

Eighteenth-century Sculpture and its Interpretation

Malcolm Baker

University of Edinburgh

PhD (by Research Publications)

2003

Eighteenth-century sculpture and its interpretation

Publications by Malcolm Baker submitted for Degree of Ph.D by Research Publications

The following publications are submitted for the above degree:

1. Figured in Marble. The Making and Viewing of Eighteenth-century Sculpture, London and Los Angeles, 2000. (65,431 words)
2. Roubiliac and The Eighteenth-century Monument. Sculpture as Theatre, New Haven and London, 1995, 207-273, 382-387. (23,337 words)

(The text submitted by the candidate forms part of a collaborative work by David Bindman and Malcolm Baker; the volume is made up of several distinct authorial contributions and the responsibility of each author for different parts is clearly stated in the publication.)

3. They are accompanied by a Critical Review (10, 956 words)

(Total word length: 99, 724 words.)

Appendix I: Catalogue of Roubiliac's Funerary Monuments, forming Part III of Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-century Monument, 275-359

Appendix II: A list of ten related articles.

1 and 2, along with the Critical Review, were written solely by me.

The text included under Appendix I was written almost entirely by me but incorporates some material provided by David Bindman and Tessa Murdoch.

The articles listed in Appendix II were written solely by me, except for one article of which I was the principal author, the co-authors being Alastair Laing and Colin Harrison.

I also declare that none of the above mentioned writings have been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.

1.4. xii. 02

Abstract

Eighteenth-century sculpture and its interpretation

The publications and critical review submitted by Malcolm Baker for the Degree of Ph.D by Research Publications

The publications submitted here comprise Figured in Marble. The Making and Viewing of Eighteenth-century Sculpture and my contribution to the main text of Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-century Monument. Sculpture as Theatre (pp. 207-273; 382-387). Appendix I consists of the Catalogue of Roubiliac's Funerary Monuments from the latter study, which is almost entirely my own work but incorporates some material provided by David Bindman and Tessa Murdoch) and Appendix II lists ten articles that supplement the material presented in the two books. Together Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-century Monument and Figured in Marble, along with the related articles, draw on and to some degree re-work various genres of writing employed in studies of the history of sculpture. At the same time they also take account of the large literature about British art and, more particularly, the changing approaches apparent in studies of the past twenty years.

My contribution to Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-century Monument (forming Part II, 'Making the Monuments') is concerned with the processes of designing and making the monuments that are discussed by David Bindman in Part I of the volume in terms of their typology and social and religious functions. The various types of evidence available for the procedures of commissioning, design and making followed by this one sculptor, Roubiliac, are considered here in relation to the practices adopted by other sculptors in England and abroad. But as well as situating Roubiliac's practice

in a wider context of sculptural activity, this text also very consciously departs from a simple descriptive account and throughout attempts to address the problem of how such workshop practices might be understood in terms of transactions between patron, sculptor and viewer as well as a register of the sculptor's own self-presentation. This discussion, like David Bindman's Part I, constantly draws on the detailed evidence assembled in the Catalogue which forms Part III and is here submitted as Appendix III.. These extensive entries provide very full accounts of individual monuments, in which both details – textual as well as material – about every surviving or documented model or drawing, and the descriptions of completed monuments and their construction, are prefaced with a lengthy narrative account of each commission, from its inception to its later afterlife. Far from being summaries of what may be found elsewhere in the text, these catalogue entries constitute an independent but complementary text.

Whereas Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-century Monument is a monograph (albeit of an ambitious kind) about a single artist, Figured in Marble has a more discursive form and attempts to suggest various ways of approaching eighteenth-century sculpture. After an initial introduction that argues for the centrality of sculpture in eighteenth-century British visual culture, the text is arranged in four sections in each of which a short methodological preamble is followed by three cases studies. The first section is concerned with the historiography of British sculpture and the ways in which both art-historical literature and museum displays have conditioned our viewing of it. The second section examines questions of design, making and materials while the third looks at categories and genres. The final section deals with collecting, displaying and viewing. As well as attempting to prompt historians of British art into according

sculpture the degree of attention commensurate with that given to it by contemporaries, Figured in Marble also argues for a closer linkage between making and viewing, so making explicit an approach put into practice in Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-century Monument.

The critical review of these publications outlines the framework of debate about sculpture in Britain to which these writings both respond and contribute and situates them within an historiographical context. I look first at the literature on sculpture as a distinct category of art historical writing, considering the dominant issues and methodologies, the genres of text in which these are addressed and then the place that writing about British sculpture have in this tradition. Having placed my own publications in relationship to this literature, I then go on to outline in the second section what I see as the new approaches to the history of sculpture that I have tried to develop in my work. The first two parts of this section look at sculpture as an aspect of British art and British sculpture as an aspect of European sculpture. The third and fourth parts are concerned with two central issues – firstly, the question and reception and viewing and, secondly, that of production and consumption – and consider how they might be addressed by those working on sculpture. A brief final coda attempts to draw these various strands together and to summarise how the publications submitted here represent an attempt at approaching eighteenth-century sculpture in these ways.

Eighteenth-century sculpture and its interpretation

A critical review of Malcolm Baker's publications submitted for Degree of Ph.D by Research Publications

Introduction

The publications submitted here - Figured in Marble. The Making and Viewing of Eighteenth-century Sculpture and my contribution to the main text of Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-century Monument. Sculpture as Theatre , along with the related articles listed in Appendix II - together draw on and to some degree re-work various genres of writing employed in studies of the history of sculpture.¹ At the same time they also take account of the large literature about British art and, more particularly, the changing approaches apparent in studies of the past twenty years. This review will consider the relationship of these publications to these historiographical traditions and examine what I see as the major issues to be addressed in discussion of sculpture in eighteenth-century Britain. While a retrospective account such as this runs the risk of exaggerating the degree to which this body of work was planned as a coherent whole, these studies have running through them certain concerns and approaches that may be seen as responses to a substantial and distinctive literature about sculpture and to a lively and continuing debate about British art in this period. Together these publications represent a continuing attempt to find a mode of interpretation that takes account both of the materiality of sculpture and of the uses to which such works were put within the historical context of eighteenth-century Britain. In this way they situate sculpture within a framework of discussions of visual imagery as these have developed over the past twenty years. One striking feature of these developments is

the manner in which they combine methodological and interpretative innovation with a conservative approach to what constitutes the canon of British art by largely ignoring anything other than painting. By seeing sculpture as a category of visual culture that crosses familiar boundaries, I have tried to shift this focus by considering the production and consumption of sculpture in relation not only to the practices of painters and their patrons but also to the operation of the luxury trades and their market. I suggest that by taking account of the substantial and significant work on the decorative arts in this period, sculpture offers a means of working between what are usually considered separate spheres of art historical activity.

The publications submitted here are based on research over the past twenty years about the functions of sculpture in eighteenth-century Britain, the conditions of its production and its reception by both contemporary and later viewers. Together these form a sustained attempt to write sculpture back into the familiar narrative of British art in which painting, and to a lesser extent architecture, have long been given the dominant roles. These various studies cover the “long” eighteenth century, though much of the material discussed was produced between 1730 and 1770, a period in which, I argue, sculpture had particular prominence as a category of public art that registered many of the central concerns of an emergent “polite and commercial” culture.² The publications submitted here deal with the full range of sculptural genres during this period, including monuments, busts, garden sculpture, ivory reliefs and medals; these are considered in relation to other classes of artistic production, such as portrait painting and conversation pieces, as well as to luxury trades, such as that of the goldsmiths. At the same time as locating the production and use of sculpture within the context of Georgian Britain, these studies also assume a complex and

dynamic relationship between the work of sculptors active in Britain (mainly London) and that of sculptors in major European centres. Roubiliac's distinctiveness as a sculptor, for example, is understood in terms of his familiarity not only with the work of Coyzevox and Coustou in Paris but also with Permoser and Egell in Dresden, while Wilton's position as a artist is considered in relation to his continuing (and reciprocal) dialogue with French sculptors such as Pigalle. In line with this, sculpture in Britain is understood here not simply as sculpture produced in Britain but as works, including antique marbles and Italian bronzes, that were being acquired and displayed in England and (on occasion) Scotland.

Central to the interpretations proposed here is a concern to bring into dialogue issues of both production and consumption. Throughout these texts runs an interest in working with both information about the techniques and materials of sculptural production and evidence about reception and response, as this may be deduced from both the documentation about settings and viewing conditions and contemporary critical comment. In accord with this methodological position, my aim has been to combine a substantial amount of new documentation about what may be claimed to be major works in the history of eighteenth-century European art with new approaches to their interpretation. It has also meant that these publications involve a variety of modes of art-historical writing. These range from a monograph about one genre of work produced by a single sculptor - albeit a monograph in which the standard relationships between both authorial production and social context and discursive text and catalogue raisonné are reconfigured - to a series of case studies about various issues in eighteenth-century sculpture, organised thematically. Together they argue for the significance of what has been a neglected aspect of eighteenth-century art.

