

Gettsy

Body Doubles

Sculpture in Britain, 1877–1905

Body Doubles

Sculpture in Britain, 1877–1905



David Gettsy

David J. Getsy

Body Doubles

Sculpture in Britain, 1877–1905

Published for

The Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art

by

Yale University Press

New Haven and London

Copyright © 2004 by David J. Getsy

All rights reserved.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that copying permitted by Sections 107 and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law and except by reviewers for the public press), without written permission from the publishers.

Designed by Gillian Malpass

Printed in China

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Getsy, David.

Body doubles : sculpture in Britain, 1877–1905 / David J. Getsy.
– 1st ed.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-300-10512-6 (cl : alk. paper)

I. New sculpture (Art movement) I. Title.

NB467.5.N48G48 2004

730'.941'09034 – dc22

2004002211

A catalogue record for this book is available from
The British Library

Frontispiece James Havard Thomas, *Lycidas*, 1905 (cast 1908),
bronze, 161 × 83 × 52 cm.; Tate, London.

Contents

Acknowledgments	vi
Introduction	i
1 Frederic Leighton's <i>Athlete Wrestling with a Python</i> and the Theory of the Sculptural Encounter	15
2 Animating the Classical: Hamo Thornycroft's Experimentation with the Ideal Statue, 1878–1884	43
3 “Licentious Plasticity”: Alfred Gilbert and Sculpture beyond the Body, 1884–1886	87
4 “Hard Realism”: The Thanatic Corporeality of Edward Onslow Ford's <i>Shelley Memorial</i>	119
5 Figural Equivalence and Equivocation: James Havard Thomas and the <i>Lycidas</i> “Scandal” of 1905	143
Conclusion: “Caressability” and the Formulation of Modernist Sculpture in Britain	181
Notes	188
Bibliography	210
Index	234

Introduction

Body doubles stand in for actresses and actors in the process of making a film. Sometimes this substitution can be highly generic – the body double merely occupies the place and space of the actor in the scene. At other times, the body double can be used to idealize the actor, replacing and supplementing her or his body. Directors compose idealized images of actors through the use of one or more body doubles, whose individual parts surpass those of the actor and become synthetically integrated into the filmic image. In short, the body double's role centers on a substitute physicality and its visual idealization.

When sculptors in Britain in the last quarter of the nineteenth century attempted to formulate a new direction and a modern idiom for sculpture, they created body doubles. That is, they sought ways to activate and animate the conventional format of the freestanding ideal statue in such a way that it would convincingly and compellingly stand in for both a living body and an ideal image. Complicating the neoclassically derived stylistic conventions that had characterized much previous sculpture in Britain, these sculptors fervently pursued a commitment to the mimetic rendering of the body in three dimensions and attended to the problems and perils such a commitment entailed.

Heightened verisimilitude of the sculptural body had the potential to interfere with the exemplary aspirations of sculpture. In effect, the nuanced rendering of surface detail and variation brought to the viewer's attention details of the quotidian circumstances of actual bodies. The excitement generated by greater freshness and naturalism in sculptural representation was tempered by anxieties about the propriety of sculptural realism. Conversely, the greater attention to representational accuracy in the rendering of the details of the flesh also had the potential to accentuate and dramatize the gap between the immotile marble or bronze statue and living, moving bodies. The more a statue emulated the semblance of a body, the more the obdurate nature of the material, sculptural object became clear. In response to these issues, sculptors in late Victorian Britain pursued strategies that would allow them to accommodate varieties of naturalism and symbolism along with the materiality of sculpture, exploring the interplay between the physical presence of the statue and the figural representation it conveys. Corporeality, the potential fusion or interlacing of figural image and object, emerged as a central theme in the attempts to negotiate the expectations of sculpture's ideal and exemplary role and became a fundamental aspect of the theories of modern sculpture formulated in late nineteenth-century Britain.

Body Doubles focuses on the pivotal place occupied by the ideal statue in these developments and examines a series of polemical sculptures created for exhibition at the Royal

Academy of Arts in London between 1877 and 1905. This book does not seek to provide a comprehensive or synthetic overview of the rapid and sophisticated innovations in sculpture theory in this period. Beyond the statues discussed here, there are many sculptures and public monuments that would repay close attention. Instead, I have chosen a small group of exemplary sculptures to be studied in depth. Throughout, I have focused on what I see as a crucial and largely unrecognized sophistication in sculpture theory in and among these seemingly conventional and “academic” works. *Body Doubles* discusses in detail the artworks and episodes that illustrate the issues at play in the development of a modern theory of sculpture in this period.

A common reaction to the work of such artists as Frederic Leighton, Hamo Thornycroft, Alfred Gilbert, Edward Onslow Ford, or James Havard Thomas has been to dismiss any substantive connection to modern art. These sculptors initially appear largely oblivious to the strategies for engaging with modernity that characterized late nineteenth-century art. On first glance, the sculptures illustrated here seem to be mired in the past and have little to say to the future. *Body Doubles* looks beyond the conventional narratives of modernism’s stylistic roots to reconsider the nomenclature of the “modern” in light of these ostensibly “academic” works. In this regard, I align my project with the growing number of scholars of nineteenth-century Britain who contend that the sophistication of Victorian art as well as its wider relevance to the history and theory of visual art have been inadequately apprehended. Specifically, it has been argued that what is needed for a more thorough understanding of nineteenth-century art is “a dissolution of the academic/avant-garde split as it is currently understood: as a means to equate avant-garde identity with aesthetic legitimacy.”¹ I stress throughout that neither the traditional notions of the “academic” nor of the “avant-garde” adequately capture the complexity of these sculptors’ art-theoretical aims.

Instead of seeing verisimilitude as a reactionary response to modernity, I argue that these sculptors attempted to work within the parameters of an idealized illusionism in order to invigorate the medium. I pursue the ways in which these ambitious artists questioned physicality, corporeality, and the viewer’s encounter with sculpture. What becomes clear is that an active discourse of the sculptural body informed and was driven by works such as those examined in this book. While they do not fit easily into existing narratives of modernism and modernity, their frequent estrangement from yet engagement with pivotal issues for modern sculpture make them a surprisingly rich resource as objects for study.

The New Sculpture

During the last two decades of the nineteenth century, London experienced an unprecedented and rapid increase in the interest in sculpture by both its practitioners and its audience. The “New Sculpture,” as the trend was dubbed, overtook the city and established itself more prominently in exhibition spaces and public places. Beginning with Frederic Leighton’s widely acclaimed *Athlete Wrestling with a Python* in 1877, sculpture emerged from its subordination to painting and became a major site of art-theoretical innovation. By the 1880s, there was an explosion in the production of sculpture that valued self-reflexive theorization about the properties and priorities of the sculptural medium.

