



Genteel Mavericks

Professional Women Sculptors in Victorian Britain

Shannon Hunter Hurtado

Peter Lang

Cultural Interactions: Studies in the Relationship between the Arts

Sculpture was no occupation for a lady in Victorian Britain. Yet between 1837 and 1901 the number of professional female sculptors increased sixteen-fold. The four principal women sculptors of that era are the focus of this book. Once known for successful careers marked by commissions from the royal family, public bodies and private individuals, they are forgotten now. This book brings them back to light, addressing who they were, how they negotiated middle-class expectations and what kind of impact they had on changing gender roles.

Based on their unpublished letters, papers and diaries coupled with contemporary portrayals of female sculptors by novelists, critics, essayists and colleagues, this is an unprecedented picture of the women sculptors' personal experience of preparing for and conducting careers as well as the public's perception of them. The author examines each woman's ability to use her position within the historical and cultural context as a platform from which to instigate change. The analytical emphasis throughout is on the art of negotiation and the result is an interdisciplinary work that delves deeply into the experience of an undervalued cohort of artists who had a disproportionate influence on Victorian social norms.

Shannon Hunter Hurtado is an independent scholar who specializes in nineteenth-century British sculpture, particularly sculpture made by women. She teaches history of art at the University of Edinburgh and has been a researcher for the Public Monuments and Sculpture Association's National Recording Project, Edinburgh volume. Previously, she held a post-doctoral fellowship at the Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities, University of Edinburgh.



Genteel Mavericks

CULTURAL INTERACTIONS
Studies in the Relationship between the Arts

Edited by J.B. Bullen

Volume 27



PETER LANG

Oxford • Bern • Berlin • Bruxelles • Frankfurt am Main • New York • Wien

Shannon Hunter Hurtado

Genteel Mavericks

Professional Women Sculptors
in Victorian Britain



PETER LANG

Oxford • Bern • Berlin • Bruxelles • Frankfurt am Main • New York • Wien

Bibliographic information published by Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek. Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data:

Hurtado, Shannon Hunter, 1951-

Genteel mavericks : professional women sculptors in Victorian Britain / Shannon Hunter Hurtado.

pages cm -- (Cultural Interactions : studies in the relationship between the arts ; 27)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-3-0343-0756-7 (alk. paper)

1. Women sculptors--Great Britain--Social conditions--19th century.

I. Title.

NB496.H87 2012

730.82'0941--dc23

2012007140

ISSN 1662-0364

ISBN 978-3-0343-0756-7 (**paperback**)

ISBN 978-3-0353-0320-9 (eBook)

Cover image: Roger Fenton, *Mary Thornycroft with 'Princess Helena as Peace'* (c. 1848). © Conway Library, Courtauld Institute of Art, London.

© Peter Lang AG, International Academic Publishers, Bern 2012

Hochfeldstrasse 32, CH-3012 Bern, Switzerland

info@peterlang.com, www.peterlang.com, www.peterlang.net

All rights reserved.

All parts of this publication are protected by copyright.

Any utilisation outside the strict limits of the copyright law, without the permission of the publisher, is forbidden and liable to prosecution.

This applies in particular to reproductions, translations, microfilming, and storage and processing in electronic retrieval systems.

Printed in Germany

To Larry, Elysse and Jess

In memory of Betty and Gorde Hunter

Contents

List of Figures	ix
List of Abbreviations	xiii
Acknowledgements	xv
Introduction	i
 PART I Personal Experiences	 ii
 CHAPTER 1	
Family Matters	13
 CHAPTER 2	
Carving Out a Career	69
 CHAPTER 3	
Making their Way	113
 CHAPTER 4	
Characteristics and Convictions	161

PART II	Public Perceptions	205
CHAPTER 5		
	Critical Appraisals	207
CHAPTER 6		
	Hoydens or Heroines? Literary Portrayals of Female Sculptors	239
CHAPTER 7		
	Impacts	273
	Epilogue	287
	Appendix	291
	Bibliography	293
	Index	325

