1839, Bouton
opened another on the boulevard Bonne-Nouvelle, and when this one also burned down in 1849, he built yet another in the Champs-Élysées.³⁸

That French interest in the panorama and diorama existed on all levels is indicated by, on the one hand, the establishment of a commission on the panorama by the Institut de France, just a year after Fulton had introduced it to France (see Chapter IX), and, on the other hand, by a popular song which ran:

Paris pas plus grand que cela
Jouit de succès légitime
Un savant vous le montrera
Pour un franc cinquante centimes
Et tout le monde donne ou donnera
Dans le pano, pano, panorama.³⁹

Honore de Balzac, in his novel Le Père Goriot, noted that "la recénte invention du diorama, qui portait l'illusion de l'optique à un plus haut degré que dans les panoramas, avait amené dans quelques ateliers de peinture la plaisanterie de parler en rama."⁴⁰ Characters in the novel add the ending -rama to a number of words, one character even referring to Goriot's death as a "mortorama."

In 1827 Jean Pierre Alaux attempted to improve the illusion of the diorama, by combining dioramic painting and lighting effects with the circular format of the panorama. Like the diorama, Alaux's exhibition, which he termed the Neorama, presented views of architectural interiors; the first two subjects were St. Peter's in Rome and Westminster Abbey. Alaux's combination of the diorama and panorama did not prove very satisfactory, and the Neorama enjoyed little success.⁴¹
Two years after the opening of Alaux's Neorama, Colonel Jean-Charles Langlois, a veteran of the Napoleonic campaigns, erected a panorama building in the rue du Marais-du-Temple which was about ten feet greater in diameter than the Prévost panorama in the boulevard des Capucines had been. Retired from the service on half pay in 1815, Langlois had devoted himself to painting military subjects, studying under Girodet and Horace Vernet. In 1830 he brought out his first panorama, *La bataille de Navarin*. This was followed in 1833 by *La prise d'Alger* and in 1835 by *La bataille de la Moskowa*. He then moved to a new rotunda built for him by the architect, Jakob Ignaz Hittorff, in the Champs-Élysées. This rotunda opened with a panorama of the burning of Moscow, which was succeeded by *La bataille d'Eylau* in 1843, and *La bataille des pyramides* in 1849. When, for the first Exposition universelle in 1855, Langlois's rotunda was taken over as an exhibition hall, he opened yet another in the Champs-Élysées where, from 1860, he presented *Le prise de Sebastopol* and, from 1865, *La bataille de Solferino*.

Langlois was noted for his ingenious incorporation of actual objects into the foregrounds of his panoramas and for his integration of the viewing platform into the scene presented. For his panorama of the Battle of Navarin, he obtained part of the *Scipion*, a ship which had distinguished itself in the battle and was being sold for scrap, and made it into the viewing platform. In his *L'incendie de Moskowa* the viewing platform was made to represent one of the towers of the Kremlin. Even in *Solferino*, his last panorama,
Langlois was still perfecting ways of heightening the illusion, altering the treatment of the space between the viewer and the canvas, in response to comments in a paper on optics read before the Académie des sciences. 46

When Langlois died in 1870, his panorama was taken over by Henri Felix Philippoteaux, who replaced Solférino with his own Le bombardement du Fort d'Issy in 1873. The Philippoteaux painting was still on exhibit in the late 1880s. 47 The Langlois panoramas, taken together with their continuation under Philippoteaux, spanned a period which, in London, had seen the disappearance of the three hundred and sixty degree panorama and its revival, and the rise and decline of the moving panorama; however, the sense of greater continuity in the history of the panorama in Paris may be deceptive. Langlois was but one exhibitor, and how his panoramas fit into the general pattern of exhibiting over such a long period has not been established.

Although moving panoramas, like Banvard's Mississippi or Hamilton's Excursions, seem to have enjoyed great success in their Continental tours, the moving panorama does not seem to have been as popular on the Continent as it was in America and Britain. Certainly in Paris it never completely displaced the circular panorama, as it did in London.

We learn from Bapst that in 1889 there were, in addition to Philippoteaux's d'Issy, a number of other circular panoramas exhibiting in Paris, including Merelle and Langerock's Vue de Rio Janeiro, Theophile Poilpot's Eclat de la Seine, and Édouard Detaille and Alphonse de Neuville's
Poilpot had already painted more than a dozen panoramas for exhibition in various cities in France, England, and America. His Charge of the Light Brigade, painted in collaboration with Jacob Stephen, had appeared in London in 1881. Detaille and de Neuville had earlier scored a success with a panorama of the Siege of Champigny, and their Rezonville, which would be exhibited in London the following year, won the grand prix d’honneur at the Exposition universelle of 1889.

Like the Americans the French tended to regard the panorama as their own, or at least to consider themselves the foremost practitioners of the form. Comparisons between panorama painting in France and England were inevitable, but such comparisons were seldom free from bias. The only comment which can be considered as unaffected by national or personal pride was made at the beginning of the nineteenth century. When John Samuel Hayward visited Paris during the Peace of Amiens, he recorded his impressions of a panorama of Lyons exhibiting there (apparently in one of the Thayer rotundas):

The panorama of Lyons is by far the best thing of the kind I have anywhere seen. There are parts in that picture which are the most delicious. The perspective is exact and true, the touch smart and uniformly bold. As a whole I never felt the effect of Illusion more compleat in my life. So much for nature!

The British more often dismissed the panoramas of other countries, or remained ignorant of their existence. An article in Chambers's Journal in 1860, obviously written in
ignorance of the true extent of panorama exhibiting in Paris, noted:

Panoramas seem to have met with but little success in any other country than our own. One of Rome was exhibited, we believe, in Paris, in that part which is now known as the Passage des Panoramas; and three or four more, including one of Moscow in a building in the Champs Elysées, which formed a part of the edifice prepared for the Great Exhibition of Paris. So small, however, was the attendance, that Mr. Burford, the painter of our chief modern panoramas, informed the writer that when he visited the exhibition of the picture of Moscow with a friend, they found themselves the only spectators.\textsuperscript{52}

Just a few years before Burford visited the Langlois panorama of Moscow, Hittorff, the architect of the Langlois Rotunda, had been to London to study the Colosseum, presumably in preparation for his work for Langlois. His conclusion was that the Colosseum panorama could not be compared with the much superior works of Prévost and Langlois.\textsuperscript{53} Bapst, writing almost a half-century later, echoed Hittorff's opinion of panorama painting in London.\textsuperscript{54} Certainly by the time Bapst was writing, the British had ceased to produce any significant panoramas, and those panoramas which were appearing in London were imported from abroad, largely from France.

IV

The earliest appearance of a panorama in Germany seems to have been in 1799, when the Barker panoramas of London and the Grand Fleet at Spithead appeared in Leipzig and Hamburg, under the name Nausorama.\textsuperscript{55} After six months the panoramas switched; London went from Leipzig to Hamburg, and Spithead from Hamburg to Leipzig. The deteriorated
state of these panoramas at the time suggests that they had had numerous exhibitions (not yet identified) since their original showing in Leicester Square. A Leipzig newspaper commented on the view of London:

Das Gemälde ist so abgenutzt und verblichen, alle Partien so undeutlich und verworren, dass alle Genügsamkeit und Nachbeterei der hüflichen Sachsen dazu gehört, um dieses Schauspiel nicht weit hinter den pomphaften Ankündigungen zu finden.\(^5\)

The first native production in Germany was a panorama of Rome which opened in Berlin in July, 1800.\(^5^7\) Breysig, the German claimant for the role of inventor of the panorama, collaborated with the engraver, Johan Friedrich Tielker, and the landscape painter, Carl Ludwig Kaaz, in the production of a painting based on drawings made by Breysig in Rome in 1792.\(^5^8\) The Ansicht Roms von den Ruinen der Kaiservilla aus was exhibited in a wooden rotunda about fifty feet in diameter, with a central viewing platform about fourteen feet in diameter.\(^5^9\) Tielker went on to paint a panorama of Berlin in 1802 and other popular panoramas of Riga, St. Petersburg, and Moscow.\(^6^0\)

Seven years after the opening of the Breysig-Tielker-Kaaz panorama in Berlin, the architect, Karl Friedrich Schinkel, in conjunction with the Berlin entrepreneur, Wilhelm Gropius, began to exhibit various pictorial entertainments in the city.\(^6^1\) In 1807 Schinkel executed a series of "perspektivisch-optische Gemälde" of sites such as Jerusalem and Constantinople. The next year he painted a panorama of Palermo, which was fifteen feet high and ninety feet in circumference. In the following years up to 1815,
Schinkel produced another series of scenes with dramatic lighting effects and music, some form of moving panorama entitled *Die Sieben Weltwunder*, and panoramas of *Der Brand von Moskau*, *Schlacht von Leipzig*, and *St. Helena*.

Schinkel's entertainments were immensely popular. Great crowds fought their way into the exhibition of *Der Brand von Moskau* when it opened in 1813. It has been stated that Schinkel's appointment as a civil architect in 1810 resulted in part from the interest shown in his panoramas by Queen Luise. Although he painted no more panoramas after 1815, Schinkel retained his interest in such exhibitions. In 1840, the year before his death, he discussed with Gropius's son, Carl Wilhelm, the possibility of re-exhibiting his panorama of Palermo and proposed the exhibition of a panorama presenting major historical monuments from Ancient Egypt and Greece to Medieval Germany.

Daguerre's Diorama in Paris gave rise to similar establishments at Breslau, Berlin, and Cologne, although none of these ever exhibited the Daguerre and Bouton paintings as did the dioramas established in British cities. The Breslau Diorama was opened by August Siegert in 1826; the following year Carl Wilhelm Gropius opened a Diorama in Berlin in a building designed by Schinkel. Gropius exhibited paintings on Daguerre's principles until 1832, when he introduced a moving panorama with dioramic effects, which had been devised by the Breslau architect, Carl Ferdinand Langhans. The exhibition, termed the Pleorama, presented the illusion of a voyage in the Gulf of Naples or down the
Rhine. The next year Gropius returned to the exhibition of dioramas, which he continued to present until 1850. It seems that, as in Britain, there was a falling off of interest in the panorama and diorama in Germany after mid-century. Again there was a revival of interest in the period around 1880, which reached its highpoint with the exhibition in Berlin in 1883 of a panorama of the Battle of Sedan. Like their French counterparts, the German panorama painters found the events of the Franco-Prussian War highly emotive subjects. The depiction of the decisive victory of the Germans over the French was as much a patriotic as an artistic event, opening on September 1, 1883—the thirteenth anniversary of the battle—in the presence of the Kaiser and the assembled notables of the government and the military. It had been painted under the direction of Anton von Werner, the director of the Berlin Academy of Art, who had mobilized a group of Academy students and teachers to interview officers who had taken part in the action, to study staff documents and war diaries, to take detailed sketches on the site of the battle, and to accumulate an entire arsenal of weapons and uniforms to provide accurate models from which to paint. As an instrument of propaganda and as documentation of an event, the panorama of the Battle of Sedan represented the culmination of the panoramists' work.

The occasional references to panoramas and dioramas outside Britain, America, France, and Germany provide
glimpses of a yet greater expanse of uncharted panorama activity. In the first years of the nineteenth century, Vienna, Copenhagen, and Amsterdam joined the group of cities on the Continent which supported panoramas. In November, 1801, the *Monthly Magazine* reported that a panorama "after the English fashion" had been established at Vienna, which presented "London, from the point of the Albion Mills." This was perhaps the Barker *London* which had been showing in Leipzig and Hamburg. The *Monthly Magazine* also noted that "at Copenhagen another panorama will be erected, to exhibit the last naval battle in the Sound." Another panorama, almost eighty-eight feet in diameter, opened in Vienna, presenting a view of that city, painted by a Professor Jausche and the landscape painter, Karl Postl, from drawings by William Barton. In 1806 a panorama of Gelderland was opened in Amsterdam by an artist named Van de Watt. It seems unlikely that, after this initial flowering, the panorama would have withered away in these cities while continuing to develop and give birth to a variety of offspring in cities like London, Paris, or New York.

A certain amount of panorama exhibiting must have taken place in the Russian cities of St. Petersburg and Moscow. Robert Ker Porter brought his *Battle of Lodi* to Russia in 1804, and Girtin's *Bidometropolis* may well have appeared there. The Tielker panoramas of Moscow and St. Petersburg were both exhibited in the cities they depicted. Another German production, Schinkel's panorama of Palermo, was copied and exhibited in St. Petersburg in 1844.
While the influence of Daguerre's diorama spread in one direction as far as America, in another direction it reached the Scandinavian cities like Stockholm where, in the 1840s, three dioramas appeared. Two rival exhibitions with the name diorama were exhibiting in 1843. Three years later a permanent diorama establishment was erected by G. A. Müller, a painter for the Royal Theatre and also a daguerreotypist. 78

Of panorama exhibiting of the later years of the nineteenth century, we gain some idea from the London advertisement for Castellani's Waterloo in 1881, which enumerated panoramas then being shown in Brussels, Vienna, Naples, and Madrid. 79 It was in 1880 that the Dutch artist, Hendrik Willem Mesdag, created his panorama of Scheveningen, which is still exhibiting in The Hague. The painting, done in collaboration with his wife, Sina Mesdag-van Houten, Theophile de Bock, and George Hendrick Breitner, occupies a circle forty-five feet high and four hundred and twenty feet in circumference. 80

As late as 1912 a new panorama was put on exhibit in Moscow. Its opening marked the centenary of the Battle of Borodino, which it depicted. The three hundred and eighty by fifty foot painting was the work of the Russian Academician, Franz Rubo. After only two years exhibiting it was damaged by fire and lay derelict for a number of years. Following a thorough restoration it was reopened in Moscow in 1962 in a cylindrical structure of glass and aluminum built to house it. 81 Together with the Mesdag
panorama of Scheveningen and the Philippoteaux panorama of Gettysburg, it survives as an example of the final flowering of that art form which had been so popular in the previous century.
APPENDIX C

A CHRONOLOGY OF PANORAMAS EXHIBITED AT THE LEICESTER SQUARE AND STRAND PANORAMAS

The following provides a complete listing of the paintings exhibited at the two Barker-Burford establishments in London. At Leicester Square the panoramas exhibited in the large circle were approximately 10,000 square feet, those in the upper circle approximately 2,700 square feet, and those in the small circle approximately 1,300 square feet. At the Strand the paintings in the large circle were sixty feet in diameter. No reference to the size of the paintings in the Strand's lesser circle has been found. Opening and closing dates of the exhibitions derive from advertisements in The Morning Chronicle and The Times. The abbreviations (B. M., British Museum; V. & A., Victoria and Albert Museum; G. L., Guildhall Library; N. L. S., National Library of Scotland; E. P. L., Edinburgh Public Library) following the titles of the panoramas indicate that the institutions possess copies of the keyed outline prints and descriptive booklets for these subjects.

Leicester Square Panorama

View of the Grand Fleet at Spithead, in the Year 1791
May 25, 1793--April 19, 1794
Large Circle
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View of the City of Bath and the Surrounding Country
July 7, 1794--May, 1795

View of London and the Surrounding Country
March 28, 1795--February 13, 1796

Lord Howe's Naval Victory; the First of June, 1794 (V. & A.)
c. June 2, 1795--April 2, 1796

Admiral Cornwallis's Unparalleled Retreat (V. & A.)
March, 1796--November 26, 1796

Lord Bridport's Victory off Lorient
May 13, 1796--May, 1797

View of Brighton
c. February 9, 1797--December 15, 1798

View of Plymouth from Mount Edgcumbe
c. June 7, 1797--c. May 12, 1798

View of Windsor (B. M.)
June 4, 1798--May 14, 1799

View of Margate
December 26, 1798--May 10, 1800

Nelson's Victory; the Battle of the Nile (E. N.)
c. May 20, 1799--April 18, 1801

View of Ramsgate
c. May 23, 1800--November 14, 1801

View of Constantinople from the Tower of Galatea (B. M., V. & A.)
April 27, 1801--May 15, 1802

View of Constantinople from the Tower of Leander (V. & A.)
November 23, 1801--May 14, 1803

Lord Nelson's Attack of Copenhagen (V. & A.)
May, 1802--April, 1803

View of Paris from the Seine
May 2, 1803--April, 1805

View of Paris Taken between the Pont Neuf and the Louvre
August 15, 1803--May 30, 1804
View of Edinburgh and the Surrounding Country (E. P. L.)
June 8, 1804--January 5, 1807

View of Gibraltar and Bay (V. & A.)
May 13, 1805--May 3, 1806

Battle of Trafalgar (E. N.)
c. May 14, 1806--May 25, 1807

View of Weymouth at Sunset
c. February 21, 1807--January 30, 1808

View of the Bay of Dublin
c. June 2, 1807--December 14, 1807

Grand View of Paris
January, 1808--March 26, 1808

Interior of Dublin
c. February 15, 1808--February 27, 1810

View of the Rock and Bay of Gibraltar
c. April 5, 1808--March 25, 1809

View of Grand Cairo
c. April 7, 1809--May 26, 1810

The Siege of Flushing
c. March 10, 1810--November 30, 1812

Grand View of Malta
c. June 6, 1810--May 18, 1811

View of Messina in Sicily (B. M., V. & A.)
c. June 1, 1811--February, 1812

View of Lisbon (B. M.)
c. February 28, 1812--April 3, 1813

View of the Grand Harbour of Malta (B. M.)
December, 1812--March 11, 1815

Badajoz and the Surrounding Country,
Representing the Siege in 1812 (B. M.)
c. April 14, 1813--July, 1814

View of the Battle of Vittoria (B. M.)
July, 1814--April 29, 1815

Battle of Paris
c. March 25, 1815--April, 1817

View of the Island of Elba and Town of Porto-Ferrajo (B. M.)
c. May 10, 1815--March 2, 1816
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View of the Battle of Waterloo (B. M.)
c. March 13, 1816--May, 1818

View of the City of St. Petersb (V. & A.)
c. April 9, 1817--December, 1819

Lord Exmouth's Attack upon Algiers (B. M.)
c. May 11, 1818--March, 1819

View of the North Coast of Spitzbergen (B. M., N. L. S.)
April 12, 1819--September 23, 1820

View of Lausanne and the Lake of Geneva (B. M., N. L. S., V. & A.)
c. December 27, 1819--November 19, 1825

View of the Battle of Waterloo
October, 1820--May, 1821

View of Bern and the High Alps (B. M., N. L. S.)
c. May 21, 1821--December, 1822

Procession of the Coronation of His Majesty George the Fourth (B. M., N. L. S.)
December, 1822--April, 1824

View of the Ruins of Pompeii and Surrounding Country (B. M., N. L. S.)
May, 1824--March, 1825

View of the City of Edinburgh and Surrounding Country (B. M., N. L. S., E. P. L.)
April, 1825--September, 1826

View of the City of Mexico and Surrounding Country (B. M., N. L. S.)
December 12, 1825--June, 1827