The New Sculpture received its name from a series of essays by the critic and poet Edmund Gosse in 1894.² Gosse self-consciously set himself the task of writing the history of sculpture as it had developed over the previous two decades. By the time of his articles, other critics had emerged with a vested interest in sculpture theory (such as Claude Phillips, Walter Armstrong, and Marian Hepworth Dixon), but it was Gosse who had been the primary (and often solitary) voice in sculpture criticism in the 1880s.³ He formulated the parameters of the new movement in 1880 and 1881 out of his deep engagement with the work of his close friend Hamo Thornycroft (see chapter 2). As early as this, he had developed the formula that he would later reiterate to define the new movement:

What seems to be the central feature of Mr. Thornycroft's work as far as it has yet shown itself is the pursuit of an imaginative and spiritual aim under forms of absolute truth. In other words, he does not, like Gibson, go straight to antiquity and slavishly copy the Greeks, but he translates into exact and modern language such ideas of beauty as are most analogous to the best Greek feeling.⁴

Here Gosse set out the basic terms of his definition of New Sculpture: (1) a repudiation of conventionalized neoclassicism; (2) an embrace of naturalistic treatment of bodies and details – what he rather pompously called “absolute truth”; and (3) a concern with the sculptural object as a modern site of meaning, exemplarity, and ideality (which sometimes manifested itself in terms of subject matter and at other times in its art-theoretical posture). Into the next decade, Gosse reasserted terms as criteria for evaluation, influencing the outlook of other critics and, at times, the sculptors themselves.

Gosse developed his own position on sculpture from his discussions with Thornycroft, and both saw Leighton's *Athlete Wrestling with a Python* as a key catalyst for later developments. As I discuss in chapter 1, Leighton's statue did establish the prototype for the New Sculpture and initiated a trend of art-theoretical investigation into the medium of sculpture. Neither Leighton's *Athlete* nor Thornycroft's groundbreaking statues of 1880–81, however, encapsulate the full range of options that would come to make up the “movement.” As with all designations of movements and eras, the label “New Sculpture” must be used with caution. An umbrella term, it covers the wide range of experimentation in sculpture theory, subject matter, and representation that characterized the competitive and active climate of sculptural production in late Victorian Britain. Through my analysis of individual works, I suggest that one can begin to look beyond the preliminary definitions offered by Gosse and other contemporary critics into the wider implications of the (sometimes competing) art-theoretical positions of late Victorian sculptors and critics as they struggled to formulate a modern sculptural idiom.

The conditions for the production and reception of sculpture evolved rapidly in the late Victorian era. Many emerging sculptors had been trained in a different manner from their mid-Victorian predecessors.⁵ A greater emphasis on modeling and an infusion of techniques from French artists (most importantly the expatriates Alfonse Legros and Aimé-Jules Dalou) raised the technical standards of the younger sculptors. British sculptors began to have more access to a range of technical options and approaches to sculptural representation both at home and abroad. Leighton, too, acted as a catalyst, inspiring students such as Thornycroft and Gilbert. In the years after his *Athlete Wrestling with a Python* stole the show at the Royal

Academy exhibition of 1877, sculpture became an increasingly important topic in the schools and in the galleries. As President of the Royal Academy from 1878 to 1896, Leighton made sculpture a priority, encouraging technical and stylistic innovations as well as being a strong advocate for its practitioners.⁶ More generally, he persuaded the institution into a greater engagement with Aestheticism and with formal and art-theoretical sophistication, providing an environment that was more supportive of sculptural experiment.⁷ In many ways, the modern ambitions of the New Sculptors were framed by the academic institution of the Royal Academy in London. During this time, London's Royal Academy was significantly different from the Académie des Beaux-Arts and the École des Beaux-Arts of Paris in that the codes, rules, and conventions that made up the "academic" norm for sculpture were far more diffuse and less centrally regulated.⁸ Although, as in the case of James Havard Thomas, for example, the Royal Academy later came to resist innovations in sculpture theory in much the same way it had done with painting in the late nineteenth century, during the 1880s and 1890s it largely welcomed the New Sculpture.

The Royal Academy's exhibition spaces were rehabilitated in 1882, preparing the way for a new engagement with sculpture. Previously, sculpture had been exhibited poorly and with inadequate light. To remedy this situation, the Royal Academy's home at Burlington House, Piccadilly, was re-roofed to increase the availability of natural light. From that point, sculpture received two large, open rooms including the Lecture Room where Leighton's *Athlete* had been the pioneering statue.⁹ The young sculptors increasingly sought to occupy these new, well-lit galleries with ambitious works.

The renewed enthusiasm for sculpture in London also resulted from the "statuemanía" that had infected London and other European capitals.¹⁰ Beginning with works such as the Albert Memorial (finally completed in 1876) and reaching manic proportions by the time of Queen Victoria's Jubilee in 1887–88, more and more statues began to sprout across the city and the Empire.¹¹ The completion of the Chelsea, Victoria, and Albert Embankments in 1874 added new roads and railways but also provided further space for sculpture to colonize. The new public sites opened up in this development were gradually taken over with new monuments and displaced statues from other parts of the city. Sewers, gas lines, and subways remapped and reconceptualized the city.¹² Monuments to engineers were erected throughout the city, and development projects used sculptures to beautify or mask new kinds of urban site such as underground stations. Increasingly, every constituency wanted and needed a sculpture. In the closing decades of the nineteenth century, the number of well-trained sculptors in London was higher than before; there was also a new configuration of urban space and an increased variety of public bodies wishing to install statues within the city.¹³

Beyond the hub of London, rapidly expanding northern towns such as Liverpool, Manchester, and Leeds engaged in ambitious sculptural programs. British sculpture was also distributed across the world in conjunction with the sweeping expansion of the Empire in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Numerous works were installed across Australia, New Zealand, and Africa, and scores of statues were sent to India as reminders of imperial power.¹⁴

In addition to commemorative public statues, the presence of sculpture at home and in relation to architecture became crucial areas of expanded interest and production. Beginning in the late 1880s, the production of small-scale statuettes intended for domestic display had

grown with the establishment of publishing companies (such as Arthur Collie's in 1889) and the renovation of the bronze-founding industry in and around London. Foundry companies such as J. W. Singer's provided facilities that allowed sculptors to produce quantities of art bronzes of higher quality than previously available in Britain. Consequently, the technically refined statuette became a crucial part of the new emphasis on integrated interior design and a further avenue for art-theoretical inquiry.¹⁵ Sculpture, as well, began to engage in a more self-conscious collaboration with architecture, and one of the most important aspects of the New Sculpture was its emphasis on architectural relief.¹⁶ No longer confined to parks and galleries, sculpture had begun to exert a more noticeable presence in the home and in urban streets.

