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I. Introduction

Both Julia Margaret (Pattle) Cameron and her great niece Virginia Woolf advocated opening the door to a more unconventional and unique world of art as women whose values were restricted and determined by Victorianism. Cameron’s biographer, Victoria C. Olsen, remarks about Cameron’s uniqueness in the art world as well as in a family circle: “Cameron’s work had been the subject of revived interest among turn-of-the-century art photographers, but also her life had been mostly the object of family legends as anecdotes about her passed from generation to generation” (3). Cameron’s eccentricity, fame, and also unusual career as a photographer in Victorian England were transmitted from generation to generation especially among her close relatives such as the Pattles and the Stephens, and eventually the Bloomsbury Group. Woolf, as a relative and also writer of the twentieth century, shared a distinct and keen consciousness of creating art with Cameron beyond two generations.

As artists, both Cameron and Woolf had to strive against the male-centered world of art so that they trained themselves outside art and academic institutions. In the process of educating themselves, Cameron and Woolf nourished their keen sense of observing human inner selves and attempted to describe them in photography and fiction respectively. Because of those
similarities, Woolf admired Cameron, and compiled a play, *Freshwater: A Comedy*, in 1923. As a familiar figure among Stephen relatives and friends, Cameron was an attractive subject for Woolf to recreate in the form of drama as a way of giving voice to her photographs. For Woolf, Cameron had an unusually strong personality as Gerhard Joseph notes in introducing Woolf’s description of Cameron in “Julia Margaret Cameron,” Introduction of *Victorian Photographs of Famous Men and Fair Women* (44).¹ Paying more attention to Cameron as an artist, in 1926, Woolf and Roger Fry worked together in order to publish that selection of photographs by Cameron by the Hogarth Press. In 1935, moreover, Woolf revised her original 1923 script of *Freshwater* for a family and friend performance at Vanessa Bell’s studio. This revision represents, as Lucio P. Ruotolo remarks, “how Virginia had researched the subject of her great-aunt Julia Margaret Cameron” (vi). In this sense, there existed a closer collaboration between Cameron and Woolf and this collaboration represents Woolf’s commitment to creating her own world of art in three stages: women as prisoners, outsiders, and eventually artists.

II. Women as Prisoners of Victorianism

In the Victorian and Edwardian societies, women were both physically and psychologically imprisoned in male-centered values, customs, life-styles, and viewpoints. Consequently, Victorian idealism had a paradox which reflects the limitations of its excessive idealism. At the same time, both Victorian idealism and its limitations were exported to and transplanted in Anglo colonial spheres such as India and Ceylon, where Cameron with her sisters, including Woolf’s mother, spent their lives. In this shared environment, women attempted to unite together or share common interests with the other
outsiders, especially in artists’ communities. As Olsen points out, Cameron had a strong tie with her sisters and also established friendship with the other artists at Little Holland House in Kensington, where her sister, Sarah Prinsep, hosted a salon, after returning to England in 1848, whereas Woolf kept an unbreakable tie with her sister Vanessa (Stephen) Bell and furthermore, became deeply involved in the Bloomsbury Group. It was, however, in Freshwater, the Isle of Wight, where Cameron established her own artists’ colony and overcame the boundaries of Victorianism; whereas it was in Bloomsbury where Woolf liberated herself from her father’s ghost and Victorian and Edwardian values.

As the most striking symbol of Victorianism, the idealized image of women was rooted in all households, classes, communities, and also colonial spheres. Cameron challenged this image in her visual art, whereas Woolf did so in her verbal art. When Coventry Patmore’s *The Angel in the House* was published between 1854-6, it influenced a cultural norm of Victorianism. After his conversion to Catholicism, moreover, its ideology was strengthened in the 1880s when Patmore revised *The Angel in the House* and his idea was more definitely addressed by Gerard Manley Hopkins who had asked Patmore to “reconsider his slackness in regard to the gender hierarchy in marriage” in *The Angel in the House* (Munich 82).

