Birkbeck BA History of Art, Nineteenth Century Landscape, Year 3

Laurence Shafe

Turner's *Ploughing Up Turnips, near Slough* is a "complexly nuanced image freighted with troubling socio-political implications." Discuss.

Laurence Shafe, Birkbeck BA History of Art,
Nineteenth Century Landscape, Year 3

Turner's Ploughing Up Turnips, near Slough is a "complexly nuanced image freighted with troubling socio-political implications." Discuss.

Much recent art historical research has focused on social signifiers in early nineteenth century landscape paintings. One of the first art historians to take this approach was John Barrell in *The Dark Side of the Landscape*[1] and this book has been followed by many others.[2] The quote in the title is taken from an article by Michelle Miller that follows the same tradition.[3] Her article is about Turner's *Ploughing Up Turnips, near Slough*, a painting that was first exhibited at the height of the Napoleonic War[4] in 1809.

I intend to put Miller's approach into an art historical perspective by exploring various ways of looking at this painting. I will suggest that such socio-political analysis is often biased by the author's cultural assumptions and we can arrive at a broader view by placing equal emphasis on multiple interpretations. For example, although the painting can be seen as a "complexly nuanced image freighted with troubling socio-political implications" it can also be argued that it conformed to contemporary aesthetic conventions and that it reinforced the view of the land-owning class about the importance of agriculture and the role of the rural worker during a period of war.

---

[1] J. Barrell, *The Dark Side of the Landscape: The Rural Poor in English Painting 1730-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983)

[2] For example C. Payne, *Toil and Plenty: Images of the Agricultural Landscape in England 1780-1890* (London: Yale University Press, 1993) and E. K. Helsinger, *Rural Scenes and National Representation: Britain, 1815-1850* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997)

[3] M. Miller, J.M.W. Turner's 'Ploughing up Turnips, near Slough': The Cultivation of Cultural Dissent, *Art Bulletin*, 77:4, (1995:Dec.), pp. 573-583

[4] The Napoleonic War between the United Kingdom and France began in 1803, following the peace of Amiens in 1802, and ended on 20 November 1815. However, when referring to the war period I use the term to refer to the nearly continuous period of revolutionary conflict and warfare between 1792 and 1815.

I will first discuss the socio-political environment during the war period, then the development of landscape leading up to and during the war, before looking at Miller's article in the context of alternative art historical approaches.

Turner exhibited the painting at a time when revolution was in the air, England was at war and the country depended on its farms to feed the nation.[5] Dissent was widespread and the common ownership of land was central to the revolutionary aims of radicals such as the Northumberland schoolteacher Thomas Spence.[6] Tension later erupted into incidents such the Spa Fields riots of 1816, the Peterloo Massacre of 1819 and the Cato Street Conspiracy of 1820.[7] A banner carried at the Spa Fields meeting made the link between the grievances and land—"Nature to Feed the Hungry".[8] Worrall suggests this means there was a radical belief that the bountiful English soil correctly cultivated and in the right hands could feed all the hungry.

Underlying the unrest was the removal of access to farming land from a large section of the rural population by the various Enclosure Acts, the poor harvests of the first decade of the century and the Corn Laws of 1815 that limited the import of wheat when the price fell below a certain level. Rural workers at this time would spend a large part of their wages on bread.[9] The government suppressed the revolutionary movements by, for example, suspending habeas corpus,[10] a move that was even criticized by *The Times*.[11] One of the central areas of dispute was around land and land ownership.[12] Only landowners were allowed to vote and become MPs and land ownership was central to the move to enclose land and create larger farms. It was argued by