Figures

- 1 Mary Grant, *The Ladies' Field*, 15 July 1899, original photograph by Thomson, Grosvenor Street, London, reproduction: National Library of Scotland © Trustees of the National Library of Scotland.
- 2 Susan Durant, *The Queen*, 27 February 1873, steel engraving.
- 3 D. O. Hill and Alexander MacGlashon, *The Sculptor of 'Sir Galahad, the Good Knight'*, 1861–1862, albumen silver print from glass negative. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, David Hunter McAlpin Fund, 1946 (46.1.13) Image © Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- 4 Roger Fenton, *Mary Thornycroft with 'Princess Helena as Peace'*, c. 1848 photograph © Conway Library, The Courtauld Institute of Art, London.
- 5 Amelia Paton Hill, *Self Portrait*, [1849], wax, Dunfermline Museum © Fife Council Museums: Dunfermline. Licensor www.scran.ac.uk.
- 6 Susan Durant, *Baron Henry de Triqueti*, 1864, marble © J. Faujour/Musée Girodet, Montargis, France.
- 7 Amelia Paton Hill, *James Hay Erskine Wemyss Esq. of Wemyss*, 1865, marble, Cupar County Hall © Fife Council Licensor www.scran.ac.uk.
- 8 Mary Grant, *Sir Francis Grant, PRA*, 1866, marble © Royal Academy of Arts, London.
- 9 Mary Grant, *Memorial to Lady Augusta Stanley*, 1876, marble, South transept, Dunfermline Abbey, photograph: author's own, photographic editing: Jesse Hurtado.
- 10 Mary Grant, *Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, Dean of Westminster*, 1884, bronze relief, St Giles' Cathedral, Edinburgh © Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland B/64025.
- 11 Mary Grant, *Queen Margaret Canmore*, 1876, marble, Dunfermline City Chambers, photograph: author's own, photographic editing: Jesse Hurtado.

- 12 Mary Thornycroft, *Melpomene*, 1872, bronze © Leeds Museums & Galleries (Henry Moore Institute Archive).
- 13 Amelia Paton Hill, *Mary Louise, Countess of Elgin and Kincardine*, 1863, marble, Ottawa © Crown Collection, Official Residences of Canada, National Capital Commission.
- 14 Amelia Paton Hill, *Mrs A. Burns Shand*, [*Lady Shand*], 1865, marble © Royal Scottish Academy.
- 15 Amelia Paton Hill, *Robert Burns*, 1882, marble, Dumfries © Dumfries and Galloway Museums Service. Licensor www.scran.ac.uk.
- 16 Susan Durant, *Monument to Leopold King of the Belgians*, 1867, marble, Esher Parish Church, Surrey © Conway Library, Courtauld Institute of Art, London, photograph: A. F. Kersting.
- 17 Sir John Steell, *Albert Memorial*, 1876, detail, bronze, Charlotte Square, Edinburgh, photograph: L. W. Hurtado.
- 18 Susan Durant, *Ruth*, 1869, marble, private collection, photograph: L. W. Hurtado.
- 19 Mary Thornycroft, *Princess Alexandra*, 1864, Parian porcelain © The Trustees of the British Museum. All rights reserved.
- 20 Mary Thornycroft, *Skippping Girl*, 1856, marble, private collection © Christie's Images Ltd 2011.
- 21 Amelia Paton Hill, *D. O. Hill*, 1868, marble © Scottish National Portrait Gallery.
- 22 Mary Grant, *Diana After Her Bath*, 1889, marble, BUILD-A-BOOK Initiative, *Celebration of Women Writers*, <http://digital.library.upenn.edu/women/elliott/art/art.html> (consulted 1 July 2011).
- 23 Susan Durant, *The Faithful Shepherdess*, 1861, marble © Guildhall Art Gallery, City of London.
- 24 Amelia Paton Hill, *David Livingstone Monument* 1876, bronze, Princes Street, Edinburgh © T. Jack Thompson.
- 25 NPG 1087 *Charles Stewart Parnell* by Mary Grant, plaster cast of bust, 1892 © National Portrait Gallery, London.