Based upon hierarchy, Christian marriage depends on woman’s subservience to her lord as man is subservient to his Lord. Correspondence between wife and sinner, lord and Lord, is a system facilitating allegorical representation. Wives’ politeness compared to religiosity rather than to true belief. Since domestic hierarchy is analogous to the Church’s temporal authority, a wife’s mere courtesy compares to the undermining of the Church. (Munich 83)
Dedicated to Coventry Patmore, Cameron’s portraiture of Emily Peacock entitled *The Angel in the House* was taken in Freshwater in May, 1873 (Weaver, *Julia Margaret Cameron 1815-1879* 129: Figure 1). It is quite evident that the cultural icon of Patmore’s *Angel in the House* was so universal that it became the theme of other arts in Victorian England. Patmore’s *Angel in the House* is, however, known for its irony in that Patmore’s wife and model of *The Angel in the House* had already passed away because of hardships in life when the poem was published. Cameron’s photograph implies this irony as is witnessed in the uncertain and undetermined expressions of the woman whose external appearance fits the image of *The Angel in the House*, yet whose internal self lacks the satisfaction and determination as if she wished to be liberated from the role and expectations imposed upon her.

The irony embedded in *The Angel in the House* is transmitted to another irony conveyed by the other angel photographs by Cameron. Along with Cameron’s *Angel in the House*, there is a series of angel-women portraits of Mary Ann Hillier entitled *The Angel at the Sepulchre* (1869-70, Figure 2) and *The Angel at the Tomb* (1869-70, Figure 3), and those angels display more ironical implications. Even though these angel-women portraits present to us different themes on a surface level, they possess similar tones and meanings. Victorian implication of “The Angel in the House” is an idealized womanhood. However, the biblical original of the other angel is not female but male (Ford 55). The biblical angel is generally considered a male figure and the guardian angel plays a significant role in male-centered Christian churches. As for Christian marriage, moreover, its hierarchy is based on the theory that woman is subservient to her “lord” or her husband as man is to his Lord (Munich 83). Transcending the sex difference, however, the image
of purified angel was virtually transformed into that of woman in Victorian England. Transcending the sex difference, again, the image of purified woman was switched into that of the guardian angel in Cameron’s photography.

In addition to the transformation of sex, the models of those portraits have ironical backgrounds. Not precisely identified, Emily Peacock, with her sister Mary, was believed to be the neighbor’s daughter, a frequent visitor of the Camerons in Freshwater, who modeled in Cameron’s photo illustrations to Tennyson’s *Idylls of the King* as Sylvia Wolf remarks (225). As in another portrait entitled *The Sisters* (1871, Figure 4), Peacock wears a dark dress with white furs around her neck. It is apparent that her traditional beauty and elegance is well suited to the image of *The Angel in the House*, yet it is ironical that her expressions are gloomy as in most of Cameron’s women’s photos. On the other hand, Mary Ann Hillier, the daughter of a shoemaker on the Isle of Wight, began to work as Cameron’s parlor maid at age fourteen and remained Cameron’s favorite maid and model till Cameron left for Ceylon in 1895 (Wolf 221). Hillier was considered less beautiful than another Mary and Cameron’s frequent model, Mary Ryan (Ford 55). In *Annals of My Glass House* (1874), however, it is proven that Hillier’s beauty attracted Cameron as she depicts her as “‘one of the most beautiful and constant of my models, and in every manner of form has her face been reproduced, yet never has it been felt that the grace of the fashion of it has perished’” (Wolf 221). Consequently, Hillier was frequently posed as the Madonna and also as other religious figures. Overall, however, both Peacock and Hillier were the models whose identifications were not necessarily important and whose personalities did not have to be mirrored through the lenses. Alison Chapman states that as Cameron herself in *Annals of My Glass House* “suggests that her camera has a distinctive and gendered agency of its own” and also confesses that,
before those Victorian eminent male sitters, her “‘whole soul has endeavoured
to do its duty towards them in recording faithfully the greatness of the inner
as well as the features of the outer man’” (52); consequently, Cameron had
to “‘arrest ‘great men’ with her lens’” in her photographic portraits (53).
Compared to Cameron’s photographs of such great male figures with
distinguished features and physiques as George Frederick Watts (Figure 5),
Tennyson (Figure 6), Thomas Carlyle (Figure 7), and Charles Darwin (Figure
8), Cameron’s women models represent the diversity and universality of
women in Victorian England.