[5] E. J. Evans, *The Forging of the Modern State: Early Industrial Britain 1783-1879* (Harlow: Pearson Education, 2001), p. 86
[6] S. Copley, P. Garside (eds.), *The Politics of the Picturesque: Literature, landscape and aesthetics since 1770* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 244
[7] E. J. Evans (2001), p. 223
[8] D. Worrall, Agrarians against the Picturesque: ultra-radicalism and the revolutionary politics of land in S. Copley, P. Garside (eds.), *The Politics of the Picturesque: Literature, landscape and aesthetics since 1770* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 244
[9] It is very difficult to generalize but the average weekly wage for agricultural labourers in Buckinghamshire in 1794-5 was 7s 4d and a sack of flour was 75s, M. J. Daunton *Progress and Poverty: An Economic and Social History of Britain 1700-1850* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 426-7
[10] E. J. Evans (2001), p. 90
[11] *The Times*, June 6th 1817, p. 2, col. F. The suspension of Habeas Corpus was described as "ill advised", "inhuman" and "evil", and this resulted in "disgust, terror and indignation" by the people.
[12] D. Worrall (1994), pp. 240-260

land owners that enclosure was justified by the need to farm land more productively for the benefit of the nation. Agricultural productivity was a topic that was much discussed as it was central to feeding the nation during the French blockade.[13] Although the economy grew and this benefited industrialists, businessmen and land owners, the price increases put people near the poverty line into destitution and starvation. [14]

All of this meant that any representation of agriculture in landscape painting was potentially "freighted with troubling socio-political implications."

The sequence of changes that took place in landscape paintings has been discussed by Barrell and others.[15] In the second half of the eighteenth century there was a growing interest in wealth production through mining, industrial production and new farming practices. This interest in industry justified paintings that showed farm workers working or perhaps resting after work. Such paintings could also be intellectually justified by appealing to Virgil's Georgic verses. The rural workers were idealised by being shown as cleanly dressed, attractive, healthy, and willing and happy workers. A few painters stretched or broke these conventions. G. Morland for example, showed rural workers poorly dressed, being idle or even drinking. Morland was one of the first artists in England to produce work at his own expense and then sell it through an agent.

[13] "To raise income and meet demand, landowners and farmers were frantically improving their land, and Louis Simmond, travelling through England in 1810, noted that every gentleman's conversation was dominated by turnips, clover, enclosure and drains." D.B. Brown, *The Art of J.M.W. Turner* (London: Quantum Publishing, 2003)

[14] Population growth through the period averaged 1.2% per annum and reached 10 million in 1812. The average life expectancy during the period was about 35-39 years, roughly the same as it had been for the previous 50 years. The average price of domestic wheat per Imperial quarter fluctuated widely but was 97s in 1809 compared to 43s in 1792, more than double. The price index for consumer goods was 212 compared to 122 in 1792 and it was substantially higher during the whole war period than in the period before the war. England became a net importer of wheat in about 1764 although the war saw the start of a large increase in wheat imports (except for 1808) and wheat imports did not fall after the war ended in 1815. Coal and pig iron output continued their rise, for example, pig iron output in 1809 was 350,000 tons compared to 100,000 tons in 1792. Despite the blockade the value of external trade more than doubled and cotton imports were over two and a half times higher. From M. J. Daunton (1995), pp. 426-427

[15] The historical analysis presented here is based on J. Barrell, *The Dark Side of the Landscape: The Rural Poor in English Painting 1730-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), and C. Payne, *Toil and Plenty: Images of the Agricultural Landscape in England 1780-1890* (London: Yale University Press, 1993) and to a lesser extent E. K. Helsinger, *Rural Scenes and National Representation: Britain, 1815-1850* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), pp. 106-112

In this way he chose not to "accommodate himself" to the "whims of gentlemen".[16]

However, in the mid to late eighteenth century the development of aesthetic theories concerning the sublime and books on the picturesque promoted the idea of avoiding showing the rural worker in a too particular way. W. Gilpin advised artists to paint "sublime" subjects and wrote that "haymaking-harvesting-and other employments of husbandry" were "low vulgarisms" suited only to "inferior modes of landscape".[17]