- 26 Mary Thornycroft, *Winter – the Prince of Wales*, 1846, marble, from S. C. Hall, *The Gallery of Modern Sculpture*, 1854, engraved by W. Roffe, Osborne House, photograph: © Trustees of the National Library of Scotland.
- 27 Mary Grant, *St Margaret and the Dragon*, 1878, marble, from the *Art Journal*, 1881, engraved by G. J. Stodart, Cathedral Church of St Paul, Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, photograph: © Edinburgh City Libraries www.capitalcollections.org.uk.
- 28 Susan Durant, *Harriet Beecher Stowe*, wood block engraving, *Illustrated London News*, 18 July 1857, photograph: © Edinburgh City Libraries www.capitalcollections.org.uk.
- 29 Mary Grant, *George Vanderbilt*, 1889, bronze, Biltmore House. Used with permission from The Biltmore Company, Asheville, North Carolina.
- 30 Amelia Paton Hill, *Margaret Carnegie*, 1881, marble, Dunfermline Carnegie Library, photograph: author's own, photographic editing: Jesse Hurtado.
- 31 Amelia Paton Hill, *Richard Coeur de Lion*, RSA 1874, stone, Scott Monument, Princes Street, Edinburgh © City of Edinburgh Council Licensor www.scran.ac.uk.
- 32 Mary Thornycroft and John Gibson, *Monument to Sarah, Baroness Braye*, 1862, marble, St Nicholas' Church, Stanford-on-Avon, Northamptonshire © Conway Library, The Courtauld Institute of Art, London.
- 33 *Braye Monument*, detail © Conway Library, The Courtauld Institute of Art, London.
- 34 Mary Grant, *Monument to Henry Fawcett*, 1896, detail, bronze relief, medallion and inscription Victoria Embankment, London © Conway Library, The Courtauld Institute of Art, London.
- 35 Mary Grant, *Reredos*, 1880, marble, St Mary's Episcopal Cathedral, Edinburgh © Conway Library, The Courtauld Institute of Art, London.
- 36 Mary Grant, *Reredos*, detail, marble roundel © Conway Library, The Courtauld Institute of Art, London.
- 37 Susan Durant, *Harriet Beecher Stowe*, 1857, marble © Harriet Beecher Stowe Center, Hartford, CT, photograph: E. Irving Blomstrann.

- 38 Susan Durant, *George Grote*, 1863, marble, image by courtesy of the Conway Library, The Courtauld Institute of Art, London, photograph: Rupert Gunnis.
- 39 Susan Durant, *Nina Lehmann*, 1871, white marble and hardstone inlay, private collection © Prudence Cuming Associates Limited.
- 40 Mary Thornycroft, *Mary, Duchess of Gloucester*, 1852, marble, Frogmore House, Windsor, The Royal Collection © 2011 Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.
- 41 Mary Thornycroft, *Mrs Russell Barrington*, 1881, bronze, Leighton House, London © Leighton House Museum, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, photograph: John Rogers.
- 42 Amelia Paton Hill, *Hugh Miller*, 1869, marble, half life-size, SCOTLANDS-IMAGES.COM, National Museums Scotland.
- 43 Amelia Paton Hill, *Alexander Kilgour*, 1881, bronze, City Chambers, Dunfermline, photograph: author's own, photographic editing: Jesse Hurtado.
- 44 Amelia Paton Hill, *Thomas Carlyle*, 1867, marble, Ecclefechan, Dumfries © Conway Library, The Courtauld Institute of Art, London.
- 45 Amelia Paton Hill, *Sir Joseph Noel Paton*, 1874, marble © Scottish National Portrait Gallery.
- 46 Left hand of Mrs Thornycroft, plaster cast by J. E. Boehm © Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
- 47 Amelia Paton Hill, *Minnie Troil*, 1871, stone, Scott Monument, Princes Street Gardens © The City of Edinburgh Council Licensor www.scran.ac.uk.
- 48 Mary Grant, *Henry Erskine, Lord Advocate*, 1877, marble © Scottish National Portrait Gallery.
- 49 Susan Durant, *Princess Louise*, 1866, marble, Albert Memorial Chapel, Windsor Castle, The Royal Collection © 2011 Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