Overall, Cameron’s Angel in the House implies the uncertain and unsatisfied
expressions of woman in such respects as her more-natural-look hairs,
ambiguous eyes, and partially-ajar lips. The “deep emotion” or “the inner-
self or inner-truth” of Cameron’s woman sitter, conveys “a shadow of
conventionality” (Wynne-Davies 130). There exists women’s concealed revolt
against the external and determined image of their own. The Angel at the
Tomb, more ironically, possesses the double image of women, “the pure and
impure, the sacred and profane” because it represents the female guardian of
the Holy Sepulchre on one hand and “the type of Mary Magdalene, whose
principal attribute is her hair, with which she concealed her nakedness as a
fallen woman and in her humility used to dry the feet of Christ” (In Focus
78). Cameron’s female angel portraits played important roles in defining the
woman because the angel’s unconventional pose, unarranged natural flow of
hairs, and also loose robe reflected the ironical image of the guardian angel.
Cameron’s portraiture of angel women as prisoners shows the dual uniqueness
in which there were both outer and internal imprisonments of women of
different backgrounds.

Another challenge to break the imprisonment of The Angel in the House is
discovered in one eminent actress, Ellen Terry. As for Woolf’s use of Terry’s “acting” in *Freshwater*, Penny Farfan makes an interesting examination on Woolf’s acting theory and fiction “as an alternative to the historical entrapment of women in restrictive, male-determined roles” (4). In Act II of the 1935 version of *Freshwater*, Terry, a prisoner of Victorian patriarchy and a young wife of old Watts, is awakened to herself when her new lover attempts to persuade her to elope with him to Bloomsbury, which for Woolf is a symbol of freedom. Even though Terry in *The Story of My Life* refers to the happy moment of getting married to Watts at age of sixteen and her new life at Little Holland House as “a paradise, where only beautiful things were allowed to come,” she soon realized that she was only lightly regarded as “the girl-wife of a famous painter” and they separated within a year (33). Terry’s position as wife and model of a great Victorian artist nicknamed “Signor” represents the imprisonment of women and also their selves.

Nell: And my name is Mrs. George Frederick Watts.
John: But haven’t you got another?
Nell: Oh plenty. Sometimes I’m Modesty. Sometimes I’m Poetry. Sometimes I’m Chastity. Sometimes, generally before breakfast, I’m merely Nell.
John: I like Nell best.
Nell: Well that’s unlucky, because today I’m Modesty. Modesty crouching at the feet of Mammon. Only Mammon’s great toe was out of drawing and so I got down; and then I heard a whistle. Dear me, I suppose I’m an abandoned wretch. Everybody says how proud I ought to be. Thinking of handing in the Tate Gallery for ever and ever — what an honour for a young woman like me! Only — isn’t it awful — I like swimming. (27)
For Cameron, too, Watts was such an influential mentor of art that she “spent much time in the misguided effort to explore the realm of fancy, and like the Academic painters of the period, whom she emulated, produced the worst kind of Victorian trash in pictures like Pray God, bring Father safely home” (Gernsheim, A Concise History 75).

Cameron’s famous portrait of Terry entitled Sadness (1864), which was taken during her honeymoon at Freshwater, evidently “suggests the realization of a mismatched marriage” (In Focus 12; Figure 9). The shadowed face and leaned pose of the newly-wed young woman signify her intense sense of anxiety caused by a lack of physical and spiritual freedom, a lack of respect, and also a lack of understanding in her married life. At Little Holland House and Freshwater, Terry lost her own self and primarily played the role of the subject of art and also of male-expectation. In such an environment, Terry was deprived of all her own senses, abilities, and chances by Watts, who strictly prohibited her from speaking to others in her own way. Terry was, however, convinced later that “‘the three I’s,’” that is, “[i]magination, industry, and intelligence” are “all indispensable to the actress” (24) because the actress is not merely the subject to be described or drawn, but the artist. Terry actually wrote her own story, as its action is described by Woolf who praises Terry for her talents as an actress: “With her pen then at odds and ends she has printed a self-portrait” (“Ellen Terry” 174).