View of the City of Madrid and Surrounding Country (B. M., N. L. S.)
September, 1826--April, 1828

View of the City of St. Sebastian and the Bay of Rio Janeiro (B. M.)
June, 1827--December, 1828

View of the City and Bay of Genoa (B. M., N. L. S.)
April, 1828--April, 1829
View of the Town of Sydney, New South Wales (B. M.)
c. December 20, 1828--December, 1830 Upper Circle

Milton's Pandemonium (N. L. S.)
April 20, 1829--February 17, 1830 Large Circle

View of the City of Calcutta (B. M.)
March 1, 1830--early 1831 Large Circle

View of the City of Quebec (B. M.)
December 22, 1830--December, 1831 Upper Circle

View of the Island and Harbour of Bombay (B. M.)
Early 1831--May, 1832 Large Circle

View of the City of Florence and the Surrounding Country (B. M., N. L. S.)
December 17, 1831--December 1, 1832 Upper Circle

View of the City of Milan and the Surrounding Country (B. M., N. L. S.)
May 30, 1832--March, 1833 Large Circle

View of Stirling and the Surrounding Country (B. M.)
c. December 8, 1832--June, 1833 Upper Circle

View of the Siege of Antwerp (B. M., N. L. S., E. P. L.)
March, 1833--January, 1834 Large Circle

View of the Falls of Niagara (B. M.)
June 15, 1833--December 6, 1835 Upper Circle

View of the Continent of Boothia (B. M., N. L. S.)
c. January 24, 1834--June, 1834 Large Circle

View of the City of New York (B. M.)
June 16, 1834--March 21, 1835 Large Circle

View of the Cemetery of Père La Chaise (N. L. S.)
January, 1835--June 11, 1835 Upper Circle

View of the City of Jerusalem and the Surrounding Country (B. M., N. L. S.)
April, 1835--February, 1836 Large Circle

View of the Great Temple of Karnak and the Surrounding City of Thebes (B. M., N. L. S.)
June 15, 1835--June, 1836 Upper Circle
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View of the City of Lima and the Surrounding Country (B. M.)
March 26, 1836--January, 1837

View of Isola Bella, the Lago Maggiore, and the Surrounding Country (B. M.)
June 16, 1836--May, 1837

View of Mont Blanc, the Valley of Chamounix, and the Surrounding Mountains (B. M.)
c. February 4, 1837--April, 1838

View of the City and Bay of Dublin (B. M.)
c. May 17, 1837--December, 1837

View of the Bay of Islands, New Zealand (B. M.)
c. December 21, 1837--February, 1839

View of Canton (B. M.)
April 14, 1838--February, 1839

View of Rome Taken from the Tower of the Capitol (B. M., N. L. S.)
February 26, 1839--early 1840

View of the Interior of the Coliseum and Part of the City of Rome (B. M., N. L. S.)
February 26, 1839--June, 1839

View of the Grand Harbour of Malta (B. M.)
c. June 15, 1839--December, 1839

View of the Palace and Gardens of Versailles (N. L. S.)
c. January 11, 1840--May 30, 1840

View of the Holy City of Benares and the Sacred Ganges (B. M.)
Early 1840--December, 1840

View of Macao in China (B. M.)
June 8, 1840--January 16, 1841

View of the City of Damascus and the Surrounding Country (N. L. S.)
December 19, 1840--March, 1842

View of the Bombardment of St. Jean d'Acre (B. M.)
January 30, 1841--May 14, 1842
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View of the City of Jerusalem and the Surrounding Country (B. M., N. L. S.)
August 20, 1841--April 1, 1843

View of the Battle of Waterloo (B. M.)
March 22, 1842--February 18, 1843

View of the City of Cabul, the Capital of Afghanistan (B. M.)
May 21, 1842--June 6, 1843

View of the City of Edinburgh and Surrounding Country at the Period of Her Majesty's Arrival, 1st September 1842 (E. P. L.)
February 25, 1843--March, 1844

View of Baden Baden (N. L. S.)
April 8, 1843--July 3, 1845

View of the City of Coblentz, the Fortress of Ehrenbreitzen, the Rhine, and the Surrounding Country (B. M., N. L. S.)
July, 1843--December 16, 1843

View of Treport, the Surrounding Country, and the Chateau d'Eu with the Arrival of Queen Victoria on Her Visit to His Majesty Louis Phillippe (G. L.)
January, 1844--June, 1844

View of the Island and Bay of Hong Kong (B. M.)
March 26, 1844--April 12, 1845

View of the Ruins of the Temples of Baalbec (B. M.)
June 29, 1844--December 4, 1844.

View of the City and Bay of Naples by Moonlight (B. M.)
c. December 24, 1844--December 13, 1845

View of the City of Nanking and the Surrounding Country (B. M.)
c. April 29, 1845--March 21, 1846

View of Athens and the Surrounding Country (B. M.)
July 10, 1845--December, 1848

View of the City of Rouen and the Surrounding Country (G. L.)
December 20, 1845--May 25, 1846
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View of Constantinople (G. L.)
March 28, 1846--February 27, 1847

View of the Battle of Sobraon (B. M.)
June 1, 1846--June 19, 1847

View of the City of Cairo and the Surrounding Country (B. M., G. L.)
March 12, 1847--March 4, 1848

View of the Himalaya Mountains (B. M.)
June 26, 1847--May 20, 1848

View of the City of Vienna and the Surrounding Country (B. M.)
March 13, 1848--March 3, 1849

View of the City of Paris Taken from the Place de la Concorde (G. L.)
May 26, 1848--September, 1849

View of the Ruins of the City of Pompeii and the Surrounding Country (B. M.)
December 23, 1848--December 14, 1850

View Taken from the Summit of Mount Righi of a Great Portion of Switzerland (B. M.)
March 12, 1849--January 30, 1850

View of the Valley of Cashmere
September, 1849--May 4, 1850

Summer and Winter Views of the Polar Regions as Seen during the Expedition of Capt. James Clark Ross (B. M.)
February 11, 1850--April 12, 1851

View of the Lakes of Killarney (B. M.)
May 13, 1850--December, 1851

View of the Lake and Town of Lucerne (G. L.)
December 20, 1850--December, 1852

Views of Niagara Falls and Jerusalem
April 19, 1851--March 27, 1852

Nimroud, the Original Foundation of Nineveh
December 19, 1851--June 25, 1853

View of the City of Salzburg in Austria (B. M.)
April, 1852--November, 1852
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View of the Battle of Waterloo
November 17, 1852--March 12, 1853
Large Circle

View of the Bernese Alps Taken from the
Faulhorn Mountain (B. M.)
December 22, 1852--June, 1858
Small Circle

View of the City of Granada, with the
Celebrated Fortress and Palace of
the Alhambra (B. M.)
March 19, 1853--April 22, 1854
Large Circle

View of the City of Mexico
July 1, 1853--December 17, 1853
Upper Circle

View of Constantinople (G. L.)
December 23, 1853--December, 1854
Upper Circle

View of Berlin and the Surrounding
Country (G. L.)
April 29, 1854--May 18, 1855
Large Circle

View of the Battle of Alma (B. M.)
December 23, 1854--April 26, 1856
Upper Circle

View of the City of Sebastopol and the
Surrounding Fortifications; the Attack
of the Allied Armies (B. M.)
May 25, 1855--February 2, 1856
Large Circle

View of the City of Sebastopol including
the Assaults of the Malahof & the
Redan (B. M.)
February 21, 1856--March 17, 1857
Large Circle

View of the City of St. Petersburg
May 3, 1856--May, 1857
Upper Circle

View of the City of Moscow with the
Entry of the Emperor Alexander II
into the Kremlin (G. L.)
March 26, 1857--January 15, 1858
Large Circle

View of Sierra Leone
May 29, 1857--March, 1858
Upper Circle

View of the City of Delhi with an
Action between Her Majesty's Troops
and the Revolted Sepoys (G. L.)
January 23, 1858--February 25, 1859
Large Circle

View of Lucknow
March 27, 1858--May 14, 1859
Upper Circle
View of Switzerland from Righi Kulm at Sunrise
June 19, 1858--March, 1863

Interior of Canton
March 4, 1859--May 4, 1860

View of Benares and the Sacred Ganges
May 21, 1859--January 7, 1860

View of Venice
January 14, 1860--December 14, 1860

View of Rome from the Tower of the Capitol
May 11, 1860--July 20, 1861

View of Messina
December 21, 1860--March, 1863

View of Naples
September 5, 1861--February 14, 1863

View of Rome from the Tower of the Capitol
March 2, 1863--December 12, 1863

View of Athens and the Surrounding Country
April 6, 1863--September, 1863

View of the City of Mexico
April 6, 1863--December 12, 1863

View of the Ruins of the City of Pompeii
September 14, 1863--December 12, 1863

Strand Panorama

View of Rome from the Pincian Hill
July 11, 1803--January, 1804

View of Rome Taken from the Capitol (B. M.)
c. April 17, 1804--March 30, 1805

Sir Sidney Smith's Action off Ostend
c. January 15, 1805--October, 1805

View of the Bay of Naples (B. M., V. & A.)
May 20, 1805--January 10, 1807
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Date &amp; Location</th>
<th>Circle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>View of the City of Florence (B. M., V. &amp; A.)</td>
<td>January 6, 1806--December 19, 1807</td>
<td>Lesser Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of the City of Oxford, Taken from the Radcliff Library</td>
<td>May 27, 1807--September, 1808</td>
<td>Large Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of the City of Copenhagen</td>
<td>c. March 18, 1808--November 25, 1809</td>
<td>Lesser Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of Dover (V. &amp; A.)</td>
<td>c. March 27, 1809--October 27, 1810</td>
<td>Large Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of the Islands of Scilly (V. &amp; A.)</td>
<td>May, 1810--early 1812</td>
<td>Lesser Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of the City and Bay of Cadiz</td>
<td>Late 1810--early 1812</td>
<td>Large Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of the City of Lisbon</td>
<td>Mid-1812--January 30, 1813</td>
<td>Large Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of Florence</td>
<td>Mid-1812--mid-1814</td>
<td>Lesser Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of the City of Moscow in Flames</td>
<td>c. February 23, 1813--February 12, 1814</td>
<td>Large Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of Berlin (B. M., N. L. S., G. L.)</td>
<td>March, 1814--September, 1814</td>
<td>Large Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle of Corunna</td>
<td>Mid-1814--late 1815</td>
<td>Lesser Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of Paris from Montmartre (B. M.)</td>
<td>September, 1814--May 6, 1815</td>
<td>Large Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of the Interior of the City of Paris Taken from the Tuileries (B. M.)</td>
<td>May 15, 1815--late 1815</td>
<td>Large Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of Ostend</td>
<td>Late 1815--mid-1817</td>
<td>Lesser Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of the Victory in Front of Waterloo (B. M.)</td>
<td>January 30, 1816--late 1816</td>
<td>Large Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of Paris from the Tuileries</td>
<td>December, 1816--mid-1817</td>
<td>Large Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of Dover</td>
<td>Mid-1817--mid-1819</td>
<td>Lesser Circle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

View of Rome Taken from the Tower of the Capitol (B. M., N. L. S.)
August, 1817—early 1818

View of Athens and the Surrounding Country (B. M., E. P. L.)
c. March 18, 1818—April, 1819

Venice from the Piazza di S. Marco (B. M., N. L. S.)
c. May 17, 1819—November, 1820

View of Naples and Surrounding Scenery (B. M., N. L. S., E. P. L.)
December, 1820—November 30, 1821

Island and City of Corfu with Part of the Coast of Greece (B. M., N. L. S.)
December, 1821—November, 1823

View of the Ruins of the City of Pompeii and Surrounding Country (B. M., N. L. S.)
December, 1823—March, 1827

View of the City and Lake of Geneva (B. M., N. L. S.)
April 9, 1827—January, 1828

View of the Battle of Navarin (B. M., N. L. S.)
January, 1828—August 13, 1829

View of the City of Paris Taken from the Place Louis XVI (B. M., N. L. S.)
December, 1828—late 1831

View of the City of Constantinople (B. M., N. L. S.)
August 22, 1829—May, 1830

View of the City and Harbour of Amsterdam (B. M., N. L. S.)
June 10, 1830—March 12, 1831

View of Hobart Town, Van Dieman's Land, and the Surrounding Country (E. M.)
c. March 21, 1831—late 1831
CHAPTER I


4. During the period when "high sky" views were in vogue, paintings by Seghers which had originally been oblong were altered by the addition of canvas extending the sky to bring them into line with the current fashion (Ibid., p. 36).

5. One exception is the Jacob van Ruisdael view of Amsterdam, now in a private collection in England, which is reproduced as Fig. 260 in Stechow.

6. The most recent of a number of suggestions that the painting was part of a perspective box is in Walter A. Liedtke's "The 'View in Delft' by Carel Fabritius," Burlington Magazine, Vol. C XVIII (February, 1976), pp. 61-73.


Herrmann, pp. 28-31.

The view towards the City was engraved by Edward Hooker in 1750; the view towards Westminster by J. S. Müller in 1751 (Ibid., p. 29).

The Morning Chronicle, June 20, 1804.

As a teacher of perspective, Barker may well have been familiar with the perspective constructions of Baroque quadratura decoration (see Chapter II).


The room still exists and is illustrated in Croft-Murray (Vol. II, Fig. 117). In 1850 it was repainted by Edmund Thomas Parris, whom we shall meet later (Chapter V and VI) in connection with two panoramas.


Somerset House Gazette, Vol. II (May 1, 1824), p. 46.


In 1827 John Britton considered that "Walls covered with landscape, so as to give a room the appearance of an unenclosed space, is rather too much of an extravagant conceit to satisfy a correct taste." He emphasized that such a decoration could only be effective when the spectator had to keep a proper distance from the painting, but if such a distance could be maintained, a picture "on a semi-circular wall, and painted on the principle of a panorama" or "a dioramic
p. 10 picture" might produce "a very powerful and pleasing illusion" (The Union of Architecture, Sculpture and Painting . . . with Descriptive Accounts of the House and Galleries of John Soane [1827], p. 3n, quoted by Croft-Murray, Vol. II, p. 64).

22Anna Seward, Letters . . . Written between the Years 1784 and 1807, Vol. III (1811), p. 381, quoted by Croft-Murray, p. 62. "watery delusion" refers to the panorama of the Grand Fleet at Spithead, which was exhibiting at Barker's establishment in Leicester Square.

23The Public Advertiser, December 14, 1794, quoted by Croft-Murray, pp. 245-246.


26Ibid., pp. 76-80.

27Ibid., p. 83.


p. 12

29Gage ("Loutherbourg," p. 335) notes that an H. P. Dean exhibited in 1780 a moving eruption of Vesuvius, with sound effects, which lasted a quarter of an hour.

NOTES

269

p. 13


p. 14
33Similar models had been provided by John Thomas Serres, later a painter of panoramas, for de Loutherbourg's first production at Drury Lane in October, 1773, which included a Grand Naval Review at Portsmouth (Rosenfeld and Croft-Murray, "Checklist of Scene Painters," Vol. XIX, pp. 106-107).


p. 15


p. 16

CHAPTER II

p. 17

2Germain Bapst began his report on the history of panoramas for the Exposition universelle of 1889 (Essai sur l'histoire des panoramas et des dioramas [Paris: G. Kasson, 1891], p. 7), with the account of Barker realizing the method of lighting for his future exhibitions while reading a letter by light admitted by a high window in his prison cell. However, Bapst set the anecdote in Edinburgh about 1785. He did not name the source of this story and seems himself to have doubted its authenticity.
When H. A. Barker took over the proprietorship of the Leicester Square Panorama after the death of his father, he stated that he himself had taken the views and had alone supervised the painting of the panoramas which had been exhibited during his father's lifetime (The Morning Chronicle, May 14, 1806). Of course, in order to insure a continuance of popular patronage, H. A. Barker would have found it expedient to minimize his father's part and maximize his own part in the production of the paintings. An advertisement in The Sun on August 3, 1802, stated that Robert Barker was taking the drawings for the panorama of Edinburgh which would be exhibited in 1804, at the same time that Henry Aston was taking drawings for panoramas of Paris. By the following summer Robert had retired to a purely proprietary status, advertising that all his views would be “drawn and painted” by Henry Aston (The Morning Chronicle, July 14, 1803).

Corner, p. 4.

Corner stated that Barker first conceived the idea of a 360 degree painting while walking on the Calton Hill with his daughter. That the idea was inspired by the view from Calton Hill is supported by Quin (p. 19) and by the statement printed on the descriptive key of the view of Edinburgh exhibited in Leicester Square in 1805 (see Pl. 53). An article printed in Edinburgh in 1860 stated that the possibility of painting a circular picture suggested itself to Barker while he was sketching on Arthur’s Seat, but as the article also maintained that his first exhibited view of Edinburgh was taken from Arthur’s Seat, this account can be dismissed ("Panoramas," Chambers's Journal of Popular Literature, Vol. XIII [January 21, 1860], p. 33).

Corner, p. 4.

Ibid.

Ibid.

The moving or peristrephic panorama was considerably different, but it was based on a quite different conception and had little in common with the original panorama other than its name (see Chapter III).

Corner, p. 5. A correspondent to Notes and Queries (Vol. IV [August 16, 1851], p. 118) claimed that H. A. Barker had told him that the view of Edinburgh exhibited was a half circle. This statement must have resulted from a confusion with the earlier sketch. The advertisements for the exhibition make it clear that the painting completely surrounded the viewer.

An English translation of Rules and Examples of Perspective Proper for Painters and Architects, &c. by John James, with engravings by John Sturt, was published in London in 1707. The Hundred Figure presented a system which could easily be adapted to panoramic practice.

In the set of prints in the Edinburgh Public Library, two sheets are not marked with the date. The following dates appear on the other four: "Oct. [day of the month unreadable] 1789," "Jan. [rest of the date unreadable]," "March 25, 1790," and "June 14, 1790."

While the later date would suggest that the watercolour was a specially executed version post-dating the engravings, the watercolour is in no way superior in execution or elaboration as one would expect of a special version.

The Edinburgh Evening Courant, December 29, 1787, and February 2, 1788.

Ibid., February 2, 1788.

Ibid., March 24, 1788.

Ibid., December 29, 1787.