In such an environment of expanded need for and interest in sculpture on multiple fronts, sculptors increasingly found it necessary to rival their peers in the eyes of critics and the public as well as in the competitions for monuments themselves. The annual Royal Academy Summer Exhibition was the forum in which these contests were played out. There were many venues for painting, and the portability of most easel paintings meant that shows could be hung with relative ease and consistent variety. The slower production of sculpture, combined with the relative difficulty and expense of exhibiting large pieces, largely limited sculptors to the Royal Academy's yearly overview. The Grosvenor Gallery did exhibit sculpture (often small-scale), but it was in the galleries of the Royal Academy that a sculptor made his or her name. Furthermore, the Royal Academy remained the central exhibition space for sculptors into the twentieth century even as its dominance as a venue for painting waned.¹⁷ As late as 1907, William Goscombe John lamented in a letter to his fellow sculptor Havard Thomas: "for after all [the Royal Academy] is the *only place for us*. This is not unfeeling ritual, it is a rite [?] show; in spite of many unpleasant slaps in the face that we *all* get there, *insiders as well as outsiders*, it remains one important exhibition."¹⁸

While many pieces exhibited were commissioned busts, studies for monuments, and the like, each show also contained speculative pieces in the "imaginative" or "ideal" genre. At the top of the hierarchy of sculpture genres, the ideal freestanding statue (conventionally depicting a mythological character) had historically served as the proving ground for sculptors' highest aspirations to exemplarity, universality, ideality, civic function, beauty, intellectual mastery, and artistry. It was through these artworks that late Victorian sculptors established a public profile necessary to gain the lucrative commissions for monuments and portraits. With the greater scrutiny being given to sculpture and with the emergence of critics such as Gosse attuned to its concerns, sculptors were now required to display more than their technical proficiency. It was incumbent upon them to stake out an art-theoretical position through their ideal statues. Leighton's *Athlete* set the pattern for self-reflexively commenting on the state and future of sculpture (see chapter 1), and subsequent sculptors continued in this vein.¹⁹ In sum, the climate for sculpture in late Victorian London and specifically the singular environment of the Royal Academy exhibitions encouraged the development and complexity of sculpture theory.

Statues which made such a self-reflexive statement about the medium of sculpture emerged as a constitutive element in late Victorian art. These works functioned as manifestos for an artist's attitudes toward sculptural representation and served to highlight the differences with his or her peers. Through these works, sculptors positioned themselves in relation

to the discourse of sculpture theory and put forth art-theoretical claims for and about the medium. They used these objects to make declarations about what sculpture was, what it represented, what it meant, how it should be made, and how it should be experienced. The polemical and art-theoretical nature of the ideal statue in these decades can be related to Victor Stoichita's argument that the "metapictorial act forged the modern state of art."²⁰ For Stoichita, meta-painting exhibited a self-awareness of its conventions, relations, and limitations through the representation of paintings and pictorial devices themselves. The meta-artistic impulse that Stoichita argued was central to conceptions of art from early modern Europe to the twentieth century is, in my analysis, examined in terms of the sculptures' allegorization or thematization of conditions of their own production, conception, or reception as objects as well as images. Late Victorian sculpture theory manifested itself not in textual manifestos or artists' statements so much as in these polemical, metasculptural objects that explored the relations between the object of sculpture, its making, its figuration, and the viewer's encounter with it. Only through a detailed examination of individual works does the complexity of these artists' claims begin to be understood.

In emphasizing the genre of the imaginative or ideal statue as a vehicle for sculpture theory, artists in late nineteenth-century Britain were in step with the contemporary attempts to reconceptualize the medium and its prospects. Across Europe, sculptors in the last quarter of the nineteenth century increasingly sought to formulate a modern sculptural idiom through "ideal" works. In France, Auguste Rodin's crucial early works such as *L'Âge d'airain* (1876) and *St. Jean-Baptiste prêchant* (1878) similarly engaged with the definition of sculpture and mediated the tradition of the classical freestanding nude. In Germany, Adolf von Hildebrand also created polemical objects to illustrate theoretical positions. Although better remembered for his treatise *The Problem of Form in Painting and Sculpture* (1893), Hildebrand had made an initial formulation of his formalist aims with his statue *Stehender Mann* (1884).²¹ Both Rodin and Hildebrand have found places in the narratives of modern art while the New Sculptors' analogous efforts have gone unrecognized. This inclusion of Rodin and Hildebrand can be partly explained by their relative amenability to the issues central to the formulation of modernism in painting. Rodin's emphasis on perception, combined with a style that some have (often unconvincingly) linked to Impressionism, allows his work to be seen in relation to avant-garde pictorial strategies and attitudes. Similarly, Hildebrand's treatise and its emphasis on opticality have allowed him to be seen within a history of visuality, culminating in Greenbergian modernism.²² With their idiosyncratic commitments to verisimilitude and to the exploration of the physicality of the sculptural medium, however, the New Sculptors have proved to be more consistently difficult to integrate into a history of modern painting. In contrast, I contend that their exploration of the experiential, material, temporal, and physical elements of sculpture can be fruitfully considered – even with their commitment to an idealized verisimilitude – in light of later engagements with sculpture theory (for example, with the emphasis on literality and the phenomenal encounter by American Minimalism and Postminimalism).

* * *

Critical Positioning of the New Sculpture

The new variety of options offered by late Victorian statues often provoked comment in exhibition reviews. In 1883, for example, an article in *Macmillan's Magazine* stated, "There has never been a time since the beginning of the present century when there were so many signs of vitality in this art [of sculpture] as we now find about us."²³ In 1884 Cosmo Monkhouse began his multiple-article review of the Royal Academy Summer Exhibition with the observation, "The present exhibition will be chiefly memorable as the first in which the average quality of the sculpture is higher than that of the painting."²⁴ Even the cynical George Bernard Shaw noted in 1889, "Indeed, there is a perceptible movement among sculptors as if their stocks and stones were coming to life at last."²⁵ Over the 1880s and 1890s it became standard practice to begin a review of the sculpture by contrasting the exciting new developments with mid-Victorian norms. Claude Phillips encouraged aspects of the new momentum in sculpture even as he became a vocal critic of some of its practitioners (see chapter 4). He wrote in 1886:

Here, at any rate, especially in the works of Mr. Hamo Thornycroft, Mr. Gilbert, and Mr. Onslow Ford, appears evidence of a close, loving study of nature, of independent thought, and, if not an entire emancipation from conventionality, at any rate a tendency to yield to higher and better influences than such as have so long been potent with English sculptors.²⁶

Two years later Walter Armstrong reaffirmed this evaluation:

The burst of life which has of late years come to cheer those in whom all hope for English sculpture was not extinct has taken that middle course between two extremes in which safety lies for the artist as for most men. It has neither, on the one hand, attempted to revivify the old belief in what, no doubt in all sincerity, was called pure classicism, nor has it followed the French developments in the opposite direction – developments which threatened at one time to obliterate all distinctions between sculpture and painting but those which can be recognised by the sense of touch.²⁷

Importantly, Armstrong pointed to the self-reflexive impulse in much of the New Sculpture – to explore what was sculptural about sculpture. He stressed that the New Sculpture not only avoided the cold conventionality of previous styles but also resisted French sculpture's pictoriality and abandonment of sculpture's specific, physical traits.