III. Women as Outsiders against Victorianism

Even though Cameron and Woolf belonged to different generations and lived in different eras, both of them as women had to overcome the invisible barrier of Victorian patriarchal society and resist Victorianism. In addition to comparative studies on Cameron’s photographic illustrations for such
Victorian masterpieces as Tennyson’s *Idylls of the King*, there have been recent comparative criticisms on Cameron from twentieth-century modernist, feminist, and postcolonial perspectives (Aleksiuk, Chapman, Flesher, Hill, Reid, and Wussow). Wolf points out that Woolf’s mother, Julia Jackson, who was Cameron’s niece and favorite model, “provides a neat yardstick for cultural change: two generations to go from an age of idealism to an age of irony, from Tennyson to T. S. Eliot, from high Victorian to thoroughly modernist” (20-21). Since Cameron’s photographs of her niece and Woolf’s mother, Julia Jackson (or Julia Duckworth after her marriage to Herbert Duckworth), connect Cameron with Woolf, who also based Mrs. Ramsay on Julia in *To the Lighthouse*, the subject of Victorian women is shared by Cameron and Woolf. For both Cameron and Woolf, women were primarily prisoners of Victorian values and male-expectations symbolized by *The Angel in the House*.

Both Cameron and Woolf inscribed their revolt against women as prisoners of Victorianism in their art. Cameron’s portraits of Julia Jackson — especially, *Mrs. Herbert Duckworth* (April 1867, Figure 10) and *My Niece Julia Full Face* (April 1867, Figure 11) — have more distinct features than Cameron’s other portraits of women. Widely known as a beauty since her childhood, Julia was a constant model for leading artists such as Watts, Edward Burne-Jones, and Thomas Woolner (the Pre-Raphaelite sculptor), and also by eminent writers such as James Russell Lowell, George Meredith, and Henry James even after her second marriage to Leslie Stephen. Julia was definitely considered as the perfect image of idealized women in Victorian England. Regarding this important element of Victorian women, Woolf makes Watts, an eminent Victorian painter, remark: “[I]n the first place I wish to convey to the onlooker the idea that Modesty is always veiled; in the second that Modesty
is absolutely naked” (*Freshwater* 17). Cameron’s early portraits of Julia, two portraits entitled *Julia Jackson* (1865-66, and 1866; Figure 12, Figure 13, and Figure 14), represent the veiled “Modesty.” Regarding those portraits, April Watson suggests that Julia “appears as a symbol of eternal pulchritude and divine purity” (16) and also her beauty represents “angelic immortality” (17). It is more striking that both Cameron and Woolf attempted to break this veiled “Modesty.”

Both visual and verbal portraitures of Julia by Cameron and Woolf signify how both artists unveiled the Victorian values. It was in 1867 when Julia at age twenty-one finally accepted Herbert Duckworth’s proposal after turning down several proposals by well-established men, such as William Holman Hunt. It is mentioned that in Cameron’s *Mrs. Herbert Duckworth*, which was taken just before her marriage, “[the] perfect framing of the bust is given great emphasis by Cameron’s handling of light, which is carefully cast to accentuate the strength and beauty of the head” so that this quality and effect of this portrait is close to those of men rather than women (*In Focus* 58). This portrait just before marriage, which captures “her cool, Puritan beauty,” remarkably depicts a distinct intensity and dignified human nature, especially in her straight and firm neck that leads to her determined expression. Joanne Lukitsh, furthermore, analyzes that “[the] dramatic contrasts of light and dark in [Julia] Jackson’s profile and neck idealize her beauty, strength of character and intelligence” (*Five Great Woman Photographers* 68). Naomi Rosenblum also remarks that the portrait of Julia “combines strength and diffidence” (12). Though always admired and even adored for her external appearance and also idealized image of an angel in the house, Julia had the inner strength to confront women’s sufferings and agony; first in her husband’s unexpected early death, then her pregnant widowhood with two children,
and finally her second marriage in which she was indulged by her husband in managing the household and raising her children (three in her first marriage and another four including Woolf in her second marriage).

Cameron’s keen awareness of Julia’s duality or struggle between two opposing characters inside her is proven in her photos of Julia.

Only through acting other parts could women give at least symbolic expression to their own aspirations and emotions, at a time when simply being someone else’s relative — a wife, mother or sister — was intended to be a woman’s self-fulfilment. A clear expression of this double standard occurs in Julia Margaret’s photographs of her niece, Julia Jackson. On the one hand Julia is regularly photographed under her own name, with all the attention to dramatic lighting and imposing costume that is afforded the ‘lionised men.’ On the other, she is also presented successively as Mrs. Herbert Duckworth and Mrs. Leslie Stephen, as though her own powerful personality were entirely subsumed within her husbands’ [sic] identities. (Hopkinson16)

Julia’s powerful personality was similar to Cameron’s as remarked by Anne Thackeray regarding her father’s memory that Cameron was “‘generous, unconventional, loyal and unexpected’” throughout her life (Melville 37). Julia’s unconventional personality and her unexpected or even ‘vicious’ behavior were also remembered among her relatives and friends (Hopkinson 5). Cameron’s compassion toward Julia drove her photographing women’s intensive countenance like Julia’s and also Cameron’s own countenance.

