

5-8-2022

Contested Cosmopolitanism: William and Elizabeth A. Sharp's Glasgow Herald Reviews of the Paris Salons 1884-1900

Michael Shaw
University of Stirling

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ssl>



Part of the [Fine Arts Commons](#), and the [Literature in English, British Isles Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Shaw, Michael (2022) "Contested Cosmopolitanism: William and Elizabeth A. Sharp's Glasgow Herald Reviews of the Paris Salons 1884-1900," *Studies in Scottish Literature*: Vol. 48: Iss. 1, 37–47.

DOI: 10.51221/sc.ssl.2022.48.1.5

Available at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ssl/vol48/iss1/5>

This Article is brought to you by the Scottish Literature Collections at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Studies in Scottish Literature* by an authorized editor of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact digres@mailbox.sc.edu.

**CONTESTED COSMOPOLITANISM: WILLIAM AND
ELIZABETH A. SHARP'S *GLASGOW HERALD*
REVIEWS OF THE PARIS SALONS 1884-1900**

Michael Shaw

While in Paris to review the annual Salons in 1892, the poet and literary critic William Sharp (who developed the Fiona Macleod persona the following year) wrote to his friend Thomas Janvier about his lifestyle in the French capital. Relating his carefree “roughing” with his “comrades” in Paris—name-dropping Jean Moréas, Maurice Barrès and his chance encounter with Paul Verlaine—Sharp reassured Janvier that he was going to become more respectable in the coming weeks:

I am keeping down my too cosmopolitan acquaintanceship in Paris to the narrowest limit: and on and after the second of May am going to reform and remain reformed.¹

In referring to his “too cosmopolitan acquaintanceship” here, Sharp is at least partly using the word “cosmopolitan” to signal “bohemian”: indeed, he comments on the “feverish bohemianism” of his friends two sentences on. But Sharp’s notion that cosmopolitanism, not simply bohemianism, should have limits, or a grounding, is also telling. In the 1890s, Sharp frequently wrestled with his enthusiasms for both cosmopolitanism and various forms of cultural particularism, ranging from folklore and pagan traditions to Scottish identity and Celtic revivalism. As Flavia Alaya notes, he hoped to combine “his cosmopolitan commitment” with “the strong nostalgia he felt for Celtism.”² Sharp was a committed cosmopolitan, but his cosmopolitanism seldom took the form of “non-belonging,” outright opposition to nationhood and national identity, that defined some

¹ Letter from William Sharp to Thomas Janvier (23 April 1892), in *The Life and Letters of William Sharp*, ed. by William F. Halloran, 3 vols (Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, 2018), I, 394. Abbreviated as *Life and Letters* in subsequent references.

² Flavia Alaya, *William Sharp—“Fiona Macleod” 1855-1905* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970), 147.

conceptions of cosmopolitanism.³ Instead, he often sought to accommodate cultural particularism and national identity within his cosmopolitanism, explaining why he might have viewed some cosmopolitans as “too cosmopolitan.”

Sharp’s wrestling with cosmopolitanism and cultural particularism was in many ways a reflection of his historical moment. Stefano Evangelista highlights that the late nineteenth century witnessed a shift in the way cosmopolitanism was conceptualised. Citing Herder’s internationalism and Mazzini’s commitment to both Italian nationalism and a united Europe, Evangelista notes that cosmopolitanism and nationalism were not necessarily perceived as opposing concepts earlier in the nineteenth century. But, by the 1890s, they were increasingly defined as “irreconcilable opposites” through the rise of energised, competitive nationalisms.⁴ Evangelista rightly stresses that some imperialists of the fin de siècle attempted to co-opt the idea of cosmopolitanism, thereby linking nationalism with cosmopolitanism. But—despite such efforts—to be a cosmopolitan at the fin de siècle was increasingly viewed as an “oppositional” identity, one broadly opposed to nationalism.⁵ Sharp’s notion of cosmopolitanism seldom aligned with this emerging definition, which led him to debate and theorise his ideas.