It should be noted that, in his discussion of the blurred boundaries between painting and sculpture, Armstrong voiced a widespread opinion in Britain about French sculpture ranging from the work of Rodin to that of Albert-Ernest Carrier-Belleuse and Antoine-Louis Barye. French influences and examples made a crucial contribution to the expanded range of experimentation and technical ability practiced by the New Sculptors, but there was also a deep-seated suspicion of the terms and implications of French work.²⁸ While the French artists were technically sophisticated, critics such as Armstrong argued that the British artists had a deeper commitment to sculpture itself.²⁹ The deep engagement with the physical processes and implications of the medium that was a key theme in the New Sculpture grew, in part,

from a desire to avoid the pictorialism that French naturalistic techniques often encouraged. From Leighton's *Athlete* onward, many New Sculptors explored and emphasized the materiality and physical presence of the sculptural object as a means of counterbalancing the sensuous pictoriality they saw in their French counterparts. Even Gilbert, the most pictorial of the New Sculptors, emphasized the material basis for sculpture and resisted an equation of his work with the French.³⁰

Within a decade, a specifically "New Sculptural" set of questions and concerns emerged that infused art criticism and informed the creation of sculptural objects. Much of the complexity of this sculptural discourse, however, has been lost in the secondary literature. The increasing formality in discussions of contemporary British sculpture culminated in Gosse's retrospective "New Sculpture" articles of 1894. A year later, he published a series of articles on the theme of "The Place of Sculpture in Daily Life" that analyzed the everyday interactions with monuments, decorative work, and domestic objects.³¹ These sets of articles remained the central retrospective and synthetic look at British sculpture until the publication of Marion H. Spielmann's *British Sculpture and Sculptors of To-Day* in 1901. It was the first book on contemporary British sculpture and provided a synoptic account of each of the major contemporary sculptors. With the exception of its opening observations, Spielmann's book is largely a collection of journalistic details and anecdotes collected from the critical literature of the previous two decades. Organized as a dictionary of artists and heavy on biographical information, it was intended to popularize the art of sculpture. Spielmann's role as an authority in this area grew after its publication and was also aided by his other projects.³² Both the book and his entry on British sculpture for the 1911 edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* superseded the earlier critical literature on this subject, which was available only in old newspapers and magazines. Ultimately, Spielmann's accessible compilation diluted the contentions and convictions of Gosse, Dixon, Armstrong, Phillips, and the other critical voices of the previous quarter century. Spielmann largely homogenized the variety of compelling differences among sculptors into a more or less undifferentiated norm. It was this stereotype that would be the target of so many of the modernist rejections of earlier sculpture, in which the actual objects were often overlooked.

As modernism took its hold, the literature on late Victorian sculpture and its impact rapidly dwindled.³³ It would not be until the 1980s that the New Sculpture received much attention. Benedict Read's *Victorian Sculpture* (1982) was the first book to contain a lengthy discussion of late Victorian sculpture, but it was Susan Beattie's *The New Sculpture* (1983) that provided the first, and so far only, major art-historical study of this era.³⁴ Beattie's book has had a powerful influence on the little that has since been written about the New Sculpture. It emphasizes the connections between the New Sculpture and the Art Workers' Guild, stressing the themes of the unity of the arts and the "contribution of art to everyday life" as a means of understanding the era. Consequently, the book focuses on the architectural sculpture and the public arenas in which sculpture became generally accessible. While it focuses on monuments and domestic statuettes, the imaginative presentation pieces made for the Royal Academy exhibitions are almost grudgingly considered.

Beattie began her book polemically, arguing that Gosse's terms of analysis were patently misguided. He had perpetrated a "fundamental misinterpretation of [the New Sculpture's] character," she believed, by stressing the ideal works made for an elite gallery-going audience.

These sculptures were “traditional,” in her eyes, because they conformed to the proper role of sculpture as separated from everyday life, in contrast to the rapid advances in architectural sculpture, monuments, and statuettes. Falling back on the academic/avant-garde hierarchy, she argued that the gallery works were “not the substance but the symptoms of a revolution extending far beyond the walls of the art establishment and the scope of the Salon nude.”³⁵

My study is based on a fundamental disagreement about the nature and importance of these “proper” sculptures. Beattie was by no means incorrect in stressing the important innovations occurring outside the gallery. In establishing a dichotomous relationship between the outside and the inside of the art establishment, however, she blinded herself to the complexities of the pieces intended primarily for these exhibitions. Her book consistently (and, at times, narrowly) emphasizes the architectural and decorative connections and readings of the New Sculptors. This focus often distracted her from other, equally compelling, arenas of inquiry. Leighton’s *Athlete*, for instance, is barely mentioned, despite its well-documented importance as a prototype for many of the New Sculptors.³⁶ Many sculptors fall by the wayside in her supposedly inclusive analysis.

In contrast, I have not attempted to speak for the movement as a whole, and some readers will note the absence of several major sculptors of the period (Harry Bates and George Frampton, for instance). Instead, I have focused on a set of individual objects that I take to encapsulate central and pivotal instances in the delineation of sculpture theory’s parameters during this time. Beattie’s book will continue to be valuable, but her definition of the New Sculpture, like Gosse’s, should not be considered definitive.

From the viewpoint I have adopted, different objects and artists emerge as the most compelling of the period. Whereas Beattie quickly dismissed Havard Thomas as working “in a bland academic style,”³⁷ I contend that his highly sophisticated theory and technique expose fundamental issues for sculpture and the emergence of modernism. Whereas Beattie mentioned Onslow Ford’s *Shelley Memorial* once in passing, I consider it to be crucial to an understanding of the relationship between figuration and materiality in sculpture. The picture of the New Sculpture and its impact that I offer does not contradict the overall argument of Beattie’s book. Rather, I continue the process of excavating the depth and implications of this period in the history of sculpture. Her stress on the greater engagement between sculpture and the viewer was correct, but her emphasis on the public sites for sculpture led her to disregard the active engagement pursued by sculptors for their gallery work as well. For through these “ideal” works at the Royal Academy, sculptors tackled questions about the physicality of sculpture and its relationship to the viewer.

Physicality and Corporeality

Physical traits and responses are fundamental to freestanding sculpture. The viewer looks at a statue not just as an image of a human being but also as a three-dimensional object with actual depth, shadow, reflected light, mass, volume, spatial displacement, and other qualities encountered daily in objects surrounding her or him. More so than pictorial media, sculpture negotiates between conveying an image and being an object with these traits. Sculptors have approached this relationship in various ways. Sometimes, sculptors have enforced a

separation of and a distinction between image and object. Others have suppressed one or the other components. Some have encouraged their mutual interference, while others have explored the possibilities of their synergistic overlap and fusion. Additionally, the viewer's response to sculpture draws upon both the representational qualities of sculpture as well as upon physical and temporal relations with the object.

The images and imagery of nineteenth-century sculpture have often been the subject of art-historical investigations, but less frequently has the issue of physicality been brought to bear in a substantive way on these studies. (This is especially true of the study of sculpture in Britain.) "Physicality" here refers to the dynamic condition of the statue as a three-dimensional thing encountered in relation to the viewer's body. All art objects are to some degree physical, but sculptures are more self-evidently actual and obdurate things occupying space with their mass. Sculpture is still primarily experienced through optical perception, but that experience is interwoven with movement, temporality, and the recognition of shared environmental conditions (light, gravity, etc.) affecting both the object and the viewer's body.

"Materiality" is a basic element of sculpture's physicality and refers to the constitution of the sculptural object by and as actual matter – stone, metal, wax, ivory, and so on. The statue's image (for example, the figure) is created in and through the manipulation of the material substrate, and the sculptor must negotiate to some degree the integration of or interference between figuration and materiality when creating a representational sculpture. So, too, must the viewer see the statue as a combination of matter and figure. Materiality also plays a role in the other media such as painting and photography, but for sculpture it is crucial. "Literality" is more often solely a sculptural issue in that it refers to the emphasis on the sculptural object as actually and directly present in the same space as the viewer. Within Minimalist art theory, literality was primarily achieved through the near-total suppression of representation, signification, and allusion – the Minimalist object was nothing other than itself. By definition, a figural statue cannot achieve this degree of literality and immediacy because it renders an image. Nevertheless, some figural sculptors did seek to dramatize the literal existence of their figural statues and their co-presence with viewers in space.