Julia’s inner strength was inherited by Woolf, who imposed her mother’s strong personality upon her fiction, especially in To the Lighthouse.

When she [Mrs. Ramsay] looked in the glass and saw her hair grey.

Her cheek sunk, at fifty, she thought, possibly she might have managed
things better — her husband; money; his books. But for her own part she would never for a single second regret her decision, evade difficulties, or slur over duties. She was now formidable to behold, and it was only in silence, . . .

*(To the Lighthouse 14)*

Mrs. Ramsay’s internal strength and determination are always silenced by the voices, emotional expressions, and behaviors of the people around her, especially her egoistic husband, children, and their guests, most of whom are artists. In this second marriage to an eminent Victorian figure and author, surprisingly, Julia herself kept writing stories as well as diaries just as Mrs. Ramsay creates stories for her children. Julia’s writings were, however, never paid attention to until the end of the twentieth century, because she was always the subject of art and also a diligent wife and muse for the Victorian patriarch Sir Leslie Stephen. However strong Mrs. Ramsay’s inner self may be, her subjection to her husband — that is, Victorian patriarchy — imprisons her, and only the author Woolf can unveil what is hidden in the imprisonment of the idealized space of home.

As for the resistance to home and victimization within home in Victorian England, Woolf creates an internal monologue in a play of British history in *Between the Acts*.

But Mrs. Lynne Jones still saw the home. Was there, she mused, as Budge’s red baize pediment was rolled off, something — not impure, that wasn’t the word — but perhaps ‘unhygienic’ about the home? Like a bit of meat gone sour, with whiskers, as the servants called it? Or why had it perished? Time went on and on like the hands of the kitchen clock. (The machine chuffed in the bushes.) If they had met with no resistance, she mused, nothing wrong, they’d still be going
round and round and round. The Home would have remained; and Papa’s beard, she thought, would have grown and grown; and Mama’s knitting? what did she do with all her knitting? Change had to come, she said to herself, or there’d have been yards and yards of Papa’s beard, of Mama’s knitting. (103).

Throughout the various historical changes, Victorianism finally became the past ideal that confronted “resistance.” In “Professions for Women,” Woolf states that what she had to do for her professional life is “killing the Angel in the House” inside her (105). Cameron and Woolf discovered the same theme in the same subject, Julia. Julia exists between Cameron and Woolf in the transformation of women from the mere subject and model of men’s art to the creator of art herself. The women of the three generations centered in Victorian England formed a revolution against Victorianism, which deprived women of physical and spiritual freedom.

IV. Women as Artists

Owing to their imprisonment in Victorian society, women turned to be keen observers who can transmit their internal oppression into their profound compassion toward, and understanding of, outsiders. In Freshwater, Woolf recreates Cameron’s philosophy: “Still, to the true artist, one fact is much the same as another. A fact is a fact; art is art; a donkey’s a donkey” (16). Both Cameron and Woolf were keen observers and critics who could manipulate irony in their art. Comparing Cameron with Woolf, Natasha Aleksiuk remarks that the “visual and verbal irony thus generated may be used strategically to challenge gender and class stereotypes” (2). Olsen states that, for Cameron, Little Holland House in Victorian England played the same role as the Bloomsbury Group for Woolf, since Little Holland House
“seems to have been a place where outsiders were made to feel comfortable and included, even powerful and influential” (107). To be outsiders means to become observers. On Cameron as a pioneer in the history of photography, Helmut Gernsheim points out that Cameron “had the real artist’s gift of piercing through the outward appearance to the soul of the individual” (A Concise History 58). Wolf also insists that Cameron who wished to make portraits had a great interest in “the world within” even though she had lived in Ceylon and France and experienced those different outer worlds and landscapes (31). On the other hand, Woolf repeated experimental writings to explore the human inner self and finally established her own style of the stream of consciousness. Both Little Holland House and Freshwater were conflicting spaces where women’s inner selves were blindly neglected and consequently imprisoned, yet from where these women began to observe the hidden aspects of another imprisoned women and also to seek their possibilities. For transcending the limitations of portraits as visual biography and biography as verbal portraiture, both Cameron and Woolf seek universality in impersonations or mythology.