By the time of the Napoleonic War there were a wide variety of landscape themes including Claudian landscapes, such as Joseph Turner's *Thomson's Aeolian Harp* (1809, Manchester City Art Gallery), pastoral landscapes such as John Constable's *Dedham Vale* (1802, Tate Britain), picturesque landscapes such as Philip de Loutherbourg's *The River Wye at Tintern Abbey* (1805, The Fitzwilliam Museum) and James Ward's *Gordale Scar* (1814, Tate Britain), and the new naturalism of paintings such as Constable's *Stour Valley and Dedham Church* (c. 1814, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston), George Lewis's *Hereford, Dynedor and the Malvern Hills, from the Haywood Lodge, Harvest Scene, Afternoon* (1815, Tate Britain) and Turner's *Ploughing up Turnips, near Slough* and *Harvest Home* (c. 1809, Tate Britain). Turner, in his *Liber Studiorum* (1806), had his own classification system that consisted of Architectural, Marine, Mountainous, Historical, Pastoral, and Elevated Pastoral.[18]

Certain types of landscape became very popular during the war period. At the start of the period the number of rural genre pictures exhibited at the Royal Academy increased to about three times the average for the previous five years, dipped during the cessation of hostilities and continued at a high level until 1818.[19] One reason was that rural subjects were seen in a strongly nationalistic

[16] J. Barrell (1983), p. 95
[17] C. Payne (1993), p. 48
[18] E. Shanes, *Turner: The Life and Masterworks*, (New York: Parkstone Press, 2004), p. 28
[19] J. Barrell (1983), p. 20

light as is indicated by Morland's critics in the 1790s who pointed out that showing men not working was "unpatriotic" and "unsafe".[20]

Christiana Payne points out that by the 1790s "the sentimental yearning for the simple life came to seem old-fashioned and potentially dangerous or subversive."[21] She also points out that the decade immediately following the French revolution was a time of repression and attempts were made to make the poor "contented" so that social order could be maintained. Painters like Westall and Wheatley gave the rural poor an "elevated" air and "noble" emotions that appealed to the sentiment of charity in the viewer and in this period agricultural landscapes (rather than genre) went out of fashion partly, as explained above, as a result of the influence of theories of the picturesque.

The majority of landscape artists depended on selling their art to survive and so the market and its requirements were paramount. At this time landscape artists depended on a small number of exhibitions[22] where their work could be displayed for sale or, for established artists, the sale of print rights to publishers. Commissioned landscapes were rare unless they were of particular places. This meant artists had to choose subjects and paint them in a style that would appeal to "public taste". This was a new concept that was associated primarily with the new middle-class buyer and was defined by the arbiters of taste, the critics and commentators, writing in publicly accessible print media. In order to sell their work landscape artists would therefore have to try to determine and work within the representational traditions that the critic and the buyer deemed acceptable and desirable.

Miller's article suggests that Turner incorporated elements that signified support for, or at least recognition of, social dissent. The idea of an artist producing a work of art as a political statement and therefore reducing the size of its potential market is a Romantic notion that required an artist to be of

[20] J. Barrell (1983), p. 61
[21] This paragraph is based on C. Payne (1993), p. 51
[22] "Exhibitions were extremely important for landscape painters, because very few works were done on commission", C. Payne, *Toil and Plenty: Images of the Agricultural Landscape in England 1780-1890* (London: Yale University press, 1993), p. 47

independent means. Even financially-independent Romantic artists, such as Constable in his later life, saw landscape as a personal statement rather than a political statement. There is no evidence that Turner was anything other than a financially successful artist who appealed to a large audience.

I will next consider the various approaches to art history and show there is no single approach to analysis and that the art work supports multiple interpretations.

Perhaps the biggest change in approach over the last 180 years is from formal analysis, as typified by Heinrich Wölfflin, to the study of subject matter as introduced by Erwin Panofsky. Following Panofsky subject matter has been analysed from many perspectives, such as socially, by for example, Tim Clark and Barrell, in gender terms, by for example, Griselda Pollock and Linda Nochlin and in cultural terms by Roland Barthes.

