Female Self-determination in Victorian Britain:

Finding the parallels between Mary Elizabeth Braddon's *Lady Audley's Secret* (1862) and Dante Gabriel Rossetti's *Proserpine* (1874)

———

SEZ MAXTED

The gender history of nineteenth-century Britain can be seen as a gradual but determined female challenge against an overarching patriarchal model with the period witnessing changes in ideas respecting gender relations towards a more modern notion of gender equality. With male power enforcing female dependency, and parliamentary franchise withheld from women, the right to non-discrimination on the grounds of gender was far from achieved. However, there were some positive changes in both knowledge and practice. This essay will first suggest that Dante Gabriel Rossetti's *Proserpine*, 1874 (figure 1), and Mary Elizabeth Braddon's novel *Lady Audley's Secret*, serialised in Sixpenny Magazine, and published in three volumes in 1862, reflected the changing attitudes. It will further explore the strong parallels between Proserpine and Lady Audley, both of whom are linked through their challenge of the deeply held Victorian belief in the sanctity of the home and domestic peace, capitalising on the contemporary anxieties about femininity.

I n many ways, resistance to change in gender relations represented a concentrated reaction against general democratisation with the evolving patterns of patriarchal authority falling within a wider landscape of diminishing subservience for many, coupled with expanding rights.[1] The role of women was the subject of intense literary and public debate with the Victorian conscience tending to focus on female weakness with the concept of home as a location of tranquillity epitomised by the middle-class wife and mother, and with the poet Coventry Patmore's *Angel in the House* (1854) an enduring icon of Victorian anti-sensuality.[2]

---

[1] Jan Marsh, *Gender Ideology and Separate Spheres in the 19th Century*, V & A (online) <http://www.vam.ac.uk/content/articles/g/gender-ideology-and-separate-spheres-19th-century/> [accessed 7 February 2019] (para 2 of 21).

[2] Coventry K. D. Patmore, *The Angel in the House,* London, 1858, in British Library Collection items. <https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/coventry-patmores-poem-the-angel-in-the-house> [accessed 7 February 2019].

Figure 1: Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Proserpine, *1874, oil paint on canvas, 12.51 x 61 cm, Tate Britain, London. Photo © Tate; Creative Commons. CC-BY-NC-ND (3.0 Unported). <https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/rossetti-proserpine-n05064>*

Social philosophers such as Auguste Comte, Arthur Schopenhauer and Herbert Spencer reinforced this concept, which developed into the mid-century doctrine of separate spheres whereby women were positioned as either decorative additions or spiritual guardians of men's immortal souls.[3] John Ruskin wrote of the middle-class wife in *Sesame and Lilies* (1865), which centred on the differing natures of men and women and blatantly encouraged women to provide moral guidance to their husbands.[4] A pseudo-scientific dimension was added to this social construct via Darwin's *The Descent of Man* (1871),[5] which placed men higher on the evolutionary ladder by arguing that evolution made man 'superior' to woman.[6] Separate spheres and the domestic-public dichotomy referring to an empirical

---

[3] Marsh, (para 9 of 21).

[4] John Ruskin, *John Ruskin Selected Writings*, ed. by Dinah Birch (Oxford: Oxford World Classics, 2009), p. 154–174.

[5] Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*, 1871, 2nd edn 1879, intro. by James Moore and Adrian Desmond (London: Penguin Classics, 2004), p. 256.

[6] Rebekkah Rubin, 'The Woman Who Challenged Darwin's Sexism', *Smithsonian* (online) <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/science-nature/woman-who-tried-take-down-darwin-180967146//> [accessed 14 February 2018] (para 4 of 20).

separation between the private (or domestic) sphere and a public (or social) sphere[7] reinforced patriarchal ideologies by confining women to the private sphere.[8] Although this ideology was not the dominant reality, it was potent in ordering society's values according to its precepts and was effective in polarising the traits of masculinity and femininity in the popular imagination.[9]

Both *Proserpine* and *Lady Audley's Secret* challenged this ideology in a culture that was something of a paradox. While the monarch was female and was therefore both socially and symbolically superior to every other citizen in Britain regardless of gender, in a letter to Theodore Martin, written on 29 May 1870, she referred to the 'wicked folly of "Woman's Rights", with all its attendant horrors, on which her poor feeble sex is bent, forgetting every sense of womanly feeling and proprietary'.[10] In the same letter, she notes that 'God created men and women different – then let them remain each in their own position'.[11] Despite this assertion, surprisingly, religion played a role in challenging the patriarchal ideal as, although Christian teaching instructed (inferior) women to submit to their husbands, it also communicated the message that men and women are equal in the eyes of God.[12]