Outsiders’ keen sense of observation was nourished not only within the newly-knitted artists’ community in Britain but also in British colonial societies. The Anglo-Indian society where Cameron was born and mostly brought up had been established through the rapid growth of British industrialism and colonialism in the nineteenth century. Anglo-Indian society in that era can be defined as a microcosm of Victorian England, yet at the same time, it possessed a uniqueness of environment, landscape, and also behaviorism. Cameron was a colonial girl born of an English father and a French mother in Calcutta, India, was trained at home as a Victorian gentlewoman and in addition was sent to Versailles for further education. It
is generally stated that Cameron’s productive life as a photographer was over when she returned to Ceylon in 1875 and that she produced less work till her death in 1879 because of the lack of materials and also the loss of an artists’ community. Among the few surviving India photos, however, another outsider’s view of colonial India was discovered (Reid). Cameron’s view as an outsider was inherited by Woolf who could not behave like a Victorian gentlewoman, attempted to become a professional writer, would often suffer mental breakdowns, and ultimately had a strong sense of exclusiveness in her own country.

In Cameron’s case, she was not only a pioneer woman photographer but also lived beyond the nineteenth century since in England no woman professional photographer appeared after Cameron till more contemporary Susan Meisalas and Cindy Sherman because women were merely subjects and women’s works were ignored (Davidov 390). Rosenblum made a brief yet significant survey of women and photography, and mentions that women had made the same start as men in producing pictures in 1893 when photography was introduced as the new medium, yet women’s works were not so equally evaluated (11). Cameron, who was a gentlewoman of leisure, was given a camera at age 48 in 1863, yet was not precisely considered a professional photographer; however, her serious attitude toward photography both as a financial source and “aesthetic production” (Joseph 44) anticipates subsequent female artistic photographers.

Cameron’s deep involvement in photography is depicted in *Freshwater*; how Cameron’s will was strong enough for her to behave, unlike a Victorian lady, as a hunter. Cameron kills a tamed turkey because she needs its wings for her photography.

Mrs. C. [re-entering]: Here’s the turkey wings.
Ellen: Oh, Mrs. Cameron, have you killed the turkey? And I was so fond of that bird.

Mrs. C: The turkey is happy, Ellen. The turkey has become part and parcel of my immortal art. New, Ellen. Mount this chair. Throw your arms out. Look upwards. Alfred, you too — look up! (Freshwater 13-14)

Cameron’s obsession with her art is illustrated in this episode where her belief in the immortality of her art is strong enough for her to sacrifice the living thing. Cameron was known literally as “a lion hunter” because she was eager to make everybody around her, even travelers to the Isle of Wight, sit for her. Cameron’s obsession with photographs foreshadows the coming wave of women artists in the twentieth century.

The seemingly artistic techniques that Cameron employed are often criticized as the accidental product of undeveloped camera technology, yet those techniques feature Cameron’s unique ways. Regarding her soft-focus technique, Millard explains:

She [Cameron] would, no double, have preferred technically perfect prints, but she was wholly able to accept, even to encourage, technical imperfections when they seemed to reinforce the effect she sought. Thus, many of the soft-focus images have a breadth they could not otherwise have achieved, as Roger Fry has pointed out. . . . In sum, each of Mrs. Cameron’s images was sui generic, responsive only to her vision of the moment and not part of an overall plan or the result of preconceived ideas about what a photograph should be. (198-99)

In spite of this comment, there are, as some other critics have noted, some proofs to represent a set of contrasts, the light and the shadow, perfection and imperfection, and the past and the present. Regardless of the early
equipment and materials, the quality of Cameron’s work can be favorably compared to that of the emerging artistic photographs in the twentieth century.