Physicality, materiality, and literality all exist in a dynamic interplay with any figural representation or allusion in sculpture. When there is an attempt to integrate or overlap figuration with physicality or materiality, the statue can be understood to exhibit a kind of corporeality in which the image and object synergistically co-ordinate. This attempt at the fusion of the literal, material sculptural object and the body it represents was a central aim of much late Victorian sculpture. (The term "vitality" was sometimes used to refer to this concept.) The New Sculptors valued both representational precision and the physical and material elements of sculpture. They sought to find a way to bring these elements together to energize and animate statuary as a surrogate living presence. In other words, they aspired to creating statues that functioned as body doubles. As I discuss in relation to Onslow Ford's *Shelley Memorial*, corporeality was best achieved within the boundaries of naturalism only under very limited conditions.

Corporeality can be sensed as an evaluative quality in much of the sculpture criticism in this period, especially after the New Sculpture was well under way. For instance, in 1901 D. S. MacColl criticized a work by Goscombe John on these terms. He argued that

a last step is missing, if we can call that transcending and quickening a step – that lifting of all excellences to a higher power by a fusing act of design, in which the man, his clothes and the block intensify and transform one another.³⁸

MacColl voiced a concern that was central to British sculpture in these decades, one that was rarely spoken so clearly. The fusion of the figural image and the literal material block resulted in that corporeal “transcending.” Privately, Havard Thomas seized upon this idea, recognizing its crystallization of a central set of concerns. In his clipping of this review, he wrote next to MacColl’s statement the words “higher motivation or emancipation.”³⁹

Corporeality, this “emancipation,” is a concept found throughout the history of sculpture. Guido Kaschnitz von Weinberg, for instance, used similar concepts to discuss Egyptian sculpture and its “corporeal energies and energies of mass.”⁴⁰ An analysis of the development of Egyptian sculpture, he argued, demonstrated that the literal experience of mass and weight determined the formal qualities of earlier sculptures. Mass and weight were gradually transposed into a metaphysical rendering of these qualities and their meanings. I will not, here, enter into an evaluation of his teleological method or historical claims. What interests me are the terms he used to discuss this evolution – that is, “the notion of mass that leads to corporeality” on the part of Egyptian sculpture.⁴¹ He argued that conventional Western modes of discussing figurative sculpture had been unable to perceive the central concerns of the Ancient Near East. His corrective approach took a metaphoric reading of the relationship between figuration, physicality, and materiality. In his discussion of the evolution of this process, he stressed the “compact nexus of an organic mass”⁴² and the “physicality” of the early stages which were

still determined by the experience of mass perceived through the senses. [. . .] The mass is really present, and it is from its weight, perceptible to the senses, that the [predynastic figurine of a crouching woman] derives all that it possesses by way of vitality.⁴³

This essay, in which Kaschnitz von Weinberg argued for the potency of an originary fusion of figuration and sculptural materiality, was written in 1933, when sculptors in Britain such as Barbara Hepworth were beginning to address corporeal potential through biomorphic abstraction. Artists such as Hepworth and writers such as Adrian Stokes can be understood as synthetically engaging with the concept of corporeality that had informed the previous half-century of sculpture theory in Britain.⁴⁴ Like Kaschnitz von Weinberg’s figurine, Hepworth offered a possible synthesis between figural denotation and material specificity.

Many writers on sculpture have concerned themselves with what I am calling corporeality. A resistance to it characterized the writings of Walter Pater (see chapter 4) and John Addington Symonds on sculpture.⁴⁵ Almost a century later, Etienne Gilson, in his *Forms and Substances in the Arts*, struggled over how the literal, obdurate physicality and materiality of sculpture related to mimesis.⁴⁶ John Ruskin had earlier implied this question when he noted that all sculpture is, to some degree, “sensual and imitative.”⁴⁷ Gilson differentiated sculpture from other arts because it was “a *thing* among others and that it preserves its ontological status even if its purpose happens to be imitation.”⁴⁸ Gilson’s analysis adopted a common set of priorities for modernist sculpture (in particular, his emphasis on carving over modeling as having more formal integrity). Successful sculpture, he implied, found a rapprochement between objecthood and mimesis:

Matter aspires to the form potential in it. The more form dominates, the less it need fear a dialogue with matter, and, at times, to heed it. Hence, there can be an intelligible relation between material form and artistic form; the form that art imparts to matter does not come to it exclusively from without.⁴⁹

The ontological fact of the sculptural object was, in Gilson's terms, an obstacle to be subsumed into the artistic intention. Whether approached negatively like Gilson or positively like many British sculptors, the question of corporeal fusion between figurative image and object in a work has been operative in many modern discourses on sculpture. In 2000 Alex Potts discussed

the potential for frustration resulting from the fact that, however convincingly a sculpture might conjure up a warm living body, it remains a cold, inert object. This discrepancy between image and object was seen as a problem posed by sculpture even in antiquity, and it has shadowed most modern discussions of sculpture.⁵⁰

It was this concern that drove the New Sculpture. Such works as Onslow Ford's *Shelley Memorial* were concerted and earnest attempts to offer a solution to this problem.

I do not argue that sculptors in Britain finally achieved a seamless overlap between figuration and physicality, but I do contend that seeing this period with this question in mind will enhance an understanding of the diversity and sophistication of the art-theoretical positions put forth by late Victorian artists and their impact on the formulations of a modernist sculptural vocabulary.

Throughout my discussion, the general question of sculptural physicality and the more specific one of corporeality will be variably put into play in discussing these objects. There was no one consensus, but what the artists had in common was an attention to physicality, to materiality, and to the ways in which these elements played themselves out in the statue and in relation to the viewer. I begin my case studies with an analysis of Leighton's *Athlete* and its compositional incitement of a physical and temporal engagement with the viewer. He transposed his process of handling small sketch models into an understanding of the life-size statue that made three-dimensionality and circumambulation its core traits. From there, I discuss the most sustained and considered of the immediate responses to Leighton in Thornycroft's work between 1878 and 1882. In a series of experimental statues that stressed internal formal dynamism and external address to the viewer's space, Thornycroft sought to incorporate Leighton's challenges to conventions of sculpture without losing the traditional authority and ideality of the classical mode. I then examine his abandonment of this mode in favor of unorthodox contemporary subject matter cloaked in a return to familiar compositional norms. Gilbert, too, provided a direct engagement with Leighton's statue, and I track his increasing dissatisfaction with sculptural realism as it became the dominant style of the 1880s. In *The Enchanted Chair* (1886), he thematized the relationship between realism, materiality, and sculptural body, displacing the potential for corporeal engagement into the fantastic and the fantasmatic. Couching his realistic female nude in a literal dream image, Gilbert argued that sculpture's role was not in the presentation of the veracious body but in the exploration of the freedom offered by new techniques and materials.