Ibid., February 2, 1788.
NOTES

p. 25

28 Ibid., April 21, 1788, and May 12, 1788.
29 Corner, pp. 5-6.
30 The Caledonian Mercury, October 17, 1789.
At the time of his exhibiting in Edinburgh, Barker gave his address as Writers' Court (The Edinburgh Evening Courant, December 29, 1787).
31 The Morning Chronicle, and London Advertiser, March 14, 1789.
32 Ibid.

p. 26

33 The Diary; or, Woodfall's Register, July 4, 1789.
34 Ibid., April 9, 1789.
35 The Morning Chronicle and London Advertiser, March 14, 1789.
36 Ibid.
37 Quin, p. 19.
38 The Diary; or, Woodfall's Register, March 31, 1789.
39 Ibid., April 22, 1789.

p. 27

40 Quin, p. 19.
41 The Morning Chronicle, June 11, 1791.
42 Corner, p. 6.

43 The Morning Chronicle, June 11, 1791. A correspondent to Notes and Queries (Vol. IV [July 26, 1851], p. 54) remembered the exhibition "in a rough building—not, I believe, erected for the purpose—at the back of a small house on the eastern side of that street." It seems likely that this should have read "in a rough building—I believe, erected for the purpose." Certainly the statement in The Morning Chronicle advertisement that the painting was "erected on the spacious ground behind Mr. Barker's house" suggests that a structure was specially raised to house the painting.
44 The Morning Chronicle, June 11, 1791.
46 Ibid., February 23, 1793.

p. 28

47 Ibid., June 25, 1791.
Corner, p. 6. One wonders how well Reynolds, with his failing eyesight, could have judged of the effect; however, Reynolds's high opinion of the panorama was supported by the following statement of James Northcote: "He [Reynolds] was a prodigious admirer of the invention and striking effect of the Panorama in Leicester-Fields, and went repeatedly to see it. He was the first person who mentioned it to me, and earnestly recommended me to go also, saying it would surprise me more than anything of the kind I had ever seen in my life; and I confess I found it to be as he had said" (James Northcote, The Life of Sir Joshua Reynolds, Vol. II [London: Henry Colburn, 1818], p. 242).

The lease, recorded in the Middlesex Land Register, was granted by Wright for a period of ninety-six years from Michaelmas, 1794; it was dated October 20, 1794 (Survey of London, Vol. XXXIV: The Parish of St. Anne Soho, gen. ed. F. H. W. Sheppard [London: The Athlone Press, 1966], p. 483). Corner (p. 7) stated that the agreement for taking the ground was dated September 16, 1793. Some agreement must have been reached prior to either date, as the new Panorama building opened in May, 1793.

Survey of London, Vol. XXXIV, p. 429. The Survey produces a considerable list of artists who gave their address in exhibition catalogues as either Leicester Square or Leicester Fields, including David Allan, John Singleton Copley, Thomas Hearne, Sir Thomas Lawrence, John Nash, and Francis Towne (Vol. XXXIV, pp. 429-430).

Little is known of Mitchell but that he was a native of Aberdeen and lived at 72, Newman Street, in London from 1775 until 1810, at the end of which period he was described in the rate-books as poor. His best surviving work is Preston Hall, Midlothian. In 1801 he published Plans and Views in Perspective, with Descriptions of Buildings Erected in England and Scotland: And Also an Essay, to Elucidate the Grecian, Roman and Gothic Architecture, Accompanied with Designs (London: The Oriental Press, 1801). In this volume, which illustrates a number of his works, there is a description and a cross-section of the Leicester Square

56. The watercolour by T. H. Shepherd in the British Museum shows the entrance in 1858 when Delhi and Lucknow were exhibiting at the Panorama. An almost identical watercolour of the entrance in 1872, with Waterloo and Jerusalem advertised, is in the collection of the London Museum and is reproduced in the Survey of London, Vol. XXXIV, Pl. 41b.

57. Mitchell, p. 8.

58. Corner, p. 15.

p. 31


60. Corner, p. 15.

61. The Morning Chronicle, February 26, 1799.


p. 32

63. Bapst, p. 11.


65. Bapst, p. 11.


67. The Morning Chronicle, May 24, 1793.

68. A later advertisement described the subject as "a View of the Grand Fleet, being the Russian Armament in 1791" (The Morning Chronicle, June 3, 1793).

69. Corner, p. 7.

p. 33


71. According to several contemporary German periodicals, the illusion was heightened by having the viewing platform constructed so as to represent
p. 33 the deck of a frigate (S. Hausmann, "Die Erfindung der Panoramen," Die Kunst für Alle, Vol. IV [April, 1889], p. 200). From the evidence of Mitchell's cross-section (Pl. 15) and in view of the frequent changes of subject, such elaboration seems unlikely.

72 The Morning Chronicle, April 7, 1794.
73 Ibid., July 5, 1794.
74 Ibid., March 28, 1795.
75 Ibid., April 13, 1795.

p. 35 Corner (p. 14) listed a view of Dover as appearing in 1799, but I have been unable to find any newspaper advertisements of that subject for that year. A view of Dover was exhibited at the Strand Panorama in 1809 (see Pl. 55).

76 The Morning Chronicle, January 1, 1798.
78 Ibid.

p. 36
80 The extent to which the Barkers did become involved in provincial exhibiting is difficult to determine. In Edinburgh in 1802 an advertisement stated that "Mr. Barker, proprietor of the Panorama, Leicester-square," was opening a Panorama in that city (The Caledonian Mercury, July 17, 1802); however, this establishment, which exhibited old panoramas from Leicester Square, may simply have been capitalizing on Barker's name. In any event the establishment closed after only two years. In July, 1805, Robert Barker received a letter from a Francis Braidwood in Edinburgh with the following advice: "Leith Races begin on Monday the 29 Current & if you have a Panorama which has not been exhibited here it might be much for your advantage to send it instantly & try to get it set up if possible by that time; for soon after all our people of Fortune go into the Country. In the meantime I will see it set up & get two people of the description you point; & if my Son & self can make it convenient; we will superintend it; if not; we will point out some other in whom we can confide" (National Library of Scotland, MS 9653). Apparently no panorama was sent. Trevor Fawcett, in The rise of English Provincial Art: Artists, Patrons, and Institutions outside London, 1800-1830 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), p. 155), states that Robert Barker actually erected a panorama building in Birmingham in 1802. He also states (p. 156) that H. A. Barker collaborated with someone named Sinclair on a moving
panorama which exhibited in Bristol in 1825. The H. A. Barker-Sinclair collaboration seems highly unlikely, and probably results from confusion with another artist or exhibitor of the same name.


82. Fulton was cited as the inventor in "Note sur la construction des panoramas," Journal des connaissances usuelles et practiques, Vol. XXV (February, 1837), p. 87. Bapst (p. 8) noted that the invention was attributed to Prévost in the biography written by his brother—the result of familial as well as national feeling.

83. Hausmann, p. 198.

84. Ibid., pp. 201-202.

85. The Edinburgh Evening Courant, March 24, 1788.

CHAPTER III


5. The Morning Chronicle, June 10, 1795.


7. Although H. A. Barker, in newspaper advertisements, stated that permission to take the drawings had been obtained through Elgin's influence (The Morning Chronicle, June 10, 1795), in the journal which Barker kept during his trip to Constantinople, he noted that on his first meeting with Elgin, "his
Lordship took no notice of my business & very little of myself" (N. L. S., MS 9647, p. 83). Elgin later did express interest in Barker's project (Ibid., p. 84), but it was through a Mr. Spencer Smith and a Mr. Pisani that Barker received the order from the Porte to be admitted to the Tower of Galatea (Ibid., pp. 86-88, 90-91).

8. The Morning Chronicle, April 21, 1801.
9. Ibid., November 10, 1801.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid., April 21, 1801.
12. Ibid., February 16, 1796.
13. Ibid.
15. The Caledonian Mercury, December 15, 1796.
17. Ibid., July 31, 1800.

19. Ibid.
23. The Morning Chronicle, April 24, 1800.
26. Ibid.
27 Farington (typescript), July 28, 1800.
28 The Morning Chronicle, July 31, 1800.
29 The Caledonian Mercury, January 29, 1801.
30 Ibid., April 13, 1801.
31 Ibid., August 24, 1811.
32 The Morning Chronicle, April 7, 1801.
33 Ibid., April 2, 1801. The later pictures in the series were advertised as being on the same scale as the Storming of Serengapatam and the Siege of Acre, suggesting that the difference in size between the first two pictures could not have been great. The pictures do seem to have increased a little in size, for the Battle of Asincourt of 1805, while it was said to be on the same scale as all the previous pictures, including Serengapatam, was 2,807 square feet (Ibid., April 16, 1805).
34 Ibid., April 2, 1801.
35 Ibid., April 24, 1801.
36 Ibid., June 9, 1801.
37 Farington (typescript), August 8, 1801.
38 The Morning Chronicle, February 8, 1802. Although London advertisements do not speak of Arnold's picture as being a panorama, it was advertised as such when it exhibited in Edinburgh later in the year (The Caledonian Mercury, December 23, 1802).
39 The Morning Chronicle, July 23, 1802.
40 Ibid., February 8, 1802; May 26, 1801; June 4, 1801.
41 Ibid., September 21, 1802.
42 Ibid., October 26, 1802. The Lisbon earthquake later formed the subject of the Cyclorama opened in conjunction with the Colosseum (see Chapter V). This catastrophe seems to have particularly captured the European imagination. Kenneth Clark has suggested the earthquake as a candidate for the point of origin of the Romantic consciousness (The Romantic Rebellion: Romantic versus Classic Art [London: John Murray, 1973], p. 45).
43 The Morning Chronicle, March 5, 1803.
Of all the panoramas exhibited at the Leicester Square Panorama, Milton’s Pandemonium (Pl. 60) is the sole example of a work on a literary subject. No panoramas appeared there depicting events which had taken place over a decade earlier, with the exception of Waterloo which, while originally painted shortly after the battle, was repainted and re-exhibited several times during the first half of the century.

Corner, p. 10.

The Morning Chronicle, April 27, 1803; August 9, 1803. A set of drawings for one of these views is in the Victoria and Albert Museum (Pl. 33-40).

Girtin sent the following letter to his brother from Paris in April, 1802:

Dear Jack

Supposing it likely you may open this letter in presence of someone say nothing of its contents to any but our Family—I receed yours of the 30th, and much approve of Sir George Beaumonts Plan—of course you will expect to see me home in a short time a fortnight or three weeks. But what I have most particular to say is, will you contrive to find out wether Hawkins is or is not painting the view of Paris what sort of thing it is like to be, and so on, but dont let your enquiries be known. If tis not doing or doing but Badley—which I think it must be—then enquire about the Ground West of Temple Bar or opposite to it. Tis most likely they will not Build for a length of time on account of the Church. However you can but make enquiries as it is the very Best Spot in all London & I might then have a Tuch at Paris—there will be no harm done by making those enquiries and letting me know. If there is time before I leave. If it will take long to get this information. Why I shall know it when I return that may do as well. What sketches I make are done from the windows of Hackey Coaches of course they cost a little. I allterd my plan directly I got your letter for I had then Eegun to skech on a Large scale, and to Colour on the spot. This would have been very tedious. But now I am for getting the Best views I can. And merly sketches.

Adieu Dicky We shall soon shake hands.

In Haste

I think the Panorama here does not answer—

51 The Morning Chronicle, May 10, 1802.


53 N. Neal Solly, Memoir of the Life of David Cox (London: Chapman and Hall, 1873), p. 7. David Cox worked as an assistant to De Maria at the Birmingham Theatre. As Cox left Birmingham for London in 1804, De Maria must have been at the Birmingham Theatre not long after the London exhibition of his panorama of Paris.

54 Roget (Vol. I, p. 189) stated that the subject of this panorama was Constantinople. I can find no evidence of an early panorama of Constantinople other than the two exhibited at Barker’s Leicester Square Rotunda. There is no reason to doubt that Cristall worked for Barker for a time; however, it seems unlikely that Hayward, an amateur with his own manufacturing business to run, would have been in Barker’s employ. Roget (Vol. I, p. 190) recorded that Cristall and Hayward “used to say that they had great difficulty in getting through their work; being in no small danger of falling from the very high scaffolding erected for their purpose, and under the vigilant eye of a proprietor who was so diligent in overlooking them, that, although benumbed with cold, they were unable to come down and warm themselves.” Could this cruel taskmaster have been Robert or Henry Aston Barker? Another artist who did work for the Barkers was Edward Dayes, whose work diary for the year 1798 (Victoria and Albert Museum, Box III, 86kk) shows that he was employed on the panorama of Windsor.


56 The Morning Chronicle, May 10, 1802.

57 Ibid., July 12, 1802.

58 Ibid.
60. True Briton, July 10, 1802.

61. The Morning Chronicle, July 12, 1802. It is not clear whether a guide in attendance on the viewing platform was a standard feature of the panoramas. Only a few Leicester Square panoramas were advertised as having a person to explain the view.

62. The Caledonian Mercury, April 7, 1803.

63. Ibid., August 1, 1803.

64. Ibid., September 19, 1812.


68. Edward Edwards, Anecdotes of Painters Who Have Resided or Been Born in England (reprint of London: Leigh and Sotheby, 1808; London: Cornmarket Press, 1970), pp. 279-280. Edwards stated that Girtin's panorama "was not much noticed by the public." A review of the Eidometropolis, which appeared several months after its opening, mentioned that it was "very well attended" (Monthly Magazine, Vol. XIV, p. 254). Unless some unknown circumstance prevented its further exhibition after its close in London, the subsequent history of the Eidometropolis would suggest that it did not enjoy a very great popularity.

69. Hubert J. Pragnell, The London Panoramas of Robert Barker and Thomas Girtin circa 1800 (London: London Topographical Society, 1968), p. 10. Pragnell has convincingly demonstrated that the roof of the British Plate Glass Manufactory, which had earlier been given as Girtin's station for the taking of his panorama, could not have provided a suitable view and that his actual station must have been on the roof of some adjacent houses which were owned by the Manufactory.

70. The Albion Mills were destroyed by fire on March 2, 1791.

71. Although many subjects were repeated by the Barkers, they never returned to the subject of London. After Girtin's Eidometropolis no other large-scale panorama of the city was exhibited in London until the Colosseum opened in 1829.
A good bibliography and a concise account of the subject is given in Watercolours by Thomas Girtin, exhibition catalogue (Whitworth Art Gallery, University of Manchester and the Victoria and Albert Museum, 1975), pp. 17, 34–36. One omission in the bibliography is Pragnell's book. Although Pragnell is guilty of numerous glaring factual errors, he does provide some interesting new information on the Eildometropolis.


Girtin and Loshak, p. 36.

Girtin and Loshak, p. 45n.

In 1807 after a conversation with Lord Mulgrave, Farington recorded: "Girtin having a desire to carry to Paris a panorama view of London with a view to exhibit it there, Lord Mulgrave procured Him a Passport; but when He arrived at Paris He was not permitted to exhibit it" (The Farington Diary, ed. J. Greig, Vol. IV [London: Hutchinson & Co., 1921], p. 103).

The extent of the motives of health and business for Girtin's trip to Paris have not been determined. Clearly the trip was in part undertaken for business reasons, but Girtin was also a very sick man at this time. In October he was advised to go into the country to improve his health (Girtin and Loshak, p. 43).

Arnold's painting was still being shown in early summer (The Morning Chronicle, June 19, 1802).

Gentlemen's Magazine, Vol. LXXII, Pt. 2, p. 1,163 and Vol. LXXIII, Pt. 1, p. 188; Morning Herald, November 12, 1802. The other work in oils was Bolton Bridge, Yorkshire, which was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1801.
An obituary in the Gentleman's Magazine (Vol. LXXIII, Pt. 1, p. 188) stated that Girtin "delineated two of the scenes at Covent-Garden Theatre; one a view of the Conciergerie at Paris, for a pantomime of Dibdin's, and the other the Rue St. Denis."

Much has been made of the fact that certain splashes of paint on one of the studies for the Eidometropolis show no sign of oil stain on the paper, but this hardly seems conclusive evidence (Girtin and Loshak, p. 35).


A pen and ink drawing, claimed by Fragnell (p. 7 and 15, illustrated pl. xvii) as the remaining segment of the circle, is in the collection of Prof. J. Isaacs. Pen and ink studies of two of the E. M. watercolours are in the collection of Thomas Girtin (Girtin Catalogue, 225.1. and 230.1.).

That Francia's semicircle does not simply represent half of the view is easily seen in the presentation of part of the Albion Mills facade at either end of the semicircle. The discrepancy in size between the two halves of the facade demonstrates the considerable distortion of the etching.

The article in the Library of the Fine Arts (Vol. III, p. 317) stated that "after his death it [the panorama] was sold to a Russian nobleman, who took it out of the country." According to Roget (Vol. I, p. 107) the sale did not take place until about 1825. Prior to that the panorama lay rolled up above a carpenter's shop in St. Martin's Lane. It was finally sold by a Mr. Cohen, the second husband of Girtin's widow, to "some persons in Russia" or to "a Russian nobleman"—Roget's source was not clear. It was exhibited in St. Petersburg. In 1851 a correspondent to Notes and Queries (Vol. III, p. 526) recalled that "not many years back" he had seen it in St. Martin's Lane. It seems most likely that the "not many years back" of the Notes and Queries correspondent was really about a quarter of a century.
The Morning Chronicle, November 21, 1804.

Redgrave, A Dictionary of Artists, p. 387.

The Morning Chronicle, April 16, 1805.

Ibid., January 30, 1806.

Ibid., April 13, 1808.

It was exhibited at Harper's Pantheon, Norwich (see Pl. 48).

The Morning Chronicle, March 31, 1806.


The Morning Chronicle, May 2, 1804.

Serres's Trafalgar was most probably the "Nelsonian Exhibition" advertised at Spring Gardens in April, 1806, which consisted of transparent paintings (Ibid., April 7, 1806).

Ibid., June 5, 1807.

Ibid., May 23, 1808.

Ibid., August 8, 1810.

The Caledonian Mercury, March 26, 1801.

Ibid., May 16, 1801. Sanders was trained in Edinburgh as a coach painter, and began his career painting miniatures and marine subjects. His view of Edinburgh from the Forth was seen by Farington in Glasgow in 1801 (David and Francina Irwin, Scottish Painters at Home and Abroad, 1700-1900 [Faber and Faber, 1975], pp. 80-81, 143).

Ibid.

Ibid., February 19, 1814.

Redgrave, A Dictionary of Artists, p. 15.

NOTES

111 The Caledonian Mercury, June 19, 1809.
112 The Morning Chronicle, August 8, 1810.
114 The Morning Chronicle, March 31, 1806.
115 Ibid., February 17, 1807.
116 The advertisement in The Morning Chronicle on February 17, 1807, stated that an exhibition on this principle had been "much admired at Paris in the peace of the year 1802." An advertisement for the later exhibition in Princes Street specified that it had been shown at the Palais Royal (Ibid., February 8, 1808).
117 Ibid., February 8, 1808.
118 Ibid.
119 Ibid., February 21, 1809.
120 Ibid., May 16, 1801.
121 Ibid., May 9, 1808.
122 Ibid., February 23, 1813.
123 Ibid., March 28, 1806.
124 Ibid., April 5, 1806.
125 The best known of the eighteenth century paintings of the subject is Richard Wilson's in the National Gallery, London.
126 The Morning Chronicle, January 11, 18, and June 29, 1808.
127 Ibid., May 1, 1816.
128 Reinagle later made extraordinary claims about his own role in the Panorama:
"At 10 years of age, I invented panorama's. Mr. Barker who carried out the invention on his part has the reputation of being the inventor; but Sir George Beaumont also invented the same mode of representing Nature. He built a small Temple on purpose, on the Walls he intended as he told me, to have Keswick Lake represented. I built what is now converted into the Strand Theatre, a Panorama building 60 feet in diameter--my first view was Rome from the Tower of the Capitol.
"My next was the city seen from the Villa Ludovisi--my 3d. was Florence--my 4th was the Bay
p. 60 of Naples from the shores of Vico & Sorrento
(letter of March 22, 1847 [reprinted in The Times, August 18, 1937]).