Braddon's novel and Rossetti's painting can be linked by a portrait of Lady Audley, which is described in detail. While George Talboys views the painting, the narrative notes that 'No one but a Pre-Raphaelite would have painted, hair by hair', 'No one but a Pre-Raphaelite would have so exaggerated every attribute' and, critically, 'No one but a Pre-Raphaelite could have given to that pretty pouting mouth the hard and almost wicked look it had in the portrait'.[13] This description could be applied to *Proserpine*, so although Lady Audley and Proserpine have different physical traits, such as differing hair colour, the overall mood of Lady Audley's portrait and the painting of Proserpine is similar. The commentary continues with a suggestion that viewing the portrait is not entirely comfortable: 'the first effect of the painting by no means an agreeable one' and that in this image, Lady Audley 'had something of the aspect of a beautiful fiend'.[14] The detail in this ekphrasis would therefore be apt for *Proserpine*.

---

[7] Linda K Kerber, 'Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman's Place: The Rhetoric of Women's History' in *No More Separate Spheres!,* ed. by Cathy N. Davidson and Jessamyn Hatcher (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2002), 29–65 (p. 31).

[8] Catherine Hall, Keith McClelland and Jane Rendall, *Defining the Victorian Nation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 30.

[9] Philippa Levine, *Victorian Feminism 1850-1900* (University Press of Florida 2018), p. 12–13.

[10] Victor Shea and William Whitla, ed., 'Gender, Women, and Sexuality', in *Victorian Literature: An Anthology* (Blackwell Anthologies: Oxford, 2015), 48–79 (p. 55).

[11] Shea and Whitla, p. 55.

[12] Joan Perkin, *Victorian Women* (London, 1993), p. 239.

[13] Mary Elizabeth Braddon, *Lady Audley's Secret,* ed. by Lyn Pykett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 65.

[14] Braddon, p. 65.

A description of Lucy Graham, the future Lady Audley, had been given earlier in the novel where she 'seemed to take joy and brightness with her' and was described as having a 'fair face [that] shone like a sunbeam'.[15] This is the archetypal Victorian ideal, so when the visual analysis of the portrait notes: 'It was so like and yet so unlike',[16] this could be seen as a comment on Victorian expectations of how a woman with angelic looks should behave as a visual representation of domesticity and goodness. That a woman's outer appearance was no longer a clear indicator of inner character was a contemporary concern as uncertainty replaced previously visible distinctions between classes and visual demarcations of femininity started to blur.[17]

In a second, more dissentious description of the same portrait, Alicia Audley responds to Robert's observation that 'there's something odd about it', by declaring that: '*We* have never seen my lady look as she does in that picture, but I think that she could look so.'[18] Alicia's comments promote a strong rebuttal from Robert and he implores Alicia: 'I'm not metaphysical' he says, 'don't unsettle me', which was repeated several times.[19] Alicia's suggestion seems to parody contemporary ideas on the importance of the artist's perception of reality,[20] along with a recognition of the growing popularity of physiognomy.[21] With this shift of perspective, Lady Audley's angelic face becomes demonic,[22] which could give her a power over men and is perhaps why Robert appears so intimidated, responding to Alicia with an 'air of terror perfectly sincere'.[23] Exacerbating his fears, if Lady Audley is an imposter, she is capable of debasing his patrimony.[24]

During the course of the novel, Lady Audley possesses five different sets of proper names, each one echoing her belonging to a man and suggesting the transient and tenuous social identity for a woman in the 1860s.[25] At the start of the book, she is Miss Lucy Graham, the reader then knows she was Mrs George Talboys (formerly Miss Helen Maldon), she becomes Lady Audley, and finally dies as Madame Taylor. By

---

[15] Ibid., p. 11.

[16] Braddon p. 65.

[17] Deborah Cherry, *Beyond the Frame, Feminism and Visual Culture, Britain 1850-1900* (London, 2000), p. 163.

[18] Braddon, p. 66.

[19] Ibid., p. 66.

[20] Saverio Tomaiuolo, *In Lady Audley's Shadow* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, reprinted 2011), p. 152.

[21] Susie l. Steinbach, *Understanding the Victorians: Politics, Culture and Society in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2012), p. 238–9.