This critical review outlines the framework of debate to which these writings both respond and contribute. I shall first look at the literature on sculpture as a distinct category of art historical writing. My discussion will consider the dominant issues and methodologies, the types of text in which these are addressed and then the place that writing about British sculpture has in this tradition. Having placed my own publications in relationship to this literature, I shall go on to outline in the second section what I see as the new approaches to the history of sculpture that I have tried to develop in my work. The first two parts of this section look at sculpture as an aspect of British art and British sculpture as an aspect of European sculpture. The third and fourth parts are concerned with two central issues – firstly, the question and reception and viewing and, secondly, that of production and consumption – and consider how they might be addressed by those working on sculpture. A brief final coda attempts to draw these various strands together and to summarise how the publications submitted here represent an attempt at approaching eighteenth-century sculpture in these ways.

1. Sculpture studies and methodologies

a. Writing about sculpture

Just as the history of Renaissance and later European art has been understood – and taught – as largely the history of painting, so its literature is concerned above all with painting, rather with sculpture and architecture, let alone the “decorative” or “minor” arts. It is therefore unsurprising that writing about sculpture hardly figures prominently in Julius von Schlosser’s Kunstliteratur (1924).³ The art historiographical tradition being mapped here is one that in large part founded on Vasari; as a result the literature of art history is not only Italianate in its emphasis but

also takes painting as its primary focus of study. It is indeed significant that the greatest attention paid to sculpture is in the literature concerned with debates around the paragone, where discussion of this category of artistic production is in a sense legitimised or allowed because it is being considered in relation to painting. But the marginality of sculpture within this literature may be understood in another, albeit related, way: Vasari's concern with the status of the artists, along with the anxiety evident in discussions of the paragone about the 'mechanical' nature of making sculpture, meant that painting was given centrality in the academic training of artists and the theoretical writings about art that went with this. Likewise, sculpture was given little attention in the salon criticism that was such a growth industry in eighteenth-century France. As a result, later art historical writing simply had many more texts about painting than about sculpture to draw on.

While sculpture occupies far from a marginal position in histories of antique or medieval art, the very simplistic account I sketched out above seems roughly right as far as discussions of Renaissance and later sculpture are concerned. Sculpture has always had a prime place in the canon of both classical and antique art, from Johann Joachim Winckelmann and Bernard de Montfaucon onwards, even though those canons may have been periodically reconfigured. In accounts of medieval art, works such as the Ruthwell cross, the west portal at Chartres or the figures of Ekkahard and Uta are not merely occasional sculptural moments in a narrative made up of works in other media but, on the contrary, constitute the very core of the canon being constructed and explicated there. By contrast, only a handful of sculptures appear in surveys of Renaissance and later art and few sculptors – Donatello, Michelangelo, Bernini, Rodin, and (perhaps) Canova - figure in the familiar pantheon of Western

artists. The art-historically literate we would assume to be familiar with Rogier van der Weyden could not necessarily be expected to know of Veit Stoss. Few sculptors outside Italy command any recognition, even among art historians who readily acknowledge the role of major painters of their period when they were working in another country. Thanks to the Vasarian tradition, Italian sculptors such as Donatello and Luca della Robbia are names we would expect to appear not only in accounts of Florentine Renaissance art but in a wider survey of the art of the period in Europe; on the other hand, Nikolaus Gerhaert - a sculptor arguably as important as Donatello - hardly receives a mention even in discussions of Northern Renaissance art.⁴ Sculptors fare even less well in surveys dealing with the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries where figures as inventive as Artus Quellinus, Pierre Puget, Balthasar Permoser, Jean-Baptiste Pigalle, Paul Egell and Louis-François Roubiliac remain at best obscure figures even for those who consider themselves specialists within the art of the period. Marginalised though they might be, however, all these sculptors have formed the subject of monographs written during the past twenty years or so.⁵

It is indeed the monograph that has formed the principal genre of art-historical literature adopted by those working on sculpture, during a period when the discursive, thematic or contextual study has in other areas of the discipline tended to be more highly regarded than the monographic account of life and works. Just as in the 1980s the monograph went out of fashion as a genre that was too closely linked with outdated notions of individual authorship and biography, so the catalogue lost status as mode of art historical enquiry as issues of connoisseurship and attribution were increasingly seen as more the concerns and activities of the sale-room and museum than the university. Seen as merely a compilation of data, achievable without any

scholarly rigour, the catalogue in particular has almost become the art-historical genre that dare not speak its name.

Some art galleries and museums have continued to focus a considerable proportion of their scholarly activity on the research and writing of permanent collection catalogues, when not preoccupied with that hybrid genre, the exhibition catalogue. At their best, such publications are based on rigorous and meticulous consideration of evidence ranging from scientific and physical data to issues of provenance and attribution. Only rarely, however, is there any acknowledgement of the conventions of the genre of writing. Conversely, Anglo-American academics working outside museums have increasingly tended to write in a consciously self-reflexive way, drawing explicit attention to the constructed nature of their projects and avoiding the misleading completeness that both the monograph and catalogue might seem to claim. But at the same time they often assume the information drawn from catalogues to be so much primary evidence and show little awareness of the processes of interpretation to which such data has already been subjected.

While these remarks – albeit a crude simplification of shifts in modes of art-historical writing over the past twenty years – might apply to publications in the field of eighteenth-century painting, they characterise far less well what has been produced on sculpture during this period. Overall, this might be seen as a more conservative field in which the monographs and catalogues have far outnumbered more discursive, contextual studies taking account of interpretative and theoretical concerns or even the social history of art. But there are, I suggest, other more telling and persuasive reasons for the continuing adoption of these traditional genres of art-historical writing by those writing about sculpture.

Despite the sustained and intensive archival research that underpins writing about, for example, Florentine Renaissance sculpture, there are far more attributional problems remaining as far as sculptors are concerned than is the case for painters of the same periods and areas. The production of reference works such as François Souchal's Dictionary of French Sculptors. The Age of Louis XIV (1977-93) and Rupert Gunnis's Dictionary of British Sculptors 1660-1851 (1953) deal with questions that remain very much live issues for sculpture historians as well as issues that have important implications for any interpretative work.⁶ To take but one instance, it was impossible to get any impression of Clodion's activity as one of the key sculptors of late eighteenth-century France until Guilhem Scherf and Anne Poulet published their ambitious exhibition catalogue in 1992.⁷ But the continuing importance of the monograph and catalogue have still more to do with the unusual complexity of sculptural production – both the conditions of production and the technical procedures involved. The commissioning and making of sculpture not only often entailed, as with a painting, the production (and presentation to a patron) of a small-scale sketch or model and a transition from this to the execution of a larger-scale finished work. It also frequently required shifts between two and three dimensions, the use of a wide variety of materials and the employment of the different techniques of modelling, casting and carving (not necessarily in the same or expected order), all within a framework of collaboration and sub-contracting that was as varied as it was complex. This, in its turn, has implications for how we understand the status and nature of the multiple versions that might be produced and the marketing and reception of such works. Of course, the workshop practices of, say, Kneller and Reynolds – not to speak of these artists' symbiotic relationships with those mezzotinters who reproduced their

images – were hardly straightforward. But the complexities and intricacies of sculptural design and execution were such that they have to figure far more prominently in writing about this category of artistic production. The insistent materiality of sculpture in itself seems to demand engagement with the details of technique and process, although not necessarily in a traditionally descriptive way.

Such engagement is a characteristic of the most distinguished writing about the history of sculpture published over the past twenty years, even though these books take a variety of forms that re-work in different ways the familiar genres of monograph and catalogue. One option is that offered by Anne Wagner in her Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux. Sculptor of the Second Empire (1986).⁸ Here discussion of the ideation and execution of individual sculptures continually draws on the material evidence of sketch, model and finished work and the physicality of these various stages of making but interprets them within the context of a developing argument about how a sculptor shaped a career in nineteenth-century France. Instead of a descriptive narrative of the commissioning and making of particular works, we have here an analysis of the place of sculpture and sculptor within that culture, but – and this is the significant point – an analysis that is at every point informed by an awareness of the materiality of sculpture, even though it eschews the formulation of these processes in the form of a catalogue. If Wagner gives us a radical re-working of the monograph so that it at once focuses on the production of one individual artistic agent and explores the context in which he operated, a very different mode of sculptural monograph is found in Jennifer Montagu's superb Alessandro Algardi (1985).⁹ While consciously rejecting the categorisation of Algardi initiated by Bellori and maintained in later histories of art, Montagu nonetheless adopts an apparently

conventional format for the discursive first volume in which the artist's activity is followed broadly chronologically, except for chapters dealing with reliefs and busts, the production of which spanned wide date ranges. The catalogue that constitutes the second volume, on the other hand, is radically different from, as well as being far more ambitious than, any previous catalogue raisonné of a sculptor's oeuvre. The catalogue's function is in part to inform and complement the text of the preceding volume and by placing detailed discussion of each commission and its documentation in these extended entries Montagu allows herself the freedom to follow lines of argument in the text proper. What is most innovative here, however, is the structuring of the catalogue to take account of the complexity of sculptural production and techniques. In this way each entry consists of an often lengthy account of a commission's history, followed by sub-entries for sketches, models, finished works, versions, multiples and replicas. Making constant use of judicious connoisseurial judgements, these entries classify these various categories of work according to an elaborate scheme that tellingly registers their interrelationships. The distinctive nature of Montagu's monograph results from an acknowledgement of the need for a mode of writing appropriate to sculpture. In this the catalogue is not merely an appendix but an integral and active component of her interpretation of Algardi's activity as a designer and maker of sculpture.

