

'The sister arts': Modern Sculpture and its settings in Britain, c. 1725-1895

Julius Bryant

Degree awarded by Oxford Brookes University

**Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the award of Doctor of
Philosophy by Published Work in the Humanities.**

September 2019

Table of Contents

Abstract	3
Text of Critical Appraisal	4-47
Illustrations	48-50
Publications on British Sculpture and its settings (c. 1725-1895)	
by Julius Bryant	51-53
Select Bibliography	53-55

ABSTRACT

As the Critical Appraisal explains, my publications address a fundamental issue in the way that the history of sculpture in Britain (c. 1725-1895) has been approached and written. The significance of architectural settings and related crafts is often underestimated by discussing sculptures as independent works of art, as part of the modern art world led by painters and exhibitions. My publications (since 1983) have promoted a more contextual understanding of the sculpture of this era. I have explored sculpture as an aspect of architectural design and of the decorative crafts, demonstrating the web of patronage and other, overlapping, professions within which sculptors worked in this period. As both fine and decorative art, sculpture is the key medium with which to reconcile this artificial divide, which I attribute mainly to the founders of the Royal Academy and to their influence on historians.

My publications demonstrate continuity between sculpture, furniture and interior design, from the 1720s to the 1880s. A key link, and my core subject of study, is Thomas Banks (1735-1805), the Royal Academy's heroic father of the British School of neoclassical sculpture. I revealed how he had wider concerns than ideal statues and independent bas-reliefs. Having trained in the decorative crafts and guild system he was exceptional among neoclassical sculptors in being a virtuoso carver himself, and one who cared about interior design and furnishings. I have shown how later sculptors and designers for sculpture also integrated sculptures with their settings, both visually and intellectually, and how new understandings can be found by reconstructing the way sculptures looked and worked in their historic locations.

The Critical Appraisal is in four parts: aims and methodology; terminology; the field; the submitted work; conclusion. Part three situates my work not only in the field of sculpture but also of British architecture, furniture and interior design. My publications demonstrate a distinct approach that reflects my employment not as a historian of sculpture nor as a curator of sculpture, but rather as a curator of historic houses and of international exhibitions, where sculpture, furniture, architecture and paintings are studied together as equals, among the 'sister arts' of visual culture.

CRITICAL APPRAISAL.

1. The Research programme: aims and methodology

My distinctive approach and original contribution to the understanding of modern sculpture in Britain (c.1725-1895) has been to explore beyond the customary framing of a modern art world preoccupied with oil paintings, artists and exhibitions and to look at sculptures in historic settings, as an aspect of architectural design and of the decorative crafts. Like my approach, my publications on sculpture and designed interiors arise mostly from my work as a curator of historic houses (Kenwood and English Heritage, 1983-2005) and as a maker of exhibitions at the Victoria and Albert Museum and abroad (2005 to present). Curatorial work has given me a wider knowledge of architecture, furniture and interior design and a more practical and empirical appreciation of the significance of sculptures' original environments. As a collecting curator I reinstated many objects back in their historic house settings. As an exhibition curator, borrowing objects, I have found ways to convey to the public the significance of their original physical contexts. Through case studies I have explored the interdependence between sculptures and their settings and have challenged the traditional distinction between the fine arts and the decorative crafts. My contribution to the study of sculpture in Britain is also distinctive through bridging both the long eighteenth century and the late Victorian eras (c. 1725-1895).

In reviewing my publications together for this appraisal, it has become clear that my research has developed to the point where it can now address a fundamental methodological issue, about the limited way the history of British sculpture has been written and understood. From making this appraisal I see the need for a fresh and more comprehensive narrative for the history of British sculpture in this period. In brief, the Royal Academy (RA)'s initial definition and promotion of modern sculpture as autonomous art objects came at the expense of the traditional crafts of ornamental wood carving and stonemasonry as part of interior design. Within a generation this led to calls for change, when the RA's first professor of sculpture, John Flaxman

encouraged sculptors to work with the ‘sister arts’, particularly architecture.¹ However, the academic divorce continued and has been maintained by specialist branches of art history to this day.

The history of British sculpture is usually written in terms of the influence of the RA, particularly of its first president, Joshua Reynolds.² His concept of a liberal art with a canon of ideal beauty and elevating content in a hierarchy of genres sought to confer on artists the social and professional status of gentlemen of intellect. Reynolds adopted Vasari’s notion of painting and sculpture progressing through innovative and influential masters, culminating in the achievements of Michelangelo.³ However, Reynolds had a very limited understanding of the practicalities of sculpture, a medium he regarded with some condescension as less ‘complicated’ than paintings⁴. Since the early nineteenth century historians of British sculpture have followed his lead in writing about sculpture as fine art.⁵ Most recently, in 2018, the RA’s celebrations of its 250th anniversary (in partnership with the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art) reinforced this perspective, without acknowledgement of the continuing relevance and values of the decorative crafts.

This traditional history is based on an Anglo-French Enlightenment agenda that sought to elevate artist-sculptors from the craftsmen whose training and professional qualifications had been controlled through guilds rather than through academies under royal patronage. The RA’s reframing of British sculpture by its founders has been accepted and reinforced by academics, the art trade, by specialist organisations and societies, most of whose conferences and publications promote sculpture as art by artists, intellectually distinct from furniture and other decorative crafts. Since the 1980s sculpture studies has grown and been taken in new directions (most notably by Baker, Bindman, Craske and Yarrington, as discussed below). Nevertheless, British

¹Flaxman uses the term ‘sister arts’ in his tenth and final lecture ‘Modern Sculpture’, first published as John Flaxman, *Lectures on Sculpture*, London, 1829 p. 324 and in ‘An Address ...on the Death of Thomas Banks’ which first appeared as an annex to the second edition, London, 1838, pp. 266, 284.

² Margaret Whinney, *Sculpture in Britain, 1530-1830*, Harmondsworth, 1964, edited and revised by John Physick, London, 1988.

³ Giorgio Vasari, *Lives of the Most Eminent Painters, Sculptors and Architects*, Florence, 1550, transl. G. Du C. de Vere, 10 vols, London 1912-15.

⁴ Joshua Reynolds, ed. Robert R. Wark, *Discourses on Art*, New Haven and London, 1979 p. 175.

⁵ J. T. Smith, *Nollekens and his Times*, London, 1828; Allan Cuninghame, *The Lives of the Most Eminent British Painters, Sculptors and Architects*, 2nd edn., vol. 3, London, 1830.

sculpture of this period is still approached as fine art by artists, in much the same way as British paintings. My integrated approach to modern sculpture in Britain explores the interdependence of sculptors, architects, designers, decorators, craftsmen and clients, with sculpture as one aspect of design and execution in three dimensions. In summary, my contribution to the literature on 18th and 19th century sculpture in Britain is threefold: –

1. A cross-disciplinary approach to sculpture, sculptural furnishings and decorative interiors.
2. Definitive new reference sources in the field of sculpture and of decorative interiors.
3. Models for a more integrated approach to cataloguing sculptures from (or still in) their historic settings.

The decline of the Masons' Company has been identified with the move of elite sculptors from the City of London to the City of Westminster following fashionable urban developers, and to the founding of the Society of Arts in 1760.⁶ I believe that the break in the British tradition of sculpture and decorative carving can be identified, more specifically, with the two leading founders of the RA, William Chambers and Joseph Wilton, and with a commission they shared in 1761. This provides a vivid example of the split in the profession between decorative craft and fine art. Grinling Gibbons had served as Master Sculptor and Carver in Wood to the Crown from 1693. His successor, James Richards, is best known for carving the royal barge designed by William Kent for Frederick, Prince of Wales (1732, National Maritime Museum). Richards died in 1759; his successor in royal office was his assistant, George Murray, who died in 1761. He was succeeded by Samuel Norman, who went bankrupt in 1767. When the sculptor Joseph Wilton won the commission for a new state coach for George III in 1760 his defeated rivals included a coachmaker, Samuel Butler (who became Master of the Coachmakers Company in 1768), with his nephew John Linnell, who became a leading furniture designer and cabinet-maker. In 1761 Wilton was appointed to the newly-created post 'Sculptor in Ordinary to His Majesty'. The same year William Chambers (who designed the state

⁶ Matthew Craske, 'Contacts and Contracts. Sir Henry Cheere and the Formation of a new Commercial World of Sculpture in Mid-Eighteenth-Century London', in Cinzia Sicca and Alison Yarrington, *The Lustrous Trade: Material Culture and the History of Sculpture in England and Italy c. 1700-c. 1860*, London and New York, 2000, pp. 94-113.

coach) was appointed ‘Architect to the King’. Seven years later, in 1768, Wilton and Chambers recruited Reynolds and co-founded the RA, but retained control over it, with Wilton as first Secretary and Chambers as its Treasurer. The state coach commission marks the end of the tradition of craftsmanship embodied in the position of ‘Master Sculptor and Carver in Wood to the Crown’ and the start of the more specialist gentleman artist known as ‘Sculptor in Ordinary to His Majesty’. Even so, Wilton subcontracted the coach to a specialist wood carver.⁷

Wilton’s career had begun in the decorative crafts. His father, an ornamental plasterer with an extensive papier-mache manufactory, became wealthy enough to send his son to train as a sculptor under Laurent Delvaux in Nivelles (where he helped to carve an oak pulpit) and then in Paris under Joseph Pigalle. Chambers was a friend of Wilton’s father and had also trained in Paris (in J. F. Blondel’s Ecole des Arts). Following the example of the French Academie de Peinture et de Sculpture, the RA set painting, sculpture and architecture apart from the guilds and under royal protection. They admitted to their membership only ‘artists by profession’⁸ thereby excluding makers of furniture, carved decoration and other crafts. This was a divide driven by social and professional ambition rather than by the traditions and practicalities of production and installation.

Reynolds reinforced this concept of sculpture as autonomous art objects in his tenth *Discourse* (1780) by criticising the legacy of Bernini. The exemplars Reynolds cited for academic sculpture were the white marble statues and reliefs that had survived from antiquity, the original settings of which were rarely known. Reynolds ignored the way British sculpture played its part as one component of designed environments. When William Kent returned from Rome with Lord Burlington in 1719 he brought the Baroque approach to the Anglo-Palladian interior, where stonemasons and master wood carvers supplied every form of architectural decoration. The RA’s strategy to create art professions was at the expense of such traditional polymaths.

⁷ The commission is described and documented (but without noting its wider significance, or any comparison with the royal barge) in Jonathan Marsden and John Hardy, ‘O fair Britannia Hail’. The ‘most superb’ state coach’, *Apollo*, vol 153 (February 2001) pp. 3-12.

⁸ ‘The Instrument of Foundation’, Sidney C. Hutchison, *History of the Royal Academy 1768-1968*, London, 1968, p. 209.

By the 1870s this professional polarization reached a peak when the RA's third Professor of Sculpture, Henry Weekes, stated in his lecture on Taste: 'where ornament is primary and the figure secondary, it becomes merely decorative art'.⁹ Despite the RA's efforts to elevate sculpture, several of the craftsmen now claimed by historians as 'sculptors' continued to carve architectural furniture and fittings, such as pedestals, brackets, pier tables, wall memorials, mirror frames and chimneypieces, for specific settings rather than for exhibitions. The Victorian Arts and Crafts movement is usually presented as a reaction against industrial mass production and against the RA's professional elitism but, as my publications illustrate, the traditional link between sculpture and the arts of interior design and the crafts of decoration continued alongside the RA's sphere of influence.

Following the RA's agenda, accounts of sculpture in Britain still centre on ambitious heroes aspiring to make independent modern art. I too followed this approach to research when I first registered (in 1981) for an Mphil/PhD thesis on Thomas Banks (1735-1805), whom the RA upheld as Britain's first modern sculptor. The usual approach is to look forward, evaluating an artist as an influential innovator, but increasingly I looked sideways and back in time. Gradually, I came to see Neoclassical sculpture as a phenomenon, driven by many other factors than an artist's ambition to rival the antique through academic study and personal genius.

The fact that sculpture of this period needs to be understood more as an aspect of design, decoration and ornamental carving became clear when I worked (for 21 years, 1983-2005) as a curator of eighteenth-century houses, especially those with interior decoration by James Richards, William Kent and Robert Adam (Marble Hill, Chiswick, Kenwood and elsewhere). Taking a curatorial perspective, and researching more as an architectural historian, I came to appreciate other influences on the development of British sculpture, especially the crafts traditions of sculptural carving and the influence of permanent physical contexts. These locations vary from the historic (as in ecclesiastical settings for monuments) to the contemporary (as in architects' designs, especially for private houses). When works are reinstated back in situ, or presented as such elsewhere by a curator, patient viewing and formal analysis can reveal continuities between the art object and adjacent decor and long-

⁹ Henry Weekes, *Lectures on Art*, London, 1880, p. 107.

overlooked concerns of the maker and client. Studying the influence of interiors, their designers and decorators, both on sculptors and on the range of viewers' responses, raised more curatorial questions. At what point could a decorative component become a modern sculpture? How can its appearance and meaning change when it is extracted and repositioned, or rediscovered and returned? Placing a sculpture or an example of sculptural furniture back in its original location in a historic house can reveal overlooked visual qualities and highlight forgotten symbols and subject matter, especially in figurative carved decoration. I explored this theme further on moving to the Victoria and Albert Museum (V&A) where I have curated a series of three international exhibitions on polymath designers in the 18th and 19th centuries (2005-17).¹⁰ Taking a sculpture into a museum exhibition gallery challenges a curator to identify and convey the significance of its original intended position. From this experience, and from reviewing my related publications, I have come to ask if a different history of sculpture in Britain needs to be written, a more contextual and integrated one that also features architects, designers, decorators, stonemasons, woodcarvers, stuccoists, furniture makers and other craftsmen.