[22] Nina Auerbach, *Woman and the Demon, The Life of a Victorian Myth* (London: Harvard University Press, 1982), p. 107–8.

[23] Braddon, p. 66.

[24] Eva Badowska; 'On the Track of Things: Sensation and Modernity in Mary Elizabeth Braddon's Lady Audley's Secret', *Victorian Literature and Culture*, vol. 37, no. 1, 2009, 157–175. *JSTOR*, < www.jstor.org/stable/40347219 > [accessed 8 February 2019].

[25] Susan David Bernstein, *Confessional Subjects: Revelations of Gender and Power in Victorian Literature and Culture* (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997), p. 95.

describing marriage as 'the world's great lottery',[26] she is simultaneously recognising that for a woman, wholly dependent on her husband, her own happiness is not within her control and by doing so is questioning the contemporary vision of domestic subservience. Her long confession to Robert Audley and Sir Michael Audley allows her to vent her rage over the men she felt had let her down: her father, her husband and even her husband's father:

> I resented bitterly – I resented it by hating the man who had left me with no protector but a weak, tipsy father, and with a child to support. […] I recognised a separate wrong done me by George Talboys. His father was rich […][27]

Similarly, with her own life directed by men who control her, Proserpine, Queen of the Underworld and daughter of Zeus, stands in a shadowed corner with only a small shaft of light penetrating the gloom. In her hand she holds a pomegranate fruit, her consumption of its seeds condemning her to stay for half of each year with her abductor (and husband) Pluto, who had promised to return her to her mother Ceres only if she hadn't eaten in his realm.[28] The only movement in the painting comes from the smoke rising from an incense-burner (the attribute of a goddess)[29] and Proserpine herself looks fixed and immobile, seemingly trapped forever in the dark underworld with no hope of a permanent return to the upper world she loves.

The sonnet inscribed in Italian in the top right corner of the painting and in English on the frame gives further depth to the meaning and in many ways draws Proserpine closer to Lady Audley.[30] If Lady Audley is living a double life, similarly, at the beginning of the sestet, Proserpine laments: 'Afar from mine own self I seem', indicating a split personality, or perhaps another part of herself. The introduction of a second voice could be her unconscious mind, and as the two voices are so intertwined ('Continually together murmuring'), they could be a single person. Reading the sonnet through this lens, perhaps this is Proserpine looking inwards towards her buried self and presenting the agony of separation due to her own actions in a similar way to Lady Audley having to live through the tragic consequences of her own behaviour. Ultimately, Lady Audley was trapped by her secret just as much as Proserpine was trapped in the underworld. In Braddon's novel we watch as Lady Audley's life spirals beyond her control as she desperately attempts to keep the knowledge of her first

---

[26] Braddon, p. 298.

[27] Braddon, p. 300.

[28] Victoria Osbourne, 'Secular Ministry', in *Victorian Radicals: From the Pre-Raphaelites to the Arts and Crafts Movement, travelling exhibition, 2019-2021,* ed. by Martin Ellis, Victoria Osborne and Tim Barringer (New York: American Federation of Arts, 2018), 158–212 (p. 197).

[29] Terry Riggs, *Proserpine* (February 1998), Tate (online) https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/rossetti-proserpine-n05064 [accessed 23 February 2019]. (para 3 of 4).

[30] Riggs, para 3 of 4.

marriage secret. There was no happy ending for either Lady Audley or Proserpine and the concluding line of Rossetti's sonnet: 'Woe's me for thee, unhappy Proserpine!' is as relevant to Lady Audley as to Proserpine herself.

Both *Proserpine* and *Lady Audley's Secret* are complex and contradictory. In the case of *Proserpine,* Rossetti has painted more than a simple portrait of Jane Morris and the symbolic elements along the pose of the body and the strength of the gaze build a story of a woman reacting against the undeserved actions of a man. Her only role was having a beauty so captivating that Pluto fell in love with her on sight and his actions alone took her to the underworld. The contradiction is that by eating she triggered the need to remain, and without the actions of another woman (her mother) she would be forced to stay in the underground without respite.[31] Lady Audley's beauty was also her downfall as Sir Michael Audley was unable to resist her appeal despite the significant differences in their age and social position. The plot twists give an obvious complexity to the novel, such as the presumed death of George Talboys – a man revealed to be alive too late to save Lady Audley. However, it is the contradictions which demonstrate so successfully the frustration of economic, social and sexual oppression for contemporary women. For instance, George Talboys can design a new life for himself and his wife cannot, and Robert Audley is weak and conceited but due to his gender is given power and authority to act. The ultimate contradiction is that the other female characters fail to support Lady Audley, contributing directly to her downfall.