While always alive to the qualities of the works themselves, Montagu's study is above all grounded in sustained archival research about the processes of commissioning and the documentation of the often erratic progress of a work's execution. What is far less apparent here (despite the structuring of the catalogue) is the use of detailed evidence about the physical making of these sculptures. So too is the part played by the viewer

and the interpretation of evidence about this. These two concerns are, however, very much at the forefront of a third key text about the history of sculpture, Michael Baxandall's Limewood Sculptors of Renaissance Germany (1980)¹⁰. While it incorporates monographic elements, including brief sculptors' biographies, oeuvre summaries and catalogue entries for selected works that very much acknowledge artistic agency, Baxandall's book is organised so as to situate that remarkable body of sculpture produced in South Germany around 1500 within the context of a culture undergoing critical change. As both an exemplary cultural history of art and an attempt to write about a category of artistic production that lacks contemporary critical terms of the sort available for Italian art, Baxandall's book has been rightly recognised as one of the most influential and original contributions to art history within the past twenty-five years. But my interest in it is above all as a model for writing about sculpture. Running throughout the book is a preoccupation with both the materiality of sculpture and the viewing of sculpture, not as separate issues but as interlinked phenomena. To use his chapter titles, "Material" and "Period Eye" need to be brought into conjunction. Baxandall's engagement with both the material qualities of sculpture and the cultural context of these images offers, I suggest, a new, if challenging and demanding, model for writing about sculpture.

Baxandall's approach was a starting-point for the writing about sculpture submitted here, while the books by Wagner and Montagu provided alternative formats that I have also in part adopted. In the two publications offered here I have attempted to explore the ways in which the production and consumption of sculpture – both making and viewing – might be considered together. This is most explicit in Figured in Marble, where Baxandall's approach is discussed. But the same set of concerns

also inform my part of Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-century Monument. In the latter, however, I was also very consciously re-working the monographic models fashioned by Wagner and Montagu. By opting for a study that considered only part, namely one genre, of an individual artist's oeuvre my co-author and I were following Wagner's selective approach and a strategy that allowed us to examine issues of artistic authorship within a broader cultural context and without the constraints of a biographical narrative. As in Wagner's account of Carpeaux, Roubiliac's fashioning of a career and reputation as a sculptor was understood very much in terms of changing attitudes to sculpture and shifting notions of sculptors as artists. For my part of the book, Wagner's treatment of design processes was also especially productive. But in dealing with the techniques and materiality of sculpture the examples of Baxandall and Montagu were decisive in different ways. If Baxandall opened up the possibility of making the materiality of sculpture central and of interlinking making and viewing, Montagu's model for meshing discursive text and catalogue provided a means of organising the specificities of sculptural production as well as a mode of exegesis. The catalogue in Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-century Monument essentially has a format adapted from that developed by Montagu. It differs, however, in several important respects. While the extended introductions to each entry trace a narrative of commissioning, designing and executing, drawing on all available documentation, they differ from Montagu's in including evidence about later responses to each work, so as it were continuing the narrative to cover the sculpture's afterlife and bringing into play the issue of how later perceptions (and even physical changes and re-positioning) condition our viewing. This gesture to post-modern interpretative approaches may also be seen in the organisation of each entry to suggest that however rich the documentation and other evidence might be, what is being

presented here is very much a constructed narrative, a scholarly fiction.¹¹ Even where a model mentioned in an eighteenth-century sale catalogue might well be identifiable with a surviving terracotta, I have given it a separate entry to foreground the partial and arbitrary nature of the catalogue as a genre. My most significant modification of Montagu's catalogue format, however, has been in the much greater emphasis I have placed on the physical details of construction, in part because a grant from the Paul Mellon Centre made such detailed examination of the monuments possible. This has meant that, while drawing heavily on documentary sources, the accounts of monuments given here are less obviously archivally grounded narratives. And it is at this point that Baxandall's concern with the materiality of sculpture once more comes into play, allowing the catalogue entries to inform and complement Part II of the text as well as Part I.

In these various ways both Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-century Monument and Figured in Marble are indebted to, and at best complement, various key writings about sculpture from Germany, France and Italy. But both books also respond to another tradition of writing about sculpture comprising those accounts of British sculpture from George Vertue and Horace Walpole onwards.

b. The literature and historiography of British sculpture

One necessary starting point for the planning of both books submitted here is to be found in a body of writing about British sculpture by scholars such as Katharine Esdaile, Rupert Gunnis, Margaret Webb and Margaret Whinney between about 1920 and the early 1960s. Recent work, including mine, both draws on their publications and revises the history of sculpture in Britain that these construct. This history is one

that of course rests on several much earlier narratives. One of these is that which underlies the section on sculptors in Horace Walpole's Anecdotes of Painting on the basis of George Vertue's notebooks, the single most important primary source about British sculpture in the first half of the eighteenth century.¹² Indeed, the way in which Vertue is be used remains a central issue anyone writing on earlier eighteenth-century British sculpture. Another influential narrative is that shaped by Allan Cunningham in volume III of his Lives of the British Painters, Sculptors and Architects (1830).¹³ Although assembling information in different ways and certainly writing in different modes, Vertue and Cunningham both approached the activities of earlier sculptors from the position of practising artists keen to raise the status of the artist in Britain. As I argue in Chapter 2 of Figured in Marble, the choices as to which sculptors should be discussed in these texts were made with this concern in mind. Consequently, the canonical figures that dominate most accounts of British sculpture – even that given in Margaret Whinney's Sculpture in Britain 1530-1830 (1964) – are largely those foregrounded by Vertue and Cunningham.¹⁴ By contrast, those sculptors who ran very busy workshops, producing not only busts and monuments but also a wide range of decorative sculpture such as chimney pieces are kept very much on the margins. Any suggestion that the production of sculpture might be linked with the manufacture and marketing of the luxury arts was avoided, just as were the business practices adopted by the sculpture trade. Such an emphasis on the creative abilities of individual authors has of course hardly been confined to accounts of sculptors. But it has unusually acute consequences in the case of sculpture because of the importance that the acknowledgement of the material and financial practicalities of running a workshop has for an understanding of sculptural production. The erasure of what might be described as the trade and business of sculpture from much of the literature has

resulted in an historiographical tradition that is most strikingly out of line with the archival evidence to be found about the production and consumption of sculpture in eighteenth-century Britain.

It is no surprise that the notion of sculpture as fine art and the idea of a history of sculpture made up of biographies of individual sculptors together underpin the standard accounts of British sculpture from Cunningham onwards, whether these take the form of monographs or surveys. It also determined which sculptors were to be included in the old Dictionary of National Biography. What is more interesting, however, is the way in which these have taken different forms from the 1920s onwards. The pioneering work of replacing a series of artist biographies based on inherited and often confused anecdotes with a history of British sculpture grounded on both documentary evidence and assessment of actual works in churches throughout the country was undertaken by Katharine Esdaile in a prodigious number of articles, several surveys and a monograph about Roubiliac published in 1928 (to which I shall return shortly).¹⁵ Although Esdaile's scholarship has been criticised for speculative indulgence and lack of rigour, her championship of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century sculpture meant that it began to receive the serious attention hitherto given only to medieval sculpture. While Esdaile was almost alone in opening up this field, her enthusiasm for an aspect of British art needs to be seen as but one register of a wider interest being shown during the 1920s and 30s in native achievements in the visual arts, evident in, for example, studies of English medieval enamels, ivories and opus Anglicanum as well as in the V&A's shift in acquisition policy towards British works, including sculpture.¹⁶ Esdaile failed to realise her ambition to write a comprehensive dictionary of British sculpture but this was achieved by her protégé,

Rupert Gunnis, with his Dictionary of British Sculptors 1660-1851, published in 1953. Gunnis's investigation of family archives unearthed much new information, especially about those various practitioners within the sculpture trade whose activities had been ignored, although the significance of these figures for an understanding of the sculpture trade is only now being recognised.

Although establishing post-medieval British sculpture as a serious field of study, Esdaile and Gunnis were working very much within a British antiquarian tradition that took little account of either the emerging discipline of art history and its methodologies or the traditions of European sculpture to which the work of their 'British' sculptors belonged. This was to change during the 1950s and 60s through what amounted to a professionalisation of British sculpture studies by Margaret Webb, Terence Hodgkinson and Margaret Whinney. Webb's monograph on Rysbrack (1954) in which the work of this Antwerp-born sculptor was interpreted in terms of a tradition of Flemish baroque classicism was the first study to consider how a sculptor's style was formed through a European training and modified to meet the needs of his English patrons.¹⁷ Still more responsive to the methodology of German emigré art historians such as Rudolf Wittkower, Terence Hodgkinson drew on his deep familiarity with contemporary French and German sculpture in a series of seemingly modest but fundamental studies of works by Roubiliac and Wilton that set new standards for the study of British sculpture.¹⁸ The work of Webb, Hodgkinson, Gunnis and Esdaile provided the basis for the synthesis undertaken by Margaret Whinney in her Pelican History of Art volume. As well as being the most ambitious account yet written of British sculpture in both its scale and detail, this remains the standard survey and much have what has been written (including the two books

submitted) has necessarily been a response to – sometimes, echoing and amplifying, sometimes revising and correcting – the overview that this book offers. While serving as a firm basis for serious study of British sculpture, Whinney's work is inevitably very much a history built around the achievements and careers of certain individual sculptors as well as one which celebrates a canon established by Walpole and Vertue. Its narrative is one that tells how the mason-sculptors, producing largely tomb sculpture of an aesthetically unambitious sort in the seventeenth century, were succeeded by continental trained sculptors such as Rysbrack and Roubiliac who raised sculpture in Britain to a higher standard. Their presence and the increasing opportunities for native-born sculptors to travel abroad eventually led to the emergence of figures such as Joseph Wilton, Joseph Nollekens, John Flaxman and Sir Francis Chantrey who were responsible not only for busts and monuments but also ambitious public sculptures and some "ideal" figures of the type encouraged by the Royal Academy. What receives little attention here is either that part of the sculpture trade producing chimney pieces and that class of decorative sculpture that formed an important part of the sculpture trade's activity or the public functions of sculpture and the ideological meanings that it carried. These are among the concerns that been addressed in the more recent literature which collectively presents us with a very different view of British sculpture from that offered by Whinney