In this way my interests developed beyond the Academy-centric tale of the rise of modern art sculpture in Britain. Nevertheless, its lead protagonist, Thomas Banks, has remained central to my evolving understanding. Banks did not spring forth fully-formed as an artist from the RA, but came from a crafts tradition, having trained in the guilds system under a city of London stonemason and wood carver. Like other sculptors with this background, he went on to produce, at first, architectural carvings for Anglo-Palladian interiors designed by architects. Reynolds claimed Banks as a role model for his students, as 'the first British sculptor who had produced works of classic grace' whose 'mind was ever dwelling on subjects worthy of an ancient Greek'.¹¹ But he was also an expert craftsman. When Banks went to Rome on an RA scholarship (aged 37), one of the main lessons he learnt was to improve the quality of his carving technique (from Giovanni Battista Capezzuoli, to whom Wilton had subcontracted the presentation model of the state coach). In 1783 an admirer described him as a 'Statuary who to a very refined judgement adds great learning and

¹⁰ Bryant 2006; Bryant 2013a; Bryant 2017.

¹¹ Cunningham, *op. cit.* at note 5, p. 86

perfect mechanical skill, the result of many years intense study and labour'.¹² His exceptional virtuosity as a carver is demonstrated in his RA Diploma Piece, *A Falling Giant* (1785-6) in its undercutting, drill-work, claw-chisel hatching and fine polish across a range of simulated surfaces, from rough rocks tumbling towards tensed muscular flesh.¹³

Banks's only known assistant was his younger brother Charles, whereas Canova's workshop relied on skilled specialists. The quality of Banks's carving also sets his work apart from that of Flaxman who, like Bacon, had trained and first worked as a modeller rather than as a carver. As Chantrey's foreman and secretary, Allan Cunningham observed in 1830: 'Flaxman is stiff in the workmanship of his marble'.¹⁴

Banks remained proud of his background in the sister arts. As an article in *The European Magazine* (1790) (evidently based on an interview with Banks) explains: 'his first employment was in the architectural way under his father William Banks of Great Badminton...who was many years steward to the late Duke of Beaufort, and surveyor of his buildings and works executing there, from the designs of Mr. Kent. He never was placed with any sculptor but at the age of fifteen was sent to London, and bound apprentice for seven years to a wood-carver and completed his apprenticeship'.¹⁵ In his tribute lecture after Banks died in 1805 Flaxman described him as the son of 'an architect' who 'taught him how to introduce and combine sculpture with architecture, advantageously to both'.¹⁶ Flaxman also explained how much Banks appreciated the potential of positioning memorials to transform a church into 'a museum of sacred sculpture'.¹⁷ In his tributes to Banks and later to Canova on his death (1822) Flaxman refers to their commitment to positioning sculptures in planned church settings. Flaxman too had come from a crafts background and in his Academy lectures called for sculptors to work alongside 'the sister arts'.¹⁸ With this

¹² George Cumberland to Edward Lovenden Lovenden, 19 August 1783, unpublished MSS, British Library, quoted in C. F. Bell, *Annals of Thomas Banks*, Cambridge, 1938 p. 56

¹³ Bryant 2005, pp. 33-4.

¹⁴ Cunningham, op. cit. at note 5, p. 367, underlining in original.

¹⁵ Anon., 'An Account of Mr. Thomas Banks', *European Magazine and London Review*, vol. 18 (July 1790) pp. 23-4.

¹⁶ Flaxman, 1838 op. cit. at note 1, p. 290

¹⁷ Flaxman, 1838, op. cit. at note 1, p. 293

¹⁸ Flaxman, 1838, op. cit. at note 1, pp. 266, 284; for Canova p. 302.

concept Flaxman presented an Academy-endorsed opportunity to reunite sculpture with the wider concerns it risked losing through professional specialisation in the modern art world.

To sum up, the first principles of my methodology have been empirical. I relocated sculptures and sculptural furniture in their historic settings, which either survive or are reconstructed through my research. I observed how they relate to adjacent art, architecture and decoration and to the use of the space. This has led me to see how, while modern sculpture in Britain was encouraged to distance itself from the traditional crafts of ornamental carving (Gibbons, Richards, Boson, Norman) its two leading exponents (Banks and Flaxman) looked beyond the new exhibition culture that promoted oil paintings as independent fine art. They advocated reunion with the 'sister arts'.

2. Terminology

Reynolds does not provide a definition of modern sculpture in his *Discourses* but it is implicit. The terms 'ideal' or 'poetical' sculpture are used by historians today to denote what Reynolds wanted: independent prestige works made on the sculptor's own initiative for aesthetic appreciation, that seek to rival classical statues, especially of nude figures, to face posterity as modern classics.¹⁹ Created by named artists, in the academic hierarchy they are the equivalent of 'history paintings', as Grand Manner sculptures to be shown in galleries. However, Reynolds does not use these terms for modern sculpture. In his tenth *Discourse* (1780) (his only one devoted to sculpture) he describes the best-known statues of classical antiquity as examples to follow in the pursuit of 'ideal beauty' and in his final sentence asserts that the sculptor's 'materials...are only white marble'.²⁰ Reynolds offers no definition but it is clear that the only kind of sculpture he seeks to encourage is neoclassical marble statues, as an elite product of the modern art world established by the Royal Academy.²¹

¹⁹ In this Critical Appraisal the term 'ideal' (rather than 'poetical') is used to denote sculptures of allegorical, historical or literary subjects.

²⁰ Reynolds, op. cit. at note 4, pp. 183, 188. The only modern sculpture he praises is a relief by Pierre LeGros II, on p. 186.

²¹ 'Neoclassical' is a mid-19th century pejorative term that I use as redefined in Hugh Honour, *Neoclassicism*, Harmondsworth, 1968, rev. ed. 1977, pp. 13-15. In academic publications it is no longer capitalised and hyphenated.

Some aristocratic collectors of classical sculptures used the term ‘modern’ disparagingly but ‘Modern Sculpture’ is the title of Flaxman’s last lecture as Professor of Sculpture (first published 1829). He uses the term to refer to post-classical sculpture, for he praises Italian sculptors from Nicola Pisano to Cellini before following Reynolds in criticising Bernini, and by implication the Baroque influence on Rysbrack and Roubiliac. The word ‘modern’ took on the sense of ‘contemporary’ through the example of Canova, as a successful cosmopolitan sculptor, gentleman and celebrity. In the early literature on Canova the term ‘modern sculpture’ has positive associations, as new original fine art objects; this is the way I use it.²²

The ‘sister arts’ traditionally refers to the interdisciplinary relationship between the verbal and visual arts, most often in word and image studies comparing poetry and painting.²³ Flaxman spoke of the ‘sister arts’ in his lecture on Banks, describing their contribution to ‘commodious villas and palaces’ and elsewhere²⁴ Given his crafts background, versatility and continuing work as a designer and modeller for the decorative crafts while preparing his Academy lectures²⁵ I take Flaxman’s use of ‘the sister arts’ to refer to painting, architecture, sculpture, interior decoration and design (as well as poetry, for his lecture ends with Milton). To Flaxman the ‘sister arts’ are equals and collaborative, unlike Reynolds’s hierarchy of rivals. Flaxman must have had in mind the personifications of the sister arts by Angelica Kauffman (painted 1779-80) that his audience could admire in the decoration of the ceiling of the Royal Academy’s lecture room (a subject I explored in discussing Kauffman in my catalogue of the paintings at Kenwood).²⁶ This theme of a reunion of all the arts was taken up by John Soane (a friend of Flaxman and Banks, many of whose works

²² For example, John S. Memes, *Memoir of Antonio Canova, with a Critical Analysis of His Works, and an Historical View of Modern Sculpture*, Edinburgh, 1825. James Dallaway, *Anecdotes of the Arts in England*, London: Cadell & Davies, 1800, p. 394 describes Canova ‘now flourishing in great celebrity’.

²³ Hildebrand Jacob, *Of the Sister Arts; an essay* (London, 1734) mentions sculpture briefly, p. 26, as having the advantage over painting and poetry of physical durability. Some indication of the term’s wider use for crafts when Flaxman was writing is given by John Baxter, *The Sister Arts, or a concise and interesting view of the nature and history of paper-making, printing and bookbinding*, (London, 1809). See also Ann Hurley, ed., *So rich a tapestry: the sister arts and cultural studies*, London, 1995.

²⁴ Flaxman, 1838, op. cit. note 1, p. 284

²⁵ David Irwin, *John Flaxman, 1755-1826. Sculptor, Illustrator, Designer*, London, 1979 p. 207

²⁶ Julius Bryant, *Kenwood. Paintings in the Iveagh Bequest*, New Haven and London, 2003 pp. 142-5.

Soane owned) in the creation of his museum, the first published description of which is entitled *The Union of Architecture, Sculpture and Painting* (1827).²⁷

3. The Field

Sculpture is still outside the ‘main stream’ of British art history, to judge from its absence from David Solkin’s volume *Art in Britain 1660-1815* (2015) in the Pelican History of Art series. This prioritises paintings as the core medium for discussion, despite the fact that much more was spent on sculptures, which were far more conspicuous as modern art on permanent display, beyond the RA’s summer shows. The history of British sculpture is grounded in biographical accounts of sculptors as artists. Most of the traditional literature takes the form of monographs and dictionaries. In 1979 Banks featured in the exhibition *The Fuseli Circle in Rome* (Yale Center for British Art). In her catalogue Nancy Pressly presented him as a member of a cosmopolitan avant garde through five ideal sculptures of classical narrative subjects. But among the twenty-five artists chosen only two others were sculptors (Flaxman and Sergel), thereby framing Banks with the concerns and traditions of a different medium.²⁸ H. W. Janson’s *Nineteenth Century Sculpture* (1982) promised ‘a revolutionary approach to the period and one of the few comprehensive treatments of its sculpture’ but despite his international range, Janson remained tied to a biographical chronological narrative about successive styles and artistic sources, illustrated with masterpieces shown in full-frame isolation.

I studied sculpture under David Bindman, while he curated his exhibition *John Flaxman, R. A.* (RA, 1979). Inspired by his integration of art and cultural history, I followed his suggestion to pursue postgraduate research on Thomas Banks. Since then, most developments in sculpture history over the past three decades have been in studies of monuments and portraits. These types of sculpture attract research as they readily reflect historic personalities, events and political concerns through their subjects and sitters and so can be more readily discussed in terms of contemporary social issues. However, the few recorded critical responses before the nineteenth

²⁷ John Britton, *The Union of Architecture, Painting and Sculpture*, London, 1827. The museum is usually described as his teaching resource for architects, but Soane sought a wider audience.

²⁸ Nancy Pressly, *The Fuseli Circle in Rome*, exh. cat., Yale Center for British Art, 1979. This perspective is followed in Martin Myrone, *Bodybuilding. Reforming Masculinities in British Art 1750-1810*, New Haven and London, 2005, pp. 163-190, chapter 7: ‘Henry Fuseli and Thomas Banks in Rome’.

century (a time when the vocabulary around sculpture was limited) concern the way new sculptures looked, rather than their political resonance. This suggests that a different approach would be more in keeping with the interests of the public at the time.

Malcolm Baker's *Figured in Marble* (2000) was a turning point. It includes pioneering chapters on the historiography of sculpture, on the influence of location, on viewing church monuments, on workshop practices and on the arrangement of classical marbles at Wilton. His essays on Rysbrack at Houghton, on the placement of busts and small bronzes, and of Canova's 'Three Graces' when at Woburn, were innovative. More recently, he discusses interior settings in *The Marble Index* (2014) but his concern is how, in the Enlightenment, the portrait bust (alone, in pairs and in sets) becomes autonomous, achieving the point of focus as art rather than as part of the decoration. He has not (yet) explored sculptural furniture, decoration and architects' designs for interiors.

The study of collections in the private galleries of Chatsworth, Petworth and Woburn, where sculptures were installed as modern masterpieces, has been led by John Kenworthy-Browne and Alison Yarrington. Particularly fascinating is the latter's demonstration through a series of articles of how the intellectual programme of the sculpture gallery at Chatsworth was never finite but changed through successive arrangements as the sixth Duke of Devonshire could not stop collecting sculpture.²⁹ However, most published analysis has been about sculptures' political relevance in the age of the French Revolution and Napoleon. Studies of the heroic monuments from this era in St Paul's Cathedral by Yarrington and Holger Hook, in Westminster Abbey by Martin Myrone, and in the British empire by Joan Coutu³⁰ also concern themselves mainly with political issues, especially British national

²⁹ Alison Yarrington, 'Bringing Modern Rome to Chatsworth: The Formation of the 6th Duke of Devonshire's Sculpture Collection' in Tomas Macsotay, ed., *Rome, Travel and the Sculpture Capital, c. 1770-1825*, London and New York, 2017, pp. 79-92; Alison Yarrington, 'Canova and Thorwaldsen at Chatsworth', in D. Dethloff, T. Murdoch, K. Sloan and C. Elam, eds., *Burning Bright. Essays in Honour of David Bindman*, London 2015, pp. 76-88.

³⁰ Alison Yarrington, *The Commemoration of the Hero, 1800-1864. Monuments to the British Victors of the Napoleonic Wars*. New Haven and London, 1988; Holger Hook, *The King's Artists. The Royal Academy of Arts and the Politics of British Culture 1760-1840*, Oxford, 2003. Joan Coutu, *Persuasion and Propaganda. Monuments and the Eighteenth-Century British Empire*. Montreal and London, 2006; Martin Myrone, *Bodybuilding. Reforming Masculinities in British Art 1750-1810*, New Haven and London, 2005, 23-32.

ideology and identity. Yarrington's excellent study of display conditions at the Royal Academy's summer exhibitions revealed how sculpture was isolated away from paintings in the 'dungeon' where the poorly-lit setting hindered its appreciation and reputation.³¹ However, in my publications I have demonstrated how, for some late neoclassical ideal statues, the RA exhibition was not their principal public setting (unlike oil paintings) for they had been commissioned for specific permanent locations in London, where they are best understood.