In the early twentieth century many articles about Turner were subjective, used abstract terms to describe the paintings and made personal judgements, for example, "for all its delicate truth, lacks intensity and coherence", "He alone has achieved the transition from ancient to modern art without any rupture of tradition."[23] Such articles also typically compared artists, for example Turner with Claude and Rubens, "a scene of Claude-like serenity," and used formal descriptions, for example, "deft play of opalescent filmy tones over a dazzling white ground."

Wölfflin took a formal but a less subjective approach based on a system of five factors that he identified as fundamental to classifying works of art and identifying styles. These factors were linear versus painterly, plane versus recession, closed versus open form, multiplicity versus unity and absolute versus relative clarity.[24] Although these contrasting factors were developed by

[23] C. Holmes, Three Pictures by Turner, *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, Vol. 14, No. 67 (Oct., 1908), pp. 17-26, A. Finberg, Turner's Landscape, with Cattle in Water, *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, Vol. 14, No. 69 (Dec., 1908), pp. 167-168, A. Clutton Brock, The Weakness and Strength of Turner, *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, Vol. 18, No. 91 (Oct., 1910), pp. 21-23

[24] H. Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History: The Problem of the Development of Style in Later Art* (New York: Dover, 1950)

comparing Renaissance with Baroque works he argues they can be applied to later periods (he regarded earlier works as "an archaic form of art"). We can see that Turner's *Ploughing up Turnips, near Slough* has a planar style, like a stage set, it is closed, as the edge of the canvas forms a neat tableau, it exhibits multiplicity, as the individual elements can be extracted and analysed individually and it exhibits absolute clarity in that these elements are distinct and can be clearly distinguished. According to Wölfflin this combination of factors classifies the work as following the style of High Renaissance. The formal ambiguity is that the painting style should therefore be linear with the elements clearly identified by outline and filled-in with colour. However, Turner has used a painterly style with the paint loosely handled, the figures with soft outlines and the edges indistinct.

Panofsky introduced the idea of studying the subject matter of the image and assigning no meaning to the form.[25] He approached this in a very broad way and suggested layers of interpretation from the pre-iconological, for example, recognising a plough, through the iconographical, for example, recognising agricultural practices and productivity, to the iconological, which in this case might be nationalism or Englishness. Arriving at the iconological interpretation requires what he calls "synthetic intuition" and this is based on reading as many contemporary documents as possible about the political, social, poetical, religious and philosophical situation of the period.

Barrell takes a Panofskian approach in that he interprets the subject matter using contemporary sources but these are overlaid with a modern socio-political framework for interpreting these sources. For example, Barrell briefly discusses *Ploughing up Turnips, near Slough* and suggests the workers were presented "not as Arcadians, nor as automata, but as men" because they were shown neither working nor in Arcadian bliss but paused during their work, possibly because of a broken plough.[26]

[25] E. Panofsky, *Meaning in the Visual Arts* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970), pp. 51-67
[26] J. Barrell (1983), p. 153

Miller analyses the painting more fully and proposes a radical interpretation that raises questions about the cultural assumptions that lie behind the painting and possibly Turner's political allegiances and motives. [27]

She looks closely at the subject matter of the painting and asks many questions about agricultural practices. These questions raise doubts about whether it is a pastoral narrative or a radical work, or at least a work with radical undertones. The issues are concerned with modern farming practices, in particular crop rotation and enclosure as well as those concerned with seemingly innocuous features such as the significance of the weeds and the bottle in the foreground. For example, she points out that turnips were rarely fed to cows but more often to sheep and this particular area around Windsor Castle was associated with sheep farming. George III ("Farmer George") even set aside part of the grounds of Windsor Castle to breed Marino sheep. If turnips are fed to dairy cows the taste of their milk is affected, it leaves a "bad taste in the mouth". Perhaps, Miller suggests, Turner was implying that modern farming practice also left a bad taste in the mouth. The turnip was known to be the worst vegetable to grow in a clay soil and Turner emphasises the heavy clay soil by showing a team of four horses pulling the plough and by showing a broken plough. Turnips were also used to caricature the Hanoverians and were associated with extreme poverty as even poor people would not eat them unless close to starvation.