Sharp wasn’t the only writer in fin-de-siècle Scotland who attempted to reconcile an enthusiasm for cosmopolitanism with nationhood. Among others was his wife and biographer, the editor and art critic, Elizabeth A. Sharp, who similarly debated the two concepts. One of the places where both William and Elizabeth expressed their views on cosmopolitanism and national identity was in their annual reviews of the Paris Salons for the *Glasgow Herald*, from 1884 until the end of the century. Both William and Elizabeth served as art correspondents for the *Glasgow Herald* (with Elizabeth succeeding William at some point in the 1890s) and part of their remit was to travel to Paris to review the Salons, which took place annually in the Spring. Inspired by these great cosmopolitan exhibitions, and the debates surrounding domestic and international art in Paris at that time, their reviews became sites for them to develop and define their ideas on cosmopolitanism and its relationship to nationhood. In these reviews, their interest in reconciling cosmopolitanism and national identity is evident, although we occasionally find the two concepts in tension too. These reviews provide us with insights into how Scottish writers were

³ Stefano Evangelista, *Literary Cosmopolitanism in the English Fin de Siècle: Citizens of Nowhere* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), 1.

⁴ Evangelista, *Literary Cosmopolitanism*, 5.

⁵ Evangelista, *Literary Cosmopolitanism*, 9. Alaya also outlines some of the features and contexts of this “new cosmopolitanism” in *William Sharp*, 153-65.

conceptualising cosmopolitanism at a time of change and into the concerted cosmopolitanism of Scotland's Celtic Revival. More generally, they remind us of "the important role played by the periodical medium in the creation of literary cosmopolitanism as a discursive phenomenon."⁶

The Sharps' Cosmopolitanism

The Sharps' interest in cosmopolitanism is evident in a number of their works and activities, but it is perhaps best embodied in their contributions to the culture of Celtic revivalism in fin-de-siècle Edinburgh. William Sharp and Patrick Geddes were united in their conviction that a Celtic or Scottish Revival could not be parochial but had to be receptive to, and engage with, the wider world. As Elizabeth Sharp commented on in her memoir of her husband:

Both were idealists, keen students of life and nature; cosmopolitan in outlook and interest, they were also ardent Celts who believed in the necessity of preserving the finer subtle qualities and the spiritual heritage of their race against the encroaching predominance of materialistic ideas and aims of the day.⁷

Here, Sharp notes Geddes and her husband's conviction in a spiritual nationalism, suggestive of Herder's *volksgeist*, but she also details that they were nevertheless deeply cosmopolitan. This characterisation of Geddes and William Sharp's ideas chimes well with one of Geddes's own statements about his projects in Edinburgh: "Our little scholastic colony in the heart of Edinburgh symbolises a movement which while national to the core, is really cosmopolitan in its intellectual reach."⁸ This fusion of cosmopolitanism and cultural nationalism is found throughout a magazine that William Sharp and Geddes established—and one that Elizabeth Sharp contributed her short story "Frost" to—*The Evergreen*. Even the magazine's structure signalled and embedded its dual commitment to Scotland and to the world: each of the four issues (dedicated to a season) included sections titled "in the world" and "in the north." The "in the world" sections didn't simply include texts by international authors but also untranslated French texts, such as Abbé Félix Klein's "Vers l'Unité," which commented on cosmopolitanism, in the Summer issue. The concern with fusing the cosmopolitan with the particular was sustained until the very last prose contribution, the magazine's Winter "Envoy" by Geddes and William Macdonald, which celebrated "the profound and renescent unity of local and regional survivals and initiatives with racial and

⁶ Evangelista, *Literary Cosmopolitanism*, 28.

⁷ Elizabeth A. Sharp, *William Sharp (Fiona Macleod): A Memoir* (London: William Heinemann, 1910), pp. 248-49. Hereafter abbreviated as *A Memoir*.

⁸ Cited in *A Memoir*, 249

cosmopolitan ones” and went on to call for “fresh gatherings and meetings, studious and joyous, Scottish or cosmopolitan.” Much of this envoy focuses on the relationship between the sciences and the arts, reflective of the fact that the cosmopolitanism of the magazine was closely connected to Geddes’s generalism and his desire to understand the “whole.”⁹