The first two significant attempts to place British sculpture – in both of these cases, largely from the early nineteenth century – within alternative contexts were Nicholas Penny's Church Monuments of Romantic England and Alison Yarrington's Commemoration of the Hero.¹⁹ The former was arranged thematically and considered the imagery of the monument between 1780 and 1840 in terms of attitudes to death as

these were registered in contemporary literature; the latter examined the many sculptural commissions prompted by the British victories in the Napoleonic wars and interpreted them within a framework of political events and changing notions of national identity. A rather different interpretative framework has been developed more recently by Nigel Llewellyn in his study of seventeenth-century tomb sculpture (2000) in which he consciously rejects Whinney's judgment of these works as art in favour of an assessment of their significance according to anthropological models of Vovelle and others.²⁰ For the eighteenth-century material, the single most important study (as yet unpublished) has been Matthew Craske's 1992 thesis on monuments and the imagery of the family which combines sustained archival research on the circumstances in which monuments were commissioned with an historically sophisticated understanding of the political and family alliances that these costly and prominent public images were in large part made to register and support.²¹ Rich in detail about the operation of the sculpture trade, funeral practices and the factors involving in the commissioning and making monuments, this study (especially in its reworked form) treats these monuments as historical phenomena rather than primarily as works of art, although the aesthetic qualities are very much part of the discussion. If these various contributions (along with other key texts on British art discussed below) mean that the familiar account of British sculpture formulated by Esdaile, Webb and Whinney requires substantial revision, a further development in the field makes it difficult to think of 'British sculpture' as meaning sculpture produced in Britain. The remarkable growth in the history of collecting, manifested most obviously here in the collaborative volume on Charles I's collection (its essays including David Howarth's on the King's sculpture), demands that we should now think of 'sculpture in Britain' as including that wide variety of antique and modern

works that were as important, of not more so, as those works commissioned and made in this country.²² As in other areas of eighteenth-century studies, issues of reception, consumption and commodification have increasingly shaped thinking about sculpture and the questions to be asked of its history.

The two books submitted here were being planned and written at the same time as the studies just described and the ideas they develop have certainly been much refined as a result of dialogue with all these authors. Together, they constitute an attempt to build on and modify the traditional accounts of sculpture in Britain. Most obviously, Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-century Monument was necessarily conceived with an awareness of the strengths and weaknesses of Esdaile's monograph as well as of the very different issues a study of such an artist might now be expected to address.

Esdaile's investigation of sources such as the Westminster rate books for documentation about Roubiliac's life was very thorough and the book by David Bindman and me had little to add to this. On the other hand, our research about Roubiliac's European background and his training in Dresden and Paris yielded material that significantly changed our view of his sculpture in England. Likewise, our work on the circles of patronage, the circumstances in which each monument was commissioned and indeed the evidence for the attribution of early monuments – all material largely assembled in my writing of the catalogue (submitted here as Appendix I) - meant that the entwined roles of artist and patron in creating a succession of highly original monuments was brought into far sharper focus. Apart from its concentration on one category of sculptural production, Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-century Monument differs from Esdaile's monograph, as well as from the treatment of Roubiliac's monuments in studies such as Whinney's, in two main

respects. Firstly, it considers these monuments as arguably the most prominent and most costly components of the public visual culture of mid-eighteenth-century Britain, registering a complex set of changing and often conflicting ideological and religious concerns. This informs my discussion of, for example, political affiliations and the content of inscriptions within the catalogue as much as it does Bindman's consideration of the public role of monuments in the first part. Secondly, it examines far more rigorously than any of the earlier literature on British sculpture the way in which such monuments were made and how their qualities of facture and finish were viewed. As well as looking at the detailed processes of design and production within the wider context of the sculpture trade, the part of the book submitted here also explores the way in which the sculptor at once ran a business and took advantage of (and encouraged) a perception of sculpture as being worthy of sustained aesthetic attention. Rather than Part II being simply a descriptive account of how these monuments were made, it uses the evidence about the making and viewing of sculpture to examine issues raised in Part I of the book from a different, but complementary, perspective.

Many of the same preoccupations surface again in Figured in Marble but here within the context of a discursive rather than monographic text. Arranged thematically, this book attempts among other things to provide an alternative to the dominant narrative formulated by Esdaile, Webb and Whinney. With its various sections and their introductions it sets out to draw attention to the methodologies and interpretative approaches that might be employed to read against the grain of the art-historiographical tradition I have described above. Issues that received little attention in Whinney are foregrounded here. For instance, the public and social roles of

sculpture, and the ways these were registered through contemporary responses, are very much to the fore in the chapters on garden sculpture (Chapt. 10) and the Duke of Argyll's sculpture gallery (Chapter 11). At the same time as these questions of reception are discussed, so the practices of making sculpture and running a workshop are also brought into play. One of the themes running through the book is indeed the interrelationship of making and viewing, production and consumption. The book also attempts to re-work the familiar narrative by expanding the canon of works discussed. While more might have been said about, for instance, chimney pieces, the chapters on bronze sculpture (Chapt. 7) and on garden sculpture (Chapt. 10) as well as the references to the luxury trades (Chapt. 6) and the collecting of sculpture other than British (Chapts. 12 and 13) map out a rather different territory from that explored by Esdaile and her successors. Both Figured in Marble and Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-century represent attempts to develop new ways of approaching British sculpture.

2. New approaches to British sculpture

Some of the new approaches to British sculpture attempted in the books submitted here have already been outlined in the discussion in Section 1 of the place of my work within various art-historiographical traditions. But the ways in which I have tried to shift the study of British sculpture may be summarised under four headings.

a. Sculpture as British art

Roubiliac and Figured in Marble were being written during a period in which British art studies were becoming a lively area for both research and methodological debate. Eighteenth-century British art in particular has in the later 1980s and 90s attracted

innovative interpretation and writing in the same way that French nineteenth-century art stimulated methodological shifts in the 1970s and 80s. Beginning with the work of John Barrell in The Dark Side of the Landscape (1980) and The Political Theory of Painting (1986), the field has been further enlivened by – to mention but a few – Ann Bermingham’s Landscape and Ideology (1986), Marcia Pointon’s Hanging the Head (1992), and David Solkin’s Painting for Money (1993).²³ In all of these exemplars of what might be called the social history of art, those concerned with visual culture have made effective use of work by historians such as Lawrence Klein (1994) and J.G.A. Pococke (1985) – most notably their formulation of the notion of civic humanism – while historians such as John Brewer (1998) and Linda Colley (1992) have reciprocated by using images as an integral part of a more broadly based cultural history.²⁴

While British sculpture studies have in many ways flourished during the same period, most of the publications in this area – with a few exceptions such as the work of Alex Potts and Alison Yarrington on Chantrey – have made little or no reference to the debates initiated and pursued in the books mentioned above.²⁵ This is partly because a great deal of fundamental documentary and attributional work remains to be done. This was the case with Peter Scheemakers, for example, and Ingrid Roscoe’s publication on this sculptor in the The Walpole Society has provided a firm basis on which other more interpretative accounts can be built.²⁶ It is nonetheless striking that those category of public image – the bust, statue and monument – that most tellingly exemplify a civic humanist ideal and articulate this plainly in the inscriptions that form physically part of them has been the least considered in terms of such ideological concerns. Similarly, those writing about monuments in churches attached

to houses at the centre of landed estates have hardly paused to think about how such works formed for tenantry and peers alike as powerful a mode of self-representation as any conversation piece showing a gentleman or nobleman in his estate. Although the relatively restricted conventions employed for sculpture prompt art historians to consider such works as rather apart, many works of eighteenth-century British sculpture can be legitimately and fruitfully read in these terms. The interpretations of the Wentworth, Shelburne and Foley monuments proposed in Figured in Marble (Chapts. 1, 5 and 9) attempt to redress this.