There are other paintings of the period that could be seen to invoke similar socio-political considerations, for example Turner's *Dorchester Mead* (exhibited 1806?, Tate Britain), *Frosty Morning*[28] (1815, Tate Britain) and his *Harvest Home*[29] as well as many paintings by Morland. However, the anomalies pointed out by Miller may have other explanations. For example, it is suggested by Tate Britain that *Dorchester Mead* was painted to complement *Ploughing up*

[27] L. Miller (1995), pp. 573-583
[28] E. K. Helsinger (1997), pp. 106-112
[29] *Harvest Home* shows a complex narrative involving the land owner and rural workers and their families. The Harvest Home or "horkey" was a popular event with a long history and it was the only time of the year that land owner and rural workers would interact socially. It is rarely painted and during the Victorian period stopped being held as it evolved into the Harvest Festival, a religious thanksgiving rather than a rowdy celebration. These issues are mentioned by C. Payne, p. 18, but are worthy of deeper analysis.

Turnips, Near Slough, in which case this could be a simple explanation of why Turner shows cattle near Windsor Castle, to complement the cattle in *Dorchester Mead*. [30]

It is also possible Turner was not knowledgeable about modern agricultural practice but Miller maintains that knowledge of agricultural practice was widespread and this is also suggested by Louis Simmond's contemporary comment (see footnote 13). This implies that Turner would have been aware of the issues raised by Miller and she states he must therefore have been making a specific point by including them. This conclusion depends on how obvious the "issues" were regarded at the time and there is no contemporary evidence mentioned by Miller that the painting was regarded as radical.

Miller's analysis depends for its force on the figures and their apparent actions. Turner was well known for including figures and cattle although they were not always well received. However, this was not because of their socio-political associations but for aesthetic reasons. In a review in The Times in 1823 it says he "has here introduced too much of that in which he is the weakest – namely cattle and figures."[31] Of course, as Ruskin pointed out later "The interest of a landscape consists wholly in its relation to figures present – or to figures past – or to human powers conceived."[32]

It is interesting to contrast Miller's approach with what Turner said about landscape at the time. Unfortunately, Turner was not a good speaker or writer but we do have the text of his 1815 lecture, part of the series he gave at the Royal Academy as Professor of Perspective. Although he does not mention his own work the lecture is notable for the way he discusses the correct form of the landscape background for a painting and he says very little about the content or iconography. This raises the question of the contemporary significance of form over iconography. We know Turner was fired by the conviction that society

[30] This painting is called *Dorchester Mead* in the gallery and *Abingdon* on the Tate Britain website, Tate Britain: Joseph Mallord William Turner (1775-1851), *Abingdon*, Tate Collection Online, http://www.tate.org.uk/servlet/ViewWork?workid=14745&searchid=26892 (accessed 19 Nov 2005)
[31] A review of Pevensey Castle, Sussex in *The Times*, Jan 15, 1823, p. 3, col. B
[32] Dinah Birch, Ruskin on Turner, (London: Cassell Publishers, 1990), p. 118

evolved into civilization only when it produced "great moral art"[33] but this raises the question of what he meant by the phrase. It is also clear from his lecture that he was inspired by establishment figures such as Reynolds and established painters such as Claude.