In the book published in 2018 to mark the RA's 250th anniversary the chapter on sculpture retells the familiar traditional history, from Joseph Wilton to E. H. Baily, without wider context or questions.³² From Benedict Read's *Victorian Sculpture* (1982) to *Sculpture Victorious. Art in an Age of Inventions, 1837-1901* (2014) by Martina Droth, Michael Hatt and Jason Edwards, books on nineteenth century British sculpture have greatly enlarged the cast of characters and number of issues to address but they have yet to bring the wider perspective of a curator of architectural interiors. My publications explore the way modern sculpture was encountered, observed and understood in great houses, public buildings and in more modest interiors, as part of designed and decorated settings.

Turning from sculpture to the field of literature on historic interiors of 18th and 19th century Britain, this belongs mostly to architectural historians and to curators of furniture and the decorative arts. One advantage the literature of interiors has over that of sculpture studies is that it is not centred on the RA; no one ever suggests that the RA had a controlling monopoly on the history of British interior design and decoration. Best known are the companion volumes commissioned by Yale University Press as standard surveys: *The Genius of Robert Adam: his interiors* by Eileen Harris (2001) and *Early Georgian Interiors* by John Cornforth (2004). It seems extraordinary that neither discusses modern sculpture. The closest Harris comes is in detailed documentary descriptions of Adam's designs for galleries for classical sculpture (Croome Court, Lansdowne House, Harewood, Newby Hall) and of the sculpture-lined dining room at Syon House, but there is no discussion of

³¹ Alison Yarrington, 'Art in the Dark: Viewing and Exhibiting Sculpture at Somerset House', in David Solkin ed., *Art on the Line*, New Haven and London, 2001, pp.173-187.

³² Katherine Eustace, 'The Dominance of Sculpture. Joseph Wilton to E. H. Baily', in Robin Simon, ed. with MaryAnne Stevens, *The Royal Academy of Arts. History and Collections*, New Haven and London, 2018, pp.178-207.

sculpture itself, ancient or modern. For example, she notes in passing some chimneypieces by ‘the carver John Devall’ and ‘the mason John Devall’ without specifying John Devall the Elder or Younger.³³ Both worked for Adam and each in turn was appointed chief mason to the royal palaces and Master of the Masons’ Company. Both achieved status and wealth, working across the professions of sculpture, architecture and decoration, beyond the confines of the RA and its definition of sculpture as fine art.

Even more surprising is the absence of any discussion of modern sculpture in *Eighteenth-Century Decoration: Design and the Domestic Interior in England* (1993) by Charles Saumarez Smith, which he wrote when Head of Research at the V&A. This absence in his text is despite the wealth of visual evidence in the architectural drawings and conversation piece portraits illustrated. The same can be said of *Authentic Decor. The Domestic Interior 1620-1920* by Peter Thornton (1984), a former Keeper of Furniture and of Textiles at the V&A. Mark Girouard’s *Life in the English Country House* (1978) transformed thinking by giving priority to the analysis of inventories and floor plans for their social information about visitor routes and behaviour. Unlike traditional historians of Georgian architecture, he looked beyond the attribution and aesthetic evaluation of buildings as designed elevations, but he did not study sculpture. In 2004 I was invited to contribute to a conference at the Yale Center for British Art on ‘the state of the field’ of architectural history. At the end of two days our host’s conclusion called for a greater integration of the traditional research concerns of architectural history (attributions, sources, styles and quality) with wider questions about patrons and publics, owners and historic visitors, collections and their changing display. I responded that any curator of historic houses with collections has been taking that broader and more integrated approach for visitors for years and that scholars would find some of the latest generation of house ‘guidebooks’ worth reading.

For the classical taste in British houses the most-read recent study is Vicky Coltman’s *Fabricating the Antique: Neoclassicism in Britain 1760-1800* (2006). Impressive as this is as a study of the influence of classical scholarship it does not

³³ Eileen Harris, *The Genius of Robert Adam: his interiors*, New Haven and London, 2001, pp.128, 353 n. 28.

merit the author's ambitious claim that 'I have located neoclassicism in the discipline of material culture'.³⁴ Beyond the spread of classical texts and the supply of copies of antique statues she makes only passing references to neoclassical sculpture.

Moreover, Coltman views sculpture as fine art objects, distinct from furniture, thereby reinforcing the RA's polarity and hierarchy. For example, on the group of marble copies of antique statues commissioned for the hall at Wentworth Woodhouse she writes that 'by specifying the quantity and size he required instead of ...subject matter or material, Rockingham conceived of them as articles of furniture'.³⁵ She mentions Canova's *Napoleon as Mars* at Apsley House but shows no curiosity about the setting, as I discuss below.

The British scholars with whom my work has the closest affinity are those rare polymaths who have written about sculpture, the decorative arts and interior decoration together, such as Timothy Clifford, Michael Snodin and Geoffrey Beard. However, for all their productivity, the field remains undefined, almost a no-man's land, between sculpture as a 'fine art' and sculpture as a formal quality ('the sculptural') within the 'sister arts' of sculpture and the architecture of interior design and decoration.

In reviewing the literature of my field, I have sought to identify other factors than the RA's influence for this relative absence of academic interest. One explanation seems to be that, in the twentieth century, the artificial divide between fine and decorative arts became reinforced through the rise of the related professions of curators and art historians. Ironically, one contributing factor may have been the Victoria and Albert Museum and its influence from around 1898, when five materials-based curatorial departments were first established. There were and remain practical reasons for dividing collections and curators by materials (rather than by period, style or by geographical region), such as storage and conservation requirements and the need to develop expertise in techniques of production. However, these practical categories were never intended to become intellectual boundaries. The V&A's structure reinforced the academic status of sculpture as a fine art, above the decorative arts, for from 1898 sculpture was the responsibility of the Assistant Director, rather than of

³⁴Vicky Coltman, *Fabricating the Antique: Neoclassicism in Britain 1760-1800*, Chicago and London, 2006, p. 195

³⁵ Coltman, op. cit. note 32, p. 134,

one of the new keepers. The V&A's two leading scholar-directors, Sir Eric Maclagan and Sir John Pope-Hennessy, were both sculpture experts.³⁶ The creation of the Department of Architecture and Sculpture in 1910 acknowledged the interdependence of two sister arts in the tradition of the South Kensington Museum (as the V&A was known, 1857-99) which influenced the Arts and Crafts movement through reviving the ethos of the Renaissance atelier, where all the visual arts were inter-dependent, with the workshop master as lead designer.

Beyond museums, sculpture studies followed the example of the RA in setting itself apart from the decorative arts as an academic discipline in Britain. More than a parallel may be drawn between the redefinition of sculpture as a fine art at the Royal Academy from 1768 and the professionalization of Art History 200 years later. I recall how, in the 1970s (following the founding of the Association of Art Historians in 1974 and with the launch of the journal *Art History* in 1978) the leaders of the evolving academic discipline of Art History sought to distance themselves intellectually from the polite world of 'art appreciation' classes for aspiring interior decorators, amateur collectors and antiques dealers. After the V&A, the greatest promoter of sculpture studies in this country has been the Henry Moore Foundation (established 1976 but most active after Moore's death in 1986), through its Henry Moore Centre for the Study of Sculpture in Leeds (opened 1982, under Terry Friedman) with exhibitions and conferences. The Foundation also supports the teaching of sculpture's history at Leeds University (formerly by Benedict Read) and York University (formerly by Malcolm Baker, as Henry Moore Lecturer in the History of Sculpture, on secondment from the V&A) and sponsored the Public Monuments and Sculpture Association, which launched *The Sculpture Journal* in 1997. Throughout these developments the understanding of sculpture in Britain has been framed and taught as a liberal art, positioning sculpture closer to the intellectual history of paintings, than to the decorative arts/crafts and interior design.

While the world of British sculpture studies has taken strides, through new university courses, centres, societies and journals, in some ways it has grown more insular. When I enrolled as a post-graduate in 1981 I belonged to the generation of students inspired by John Barrell's *Dark Side of the Landscape* (1980). Controversy sparked

³⁶ Maclagan was director of the V&A 1924-44. Pope Hennessey was director 1967-73.

by David Solkin's catalogue to his *Richard Wilson* exhibition (Tate Gallery, 1982) led to attempts to polarize the discipline.³⁷ It was as if Art History needed to be purged of the old connoisseurs by the young born-again Marxists who preferred finding evidence in art of past power struggles between social classes to other ways of exploring a painting's meaning and significance. Museum curators were seen by some New Art Historians as, by implication, defenders of the Old, as intellectually complacent and compromised by association with wealthy collectors and art dealers. Such attempts to divide Art History had a greater impact on the history of paintings than on sculpture studies, possibly because of the appearance of another seminal work at the same time, Michael Baxandall's *Limewood Sculptors of Renaissance Germany* (1980).

Written by a former curator of sculpture at the V&A, this combined directly relevant cultural, political and economic history with a materials-and-techniques-based appreciation of sculpture as the product of competitive carvers working for customers through guild-controlled contracts and through sub-contractors. I was working at the V&A at the time (employed 1981-3, initially part-time as a Student Assistant while enrolled at the Courtauld Institute) and I suspect that Baxandall's approach was indebted to the two German philosophies of style that still influence the presentation of the V&A's galleries. Gottfried Semper's belief that style was driven by the inherent qualities of materials had established the galleries devoted to specific materials; the *zeitgeist* approach of Alois Riegl underpins the period or 'primary' galleries at the front of the museum.³⁸ Baxandall's more tangible integration of sculpture and social history as visual culture enabled him to examine sculptures on their own terms, close to how they were originally seen, through (the term he coined) the 'period eye' and 'the period style of imposing order on what it met'.³⁹ Above all he made slow looking the primary means to understanding.

³⁷ Neil McWilliam and Alex Potts, 'The Landscape of Reaction: Richard Wilson (1713? -1782) and His Critics', in A. L. Rees and Frances Borzello, ed., *The New Art History*, London, 1986, pp. 106-119.

³⁸ Julius Bryant, ed., *Art and Design for All. The Victoria and Albert Museum. exh. cat.*, Kunst-und Ausstellungshalle der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Bonn, 2011, pp. 33, 153

³⁹ Michael Baxandall, *Limewood Sculptors of Renaissance Germany*, New Haven and London, 1980 p. 151

Another key contribution to the field when I was a student was Rudolf Wittkower's *Sculpture. Process and Principles* (1977). His (1970-71) Cambridge University Slade Professor lectures on 'sculptural techniques and thought processes linked to them' offered 'conclusions drawn from unchallengeable visual evidence'.⁴⁰ He focussed on the relationship between a sculptor's modelled sketch and his carved or cast finished sculpture. Wittkower did not include any British sculptors before Eric Gill and Henry Moore but, like Baxandall, began from the materiality of sculpture. The same year saw the publication of Nicholas Penny's PhD thesis as *Church Monuments in Romantic England* (1977). Covering the years c. 1780-1850 it expanded the field by discussing religious ideas and social attitudes behind the changing visual conventions of commemorative sculpture. In its time frame, however, Penny's study reinforced the cut-off of the 'long eighteenth century' from the Victorian era.

Despite these publications, the traditional biographical approach of Margaret Whitney's volume for *The Pelican History of Art (Sculpture in Britain 1530-1830, 1964)* was endorsed in 1988 by the publication of a new edition, revised by John Physick. The first history of sculpture to take Baxandall's approach into the period of study was *Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-Century Monument* by David Bindman and Malcolm Baker (1995), which won the Mitchell Prize. The second and third sentences of their Acknowledgements credit not Baxandall but rather the PhD thesis of Matthew Craske, later published as *The Silent Rhetoric of the Body: a history of sculpture and commemorative art in England 1720-1770* (2007), the most original and well-researched book in the field.⁴¹ Craske challenged Solkin's social history of art⁴² that favoured the rise of 'the bourgeois public sphere' by showing how he underestimated the continuing role of elite landed families. From the depth of his immersion in the primary documentation of commissions and from the breadth of his

⁴⁰ Rudolf Wittkower, *Sculpture. Process and Principles*, London, 1977 p. 9

⁴¹ Matthew Craske, *The Silent Rhetoric of the Body: a history of sculpture and commemorative art in England 1720-1770*, New Haven and London, 2007.

⁴² For example: David H. Solkin, *Painting for Money. The Visual Arts and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth Century England*, New Haven and London, 1993. I responded to David Solkin's generalisations about the social attitudes of Wilson's clients and other viewers by studying texts accompanying topographical engravings in 18th and early 19th century tour books; this formed the basis of my Kenwood exhibition and catalogue: *Finest Prospects* (1986) and my essay 'Villa Views and the Uninvited Audience', in D. Arnold, ed., *The Georgian Villa*, Stroud, 1996 pp. 11-24.

reading of period literature he brought new contexts for analysing church monuments, such as the principles of oratory, of new evangelical theology and changing social attitudes to appropriate forms of mourning. In brief, Craske looked at church monuments as they were first seen, as through Baxandall's 'period eye'.