If historians of sculpture have neglected more recent modes of interpretation in British art studies, those responsible for some of the most important contributions to these debates have almost entirely ignored sculpture, despite its relevance and usefulness to their arguments. In some cases, this has been a consciously made and well-reasoned exclusion. Marcia Pointon makes reference to portrait busts and their significance in Hanging the Head but in order to develop effectively what are already wide-ranging and ambitious arguments she does not choose to pursue this. In other cases, the exclusion of sculpture is more puzzling. Despite having the sub-title, 'Visual Culture and the Public Sphere', David Solkin's Painting for Money is concerned almost exclusively with painting and prints, the only sculpture to receive attention (it must be admitted, in a wholly convincing and revealing reading) being Roubiliac's statue of Handel which could hardly be excluded from a discussion of the supper box paintings at Vauxhall Gardens. On the other hand, Solkin's eloquent and subtle analysis of Benjamin West's 'Death of Wolfe' (1770) loses much from ignoring the evidence assembled about the related sculptures in the lengthy catalogue entries for the 1984 Rococo exhibition.²⁷ This showed that most of the principal elements of West's

composition had already been established in Wilton's design for the monument in Westminster Abbey, that this and similar proposals from rival sculptors were already widely known in 1760 and that the full scale model was publicly exhibited by 1765. This is not merely a case of the sculpture 'coming before' the painting, but of sculptors playing a key but almost entirely neglected role in the formulation of public narrative imagery in eighteenth-century Britain. It might even be argued that it was sculptors such as Roubiliac, Wilton and Nollekens who provided in their monuments those large-scale serious narrative images that the history painters largely failed to produce.

The two books submitted here attempt in different ways to engage with recent debates within the field of eighteenth-century British art and bring sculpture into dialogue with painting and other media at numerous points. In both the overarching narrative of David Bindman's Part I of Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-century Monument and in the more detailed archivally-based work showing that contemporary writers were linking the inventive powers of Roubiliac and Wilton with those of Hogarth, we were together keen to treat the commissioning, making and viewing sculpture that was not separate from the relationship between painters and their patrons. Likewise, Figured in Marble makes constant reference to contemporary painting, not as a standard to which sculpture was expected to aspire, but as an equal and related mode of imagery. Not least by including so many illustrations of paintings - and the quality of the sculpture leaves one in no doubt as to its relative strength - the book sets out from the start to write sculpture back into the familiar narrative of British art and to interpret it as an integral and significant component of eighteenth-century culture. At the same

time, however, it needs also to be understood in relation to European art and particularly to sculpture from this period.

b. British sculpture as European sculpture

The model underlying the conventional view of the relationship between British sculpture and that being produced in various other European countries is essentially one of centre and periphery. According to Whinney, styles, formats and motifs were brought from the Netherlands or France by immigrant sculptors or learned by native-born artists who had travelled to Rome. Although such an account is justified in many ways in that echoes the documentation and opinions provided by Vertue and Cunningham, the relationship assumed here is, I suggest, too simplistic in the hierarchy it invokes and the unbalanced dynamic that it describes. Just as Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann has in his Court, Cloister and City re-configured the relation between Italy and Northern Europe and elsewhere argued for the concept of 'acculturation' in the response of Netherlandish artists to the Italianate, so a more subtle and sophisticated model is required to map out what was happening between British and European sculpture in the eighteenth century.²⁸ I cannot claim to have achieved this in the two books submitted here but they do indicate ways in which this might be done.

Recent writing about European sculpture in the eighteenth century has opened various possibilities. In Italy the concentration of attention on seventeenth-century Rome meant that until the 1970s little work had been done, except at a very local level, on sculptors active in Italian centres during the succeeding century. The pioneering research of Klaus Lankheit in his Florentinische Barockplastik (1962), which showed

the variety of sculpture commissioned by the late Medici and the interest being shown in this by other European patrons, was followed by the publication in 1976 of Robert Enggass's Eighteenth-century Sculpture in Rome, making apparent both the scale and originality of projects being undertaken around 1700 and, in particular, the role of French sculptors in these.²⁹ Around the same time Eugenio Riccomini (1972) was mapping out the extent of sculptural production in Bologna, while Camillo Semmenzato (1966) and Elena Armani and Maria Galassi (1988) were doing the same for Venice and Genoa.³⁰ If Whinney's discussion of, for example, Francis Bird's familiarity with Legros's sculpture in Rome had to be based on a limited range of earlier surveys, those working on early eighteenth-century sculpture in Britain in the 1980s could draw on these vastly increased body of material. Taking their lead from Hugh Honour's 'English Patrons and Italian Sculptors in the first Half of the Eighteenth Century' (1958), studies such as Terry Friedman's 'Lord Harold in Italy' (1988) used these new resources to explore the extent of commissions from British patrons in Italy and the interest in the collecting of Italian late baroque sculpture to sketch out a notion of sculpture in Britain rather than British sculpture.³¹ As well as prompting specific questions such as about who the Scottish collectors of Piamontini's bronzes might have been, these publications allow us to think of British patrons and sculptors as rather more active agents in Italo-British cultural exchange.

In France the large but traditionally monographic literature on sculptors has been enhanced by recent contributions that not only add to the history of French sculpture but set this history within a wider European context. The publication of François Souchal's Dictionary of French Sculptors. The Age of Louis XIV (1977-93) has made it possible to assess the full range of sculptural commissions from this period while

Betsy Rosasco's work on the garden sculpture of Marly (1986) and Gerold Weber's Brunnen und Wasserkünste (1985) provide sustained analyses of major categories of sculpture.³² The standard monographs from around 1900 are being gradually replaced by studies such as the exhibition catalogues of Jean-René Gaborit on Pigalle (1985) and Guilhem Scherf and James Draper on Pajou (1997), Klaus Herding's subtly nuanced study of Puget (1970) and the monumental investigation by Souchal of the Slodtz family's sculptural and decorative undertakings (1967).³³ One striking feature of these latter contributions is the awareness they show not only of responses outside France to French sculpture but of the interest being shown by French sculptors on sculptural innovations elsewhere, including those of Michelangelo Slodtz or Pajou to tombs in Westminster Abbey.

An increasing willingness to move away from self-contained national or local accounts of particular sculptors is also apparent in recent studies of Netherlandish and German sculpture. Along with monographic studies such as that by Alain Jacobs on Delvaux (1999), which rightly presents the sculptor as working productively with the different genres required in England and Flanders, Frits Scholten's current research work on the sculpture trade in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Holland is building on the work of Katharine Freemantle and Willy Halsema-Kubes (1977) on Artus Quellien to formulate a more richly contextualised account of sculptural activity in Amsterdam.³⁴ Likewise, Peter Volk's publications on South German sculpture – most notably in his Rokokoplastik (1981) and the exhibition catalogue Bayerische Rokokoplastik. Vom Entwurf zur Ausführung (1985) – shifts the emphasis away from regional traditions, seeing local conditions operating and intersecting with genres and practices from elsewhere.³⁵

These various publications have not only greatly increased our knowledge of what sculpture was being produced during the eighteenth centuries in these different countries but through their range of approaches have opened up the possibility of thinking about the relationship between European sculpture and British sculpture in a new way. The contributions of Volk and Scholten have allowed us to see the practices of design and making employed in Britain as having common features with other centres but also various differences. Likewise, the analysis of genres by Weber (1986) and Rosasco (1985) has prompted us to see the relative absence in Britain of fountain sculpture and the proliferation of monuments and busts in a new light. Here it is now longer necessary to see British sculpture as inferior or subsidiary and to read the changes as a narrative of loss and diminishment but rather one of difference. Although the point is not made as explicitly as it might have been, this interpretative position is common to both Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-century Monument and Figured in Marble in which, say, conventions of tomb sculpture current in all the countries I have mentioned were appropriated but re-worked into formats that were distinctive and carried their own weight of meaning and aesthetic worth. The complexity of this alternative to the models of centre and periphery, or source and derivative, may be seen in Chapters 12 and 13 of Figured in Marble where the role of British collectors and patrons is examined. It is still more apparent in the article on Bouchardon's British sitters in which I examine how various English and Scots sitters commissioned classicising busts from a French sculptor in Rome and suggest the place these portraits had in the formulation of a distinctive type of British portrait bust.³⁶ The ways in which British artists were an integral part of an international community in Rome in the 1750s is also touched on in Chapters 1 and 3 in the discussion of Joseph

Wilton and the Wolfe monument. Although worth exploring more fully, this case offers a useful corrective to the simplistic interpretative model of sources and influence in that it involves a native-born English sculptor, with experience in a leading French sculptor's workshop, working alongside an Anglo-Swedish architect, a French architect and a French sculptor in Italy. Wilton then returns to London, collaborates with the Anglo-Swedish architect to secure the commission for a monument to the general who played the most decisive role in reversing French fortunes in North America by designing a composition that makes clear reference to a monument to Louis XV then being made. Wilton's full-scale model was then first described in detail by a French writer.³⁷ Just as British sculpture is part of British art, so is it also an integral and distinctive component of European sculpture.

c. The Viewing and Reception of Sculpture

Another major shift in approaches to sculpture that has informed the writing of the two books submitted here has been the increasing interest in issues of reception and in particular the question of how sculpture was viewed. A concern with the role of the beholder was a notable feature of art-historical literature of the 1980s, forming a central theme of Michael Camille's The Gothic Idol (1989), John Shearman's Only Connect (1992) and David Freedberg's The Power of Images (1989).³⁸ In all of these works sculpture of various sorts has been given a place of unusual prominence and made the subject of attention that it has rarely received in wide-ranging art-historical texts. Freedberg's attack on the way art historians have neglected the directness of viewer's responses to images may have been legitimately criticised for the way it equates responses to polychromed sculptural images with responses to living figures, thereby collapsing sign and signified and downplaying the engagement of the viewer

in the artifices of representation. But it has prompted new and important questions about viewing sculpture, at once image, object, and artefact. One of these might concern the way in which the staging and settings of sculpture determine our viewing and the extent to which shifts in viewing practices are prompted by changes in location, such as re-contextualisation of site-specific works within a museum. We might ask about the degree to which the viewing of sculpture at once invites and denies the haptic as well as how the surfaces of sculpture are perceived. Another related question concerns how different materials are viewed and in what ways these might prompt spectators into shaping their own narratives of making.