Abbreviations

BI	British Institution
DNB	Dictionary of National Biography
GI	Royal Glasgow Institute of the Fine Arts
GSLA	Glasgow Society of Lady Artists
NLS	National Library of Scotland
ODNB	Oxford Dictionary of National Biography
PRA	President of the Royal Academy
PRSA	President of the Royal Scottish Academy
RA	Royal Academy of Arts
RSA	Royal Scottish Academy
SFA	Society of Female Artists
SWA	Society of Women Artists (formerly SFA)

Acknowledgements

As I made the final preparations for the publication of this book, I was profoundly aware that what, at times, had seemed to be a solitary endeavour entailed contributions from a host of individuals and institutions to whom I would like to express my appreciation.

I am grateful to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II for kindly granting access to the documents in the Royal Archives and images from the Royal Collection which made it possible to bring these sculptors back to light. Likewise, I am indebted to those private collectors who permitted me to view and photograph those works by women sculptors in their possession.

At different stages of the book's development I received advice and encouragement, initially from Peter Bailey, my doctoral supervisor, Janice Helland, Mary Kinnear, Claudine Majzels, and Arlene Young, who helped shape my doctoral thesis, and subsequently from Sylvia Allen, Patsy Campbell, Vicky Coltman, Elizabeth Cumming, Dianne King, Fiona Pearson, Sian Reynolds, Tracy Smith, Mark Stocker, Belinda and Richard Thomson, Alison Yarrington and Eileen Yeo. From the outset of the project, Philip Ward-Jackson, former Conway Librarian, has served as a beacon, shedding light upon valuable sources of information about Susan Durant and her works. Helen Smailes, National Gallery of Scotland, freely shared her knowledge of Amelia Paton Hill's and Mary Grant's careers, smoothing the way for my research through introductions to other researchers and owners of the sculptors' works. Ruth Spoerri, former archivist, Cathedral Church of St Paul, Fond du Lac, Wisconsin supplied copies of Grant's correspondence and Joan Copeland allowed ready access to her transcriptions of the sculptor's diary. I am indebted to Margaret Campbell who alerted me to the existence of this diary and other helpful resources.

At the Henry Moore Institute Jon Wood and archivists Adeline van Roon and Victoria Worsely made the long days of delving into the Thornycroft archive especially fruitful, alerting me to auxiliary materials

and discussing the implications of my findings. Lady de Bellaigue, the former Registrar of the Royal Archives at Windsor Castle, and her staff, greatly facilitated my research visits with their efficient presentation of archive documents and friendly welcome. Miss Pamela Clark, the current Registrar, meticulously checked relevant portions of the manuscript, sharpening the focus and ensuring accuracy. Klaus Dorst, Kustos für Architektur und Denkmalpflege, at Schloss Sanssouci, Potsdam, was most helpful in showing me a grave monument related to Durant's work and in providing relevant documentation. Richard Dagonne of the Musée Girodet, Montargis gave ready access to the files relative to the Triqueti family.

My gratitude goes to Patsy Campbell, Philip Ward-Jackson and Ben Read for the effective references they wrote and advice they offered. Sara Stevenson, Scottish National Portrait Gallery, Alison Morrison-Low, National Museum of Scotland, and Janice Helland, Queens University, Canada, all provided me with copies of important articles that I otherwise would have had difficulty obtaining; Rocco Lieuallen and Roddy Simpson supplied helpful leads. The Visual Arts Research Institute, Edinburgh afforded the opportunity to present and discuss aspects of my research at an Institute colloquium.