Fortunately, there is a corner of this great field that Craske has left untilled for others. Through all his research on the lives of patron families and the church monument in country life he stays loyal to four great London sculptors (Rysbrack, Roubiliac, Henry Cheere, Peter Scheemakers) and focuses on individual monuments. In my publications I have studied sculptural furniture, decorative carving and the use of sculpture by architects and interior designers. Given these landmark publications it was disappointing to find that the most recent book in my field, *The British School of Sculpture c. 1760-1832*, edited by Jason Edwards and Sarah Burnage (2017) remains RA-centric and makes only brief mention of historic interiors and the process of observation. The exception is Craske's chapter on a monument in Westminster Abbey from 1770 where he showed how its poor location caused 'optical problems' that led to misunderstanding and criticism by its first viewers.⁴⁵

One vivid example of the consequence of the academic divide between sculpture and the sister arts is the exhibition catalogue *Taking Shape: Finding sculpture in the decorative arts* (Henry Moore Institute, Leeds and the J. Paul Getty Museum, 2009), edited by Penelope Curtis and Martina Droth. The catalogue's foreword tells us that the exhibition grew from the Getty Museum's administrative decision to combine two departments into one, as Sculpture and the Decorative Arts. Despite the merger, the new department's name continues to mark the distinction and relative status between the two collections. The premise of the exhibition was that sculpture and the decorative arts are distinct disciplines, when in fact they are Enlightenment constructs. The editors (both specialists in late 20th century sculpture) wrote as if surprised to find sculptural qualities in early 18th century figurative furniture (the latter is my term for such crossover works). Most of the furniture was lent from Temple Newsam, Leeds whose curators wrote their catalogue entries without

⁴⁵ Matthew Craske, 'Extracting the meaning of a pile of pancakes. An analysis of Nicholas Read's monument to Admiral Tyrell (1766-70)' in Jason Edwards and Sarah Burnage, eds., *The British School of Sculpture c.1760-1832*, Abingdon and New York, 2017 pp. 238-9. My work is cited pp. 2,18, 20, 185-6; the bibliography lists six of my publications on sculpture.

engaging with the supposed dilemma caused by a polarised preconception of sculpture and the decorative arts.⁴⁶

The most recent example of an architectural historian researching between the fields is *Making Magnificence: Architects, Stuccatori and the Eighteenth-Century Interior* (2017) in which Christine Casey challenges ‘the barbs of the boundary police’, one of whom asked her ‘but is this architectural history?’⁴⁷ Since the work of Geoffrey Beard and Alastair Laing, stuccatori have remained in the academic gap between architecture and the decorative arts, and could be a missing link. Casey’s study reassembles the ‘British squadra’, a network of migrant specialist professionals who provided sculptural decoration for Anglo-Palladian interiors. But she says almost nothing about their impact on British plasterers (beyond naming their immediate employers as sub-contractors) and on the decorative wood carvers (Gibbons, Richards, Boson and Norman are not mentioned) whose prices the stuccatori undercut. By documenting high-relief decoration for ceilings and coves while not addressing sculptural furniture and sculpture her study remains within the self-imposed ‘boundary’ of architectural history.

Another example of how sculpture is studied away from its sister arts is the identification of craftsmen in current dictionaries. Just as sculpture studies rose through establishing a dictionary of sculptors and then its own society and journal, so the history of British furniture has done the same. I may be unusual in having served on the Council of the Furniture History Society and on the steering committee of the AHRC ‘Centre for the Historic Interior’ at the Royal College of Art, while publishing mainly on sculpture and architecture. For example, while working on Chiswick I found entries on Lord Burlington’s stonemason, John Bosun, in both Rupert Gunnis’s dictionary of sculptors and in the equivalent volume on furniture edited by Christopher Gilbert and Geoffrey Beard.⁴⁸ Neither dictionary entry made reference to the other. Bosun carved furniture and mirror frames designed by William Kent for Chiswick but also architraves, capitals, columns, overdoors, terms,

⁴⁶ Jonathan Marsden, ‘Taking Shape: Finding Sculpture in the Decorative Arts’, *Sculpture Journal*, vol. 18 no. 1 (2009) pp. 131-3.

⁴⁷ Christine Casey, *Making Magnificence: Architects, Stuccatori and the Eighteenth-Century Interior*, New Haven and London, 2017 pp. 6-7.

⁴⁸ Rupert Gunnis, *Dictionary of British Sculptors, 1660-1851*, London, 1953; Geoffrey Beard and Christopher Gilbert, eds., *Dictionary of English Furniture Makers, 1660-1840*, Leeds, 1986.

gate piers, the organ screen in Westminster Abbey and (alongside James Richards) ornaments for the Prince of Wales's barge designed by Kent. Other specialist carvers claimed by both dictionaries include Sefferin Alken, Sefferin Nelson, Samuel Norman, James Whittle and Edward Wyatt. Cross-references are given in the new edition of Gunnis by Roscoe where examples of 'architectural sculpture' include curtain cornices, mirror frames and other carved furniture. In this way, recent scholarship seems to struggle to maintain the RA's definition of sculpture.

Two exhibitions on British sculpture, both held at Tate Britain can serve to summarise the dilemma of sculpture studies as I see it and help to illustrate the divided field that my work spans. First came *The Return of the Gods: Neoclassical Sculpture in Britain* (2008) which assembled some heroic masterpieces of sculpture by Banks, Nollekens, Deare, Gibson, Canova, Sergel, Thorwaldsen and others and presented them in Tate Britain's Duveen Hall, highlighted by spotlights in dramatic chiaroscuro.⁴⁹ This was the academic ideal of autonomous masterpieces, but no gallery ever looked like this in Britain, whether at the Royal Academy or in great country houses. By contrast, *Sculpture Victorious. Art in the Age of Invention, 1837-1901* (2015) (Yale Center for British Art and Tate Britain)⁵⁰ presented sculpture across many media, including mass reproduction, but lacked the equivalent masterpieces in Tate Britain's sequel exhibition. In making this divide in time, between Georgian and Victorian sculpture, for aristocratic and for middle class buyers, Tate Britain underlined traditional splits in the field.

4. The Submitted work.

To introduce a selection of my own publications I must emphasize that the overall programme of research developed over decades. Much of my research has been empirical, done as part of my work as a museum curator, as relevant opportunities arose, such as exhibitions, house restorations, redisplay and acquisitions. I have specialised in the history of interior design and have not been a sculpture curator as such. As the first Director of Museums and Collections (a.k.a. chief curator) at English Heritage (EH) (1990-2005) I established a team responsible for the only

⁴⁹ Marjorie Trusted, *The Return of the Gods: Neoclassical Sculpture in Britain*, exh. cat. Tate Britain, 2008.

⁵⁰ Martina Droth, Michael Hatt and Jason Edwards, *Sculpture Victorious. Art in the Age of Invention, 1837-1901*, New Haven and London, 2015.

nationwide nationally-funded museum collection in England, spread across 412 historic sites and 32 registered museums, where we specialised in presenting objects in their physical and intellectual contexts. Most of my collecting and thinking about sculpture has been for restoration projects, rediscovering and reinstating art and furniture into its historic locations in houses and gardens. After specialising as a curator of house museums I moved to the V&A in 2005 as Keeper of Word & Image, the department of paintings, prints, drawings, photographs, designs, the Archive of Art and Design, the National Art Library and with responsibility for the V&A's new partnership with the RIBA's collection and curatorial team. There, while making acquisitions that included many designs for sculpture, most of my research has arisen from serving as lead curator for three international exhibitions on artists who worked as interior designers (Kent, Stuart and Kipling) each with accompanying books published by Yale University Press.

This polymath approach has the advantage of seeing sculpture in context. I have studied a succession of surviving and lost sculptures and sculptural furnishings by reconstructing the circumstances of their commissions, early display and the early responses to them, as a way to determine their original meanings and their impact on their surroundings. Much of such research and thinking was driven by the necessity of convincing potential donors, lenders and grant-giving bodies, and as part of the restoration and reinterpretation of houses prior to re-launching them to the public. At the V&A I have been able to pursue my interest in sculpture as a key element in designed environments.

Two complementary themes run through and connect my publications on British sculpture: the emergence of 'modern sculpture' and the relevance of sculptures to their decorative settings. Rather than rely on the Romantic trope of artists being driven by noble ambitions and their own sense of genius, I have searched for other factors. I have become intrigued by how sculptors and craftsmen have responded to locations in the way they determined how the viewer encounters their work, and how they have collaborated with, or rivalled, architects in seeking favourable locations, as part of wider decorative schemes. The following survey of a selection of my published work takes a chronological approach in terms of artists and sculptors, rather than by publication date.

4a. William Kent

George Vertue criticised both William Kent and James Gibbs for underpaying Michael Rysbrack, the sculptor who realised their designs for monuments in Westminster Abbey.⁵¹ This professional rivalry between architect as designer and sculptor as artist is evidence of the evolving status of sculptors in Britain by the 1730s. Led by the example of immigrant artist-sculptors, some versatile carvers sought to specialise as statuaries in the decades before the founding of the RA. As a designer for sculpture and for sculptural interior furniture and fittings Kent is key to understanding this change. My initial research on Kent was for Marble Hill, the Palladian villa in Twickenham for which I had curatorial responsibility while based at Kenwood. I organised an exhibition there in 1988 to mark the tercentenary of the owner, Mrs Howard, later Countess of Suffolk. In the accompanying catalogue (reviewed by Brian Allen in the *Burlington Magazine* as ‘excellent...Bryant’s catalogue discusses so intelligently’⁵²) I published the historic sculpture still in situ and the house’s William Kent pier table, which had just returned from Australia, following my identification of it from old correspondence on file (fig. 1).

The unusual central motif, of a peacock (emblem of Juno) led to my article on the symbolism of the room as a whole (Bryant 1990), the elaborate carved decoration of which is fully documented as by James Richards, a city of London stonemason who succeeded Grinling Gibbons as Master Sculptor and Carver in Wood to the Crown. The table frames must be by Richards and his assistant (and successor in royal office) George Murray.

Soon after the GLC’s three house museums transferred to English Heritage (EH) in 1986 I was given curatorial responsibility for Chiswick House (managed hitherto by EH’s forebears in the Department of the Environment). For want of collections there, I created a sculpture gallery on the ground floor with original examples from the gardens, which I replaced with replicas (to avoid vandalism and acid rain). I discovered that the statues of Palladio and Inigo Jones flanking the entrance were first made as architectural decoration for niches on the façade of Burlington House.

⁵¹ M. I. Webb, *Michael Rysbrack, Sculptor*, London, 1954, pp. 49, 84.

⁵² Brian Allen, ‘Lady Suffolk and Alexander Pope’, *Burlington Magazine*, vol. 130 (August 1988) p. 643.

⁵³At Chiswick I researched the garden sculpture and explored its lost meaning, as a political programme or as a sculpture garden of more aesthetic appeal. ⁵⁴As with the return of the William Kent pier table to Marble Hill, the rediscovery and purchase of the two missing ‘William Kent’ console tables for Chiswick highlighted the pervasive sculptural qualities of the house’s interior design and architectural ornament (fig. 2).

The two tables were sold (for over £1m) as designed by Kent and made by John Boson. Christie’s had John Hardy and John Harris write up their attribution. ⁵⁵ I published them as more likely designed and made by the sculptor G. B. Guelfi (Bryant 1996) based on visual comparison with Kent’s secure pieces and designs, and the striking visual difference from the Kent and Richards pier table at Marble Hill. Kent and Burlington recruited Guelfi in Italy and he lived at Burlington House from 1715. The tables have mosaic marble tops that Burlington bought in Genoa on his second Grand Tour in 1719. The frames (as they were called) are closer to Genoese Baroque examples than they are to the more rectilinear architectural furniture of the English Palladian taste, as made by the British craftsmen used by Kent and Burlington. In London’s most fashionable suburban villa they would have been seen at eye level by guests entering the Gallery via the perron (exterior stairs) from Burlington’s Italianate sculpture garden. With their supporting pairs of writhing voluptuous gilded sea nymphs, they probably attracted more attention than the four ideal statues in niches by Peter Scheemakers and Guelfi in the same room. Carved furniture of such plasticity and quality challenges the boundaries of conventional histories of sculpture.

Moving to the V&A presented the opportunity to propose an exhibition on Kent. I explored the status of sculpture as an ingredient in interior design and display as the V&A’s lead curator for a series of three major exhibitions with the Bard Graduate Center, New York (BGC): *James ‘Athenian’ Stuart* (2007); *William Kent* (2013) and *John Lockwood Kipling* (2017) (the latter two’s accompanying books each made the

⁵³ Bryant 2013 pp. 550-553.

⁵⁴ Julius Bryant, ‘Gentlemen prefer Bronze: Garden Sculpture and Sculpture Gardens in Eighteenth Century England’, paper given at The Frick Collection, The Center for the History of Collecting, New York, 20 May 2017, symposium publication forthcoming in 2020.

⁵⁵ John Hardy and John Harris, ‘The Chiswick Tables’, *Christie’s International Magazine*, vol. 13 no. 6, (July/August 1996) pp. 18-20.

final five shortlisted for the annual William Berger Prize for British Art History). These drew upon my previous research at English Heritage, particularly on Chiswick House and Osborne. In all three shows and books I addressed sculpture as part of the oeuvre of polymath designers.

For my essay on Kent's designs for sculpture (Bryant, 2013) I studied his responses to architectural settings in the sculptures he designed (with Rysbrack and Peter Scheemakers) for Westminster Abbey. Malcolm Baker, David Bindman and Matthew Craske have led the study of monuments in the Abbey, but I found more to say through visual analysis. From observing the monuments in the Abbey at different times of day, and during church services, I coined the term 'indoor picturesque' for the way Kent designed for large-scale interior locations. For example, the monument to Isaac Newton is always studied and illustrated front-on in isolation. Kent conceived it as one of a pair, indeed as the second work, as a companion to the monument to Earl Stanhope, which Kent reversed on paper prior to execution.⁵⁶ In their matching positions, each reclining away from the nave, both seem to engage with passers-by in the north and south aisles. Both hold prime positions facing the newly-completed west doors and were soon (1738) accompanied by another pair (by Henry Cheere) flanking the doors, so staking out the corners of the nave as a fashionable indoor promenade for Westminster. I also noticed how the pair are positioned not against a blind screen (as if in a pre-Reformation church) but as flanking figures to an open gateway (like the statues of Palladio and Inigo Jones at Chiswick) that presents a vista to the high altar. The screen supports a gallery for an organ whose paired pipes soar up (both visually and with music) directly above each monument's backing pediment. The other two sculptures designed by Kent for the Abbey also repay slow encounters, as *Shakespeare* and *General Monck* can only be approached from their sides (as I explain in my annual tours of the Abbey's sculpture for Westminster School, since 2007).