Geddes was certainly influential in nurturing the cosmopolitanism of Edinburgh’s Celticist community, but William and Elizabeth Sharp were equally ambitious. In a letter to Geddes, William proposed that the publishing firm, Patrick Geddes & Colleagues, which published *The Evergreen*, might release a “cosmopolitan series”: “What about a series of short books of fiction—as this is so much the vogue at present... It might be called ‘*The Evergreen Series*’: or, say, the ‘Cosmopolitan’ Series”.¹⁰ Sharp then lists numerous writers that could be included in such a series, ranging from Hanssons to Gabriele D’Annunzio to Georges Eekhoud. Sharp was keen to place his and others’ Celtic revival writings in dialogue with wider developments in “new” literature; indeed, alongside the various contributions he made to *The Evergreen*, writing as both Sharp and Macleod, he also translated the work of the Belgian writer Charles van Lerberghe, “The Night-Comers,” for the Autumn issue. Elizabeth Sharp’s work with Patrick Geddes & Colleagues similarly revealed her disinterest in the parochial. Her edition of poetry, *Lyra Celtica*, was a key anthology of the Scottish Celtic Revival, but it was far from insular, as reflected in its subtitle: “Ancient Irish, Alban, Gaelic, Breton, Cymric, and Modern Scottish and Irish Celtic Poetry.” The anthology also included Manx, Cornish, and Welsh poetry as well as a final section, “The Celtic Fringe”—a wry appropriation of the dismissive expression that had only gained traction during the Home Rule debates of the 1890s. This “Celtic Fringe” section of the anthology focussed on those living beyond the Celtic nations loosely “of Celtic blood” (p. 422), showing that while the anthology was expansive, a concern with race and roots also underpinned fin-de-siècle Celticism.

Beyond Patrick Geddes & Colleagues, the Sharps’ works reveal their commitment to cosmopolitanism and their interest in cosmopolitan figures. Elizabeth would publish an illustrated biography of Rembrandt (1904), noting his “cosmopolitan mind,” and she translated Heinrich Heine’s *Italian Travel Sketches* (1892), which was published alongside her translation of Heine’s previously untranslated *The French Stage: Confidential Letters addressed to M. August Lewald*.¹¹ William had also

⁹ Patrick Geddes and William Macdonald, “Envoy,” *The Evergreen* 4 (1896): 156.

¹⁰ Letter from William Sharp to Patrick Geddes (29 April 1895), in *Life and Letters*, II, 58.

¹¹ Elizabeth A. Sharp, *Rembrandt* (London: Methuen, 1904), 56.

researched Heine, and wrote a biography of him (1888), which characterised Heine as a “typical cosmopolitan,” “one of the men of no nationality” with “nothing parochial in his type.”¹² William too wrote on Rembrandt, publishing an essay on him in *Cosmopolis: An International Review*, where he also published his story “The Wayfarer,” in 1898. Among William’s various other cosmopolitan endeavours, he became particularly interested in the literature of the Low Countries, especially Belgium, and wrote several articles on Belgian literature. William’s letters reveal that the Sharps were regularly travelling abroad in the 1890s and early twentieth century, and they sustained a number of cosmopolitan friendships and correspondences. Indeed, one of William’s late letters was written to a young Yone Noguchi. And before contributing to *The Evergreen*, William and Elizabeth had published in *The Scottish Art Review*, which featured a remarkable range of contributions, from poetry by “Michael Field,” to translations of Goethe and Gautier by Edward Carpenter, to an essay on “Tourguéneff, Tolstoi, and Dostoievsky” by Peter Kropotkin. Like *The Evergreen*, *The Scottish Art Review* placed the Scots arts scene in dialogue with European culture more widely.

What is clear is that Elizabeth and William Sharp’s Celtic revivalism, and their interest in Scottish tradition, literature and folklore, was by no means insular. But, unlike Heine in William’s framing, these were not figures with no nationality (even if they were sometimes drawn to that idea).¹³ Theirs was a cosmopolitanism that frequently saw cultural particularism and cosmopolitanism as co-dependent, not opposed. Their attitude often embodied the conception of cosmopolitanism articulated by Israel Zangwill, when he was commenting on Geddes’s circle in Edinburgh: “the quest at once of local colour and cosmopolitanism is not at all self-contradictory. The truest cosmopolitanism goes with the intensest local colour, for otherwise you contribute nothing to the human treasury and make mankind one vast featureless monotony.”¹⁴ Cultural particularism and cultural nationalism could strengthen and enliven cosmopolitanism for these figures. But that does not mean the two concepts were always mutually supportive in their framings, which is evident in their reviews of the Paris Salons for the *Glasgow Herald*.

The Sharps’ Paris Salon Reviews

The Paris Salon was one of Europe’s greatest annual art exhibitions, and had been since the mid-eighteenth century, with its origins stretching back

¹² William Sharp, *Life of Heinrich Heine* (London: Walter Scott, 1888), 12.

¹³ Alaya, *William Sharp*, 170.