Many thanks are due to the staff of several institutions who made special efforts to assist my work: the National Library of Scotland (especially issue hall staff); the British Library Manuscripts Reading Room; Geoffrey Fisher at the Conway Library, Courtauld Institute; David Doughan formerly at the Fawcett Library, Guildhall University, London; Joanna Soden, the Royal Scottish Academy; S. Munt, Ipswich Record Office; the National Art Library, Victoria and Albert Museum; the National Portrait Gallery; the House of Lords Library; the staff of the library of the Royal Commission on Ancient and Historical Monuments in Scotland; Alison Stoddart, Fine Art Department, Edinburgh City Libraries; Kate Perry at the Girton College Archive, Cambridge University; the Guildhall Archive, London; Christopher Ridgway, Castle Howard; and Marjorie Trusted and Amy Mechowski, the Victoria & Albert Museum.

Obtaining the images that enliven the text was made possible through the assistance of Louisa Dare, Courtauld Images; Daniel Bell, Royal Collection; Neal Stimler, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Jane Freel,

Kirkcaldy Museum and Art Gallery; Dunfermline Carnegie Library staff; Philip Hunt, National Galleries of Scotland; Joanna Soden and Sandy Wood, Royal Scottish Academy; Monika Duda, Guildhall Art Gallery; Chris Sutherns, British Museum Images; Steven McNeil and Kenn Bingley, Official Residences of Canada; Jennifer Camilleri, Royal Academy of Arts; Elizabeth Burgess, Harriet Beecher Stowe Center; Rebecca Jallot, Leighton House Museum; Jill Hawkins and Erica Walker, Biltmore Estate; Claire Mayoh and Jim Bright, Henry Moore Institute Archive; Tom Morgan, National Portrait Gallery, London; Celia Harvey, Christie's Images Limited; Patricia Clement, Musée Girodet; Louise McCarron, National Library of Scotland; Marc Dalton, Prudence Cuming Associates Ltd; Jack Thompson; and L. W. Hurtado and Jesse Hurtado.

My research was supported by generous financial assistance from the following: the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Doctoral Fellowship Programme; the University of Manitoba Graduate Fellowship program; the J. G. Fletcher Faculty of Arts Award fund, University of Manitoba; and the Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities, University of Edinburgh, Postdoctoral Fellowship. Grants from the Henry Moore Institute, Leeds (for publishers) and the Paul Mellon Foundation (for authors) defrayed the costs of publishing the images.

Warm thanks are due to my publisher, Peter Lang Ltd, for producing such a pleasing result. Hannah Godfrey (editor), Isabel James (office administrator) and Gemma Lewis (text formatter) enviably combined the qualities of patience and efficiency necessary to bring the project to a satisfying conclusion.

Kind friends Shirley Levacy, Linda Parsons, Joy Ooto, Mary Dewar and Grace Evans in Canada lent their word-processing skills and acted as sounding boards to my ideas and anxieties. Elizabeth Koepping, Helena McIntyre and Christina Martin cheered me on in Edinburgh. The unflagging (often hilarious) support of the 'Aunty-bodies,' Daphne Bowles, Jody Hunter and Sandra Pritchard, buoyed me up. Throughout this project, Larry Hurtado has been my warmest advocate. His enthusiastic encouragement, sound advice and readiness to assist with indexing, photography and proof reading have enabled me to bring it to fruition, for which I am deeply grateful.

Introduction

Sculpture, once described by Zola as the ‘manliest’ of the arts, became the chosen profession of an increasing number of women during the course of the nineteenth century.¹ By the 1850s the major art exhibitions in Great Britain, Europe and North America regularly displayed statues, reliefs, and busts created by women. This development marked a considerable departure from the art activity of British women during the previous century when just one female sculptor was recorded at the exhibitions.