There is a strongly nationalistic sentiment in his talk associated with the desire to maintain the high status of English art.[34] For example, he recalled his time in Paris in 1802 and criticised the Neo-classical French taste for line and their inability to appreciate fine colour. He praises the idyllic and classical phase of baroque art and the works of Claude and Poussin but he criticises Rubens for destroying "the simplicity, the truth, the beauty of pastoral nature". Of the Dutch school he praises Rembrandt unreservedly and mentions Aelbert Cuyp, Paulus Potter and Adriaen van de Velde but not Jacob van Ruisdael and Willem van de Velde, leaving us wondering if he, like Reynolds, considered them vulgar through an excessive imitation of nature. Turner is clearly trying to elevate landscape painting to the same level of acclaim as history painting. He said,

> *"To select, combine and concentrate that which is beautiful in nature and admirable in art is as much the business of the landscape painter in his line as in the other departments of art."*[35]

This is a very clear statement that the landscape painter's task is to idealise nature rather than to copy its "vulgar" detail. Selecting that which is beautiful in nature and combining it with the admirable in art suggests a painting such as *Thomson's Aeolian Harp* rather than *Ploughing Up Turnips, near Slough* but he goes on later to say about Rembrandt's *Three Trees and the Mill*[36] "but over each he has thrown that veil of matchless colour, that lucid interval of Morning dawn and dewy light on which the Eye dwells so completely enthrall'd".

[33] Michael Rosenthal The Fine Arts in Ford, B., *The Cambridge Cultural History of Britain, Volume 6: The Romantic Age in Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 169
[34] This paragraph is based on J. Ziff, 'Backgrounds, Introduction of Architecture and Landscape': A Lecture by J. M. W. Turner, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 26, No. 1-2 (1963), pp. 124-147
[35] J. Ziff (1963), p. 133
[36] It is not clear which painting this refers to but one that matches the description is *The Mill* (c. 1650, The National Gallery of Art, Washington DC, USA).

Maybe here we have an important clue to Turner's approach to *Ploughing up Turnips, near Slough*? If we look again at the painting we see the "Morning dawn and dewy light" and the white morning mist in the central middle-ground acts as a surrogate winding river and we are thus reminded of a Claudian landscape with the distant mountains replaced by a misty castle. One interpretation of the foreground is that Turner has simply replaced classical mythology with the myths of Merrie England with her working sons of the soil. Even setting the scene within the Thames basin could itself be a patriotic statement.[37]

Where Miller sees idleness, unrest and anomalies we can instead see productivity and modern agricultural practice being used to support a nation at war. Perhaps we are being invited to think that although the crop may be hard to turn and the plough may be temporarily broken the supervisor and the workers will soon have the agricultural "production line" in action again through their English industry. The enclosure of the field, the rotation of the crops implied by the turnip harvest, the strength of the four-horse plough, the industry of the women pulling the turned turnips, the harrow following close behind, the worker with his seedlip ready to plant the next crop and the roller ready to complete the task all imply an industrial efficiency supporting a nation at war.

The painting could be given this interpretation or it could be, as Miller describes it, "a complexly nuanced image freighted with troubling socio-political implications." Barrell supports Miller's interpretation as he says it defies the existing conventions for depicting the agricultural landscape.[38] Yet the arguments put forward appear to contradict Turner's own words. The workers are represented sympathetically but this is not necessarily radical, they are working or soon to work. The strongest case is made by Miller regarding the unsuitability of the area for the planting of turnips yet it is hard to believe that

[37] "The massive concentration of Thames subjects in Turner's art between 1805, when he showed a view of Windsor Castle at his gallery, and 1810, was as much an appeal to patriotism as a display of his gifts as landscape and marine painter.", D.B. Brown, *The Art of J.M.W. Turner* (Cambridge: Quantum Publishing, x2003), p. 112

[38] J. Barrell (1983), pp. 153-4

this is sufficient to class the painting as troubling. Many other modern art historians see the painting as georgic and patriotic, for example, Elizabeth Helsinger says, it demonstrates the "continuing mythic and practical importance of British agriculture to a nation at war".[39]

Miller and Barrell may be reinterpreting the work with the hindsight of future socio-political developments. Hindsight inclines us to believe we have a superior viewpoint from where we can look down on the productions and events of the past. I would suggest that it is more accurate to see us all immersed in our own myth structure that determines how we code and decode meaning.[40]

The painting could equally be subjected to many other types of analysis. For example, it would certainly support a gender-based analysis as during the war period the number of men available to carry out rural work was limited and women therefore had to do a lot more of the manual labour in the fields. By examining the role of each figure in the painting we could reconstruct the social tensions of the period from a gender perspective. Such an analysis would be equally valid and could come to some startling conclusions but this would not mean that Turner was representing female emancipation.