¹⁴ Israel Zangwill, “Without Prejudice,” *The Chap-Book* 4 (1895): 232.

even further to 1667. During the nineteenth century, a number of larger newspapers (including the *Glasgow Herald* and *The Scotsman*) sent special correspondents to Paris to review the exhibition, which showcased the latest art from France and around the world. From 1890, the workload for some of these reviewers effectively doubled due to the establishment of a secessionist Salon, organised by the *Société Nationale des Beaux-Arts*. This “new” Salon, known as the *Salon du Champ de Mars*, displayed more innovative artworks, generally by newer groups of artists, and was more receptive to naturalism and impressionism than the more “academical” work displayed in the “old” Salon at the *Champs-Élysées*. The new Salon also arose due to debates over nationality: Jean-Louis-Ernest Meissonier, Puvis de Chavannes and other artists seceded from the French Artists’ Society, which ran the “old” Salon, because they believed it tried to “diminish the value of awards that foreigners received,” as Meissonier put it.¹⁵ The “new” Salon was “identified as being internationalist, feminist, Naturalist and modern,” and its popularity and influence demanded its own newspaper coverage.¹⁶

The *Glasgow Herald’s* correspondents during this period of secession were William and Elizabeth Sharp. William had moved to London in 1878, where he formed a friendship with Dante Gabriel Rossetti, and in 1881 he worked in the Fine Art Society’s Gallery in Bond Street. In September 1883, he was employed as the *Glasgow Herald’s* “London Art Critic”, as Elizabeth put it, or in his own description “art critic and correspondent.”¹⁷ Part of his remit included visiting the Paris Salon in the spring of each year and writing lengthy reviews, which were usually published as a series in the *Glasgow Herald* over the Spring months. The Paris visits were clearly one of the most enjoyable parts of the job for William: his first visit, where he “dwelt in ecstasy” in Paris, saw him forming a friendship with Paul Bourget and planning visits to Madame Blavatsky and Zola.¹⁸ William continued in this role before Elizabeth, who had accompanied him to various Salons, succeeded him as art critic for the *Glasgow Herald*. It’s not clear exactly when, but William F. Halloran writes that around 1890 “Sharp transferred the post of London art critic for the *Glasgow Herald*.”¹⁹

¹⁵ Cited in Fae Brauer, *Rivals and Conspirators: The Paris Salons and the Modern Art Centre* (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars, 2013), 111.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 125. Confusingly, despite being more “internationalist,” the new, or *Champ de Mars* Salon was also referred to by some as the National Salon, as it was run by the *Société Nationale des Beaux Arts*. The “old” Salon was sometimes referred to as the French Artists’ Salon, organised by the *Société des Artistes Français*.

¹⁷ *Life and Letters* I, 70; *A Memoir*, 79; Letter from William Sharp to J. Stanley Little (16 April 1890), in *Life and Letters* I, 287.

¹⁸ Cited in *A Memoir*, 96.

¹⁹ *Life and Letters*, I, 270.

Writing about 1894 in her memoir of her husband, Elizabeth notes that she had “for some time” undertaken “the work of the Art Critic for the *Glasgow Herald*.”²⁰ She certainly left her husband in Scotland in 1896 to “recommence [her] work on *The Glasgow Herald*.”²¹

Frustratingly, like much newspaper correspondence of the 1890s, the *Glasgow Herald* Salon reviews are not attributed; they are mostly signed “from our special correspondent.”²² But, based on William’s letters and diary entries, and Elizabeth’s memoir, we can distinguish who wrote some of the reviews.²³ For instance, William’s 1893 diary entry tells us that Elizabeth was in Paris for the Salons: “In May E. [Elizabeth] went to Paris for the Salon: I went to Ventnor and Freshwater.”²⁴ We also know that it was Elizabeth who penned the 1897 articles. In her memoir, Elizabeth notes that “I went to Paris to write upon the two ‘Salons,’ and my husband, still very unwell, went to St Margaret’s Bay.”²⁵ But that does not necessarily mean that all of the reviews written in the 1890s were exclusively by Elizabeth: in letters to Geddes from 1895, William notes that both he and Elizabeth were to travel to Paris to do “our art-work” at the Salons.²⁶ Exactly who wrote these 1895 reviews, or whether they were collaborations between the two, is unclear.²⁷

The Sharps’ reviews in the *Glasgow Herald* often touch on contemporary artistic gossip and disputes, such as whether the Impressionist or academical schools will triumph, or the fashions and demographics of the attendees, before going on to discuss a number of paintings and sculptures in detail.²⁸ These reviews became fertile sites for the Sharps to discuss cosmopolitanism due to the the cosmopolitan range of artworks that were displayed between the two Salons and the highly cosmopolitan audiences who attended the exhibitions: according to

²⁰ *A Memoir*, 233.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 266.