129 The Morning Chronicle, July 9, 1803.

130 Ibid. In fact the Monthly Magazine criticized the arrangement in the Strand ("Monthly Retrospect of the Fine Arts," Vol. XVI [September 1, 1803], p. 155): "As you cannot be conducted from the staircase to the centre, without passing intermediate objects, you must of course catch the view of the picture on one side, which shows it to disadvantage . . . . this leads those who see it to the knowledge of a circumstance which ought to have been carefully concealed--the size of the room, in which this deception is exhibited." If Reinagle's statement that the building was sixty feet in diameter can be accepted, the panorama was also considerably smaller than the large circle at Leicester Square.

131 Ibid., October 19, 1803.

132 Ibid., April 23, 1803.

133 Ibid., July 14, 1803. It seems odd that T. E., being older than H. A., did not play a greater part in assisting his father with the first attempts at circular paintings. Perhaps the estrangement of father and son pre-dated the opening of the Strand Panorama. After T. E. opened his rival establishment, Robert was never reconciled to him, and no mention of T. E. was made in Robert Barker's will (Survey of London, Vol. XXXIV, p. 483).

134 The Morning Chronicle, April 17, 1804.

135 Ibid., July 11, 1804.

136 Farington (typescript), May 17, 1804.

137 Constable, Correspondence, Vol. II, p. 34.

138 The Morning Chronicle, January 15, 1805.

139 Farington (Grieg), August 15, 1807.

140 Corner (p. 9) reported that R. Barker made generous provisions in his will for the support of his widow, but also left certain encumbrances, both of which H. A. made good by his subsequent success in running the business. These encumbrances would seem further evidence that the Leicester Square Panorama had only limited success in its early years.
Reinagle, while no longer directly associated with the Strand Panorama, may have retained an interest in the enterprise up to this time. Corner (pp. 11-12) stated that H. A. Barker and J. Burford paid a considerable sum to Reinagle and secured an annuity for T. E. Barker and his wife as the price of their interests in the Strand Panorama.

The Morning Chronicle, March 18, 1818.

Those exhibitions which did not carry the name panorama are treated in the following chapter.

The Morning Chronicle, April 15, 1811.

Ibid., July 16, 1814.

H. A. Barker exhibited a panorama of Messina in the same year (Ibid., October 15, 1811).

Ibid., April 15, 1811.

Ibid., July 16, 1814.

Ibid., February 27, 1810.

The Caledonian Mercury, February 4, 1809.

Ibid.

Later advertisements in Edinburgh referred to Marshall as the original inventor of the peri-strephic panorama, as the moving panorama was termed. Hedgrave also gave Marshall credit for the invention (A Dictionary of Artists, p. 287).

The Morning Chronicle, February 6, 1811.

The following listing is by no means complete, but it does give an idea of the extent of the Marshall business in the years between its exhibitions in London. In 1813 Marshall was exhibiting another panorama of river scenery--this time the Thames--in the Old Assembly Rooms in Manchester (The Manchester Mercury, and Barron's General Advertiser, December 28, 1813). By 1815 the advertisements were under the name of "Messrs. Marshall." In that year both the Thames and the Clyde were exhibited in Dublin (Dublin Evening Post, April 1 and August 26, 1815). Messrs. Marshalls' Grand Historical Peristrephic Painting of the Battles of Ligny and Waterloo was exhibited in the Large Room of Lillyman's Hotel in Liverpool in 1816 (The Liverpool Mercury, or, Commercial, Literary, and Political Herald, August 30, 1816). A panorama of
p. 66 the bombardment of Algiers was shown in Liverpool and Manchester the following year (Ibid., January 24, 1817; The Manchester Mercury, October 28, 1817). Marshall returned to Edinburgh in 1819 with this panorama (The Caledonian Mercury, June 14, 1819). The following year the Marshalls presented panoramas of Waterloo and the Wreck of the Medusa and "the Fatal Levee" in Edinburgh (Ibid., February 26 and November 4, 1820). Marshall panoramas of the Frozen Regions, depicting Spitzbergen and Baffin Bay, and of the Coronation of George IV appeared in Edinburgh in 1821 (Ibid., March 15 and December 10, 1821). The panorama of the Frozen Regions had been shown in Birmingham and Liverpool, and from Liverpool it was to go to Dublin (Birmingham Chronicle, April 13, 1820; Liverpool Mercury, July 7, 1820). The panorama of the Wreck of the Medusa was shown in Dublin in 1821 where it apparently stole the audience from Gericault's painting of The Raft of the Medusa which was then exhibiting there (Lee Johnson, "The 'Raft of the Medusa' in Great Britain," Burlington Magazine, Vol. XCVI [August, 1954], pp. 249-254). In 1822 the Marshalls exhibited in Liverpool a panorama which combined incidents of Bonaparte's career with scenes from their Medusa panorama (Liverpool Mercury, May 17, 1822). In the cities of Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Liverpool, the Marshalls opened special buildings which would accommodate both their own moving panoramas and other circular panoramas as well. In the case of Edinburgh, at least, they enjoyed a virtual monopoly on panoramic exhibitions in the city for several decades (see Appendix A).

155 The Morning Chronicle, March 11, 1823.
156 Ibid.

CHAPTER IV

p. 68

1 The Morning Chronicle, February 21, 1793.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid., April 1, 1793.

p. 69

4 Ibid., May 6, 1793.
5 Ibid., May 14, 1793.
6 The Caledonian Mercury, November 7, 1793.
7 The Morning Chronicle, February 14, 1799.
Although there is no direct evidence that Wilkinson was the proprietor, it seems likely, as he performed on the harmonic glasses during the showings and after the fire which broke out in the Eidophusikon in March, 1800, put a notice in the papers that he had lost his entire property and was relying on the liberality of the affluent (Ibid., March 28, 1800).

An Eidophusikon appeared in London in 1837 at the Gallery of British Artists, but de Loutherbourg's name was not mentioned in connection with this exhibition, and it does not appear to have had any direct connection with the original (John Gage, "Loutherbourg," p. 338).

J. M. W. Turner and de Loutherbourg were amongst the more noted artists to paint the subject, each choosing the climactic moment of the Orient's explosion. The Barkers also displayed a panorama of the battle at Leicester Square, again showing the explosion of the Orient. The frequent treatment of the subject may be related to the advocacy of sublime marine subjects for paintings in the periodical, Naval Chronicle, and to William Gilpin's comments on the picturesqueness of burning ships at night in his Observations on the Western Parts of England (see John Gage, "Turner and the Picturesque--I," Burlington Magazine, Vol. CVII [January, 1965], pp. 23-24).
"Every vessel performs the different evolutions of tacking, firing, anchoring, making signals, &c. as practiced in the real action" (Ibid., July 15, 1799). These evolutions were performed "on a transparent moving sea" (Ibid., July 10, 1799). It was subsequently specified that the exhibition employed transparent paintings "with the judicious union of opaque objects in motion" (Ibid., November 22, 1799).

It has been suggested that this Turner was J. M. W. Turner (Gage, "Turner and the Picturesque," pp. 24-25, and Jack Lindsey, J. M. W. Turner, His Life and Work, a Critical Biography [London: Cory, Adams & Mackay, 1966], pp. 70-72). Advertisements for the Naumachia in The Morning Chronicle describe Turner as "coach-maker" (May 5, 1800), and give his address as 129, Shoreditch (May 6, 1800). This address corresponds with that given by the W. Turner who exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1792, 1808, 1813, and 1816. This Turner also exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1787, when his address was given as "at Mr. G. Turner's, Walthamstow" (Algernon Graves, The Royal Academy of Arts, a Complete Dictionary of Contributors and their Work from its Foundation in 1769 to 1904, Vol. VIII [London: Henry Graves and Co., 1906], p. 42). It is tempting to identify this individual as the William Turner, landscape and coach painter, of Walthamstow, who appears in Kent's Directory of London in 1800, although in 1800 he should have been in Shoreditch.


Maurice Harold Grant, A Dictionary of British Landscape Painters from the 16th Century to the Early 20th Century (Leigh-on-Sea: F. Lewis, 1952), p. 201. A lengthy and heated exchange of articles in the Connoisseur in 1906 on the identity of William Turner de Lond. (attempting to prove and disprove that he was J. M. W. Turner) is largely confused but does produce some information on the artist.

The Morning Chronicle, June 3, 1799.

Ibid., June 3, July 4, August 23, and September 3, 1799.

Ibid., September 25, 1799.

Ibid., August 21, 1799.
This system, by which music seemed to drift from unseen sources at varying distances from the spectators, seems to have been devised not only to lend greater realism to the scenes presented, but also to avoid penalties for having music performed before the public without a license (Ibid., April 29, 1800).

Philipsthal was complaining "that several unqualified Adventurers continue to take advantage of the public curiosity by attempting to exhibit in various parts of the kingdom a gross imitation of his OPTICAL ILLUSIONS" (Ibid., April 19, 1802). On the same date, a M. St. Clair advertised his own Phantasmagoria "as originally performed at Paris" (Ibid.). A Pantascopia of M. Dumutier and Prof. Robertson of Paris, which was claimed to be "partly of the Spectre but different from and superior to the Phantasmagoria," was being shown in London in 1804 (Ibid., December 12, 1804). The Ergascopia opened in January, 1805, with a published explanation of the Ergascopia, Phantasmagoria, Pantascopia, and Mesascopia, designed undoubtedly to demonstrate the Ergascopia's superiority (Ibid., January 1, 1805).
Other astronomical exhibitions included Martin's Grand Mechanical Display of the Universe, which was showing in London in 1799 and the Cosmorama of 1807 and 1808 (not related to the later exhibition of the same name).

Other astronomical exhibitions included Martin's Grand Mechanical Display of the Universe, which was showing in London in 1799 and the Cosmorama of 1807 and 1808 (not related to the later exhibition of the same name).

The Morning Chronicle, January 20, 1798.

Ibid., January 1, 1798.

Ibid., July 21, 1814.

Ibid., October 31, 1814.

Thiodon opened on July 21, 1817, with the following programme: 1. The City of Naples. 2. The City of Dresden. 3. The Mountain of Grand St. Bernard, with Napoleon and his Army. 4. A Storm at Sea (Ibid., July 18, 1817). On August 11, the programme was: 1. Island of St. Helena. 2. Pont Neuf and part of Paris. 3. Mountain of St. Bernard. 4. Chinese Artificial Fireworks. 5. Storm at Sea (Ibid., August 11, 1817). Thiodon's exhibition was also popular in the provinces. In fact it was exhibiting in other British cities several years before opening in London. It was being shown in Bristol as early as 1815. As late as 1828 it was being shown in Norwich (Fawcett, p. 152).

The Morning Chronicle, April 15, 1818.

Ibid. Whether the enlarged scale was in relation to the Eidophusikon or to the scenes of Thiodon is unclear.

The Morning Chronicle, January 4, 1819.

Ibid. Miller was, of course, in error. The Eidophusikon had been exhibited in the Great Room, Spring Gardens, in 1793, but the original de Loucherbourg exhibition of 1781 had taken place in Lisle Street.

Ibid.

p. 79


Ibid., p. 306.

Ibid., p. 331.

Ibid., p. 358.

Hüdiger Joppien, De Loutherbourg, Kenwood exhibition catalogue, contains a brief discussion of his battle paintings.

Ibid.

p. 81

Quoted by Prown, p. 359.

The Morning Chronicle, May 24, 1799.

p. 82

Presumably William Hamilton, a popular historical painter, who contributed to Boydell's Shakespeare, Macklin's Bible and British Poets, and Bowyer's English History. Of his works exhibited at the Royal Academy, one depicts a sea battle, Destruction of Spanish Battering Ships before Gibraltar, shown in 1783 (Graves, Vol. III, p. 368).

Ibid., December 30, 1797; January 1 and 13, 1798. It was noted that, although the exhibition was attracting persons of high rank, Hamilton "ought, however, to find a situation more convenient for fashionable loungers" (Ibid., January 13 and 26, 1798). Several other exhibitions were presented in this inconvenient location, including the large Eidophusikon in 1799–1800.

Ibid., January 1, 1798.

Ibid., May 20, 1799. This same device was employed at the Historic Gallery the previous year for the display of de Loutherbourg's painting of the Great Fire of London.

Observer, March 30, 1823. Haydon was not as fortunate in 1846 when his pictures had the direct competition of P. T. Barnum's dwarf, General Tom Thumb. Haydon's exhibition was a complete failure.

This was Belshazzar's Feast, which was opened as a separate exhibition in May, 1821, after its success at the British Institution (The Morning Chronicle, May 21, 1821). The exhibition had over fifty thousand visitors in its first season (Ibid., April 3, 1822). William Feaver's The Art of John Martin (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975) makes an attempt at relating Martin's work to the panorama and similar exhibitions.
Martin's style, in turn, was reflected in the panorama of Milton's Pandemonium at Leicester Square in 1829-1830. The panorama was painted from drawings by Henry Courtney Selous, an assistant at Leicester Square and said to be a former student of Martin. Martin himself had treated the subject in a mezzotint of 1824 and painted a version in oils in 1841. Of course the subject had been presented much earlier by de Loutherbourg in his Eidophusikon.

Other artists working in London who gained considerable reputations in both areas were Clarkson Stanfield, David Roberts, William Telbin, and Charles Marshall.

Joppien, De Loutherbourg, Kenwood exhibition catalogue.

John Westland Marston (Our Recent Actors, Vol. I [London: 1888], p. 63) recorded that Clarkson Stanfield's scenery for Acis and Galatea in 1842 "was ecstatically applauded... as though it had been a distinguished actor."

On June 7, 1830, The Morning Chronicle carried an article entitled "The Decline of Drama," which discussed articles on the subject which had appeared in the Family Magazine and Monthly Magazine and offered its own analysis of the situation. Lavish expenditures on spectacular stage effects were cited as a primary cause of the decline.

The Morning Chronicle, January 2, 1801. This work was actually described as a "moving panorama," but whether in form it anticipated Marshall's moving panorama cannot be established.

Ibid., July 14, 1801. The view of London Bridge was the work of a Mr. Andrews, presumably the same artist who had provided scenery for Lloyd's Dioastrodoxon.

Ibid., June 29, 1801.

Stanfield and Roberts started work in the London theatres in 1822. As early as 1824 Drury Lane was showing Stanfield's Grand Local Diorama (David Roberts & Clarkson Stanfield, exhibition catalogue [Guildhall Art Gallery, 1967], pp. 5 and 29).

The Morning Chronicle, June 29, 1801. It seems most likely that this sort of stage panorama was an early development of the curved backdrop for which, in theatre terminology, the name cyclorama was later appropriated.
Models on exhibit in London from the appearance of the panorama to the appearance of the diorama included: Portsmouth Harbour in Ivory, Edinburgh and Environs, the Island of Elba, London, Rome, Paris, the Mountains of Switzerland, and the North Polar Regions.

Du Bourg was exhibiting as early as 1785 (when he lost a number of his models in a fire) and as late as 1814. His exhibition, even in its most prosperous days, gained him little money. After disposing of the exhibition for a small sum, he lived in poverty. A reminiscence of the exhibition and a plea for assistance to the former exhibitor appeared in the Somerset House Gazette (Vol. I [March 6, 1824], pp. 347-348).

The Morning Chronicle, January 24, 1803, and June 10, 1807.

The Morning Chronicle, October 25, 1814.


Timbs, 1868 edition, p. 308.

Arnott, pp. 277-278.

By the opening of the Diorama, just two and a half years later, the following views had been exhibited at the Cosmorama: Rome, the Exterior and Interior of St. Peter's, Gibraltar from Both the Mediterranean and the Atlantic, Paris, a Swiss Scene, the London Docks, St. Helena, Both from the Ocean and on the Island, Bonaparte's Funeral Procession, Valley & Glaciers of Grindelwald, Interior and Exterior of the Pantheon in Rome, the Gallery of Raphael in the Vatican, Interior of Westminster Abbey at the Coronation of George IV, Piazza Navona, Bregheutz on the Lake of Constence, the Palais Royal and the Place Vendome at Paris, Constantinople, Lisbon, the Cathedral of Notre Dame at Paris, Moscow
before the Entrance of the French and during the Conflagration in 1812, Athens, Cintra, the Monastery of Mount St. Bernard, Jerusalem, Mount Vesuvius during an Eruption, the Lake of Geneva, the Petit Hameau at Versailles, the Tuilleries from the Pont Louis XVI, Cape St. Vincent, the Falls of Stautbach in the Valley of Lauterbrunen, Rouen, Paris from the Pont Neuf, the Falls of Niagara, Stantz in Switzerland, Berne, Mexico, the Port of Cadiz, the Lake of Erê in Switzerland, the Place de Grève at Paris during an Execution by the Guillotine, the Burning of a Ship of War in Action, the Interior of the Convent of Battalha near Lisbon, the Place de Palais Royal, the Gardens of the Palais Royal, part of the Chinese Town at Moscow, the Interior of a Caffre at Constantinople, the Tagus from Bellem Castle, Lyons, the Mosque of Abou Mandour near Rosetta in Egypt, the Palace of Akbar in India, Mont Blanc, the Palace and Gardens of Versailles, the Moorish Mosque at Cordova, the Ruins of Palmyra, the Forest of Lebanon, the Mer de Glace, the Colossal Statues on the Plain of Thebes, the Ruins of the Tomb of Osymandius (commonly called the Memnonium), Antioch, the Town and Lake of Luzerne, the Pièce des Suisses in the Garden of Versailles, Alexandria, and Pristam in Kamstchatka.

96 The Times, November 26, 1861.

97 The Morning Chronicle, May 5, 1823.

98 Ibid., April 10, 1823.

99 Ibid., November 13, 1827.

100 The Times, January 2, 1850.

101 Ibid., December 28, 1852.

102 Although Daguerre was generally credited with the invention and made the claim himself in his "Description des procédés de peinture et d'éclairage inventes par Daguerre et appliqués par lui aux tableaux du diorama" (included in Daguerre's Historique et description des procédés du daguerreotype et du diorama [Paris, 1839], pp. 73-79), Bouton also claimed responsibility for the invention in a broadsheet entitled "Nomenclature des travaux artistiques de M. Bouton" (see Helmut and Alison Gernsheirn, L. J. M. Daguerre; the History of the Diorama and the Daguerreotype [London: Secker & Warburg, 1956], p. 13).