The greatest sculpture designed by Kent is the monument to the Duke of Marlborough and his family at Blenheim. It is well known from illustrations, but these usually trim the monument of its imperial eagle and the related wall decorations and give no idea of the drama of confronting it from the side, from the

⁵⁶ Bryant 2013 pp. 554-562

raised position of the Marlborough family's pew (later replaced by a staircase) where one is faced by the duke and the statue of Fame. To get this far the visitor has followed a route through the house punctuated by sculptures.

In viewing Kent as essentially a pictorial artist, with a vivid visual memory of the palaces of Rome, Genoa, Florence and Naples, I brought a fresh approach to the study of his country house interiors and coined another new term to help explain Kent's popularity, 'the Grand Tour syndrome' (that has been much quoted since). I also used visual analysis to challenge attributions by architectural historians whose devotion to bills and signed designs has limited their readiness to recognise Kent's legacy. In my chapter on his designs for country houses I discussed his chimneypieces as one element of his work as an interior designer with a sculptural sensibility who evidently enjoyed working with sculptors. Horace Walpole was confident that Kent had 'design'd all the Ornaments' at Houghton.⁵⁷ Kent's earliest dated design to include a chimneypiece (for the saloon at Houghton, 1725) is one of a pair that also includes a console table, picture hanging scheme and frames (fig. 3).

In the Marble Parlour at Houghton the overmantel by Rysbrack is usually illustrated in isolation but it is inseparable from the chimneypiece beneath and from the flanking marble-lined buffet alcoves containing marble-topped tables, all en suite. The design by Kent shows how this sculptural entity would be completed with wine coolers beneath the tables and carefully composed displays of stacked silver-gilt vessels and dishes above. Most sculpture historians stop at the overmantel bas relief by Rysbrack.⁵⁸

For Chiswick, in discussing chimneypieces and other aspects of sculptural decoration, I returned to questions raised by the purchase of the pair of carved console tables seven years earlier, and demonstrated the extent to which the interior decor is more the work of Kent than of Burlington (architectural historians had reduced Kent's contribution to the ceiling paintings alone). For Holkham I showed how Kent designed chimneypieces as the focal points of sculptural decorative schemes. For example, as the architect Matthew Brettingham noted in 1773 of Lady Leicester's bedchamber: 'the Statuary Marble Chimney-Piece, Ceiling, Sofas,

⁵⁷ Julius Bryant, 'From 'Gusto' to 'Kentissime': Kent's Designs for Country Houses, Villas and Lodges' in Susan Weber, ed. *William Kent, Designing Georgian Britain*, New Haven and London, 2013 pp. 182-241, p. 195.

⁵⁸ Webb, op. cit. note 49, p. 128

Chairs, Table Frames, and two Pier Glasses, were all executed from Designs of Mr Kent'.⁵⁹ I also demonstrated how Kent planned to install a colossal statue of Jupiter within the entrance hall stairwell, a composition that is a clear precedent (and possible source for) Benjamin Dean Wyatt's remodelling of Apsley House. As a collector of classical sculpture Kent was nearly imprisoned in Italy with his patron Thomas Coke but their prize acquisition, the statue of Diana, became part of the sculpture gallery installation at Holkham and reappears in grisaille as Kent's *trompe l'oeil* painting, life-size, on the King's stairs at Kensington Palace. At Rousham I showed how Kent's 'still bronzo mad' patron, General Dormer, had him convert a Jacobean kitchen parlour into a classical studiolo, his new low white ceiling (copied from the Golden House of Nero) being much more than a fashion statement. It had the practical benefit of maximising reflected light to enhance the viewing of his collection (on Kent's new wall brackets, pedestals and tables) of bronze figures in this 'new parlour', as recorded in the 1742 inventory.⁶⁰

For garden sculpture at Stowe, Rousham, Pope's villa and Chiswick I went beyond the conventional approach of finding meaning through identifying the symbolic values of busts and statues and reconstructing lost political narratives. I traced the way garden sculptures could also invite an aesthetic response, not only in themselves but in the contributions they can make to the visual enjoyment of an Italianate garden.

The book accompanying the William Kent exhibition won the Alfred H. Barr Jr. Award of the USA's College Art Association. Malcolm Baker told me my publication in it of Newton's Westminster Abbey monument is now the definitive account and he cited it in his next major book.⁶¹ On the strength of my discussion of Kent's use of garden sculpture I was invited to give a paper at the Frick's Center for the History of Collecting in New York, 2017 (its first conference on sculpture) in which I developed the theme of popular connoisseurship in the 1730s by studying responses to garden sculptures by Van Nost, Carpenter, Hogarth, John Cheere and

⁵⁹ Quoted in Bryant, op. cit. note 53, p. 117.

⁶⁰ Bryant, op. cit. note 54, pp. 221-223.

⁶¹ Malcolm Baker, *The Marble Index, Roubiliac and Sculptural Portraiture in Eighteenth-century Britain*, New Haven and London, 2014, pp. 383, 369 n16

others. The proceedings will be published in 2020 so are not included in my submission.

4b. James ‘Athenian’ Stuart

For the V&A/BGC research project on James ‘Athenian’ Stuart I was the V&A’s lead curator for the exhibition, as with William Kent and J. L. Kipling. This gave me an overview which confirmed my belief that ‘sculpture’ in designed interiors at this time cannot be confined to autonomous three-dimensional objects made by ambitious artists. There is often no dividing line between such items and the rest of designed interiors where the qualities of sculptural form pervade. My chapter on Stuart’s designs for villas and country houses included his oeuvre as a designer of chimneypieces for over seven houses and asserted their visual status as the focal points of rooms (especially on cold and gloomy days). Stuart’s chimneypieces contrast with the more volumetric ones by Kent and Rysbrack in quoting from the drawings he made in Greece, ahead of their publication in the book he produced with Nicholas Revett, *The Antiquities of Athens* (1762). Like Kent, Stuart was more a polymath decorator than an architect.

In publishing Stuart’s designs together for the first time (Bryant 2006) I demonstrated how, thanks in part to his early career as a fan painter, Stuart produced seductive coloured presentation drawings for clients before Adam followed his example. In these Stuart showed his young post-Grand Tour clients how he could install their new collections of Italian paintings, statues, busts and reliefs, pulled together with en suite frames, pedestals and other carved furniture linked by matching friezes, door surrounds and other decorative details, united in an iconography of classical motifs. In my reconstruction of the lost hall at Wimbledon Park I identified Stuart’s decorative use of sculptural vases ahead of the ‘vase-mania’ promoted by Adam, Piranesi and Wedgwood, while also creating a central setting for a modern ideal sculpture. As Nollekens had entrusted Stuart with a stock of his sculptures to offer to clients, I suspect that Stuart designed suitable settings for them in personal show rooms.

4c. Robert Adam: Kenwood

Unlike Kent and Stuart, Adam was the son of an architect, with brothers in the family business. But like his polymath predecessors, he was also a graphic artist and a painter of picturesque landscapes; he followed their example in conceiving complete interiors where sculpture worked on many scales and in various materials. The only British architects that the Adam brothers praised in the preface to their *Works in Architecture* (1773) are Vanbrugh, Kent and Stuart; these artist-architects I identified as an alternative tradition to the more conventionally trained professional architects such as James Gibbs, George Dance and William Chambers.⁶²

Like Marble Hill and Chiswick, Kenwood had lost its historic contents nearly a century ago. The rediscovery and return of ‘lost’ landmark furniture presented opportunities to research and publish. Since the Adam brothers illustrated Kenwood’s furniture in their collected *Works* the dining room sideboard suite has become the best-known group of British neoclassical furniture (fig. 4).

It was carved by Sefferin Nelson who also carved the wooden chimneypiece for Kenwood’s Upper Hall. Nelson supplied architectural sculpture, sculptural furniture and interior decoration to several houses where Adam worked. He is claimed by both *A Biographical Dictionary of Sculptors in Britain* (2009) and by *Dictionary of English Furniture Makers* (1986).⁶³ In his trade card in the V&A Nelson describes himself as neither, but rather as ‘Carver, Gilder & Frame Maker to their Royal Highnesses the Prince of Wales and the Duke of Cumberland’.⁶⁴ Nelson’s card is otherwise modest but another in the V&A’s collection, for William Sharp, ‘Carver, Gilder & Picture Frame Maker’ of 44 Leadenhall Street, London, printed in 1772, features flanking figures representing architecture and sculpture as the sister arts of the professional carver (fig. 5).

⁶² Gibbs trained under the architect Carlo Fontana, Dance under his father, a City of London mason, and Chambers under J. F. Blondel.

⁶³ Ingrid Roscoe, ed., *A Biographical Dictionary of Sculptors in Britain*, Leeds, 2009, pp. 879-880; Geoffrey Beard and Christopher Gilbert eds., *Dictionary of English Furniture Makers*, Leeds, 1986 pp. 640-641.

⁶⁴ V&A: E. 4733-1907.

My research on Adam focussed on Kenwood and was published in my book on Adam in 1992⁶⁵, in another on the house in 1990 (Bryant 1990a) and elsewhere. The term ‘guidebook’ hardly does justice to my 84-page publication on Kenwood. Gervase Jackson-Stops (formerly the National Trust’s head curator) praised it as ‘excellent’ in *Country Life* in 1990 for publishing Adam’s original designs, in contrast to the V&A’s new book on Osterley which, as he pointed out, did not.⁶⁶ I also quoted extensively from accounts in the Mansfield family archives from Scone Palace that I studied on deposit in Dundee University. Elsewhere in the same issue of *Country Life* the book was reviewed as ‘a mine of information...it forms a manifesto for the continued restoration of Kenwood, which is again being treated as an important house, not just as a neutral art gallery. Perhaps the National Trust could follow this example of scholarship and accessibility’.⁶⁷ Simon Jervis’s review for the *Furniture History Society Newsletter* ended ‘It is not only a guidebook but also a useful work of reference beautifully illustrated. Congratulations’.⁶⁸

Adam’s choice of stone masons and wood carvers for Kenwood’s chimneypieces suggests his need to keep control: the finest, in the Great Room or Library, was carved by John Devall the Younger; the next best (in the entrance hall) is by George Burns, who also carved architectural mouldings and fixed furniture such as the frames of pier glasses. I published (for the first time) James Adam’s designs for the Great Room and its ante room from 1764 alongside Robert Adam’s design from 1767.⁶⁹ In this comparison one may see the more sculptural approach to interior decoration proposed by James Adam, who had returned from Rome in 1763. His design includes busts, urns, a statue, a bas-relief and a much grander caryatid

⁶⁵ This book is not included in my submission but was sufficiently well received for it to be cited by Damie Stillman, ‘Robert Adam’, *The Dictionary of Art*, London and New York, 1996, 34 vols, vol. 1 pp. 134-141, p.141.

⁶⁶ Gervase Jackson-Stops, ‘Baronial Briefings’, *Country Life* vol. 184 no. 22 (31 May 1990) pp. 160-1.

⁶⁷ Anon., ‘Model Guide’, *Country Life*, vol. 184 no 22 (31 May 1990) p. 203.

⁶⁸ Simon Jervis, ‘Kenwood’, *Furniture History Society Newsletter*, no. 100 (November 1990) p. 10

⁶⁹ Hitherto engravings were used, even in Geoffrey Beard, *The Work of Robert Adam*, Edinburgh and London, 1978, plate 110. I had the designs at Sir John Soane’s Museum photographed in colour, and published them in colour, for the first time.

chimneypiece that is similar to Joseph Wilton's for the Adam dining room at Croome Court (1766, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York).

Robert Adam rejected his younger brother's initial presentation drawings. In his own coloured proposals (1767) he sought a lighter effect and proposed a history painting as the overmantel (Bryant 2003). Showing 'The Administration of Roman Justice', it would have been executed by Antonio Zucchi, who supplied the ceiling paintings. However, his patron (Lord Chief Justice Mansfield) rejected this in favour of a portrait of himself, painted by David Martin in 1776 to commemorate his earldom that year (he is dressed in his new robes). The portrait shows Mansfield seated next to a bust of Homer, believed to be by Bernini, that he inherited from his mentor Alexander Pope. In the painting the bust is presented on a carved pedestal designed by Adam that is not otherwise recorded. This portrait of Lord Mansfield has been at Scone Palace since at least 1922 but the replica I commissioned filled the void and immediately changed the focus of the room, away from the architect in favour of his client. A precedent for this intrusion would be Rysbrack's bust of Sir Robert Walpole, which is placed in front of the overmantel in Kent's entrance hall at Houghton.

This change in meaning was reinforced when I reinstated an actual sculpture. According to the *Morning Herald* (1781) Nollekens's bust of Mansfield stood on its pedestal between the far columns of the 'Great Room'. I set it back in its historic position of great prominence. In Mansfield's day, as contemporary accounts by visitors confirm, Kenwood was admired as much as the celebrity home of the 'silver-tongued' Lord Chief Justice (a self-made shrine to a self-made man) as a masterpiece by Robert Adam. Malcolm Baker cites one of my publications on sculpture at Kenwood in his book *The Marble Index* (2014).⁷⁰

4d. Thomas Banks

The sculptor I have studied the most is Thomas Banks (1735-1805), Britain's first neoclassical sculptor.⁷¹ Praised by Reynolds as an exemplar of modern British sculpture, he is always seen as a product of the Royal Academy schools, but he did

⁷⁰ Baker, op. cit. note 59, p.372 n.106-7; p.375 n74.

⁷¹ Strictly speaking, I have published more on the sculptor Anthony Caro, but that is beyond the scope of this Appraisal.

not enrol there until June 1769, when he was 34. He trained first under the ornamental carver William Barlow (who had become free of the Masons' Company in 1751) on interiors at the Mansion House (twelve chimneypieces designed by George Dance and two lavatory basins, 1751-52) and on wood-carvings for William Kent's 'great room' for Henry Pelham at 22 Arlington Street (1749-50). Banks already knew Kent's work at Badminton where his father was steward. After completing his full seven-year apprenticeship, Banks was probably employed as a carver by Richard Hayward, a prominent member of the Masons' Company who specialised in chimneypieces and architectural sculpture.