Already in 1980 Michael Baxandall was addressing the heart of the matter when he was considering the 'arc of address' demanded by Michael Erhart's *Virgin of Pity* and the changing viewing conditions of Riemenschneider's Creglingen altarpiece over the course of a day.³⁹ Notable contributions made more recently include Michael Podro's discussion in Depiction (1998) of the ways in which planes in Donatello's reliefs were perceived and Geraldine Johnson's consideration (1997) of the same sculptor's Madonna reliefs in terms of levels of contemplation.⁴⁰ But some of the most interesting writing about viewing sculpture – often in the form of short but telling articles - has been about eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century sculpture. A key contribution by Oskar Bätschmann (1992) has explored the viewing of antique sculpture (and the Niobe group in particular) by eighteenth-century viewers while Betsy Rosasco (1989) has posited a mode of viewing that was not led (as art-historians often assume) by texts and Chloe Chard (1995) has interpreted the viewing of antiquities by Grand Tourists in terms of what was forbidden or repressed.⁴¹ However, the single most important engagement with these questions, as well as the

most sustained discussion of modes of viewing sculpture, has been Alex Potts's The Sculptural Imagination. Although much of this book deals with twentieth-century sculpture by artists such as Brancusi and Donald Judd, Potts begins his book with an extended discussion of Canova, so challenging Rosalind Krauss's 'classic formulation of the post-Minimalist phenomenological aesthetic' in which 'Canova's ... Three Graces is featured ... as an exemplar of the stable wholeness demanded by traditional conceptions of sculpture'. For Potts, a Robert Morris felt piece 'dramatises something that goes on in certain moments of the close viewing of a work such as [the] Three Graces'.⁴² Central to this argument is a concern with both 'the different ways in which a work has been staged, and the different modes of viewing it has invited'. Potts sees Canova's sculptures as pivotal in that they were conceived as self-sufficient art objects, the viewing of which involved 'quite unstable oscillations between a centring and a dispersal of looking'.⁴³ This underlying tension between close and far views - between the complete and partial view - is played above all by a combination of setting and surface treatment and the modes of viewing that these both prompt and assume. While Potts distinguishes Canova's work from that of earlier sculptors in the way that it consciously sets such viewing in train, the interpretative strategies for discussing the viewing of sculpture have significant implications for consideration of sculpture in earlier periods. My approaches to the viewing of sculpture and indeed the very centrality of this issue within the two books submitted owe much to Potts's writing as well as to discussion with him, especially during the period when both the chapter on the Three Graces of Figured in Marble and that on Canova in The Sculptural Imagination were being written.

In both Figured in Marble and my part of Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-century Monument the ways in which settings conditioned the viewing of sculpture constitute a central and continuing theme. Both texts argue for a shift in viewing practices in eighteenth-century England and propose that the new modes and categories of sculpture formulated by Roubiliac and others at once prompted and assumed new ways of viewing sculpture. In the case of Roubiliac in particular, the ambitious nature of his monuments and the subtlety of their surface finish were both predicated on the assumption that these qualities would be valued by at least some spectators willing and able to give these works sustained and close attention. One of the necessary conditions for spectatorship of this kind was the establishment of spaces suitable for concentrated viewing of sculpture and Westminster Abbey increasingly provided this, anticipating spaces such as the sculpture gallery at Woburn in much the same way that, as Solkin and others have argued, the Foundlings' Hospital served as an proto-exhibition space some time before the foundation of the Royal Academy. (This is explored in Chapters 3, 4, 11, 12 and 13 of Figured in Marble.) Another condition consisted of a growing recognition of the status of sculptors as inventive agents – something much played on by Roubiliac from the promotion of the Handel statue onwards – and of the emergence of a critical language for describing such sculptors and their works. (This issue runs through both Part 2 and the Catalogue of Roubiliac and is addressed directly in Chapter 17.) But central to the arguments of both books is an engagement with the relationship of viewing sculpture to its making and both texts might be seen as an attempt to demonstrate how viewing practices were linked with the practice of designing and making sculpture and the way that this was perceived.

d. Design and production

The design and making of sculpture has all too often been treated as a subject largely distinct from its viewing and reception. Taking my cue from a number of texts – most notably Baxandall's Limewood Sculptors – which together, as I argued in the first part of this critical review, offer a valuable alternative and corrective, I have tried in these two books to develop an approach to eighteenth-century sculpture that keeps viewing and making in play together. In Part II of Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-century Monument I have attempted to write about the production of these works not as a discrete and separate activity but as an integral part of a complex interaction of sculptor, patron and viewer. To do this means finding an alternative to the seemingly straightforward description of making as a process that was linear and unproblematic. One requirement was to structure the catalogue (as discussed above) so that it took proper account of uncertainties and ambiguities. Another was to take account at every point of the way materials and procedures might be perceived and valued and so to keep the beholder there as a an active agent, whether that beholder was the sculptor himself, the patron or the visitor to Westminster Abbey inspecting the subtly finished surfaces. This same concern to connect making and viewing runs throughout Figured in Marble, as its subtitle makes clear and chapters 5-7, in the Section on 'Design, Materials and Making' explore in more specific terms.

In both texts I have not only taken advantage of the lines of approach opened up by Baxandall, Wagner and Potts, but have also tried to suggest to find an alternative to the predominantly descriptive mode usually adopted for discussions about the making of sculpture. As if reiterating the assumptions that underlie the story of Pygmalion, the narrative of sculptural production has customarily involved a single sculptor

bringing life to the material of ivory or marble. Usually forming part of biographical accounts that have attempted to make sculptors the equals of painters (and so, by implication, of writers too), this creative activity has been celebrated at the expense of the mechanical aspects of sculptural production, not to mention the way this operated as a business.

One way in which I have attempted to deal with this splitting of the creative and the aesthetic, on the one hand, and the practical materiality of workshop and business practice, on the other, is to explore how some sculptors, most notably Roubiliac, foregrounded the aesthetic and marginalised the mechanical in their own self-representation. As I argue in Chapter 20 of the monograph, Roubiliac appears to have set himself apart not only through his encouragement of commentaries that emphasised his powers of invention but also by adopting a workshop practice that was markedly distinct from that of his rivals. Just as Veit Stoss (according to Baxandall) made effective use his virtuosity and distinctiveness as a carver of limewood within the competitive market of early sixteenth-century Nuremberg, so Roubiliac took advantage of the aestheticisation of sculpture within a culture of increasing commodification. Taste and aesthetic distinction could themselves become commodities for consumers of sculpture who wished to be seen as discerning.

But another way of shifting conventional approaches to sculptural production involves finding an alternative to accounts of making in which the process of design and execution is unproblematically described as a smooth progression involving the sculptor developing his ideas through drawing and model to finished work. In so far as questions about workshop practice are addressed at all in the modern literature on

British sculpture, the complexities of sculptural procedures and the importance of materials and making for the viewing and reception of sculpture have been marginalised. The two texts submitted here attempt to formulate alternatives to this.

One strategy for doing this is through thinking about sketches, models and the contingencies of the design process. Sculptors' drawings have occasionally been discussed in their own right and John Physick (1969) brought together a telling selection of examples for sculpture in Britain.⁴⁴ But over the past ten years or so sculptors' models, like painters' sketches, have attracted increasing attention, beginning with the work of Peter Volk on South German examples and Gulia Barberini on Italian models.⁴⁵ Through their contributions, and more recently the initiatives of Ivan Gaskell and others, interest has shifted to the intriguing afterlives of these objects and the possibility of their having shifting and multiple roles from the start.⁴⁶ If a model could at once function as a record of a sculptural invention, a suggestion to the patron of how the finished work might appear and a stage in a sequence of designs, the relationship between them (as well as between them and any drawings) becomes more ambiguous and the seemingly linear development of a design by the sculptor is rendered more (and interestingly) problematic. Such concerns have informed the structuring and writing of both Part II of Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-century Monument and run through Figured in Marble, surfacing most explicitly in Section II.

Complementing this approach in both books is a sustained investigation (most evident in the catalogue of the Roubiliac monograph) of the use of materials and the detailed construction of the works discussed. Rather than being simply descriptions of how a

monument was assembled, these analyses explore the implications of such material evidence (in the most literal sense) for our understanding of workshop organisation and the operation of the sculptural trade as well as how these techniques were employed to create those illusionistic effects that so engaged contemporary (and modern) viewers. Making and viewing are once more brought into conjunction. But to approach sculpture and sculptural production in this way mean not only looking at how sculptors' practices related to those of painters in organisation, business strategies and questions of genteel status. It at the same time prompts connections to be made with the luxury trades, such as that of goldsmiths. As Chapter 6 of Figured in Marble argues, the complex arrangements for sub-contracting and collaboration that were so important for the eighteenth-century sculpture trade may best be understood by considering the better documented examples of the goldsmiths' trade. By looking closely at the evidence for sculptural production, we can situate sculptural practice between the so-called 'fine' and 'applied' arts and so open up the possibility of seeing the whole range of eighteenth-century visual and material culture in a new way.