²² For a detailed study of Victorian special correspondence, see Catherine Waters, *Special Correspondence and the Newspaper Press in Victorian Print Culture 1850-1886* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019).

²³ It is highly unlikely that William reviewed the 1886 Salon as he was suffering from scarlet and rheumatic fevers during the time of the Salon. I am grateful to William F. Halloran for highlighting this detail.

²⁴ Cited in *A Memoir*, 215.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 285.

²⁶ Letters from William Sharp to Patrick Geddes (27 April 1895 and 29 April 1895), in *Life and Letters*, II, 57.

²⁷ Elizabeth also published an unsigned review, “Sculpture at the Salon,” in *Scottish Art Review* (June 1889), 13-14; Letter from Elizabeth Sharp to James Mavor (10 May 1889), in *Life and Letters*, I, 244.

²⁸ “The Paris Salons: The New Salon,” *Glasgow Herald* (23 April 1897), 9.

Théodore Duret, “incessantly foreigners arrive in large numbers.”²⁹ And in their reviews we find both authors wrestling with their interests in both nationhood and cosmopolitanism.

Even the supposedly more “national” Salon, the “old” Salon in the *Champs-Élysées*, drew the Sharps because of its cosmopolitanism. The 17 March 1890 review can be confidently attributed to William Sharp, because William was in Paris that Spring and the review references a past conversation that the reviewer had with Paul Bourget, who William had spent considerable time with in Paris in 1884, when Elizabeth wasn’t there.³⁰ In this review, titled “Sunday at the Salon,” Sharp applauds the cosmopolitanism of the artists showcased. While he clarifies that many French artists and artworks feature at this Salon, he notes the number of American and British artists, and highlights the presence of “the younger Scotsmen—Mr J. Lavery, Mr Paterson, Mr W. Kennedy, Mr Guthrie.” Sharp concludes that:

It is this cosmopolitanism, indeed, which is one of the chief attractions of the Salon. It is well that there is at least one great art exhibition where the parochial element is not conspicuously dominant.³¹

Sharp clearly favours cosmopolitanism over parochialism here, but it is also clear that his notion of cosmopolitanism embraces cultural particularity and national identity. Earlier on in the review, when commenting on the attendees at the Salon, Sharp mocks those who cast off their nationality. He takes particular aim at the upper classes, including the “wealthy foreign contingent,” who attend on Fridays. These upper-class Friday visitors “all seem to be of one race, of one people, with merely individual differences of feature and manner.” When commenting on these visitors, Sharp relates a conversation with Bourget, who told him that: “one only needs to go to the Salon on a Friday to see how little affected by nationality is the *beau-monde*.”³² Sharp portrays these visitors as languid socialites, who “take a certain interest in the canvases bearing the signatures of artists of note, go through a few of the rooms, stroll through the Sculpture Court, shake a great many hands and chat a great deal, and ultimately depart, satisfied that they have done all that is necessary both for the patronage of art and for the acquisition of ample subject matter for conversation.”

²⁹ Cited in Brauer, p. 2.

³⁰ Letter from William Sharp to Elizabeth A. Sharp (10 May 1884), in *Life and Letters*, I, 126-127, 268.

³¹ [William Sharp], “Sunday at the Salon,” *Glasgow Herald* (17 May 1890): 4.

³² *Ibid.*

Sharp's condescension for this generic, if international, grouping is further revealed when he compares these Friday visitors to the Sunday visitors, who are of "such characteristic types of the French people." These groups, ranging from "genuine students" to "country visitors" and "marines or sailors" to "the *épicier* of the small *rues*," together embody their nationality and Sharp finds this audience far more "wonderful" and their criticism much more incisive, noting that "even the most ordinary among the visitors make shrewd remarks."³³ Sharp simultaneously applauds cosmopolitanism while distancing himself from an anti-national form of cosmopolitanism. Instead, a collection of national types, and the interaction of different national types, defines Sharp's cosmopolitanism in this review.