Monographic exhibitions on British sculptors of this period are extremely rare today, owing in part to the greater cost of moving and installing sculptures, compared to paintings. For the bicentenary of his death I proposed and curated Banks's first ever one-man exhibition. In my pitch to Sir John Soane's Museum's director Margaret Richardson (and subsequently to the director of the Henry Moore Foundation, Tim Llewellyn) I compared the museum to Tate Modern, as the best place to see contemporary sculpture in Soane's London. I also stressed how Soane had an agenda for the reunion of the 'sister arts', for his museum was aimed at a far wider public than students of architecture. Margaret Richardson gave me the opportunity to highlight in the installation the importance of modern sculpture to the original meaning of the museum. As Guest Curator (2002-05) I also encouraged the museum to make more of their modern sculptures by Banks and Flaxman in the ongoing restoration of the interiors.

I provocatively subtitled the exhibition 'Britain's first Modern Sculptor'. This may have helped to win over the Henry Moore Foundation as principal sponsor, but it was an important theme to explore. The catalogue came runner-up for the Axa/Art Newspaper Museum Catalogue of the Year prize.⁷² Joan Coutu's review of the catalogue in the *Burlington Magazine* noted how 'Bryant's discussions of mediums and techniques are exceptionally strong'. She admired how 'many of the images are reproduced in very good colour, still a rarity in publications on sculpture' (many of the photographs I had taken myself, as well as overseeing new professional

⁷² The prize was won (posthumously) by Robert Woof, director of the Wordsworth Trust.

photography). In concluding she praised it as ‘rich and multi-faceted’ and as such ‘a worthy successor to C. F. Bell’s *Annals of Thomas Banks* (1938).’⁷³

In her review for *Sculpture Journal* Vicky Coltman noted how the catalogue is ‘arranged into seven thematic sections...this typological arrangement rejects the traditional chronological/biographical approach that still haunts studies of individual artists’.⁷⁴ The catalogue benefitted from my three-way approach, exploring the ambitions of artists alongside those of their clients and critics and the influence of historic physical settings. I investigated the problem of patronage for ideal sculpture, while also giving many case studies of the way Banks’s sculptures were first seen in their period settings. Contrary to previous studies, I did not discuss and illustrate Banks’s sculptures in physical and visual isolation, as if they were independent masterpieces, but included contextual illustrations.⁷⁵ Coltman concluded her review: ‘This is a groundbreaking publication...a rich survey...Banks has been retrieved from the abyss’.⁷⁶

In six articles on Banks for refereed journals and books I published precedents for, and some of the social factors beyond, his own ambitions. Banks is the prime example (with James Barry, before B. R. Haydon) of a British artist finding that ‘high art’ did not pay. I demonstrated that there was, in fact, demand for modern sculpture but that it was not sustainable. Patronage came from a polite culture of encouragement, based on gentlemen’s societies rewarding artists with temporary exhibition space, good reviews, prizes from competitions, medals and travel grants to Rome, but without actual collecting. In his day Banks’s political views as a Radical were said to have cost him patrons, but he stayed in business. His professional training before enrolling at the RA sets him apart from Barry, Haydon, and the Romantic martyr figure of modern sculpture and history painting, Thomas Proctor. The latter had entered the RA Schools in 1777, age 24, with no practical training as an artist, won the Rome scholarship (with Banks’s support) but died deranged before departure. I showed how Banks survived by adapting Reynolds’s ideals to available

⁷³ Joan Coutu, ‘Thomas Banks (1735-1805): Britain’s First Modern Sculptor’, *Burlington Magazine*, vol. 147 (December 2005) p. 833.

⁷⁴ Vicky Coltman, ‘Julius Bryant, Thomas Banks 1735-1805. Britain’s first modern sculptor’, *Sculpture Journal*, vol. 14 (2005) pp. 157-159.

⁷⁵ Bryant 2005, pp. 36, 39, 44, 50, 51, 52, 54, 60, for contextual illustrations.

⁷⁶ Coltman, op. cit. note 72, p. 159.

commissions, producing high quality bespoke church monuments, chimneypieces and busts of political heroes.

In three of my articles (Bryant 1983, 1991, 2005c) I published new material on three sculptures (*Achilles Enraged*; *Cupid*; *Anatomical Crucifixion*). The first two were conceived as autonomous modern sculptures and their lack of planned settings proved to be their undoing. Banks took *Cupid* to St Petersburg and sold it to Catherine the Great who set it in a garden grotto; *Achilles Enraged* finally came to rest (thanks to Banks's great-grandson, Edward Poynter) in the lobby of the RA at Burlington House (Bryant 1983). My other articles include a survey of his church monuments (Bryant 1985) in which I characterised his approach as a preference for making unique works for an intellectual clientele as a way of adhering to his high artistic standards, rather than repeat designs like Bacon and Flaxman. In another survey article (Bryant 2005b) I showed how his politics influenced his choice of subjects in his modern sculptures as well as his treatment of potentially compromising commissions for heroic monuments in Westminster Abbey and St Paul's Cathedral. Banks channelled his politics into his art by choosing historical subjects and visual sources to convey his outlook as 'Citizen Banks'. This article on Banks as a Radical was cited by John Barrell as 'a valuable essay'.⁷⁷ My articles on Banks are cited as standard sources in John Physick's revised edition of Margaret Whinney's *Sculpture in Britain* for the Pelican History of Art (1988), in Ingrid Roscoe's *Biographical Dictionary of Sculptors in Britain* (2009), in the V&A's catalogue of its British sculpture (2002), in Marie Busco's *Sir Richard Westmacott* (1994), in Martin Myrone's *Bodybuilding* (2005), in Joan Coutu's study of sculpture in the British empire (2006) and elsewhere, along with numerous personal acknowledgements from authors in thanks for my advice.⁷⁸

⁷⁷ John Barrell, 'Thomas Banks and the Society for Constitutional Information', in S Monks, J. Barrell and M. Hallett, eds., *Living with the Royal Academy*, Farnham, 2013, p. 144.

⁷⁸ For acknowledgements and references to Julius Bryant's work on Thomas Banks and neoclassical sculpture see: Margaret Whinney, *Sculpture in Britain 1530-1830*, revised by John Physick, London, 1988, p. 478; Marie Busco, *Sir Richard Westmacott*, Cambridge, 1994 pp. 171, 189-90; Diane Bilbey, with Marjorie Trusted, *British Sculpture 1470 to 2000. A Concise Catalogue of the Collection at the Victoria and Albert Museum*, London, 2002 pp. 46-53 and passim; Martin Myrone, *Bodybuilding. Reforming Masculinities in British Art 1750-1810*, New Haven and London, 2005 p.359; Joan Coutu, *Persuasion and Propaganda. Monuments and the Eighteenth-Century British Empire*. Montreal and London, 2006 p. 283; Ingrid Roscoe, ed., *Biographical Dictionary of Sculptors in Britain, 1660-1851*, Leeds, 2009, p. 1455 and passim; Jason Edwards and Sarah Burnage, eds., *The British School of Sculpture c.1760-1832*, Abingdon

On the strength of this research I was invited to write fresh entries for Banks and Rossi for the *ODNB* (Bryant 2004, 2004a). I also contributed eight entries on eighteenth-century neoclassical sculptors to the *Dictionary of Art* (1996). These showed how Banks was not alone as a pioneer of modern sculpture, and how his contemporaries also kept working in the decorative crafts (Bacon, Banks, Carlini, Ceracchi, Deare, Fisher, Hickey, Rossi).⁷⁹ These were appreciated as key sources before the publication of the new dictionary of sculptors in Britain, edited by Roscoe (2009). For example, my entry on John Deare was cited three times in the definitive article on Deare by Peggy Fogelmann, Peter Fusco and Simon Stock in *The Sculpture Journal* (2000) where I was thanked for reading it in draft and for ‘insightful comments and suggestions for this article’.⁸⁰ These entries do not form part of my submission.

Banks’s concern for settings was recognised at the time by Flaxman. In the ‘Address’ he wrote to deliver to the RA following Banks’s death Flaxman described how in Britain ‘the improved state of society and knowledge had induced the great to build commodious villas and palaces, in which the architectural distribution made the sister arts absolutely necessary to uniformity and completion’.⁸¹ Far from presenting Banks as trained by the RA schools alone, Flaxman described how Banks ‘was instructed in the principles of architecture, and practised drawing under his father, who was an architect; this enabled him soon to form a correct taste in that art, and displayed itself in the beauty and propriety of his architectural forms in the works he has left; it besides taught him how to introduce and combine sculpture with architecture, advantageously to both. Being placed under an ornament carver gave him facility in his own ornamental sculpture’.⁸² Flaxman goes on to credit a publication by James ‘Athenian’ Stuart that ‘had initiated him in the Greek style’.⁸³ He concludes with Banks’s memorial to Margaret Petrie in Lewisham church, paired

and New York, 2017 pp. 2,18, 20, 185-6; the bibliography lists six of my publications on sculpture.

⁷⁹ Jane Turner, ed., *The Dictionary of Art*, London and New York 1996, 36 vols., vol 3 pp. 25-6, 183-5; vol. 5 p. 767; vol. 6 pp. 323-4; vol. 8 pp. 587-8; vol. 11 p. 138; vol. 14 p. 509; vol. 27 p. 197.

⁸⁰ Peggy Fogelmann, Peter Fusco and Simon Stock, ‘John Deare (1759-1798): A British Neo-Classical Sculptor in Rome’ *Sculpture Journal*, vol 4, (2000) pp. 85-126.

⁸¹ Flaxman, 1838, op. cit. note 1 p. 284

⁸² Flaxman, 1838, op. cit. note 1 p. 290

⁸³ Flaxman, 1838, op. cit. note 1 p. 291. Flaxman is referring to James Stuart and Nicholas Revett, *The Antiquities of Athens*, vol. 1, London, 1762.

with an earlier relief on the other side of the nave, ‘and consequently regular architectural decoration to the wall; by which means, together with the excellence of the work, the church becomes a museum of sacred sculpture. This example is worthy to be followed; architecture and sculpture should always be united in this manner’.⁸⁴ Flaxman ended his address on the death of Canova on the same theme, describing him ‘building a church in his native country, which he intended to decorate with sacred subjects of statues and basso-relievos in his latter [sic] years.... For this purpose, he determined the architectural design’.⁸⁵

Banks’s concern for the architectural settings of his sculpture is most evident in Westminster Abbey. Many monuments suffered truncation and relocation in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, but I traced early engravings that record them intact in their original locations while also providing evidence of the admirer’s optimum viewing position. In the Soane’s Museum’s exhibition catalogue I illustrated Banks’s monument to General Eyre Coote in this way (fig.6). I pointed out how the composition needs to be read initially from the visitor’s original direction of approach, at an oblique angle, from the outstretched feet of the *Mahratta Captive*, bottom right, before the eyes ascend up the palm tree to the portrait of the deceased. This temporal dimension (a key to admiring Banks’s sculptures afresh in situ) had been overlooked and his sculptures misunderstood by repeated illustration of documentary photographs, taken frontally, flat-on, originally by the National Monuments Record. For the exhibition catalogue the director of Soane’s Museum agreed to commission new photography, at Westminster Abbey and St Paul’s (and elsewhere) where I worked with my choice of photographer.⁸⁶

The benefits of my concern for settings are most vivid in my re-presentation of Banks’s two monuments in St Paul’s Cathedral. Nicholas Penny had described them as fine pedestals with ‘ludicrous figures on top from which no reputation could easily recover’.⁸⁷ With the help of engravings from 1818 and 1824 I showed how they were originally much higher and were positioned more prominently and open, at the central crossing, where they could be approached more in the round, rather than seen

⁸⁴ Flaxman, 1838, op. cit. note 1 p.293

⁸⁵ Flaxman, 1838, op. cit. note 1 p. 302

⁸⁶ Bryant 2005 pp. 10, 12, 20, 33, 49, 54, 55, 60.

⁸⁷ Nicholas Penny, ‘Thomas Banks’ in David Bindman, ed., *The Thames and Hudson Encyclopaedia of British Art*, London and New York 1985, p. 28.

from directly in front, as in their later positions in the south aisle today where they are silhouetted against windows.⁸⁸

Banks decided to show his *Mahratta Captive* at the RA prior to its installation as part of the monument to Eyre Coote. This is a perfect example of how, while the RA and its exhibition culture encouraged the creation of autonomous isolated sculptures, enterprising sculptors found opportunities to include original modern works in commissions for other kinds of sculpture. In many ways the *Mahratta Captive* resembles Banks's celebrated plaster model for a sculpture in search of a patron, his *Achilles Enraged*. Despite his primary plaster of the latter smashing on its way to the Academy, this dramatic interpretation of the Torso Belvedere led to his election as a Royal Academician.

I published Banks's sculpture of Mrs Johnes posed as *Thetis Dipping the infant Achilles in the River Styx* (V&A) as an example of the dilemma of patronage for ideal sculpture in Britain, for it followed the cancellation by her husband of his commission to translate into marble Banks's *Achilles Enraged*.⁸⁹ This Grand Manner portrait of Mrs Johnes has always been illustrated in profile, from one side, like one of Banks's oval bas-reliefs. This may have been Banks's first preference but in the 2005 exhibition catalogue I illustrated an engraving from 1811 of it in its historic setting: Thomas Johnes's library at Hafod, where Banks was a regular summer guest. The engraving reveals that the sculpture was encountered foot-first (like the *Mahratta Captive* but from behind), and then the composition unfolds as the viewer walks past, revealing Mrs Johnes's portrait and her infant last. Sculpturally, the visual transition is from the intriguing block-like silhouette through increasing undercutting to the surprise illusion of the dexterously suspended infant. I also identified the original wooden pedestal and oversaw the stripping back to its original brown graining (from black marbling overpaint); this gives some idea of how the white marble sculpture must have stood out against the leather spines on shelves in the dark top-lit octagonal library at Hafod.

⁸⁸ Bryant 2005 pp. 55, 60.