Onslow Ford took a different route from Gilbert and became ever more closely committed to the presentation of the sculptural body as “real.” The contentious critical evaluations of Ford’s work continually returned to the corporeal availability afforded by his emphasis on sculptural realism. He responded to these criticisms in his most important work – the *Shelley Memorial* (1892) – in which he attempted to define and defend the limits of sculptural realism, corporeality, and their poetic and evocative potential. I conclude my case studies with an examination of the public scandal surrounding Havard Thomas’s *Lycidas* (1905). Thomas, I argue, crystallized key issues for the New Sculpture’s pursuit of naturalism and ideality, exhausting the mode that had become dominant since Leighton’s statue of 1877. In turn, his statue posed questions about the relationship of the figure to meaning that were taken up in the definitions of modernist sculpture in Britain. There follows a discussion of the rhetoric of sculptural modernism in Britain, in which I emphasize the ways in which the positions of artists such as Jacob Epstein, Henri Gaudier-Brzeska, and Eric Gill can be understood in relationship to the New Sculpture’s exploration of the range of potential in between physicality, figuration, and materiality.

Throughout these studies, I have followed the exigencies of each statue, pursuing the art-theoretical issues raised by the work. I have not proposed a seamless narrative from Leighton’s *Athlete* (1877) to Thomas’s *Lycidas* (1905) but rather pointed to the ways in which the history of sculpture must be attuned to the art-theoretical claims made by objects. It has been these art-theoretical motivations and their reception that have remained my primary interest throughout. My examinations of particular works, in turn, do not presume to be comprehensive of the interpretations and receptions of these objects. I have chosen the art-theoretical discursive context as my central arena of investigation rather than economic, social, or political contexts in which these statues attempted to make their claims. Early on, I was faced with the reality that many readers will be unsympathetic to these sculptures because of their lack of fit with the modernist narratives and will consider them unengaging by comparison to more familiar modern art of the late nineteenth century. Consequently, I realized that the art-theoretical sophistication of these works needed to be established before they could then begin to be more fully understood in relation to the politics, identities, and economies of viewers and institutions. In this book, I have argued for these works’ pertinence to larger issues in the history and theory of art in hopes that such examinations will alert others to the rich potential of this material for studies from these, and other, viewpoints.

By focusing my attention on such issues as the importance of figural composition, the staging of the sculptural body, the impact of materiality, and the intertextual connections within contemporary and canonical sculptural discourses, I argue that these sculptures repay the kind of in-depth analyses normally reserved for paintings. I stress that the theory of sculpture can be located in the sculptural object itself. It is imperative to interrogate the theories of representation that underlie each artistic production in order to move beyond traditional taxonomies of modern art. Through these specific cases, I argue that – no less than its better-known counterparts in other countries – British sculpture in this period strove to conceptualize modern sculpture and its priorities. In so doing, it raised still pressing questions about sculpture’s role and potential.

Notes

Abbreviations

BLUL	Brotherton Library, University of Leeds
CBA	Collins-Baker Archive, Huntington Library, San Marino, California
HTP	Hamo Thornycroft Papers, Henry Moore Institute Archive, Leeds Museums & Galleries
OED	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i>
TGA	Tate Gallery Archive [Tate Britain], London

Introduction

- 1 Paul Barlow, "Fear and Loathing of the Academic, or Just what is it that makes the avant-garde so different, so appealing?," in *Art and the Academy in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. Rafael Cardoso Denis and Colin Trodd (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 28. For further examples with regard to Victorian art, see also Tim Barringer, "Rethinking Delaroche/Recovering Leighton," *Victorian Studies* 44, no. 1 (2001): 9–24; Caroline Arscott, "Ramsgate Sands, Modern Life, and the Shoring-Up of Narrative," in *Towards a Modern Art World*, ed. Brian Allen (London: Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art and Yale University Press, 1995), 157–68; Paul Barlow, "Millais, Manet, Modernity," in *English Art 1860–1914: Modern Artists and Identity*, ed. David Peters Corbett and Lara Perry (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 49–63; Elizabeth Prettejohn, "The Modernism of Frederic Leighton," in *English Art 1860–1914: Modern Artists and Identity*, ed. David Peters Corbett and Lara Perry (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 31–48, 221–25; Elizabeth Prettejohn, *The Art of the Pre-Raphaelites* (London: Tate Publishing, 2000); and Elizabeth Prettejohn, "Lawrence Alma-Tadema and the Modern City of Ancient Rome," *Art Bulletin* 84, no. 1 (2002): 115–29.
- 2 Edmund Gosse, "The New Sculpture: 1879–1894," *Art Journal* 56 (1894): 138–42, 199–203, 277–82, 306–11.
- 3 See Mark Stocker, "Edmund Gosse on Sculpture," *University of Leeds Review* 28 (1985–86): 283–310.
- 4 Edmund Gosse, "Our Living Artists: Hamo Thornycroft, A. R. A.," *Magazine of Art* 4 (1881): 329.
- 5 On the changes in training of sculptors, see Susan Beattie, *The New Sculpture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 9–36; and, in general, Helen Valentine, "The Royal Academy Schools in the Victorian Period," in *Art in the Age of Queen Victoria: Treasures from the Royal Academy of Arts Permanent Collection*, exh. cat. (London: Royal Academy of Arts and Yale University Press, 1999), 40–47.
- 6 See Benedict Read, "Leighton and Sculpture," in *Frederic, Lord Leighton: Eminent Victorian Artist*, exh. cat. (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1996), 81–92; and, in general, Rafael Cardoso Denis, "From Burlington House to the Peckham Road: Leighton and Art and Design Education," in *Frederic Leighton: Antiquity, Renaissance, Modernity*, ed. Elizabeth Prettejohn and Tim Barringer (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999), 247–66.
- 7 For general context on Aestheticism, see Lionel Lambourne, *The Aesthetic Movement* (London: Phaidon, 1996). On Leighton and Aestheticism, see Elizabeth Prettejohn, ed., *After the Pre-Raphaelites: Art and Aestheticism in Victorian England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999); Prettejohn, "The Modernism of Frederic Leighton," 31–48, 221–25; Elizabeth Prettejohn, "Leighton: The Aesthete as Academic," in *Art and the Academy in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. Rafael Cardoso Denis and Colin Trodd (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 33–52; Jason Edwards, "A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Aesthete: Alfred Gilbert's *Perseus Arming* (1882) and the Question of 'Aesthetic' Sculpture in Late-Victorian Britain," in *Sculpture and the Pursuit of a Modern Ideal in Britain, c.1880–1930*, ed. David Getsy (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).