103 Gernsheirn, Daguerre, pp. 3-12. The Gernsheirn book provides a full account of Daguerre's life and the history of the diorama. Contemporary sources...

104 Gernsheim, Daguerre, p. 7.

105 The word was coined from the Greek words meaning "through" and "sight" in reference either to the exhibition of the painting by light passing through the picture or to the fact that the picture was viewed through a sort of tunnel.


107 London newspapers, however, did not carry a full description of the new Parisian attraction until the following year, by which time plans for the opening of a Diorama in London may have already been known.

108 Charles was the son of an English couple named Smith living in Paris. Confusingly he was known by both the name Smith and Arrowsmith. He is perhaps best known as the art dealer who introduced the work of Constable into France (Gernsheim, Daguerre, pp. 6-7, 20).

109 Augustus Charles Pugin, a refugee of the French Revolution, worked for John Nash in Wales and London. He was known as one of the best architectural draughtsmen of his time. In addition to the Diorama building, he was also responsible for the design of the Cosmorama building in Regent Street, which opened in the same year ("New Cosmorama," Repository of Arts, 3rd series, Vol. I [June 1, 1823], p. 363). He was the father of the noted Gothic revival architect, Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin (see Colvin, pp. 479-481).

110 Differences between the Paris and London buildings were slight. At the time it was stated that the London building was larger ("The Diorama," Repository of Arts, 3rd series, Vol. II [November 1, 1823], p. 304). The Gernsheims claim that the dimensions were actually the same (Daguerre, p. 21).

111 Britton and Pugin (Vol. I, p. 66) placed the cost at about £9,000; Timbs (p. 307) estimated it at £10,000.
p. 90 112 The Morning Chronicle, September 20 and October 1, 1823.

113 Ibid., September 26, 1823.


115 The Times, April 2, 1836. A similar transformation had already been seen at the Paris Diorama with Daguerre's Éboulement dans la Vallée de Goldau, which was exhibited in 1835.

116 Gernsheim, Daguerre, p. 37.

117 The Gernsheims (Daguerre, p. 31) maintain that "double effect" dioramas involved a novel method of painting which was not employed by Daguerre until 1834. The "double effect" technique, however, already set forth in the specification of Arrowsmith's patent in 1824 (London Journal of Arts and Sciences, Vol. IX, pp. 336-339). The more dramatic transformations of the 1830s would seem to be the result of greater refinements in the established technique rather than a radical departure.


119 The Morning Chronicle, March 17, 1828.

120 The division of the salon into two price ranges was objected to by some, who claimed that the distinction was contrary to usage, "the public having been immemorially accustomed to visit exhibitions of pictures on a footing of equality" (Ibid., September 29, 1823).


122 Ibid.

p. 93 123 The description of the painting and exhibition of diorama pictures is taken from Daguerre's "Des procédés de peinture et d'éclairage . . . du diorama," pp. 75-79.

p. 94 124 The Times, October 4, 1823.


126 The Morning Chronicle, October 1, 1823.
The Morning Chronicle, September 29, 1823.

Constable, Correspondence, Vol. VI, p. 134. Constable was invited to the private showing by Arrowsmith. The real stones and silver lace seem to have been an incorrect conjecture by Constable as to how the diorama's effects were achieved. His comments on the French style of the pictures and the room seeming "a cage of magpies" suggest that his judgment was not free from an anti-French bias.


The Morning Chronicle, October 1, 1823.

The Gernsheims include a chronological listing of the pictures exhibited at the Regent's Park Diorama (Daguerre, pp. 178-180).

The reason for Bouton's move to London seems to have been related to the insufficient income from the Parisian establishment (Ibid., p. 27-28).

It is not clear whether Renoux took over management of the London establishment or merely provided the pictures. At the time of his death he was in Paris.

Gernsheim, Daguerre, p. 39.

Ibid., p. 40.

The Caladonian Mercury, January 17, 1825.
CHAPTER V

1. Barker was said to have realized £10,000 by the exhibition of this picture ("Panoramas," Chambers's Journal, Vol. XIII, p. 35). It is not clear whether this sum represented the proceeds from one or both of its exhibitions.

2. Corner (p. 12) stated that Barker retired in or before 1826. The retirement seems to have come several years before 1826, as by May, 1824, the Leicester Square Panorama was being advertised under the names of J. and R. Burford (The Morning Chronicle, May 3, 1824). On his retirement Barker moved from the home he had built in Dulwich to Cheam, Surrey. He later moved to Bristol and then to Willsbridge and Bitton, both near Bristol. He died at Bitton on July 19, 1856. One of Barker's two sons, William Bligh Barker, though intended for the medical profession, became an artist and exhibited at the Royal Academy (Corner, p. 13).


5. In 1812 and 1813 John Burford was living at 4, Paradise Buildings, Lambeth; in 1816 he was in the Romney Terrace, Horseferry Road. Robert's address was Horseferry Road in 1812 and 6, Regent Street in 1816 and 18 (Graves, Vol. I, p. 344). In addition to the panoramas and their works at the Royal Academy exhibitions, John and Robert Burford also provided, along with H. A. Barker, engravings of the Cambridge colleges for the Cambridge Almanac.


7. On January 26, 1832, the building reopened as the New Strand Subscription Theatre (The Times, January 25, 1832).
On March 11, 1823, the Ceremony of the Coronation opened; The Banks of the Clyde was added from June until September. In September The Shipwreck of the Medusa opened, and in November the Coronation was replaced by Liny, Les Quatre Bras and Waterloo. This was followed in late 1824 by Bonaparte's Casualties which was, in turn, replaced by The Bombardment of Algiers, the last subject presented. It opened in May, 1826, and closed on August 5.

The conversations of the pictured crowd include:
"Do you think it is worth half a Crown to see it my Dear?"
"Half a Crown! I assure you it's worth a Sovereign! It beats all the panoramas I ever saw."
"My dear lady get in if possible, this is my seventh attempt!"
"Never doubt me at a push. This is my seventh time of seeing it!!"
"Dear me what a crowd! I should not like to be disappointed again!"
"I hope you will not my lady. I am delighted beyond measure with it."
"It was just the same when I was here last. I think all the world must come three times over--"
"John, there are so many carriages here that I shall walk thro' the park to St. James Street. Tell the coachman to be there, and you wait till I come out."

The Morning Chronicle, March 11, 1823.
Ibid., June 17, 1824.
Gernsheim, Daguerre, p. 37.
Ibid.
The Morning Chronicle, July 8, 1826.
Scotsman, January 10, 1852.
The Morning Chronicle, October 14, 1828.
Ibid., November 16, 1829.
Ibid., February 15, 1826. The Egyptian Hall was built in 1811-1812 by William Bullock to house his Museum of Antiquities and Natural History. In 1819 Bullock sold his collections and converted the building into a suite of exhibition rooms. Until its demolition in 1905, the Egyptian Hall was host to a variety of entertainments, including Gericault's Raft of the Medusa, several exhibitions of paintings by Benjamin Robert Haydon, and numerous panoramas and


20 David Roberts & Clarkson Stanfield contains a brief account of Stanfield's career and a bibliography.

21 The other views were the ruins of Netley Abbey, Rouen, Turin, and the Interior and Exterior of the Castle of Chillon (The Morning Chronicle, February 15, 1826).

22 Ibid., June 20 and 30, 1826.


24 The Morning Chronicle, November 20, 1826.

25 Ibid., June 18, 1827.

26 Ibid., January 6, 1827. The first advertisement for the Optic Panorama mistakenly credited a "Mrs. Suhr" as the "inventress" of the exhibition.


28 The other views were Moscow from the Kremlin, St. Petersburg in Winter, the Field of Waterloo, the Sound (not further identified), Hanover, St. Stephen's Church in Vienna, and a Swiss Scene (The Morning Chronicle, February 24, 1827).

29 In May the views were of the Capitals of Hungary, Salzburg, Berlin, English Island, an Italian Scene, and Moscow and St. Petersburg from different vantage points (Ibid., May 7, 1827). In July they were Paris from the Pont Neuf, the Boulevard des Italiens in Paris, Moscow during the Carnival, Hamburg (two views), Cronstadt, Copenhagen, the Lake of Nemi, and Heidelberg (Ibid., July 10, 1827).
It is not clear in the advertisements whether Navarin was a full circle, semicircle, or a moving panorama; however, a review of the panorama which followed it (The Times, April 20, 1829) makes clear that that panorama was a full circle. It seems likely that the earlier panorama would have been of the same form.

For Wilson see Grant, p. 224, and Irwin, p. 242. For Cartwright see Grant, p. 37, and the D. N. B., Vol. XXI, p. 583.

"THE BATTLE OF NAVARIN IS NOW EXHIBITING, from Ten in the Morning until Eight in the Evening, LIGHTED by GAS, in order to remedy the defect so much complained of in Exhibitions of this nature, arising from the insufficient light afforded on bad and cloudy days, as by this means the Public have the advantage of viewing it as satisfactorily and as perfectly in the very worst weather as on the brightest and finest day" (The Morning Chronicle, January 3, 1828).

The Pass of Salzburg was added in July (Ibid., July 22, 1828); Constantinople in August (Ibid., August 18, 1828); and York Minster and Windsor Castle in March, 1829 (Ibid., March 23, 1829).

This exhibition is mentioned by Francis D. Klingender in Art and the Industrial Revolution (London: Paladin, 1968), p. 127.
The new views were of York with the Minster on Fire, the Egyptian Temple of Appolinopolis, the Interior of St. Sauvern at Caen, and the Village of Verex in Italy.

The Morning Chronicle, May 28, 1829.

Ibid., May 30, 1829.

Ibid., March 25 and May 13, 1830. The diorama views were the Interior of Durham Cathedral, Venice, the Thames Tunnel, and the Pass of Eriangon (Ibid., May 13, 1830). The physorama views were York Minster on Fire, Belshazzar's Feast, the Deluge, the Isle of Wight, Mont Blanc, the Natural Bridge in Virginia, Aurungabad in India, Edinburgh, Constantinople, Elba, Giant's Causeway, Henry VII's Chapel, Charon Church, and the Ruins of St. Mary's Abbey at York.

The Times, January 11, 1833.

Ibid., June 25, 1833.

Ibid., January 24, 1834. Captain Ross also provided the drawings and supervision for the panoramic view of Boothia which was exhibited at the Leicester Square Panorama at the same time.

Stanfield's three views were Melrose Abbey by Moonlight, the Interior of the Basilica of St. Francis at Assisi, and the Pass of Eriangon. The fourth view, by an E. Lambert, showed the Conflagration of the Houses of Parliament (The Morning Chronicle, April 22, 1835).

In 1813 Hornor had published a Description of an Improved Method of Delineating Estates, with a Sketch of the Progress of Landscape Gardening in England. In 1817 he produced an album of twenty-six watercolour drawings (now in the British Museum) arranged so as to form a tour of the Vale of Neath in Glamorganshire. The centrepiece of the album was a fold-out "General View of the Vale of Neath," which was panoramic in character.

56 A Brief Account of the Colosseum, in the
Regent's Park, London: Comprising a Description of
the Building; the Panoramic View from the Top of St.
Paul's Cathedral; the Conservatory, &c. (London, 1829),
p. 4.

57 James Elmes, in his Metropolitan Improvements;
or London in the Nineteenth Century (London: Jones &
Co., 1827, p. 71) took issue with those "careless
writers" who "indiscriminately named it the Colosseum
or Coliseum." According to Elmes, Colosseum was the
proper name, deriving from the Latin Colossus or the
Greek Kolossaion, and it was this form which was
adopted by the proprietor.

58 Colvin, p. 109.

59 Elmes, pp. 68-79; Britton and Pugin, Vol. II,
pp. 271-275.

60 The Morning Chronicle, January 6, 1829; The
Times, January 13, 1829.

61 The Times, January 13, 1829.

62 A Brief Account of the Colosseum, p. 4. The
panorama building opened by Langlois in Paris in 1830
and stated by Bapst (p. 23) to have been the largest
yet seen, was in fact only thirty-five meters in
diameter and twelve meters in height.

63 Ibid., p. 5.

64 Royal Colosseum, Regent's Pk. Catalogue of the
Panorama of London, and Other Valuable Properties . . .
Which Will Be Sold by Auction . . . on Thursday,
August 27th, 1828 . . . by Order of the Proprietor,
The picture was repainted at least once, but it seems
unlikely that in renovating the picture, the artists
would have reduced the painting by almost half. We
are left with the assumption that the initial state­
ment was a gross exaggeration.

65 The renovation was not undertaken until 1853,
at which time Farris was given the opportunity to put
his apparatus to the use for which it was originally

66 Ibid., p. 5.

67 The extension of the illusion-creating process
to the viewing platform itself by its transformation
into an integral part of the scene was here fully
developed. The viewing platform in the Leicester Square Panorama had been designed so as not to call attention to itself but to blend unobtrusively into most of the panorama landscapes. The continual changing of subjects made adapting the platform to individual scenes impractical. Serres's panorama of Boulogne may have anticipated the Colosseum treatment of the viewing area by recreating the deck of a frigate within the exhibition. The Colosseum's recreation of the galleries of St. Paul's does precede, if only by a year, the recreation of the interior of the ship, Scipion, in Langlois's Parisian panorama of the Battle of Navarin.

The Morning Chronicle, May 8, 1830. Later the sounds of various clocks "as from distant churches" and "the noble sounds of the metropolitan church bells" were added to enhance the illusion (A Description of the Colosseum as Re-Opened in MDCCCLXV London: J. Wertheimer and Co., 1845, p. 8).

A Brief Account of the Colosseum, p. 6.

Although the problem of shadows was often mitigated by rendering the glass of the skylights translucent—oil-impregnated white cloth was frequently used to cover the glass—it was only with the Parisian panoramas of the 1880s by De Neuville and Detaille that the problem was solved. The light from the skylights did not fall directly on the painting, but on a zone of white canvas above the viewing platform which reflected the light onto the painting (Bapst, p. 29).


A Brief Account of the Colosseum, pp. 7-8.

Morning Herald, December 22, 23, and 29, 1828.
The Morning Chronicle, December 23, 1828.

Hornor was with Stephenson on the afternoon of December 26, when Stephenson was feeling suicidal (The Times, January 10, 1829).

The Morning Chronicle, December 23, 1828.

Morning Herald, December 30, 1828.

Timbs, 1876 edition, p. 283.
The Morning Chronicle, January 10, 1829.

Ibid., March 30, 1829.
Hornor had in fact gone to New York where he was in his own words, "suffering much from disappointed hopes, sickness and poverty." He was rescued from this state by a group of New York gentlemen who advanced money for a three-part set of panoramic engravings of New York City. The project was less grandiose but no more successful than the Colosseum. About 1835 Hornor was apologizing to his patrons for not having finished the work. Once again he had been seduced by ambitious schemes: "I have been engaged several months on an important invention connected with my artistical pursuits." We last hear of Hornor in 1836, in debt and having abandoned two of the original three sections of the engraving. A view by him of Broadway, probably not related to the original project, was published in that year (I. N. Phelps Stokes, The Iconography of Manhattan Island, Vol. III [New York: Robert H. Dodd, 1918], pp. 625-627).

The Morning Chronicle, March 9, 1829.

Ibid., December 15, 1829.

Ibid., June 29, 1829.

The Times, October 25, 1831.

The ownership of the Colosseum during the decade of the 1830s is rather confusing. Three different dates were given for the purchase of the establishment by Braham and Yates. Timbs, in the 1855 edition (p. 223), gave the date as 1831, which is the date accepted by the D. N. B. (Vol. II, p. 1,105; Vol. XXI, p. 1,208), and by Phillip E. Highfill, Jr., Kalman A. Eurnim, and Edward A. Langhans in A Biographical Dictionary of Actors, Actresses, Musicians, Dancers, Managers & Other Stage Personnel in London, 1660-1800 (Vol. II [Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973], p. 297). Timbs stated that the property was again sold in 1835. In his 1876 edition (p. 283), Timbs changed the date of the Braham and Yates take-over to August, 1836. Osbert Wyndham Hewett, in Strawberry Fair ([London: John Murray, 1956], p. 11) placed the transfer of the management of the Colosseum to Braham and Yates on May 18, 1835. Timbs, in his 1876 edition (p. 283), introduced another character in the person of a Mr. Turner, who, Timbs stated, bought the establishment a few years after Braham and Yates and added the Cyclorama; however, the Cyclorama was not added until 1848, when the property was presumably in the hands of a David Montague. The D. N. B. account of Yates's involvement (Vol. XXI, p. 1,208) stated that Yates was bought out. On the basis of this evidence, the most
reasonable explanation would be that Braham and Yates did purchase the Colosseum in 1831, and that the transaction in 1835 was actually Mr. Turner buying out Yates's share. Turner would then have been responsible for adding a theatre to the establishment (in operation as early as 1837) which was the probable basis for the later Cyclorama.

88 Timbs, 1876 edition, p. 283. Highfill, Burnim, and Langhans (Vol. II, p. 297) state that £40,000 is incorrect and that the actual sum paid was £30,000. They also state that by 1837 Braham had invested over £100,000 in the Colosseum. The sources for these figures are not cited.

89 A Description of the Colosseum as Re-Opened in MDCCXLV, p. 3.

90 The Times, December 29, 1843.

Highfill, Burnim, and Langhans (Vol. II, p. 298) record that Braham wrote to his bankers on November 22, 1837, proposing to borrow £20,000 on the Colosseum and offering to pay back the new mortgage at £1,000 per year at five percent interest. £14,000 was due to Hornor's trustees, if Braham wished to remain in possession of the establishment. At the time Braham stated that "the profits of the Colosseum, on the old buildings alone, have always exceeded £4,000 a year, & including the new have averaged from £7,000 to £8,000." It is not known whether Braham was successful in obtaining the mortgage.

92 The Times, April 21, 1840.

93 An account of the sale of the Colosseum at the Auction Mart appeared the following day in The Times (May 12, 1843). It was purchased by a Mr. Giraud, acting on behalf of Montague.

94 A Description of the Colosseum as Re-Opened in MDCCXLV, pp. 3-6, 12-18, 23.

95 Ibid., pp. 7, 21-23.

96 Catalogue of the auction of the contents of the Colosseum in 1868, p. 4.

97 A Description of the Colosseum as Re-Opened in MDCCXLV, p. 23.

98 Ibid., p. 21.

The Royal visit lasted one and a half hours on the afternoon of May 3, 1845. After viewing the panorama of London by Day, the Queen expressed a desire to see London by Night, a portion of which was immediately set in place for her inspection (The Times, May 5, 1845).

Ibid.

Ibid., March 7, 1848.

Ibid., May 8, 1848.

Catalogue of the auction of the contents of the Colosseum in 1868, p. 4.

The Times, December 23, 1848.

Edmund Yates, Frederick's son, in His Recollections & Experiences (Vol. I [London: Richard Bentley, 1885], p. 145) described the effect of the Cyclorama of Lisbon: "The manner in which the earth heaved and was rent, the buildings toppled over, and the sea rose, was most cleverly contrived, and had a most terrifying effect upon the spectators; frightful rumblings, proceeding apparently from under your feet, increased the horror, which was anything but diminished by the accompanying musical performances on that awful instrument, the apollonicon. Never was better value in fright given for money."