Coda

By considering such a range of issues and outlining such a broadly based framework of art-historical activity my aim has not been to make over-ambitious claims for the two texts submitted here. The context that I have attempted to construct here instead represents an attempt to draw out the various methodological strands that are entwined in the two books and to suggest how these are connected with other more complex art-historical constructions. While in many ways a marginal subject, eighteenth-century British sculpture has not only the attraction of being a relatively

unworked field in which it is possible to discover new evidence and formulate original interpretations about impressive works of art as well as about, in the case of Roubiliac, an artist who can stand his ground alongside any of his European contemporaries. It is also an area of study that, by crossing various intersecting faultlines of eighteenth-century culture, offers opportunities for interdisciplinary work of an unusual sort. Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-century Monument and Figured in Marble are attempts to take advantage of these opportunities and so to write sculpture back into the narrative of British art as well as to give it more prominence within current debate of eighteenth-century studies. This critical review has tried to sketch out some of the contexts in these debates are taking place and to show how these two books relate to various traditions of art historiography.

Notes

¹ The publications submitted comprise Figured in Marble. The Making and Viewing of Eighteenth-century Sculpture and my contribution to the main text of Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-century Monument. Sculpture as Theatre (207-273; 382-387).

Appendix I consists of the Catalogue of Roubiliac's Funerary Monuments from the latter study (275-359), which is almost entirely my own work but incorporates some material provided by David Bindman and Tessa Murdoch, and Appendix II lists ten articles that supplement the material presented in the two books. The citations of my own publications here (other than to the two books submitted) use the numbering given to them in Appendix II.

² The phrase is taken from Paul Langford, A Polite and Commercial People. England 1727-17183, Oxford, 1989.

³ Julius von Schlosser, Das Kunstliteratur: Ein Handbuch zur quellenkunde de neuerren Kunstgeschichte, Vienna, 1924.

⁴ Gerhaert goes unmentioned, for example, in the chapter on the fifteenth century in the north in Ernst Gombrich's The Story of Art, London, 1966.

⁵ Such monographic treatments include Klaus Herding, Pierre Puget. Das bildnerische Werk, Berlin, 1970; Siegfried Asche, Balthasar Permoser. Leben und Werk, Berlin, 1978; Klaus Lankheit, Der kurpfälzische Hofbildhauer Paul Egell, 1691-1752, Munich 1988, and David Bindman and Malcolm Baker, Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-century Monument, New Haven and London, 1995. Monographic exhibition catalogues include Jean-Ren9 Gaborit, Jean-Baptiste Pigalle, Paris, 1985 and

Katharine Freemantle and Willy Halsema-Kubes, Beelden Kijken. De Kunst van Quellien in het Palais op de Dam, Amsterdam, 1977.

⁶ François Souchal, Dictionary of French Sculptors. The Age of Louis XIV, I-IV, Oxford and London, 1977-93; Rupert Gunnis, Dictionary of British Sculptors 1660-1851, London, n.d. [1953].

⁷ Anne Poulet and Guilhem Scherf, Clodion 1738-1814, Paris, 1992.

⁸ Anne Wagner, Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux. Sculptor of the Second Empire, New haven and London, 1986.

⁹ Jennifer Montagu, Alessandro Algardi, New Haven and London, 1985.

¹⁰ Michael Baxandall Limewood Sculptors of Renaissance Germany, New Haven and London, 1980. For a more extended discussion of Baxandall's methodology see Baker 8.

¹¹ Even in as richly documented case as the monument to the Duke of Argyll monument (Cat. No. 3) no less than four pieces of new evidence have appeared since the book's publication, significantly changing the interpretation proposed there. I shall be publishing these in a forthcoming article in the Burlington Magazine.

¹² Horace Walpole, Anecdotes of Painting, Strawberry Hill, 1786; George Vertue, Notebooks, III, in The Walpole Society, 22 (1933-34).

¹³ Allan Cunningham, Lives of the British Painters, Sculptors and Architects, III, London, 1830.

¹⁴ Margaret Whinney, Sculpture in Britain 1530-1830, Harmondsworth, 1964 (rev. ed. by J. Physick, 1988).

¹⁵ The articles begin with a series of 'Studies of English Sculptors from Pierce to Chantrey' that appeared in The Architect in 1921 and 1922.

¹⁶ For this see Baker 11.

¹⁷ Margaret Webb, Michael Rysbrack Sculptor, London, 1954.

¹⁸ His articles included 'Handel at Vauxhall' Victoria and Albert Museum Bulletin I (1965), 1-13 and 'Joseph Wilton and Dr Cocchi', Victoria and Albert Museum Bulletin, III (1967), 73-80. For Hodgkinson's contribution to the study of significance see my obituary of him in The Independent and my forthcoming entry on him in the New DNB.

¹⁹ Nicholas Penny, Church Monuments in Romantic England, New Haven and London, 1977; Alison Yarrington, The Commemoration of the Hero: Monuments to the British Victims of the Napoleonic Wars, New York, 1986.

²⁰ Nigel Llewellyn, Funeral Monuments in Post-Reformation England, Cambridge, 2000. His methodological approach is outlined in Chapt. 1.

²¹ Matthew Craske, The London Sculpture Trade and the Development of the Imagery of the Family in Funerary Monuments of the Period 1720-1760, Ph.D. thesis, Westfield College, 1992. A much revised and developed version of this text is to be published by Yale U.P.

²² David Howarth 'Charles I, Sculpture and Sculptors' in F. Haskell ed., The Late King's Goods, Oxford, 1989, 73-113.

²³ John Barrell, The Dark Side of the Landscape, Cambridge, 1980; J. Barrell, The Political Theory of Painting, New Haven and London, 1986; Ann Bermingham's Landscape and Ideology, London, 1986; Marcia Pointon, Hanging the Head, New Haven and London, 1992; David Solkin, Painting for Money, New Haven and London, 1993.

²⁴ Lawrence Klein, Shaftesbury and the Culture of Politeness, Cambridge, 1994; J.G.A. Pocock, Virtue, Commerce and History, Cambridge, 1984; John Brewer, The

Pleasures of the Imagination, London, 1997; Linda Colley, Britons, New Haven and London, 1992.

²⁵ The exemplary and very substantial entries on busts and statues by Potts and Yarrington in M. Baker et al., An Edition of the Ledger of Sir Francis Chantrey in The Walpole Society, 56 (1991-92) are written with an sharp awareness of their political and ideological significance, which is also addressed in the National Portrait Gallery exhibition catalogue by A. Potts, Sir Francis Chantrey 1781-1841. Sculptor of the Great, 1981.

²⁶ Ingrid Roscoe, 'Peter Scheemakers', The Walpole Society, 61 (1996).

²⁷ Baker 29.

²⁸ Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, Court, Cloister and City, London, 1995.

²⁹ Klaus Lankheit, Florentinische Barockplastik, Munich, 1962; Robert Enggass, Eighteenth-century Sculpture in Rome, University Park and London, 1976.

³⁰ Eugenio Riccomini, Ordine e vaghezza. Scultura in Emilia nell'età barocca, Bologna, 1972; Camillo Semenzato, La scultura veneta del Seicento e del Settecento, Venice, 1966; E.P. Armani and M.G. Galassi, Artisti e artigiani de marmo dal Cinquecento al Seicento, Genoa, 1988

³¹ H. Honour, 'English Patrons and Italian Sculptors in the first Half of the Eighteenth Century' Connoisseur 141 (1958), 220-226; Terry Friedman, 'Lord Harald in Italy', Burlington Magazine, 130 (1988), 836-845.

³² Gerold Weber, Brunnen und Wasserkünste in Frankreich im Zeitalter von Louis XIV, Worms, 1985; Betsy Rosasco, The Sculptures at the Chateau of Marly during the Reign of Louis XIV, New York, 1986.

³³ For Herding, Gaborit and Freemantle and Halsema-Kubes see note 5 above. F. Souchal, Les Slodtz, Paris, 1967; James D. Draper and Guilhem Scherf, Augustin Pajou, Paris, 1997.

³⁴ Alain Jacobs, Laurent Delvaux, Paris, 1999.

³⁵ Peter Volk, Rokokoplastik, Munich, 1981; Peter Volk, Bayerische Rokokoplastik. Vom Entwurf zur Ausführung, Munich, 1985.

³⁶ Baker 5.

³⁷ For Grosley's description of the Wolfe monument see Figured in Marble, 45-47.

This French awareness of British works is apparent not only in the use that both Slodtz and Pajou made of British tomb sculpture formats but also in the fact that Roubiliac's first recorded works in England are known from a French periodical. I shall be exploring these connections further in a forthcoming publication in the Centre Allemand's series, Passerelles.

³⁸ M. Camille, The Gothic Idol. Ideology and image-making in medieval art, Cambridge, 1989; J. Shearman, Only Connect, Princeton, 1992; D. Freedberg, The Power of Images. Studies in the History and Theory of Reponse, Chicago, 1989. For a sense of the debate prompted by these often controversial studies see Caroline Bynum's review of Camille in the Art Bulletin 74 (1990), 331-2, Ernst Gombrich's of Shearman in The New York Review of Books (4 March 1993, 19-22) Martin Kemp's of Shearman in Times Literary Supplement (2 April 1993, 13-15) and John Nash's of Freedberg in Art History 13 (1990), 566-570. The nature of this new emphasis on viewing is well illustrated by Camille's review of H. Belting's Bild und Kult in the Art Bulletin 74 (1992), 514-7.