As the 1890s developed, and the "new" *Champ de Mars* Salon became more established, it's clear that the Sharps were increasingly drawn to it on account of its even greater cosmopolitanism. The reviews even distinguish between the more "national" (old) Salon and the more cosmopolitan (new) one.³⁴ The 11 May 1892 review explicitly highlights this distinction, applauding "the cosmopolitanism of the Champ de Mars Exhibition":

The New Salon ... is in every way better worth study, and better worth even a passing visit by preference if need be, than its rival on the northern side of the Seine [...] the exhibition is really an international one. I have noted no fewer than 126 foreign exhibitors.³⁵

We are later told that artists from "almost every European country" feature, among them Glasgow's "James Guthrie, who is admirably represented," while American and Chilean painters are exhibited too. But there is also a concern in these later reviews over what is happening to French art and its national distinctiveness.

In Elizabeth Sharp's 1897 reviews of the Salons, she reflects on how French art is being affected by the rise of cosmopolitanism. In her 21 April 1897 review, commenting on the *Champs-Élysées* Salon, she writes:

Art has been and is everywhere dominated by the French method, but there seems, to judge by this year's Salon, in this cosmopolitan spreading of French methods to be a corresponding loss of distinctiveness, of nationality, in French art itself. The merging of the sentiment of nationality into a wider sentiment of the community of popular taste seems to be taking place in France, with the result that she is becoming the less and less differentiated in expression of national sentiments, and approaching more to the expression of general human emotions. In the future this tendency

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ "The Paris Salons," *Glasgow Herald* (12 May 1898): 4.

³⁵ "The New Salon," *Glasgow Herald* (11 May 1892): 4.

doubtless will produce art of the finest quality with a possible return to extreme simplicity. Meanwhile one can only regret the fact that as the divergent picturesque national characteristics disappear the issue is an art of a solid conscientious mediocrity of excellence, of bourgeois qualities—in a word, lacking distinction, lacking poetic refinement.³⁶

Sharp anticipates modernist art here, in her claim that an “extreme simplicity” may emerge in art that is no longer underpinned by nationality. But while she believes that this post-national cosmopolitanism may produce great art in the future, she laments the loss of national distinctiveness in French art in the present, finding it mediocre and—in tune with her husband—generic in its lack of national specificity. The quotation reveals that Elizabeth too appreciated national particularism within cosmopolitanism, although, unlike William, we see here that she is more welcoming of a forthcoming post-national cosmopolitanism in art. The review illustrates the tensions in Elizabeth’s thinking: she is both appreciative of particularism while considering the possible advantages of artworks by citizens of nowhere, demonstrating the frictions that some writers of the Celtic Revival felt over their relationship to national identity and cosmopolitanism.

In these reviews, the Sharps use a series of great cosmopolitan exhibitions to think through and develop their theories of national identity and cosmopolitanism. Elizabeth flirts with a form of cosmopolitanism that has little regard for the nation, but they often manage to reconcile their commitments to both national identity and cosmopolitanism, believing, like Zangwill, that a divergence of nationalities and national styles nourishes art and cosmopolitanism. Indeed, in her 1897 reviews, Elizabeth is keen to stress the great contribution that Scottish artists make to the international mix at the new Salon, noting:

Naturally, a Scot is delighted to find Scottish art so well represented as it is, and notably by Mr James Guthrie and Mr E. A. Walton; and I may say at once that much attention has been drawn among the French critics and visitors by the conspicuously-placed portrait by Mr Guthrie of Mr Alexander Sinclair, of the *Glasgow Herald*.... Mr Guthrie’s other portrait, that of a young Glasgow lady in white, has also, and deservedly, been much admired.³⁷

Elizabeth highlights Scottish achievements and contributions to this broader cosmopolitan culture, and outrage is expressed in 1900 when

³⁶ [Elizabeth Sharp], “The Paris Salon [Second Notice]”, *Glasgow Herald* (21 April 1897): 9.

³⁷ [Elizabeth Sharp], “The Paris Salons: The New Salon”, *Glasgow Herald* (23 April 1897): p. 9. There is further comment by Elizabeth on Scottish art in the 27 April 1897 review.

“even ‘the Glasgow School’ seems without a representative!”³⁸ Writing for a Glaswegian paper, the Sharps don’t simply defend the importance of national identity and national styles in cosmopolitanism but also local distinctions and movements. Together, much like their wider efforts, these reviews reveal the ways the Sharps resisted the growing tendency to see the particular and the cosmopolitan as irreconcilable opposites.

University of Stirling

³⁸ “The French Salon: A First Look Around,” *Glasgow Herald* (6 April 1900): 9.