Some idea of the mechanism of the Cyclorama can be gained from the listing of its components in the auction catalogue of 1868 (p. 6): "one back frame, 160 ft. by 43--three telescope frames, 190 ft. varying in height from 20 to 40 ft.--one frame, 70 ft. by 43--truck with sea, 80 ft. long and 4 ft. wide, running on twelve 22 inch wheels, containing working machinery for ships and waves--one large felucca--one life boat--one double-purchase crab with long shaft and 4 barrels--levers to throw in and out of gear--two single-purchase crabs--two wood barrels--and 1,520 feet of iron rails and sleepers for working same."

The Illustrated London News, March 30, 1850.

The Times, December 23, 1850. This was the only work at the Colosseum of which the medium in which it was painted was mentioned.

Ibid., March 24, 1851.

Ibid.

Ibid., May 5 and 12, 1852.
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1. The Times, December 21, 1832.
2. Ibid., January 5, 1841.
3. Ibid., May 17, 1839.
4. In 1784 Daniell had accompanied his uncle, the landscape painter Thomas Daniell, to India, where they worked together for a decade. After their return to England, William became a student of the Royal Academy in 1799, an associate in 1807, and a full member in 1822 (D. N. B., Vol. V, p. 484).
5. The Times, April 8, 1831.
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6. Ibid., August 5, 1835, and June 17, 1836.
7. Ibid., August 5, 1835.
8. Ibid., April 13, 1838.
9. Ibid., January 16, 1841. A view of Canton had been exhibited at the Leicester Square Panorama in 1838.
10. "HISTORAMA--The First Great French Revolution of 1791. NOW OPEN, at 26, St. James's Street, a splendid and colossal PICTURE, measuring 350 superficial feet, by Mons. COURT and containing more than 400 figures, 66 of which are historical portraits" (Ibid., May 3, 1836).
"EXHIBITION. -- TYPHORAMA. -- A MODELLED VIEW of the UNDERCLIFF, ISLE of WIGHT. -- It contains 125 square feet" (The Morning Chronicle, July 17, 1838).

13 The Times, December 26, 1844.
14 Ibid., October 2, 1845.

15 Ibid., March 11, 1841.

17 Cocks produced the following works for the Garden: dioramas of Brighton, Vesuvius, the Manchester Railway and Other Views in 1831; a panorama of Antwerp in 1833; a panoramic view of Mont Blanc and the Valley of Chamouni by Moonlight reshown in 1838, '39, and '41), and a Grand Dioramic Picture of the Proposed New Houses of Parliament in 1836; a panoramic view of Venice and a moving panorama of the Voyage of the Royal Vauxhall Balloon in 1837; and a moving panorama of the Rhine in 1841.

This information derives from a six-volume collection of programmes, newspaper cuttings, etc., concerning Vauxhall Gardens, which is in the Minet Library (Borough of Lambeth Public Libraries), Brixton. Croft-Murray in Decorative Painting in England, 1537-1837, Vol. II (p. 63n) provides a partial listing of the pictorial entertainments at the Gardens in the 1820s and '30s.

18 The Times, March 29, 1853.
19 The Illustrated London News, May 17, 1851.
20 "The truth seems to be that the love of illustration is greatly on the increase, and that the middle and humbler classes, who cannot afford to travel, will readily patronize the means by which remarkable scenes and places may be realized to them" (The Times, December 27, 1851).

21 The Illustrated London News, May 17, 1851.
22 Two of these American panoramas--John Banvard's and J. R. Smith's--are considered in detail in John Francis McDermott's The Lost Panoramas of the Mississippi (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1958).

23 The Times, November 30, 1848.

The American poet, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, had seen the panorama while it was exhibiting in Boston. He was at the time at work on Evangeline and recorded in his journal that the exhibition was "very apropos, the river comes to me instead of my going to the river; and as it is to flow through the pages of the poem, I look upon this as a special benediction." Of the panorama itself, he commented: "Three miles of canvas, and a great deal of merit" (McDermott, p. 39).

The Times, November 27, 1848.

Description of Banvard's Panorama of the Mississippi & Missouri Rivers (London: W. J. Golbourn, 1848).

The Times, April 12, 1849.

Ibid., December 18, 1849.

Ibid., April 27, 1850.

The Times, March 19, 1849. The hall in which Smith's panorama was exhibited was in the Savile House on the north side of Leicester Square. It had been occupied by Mary Linwood's exhibition of needlework copies of famous paintings from 1809 until Miss Linwood's death in 1845. The hall was used for the exhibition of various panoramas and similar entertainments until the Savile House was destroyed by fire in 1865 (Survey of London, Vol. XXXIV, p. 462).

The Times, September 1, 1849.


Handbill for Smith's panorama, bound with the British Museum copy of the preceding title.
36 McDermott, p. 165. It is unlikely that these panoramas were actually three or four miles long. For canvases of these lengths to completely unwind in one and a half to two and a half hours, the images would have had to pass before the audience at an uncomfortable speed. While The Illustrated London News (March 30, 1850) stated that the Ohio section of Banvard's panorama alone was 1,200 yards, McDermott (p. 167) quotes an American periodical of 1849 which states that the entire production (although the Ohio River had not yet been added) was only four hundred and forty yards in length. According to Timbs (1855 edition, p. 582), Smith's panorama presented ten scenes—each twenty feet long—every fifteen minutes, and the whole presentation lasted only one and a half hours. Thus the total length of the panorama was 1,200 feet, or 2,000 feet if it, in fact, took two and a half hours.

37 McDermott, p. 55.

38 "I, the undersigned, have had the pleasure of visiting J. R. Smith's panorama of the Mississippi, and cordially recommend it as a work of art—displaying uncommon taste and genius, and as affording high mental gratification. Thos. Sully" (Professor Risley and Mr. J. R. Smith's Original Gigantic Moving Panorama of the Mississippi River).

39 The Times, April 10, 1849.

40 Ibid., March 24, 1849; April 27 and June 15, 1850. Banvard claimed that panoramas other than his own were being advertised in the provinces under his name. As Risley and Smith exhibited in their own names, Banvard's complaints may in part have been directed against other provincial exhibitors.

41 McDermott, p. 48.

42 Ibid., p. 182n.


44 The Times, October 26, 1853, and July 27, 1854.


46 Ibid., February 7, 1850.

47 Ibid., April 23, 1850, and December 3, 1851.

48 Ibid., May 6, 1851.
Bonomi spent eight years in Egypt from 1824 and another two years there from 1842. In 1833 he accompanied the architect and panoramist, Frederick Catherwood, on a tour of the Holy Land. Bonomi and Catherwood appeared as foreground figures in the Burford panorama of Jerusalem which was painted from Catherwood's sketches (see Pl. 62).

The Times, January 16 and March 16, 1852.
In September, 1851 (Ibid., September 12, 1851), the Nile was transferred from the Egyptian Hall to the Gallery of the New Watercolour Society.

The Illustrated London News, March 30, 1850.

The Times, September 1, 1849.

Bonomi spent eight years in Egypt from 1824 and another two years there from 1842. In 1833 he accompanied the architect and panoramist, Frederick Catherwood, on a tour of the Holy Land. Bonomi and Catherwood appeared as foreground figures in the Burford panorama of Jerusalem which was painted from Catherwood's sketches (see Pl. 62).

The Times, January 16 and March 16, 1852.
In September, 1851 (Ibid., September 12, 1851), the Nile was transferred from the Egyptian Hall to the Gallery of the New Watercolour Society.

The Illustrated London News, March 30, 1850.

The Times, September 1, 1849.

Bononi spent eight years in Egypt from 1824 and another two years there from 1842. In 1833 he accompanied the architect and panoramist, Frederick Catherwood, on a tour of the Holy Land. Bonomi and Catherwood appeared as foreground figures in the Burford panorama of Jerusalem which was painted from Catherwood's sketches (see Pl. 62).

The Times, January 16 and March 16, 1852.
In September, 1851 (Ibid., September 12, 1851), the Nile was transferred from the Egyptian Hall to the Gallery of the New Watercolour Society.
p. 135 which he opened in Paris in 1860, nine years after the appearance of the Holy Land. Robert Burford had also anticipated Langlois with his own panorama of Sebastopol from photographs (taken, as Langlois's were, from the Malakoff Tower), which opened in 1856 (The Times, February 4, 1856).

67 The Times, May 16, 1851.
68 Ibid., May 20, 1851.
69 Ibid., September 8, 1851.
70 Ibid., November 30, 1851.
71 Ibid., April 9, 1853.
72 Ibid., June 7, 1853.
73 Three different subjects were shown alternately: the Wanderings of the Israelites, Nineveh, and Palestine (Ibid., September 9, 1854).
74 Ibid., June 23, and August 4, 1855.
75 Ibid., April 19 and May 15, 1850.
76 Ibid., February 19, 1853.
77 Ibid., May 21, 1850.
78 Ibid., December 27, 1851. Yates (Vol. I, p. 145) recalled that "far the best of all these panoramic shows was the series exhibited at the Old Gallery of Illustration in Waterloo Place, called "The Overland Route," and representing all the principal places between Southampton and Calcutta."
79 The other artists were Herring and Absolon. David Roberts was only mentioned in connection with the diorama by The Illustrated London News (March 30, 1850).
80 The Times, February 21 and October 28, 1852.
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81 In addition to his work for the theatres, Phillips, who was the only pupil of Clarkson Stanfield, was also a prolific landscape painter. He had bought and enlarged the Ewer Saloon in Lambeth in 1837-38, intending to produce musical shows illustrated by panoramas, but the scheme failed (Erroll Sherson, London's Lost Theatres of the Nineteenth Century [London: John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1925], p. 314). Louis Haghe, a Belgian-born artist, was a leading watercolourist in England. In 1873 he was elected
p. 138 president of the New Watercolour Society (Grant, p. 84). Knell was undoubtedly one of the three related marine painters: J. H., William Adolphus, or W. Calcott (Grant, p. 110).

82 The Times, October 14, 1850.
83 Ibid., November 25, 1850.
84 Ibid., December 7, 1850, and March 5, 1851.
85 Ibid., March 24, 1851.
86 Ibid., December 19, 1853, and January 23, 1854.
87 Ibid., December 8 and 12, 1851.
88 Ibid., September 9, 1853.
89 Ibid., January 10, 1854.
90 Ibid., December 19, 1849.
91 Ibid., May 25, 1850.
92 Ibid., January 15, 1851.
93 Ibid., March 27, 1850, and January 6, 1851.
94 Ibid., January 26, 1852.
95 Ibid., August 7, 1852, and April 6, 1855.
96 "Advice may be the means of your making thousands in the Colony" (Ibid., January 28, 1850).
97 Ibid., April 29 and August 5, 1851.
98 Ibid., February 28, 1851.
99 Ibid., March 19 and May 14, 1851.
100 Ibid., February 15, April 11 and 17, and October 6, 1851.
101 Ibid., March 6, 1850.
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103 Ibid., March 23, 1854.
104 Ibid., January 21, 1851.
105 Ibid., April 19, 1850.
Exhibiting with the panorama of The Search for Franklin was an entertainment called the Diaphora, which depicted the Lisbon Earthquake (Ibid., December 23, 1851).

Like the earlier scenes, those constituting the War with Russia were painted by Grieve and Telbin (Ibid., December 5, 1854).

Fenton's photographs were on display at the Gallery of the New Watercolour Society (Ibid., September 22, 1855); Robertson's were shown at Mr. Kilburn's Gallery, 222 Regent Street (Ibid., December 18, 1855). These seem to have been the first photographic exhibitions devoted to a topical subject to appear in London.

"Mr. Albert Smith unites two distinct classes of entertainment—the instructive diorama, which has, of late, become so much the rage, and the humorous song and characteristic sketch." Beverley's illustrations to the lecture were separate paintings "not connected as in other moving dioramas" (Ibid., May 29, 1850).

Description of a View of Salzburg in Austria; and a Vast Extent of the Surrounding Beautiful Country, Now Exhibiting in the Large Circle of the Panorama, Leicester Square (London: W. J. Golbourn [1852]).
125 The Times, May 21, 1850. It was, however, felt by some that Burford would do well to adopt some of the characteristics of the moving panoramas for his own exhibition. "The attractiveness of the exhibition would be enhanced if musical accessories were introduced, or something attempted in the nature of a descriptive narrative of the many objects of interest which the panoramas display" (Ibid., April 14, 1857).


127 Burford's claim that his panoramas were equal in quality to "gallery pictures" was supported by his obituarist in the Art Journal (Vol. VII [March, 1861], p. 76): "There have been, as we often remarked when writing of his pictures, passages in them [the panoramas] which, if framed and hung up, would have graced any gallery, free and broad as their execution was."

128 The Times, February 11, 1850.

129 Ibid., April 14, 1851.

130 Ibid., December 15, 1851.

131 Ibid., November 13, 1852. This was the same painting which Burford had exhibited in 1842. At that time it was stated that "the panorama which was exhibited shortly after the Battle, having been long since totally destroyed, Mr. Burford has availed himself (by the kind permission of Mr. Barker) of the original drawings taken on the spot, and the various important information collected from officers and others present, by that gentleman" (Description of a View of the Battle of Waterloo . . . Now Exhibiting at the Panorama, Leicester Square [London: T. Bretteil, 1842]).

132 The Times, December 19, 1853.

133 Ibid., October 26, 1854.

134 Ibid., December 24, 1856, and January 9, 1857.


136 The Times, December 28, 1857.

137 Ibid., March 28, 1856.
138 Ibid., February 9, 1856.
139 Ibid., March 22, 1856.
140 Ibid., April 29, 1856.
141 Ibid., September 14, 1857.
142 Ibid., December 28, 1857.
143 Ibid., January 19 and March 26, 1858.
144 Ibid., April 30, 1858.
145 Ibid., April 6, 1858.
146 Ibid., May 20, 1858.
147 Ibid., June 18, 1859.
148 Ibid., August 4, 1860. "This is a combination of scenic effect, pictorial beauty, and dexterity, which has seldom or never been surpassed by any of the previously tried means of producing combined effects. . . . the real waterfall, and the smoking chimneys, and the revolving waterwheels, and the other stereoscopic objects, still or in motion, will no doubt charm the simple, and make the uninitiated wonder" (Art Journal, Vol. VI [November, 1860], p. 350).
149 The Times, September 24, 1860.
150 Ibid., July 29, 1861.
151 Ibid., January 20, 1862.
152 Ibid., May 22, 1862.
153 Ibid., September 5, 1863.
154 Ibid., November 10, 1863.
157 The Times, December 21, 1860.
158 Selous (originally Slous until he anglicized his name in 1834) was born in Deptford in 1803. He was a student in the Royal Academy schools in 1818 and is sometimes said to have been a student of John Martin. Certainly the panorama of Pandemonium is a paraphrase of Martin's work. Selous gained some
p. 152 popularity as a book illustrator and in 1843 was awarded a £100 premium in the Westminster Cartoon Competition. For an account of his life, see the obituaries in The Times, October 7, 1890, and The Illustrated London News, October 11, 1890.

159 The Times, September 3, 1861.

160 Ibid., January 6, 1863. Selous’s canvases of Ancient and Modern Jerusalem had been on show in London in 1861 (Ibid., March 14, 1861).


162 The Times, September 3, 1861.

p. 153 Ibid., April 1, 1861. When the old Burford panoramas were brought back in 1863, the admission price returned to one shilling per panorama.

164 Ibid., February 13, 1863.

165 Ibid., June 15, 1864.

166 The conversion was to plans by the early exponent of iron ecclesiastical architecture, Louis-Auguste Boileau. His design, which made extensive use of cast-iron arches and ribs, created a Greek cross within the existing circular shell of the panorama building. The church was severely damaged during the Second World War. It was subsequently rebuilt in a form which preserves the cross-within-the-circle layout (Survey of London, Vol. XXXIV, p. 484, and [D. Raabe and P. O’Reilly] Notre Dame de France, Leicester Square [London, 1965]).
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1 The Times, April 22, 1867.

2 Ibid., December 29, 1869.
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3 Hamilton’s New York Illustrated News, and Guide to the Excursions across the Atlantic gave the date as 1851; the Guide Book to Hamilton’s Last New Excursions, a Journey of Nearly 20,000 Miles within 120 Minutes, Visiting the Principal Cities, Streets, Natural Scenery and Buildings at Home and Abroad gave the date as 1852 (both these and the following descriptive booklets for Hamilton exhibitions are in the National Library of Scotland).

4 The Times, December 26, 1849.
5 Joseph Hamilton's Original Overland Route to Our Great Indian Empire.

6 Hamilton's New York Illustrated News.

7 Joseph Hamilton's Original Overland Route.


10 Mr. Joseph Poole's Royal Jubilee Myriorama Depicting the Principal Events and Scenes Connected with Her Majesty's Reign (in the N. L. S.). Again in 1937 the Poole Company, which had continued in the entertainment industry even after the demise of the panorama, reiterated their claim of having been established in 1837 in 100 Years of Showmanship: Poole's 1837-1937 ([Edinburgh: Pillans & Wilson, 1937], p. 2).

11 The first appearance of Gompertz in London was the 1851 exhibition of the Voyage through the Arctic Regions. Although he did not return to London after the exhibition of the Spectroscope in 1867, he continued to exhibit in Edinburgh and elsewhere until at least 1876, when his last show to appear in Edinburgh, England and Russia, opened there (The Scotsman, June 27, 1876).

12 The exhibition opened on November 28 (The Times, November 21, 1870). The identity of the associate, Mr. Young, is not known.

13 The Times, November 28, 1870. Some relationship between Gompertz and Poole and Young is suggested by the fact that their listed subjects are almost identical. The Sikh War in Punjab, Franklin's Expedition to the Arctic Regions, The Russian War, The Indian Mutiny, and America in Peace and War were all shown by both.

14 One Hundred Years of Showmanship, p. 8.

15 Ibid., pp. 4 and 8.

16 Ibid., p. 12.

17 The Times, November 21, 1870.

18 The Scotsman, October 2, 1888.
This was Herr Strauss whose diorama of the Russo-Turkish War opened at Weldon's Circus on August 31 (Ibid., August 30 and September 2, 1878).

Hamilton was exhibiting at the Agricultural Hall in September (The Times, September 15, 1870); Poole and Young's panorama opened at the Egyptian Hall on November 28 (Ibid., November 21, 1870); Montague's diorama commenced at Westbourne Hall, Bayswater, on October 24 (Ibid., October 20, 1870); and Wallis's opened at the Palais Royal, Argyll Street, Oxford Circus, on November 24 (Ibid., November 22, 1870).