No only Cameron’s taking photographs at first primarily as private and family activities but also her publishing a collection of those portraits beginning with Mia Album is an important stage of presenting photographs as aesthetic production which “can be seen as performing a different function in a viewer’s narrative of past experiences” (Lukitsh, “Album Photographs on Museum Walls: The Mia Album” 30). In the same way as a fiction writer who writes manuscripts and eventually publishes a book, photographers are encouraged to compile the album and furthermore, publish a collection of their work as well as exhibiting photographs. Citing from cultural theorist Susan Stewart’s idea of “how, within an exchange economy, ordinary objects — such as photographs — come to realize experiences of memory, time and space,” Lukitsh states that reflection upon the unities among the contents of the Mia Album extends to a consideration of the broader social significance of the activity of assembling photographs in albums” (29). In addition, Cameron’s photography illustrations for Tennyson’s Idylls of the King extend the possibilities of reconstructing the narrative and the visual imaginations. As for this effect, Marylu Hill makes an interesting comment on “doubled pastness” in Cameron’s photos: “the past world of legend and the past world of legendary Victorians” (446). To present the private album to public as a collection of photographs is an essential step toward professionalism not only because it becomes a financial resource but also because it definitely receives reviews and criticisms. To seek the new role of photography is also important as it extends and deepens the possibilities of art.

In the case of literature, women had been excluded and their works had been nearly neglected until the new trend of fiction became popular at the
end of the eighteenth century. Reading fiction became women’s leisure, and therefore, women were employed as the subjects of writings and also writing fiction began to be seen as women’s profession. However popular writing fiction became among women, as Woolf insists in *A Room of One’s Own*, women poets and writers were not listed in great men of literature and women had been excluded from all kinds of creative activities until the twentieth century.

For women have sat indoors all these millions of years, so that by this time the very walls are permeated by their creative force, which has, indeed, so overcharged the capacity of bricks and mortar that it must needs harness itself to pens and brushes and business and politics. But this creative power differs greatly from the creative power of men. (87)

Women’s creative power actually began to be evaluated and established in the twentieth century, which in one respect embraces all the women forerunners in all art fields. Woolf’s statement reflects not only her own position as a writer but also all the women artists, whether known or unknown, who had lived and already died. For Woolf, Bloomsbury was the first space where she could liberate herself from all the social and cultural conventions and restrictions and furthermore, where she could never be excluded from the other artists and intelligent young people around her. According to Ruotolo, Woolf urgently finished writing *Freshwater* since in 1923 it was “a welcome diversion in her struggle with ‘The Hours’ (*Mrs. Dalloway*)” (viii). In addition, Woolf revised the play to produce it in 1935 at Vanessa’s studio with such cast as Vanessa as Julia Cameron, Leonard Woolf as Mr. Cameron, Duncan Grant as Watts, Adrian Stephen as Tennyson, and Angelica Bell as Ellen Terry (*Freshwater* npn). This extended Bloomsbury Group in the
twentieth century, which represents a challenging space for the young and new artists and critics, was thus chosen as the most appropriate theatre company for *Freshwater*.

**V. Conclusion**

With their double stance of being prisoners and resistant, women could be reborn as creators who were willing to appreciate and express what was veiled under the Victorian values. Their new subject, technique, and also philosophy, which were sprung from their art work, represented their strong sense of commitment to their creative activities. Both Cameron and Woolf established the ground where women could pursue their professions and experiment with their art work and it implied a challenge to examine the internal self of woman. As artists, Cameron and Woolf, thus, shared the same intention in photography and literature, and their messages are united within our contemporary space.

This paper is completed as part of my project on “Woman Artists and Transnationalism” for the 2006-2009 Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science. I thank my colleague, Professor Randall D. Terhune, for reminding me of this topic in our conversation about a new book on Cameron.
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Notes

1 Woolf describes Julia Margaret Cameron as having “‘remarkably fine eyes, that flashed like her sayings, and grew soft and tender if she was moved . . . But to a child she was a terrifying apparition, short and squat, with none of the Pattle grace and beauty about her [her Pattle sisters were great beauties], though more than her share of their passionate energy and willfulness. Dressed in dark clothes, stained with plump eager face and a voice husky, and a little harsh, yet in some way compelling and even charming, she dashed out of the studio at Dimbola [her mansion at Freshwater], attached heavy swan’s wings to the children’s shoulders, and bade them ‘Stand there’ and play the part of the Angels of the Nativity leaning over the ramparts of Heaven’” (Joseph 46).
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