⁸⁹ Bryant 2005 pp. 35-36.

In the Soane's Museum catalogue, I illustrated Banks's best-known and most influential church monument, to Penelope Boothby, in its church setting.⁹⁰ This showed how it sits in Ashbourne Church among an earlier series of recumbent effigies that clearly inspired his sensitive solution to commemorating a dead child as if she were asleep. She turns her back to her ancestors to face the wall, as the last of the family line. Nicholas Penny described it as 'one of the most original sculptures of the eighteenth century'; he set it in the social and intellectual context of travellers' guidebooks and of the patron's admiration for J. J. Rousseau and identified a classical source for the recumbent child on a sarcophagus, but he made no reference to its obviously influential neighbours and only illustrated it close up.⁹¹ With another contextual image (an 1845 drawing of a lost chapel interior) I also showed how Soane himself (presumably with his friend Banks) had installed in his house a model for a relief for a funerary monument and re-titled it. *Angels opening the gates of the Prison* is the plaster model for one side of the monument to another dead daughter, Mary Pakenham.⁹²

Other contextual illustrations in the exhibition catalogue further demonstrated the need to study sculptures in their settings. I found and illustrated a historic photograph showing Banks's bust of Warren Hastings in the stairwell at Lansdowne House, there politically paired with Joseph Wilton's bust of Oliver Cromwell (1762, now V&A). In the same catalogue I published my discovery of Banks's own bust of Cromwell, which clearly resembles Hastings in his features. The bust of Cromwell was removed from the RA exhibition in 1803 as an 'improper object' but was acquired by Johnes for Hafod.⁹³ In my most recent publication on Thomas Banks and his contemporaries (Bryant, 2015) I addressed the dilemma of patronage for original modern sculptures as a form of conspicuous charity, of encouragement without the responsibilities of ownership, before the fashion for private sculpture galleries provided suitable settings for collectors.

⁹⁰ Bryant 2005 pp. 51-3.

⁹¹ Nicholas Penny, *Church Monuments in Romantic England*, New Haven and London, 1977, pp. 115-6; 217.

⁹² Bryant 2005 cat. 58.

⁹³ Bryant 2005 pp. 41-2.

4e. Regency sculpture and interiors: Apsley House.

When promoted to the national curator role at English Heritage (1990) I took on several surviving period collections, such as Osborne and Brodsworth Hall; these provided more opportunities to study sculpture in their historic settings. Apsley House brought the chance to work with the Duke of Wellington's sculpture, especially Canova's *Napoleon* (1802-06). Recent scholars have seen this as an ill-conceived masterpiece rejected by Napoleon, installed by Wellington as if caged in a stairwell to humiliate the French. Coltman echoed C.M.S. Johns in her one sentence describing how it 'still languishes trophylike in the stairwell at his enemy's former home'.⁹⁴ I discovered and published its historic setting, which was only initially, in 1817, the old rectilinear stairwell designed by Robert Adam in 1771, before the room was redesigned by Benjamin Dean Wyatt in 1829 as a sculpture hall. The new main staircase served as a spiral viewing platform, encouraging close viewing of the statue as guests ascended to the piano nobile, beneath top lighting that gave a warm glow through a new yellow-coloured glass skylight. Canova's *Three Graces* (1814-17, installed 1819, now V&A) benefitted from similar lighting effects in Woburn's sculpture gallery. I also showed how the sculpture's prime location called for the re-arrangement of busts in the adjacent ante-room, and I deduced what this neoclassical ensemble would have meant to Wellington's international visitors. I re-presented the sculpture in its setting as the key to understanding Apsley House as Wellington's project, to create a personal museum, with a collection he formed to celebrate 'his' victory at Waterloo, to answer comparisons with Blucher and Marlborough as to who was the greatest military commander of modern times. Wellington needed a god-like image of his foe at the start of his museum to make his victory all the more colossal (Bryant 2005a).

Thinking about the social setting of Apsley House, I realised that several major sculptures by Canova had once stood close by, in the entrance halls of Park Lane town houses. For the entrance hall of his house on Park Lane the Earl of Dudley commissioned Matthew Cotes Wyatt to produce a heroic portrait of his dog, *Bashaw* (1831-34, V&A).⁹⁵ In the memorial volume to Benedict Read (2018) I showed it to

⁹⁴ Coltman, op. cit. note 32, p. 9; C. M. S. Johns, *Antonio Canova and the Politics of Patronage in Revolutionary and Napoleonic Europe*, Berkeley, 1998 pp. 88-109.

⁹⁵ Julius Bryant, *Bashaw*, V&A, London, 1983.

be the most controversial sculpture of its era, before Gibson's *Tinted Venus* (Bryant, 2018). Like Canova's *Napoleon*, Wyatt's ideal image of a dog caused concern by combining portraiture with the heroic vocabulary of Reynolds's 'Grand Manner'. Both raise issues around the social viewing of modern sculpture in private houses by Mayfair society, about the taste and intentions of the patron and the significance of display contexts.

4f. Public settings for Mid-Victorian sculpture: Mansion House

I explored the survival of the academic tradition in modern sculpture at two great events in London's mid-Victorian art world: the completion of the group commission for the Mansion House in the City of London and the showing of selections from the city's same commission at London's International Exhibition of 1862. Despite being a total anachronism by the time of its completion, Mansion House was the largest single public commission of neoclassical gallery sculpture ever in Britain. The 17 ideal statues are by artists including E. H. Baily, Foley, Theed the Younger, Weekes and J. S. Westmacott. This field of Victorian art has been dismissed as overly academic and derivative since the advent of *The New Sculpture*, c. 1877, by its champions at the time (most notably M. H. Spielmann) and by their followers to the present day (such as Richard Dorment and David J. Getsy). Indeed, only two of the sculptures in the Mansion House have featured in histories of Victorian sculpture. I identified this 'last gasp of neoclassicism' in my book on the sculpture in the Mansion House (Bryant 2013) and in my long article on fine art at the International Exhibition of 1862.⁹⁶ This took me back to Thomas Banks, who began his career (1751-2) at the Mansion House as an apprentice carver under the stonemason William Barlow. The house was designed by George Dance the Elder from 1737. In their classic surveys of British architecture, both John Summerson and Giles Worsley dismissed the Mansion House with the briefest of passing mentions, through seeing architecture as something to be judged according to their taste and as evidence of stylistic progress, or lack thereof.⁹⁷ I re-presented the building as the City of

⁹⁶ Julius Bryant, 'The progress and present condition of Modern Art', *Fine Art at the 1862 Exhibition* in *The Decorative Arts Society Journal* vol. 38 (2014) pp. 58-81.

⁹⁷ John Summerson, *Architecture in Britain 1530 to 1830*, 8th edition, London 1991, p. 341; Giles Worsley, *Classical Architecture in Britain. The Heroic Age*, London, 1995, pp. 125, 159.

London's response to William Kent's new Palladianism in the new city palaces of Westminster, enriched inside and out by decorative sculpture.

I went beyond the illustrated inventory of the Victorian statues in the Egyptian Hall (the state dining room) by Philip Ward-Jackson, by researching the full history of this scheme and by scrutinizing them in situ.⁹⁸ In 1793, after serving as mayor, Banks's patron Joseph Boydell proposed to commission sculpture to fill the empty niches. Banks should have been commissioned to make heroic or poetical statues with colleagues such as Bacon, Flaxman and Deare. The idea faded but was revived through the example of Prince Albert, both in his personal collecting of modern sculpture from 1844 (to be installed at Osborne) and in the prominence of British sculpture at the Great Exhibition in 1851. The Mansion House sculpture contracts from 1853 to 1861 survive in the London Metropolitan Archive and are very revealing. Most remarkable to discover was the absence of any control over the choice of subjects (they were to be chosen by the artists simply from British history or literature post-Chaucer). No historian had noticed that several sculptors chose subjects critical of feasting and worldly wealth, while others made adverse allusions to speech-makers. I also studied the quality of marble between the early and later commissions and, as I suspected, found evidence in the later contracts that the clients realised that this had to be specified and controlled. I also catalogued six surviving statuettes, identifying them as neither sketch models nor reduced replicas for reproduction but rather as small-scale proposals, as specified in the contracts.

My catalogue of the sculptures in Mansion House revealed for the first time the relevance of their subject matter, which made them a silent collective critique of the City's guests and of their self-indulgence. I also catalogued the splendid plasterwork and chimneypieces in the Mansion House, which (as at Chiswick) would normally fall between sculpture and architectural decoration. I documented the adverse public reception of the sculptures and their further rejection a century later by historians of The New Sculpture. I have been assured by two historians of Victorian sculpture, Michael Hatt (Warwick University) and Claire Jones (Birmingham University) who teach their students at the Mansion House, that neither had recognised the relevance

⁹⁸ Philip Ward-Jackson, *Public Sculpture of the City of London*, Liverpool, 2003, pp. 242-57. These entries appear to have been written from photographs as they do not transcribe the signatures to be found on each statue, only the inscriptions on the front of each base.

of the subjects to the setting. The book was reviewed in the newsletter of the PMSA as ‘a ‘must have’ for any Victorian Sculpture lover’s bookcase...the first ever complete account of British sculpture in the Mansion House...ranging from chimney-pieces and stucco work to highly important single marble statues, little known outside academic circles...the author brings fresh discerning eyes and appreciation to these sculptures and skilfully guides us through the history of their commissions’.⁹⁹

4g. Mid-Victorian sculpture for domestic interiors: Osborne, Brodsworth Hall, Down House and the Wernher Collection.

In the 1850s the Royal Academy liked to show sculpture against a strong dark red but elsewhere, in other exhibitions, other colours, tints and textiles were preferred by Richard Redgrave and by John Bell as backgrounds for sculpture.¹⁰⁰ When the Walker Art Gallery in Liverpool opened a new sculpture gallery in 1986, with stone-grey walls, the effect seemed to me wholly inappropriate for Victorian sculpture. The Walker’s centrepiece was Gibson’s *Tinted Venus*, which had been shown at the International Exhibition in 1862 sheltered beneath its own polychrome pavilion designed by Owen Jones. Among my former curatorial responsibilities at English Heritage two houses have rich polychrome Victorian interiors: Osborne (Isle of Wight) and Brodsworth Hall (Yorkshire). In their hallways white marble sculptures perform as contrasts to the colourful settings, and as surfaces for reflections and for coloured light falling from stained glass windows. Such effects became more obvious when, working with the Royal Collection, we had sculptures cleaned and others were returned from other houses to Osborne (also through purchase from the art trade). Similar sculptural revelations occurred at Brodsworth through a major conservation project, for the closed-up house (complete with 17,000 objects) was acquired in 1990 after the death of the first owners’ last descendant.

At Charles Darwin’s Down House (another property newly-acquired by English Heritage) as part of a comprehensive recreation and reinterpretation of the historic interior, I secured on long loan Thomas Woolner’s marble bust of the scientist, from Cambridge University’s Department of Plant Sciences. It is first recorded, in

⁹⁹ Anon., ‘Magnificent Marble Statues’, *Circumspice. Public Monuments and Sculpture Association Newsletter*, 47 (Winter 2013) p. 28

¹⁰⁰ John Bell, ‘Colour on Statues, Colour Round Statues, and Paintings and Sculpture arranged together’, *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, vol. 9, no. 440 (26 April 1861) pp. 421- 431.

Darwin's life time, holding pride of place in his dining room, alongside the collection of painted portraits that he assembled of his ancestors. The meaning of the sculpture and of the dining room (where he also heard formal appeals as the local magistrate) was transformed, along with Darwin's traditional characterisation as a modest, reclusive rural scientist (Bryant 2001).

The opportunity to 'save' the Wernher Collection (which I secured and moved from Luton Hoo to the Ranger's House, Blackheath) led me to recognise the popularity of imported Milanese sculpture that appealed to Victorian collectors in the 1860s, to Lord Iveagh (in his Dublin home) and at Osborne, Chiswick and Brodsworth. Milanese sculpture is not part of the story of British sculpture; nevertheless, as virtuoso carving in the spirit of Bernini, works by Bergonzoli, Magni, Argenti and Franchi clearly presented a market rival to the legacy of Banks, Flaxman and Westmacott and to the Rome school of Canova, Gibson and R. J. Wyatt, long before the arrival of Jules Dalou and of the New Sculpture. I published Bergonzoli's masterpiece at Luton Hoo (1864) along with other Milanese School sculptures still in their historic settings at Brodsworth and Osborne (Bryant 2002).

4h. John Lockwood Kipling

Rudyard Kipling's father might seem a long stretch from the world of British sculpture and interior design but my work on him as both a sculptor and as an interior designer of royal reception rooms (at Bagshot Park and Osborne) provides a fitting conclusion. I proposed the exhibition and book on *John Lockwood Kipling: Arts and Crafts in the Punjab and London* (2017) to the V&A, the Bard Graduate Center, New York, and to Yale University Press after the success of the William Kent exhibition. I had researched Kipling while restoring the Durbar Room that he designed for Queen Victoria at Osborne, for which I found and purchased several examples of the lost original carved furniture. Kipling trained as a ceramicist (in Stoke) and worked as an architectural sculptor on public buildings in South Kensington before moving to Bombay in 1865. The exhibition project provided an opportunity to look at British sculpture from another different perspective, from the South Kensington Schools (and their network of schools in India) rather than from the steps of the Royal Academy. The South Kensington Museum ('V&A' from 1899) did more than showcase the decorative arts. It celebrated the unity and

interdependence of the fine and decorative arts through the paradigm of Renaissance ateliers that produced paintings, sculptures and designs for tapestries, silver, armour, furniture and ceramics.

Histories of British sculpture identify the demise of neoclassicism with the rise of the Arts and Crafts movement and of ‘The New Sculpture’.¹⁰² The former is credited to William Morris from the 1860s, the latter to the French modeller Jules Dalou, who taught at the South Kensington Schools 1877-9. Lockwood Kipling has not featured hitherto in histories or dictionaries of British sculpture. Kipling’s sculpture is inseparable from his designs for medals, jewellery, furniture, interiors and from the bas-reliefs he modelled for book illustrations.