May's Pantoscope opened on June 10. Among the French artists who assisted May were the battle painters, Henri Dupray and E. Armand-Dumaresq. "It has been the special object of the co-operation in the production of these works of art to show to what extent distemper may replace oil-colour in the treatment of large historical subjects and to display the fact that size painting, when properly employed, may rival the oil process with advantage in brilliancy of effect, in strength of colour and correctness of tonality" (Ibid., June 7, 1871).

The "Grand Panorama and Dioramic Views" were exhibited in the Regent Hall, Tichbourne Street (Ibid., November 28, 1874).

This Excursion was at the Agricultural Hall in 1874 (Ibid., July 4, 1874); at the St. James's Hall, Regent Street, in 1875 (Ibid., July 27, 1875); and at Hamilton's Royal Amphitheatre, Holborn, in 1878 (Ibid., November 16, 1878). It may also have appeared in London prior to 1874, for, when it opened in Edinburgh in 1873, it was advertised as having come from St. James's Hall and the Royal Agricultural Hall (The Scotsman, October 1, 1873).

Friend's entertainment opened at the Egyptian Hall on December 21 (The Times, December 21, 1876).

Gillard's panorama opened at the St. James's Hall on July 19 (Ibid., July 10, 1873). A review of the panorama when it was shown in Edinburgh stated that "the panorama itself, instead of being designed on the usual plan by which one subject is made to shade off into another, or volumes of cloud are introduced to cover the transition, presents a series of distinct paintings, each of which, when unrolled, exactly fills an oblong frame, covered with dark cloth so as to afford an effective foil" (The Scotsman, January 18, 1876).
The Scotsman, April 30, 1872.

The Times, December 20, 1877.

Ibid., May 4, 1887. The statue had been dedicated by President Grover Cleveland on October 28, 1886.

Corry's entertainment opened at the Palais Royal, Argyll Street, on September 12, 1870 (Ibid., September 5, 1870).

Birrell's diorama opened at the Agricultural Hall on March 17 and Lamb's at the Egyptian Hall on March 24 (Ibid., March 12 and 14, 1873).

The Scotsman, November 12, 1872.

Adams's diorama opened on May 18 (The Times, May 16, 1885).

Ibid., September 5, 1870.

Rimington's Colour Organ was designed to accompany orchestral concerts or piano recitals. When played like a conventional organ, it produced no sound but projected a changing pattern of colour onto a screen before the audience. Rimington's was only one of a number of similar devices invented in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, although the earliest experiments were in the eighteenth century. In the early part of that century Louis Bertrand Castel constructed a "clavecin oculaire" with an arrangement of coloured tapes attached to the keys of a harpsichord. In 1789 Erasmus Darwin devised a similar scheme, making use of the argand lamp to project the colours (Percy A. Sholes, "Colour and Music," The Oxford Companion to Music [London: Oxford University Press, 1950], pp. 181-189).

We welcome with unfeigned satisfaction the revival of the panorama in this country. For a long time it has here suffered from undeserved neglect; but in Paris, Berlin, and in the United States it has well maintained its popularity (The Illustrated London News, Vol. XCII [March 10, 1888], p. 244).

The architect was M. L. Dumoulin of Paris (Survey of London, Vol. XXXIV, p. 464).

The Times, March 22, 1881.
40 Ibid., May 3, 1881.
42 The Times, May 31, 1881; Bapst, p. 25.
43 The Times, June 2, 1881.
44 Ibid.
46 Ibid., June 6, 1887, and March 17, 1888.
47 Ibid., May 9, 1890; Bapst, p. 29.
48 Bapst, p. 7.
49 The Times, April 20, May 11, 1893, and May 25, 1896.
50 Ibid., May 20, 1881.
51 Ibid.
52 Ibid.
53 Castellani's Waterloo closed in January (Ibid., January 13, 1882); Pichat's Tel-el-Kebir opened on July 5 (Ibid., July 4, 1882).
55 The Times, March 8, 1888.
57 One of these Philippoteaux Cycloramas, representing the Battle of Gettysburg in the American Civil War, was later established as a permanent exhibition at the site of the battlefield in Pennsylvania, where it remains on view.
58 "There was some difficulty in getting it across the water, for the owners of the steamer informed the proprietor that the only place where it could be accommodated was on the deck, and that is how it came over,
in one solid roll weighing eight tons. It took up the whole of the deck, and cost £2,000 for freight" (Tit-Bits, Vol. XXIV [April 29, 1893], p. 60).

59 The Times, March 17, 1888.
60 Ibid., April 18, May 17, 1888, and November 27, 1890.
61 The Scotsman, April 24, 1889.
64 Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 227-228.
65 The Times, December 24, 1890.
66 Jerusalem closed on November 29, and Cairo opened on December 19 (Ibid., November 24 and December 17, 1891).
67 Niagara in Winter opened on July 31 (Ibid., July 31, 1893).
68 Ibid., April 24, 1894.
69 British patents were taken out by Barber on November 27, 1894 (No. 22990) and March 7, 1898 (No. 5532). A similar system, under the name Stereopticon Cyclorama, had been invented in America by Charles A. Chase and first exhibited in 1894. In Chase's system the projectors were suspended from the ceiling rather than mounted on a platform. Louis Lumière also developed a similar system, which was exhibited in Paris in 1901 (John Barnes, Catalogue of the Collection, Barnes Museum of Cinematography, Part I, Precursors of the Cinema [Saint Ives, Cornwall, 1967], pp. 29-30).
70 How long the Electrorama actually was open is uncertain. It was advertised briefly in June, 1897 (The Times, June 6, 1897), and Barnes (p. 29) notes that it was exhibited for just two weeks in May, 1898.
71 The panorama opened at the beginning of January (The Times, January 1, 1890).
72 The Scotsman, June 2, 1888.
The Royal Naval Exhibition opened on May 2. The panorama presented "realistic scenes on board H. M. S. Victory" (The Times, April 29 and May 1, 1891).

Jerusalem opened on Easter Monday, April 18 (Ibid., April 13, 1892). There is at present no Ashley Gardens adjoining Victoria Street. It seems probable that the address should properly have read "Ashley Place," which is off Victoria Street, and that Jerusalem occupied the same building as Fleischer's Waterloo, which had been withdrawn sometime early in 1891 (Ibid., January 15, 1891).

The Analyticon was exhibited in Edinburgh from December 27, 1897, to January 8, 1898, as part of a programme which also included cinematographic subjects (The Scotsman, December 22 and 28, 1897).

The Analyticon was exhibited in Edinburgh from December 27, 1897, to January 8, 1898, as part of a programme which also included cinematographic subjects (The Scotsman, December 22 and 28, 1897).

The Analyticon was exhibited in Edinburgh from December 27, 1897, to January 8, 1898, as part of a programme which also included cinematographic subjects (The Scotsman, December 22 and 28, 1897).

Experiments in cycloramic cinema by Walt Disney in the 1950s led to exhibitions at the Brussels World Fair in 1958 and at Disneyland in California. A system of three hundred and sixty degree cinema was also developed by the Russians, but the format has never become widely popular (Barnes, Part I, pp. 27, 30-31).

CHAPTER VIII

Scaled-down painted versions of the panoramas like the Ker Porter painting of Seringapatam (Pl. 28-30) or the Knox painting of Old Glasgow Bridge (Pl. 49) bring us a step closer to the actual panoramas but can tell us little about the handling and effect of the full-scale work. Another painted version of part of a panorama composition is H. A. Barker's view of Gibraltar (Pl. 51) which was in the Leger Galleries in London in 1972. The painting, signed and dated 1804, presents part of the panorama of Gibraltar which was presented at Leicester Square in 1805 (see Pl. 52).

The Morning Chronicle, March 14, 1789.

The Diary; or Woodfall's Register, June 10, 1789.
At the end of the long succession of Barker-Burford panoramas initiated by the view of Edinburgh, an obituarist of Robert Burford commented that "the topographical accuracy of his pictures constituted one of their chief excellencies, and gained for them the most favourable testimony of those best acquainted with the respective localities and scenes" (*Art Journal*, Vol. VII [March, 1861], p. 76).

Captain Basil Hall, the noted travel writer, wrote of Niagara Falls that it could only be adequately represented by a panorama and that the panorama would have to be painted by someone who had been on the spot himself and taken his own sketches (quoted in the *Description of a View of the Falls of Niagara Now Exhibiting at the Panorama, Leicester Square* [London: T. Brettell, 1833]). Hall's requirements were met by Robert Burford, who visited the Falls in the course of an American tour in the autumn of 1832 which also resulted in a panorama of New York City.

Farington (Greig, Vol. V, p. 10) recorded in 1808 that William Alexander was to supply Barker with drawings for a panorama of Rio de Janeiro for seventy guineas. The deal must have fallen through, for a panorama of that subject did not appear at Leicester Square until 1827, from drawings taken in 1823. Farington (Ibid.) also stated that Barker had given Henry Salt, a former pupil of Farington and British Consul-General in Egypt, one hundred guineas for the use of drawings of the Pyramids. A view of Cairo appeared in 1809. Another view of Cairo appeared at Leicester Square in 1847 from drawings by David Roberts.

S. C. Erees's panoramas of New Zealand and Calcutta are examples of such an enterprise.

H. A. Barker's journals of his stay in Constantinople (N. L. S; MSS. 9647-9648) would undoubtedly have contained reference to such a device had he employed one. In his taking of the view of Edinburgh, H. A. Barker employed a movable frame (Corner, p. 4). In an account of his expenses for taking the views of Paris in 1802 (N. L. S. MS. 9649), there is included six livres for a tin drawing frame.

10 As early as 1845, Friedrich von Martens, a German daguerreotypist working in Paris, was taking panoramic views (with an angle of more than 150 degrees) with a camera of his own invention. In London Francis Frith exhibited an eight foot long photographic view of Cairo in 1856 and nine years later a thirty-five foot long panoramic photograph of Krupp's steelworks was shown (for these and other examples of panoramic photography in the nineteenth century, see Helmut and Alison Gernsheim, The History of Photography from the Camera Obscura to the Beginning of the Modern Era [London: Thames and Hudson, 1969], pp. 119, 126-127, and 316-317).

11 The Times, December 26, 1849.


13 A review of Burford's panorama of Milan which appeared in The Times (May 30, 1832) appeared at first to advocate artistic licence: "If mere accuracy were all that is to be achieved by such paintings as panoramas have become under the improvements which have taken place of late years, they would only be one degree above maps or the drawings of architects. It has however, been shown most satisfactorily, that they are capable of producing much more exalted effects. In painting, as in all other departments of the Fine Arts, it is in proportion that the fidelity of the representation is enhanced by the ideal charms with which the artist is enabled, by the force of his genius, to invest it, that it becomes the source of enjoyment to the beholders." However, when he turned his attention to the actual picture, the reviewer simply criticized the choice of viewpoint, which, being midway up the Cathedral's elevation, did not present a picturesque view of the Cathedral.

14 It is difficult to know to what extent the travellers and soldiers who provided sketches for more distant views were aware of compositional subtleties. In these views of less visited locations, the panorama painter was undoubtedly freer to manipulate his material without incurring criticism for lack of truthfulness.

15 The Times, March 13, 1848. Neither the Karlskirche or the Mouseion (the viewpoints of the panoramas of Vienna and Athens) were actually outside the city, even taking into account the difference in the cities' sizes in the nineteenth century and today. The keyed outline plate of the view of Athens makes the Acropolis appear to be at a greater distance from the Mouseion than is actually the case. It is impossible to say if the panorama itself also gave this impression.
Hermann G. Pundt, in Schinkel's Berlin: A Study in Environmental Planning ([Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972], pp. 103-105), considers Karl Schinkel's early work as a panoramist to have contributed significantly to his understanding of large-scale public environments.

The Times, February 4, 1837.

This view was also unusual in that the viewpoint was not some point on the square or the surrounding buildings but hovered in mid-air above the square.

There is no indication of this in the reviews of the panorama. According to the Repository of Arts (2nd series, Vol. VIII [July 1, 1819], p. 40), "it is very well executed, and has been much praised for the correctness of the architectural drawings."

The Times, February 26, 1838.

The ideas in this paragraph derive largely from statements about the psychology of representation by E. H. Gombrich in Art and Illusion (London: Phaidon Press, Ltd., 1960).

Dufourny, p. 168.


The Morning Chronicle, April 23, 1830.

The Times, May 13, 1837.

The Morning Chronicle, August 31, 1824.

Repository of Arts, 3rd series, Vol. IV (October 1, 1824), p. 245.


The Morning Chronicle, August 22, 1829.

Ibid., August 31, 1824.


The Art-Union, Vol. III (September 1, 1841), p. 158.

The Times, July 16, 1832.

CHAPTER IX

p. 196

p. 197
2 Whitley, Artists and Their Friends in England, 1700-1799, Vol. II (London: The Medici Society, 1928), p. 107. I have not been able to find this particular testimonial; however, in an advertisement in The Edinburgh Evening Courant (February 2, 1788), Barker mentioned that his initial sketch of Edinburgh had gained West's approbation.

3 Bapst, p. 17.

4 Dufourny, pp. 168-170.

p. 198
5 Ibid., p. 169.


8 Farington noted visits to the panoramas of Spithead (typescript, April 19, 1794), Gibraltar, and Dublin (August 4, 1808) at the Leicester Square Rotunda, to the panorama of Rome in the Strand (May 17, 1804), and to Ker Porter's Serangapatam (July 28, 1800) and Acre (August 8, 1801). Haydon noted seeing the Leicester Square panoramas of Pompeii (The Diary of Benjamin Robert Haydon, ed. Willard Bissell Pope, Vol. II [Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1963], p. 451), Père La Chaise (Vol. IV, p. 245), and Mount Blanc (Vol. IV, p. 403).

p. 199
9 Constable, Correspondence, Vol. II, p. 34.

10 Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 134.


p. 200  13 John Ruskin, The Works of John Ruskin, ed. E. T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn, Vol. XXIV (London: George Allen, 1908), p. 117. Ruskin was, in fact, mistaken in his remembrance of the view. The station was not on the roof of the Cathedral but on a nearby building, so that the Cathedral itself occupied much of the painting.


p. 203  16 Ibid., Vol. XXVI, p. 567.

p. 204  17 Ibid., Vol. XII, p. 349.

p. 205  18 Risley and Smith's Original Gigantic Moving Panorama of the Mississippi River, pp. viii-ix.

p. 206  19 Morning Herald, December 6, 1802.

p. 207  20 The Times, June 14, 1830.

p. 208  21 Ibid., February 9, 1859.


p. 211  24 The Times, December 27, 1851.


p. 213  26 Victoria and Albert showed a particular interest in panoramas and dioramas. In addition to the visit to the Colosseum (see Chap. V) and the command performances of Banvard's and J. R. Smith's moving panoramas (see Chap. VI), Albert visited the Leicester Square Panorama in 1844 to see the picture of Trepôrt (The Times, June 7, 1844). The Overland Mail to India "received the highest approbation of H. R. H. Prince Albert and the Royal Family" (Ibid., April 4, 1854), and Edward's Solvorema was "patronised by Her Majesty and Royal Family" (Ibid., February 21, 1856).


p. 216  29 Ibid., April 3, 1822.

p. 217  30 A Description of the Colosseum as Re-Opened in MDCCCXLV, p. 3.
the print, of course, derived its name from exhibition in Regent's Park. The original intention was to produce "a similar grand picture to that so long exhibited at the Colosseum." It was decided, however, to take the Duke of York's Column rather than St. Paul's as the viewpoint (Ibid., October 29, 1842).

The Times, December 27, 1861.


Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, Vol. XV (April, 1824), pp. 472-473. This article was reprinted in the Somerset House Gazette (Vol. II [June 12, 1824], pp. 151-153).


The Times, January 21, 1851.

"An Extraordinary Traveller," p. 77.

The Morning Chronicle, December 23, 1830.

Risley and Smith's Original Gigantic Moving Panorama of the Mississippi River, p. ix.


"Panoramas," Chambers's Journal, XIII, p. 34.

Hornor, Prospectus, pp. 20-21.
NOTES

p. 217 49 H. A. Barker, quoted in Corner, p. 10.
Barker made no reference to any such remark by Nelson in the journal he was keeping at the time (N. L. S. MS. 9647). The following year Barker again met Nelson at Copenhagen while taking the view and obtaining particulars of the battle. It is possible that Nelson's remark was made at this time.

p. 218 50 Bapst, p. 18.

53 The Times, March 2, 1863.
54 Klingender, p. 105.


p. 221 56 These examples of the use of the word are from the O. E. D. (Vol. VII, p. 426), which provides other illustrations of nineteenth century usage of the word.


APPENDIX A

2 Fawcett's The Rise of English Provincial Art provides a valuable survey of the growth of art outside London in the first three decades of the nineteenth century. His chapter, "Art and the Wider Public," includes a section on panoramas and dioramas (pp. 153-158).

p. 225 3 The Caledonian Mercury, December 10, 1796.
The dates and locations of all subsequent panorama exhibitions in Edinburgh are derived from advertisements in The Caledonian Mercury and The Scotsman.
Details of the size and nature of the view were only given in the advertisements for its later reappearances in Edinburgh (The Caledonian Mercury, February 29, 1812).

It is not clear whether the Nile which appeared in 1802 was the same one exhibited in Edinburgh two years earlier. The second Nile was advertised as "an entire New Painting by Livesey" (Ibid., December 18, 1802). Presumably this "Livesey" was Richard Livesay, a pupil of Benjamin West, whose numerous contributions to the R. A. exhibitions, while largely portraits, did include marine subjects in 1796, 1800, and 1804 (Graves, Vol. V, pp. 73-74).

The panoramas of Norwich and Edinburgh both seem to have been circular, Norwich taken from the Castle (The Caledonian Mercury, April 8, 1802), and Edinburgh from the Calton Hill (Ibid., January 22, 1803).

The building opposite the New College had apparently been removed by this time.

No artist for the view of Ben Lomond was named in the advertisements (Ibid., July 29, 1811).

Ker Porter's Seringapatam and De Maria's Paris reappeared in Edinburgh at this building on the Mound, Seringapatam in 1811 and Paris in 1812.

"This picture contains every remarkable object in that most interesting track of country, from Gravesend up to Windsor, including a space of nearly fifty miles. The views were taken the beginning of last summer and have occupied the artist ever since" (The Caledonian Mercury, February 2, 1811).

"This picture, the execution of which has occupied the artist during a period of nine months, contains views of the most remarkable and interesting objects in the British metropolis, from drawings made on the spot, in the early part of 1811. The whole enlivened with numerous and appropriate figures, &c." (Ibid., February 22, 1812).

The panorama of Rome which appeared in Leith Walk in 1818 had been exhibited at the Strand from 1804 to 1805. Of the subsequent paintings shown in Leith Walk, Venice and Naples also came from the Strand. St. Petersburg came from Leicester Square, and the Waterloo might have come from either London establishment. Confusion over the origin of the paintings undoubtedly resulted from the take-over of the Strand Panorama by H. A. Barker and John Eurford, just two years prior to the appearance of these pictures in Edinburgh.
14 The Marshalls had begun exhibiting on the Mound in 1819 with a Grand Historical Peristrephic Panorama of the Battle of Algiers. This had been succeeded in 1820 by The Battles of Ligny, Les Quatre Eras, and Waterloo; The Shipwreck of the Medusa, also in 1820; and The Polar Regions and the Coronation of George IV in 1821.