The expanding number of women sculptors is indicative of a trend in the wider world of art; between 1841 and 1871 the number of women employed in the fine arts in Britain rose from 278 to 1,069 – a 284 per cent increase. Just how many of these women identified themselves as sculptors to the census takers is difficult to determine, although it is safe to say that the majority of the respondents were painters in oils or water colours.² Nevertheless, a rudimentary tabulation of the numbers of female sculptors named in the *Athenaeum* reviews of the art exhibitions from 1840 to 1900 testifies to their burgeoning ranks. During the 1840s Mary Thornycroft alone gained the critics’ notice, whereas by the 1890s twenty-five women sculptors were acknowledged in the sculpture gallery reviews. This remarkable upsurge betokens a fundamental shift in attitudes toward women’s roles that developed as the century progressed.

This book is concerned with the first wave of professional women sculptors who participated in this phenomenon. Susan Durant, Mary Grant, Amelia Paton Hill and Mary Thornycroft embarked upon their

1 Emile Zola, *L'oeuvre*; quoted in Maurice Rheims, *Nineteenth-Century Sculpture*, trans. Robert E. Wolf (New York: Abrams, 1977), 7.

2 Pamela Gerrish Nunn, *Victorian Women Artists* (London: The Women’s Press, 1987), 2. Whereas the manuscript census sometimes specifies which medium a woman worked in, the published digest records female artists as an undifferentiated aggregate.

careers during the first quarter of Queen Victoria's reign, working continuously until death or old age intervened. With no tradition of professional female sculptors to follow (their most capable predecessor, Anne Seymour Damer, practised as a lady amateur), they had to chart their own career paths in a culture which was unaccustomed to women taking on such work. *Genteel Mavericks* investigates how they negotiated the middle-class expectations that both facilitated and constrained their work, and assesses the social impact of their involvement in such an unconventional occupation. Based on their personal experiences and the public's perception of them, this study is intended to advance current knowledge about the female sculptors themselves and to contribute to our understanding of changing gender relations in the nineteenth century.

Although few in number, these women occupied a strategic position in the history of women's emancipation. By adopting sculpture as a profession, they resisted the social conventions which required women of the middle classes (from which they were almost exclusively derived) to remain in the domestic realm – earning no money, doing no manual labour. Sculpting was particularly antithetical to middle-class standards of female gentility because of the physicality involved in the materials used, the subject matter treated (the human body) and the exertion demanded.³ The exposure to public scrutiny and engagement in the marketplace, which were essential to an artistic career, further contravened social boundaries.⁴

Whether or not they set out to defy class and gender norms, these women stood out as mavericks. Moreover, the obstacles they encountered in pursuit of their profession caused them to re-evaluate the legal and

3 A. R. Mills, *Two Victorian Ladies* (Letchworth: Garden City Press, 1969), 124; quoted in Pamela Gerrish Nunn, 'Critically Speaking,' in Clarissa Campbell Orr, ed., *Women in the Victorian Art World* (Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 1995), 110; 'The Beatrice Cenci: from the statue by Harriet Hosmer,' *Art Journal* (1857), 124.

4 Susan P. Casteras and Linda H. Peterson, *A Struggle for Fame: Victorian Women Artists and Authors* (New Haven: Yale Centre for British Art, 1994), 14; Leonore Davidoff, *The Best Circles: Women and Society in Victorian England* (Totawa, New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield, 1973), 81.

social position of women in Britain, modifying their self-identity in the process. For example, Mary Thornycroft signed the petition (1859) sent by women to the Royal Academicians urging the admission of female students to the Academy Schools. Perhaps emboldened by the ultimately favourable outcome of this and related efforts to obtain equitable treatment, Thornycroft joined in a protest by English sculptors to the 'Notabilia of the Universal Exhibition' (Paris 1867) over unfair exhibiting practices. Hers was the only female name among the twenty-eight signatures of notable sculptors.⁵ Thus, the female sculptors stood at the leading edge of the confrontation between the dominant culture, which restricted women's realm of action, and the emerging feminist movement, which championed the right of women to enter the professions and gain control over all areas of their lives.