There is a sexual element to the predicament of both women. Lady Audley demonstrates an acute self-awareness of her own desirability when describing how she knowingly used her 'bewitching' looks to marry better than her schoolfellows.[32] In the painting, it is through the model, Jane Morris. Although Rossetti had written about Jane that 'beauty like hers is genius', with her wiry, curly black hair and hard, angular features, her looks were far removed from the Victorian ideal.[33] Rossetti has added to her eroticism by giving the viewer a focus on her carnal red lips and the fleshy pomegranate, both of which are bright and lustrous compared to the muted and dull colours around the figure. Rossetti has altered and intensified Jane's beauty: features are accentuated (her lips), elongated (her neck) and forced (the folds in her dress). Her unnatural pose highlights this artificiality and Rossetti successfully communicates personal tragedy via her posture with the stillness of her frame and a sense of pent-up, constrained energy. Proserpine holds her left wrist with her right hand as if holding herself back, suggesting that she is capable of restraint as well as temptation. Perhaps it also demonstrates that she is cognisant of her own behaviour – her weaknesses as well

---

[31] Osbourne, p. 197.
[32] Braddon, p. 298.
[33] Jan Marsh, *The Pre-Raphaelite Circle* (London: National Portrait Gallery Publications, 2013), p. 91.

as her strengths, which helps to communicate a more rounded impression of an isolated and marginalised woman.

Although she is not engaging directly with the viewer, the defiance of Proserpine's gaze as she glares out from beneath her fringe lends a power to her expression and it is simultaneously defiant and alluring. This double message is echoed in the actions of Lady Audley. During her confession to Robert and Sir Michael, Lady Audley is described as hiding her countenance from the two men: 'her face was obstinately bent towards the floor',[34] which communicates the contradictions of both subjugation and power. By denying her gaze, Lady Audley is withholding something of herself and this personal seclusion denies the men a full interpretation of her actions. The gazes of both Proserpine and Lady Audley allow them to create agency in their own portrayal.

While Braddon gives clear descriptions of the material world that was so captivating and desired by Lady Audley, in a similar way, Rossetti uses the ivy in the background as a symbol for the viewer to interpret. In ancient Greece, ivy was the sacred plant of Dionysos.[35] As well as being the god of wine, vegetation, pleasure and festivity, Dionysos was also the god of frenzy and madness[36] – two words which are also associated with Lady Audley. The frenzy of Lady Audley's increasingly manic attempts to protect her real identity is coupled with the additional secret of her mother's madness and her ultimate fate to die due to a *maladie de langueur* in a mental institution on the Continent. The location overseas has a sense of banishment, similar to Proserpine's removal to the underworld, so both women are separated from the familiar and moved to new (unwanted) environments.

Nineteenth-century reviewers of sensation novels were united in diagnosing the genre as an expression of modernity, as noted in 1863 by H. L. Mansel, writing in the *Quarterly Review* that: 'The sensation novel, be it mere trash or something worse, is usually a tale of our own times.'[37] The fictional life of Lady Audley echoes the real life of Lady Rosina Wheeler, a woman unjustly incarcerated for a short period in a 'madhouse' after a series of highly public matrimonial battles with her husband, suggesting that the actions of a woman reacting against her predetermined fate was not an unknown in Victorian society at the time.[38] Beyond the obvious reflections of contemporary life, such as the railway and telegram, both of which play a role in the plot of *Lady Audley's Secret,* it could be argued that Braddon, a woman living with a married man, wanted her novel to present a more modern, self-determining woman.[39]

---

[34] Braddon, p. 299.
[35] Theoi Project, *Dionysos Wrath 1* (online), <https://www.theoi.com/Olympios/Dionysos.html>
[accessed on 8 February 2019] (para 1).
[36] Ibid., (para 1).
[37] Badowska, quoting H. L. Mansel, 'Sensation Novels', *Quarterly Review*, 113 (1863).
[38] Tomaiuolo, pp. 1–5.
[39] Braddon, introduction, p. x.