15 The following peristrephic panoramas appeared at the Marshall Rotunda from 1821: The Shipwreck and Raft of the Medusa (1822), The Battle of Trafalgar (1822, 1833, 1841), Bonaparte (1823, 1826, 1833), The Battles of Ligny, Les Quatre Eras, and Waterloo (1824, 1826, 1841), Bonaparte's Invasion of Russia (1826), The Battle of Bannockburn (1827), The Battle of Navarina (1828, 1831), Constantinople (1828), The French Revolution of 1830 (1830), The Coronation of William IV (1831), The Siege of Warsaw (1832), Parry's Voyages in Search of a Northwest Passage (1832), The Siege of Antwerp (1834), Ross's Expedition to the Polar Regions (1834), Niagara Falls and Canadian Scenes (1834, 1838), New Zealand (1836, 1839), The Coronation of Queen Victoria (1838), Canton (1839), The Eglinton Tournament (1840), and The Chinese War (1841, 1842). Scenes from the above were often extracted and shown in combination with scenes of other subjects, such mixed programmes becoming more frequent in the later years.

The following Barker and Burford circular panoramas were shown: Corfu (1825, 1830), Naples (1827), Venice (1829), and Florence (1835). It seems that by the late 1830s the peristrephic panorama had so eclipsed the original circular form in popularity that circular panoramas of New York, Jerusalem, Thebes, and Florence were cut up into individual scenes and displayed in the manner of moving panoramas.

16 My first remembrance of Princes Street goes back to the year 1818. It then contained few, if any, shops to the west of Hanover Street. At the foot of the Mound stood Marshall's Panorama on the site of the present Royal Institution. It may be said that it was itself an "institution" in those days. It was a great attraction to our country cousins; for at this time, apart from the theatre, there were few other places of public amusement. To make way for the present building it was removed farther up the Mound, where it remained a good many years. Its final removal was not to be regretted, as it was a large, round and rather unsightly wooden structure" (George Croal, Living Memories of an Octogenarian, Chiefly of Edinburgh, from the Years 1816 to 1845 [Edinburgh: Andrew Elliot, 1894], pp. 17-18).

17 Peter Marshall died on January 27, 1826, at the age of sixty-seven (Redgrave, A Dictionary of Artists, p. 287).
18. The following subjects (all from the Regent's Park Diorama in London) appeared at the Lothian Road Diorama: Trinity Chapel in Canterbury Cathedral (1825, 1831), Chartres Cathedral (1827), The Valley of Sarnen (1828, 1831), Holyrood Chapel (1829), Ruins in Fog (1832), The Village of Unterseen (1833), The Port of Erest (1834), The Village of Thiers (1838), The Crypt of the Cathedral of St. Denis (1839), and Mount St. Gothard (1841).

19. The Caledonian Mercury, November 6, 1830.

20. The Scotsman, December 18, 1841.

21. The following Gompertz exhibitions appeared in Edinburgh: The War with Russia (1856), Garibaldi in Italy (1861), Lord Elgin's Tour through Japan and China (1862), The Spectroscope (1868), The Franco-Prussian War (1870), Sir Samuel Baker's Route up the Nile to Dr. Livingstone's Discoveries in Africa (1873), and The Marriage of the Duke of Edinburgh and the Grand Duchess Marie (1874).

22. Poole and Young's Overland Mail Route to India opened on January 31, 1874, at the Operetta House. Another Overland Route with new scenes, but incorporating many views from the previous panorama, was brought to Edinburgh by Poole and Young in 1876.


24. These included Hill's Overland Route to India (1855); Hampton's diorama combining the Napoleonic Wars and the Crimean Campaigns (1856); Sinclair's Grand Historical Panorama of Russia and India (1859), which reappeared in the following year with scenes of Italy substituted for those of Russia; J. J. Story's panorama of seventy-four European scenes (1871); and the Hamilton and Overend Dioramic Excursions (1883 and 1885), which warned against confusion with the Hamilton Brothers' Excursions.


APPENDIX B


8 The rotunda opened with "A Panorama View of the City of Paris, by Barker" (Phelps Stokes, The Iconography of Manhattan Island, Vol. V, p. 1,601). This may have been either of the two panoramas of the city exhibited in the Strand in 1815 or the one exhibited in the upper circle of Leicester Square in 1803. The panorama of Paris was followed by panoramas of Athens, Mexico, and then Vanderlyn's Versailles (Dunlap, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 40).

9 Gardner and Feld, p. 123.

10 The panorama survives in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, where it was exhibited in 1956. It is the only full-scale circular panorama known to have survived from the first half of the nineteenth century.

11 In 1824 Vanderlyn wrote of the failure of Versailles: "The taste of the public is not strong, and requires to be studied & courted in this community particularly . . . Had I bestowed my time and attention in painting a view of N. York instead of Versailles, I should I am convinced have reaped more profits--but [I] was not aware of the general ignorance here respecting Versailles, and its former brilliant court etc." (quoted by Gardner and Feld, p. 124).
Dunlap, Vol. II, Part 1, pp. 40-41. Among the panoramas exhibited were those of Geneva, the Battle of Lodi, the Battle of Waterloo, and the Battle of Paris. Geneva may have been the panorama exhibited at the Strand in 1827-1828. The Battle of Waterloo may have been the panorama of the subject exhibited at the Strand in 1816. The public was assured that the Battle of Paris was "a genuine work of H. A. Barker" (Odell, Vol. II, p. 539). It had been exhibited in the upper circle at Leicester Square from 1815 to 1817. Lodi would seem to have been the Ker Porter picture.

Catherwood may also have assisted in the painting of these panoramas, and lectured before the panorama of Jerusalem when it exhibited at Leicester Square (Victor Wolfgang von Hagen, Frederick Catherwood, Archt. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1950), pp. 41-42.

Ibid., p. 45.

Ibid., p. 50. Niagara, Lima, and Thebes had already been exhibited at Leicester Square by 1838, but Baalbec would not appear there until 1844.

Ibid., pp. 82-83.


McDermott (pp. 9-13, 74) provides a listing of panoramic exhibitions which appeared in St. Louis from 1830 to 1850.


This was May and Kyle's Pilgrim's Progress, which exhibited on Broadway in New York in 1850 (Lee Parry, "Landscape Theatre in America," Art in America, Vol. LIX [November-December, 1971], p. 59).

McDermott includes full accounts of all these panoramas of the Mississippi River.

Lewis took his panorama to Europe late in 1851. He was exhibiting in Berlin in January, 1853. He settled in Dusseldorf, where he sold his panorama in 1857 (McDermott, p. 144).

St. Louis Weekly Reveille, October 22, 1849, quoted by McDermott, p. 68.


26 "To the European the panorama was merely an entertaining spectacle but to the American it must have been more—the answer to his natural urge for a visual expression of his experience of space... The panorama offered a model to the landscape painters who made it their goal to paint the landscape of America, the landscape of the great open spaces, of the rugged mountains and the enormous rivers—an oversize landscape in which the tiny human being did not count at all" (Wolfgang Born, "The Panoramic Landscape as an American Art Form," *Art in America*, Vol. XXXVI [January, 1948], pp. 3-4).

27 Barbara Novak, in her article "Grand Opera and the Small Still Voice" (*Art in America*, Vol. LIX [March-April, 1971], pp. 64-73) has pointed out that, although the large popular landscapes of mid-nineteenth century American art were indebted to the panorama, they continued, in large part, to rely on Claudian compositional models, while the more intimate landscapes produced by American artists more often duplicated the horizontal extension of the panorama.


29 It has sometimes been stated that Fulton worked for Robert Barker, but this does not seem to have been the case. For Fulton and his relation to the panorama in France, see Henry W. Dickinson, Robert Fulton, Engineer and Artist; His Life and Works (London: John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1913) and Yvon Bizardel, American Painters in Paris, trans. Richard Howard (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960), pp. 43-67.

30 Dickinson, p. 95; It is possible that certain Barker panoramas from London may have reached Paris before Fulton obtained his "brevet d'importation." An undated outline plate which reproduces the composition of the Barker view of London, although with some differences in detail from the Barker engraving and with a description in both French and English, is in the British Museum (reproduced as Pl. VII in Pragnell). Barker's London, which we know to have been in Germany in 1799, may have reached there by way of France.

31 In the commission report by Dufourny and the article by Millin, Thayer is referred to as "Citoyen James." Fulton returned to the United States in 1806 and continued his experiments. He is now best-known for his development of the steamboat, which he brought from an experimental stage to commercial viability.
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70 Buddemeier, p. 48.

71 Ibid., p. 49.

72 Ibid., p. 48.

74 Ibid.
75 Bapst, p. 17.
76 Ibid.
77 Fundt, pp. 103 and 203.
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1. Contemporary Newspapers

Birmingham Chronicle

Bristol Mirror

The Caledonian Mercury

The Diary; or Woodfall's Register

Dublin Evening Post

The Edinburgh Evening Courant

Glasgow Chronicle

The Liverpool Mercury, or Commercial, Literary, and Political Herald

The Manchester Mercury, and Harrop's General Advertiser

The Morning Chronicle

The Morning Chronicle and London Advertiser

Morning Herald

Observer

The Scotsman

The Sun

The Times

True Briton

2. Descriptive Booklets for the Panoramas

The existence of explanatory booklets for the various paintings exhibited at the Leicester Square and Strand Panoramas is indicated in Appendix C. Booklets for other exhibitions are cited in the notes to the text.

3. Other Sources

Art Journal.

The Art-Union.


Banvard; or the Adventures of an Artist; A Biographical Sketch. London, 1849.


Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine.


"Brevet de perfectionnement de dix ans, pour l'art de peindre les panoramas, au sieur Prévost, peintre des panoramas, à Paris." Description des machines et procédés spécifiés dans les brevets d'invention, de perfectionnement et d'importation, dont la durée est expirée, Vol. XIII. Paris: Chez Madame Huzard, 1827, pp. 5-10.
A Brief Account of the Colosseum, in the Regent's Park, London: Comprising a Description of the Building; the Panoramic View from the Top of St. Paul's Cathedral; the Conservatory, &c. London, 1829.


Croal, George. Living Memories of an Octogenarian, Chiefly of Edinburgh, from the Years 1816 to 1845. Edinburgh: Andrew Elliot, 1894.


A Description of the Colosseum as Re-Opened in MDCCCXLV. London: J. Wertheimer and Co., 1845.


Farington, Joseph. Diary (typescript). British Museum Print Room.


Gentlemen's Magazine.


The Graphic.


---. Prospectus. View of London and the Surrounding Country ... to be Published in Four Engravings. London, 1823.


The Illustrated London News.


Monthly Magazine, or British Register.


Notes and Queries.


100 Years of Showmanship; Poole's, 1837-1937. Edinburgh: Pillans & Wilson, 1937.


The Repository of Arts, Literature, Fashions, Etc.


Royal Colosseum, Regent's Pk. Catalogue of the Panorama of London, and Other Valuable Properties ... Which Will Be Sold by Auction ... on Thursday, August 27th, 1828 ... by Order of the Proprietor, P. R. Maillard, Esq., J. P. London, 1868.


_____ Papers, Print Room of the British Museum.


Pl. 1. Edward Francis Burney: The Eidophusikon, c. 1782.
Pl. 15. Robert Mitchell: Section of the Rotunda, Leicester Square, 1801.
Pl. 16. J. Buckler: Building for the Painting of Panoramas, West Square.
Pl. 17. View of Constantinople, Panorama, Leicester Square, 1801.
Pl. 27. Descriptive Sketch of the Storming of Seringapatam, 1800.
Pl. 31. Descriptive Sketch of the Battle of Alexandria, 1802.
Pl. 32. Descriptive Sketch of the Battle of Lodi, 1803.
Pl. 42. Thomas Girtin: Watercolour Study for the Eidometropolis, c. 1801.
Pl. 43. Thomas Girtin: Watercolour Study for the Eidometropolis, c. 1801.
Pl. 44. Thomas Girtin: Watercolour Study for the Eidometropolis, c. 1801.
Fl. 45. Thomas Girtin: Watercolour Study for the Eidometropolis, c. 1801.
Pl. 46. Thomas Girtin: Watercolour Study for the Eidometropolis, c. 1801.
Pl. 47. Thomas Girtin: Pen and Wash Working Drawing for the Eidometropolis, c. 1801.
I, the Flag Ship of Rear Admiral L. Austen, from the Saloon Gallery of which the Spectator views the Panorama.

**PANORAMIC PICTURE OF BOULOGNE,**
Now open at Harper's Pantheon, Norwich, from Ten o'Clock till Dusk.

*ADMISSION ONE SHILLING—DESCRIPTIVE PARTICULARS GIVEN GRATIS.*

Pl. 49. John Knox: Old Glasgow Bridge.
Pl. 50. Lord Nelson's Attack of Copenhagen, Panorama, Leicester Square, c. 1803.
Pl. 52. View of Gibraltar and Bay, Panorama, Leicester Square, 1805.
MR. BARKER, INVENTOR AND PROPRIETOR OF THE
PANORAMA, LEICESTER-SQUARE,

Pl. 53. View of Edinburgh, Panorama, Leicester Square, 1805.
REINAGLE AND BARKER's PANORAMA, STRAND.

NOW OPEN,
IN THE GREAT ROOM,
A VIEW OF THE
BAY OF NAPLES;
TO WHICH HAS BEEN ADD'D,
A REPRESENTATION OF THE RECENT
GREAT ERUPTION OF
MOUNT VESUVIUS,
BY REINAGLE AND BARKER.

Pl. 54. View of the Bay of Naples, Panorama, Strand, 1806.
BARKER'S PANORAMA, STRAND.

EXPLANATION
OF THE
VIEW OF
DOVER,
IN THE LARGE CIRCLE.

Mr. Barker will continue to bring forward a succession of Views, on these Principles of Accuracy so long practised in Leicester-square, and will use his utmost Endeavours to merit a Portion of that Patronage so liberally bestowed on his late Father, the Inventor of the Panorama.

1810.

Pl. 55. View of Dover, Panorama, Strand, 1810.
Pl. 56. View of Athens, Panorama, Strand, 1819.
Pl. 57. View of Venice, Panorama, Strand, 1819.
EXPLANATION of the VIEW of NAPLES exhibited in the PANORAMA, STRAND.

Pl. 58. View of Naples, Panorama, Strand, 1821.
EXPLANATION of a VIEW of the CITY of EDINBURGH, exhibiting at the PANORAMA, LEICESTER-SQUARE.

1. Castle.
2. St. Gildart's Church.
3. Royal Society, at the end of Castle-Mound.
4. St. John's Church.
5. Princes Street.
6. St. George's Church, Charlotte Square.
7. Register Office.
8. St. Andrew's Church.
10. Leith Street.
12. Camera Obscura.
13. Calton Hill.
14. Waterloo Place and Regent Bridge.
15. Home's Monument.
16. French Tol.
17. North Bridge.
20. Desert's Hospital.
21. Women's Baths.
22. New Church.
23. Pestilential Hills.
24. College.
25. Royal Infirmary.
26. Relief Chapel.
27. High School.
29. Jewish Cemetery.
31. Conventicle Church.
32. Ramsay's Elm.
33. Regent Road.
34. Linlithgow.
35. Site of the Children's Inf.
36. Balmoral.
37. Castle Hill.
38. Brunswicker, Earl of Moyn's Seat.
39. Island of Inch Colma.
40. New Observatory.
41. New Church, Earl Warren's Estate.
42. Broughty Castle.
43. Leith Wharf.
44. Great London Road.
45. Tottenham Crescent.
46. Kirkdale.
47. Island of Inch Colma.
49. Leith Walk.
50. North Berwick Law.
52. Port Street.
53. Port St.
54. Leith House.
55. Musselburgh.
56. Old Road to Edinburgh, Ar. by Foot.
57. Balmoral.
58. Chapel of St. Andrew's House.
59. Blind Horse.
60. Chapel of St. Anthony, in Rossa.

Pl. 59. View of the City of Edinburgh, Panorama, Leicester Square, 1825.
Pl. 60. View of Pandemonium, Panorama, Leicester Square, 1829.
Fl. 61. View of the Siege of Antwerp, Panorama, Leicester Square, 1833.
A Description of a View of Jerusalem, now exhibiting at the Panorama, Leicester Square.

2. Church of St. Peter.
3. Where the Prayer was taught.
4. Gate of the Great City.
5. Where Christ went into Jerusalem.
8. Temple of Solomon.
9. Grave of the Prophets.
10. Golden Gate.
11. Road to Jericho.
12. City Walls.
13. Praying Place.
14. Little Synagogue.
15. The Harem of the King.
17. Dead Sea.
20. Invisible Bridge.
22. Gate of Hebron.
23. Dwelling Place of Raina, Daughter of Midas.
24. El Mirge, Place of Ascension of the Prophet.
27. Mosque of the Magyars.
28. Fountain.
29. Mosque of Omar.
30. Jaffa Gate.
32. Palace of the Knights of St. John.
33. Mosque of the Seraglio.
34. Fountain.
35. Abbey of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.
36. The Hanan Schiff.
37. Mosque El Akso.
38. Mount of the Offence.
40. Fountain.
41. Mosque of the Sultana.
42. Invisible Bridge.
43. Church of St. Peter's.
44. Arch of the Holy Sepulchre.
45. Turkmens.
46. Arabs from the Border of the Dead Sea.
47. Winter of the Same Tribe.
48. Derach.
49. Merchant of Damascus.
50. Site of Herod's House.
51. Spa, Jaffa.
52. Pipe Barren.
53. Mekhi.
54. Aga, or Governor.
55. Interpreter.
56. Greek, and Latin Friars.
57. The Bastions about to be administered.
58. Turkish Sailors.
59. Arabs from the Border of the Dead Sea.
60. Guard of St. Stephen.
61. Pool of Bethesda.
62. Minster, King Herod.
63. Where the Angels appeared.
64. Chapel of the Cross of Tiberias.
65. Palace of Daniel's Place, or Aga's House.
Pl. 63. Her Majesty's Entry into Edinburgh, Panorama, Leicester Square, 1843.
EXPLANATION of a View of COBLENZ, EHRENBREITSTEIN, and the RHINE, now Exhibiting at the PANORAMA, LEICESTER SQUARE.

Pl. 64. View of Coblentz, Ehrenbreitsen, and the Rhine, Panorama, Leicester Square, 1843.
Fl. 66. Arrowsmith's Diorama, from The London Journal of Arts and Sciences.
Pl. 68. View of the Interior of the Colosseum, Regent's Park, 1829.
Pl. 69. View of the Interior of the Colosseum, Regent's Park, 1829.