- 8 For a detailed discussion of nineteenth-century French academic attitudes toward sculpture, see Anne Wagner, *Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux: Sculptor of the Second Empire* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1986); and Charles Millard, "Sculpture and Theory in Nineteenth Century France," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 34, no. 1 (1975): 15–20.
- 9 "Art Notes," *Art Journal* (January 1882): 30; and "The Exhibition of the Royal Academy," *Art Journal* (August 1882): 178.
- 10 See Penelope Curtis, *Sculpture 1900–1945: After Rodin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 38–39; and Sergiusz Michalski, *Public Monuments: Art in Political Bondage 1870–1997* (London: Reaktion Books, 1998), 13–55. Michalski's account, however, suffers from a lack of comparison with the innovations in the public monument concurrently being explored in Britain. See also Beattie, *New Sculpture*, 201–30; Edmund Gosse, "Equestrian Sculpture for London," *Fortnightly Review* 35 n.s. (1 April 1884): 530–36; T. W. Hill, "Open-Air Statues in London," *Home Counties Magazine* 12 (1910): 28–35, 122–31, 89–99, 305–17; and A. E. W. Gleichen, *London's Open-Air Statuary* (London: Longman & Co., 1928).
- 11 See Elisabeth Susan Darby, "Statues of Queen Victoria and of Prince Albert: A Study in Commemorative and Portrait Statuary, 1837–1924" (Ph.D., Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, 1983).
- 12 See Lynda Nead, *Victorian Babylon: People, Streets and Images in Nineteenth-Century London* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000).
- 13 For a detailed discussion of the range of sculpture created for the City of London, see Philip Ward-Jackson, *Public Sculpture of the City of London* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2003).
- 14 Thornycroft, Onslow Ford, Gilbert, Frampton, Brock, and other representatives of the New Sculpture all had large public monuments in South Asia. For an overview of the sheer number of statues sent to India, see Mary Ann Steggle, *Statues of the Raj* (London: British Association for Cemeteries in South Asia, 2000). Thornycroft, G. F. Watts, and Onslow Ford also had pieces in North and/or South Africa, and many Jubilee statues of Queen Victoria were installed in Australia and New Zealand in the late 1880s.
- 15 See comments in chapter 1. See also Beattie, *New Sculpture*, 181–99; Martina Droth, Jason Edwards, David Getsy, and Matthew Withey, *The Cult of the Statuette in Late Victorian Britain*, exh. cat. (Leeds: Henry Moore Institute, 2000); Jason Edwards, "An Entirely Unimportant Deviation?: Aestheticism and the Critical Location of the Statuette in *Fin-de-siècle* England," *Sculpture Journal* 7 (2002): 58–69; and Martina Droth, "Small Sculpture c.1900: The 'New Statuette' in English Sculptural Aesthetics," in *Sculpture and the Pursuit of a Modern Ideal in Britain, c.1880–1930*, ed. David Getsy (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).
- 16 See John Belcher, "The Alliance of Sculpture and Architecture," in *Transactions of the National Association for the Advancement of Art and its Application to Industry* (London: National Association for the Advancement of Art and its Application to Industry, 1888), 375–80; Alfred Gilbert, "The Sculptor's Architecture of the Renaissance," *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects* 4, no. 7 (1897): 161–73; Thomas Stirling Lee and William Reynolds-Stephens, "Sculpture in its Relation to Architecture," *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects* 12, no. 15 (1905): 497–514; H. J. L. J. Massé, *The Art-Workers' Guild 1884–1934* (Oxford: Shakespeare Head Press, 1935); Beattie, *New Sculpture*, 73–134; and Terry Friedman, ed., *The Alliance of Sculpture and Architecture: Hamo Thornycroft, John Belcher and the Institute of Chartered Accountants Building* (Leeds: Henry Moore Centre for the Study of Sculpture and Leeds City Art Galleries, 1993).
- 17 For a discussion of the Royal Academy's reputation and of competing institutions, see MaryAnne Stevens, "The Royal Academy in the Age of Queen Victoria," in *Art in the Age of Queen Victoria: Treasures from the Royal Academy of Arts Permanent Collection*, exh. cat. (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1999), 26–39.
- 18 William Goscombe John to James Havard Thomas, 22 March 1907, James Havard Thomas papers, TGA 924. Emphases original. Goscombe John's handwriting in this letter is less than clear, yet I believe that "rite" is the correct transcription of a particularly illegible word. In contrast to "unfeeling ritual," the Royal Academy exhibition would be, then, an important annual "rite" – i.e., "formal procedure or act in a religious or other solemn observance" (*OED*).
- 19 In addition to the works discussed in this book, see further David Getsy, "Strategy and Sentimentality: C. J. Allen in the 1890s," in *C. J. Allen 1862–1956: Artist and Teacher*, exh. cat., ed. Matthew Clough (Liverpool: University of Liverpool Art Collections, 2003), 73–84.
- 20 Victor Stoichita, *The Self-Aware Image: An Insight into Early Modern Meta-Painting* [1993], trans. Anne-Marie Glasheen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), xiv. W. J. T. Mitchell uses the related concept of the "hypericon," which is a

- "figure of figuration, [a] picture that reflect[s] on the nature of images." See W. J. T. Mitchell, *Iconology: Image, Text, Ideology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 158–59.
- 21 For a comparative discussion of the art-theoretical positions of Hildebrand's *Stehender Mann*, Rodin's *L'Âge d'airain*, and Leighton's *Athlete*, see David J. Getsy, "Encountering the Male Nude at the Origins of Modern Sculpture. Rodin, Leighton, Hildebrand, and the Negotiation of Physicality and Temporality," in *The Enduring Instant: Time and the Spectator in the Visual Arts*, ed. Antoinette Roesler-Friedenthal and Johannes Nathan (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 2003), 296–313.
 - 22 For a general comparison of Rodin and Hildebrand in a wider history of sculpture, see Rudolf Wittkower, *Sculpture: Processes and Principles* (London: Allen Lane, 1977), 231–49. For a defense of Rodin as "modern," see Leo Steinberg, "Rodin," *Other Criteria: Confrontations with Twentieth-Century Art* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972), 322–403. There are also sophisticated accounts of Rodin's more fundamental relations to theories of modernism and of Hildebrand's (often contrasting) role for opticality and sculpture in Rosalind Krauss, *Passages in Modern Sculpture* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1977) and in Alex Potts, *The Sculptural Imagination: Figurative, Modernist, Minimalist* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000).
 - 23 "The Pulse of English Art in 1883," *Macmillan's Magazine* 48, no. 286 (1883): 284.
 - 24 Cosmo Monkhouse, "The Royal Academy. 1.," *The Academy*, 10 May 1884, 335.
 - 25 George Bernard Shaw in *The World*, 8 May 1889, reprinted in Stanley Weintraub, ed., *Bernard Shaw on the London Art Scene 1885–1950* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989), 280.
 - 26 Claude Phillips, "The Royal Academy. 1.," *The Academy*, 8 May 1886, 333.
 - 27 Walter Armstrong, "Mr. Hamo Thornycroft, R.A.," *The Portfolio* 19 (1888): 111–12.
 - 28 There are countless instances of this rhetorical posture. An excellent example is "Sculpture of the Year," *Magazine of Art* 13 (1890): 361–66.
 - 29 A succinct summary of this position was provided by John Hamer, "Our Rising Artists: Mr. Albert Toft," *Magazine of Art* 25 (1901): 394, in which "imaginative realism" is differentiated from French "Zola-ism." According to Hamer, the sculptor Toft "always goes to nature for his models, [but] imparts to his work a quality of soul and charm of which the French realist has not the secret."
 - 30 See chapter 3 and Alfred Gilbert, "'Couleur' in Sculpture," *Universal Review* (August 1888): 524–27.
 - 31 Edmund Gosse, "The Place of Sculpture in Daily Life," *Magazine of Art* 18 (1895): 327–29, 368–72, 407–10; 19 (1896): 9–12.
 - 32 Marion H. Spielmann, *British Sculpture and Sculptors of To-Day* (London: Cassell & Co., 1901); "Sculpture for the Home," in *First Exhibition of Statuettes by Sculptors of To-Day, British and French*, exh. cat. (London: Fine Art Society, 1902), 3–6; "British Sculpture," in *The Franco-British Exhibition Illustrated Review*, ed. F. G. Dumas (London: Chatto & Windus, 1908), 93–101; "British Sculpture of To-Day," *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects* 16, no. 11 (1909): 373–96; "Sculpture: Modern British Sculpture," in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, eleventh edition, 32 vols. (New York: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1911), 24: 501–08. For commentary on Spielmann, see Julie Codell, "The Artist's Cause at Heart: Marion Harry Spielmann and the Late Victorian Art World," *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 71, no. 1 (1989): 139–63.
 - 33 Two significant books that sought to find a place for the New Sculpture alongside later modernist styles were Kineton Parkes, *Sculpture of To-Day*, 2 vols., vol. 1: *America, Great Britain, Japan* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1921); and Eric Underwood, *A Short History of English Sculpture* (London: Faber & Faber, 1933).
 - 34 Benedict Read, *Victorian Sculpture* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1982); and Beattie, *New Sculpture*.
 - 35 Beattie, *New Sculpture*, 3–6.
 - 36 See, for instance, Goscombe John's comments in Spielmann, "British Sculpture of To-Day," 395.
 - 37 Beattie, *New Sculpture*, 251.
 - 38 D. S. M[acColl], "The Academy. III. Sculpture," *Saturday Review*, 25 May 1901, 667.
 - 39 James Havard Thomas papers, TGA 924. This clipping was separated from his press file and filed with his correspondence with A. B. Horne.
 - 40 Guido Kaschnitz von Weinberg, "Remarks on the Structure of Egyptian Sculpture" [1933], in *The Vienna School Reader: Politics and Art Historical Method in the 1930s*, ed. Christopher Wood (New York: Zone Books, 2000), 217.
 - 41 *Ibid.*, 202.
 - 42 *Ibid.*, 210.
 - 43 *Ibid.*, 207.
 - 44 See, for instance, Adrian Stokes, "Miss Hepworth's Carving" [1933], in *The Critical Writings of Adrian Stokes*, ed. Lawrence Gowing (London: Thames & Hudson, 1978), 1:309–10.
 - 45 See David Getsy, "Recognizing the Homoerotic: The Uses of Intersubjectivity in John Addington Symonds's 1887 Essays on Art," *Visual Culture in Britain* (forthcoming).