In the same way, Rossetti's presentation of Jane Morris is in part due to his intimate (and imperfect) relationship with her. For Rossetti, art was indivisible from life, with the last phase of his life being one of self-revelation,[40] and this painting, the seventh of eight produced of Jane Morris as Proserpine, was painted eight years prior to his death.[41] His close association with Jane was facilitated by William Morris's own egalitarian social ideals that included believing that marriage should not be a matter of legal constraint, but rather of personal choice.[42] In many ways, *Proserpine* and *Lady Audley's Secret* revealed something of Rossetti and Braddon's own anxieties, pleasures and beliefs.

Braddon's novel and Rossetti's painting were produced during a period of conscious and radical change[43] with progress in social understanding challenging the Enlightenment confidence in reason, along with the traditional ideas regarding society.[44] While masculine values of courage and endeavour continued in contrast to the female subsidiary role with self-sacrifice and patience as key virtues, gender inequity permeated all aspects of British life.[45] However, as an indication that attitudes were changing, in 1869 John Stuart Mill began his essay *The Subjection of Women* by detailing his 'object' that 'the legal subordination of one sex to the other – is wrong in itself'.[46] Later in the essay he states that:

> All women are brought up from the very earliest years in the belief that their ideal of character is the very opposite to that of men; not self-will, and government by self-control, but submission, and yielding to the control of others.[47]

Comparing Proserpine and Lady Audley to this contemporary description of women, both have attempted to exert control to influence their own lives, and despite society attempting to keep them in the margins, they sought to assert their own power. Although their actions were deeply flawed, they reacted to their own circumstances with commitment, knowing the potential consequences of their actions.

---

[40] Colin Cruise, *Pre-Raphaelite Drawing* (London: Birmingham Museums & Art Gallery, 2011), p. 205.

[41] Riggs, para 2 of 4.

[42] Julian Trueherz, Elizabeth Prettejohn and Edwin Becker, ed., *Dante Gabriel Rossetti* (the Walker, Liverpool, 16 October 2003 – 18 January 2004; Van Gogh Museum, Amsterdam, 27 February – 6 June 2004), p. 200.

[43] Walter E. Houghton, *The Victorian Frame of Mind 1830-1870* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1957, renewed 1985), p. 23.

[44] Carmen Lavin and Ian Donnachie, *From Enlightenment to Romanticism, Anthology II*, 2nd edn (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press in association with The Open University, 2007), p. xvii.

[45] Marsh, (para 11 of 21).

[46] John Stuart Mill, *The Subjection of Women*, 2nd edn (London, 1869), British Library (online) <https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/the-subjection-of-women-by-j-s-mill> [accessed 8 February 2019], ch. 1, p.1.

[47] Mill, p. 27.

Both Rossetti and Braddon disrupted the traditional gender roles, presenting a new view of female self-determination, with Proserpine and Lady Audley troubling the Victorian certainty that gender is simply a binary matter (male and female).[48] In the case of Lady Audley, despite her angelic appearance, Braddon has given her male behavioural characteristics – she gets angry, she refuses to accept her poverty, she attempts to free herself from the bounds of subjection, and in doing so she is prepared to fight for her own future.[49] In the case of Proserpine, physically, she is distinctly unfeminine with her androgynous figure, and in her behaviour, like Lady Audley, she is prepared to disobey. Looking at Proserpine, there is a heaviness and sorrow of a trapped woman. This was also Lady Audley's fate: to be unable to escape the patriarchal society, and the novel demonstrates a systemic bias hostile to women against which she attempts to determine her own future. Both women are tragically beautiful, cursed by their appeal to powerful men. The challenge to the contemporary viewer and reader is that, along with autonomy, Rossetti and Braddon have imbued their women with an awareness of their own destiny – an understanding of the tragedy to be an object and to live in a world controlled by men. Proserpine and Lady Audley's own self-determination allows them to act on their disaffection and in doing so present an alternative, more modern perspective on middle class femininity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Braddon, Mary Elizabeth, *Lady Audley's Secret,* ed. by Lyn Pykett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

Darwin, Charles, *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex,* 1871, 2nd edn 1879, intro. by James Moore and Adrian Desmond (London: Penguin Classics, 2004)

Mill, John Stuart, *The Subjection of Women,* 2nd edn (London, 1869), British Library (online) <https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/the-subjection-of-women-by-j-s-mill> [accessed 8 February 2019]

---

[48] Deborah Lutz, *Pleasure Bound, Victorian Sex Rebels and The New Eroticism* (London, 2011), p. 105–6.
[49] Heidi Hansson & Cathrine Norberg (2013) *'Lady Audley's Secret', Gender and the Representation of Emotions, Women's Writing*, 20:4, 441–457, DOI: 10.1080/09699082.2013.823307 [accessed 8.2.19].