³⁹ Baxandall, Limewood Sculptors (note 10 above).

⁴⁰ Michael Podro, Depiction, New Haven and London, 1998, chapt. 2; Geraldine

Johnson, 'Art or artefact? Madonna and Child reliefs in the early Renaissance', in Stuart Currie and Peta Motture, eds., The Sculpted Object, London 1997, 1-24.

⁴¹ Oskar Bätschmann, 'Pygmalion als Betrachter', in Wolfgang Kemp ed., Der Betrachter im Bild, Berlin, 1992, 237-278; B. Rosasco, 'Masquerade and Enigma at the Court of Louis XIV', Art Journal, 48 (1989), 144-149; Chloe Chard, 'Nakedness and the Grand Tour: Classical Sculpture and the Imaginative Geography of the Grand Tour', Oxford Art Journal, 18 (1995), 14-28.

⁴² Alex Potts, The Sculptural Imagination, New Haven and London, 2000, 12-13.

⁴³ The phrase is from A. Potts, 'Installation and Sculpture', Oxford Art Journal 24 (2001), 8, in which the arguments about viewing are presented in a more succinct form than in The Sculptural Imagination.

⁴⁴ John Physick, Designs for English Sculpture 1680-1860, London, 1969.

⁴⁵ Peter Volk, ed., Entwurf und Ausführung in der europäischen Barockplastik, Munich, 1986; Maria Giulia Barberini, Sculture in terracotta del Barocco Romano: bozzetti e modelli del Museo del Palazzo Venezia, Rome, 1991. For an attempt to examine comparable issues raised by the eighteenth-century oil sketch see Beverly Louise Brown, 'In Search of the Prima Idea: The Oil Sketches of Giambattista Tiepolo' and Oreste Ferrari, 'The Development of the Oil Sketch in Italy' in Giambattista Tiepolo. Master of the Oil Sketch (Kimbell Art Museum exhib. cat.), Milan, 1993, 15-21 and 42-63; Linda and George Bauer, 'Artists' inventories and the language of the oil sketch', Burlington Magazine, 141 (1999), 520-530.

⁴⁶ Ivan Gaskell and Herbert Lie eds., Sketches in Clay for Projects by Gian Lorenzo Bernini (Harvard University Art Museums Bulletin, VI -3), Cambridge Mass., 1999.

Appendix II

Additional publications by Malcolm Baker

(excluding articles later adapted as chapters in Figured in Marble and articles on non-eighteenth-century subjects)

1. 'Multiple heads: Pope, the portrait bust and patterns of repetition', essay in Ritual, Routine, and Regime. Institution of Repetition in Euro-American Cultures, 1650-1832, ed. Lorna Clymer, University of Toronto Press, 2003 (forthcoming)
2. 'Representing invention, viewing models', Displaying the Third Dimension. Models in the Sciences, Technology and Medicine, ed. Nick Hopwood and Soraya de Chadavarian, Stanford University Press, 2002 (forthcoming)
3. 'Some eighteenth-century frameworks for the Renaissance bronze: historiography, authorship and production', in The Small Bronze in the Renaissance, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Studies in the History of Art, 62, 2001, 211-221
4. '“A sort of corporate company”: the portrait bust and its setting', in P. Curtis, P. Funnell and N. Kalinsky, Return to Life, (Henry Moore Foundation, NPG and NPGS exhib.cat.) Leeds, 2000
5. 'Bouchardon's British sitters: sculptural portraiture in Rome and the classicising bust around 1730', Burlington Magazine, CXLII (2000), 752-762 (with Colin Harrison and Alastair Laing)
6. 'La consommation de l'antique: le "grand tour" et les reproductions de sculpture classique' in J.-R. Gaborit and A. Pasquier eds., D'après l'Antique, (Musée du Louvre exhib. cat.), Paris, 2000, 33-41
7. 'Public fame or private remembrance? The portrait bust as a mode of commemoration in eighteenth-century England', in Memory and Oblivion. Proceedings of the XXIXth International Conference of the History of Art held in Amsterdam, 1-7 September 1996, Amsterdam, Dordrecht, 1999, pp. 527-535
8. 'Limewood, Chiromancy and Narratives of Making. Writing about the Materials and Processes of Sculpture', Art History, 21(1998), pp. 498-530
9. 'Tyers, Roubiliac and a Sculpture's Fame: a poem about the commissioning of the Handel statue at Vauxhall', The Sculpture Journal, 2 (1998), pp.41-45
10. 'Roubiliac and Chelsea in 1745', Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle, 17 (1997), pp. 222-225
11. A Grand Design. The Art of the Victoria and Albert Museum, (co-edited with Brenda Richardson), exhibition catalogue for the Baltimore Museum of Art, New York and London: Abrams, 1997

12. 'Francis van Bossuit, Böttger stoneware and the Judith Reliefs', in R. Kahsnitz & P. Volk, eds., Skulptur in Süddeutschland. Festschrift für Alfred Schädler, Munich, 1998, pp. 281-294
13. 'The ivory multiplied: small-scale sculpture and its reproductions in the eighteenth century', in A. Hughes and E. Ranfft, Sculpture and its reproductions, 1997, pp. 61-78
14. 'The making of portrait busts in the mid eighteenth century: Roubiliac, Scheemakers and Trinity College, Dublin', Burlington Magazine, 137 (1995), pp.821-831.
15. 'A Rage for exhibitions: the display and viewing of Wedgwood's Frog service', in H. Young ed., The Genius of Wedgwood, London, 1995, pp.118-27, with catalogue entries F.1-22 (pp.128-133)
16. 'The Portrait Sculpture' in D. McKitterick ed., The Making of the Wren Library, Trinity College, Cambridge, Cambridge, 1995, pp. 110-137
17. 'English responses to continental sculpture in the 18th century', Handbook to the Grosvenor House Antiques Fair, London, 1993, pp. 12-17.
18. 'Roubiliac's Argyll monument and the interpretation of eighteenth-century sculptors' designs, Burlington Magazine, 134 (1992), pp.785-797.
19. 'John van Nost le Jeune, Portrait d'homme', Musee du Louvre. Nouvelles acquisitions du departement des Sculptures 1988-1991, Paris, 1992, pp.71-74.
20. ' "Proper Ornaments for a Library or Grotto": London Sculptors and their Scottish Patrons in the Eighteenth Century", in F. Pearson (ed.), Virtue and Vision. Sculpture and Scotland 1540-1990, Edinburgh (National Galleries of Scotland), 1991, pp.44-57.
21. ' "Odzooks! A man of stone". Earth, heaven and hell in eighteenth century tomb sculpture', in J. Miller (ed.), The Don Giovanni Book. Myths of Seduction and Betrayal, London, 1990, pp.62-69.
22. 'Giambologna, Donatello and the sale of the Gaddi, Marucelli and Stosch bronzes', Städel Jahrbuch, N.F. 12 (1989), pp.179-194.
23. 'Rysbrack's terracotta model of Lady Foley and her daughter and the Foley monument at Great Witley', Städel Jahrbuch, N.F., 11 (1987), pp.261-268.
24. 'Bernini's bust of Monsignor Carlo Antonio dal Pozzo', National Art-Collections Fund Review 1986, London, 1987, pp.99-101.
25. 'Roubiliac's models and 18th century sculptors' working practices' in P. Volk (ed.), Entwurf und Ausführung in der europäischen Barockskulptur, Munich, 1986, pp. 133-146.
26. 'Sir Henry Cheere and the response to the rococo in English sculpture' in C. Hind (ed.), The Rococo in England, London, 1986, pp. 143-160.

27. 'That "most rare Master Monsii Le Gros" and his Marsyas', Burlington Magazine, 127 (1985), pp.702-706.
28. Catalogue entries 143, 144, 217, 218, 221, 225, 237, 238, 241, 478, 512, 513 in G.Jackson-Stops (ed.), Treasure Houses of Britain, Washington, 1985.
29. 'Rococo Styles in English Sculpture' and catalogue entries on sculpture and designs for sculpture (E2, E25, F1, F9, F10, S1-S54) in M. Snodin (ed.), Rococo. Art and Design in Hogarth's England, (exhibition catalogue), London, 1984, pp. 278-309.
30. 'Roubiliac and his European background', Apollo, 120 (1984), pp. 106-113. (Revised version published in K.Kalinowski (ed.), Studien zur Werkstattpraxis der Barockskulptur im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert, Poznan, 1992, pp.221-239
31. ' "A Peece of Wondrous Art" : Giambologna's Samson and a Philistine and its later copies', Antologia di Belle Arti, n.s., 23-24 (1984), pp.62-71.
32. 'Sculpture for Palladian Interiors: Rysbrack's reliefs and their setting', in K.Eustace (ed.), Michael Rysbrack, (exhibition catalogue), Bristol, 1982, pp. 35-41
33. 'Giuseppe Mazza's Judgment of Paris', Burlington Magazine, 121 (1979), pp.174-79.
34. 'Patrick Robertson's tea urn and the late 18th century Edinburgh silver trade', Connoisseur, 183 (1973), pp. 289-94.