As I have shown, the conventional interpretation of this painting is an idyllic Claudian landscape seen from a commanding viewpoint and showing modern agricultural practices being undertaken beneath the imposing sight of one of the monarch's palaces. Miller draws our attention to aspects of the painting and the culture of the period that raise doubts concerning this interpretation. However, the conclusion she draws does not seem to be supported by Turner's words or the views at the time. The painting could equally be seen to conform to the expected conventions of landscape painting.

We are left wondering why Barrell and Miller were seeking their particular meaning in the iconography of this painting. Miller claims Turner was "aware of

[39] E. Helsinger (1997), p. 162
[40] D. Chandler, Semiotics: The Basics (London: Routledge, 2002), p. 93

and concerned about the toll exacted on the rural poor".[41] This may be true but it does not appear to be supported by Turner's own words. Is it possible Miller is succumbing to the romantic myth of the artist as hero? Turner may be a great painter but this does not automatically mean he is a social revolutionary. Or is it possible that Miller is projecting her own socio-political views onto Turner's work?

We can therefore think of a landscape painting not as representing a single ideological view that it is the job of the art historian to uncover but as a dialogue between the painter and the picture on the one hand and between the picture and the viewer on the other. In this sense painting or viewing a painting is an analytical process, a to-ing and fro-ing between many possible interpretations, no single one of which is correct. What Miller is showing us is her dialogue with the painting and this tells us as much about her as it does about the painting.

(Word count, excluding footnotes and quotes: 3,434)

[41] M. Miller, p. 583

Bibliography

Barrell, J., *The Dark Side of the Landscape: The Rural Poor in English Painting 1730-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983)

Birch, D., *Ruskin on Turner*, (London: Cassell Publishers, 1990)

Brown, D. B., *The Art of J.M.W. Turner* (London: Quantum Publishing, 2003)

Chandler, D., *Semiotics: The Basics* (London: Routledge, 2002)

Clutton Brock, A., The Weakness and Strength of Turner, *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, Vol. 18, No. 91 (Oct., 1910), pp. 21-23

Copley, S., Garside, P., (eds.), *The Politics of the Picturesque: Literature, landscape and aesthetics since 1770*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

Daniels, S., *Fields of Vision: Landscape Imagery and National Identity in England and the United States* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993)

Daunton, M. J., *Progress and Poverty: An Economic and Social History of Britain 1700-1850*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995),

Evans, E. J., *The Forging of the Modern State: Early Industrial Britain 1783-1879* (Harlow: Pearson Education, 2001)

Finberg, A., Turner's Landscape, with Cattle in Water, *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, Vol. 14, No. 69 (Dec., 1908), pp. 167-168

Ford, B., *The Cambridge Cultural History of Britain, Volume 6: The Romantic Age in Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992)

Harrison, C., Wood, P., Gaiger, J., (eds.), *Art in Theory 1648-1815: An Anthology of Changing Ideas* (London: Blackwell Publishing, 2000)

Harrison, C., Wood, P., Gaiger, J., (eds.), *Art in Theory 1815-1900: An Anthology of Changing Ideas* (London: Blackwell Publishing, 2003)

Helsinger, E., *Rural Scenes and National Representation: Britain 1815-1850*, (Chichester: Princeton University Press, 1997)

Holcomb, A. M., More Matter with Less Art: Romantic Attitudes toward Landscape Painting, *Art Journal*, Vol. 36, No. 4 (Summer, 1977), pp. 303-306

Holmes, C., Three Pictures by Turner, *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, Vol. 14, No. 67 (Oct., 1908), pp. 17-26