Patmore, Coventry K. D., *The Angel in the House,* London, 1858, in British Library Collection items. <https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/coventry-patmores-poem-the-angel-in-the-house> [accessed 7 February 2019]

Ruskin, John, *John Ruskin Selected Writings*, ed. by Dinah Birch (Oxford: Oxford World Classics, 2009)

SECONDARY SOURCES

Auerbach, Nina, *Woman and the Demon, The Life of a Victorian Myth* (London: Harvard University Press, 1982)

Badowska, Eva. "On the Track of Things: Sensation and Modernity in Mary Elizabeth Braddon's Lady Audley's Secret." *Victorian Literature and Culture*, vol. 37, no. 1, 2009, 157–175. *JSTOR*, <www.jstor.org/stable/40347219> [accessed 8 February 2019)

Bernstein, Susan David, *Confessional Subjects: Revelations of Gender and Power in Victorian Literature and Culture* (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997)

Cherry, Deborah, *Beyond the Frame, Feminism and Visual Culture, Britain 1850-1900* (London, 2000)

Cruise, Colin, *Pre-Raphaelite Drawing* (London: Birmingham Museums & Art Gallery, 2011)

Hall, Catherine, Keith McClelland and Jane Rendall, *Defining the Victorian Nation*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Hansson, Heidi & Cathrine Norberg (2013) '*Lady Audley's Secret', Gender and the Representation of Emotions, Women's Writing*, 20:4, 441 457, DOI: 10.1080/09699082.2013.823307 [accessed 8 February 2019]

Houghton, Walter E., *The Victorian Frame of Mind 1830-1870* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1957, renewed 1985)

Kerber, Linda K., 'Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman's Place: The Rhetoric of Women's History' in *No More Separate Spheres!*, ed. by Cathy N. Davidson and Jessamyn Hatcher (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2002), pp. 29–65

Lavin, Carmen and Ian Donnachie, *From Enlightenment to Romanticism, Anthology II*, 2nd edn (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press in association with The Open University, 2007)

Levine, Philippa, *Victorian Feminism 1850-1900*, (University Press of Florida 2018)

Lutz, Deborah, *Pleasure Bound, Victorian Sex Rebels and The New Eroticism* (London, 2011)

Marsh, Jan, *Gender Ideology and Separate Spheres in the 19th Century*, V & A (online) <http://www.vam.ac.uk/content/articles/g/gender-ideology-and-separate-spheres-19th-century/> [accessed 7 February 2019]

Marsh, Jan, *The Pre-Raphaelite Circle* (London: National Portrait Gallery Publications, 2013)

Osbourne, Victoria, 'Secular Ministry', in *Victorian Radicals: From the Pre-Raphaelites to the Arts and Crafts Movement, travelling exhibition, 2019-2021,* ed. by Martin Ellis, Victoria Osborne and Tim Barringer (New York: American Federation of Arts, 2018), pp. 158–212

Perkin, Joan, *Victorian Women*, (London, 1993)

Riggs, Terry, *Proserpine,* (February 1998), Tate (online) <https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/rossetti-proserpine-n05064> [accessed 23 February 2019]

Rubin, Rebekkah, 'The Woman Who Challenged Darwin's Sexism', *Smithsonian* (online) <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/science-nature/woman-who-tried-take-down-darwin-180967146//> [accessed 14 February 2019]

Shea, Victor and William Whitla, ed., 'Gender, Women, and Sexuality', *Victorian Literature: An Anthology* (Blackwell Anthologies: Oxford, 2015), pp. 48–79.

Steinbach, Susie l., *Understanding the Victorians: Politics, Culture and Society in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2012)

Theoi Project, *Dionysos Wrath 1,* (online) <https://www.theoi.com/Olympios/Dionysos.html> [accessed on 8 February 2019]

Tomaiuolo, Saverio, *In Lady Audley's Shadow,* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, reprinted 2011)

Trueherz, Julian, Elizabeth Prettejohn and Edwin Becker, ed., *Dante Gabriel Rossetti* (the Walker, Liverpool, 16 October 2003 – 18 January 2004; Van Gogh Museum, Amsterdam, 27 February – 6 June 2004)