In reconstructing his career as an Arts and Crafts sculptor (Bryant 2016; 2017) I first highlighted the influence of his teachers Albert-Ernest Carrier-Belleuse and Hughes Protat. Both French sculptors taught modelling in clay at the art school attached to the Stoke potteries in the mid-1850s, over two decades before Dalou moved to South Kensington. I located Kipling at a cross roads between the tradition of Bacon and Flaxman (who both trained and worked as designers for ceramics before joining the RA to become sculptors) and the South Kensington Schools. My publication of Kipling’s early relief sculptures for buildings in Bombay benefitted from my customary approach of observing and describing them in their settings, for they function (still) as non-lingual advertisements to attract users and customers into a three-acre covered market. I showed how sensitive Kipling was in his architectural sculpture in relating style to buildings. I traced how, in his sculpture he sought to ‘assimilate’ (his word) contemporary British sculpture (to be found in Bombay’s town hall and cathedral) with his crafts background, with the lessons learnt from the South Kensington Museum’s growing collection of Italian Renaissance sculpture and casts of masterpieces, from photographs of contemporary French sculpture and (once he moved to Lahore) from his studies of the ancient Gandharan sculpture of the Punjab. This cosmopolitan and pan-material approach to British sculpture echoed my earlier call for a more international context, beyond the RA and Rome.

Of all my publications, *Kipling* has been the most reviewed (all positively) in *The New York Review of Books*, the *Wall Street Journal* and the British national press.

¹⁰² M. H. Spielmann, *British Sculpture and Sculptors of Today*, London, 1901.

The co-editor, Susan Weber, and I were rewarded in Montreal with an international first prize for an exhibition catalogue in 2018, as voted by members of the Association of Art Museum Curators; it also made the final five titles shortlisted for the annual Berger Prize for British Art History. When Professor Jason Edwards (York University) brought his sculpture history students so I could take them around the exhibition he came away convinced that ‘Kipling is major’. As evidence of my current academic standing in the field of British sculpture I would add that in 2019 Professor Edwards invited me to join the new AHRC-funded project *Pantheons: Sculpture at St Paul’s Cathedral* as one of only two sculpture specialists on the advisory board.

5. Conclusion

This Critical Appraisal demonstrates how my work challenges the limited concept of modern sculpture as fine art, as promoted by the founders of the RA from the 1760s onward. This view of sculpture, as an aspect of a modern art world dominated by paintings and by exhibitions, still frames and constrains much of the study of British sculpture of the period today. I believe sculpture in Britain needs to be understood in a much wider context. For this Critical Appraisal I am required to locate and evaluate my research publications in ‘the general literature of the field’ but, as I have shown, my field lies between, and connects, the study of British sculpture with the ‘sister arts’, not only of painting, architecture and literature but also of furniture, interior design, decoration and related crafts. In recent years, sculpture studies have benefitted from embracing the social history of visual culture, but British sculpture of this period still needs to be approached from a broader perspective, not as autonomous fine art, intellectually superior to decorative crafts, but as a collaborative medium, responding to locations, as part of the applied arts of design, and in a longer time-frame, from the Georgian (or ‘long eighteenth century’) well into the Victorian eras. Over 35 years, my research, acquisitions, publications, exhibitions and redisplay of sculptures and of sculptural figurative furniture in historic interiors, have demonstrated how to bridge this span of approaches, of time periods and of materials. In short, my work reveals both the need, and a way, to write a fresh history of sculpture in Britain.

ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Designed by William Kent, carved by James Richards and George Murray, *Pier table*, c. 1730 (English Heritage, Marble Hill)

2. Probably designed and carved by Giovanni Battista Guelfi, *Console table* c. 1720-25 (English Heritage, Chiswick House).

3. William Kent, *Designs for the North and South Walls of the Saloon, Houghton Hall*, a pair, pen and ink, grey and sepia wash, 1725 (private collection).

4. After Robert and James Adam, *Designs for furniture at Kenwood*, engraving, 1774

5. William Sharp, *Trade card*, engraving, 1772 (Victoria and Albert Museum) [V&A 28313.44]

6. J. Hamble after A. Pugin, *The North Transept, Westminster Abbey*, aquatint, 1812 (private collection).

PUBLICATIONS on British sculpture and interior settings by Julius Bryant

Numbered items are bound in with the Critical Appraisal; others submitted as books. Word count (approximate) is given below in square brackets.

Sole-authored Books:

Bryant 2005 –see book: *Thomas Banks, 1735-1805*, Sir John Soane’s Museum, London, 2005 [32,000] with an essay by Helen Dorey.

Bryant 2013 –see book: *Magnificent Marble Statues. British Sculpture in the Mansion House*. Paul Holberton Publishing, London, 2013 [20,830] with an essay by Clare Gifford.

Articles and exhibition catalogue essays and entries (sole-authored):

- 1. Bryant 1983:** ‘Mourning Achilles: a missing sculpture by Thomas Banks’ *Burlington Magazine*, 125, December 1983, pp. 742-45 [2,000]
- 2. Bryant 1985:** ‘The Church Memorials of Thomas Banks’ *Church Monuments*, I, 1985, pp. 49-64 [6,600]
- 3. Bryant 1986:** ‘Alfred Gilbert by Richard Dormant’, *Oxford Art Journal*, 9, 1, 1986, pp. 74-76 [1,350]
- 4. Bryant 1988:** *Mrs Howard; ‘A Woman of Reason’*, English Heritage, Marble Hill, exhib cat., 1988, pp. 45-50, cat.25, 28, 29 [850]
- 5. Bryant 1988a:** ‘Back as Adam Intended’, *Country Life*, 183, 3 November 1988, pp. 192-5.[2,600]
- 6. Bryant 1990:** ‘Deciphering Palladian Decoration’, *Country Life*, 184, 19 April 1990, pp.162-3 [2,300]
- 7. Bryant 1990a:** *The Iveagh Bequest, Kenwood*, English Heritage, 1990, pp. 16-19 [2,000]
- 8. Bryant 1991:** ‘Thomas Banks’s ‘Anatomical Crucifixion’’, *Apollo*, 133, June 1991, pp. 409-11 [1,850]
- 9. Bryant 1996:** ‘The Chiswick Tables’, *National Art Collections Fund Annual Review*, 1996, pp.108-9 [1,500]
- 10. Bryant 2001:** ‘Charles Darwin by Thomas Woolner’, *English Heritage Collections Review*, 3, 2001, pp. 43-44 [c. 800]

- 11. Bryant 2002:** ‘Bergonzoli’s *Amori degli Angeli*: The Victorian taste for contemporary Latin sculpture’ *Apollo* , 156, September 2002, pp. 16-21 [2,000]
- 12. Bryant 2003:** ‘William Murray, 1st Earl of Mansfield by David Martin’ in J. Bryant, *Kenwood, Paintings in the Iveagh Bequest*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 2003, pp. 284-7[1,100].
- 13. Bryant 2004:** ‘Thomas Banks’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004, 60 vols., vol. 3 pp. 698-700 [2,500].
- 14. Bryant 2004a:** ‘J.C.F. Rossi’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004, 60 vols., vol. 47 pp. 880-881 [1,200]
- 15. Bryant 2005a:** ‘How Canova and Wellington honoured Napoleon’ *Apollo*, 162, October 2005, pp. 38-43. [5,200]
- 16. Bryant 2005b:** ‘The Royal Academy’s ‘violent democrat’: Thomas Banks’, *British Art Journal*, 6, 3, winter 2005/06, pp. 51-58. [6,409]
- 17. Bryant 2005c:** ‘Thomas Banks’s Missing ‘Cupid’, *Apollo*, 161, February 2005, pp. 50-52. [2,000]
- 18. Bryant 2006:** ‘The Purest Taste’- James ‘Athenian’ Stuart’s work in Villas and Country Houses’, in S. Weber Soros, ed., *James ‘Athenian’ Stuart: the Rediscovery of Antiquity, 1713-88*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 2006, pp. 265-315. [13,200]
- 19. Bryant 2013:** ‘Exemplar Virtutis’: Designs for Sculpture’, in S. Weber, ed. *William Kent*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 2013, pp. 548-87. [13,237]
- 20. Bryant 2015:** ‘Eccentric Pioneers? Patrons of Modern Sculpture for Britain c. 1790’, in: *Burning Bright. Essays in honour of David Bindman*, ed. D. Dethloff, T. Murdoch and K. Sloan with C. Elam, UCL Press, London, 2015, pp. 66-75 [3,776]
- 21. Bryant 2016:** ‘John Lockwood Kipling’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online, unpaginated, 2016 [1,200]
- 22. Bryant 2017:** ‘ Lockwood Kipling as a sculptor’, in *John Lockwood Kipling, Arts and Crafts in the Punjab and London*, ed. J. Bryant and S. Weber, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 2017, pp. 81-105 [9,571]

23. Bryant 2018: “‘Out of the legitimate line of art’: Bashaw by M. C. Wyatt”, in *Essays for Benedict Read* edited by K. Eustace, J. Barnes and M. Stocker, PMSA Publishing, London, 2018, pp. 40-53 [3,731]

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Malcolm Baker, *Figured in Marble. The Making and Viewing of Eighteenth-Century Sculpture*, London, 2000
- Malcolm Baker, *The Marble Index, Roubiliac and Sculptural Portraiture in Eighteenth-century Britain*, New Haven and London, 2014
- Malcolm Baker and David Bindman, *Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-Century Monument. Sculpture as Theatre*, New Haven and London, 1995
- Michael Baxandall, *Limewood Sculptors of Renaissance Germany*, New Haven and London, 1980
- C. F. Bell, *Annals of Thomas Banks*, Cambridge, 1938
- Geoffrey Beard and Christopher Gilbert, eds., *Dictionary of English Furniture Makers, 1660-1840*, Leeds, 1986.
- Diane Bilbey, with Marjorie Trusted, *British Sculpture 1470 to 2000. A Concise Catalogue of the Collection at the Victoria and Albert Museum*, London
- Joan Coutu, *Persuasion and Propaganda. Monuments and the Eighteenth-Century British Empire*. Montreal and London, 2006
- Matthew Craske, *The Silent Rhetoric of the Body: a history of sculpture and commemorative art in England 1720-1770*, New Haven and London, 2007
- Matthew Craske, ‘Contacts and Contracts. Sir Henry Cheere and the Formation of a new Commercial World of Sculpture in Mid-Eighteenth-Century London’, in Cinzia Sicca and Alison Yarrington, *The Lustrous Trade: Material Culture and the History of Sculpture in England and Italy c. 1700-c. 1860*, London and New York, 2000, pp. 94-113
- Matthew Craske, ‘Extracting the meaning of a pile of pancakes. An analysis of Nicholas Read’s monument to Admiral Tyrell (1766-70)’ in Jason Edwards and Sarah Burnage, eds., *The British School of Sculpture c. 1760-1832*, Abingdon and New York, 2017 pp. 238-9. Allan Cuninghame, *The Lives of the Most Eminent British Painters, Sculptors and Architects*, 2nd edn., vol. 3, London, 1830

Martina Droth, Michael Hatt and Jason Edwards, *Sculpture Victorious. Art in the Age of Invention, 1837-1901*, New Haven and London, 2015

Jason Edwards and Sarah Burnage, eds., *The British School of Sculpture c. 1760-1832*, Abingdon and New York, 2017

John Flaxman, *Lectures on Sculpture*, London, 1829

John Flaxman *Lectures on Sculpture*, second edition, London 1838 pp. 266, 284.: 'An Address ...on the Death of Thomas Banks'

Alexandra Gerstein, ed., *Display and Displacement: sculpture and the pedestal from Renaissance to post-Modern*, London, 2007

Holger Hook, *The King's Artists. The Royal Academy of Arts and the Politics of British Culture 1760-1840*, Oxford, 2003

David Irwin, *John Flaxman, 1755-1826. Sculptor, Illustrator, Designer*, London, 1979

Martin Myrone, *Bodybuilding. Reforming Masculinities in British Art 1750-1810*, New Haven and London, 2005, 23-32

Nicholas Penny, *Church Monuments in Romantic England*, New Haven and London, 1977

Nancy Pressly, *The Fuseli Circle in Rome*, exh. cat., Yale Center for British Art, 1979

Joshua Reynolds, ed. Robert R. Wark, *Discourses on Art*, New Haven and London, 1979

Ingrid Roscoe, ed., *A Biographical Dictionary of Sculptors in Britain*, Leeds, 2009

J. T. Smith, *Nollekens and his Times*, London, 1828

Alison Yarrington, *The Commemoration of the Hero, 1800-1864. Monuments to the British Victors of the Napoleonic Wars*. New Haven and London, 1988

Alison Yarrington, 'Art in the Dark: Viewing and Exhibiting Sculpture at Somerset House', in David Solkin ed., *Art on the Line*, New Haven and London, 2001, pp.173-187

Alison Yarrington, 'Canova and Thorwaldsen at Chatsworth', in D. Dethloff, T. Murdoch, K. Sloan and C. Elam, eds., *Burning Bright. Essays in Honour of David Bindman*, London 2015, pp. 76-88

Alison Yarrington, 'Bringing Modern Rome to Chatsworth: The Formation of the 6th Duke of Devonshire's Sculpture Collection' in Tomas Macsotay, ed., *Rome*,

Travel and the Sculpture Capital, c. 1770-1825, London and New York, 2017,
pp. 79-92

Philip Ward-Jackson, *Public Sculpture of the City of London*, Liverpool, 2003

M. I. Webb, *Michael Rysbrack, Sculptor*, London, 1954

Margaret Whinney, *Sculpture in Britain, 1530-1830*, Harmondsworth, 1964, edited
and revised by John Physick, London, 1988

Rudolf Wittkower, *Sculpture. Process and Principles*, London, 1977

[16,962 words]