Humphreys, R., *Tate Companion to British Art*, (London: Tate Publishing, 2001)

Janowitz, A., The Chartist Picturesque in S. Copley, P. Garside (eds.), *The Politics of the Picturesque: Literature, landscape and aesthetics since 1770* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 261-281

Kavolis, V., Art Content and Social Involvement, *Social Forces*, Vol. 42, No. 4 (May, 1964), pp. 467-472

Kelly, T. M., J. M. W. Turner, Napoleonic Caricature and Romantic Allegory, *ELH*, Vol. 58, No. 2 (Summer, 1991), pp. 351-382

Lochnan, K., *Turner Whistler Monet*, (London: Tate Publishing, 2004)

Lukacher, B., Nature Historicized: Constable, Turner, and Romantic Landscape Painting in S. Eisenman (ed.) *Nineteenth Century Art: A Critical History* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2002)

Ousby, I., *The Englishman's England: Taste, travel and the rise of tourism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)

Miller, M.L., J.M.W. Turner's 'Ploughing up Turnips, near Slough': The Cultivation of Cultural Dissent, *Art Bulletin*, Vol. 77:4, (1995:Dec.), pp. 573-583

Panofsky, E., *Meaning in the Visual Arts* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970)

Payne, C., *Toil and Plenty: Images of the Agricultural Landscape in England 1780-1890* (London: Yale University Press, 1993)

Rosenthal, M., Payne, C., Wilcox, S., (eds.), *Prospects for the Nation: Recent Essays in British Landscape, 1750-1880* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1997)

Shanes, E., *Turner: The Life and Masterworks*, (New York: Parkstone Press, 2004)

Smiles, S., Dressed to Till: Representational Strategies in the Depiction of Rural Labour, c. 1790-1830 in Rosenthal, M., Payne, C., Wilcox, S., *Prospects for the Nation: Recent Essays in British Landscape, 1750-1880* (London: Yale University Press, 1997)

Solkin, D. H., *Painting for Money: The Visual Arts and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century England* (London: Yale University Press, 1992)

Taylor, B., *Art for the Nation: Exhibitions and the London Public 1747-2001* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999)

The Times, Apr 23, 1798, p. 3, col. A, Royal Academy

The Times, Apr 29, 1799, p. 3, col. B, Royal Academy

The Times, Apr 14, 1806, p. 3, col. C, The British Institution

The Times, Jul 19, 1806, p. 3, col. C, British Institution for promoting the Fine Arts in the United Kingdom

The Times, Jun 16, 1807, p. 3, col. C, Royal Academy, Somerset House

The Times, May 6, 1815, p. 3, col. D, The Arts

The Times, Jun 6, 1817, p. 2, col. F, Report of the trial of Mr. Wooller, author of 'The Black Dwarf'

The Times, Jun 14, 1820, p. 2, col. G, *French Papers, Paris June 10*

The Times, Jan 15, 1823, p. 3 col. B, *The Fine Arts*, includes a review of a painting by Turner

The Times, May 4, 1841, p. 5, col. E, *The Royal Academy Exhibition*, includes a review of a painting by Turner

Vaughan, W., *British Painting: The Golden Age from Hogarth to Turner* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1999)

Vaughan, W., *Romanticism and Art* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1994)

Vaughan, W., Constable's Englishness, *Oxford Art Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (1996), pp. 17-27

Wölfflin, H., *Principles of Art History: The Problem of the Development of Style in Later Art* (New York: Dover, 1950)

Worrall, D., Agrarians against the Picturesque: ultra-radicalism and the revolutionary politics of land in S. Copley, P. Garside (eds.), *The Politics of the Picturesque: Literature, landscape and aesthetics since 1770* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 240-260

Ziff, J., 'Backgrounds, Introduction of Architecture and Landscape': A Lecture by J. M. W. Turner, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 26, No. 1-2 (1963), pp. 124-147