- 46 Etienne Gilson, *Forms and Substances in the Arts* [1964], trans. Salvator Attanasio (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966).
- 47 John Ruskin, "The Cestus of Anglia" [1866], in *The Works of John Ruskin*, ed. E. T. Cook and A. Wedderburn, 39 vols. (London: George Allen, 1905), 19:154.
- 48 Gilson, *Forms and Substances*, 77.
- 49 *Ibid.*, 79.
- 50 Potts, *Sculptural Imagination*, 34. Also of note on this issue is Alex Potts, "The Impossible Ideal: Romantic Conceptions of the Parthenon Sculptures in Early Nineteenth-Century Britain and Germany," in *Art in Bourgeois Society, 1790–1850*, ed. Andrew Hemingway and William Vaughan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 113.

Chapter 1

- 1 Examples are reproduced in Michael Hart, "Physical Culture: The Male Nude and Sculpture in Late Victorian England," in *After the Pre-Raphaelites: Art and Aestheticism in Victorian Britain*, ed. Elizabeth Prettejohn (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 247; and Leonée Ormond, "Edward Linley Sambourne: A Cartoonist in the Art World," *British Art Journal* 3, no. 1 (2001): 9.
- 2 Edmund Gosse, "The New Sculpture: 1879–1894," *Art Journal* 56 (1894): 140.
- 3 For a discussion of Leighton's interventions into the genre of history painting, see Elizabeth Prettejohn, "Aestheticising History Painting," in *Frederic Leighton: Antiquity, Renaissance, Modernity*, ed. Tim Barringer and Elizabeth Prettejohn (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999), 89–110.
- 4 Leighton later described a similar process in working from the model for a single figure composition in Frederic Leighton, "The Building up of a Picture," [1889], *Magazine of Art* 22 (1898): 1–2. Leighton was not alone in using sketch models for paintings but was unconventional in the emphasis he placed on the many such modellos he created.
- 5 "Artists as Craftsmen, no. 1: Sir Frederic Leighton, Bart., P.R.A., as a Modeller in Clay," *The Studio* 1, no. 1 (1893): 6. Figure 4 depicts the Chorus without the lyre and was used to illustrate this essay which provides the account of Leighton's handling of statuettes.
- 6 See Frederic Leighton, *Addresses Delivered to the Students of the Royal Academy* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1896).
- 7 A further contribution to Leighton's choice of Apollo and the Python may also have been John Ruskin's *Modern Painters* vol. 5, part 1x, chapter 1x, devoted to J. M. W. Turner's *Apollo and the Python* (1811, Tate) [*The Works of John Ruskin*, ed. E. T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn, 39 vols (London: George Allen, 1905), 7:409–23]. For Ruskin, this painting prefigured Turner's mastery of color, becoming an emblem of Turner as an artist. While Ruskin does provide an important reference for the use of the Python in Victorian art, it seems unlikely that this passage provided anything more than a secondary context for Leighton's sculpture. Ruskin emphasized the role of color for painting, whereas Leighton specifically explored sculptural values with the *Athlete*. Ruskin even stated, "[For painting] is distinctively the art of colouring, not of shaping or relating. Sculptors and poets can do these, the painter's own work is colour" (7:412). As discussed forthwith, while the *Athlete* may have been inspired by Leighton's representation of Apollonian myths, he quickly left this specific identification behind.
- 8 Oscar Wilde, "The Grosvenor Gallery," *Dublin University Magazine* 90 (1877): 126.
- 9 H. Heathcote Statham, "At the Royal Academy," *Fortnightly Review*, 1 July 1877, 72.
- 10 Marion H. Spielmann, "British Sculpture of To-Day," *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects* 16, no. 11 (1909): 382.
- 11 Harry How, "Illustrated Interviews No. xiv – Sir Frederick Leighton, P.R.A.," *Strand Magazine* 4 (1892): 137. Though it was most likely Legros, there is some confusion as to whether it was Dalou who made this comment. See Benedict Read, "Leighton as a Sculptor: Releasing Sculpture from Convention," in *Lord Leighton 1830–1896 and Leighton House: A Centenary Celebration*, ed. Robin Simon (London: Apollo Magazine, 1996), 65.
- 12 For a discussion of Leighton's choice of bronze for the genre of the ideal statue, see Benedict Read, "Just what is it that made Leighton's sculpture so different, so appealing?," in Joanna Barnes, ed., *Leighton and His Sculptural Legacy: British Sculpture 1875–1930*, exh. cat. (London: Joanna Barnes Fine Arts, 1996), 5–12. As Malcolm Baker has discussed, bronze had in the eighteenth century been an expensive and rare material for sculpture in Britain and was used in large amounts only on important monument commissions. After the influx of commercially available small-scale bronzes from France in the nineteenth century and the material's greater availability due to its associations with newer industrial products and processes, bronze had largely lost the "royal" connotations Baker identified in the work of eighteenth-century sculptors. See