Despite having enjoyed substantial success and professional recognition during their lifetimes, like many other female artists of the period they have become shadowy figures, existing primarily as names in archives, exhibition records, biographical dictionaries and a small number of scholarly articles. Their works, which are on display in public buildings in Britain, France, Canada and the United States, stand as mute testimony to their former celebrity. These women now occupy a tenuous position at the margins of history.

Since the 1980s, considerable attention has been given to female painters and decorative artists of Victorian Britain, yet the women sculptors have remained in obscurity. References to them in books about Victorian sculpture or women artists are tantalizingly brief. In *Beyond the Frame*, Deborah Cherry includes the British women in her chapter about the American sculptor, Harriet Hosmer. Benedict Read's *Victorian Sculpture* names them and addresses the difficulties they faced. In her book, *Victorian Women Artists*, Pamela Gerrish Nunn offers glimpses of their celebrity recorded in the periodical press of the time. Charlotte Yeldham's extensive two-volume study, *Women Artists in Nineteenth-Century France*

5 'The Royal Academy,' *The Athenaeum* 1644 (30 April 1859), 581. 'Notabilia of the Universal Exhibition,' *Art Journal* (1867), 156.

and England briefly acknowledges the female sculptors in the text and in biographical sketches presented in the appendix. Susan Beattie's *The New Sculpture* devotes several pages to women's particular contributions in the field. American women sculptors have received more attention with Dolly Sherwood's lengthy biography, *Harriet Hosmer, American Sculptor, 1830–1908*, Charmaine Nelson's monograph on Edmonia Lewis, *Color of Stone: Sculpting the Black Female Subject in Nineteenth-Century America*, and Kirsten Pai Buick's book, *Child of the Fire: Mary Edmonia Lewis and the Problem of Art History's Black and Indian Subjects*. More comprehensive studies of the British sculptors are yet to be published.

What has caused this lag? Due to their greater numbers the painters have attracted much more notice from scholars of art and women's history than have the sculptors. Female artists are far less thoroughly documented than their male counterparts (largely due to gender bias), so it is not surprising that historians should concentrate their efforts on a cohort of women whose larger numbers make it easier to collect data about them. This has unexpected side-effects. Because much of our knowledge about women in the Victorian art world is derived from studies of female painters, their experience unintentionally has come to stand for that of female artists in general. As a result, there is little incentive to expend the effort necessary to rediscover a group, such as the female sculptors, whose story seemingly has been told. Certainly there are areas of overlap, but there are also important distinctions between these artists, the most pointed being the sculptors' tendency to work alongside men rather than with other women.

The second-place status accorded to sculpture is another deterrent. Nineteenth-century sources indicate that painting was given more consideration in exhibition space, review articles, and patrons' collections than was sculpture despite the latter's remarkable rise in popularity during the period.⁶ With the advent of Modernism, Victorian sculpture went out of

6 'Royal Academy,' *Athenaeum*, 22 May 1841, 406; 27 May 1848, 609; 18 May 1850, 534. The number of column inches devoted by such periodicals as the *Art Journal*, the *Times*, and the *Athenaeum* to a critique of the sculpture galleries in the major British exhibitions was considerably less than the space allotted to the paintings.

fashion among art historians for much of the twentieth century. Its recovery from this neglect has been much slower than that of Victorian painting.

An erroneous assumption, that women were physically unsuited to sculpting, has further deflected scholarly interest. Feminine weakness is a recurrent theme from the nineteenth century onward, ostensibly enlisted to explain why there were so few women sculptors or to justify (even prescribe) their production of small-scale works. Regardless of why it is invoked, an emphasis on weakness implies that sculpture made by women is inevitably second-rate: unworthy of our attention either because it is clumsily executed, insignificant or largely the work of male assistants. A better understanding of the standard studio practices of the period together with evidence of women's capability with carving tools and casting techniques will put the lie to this presupposition.

Attitudes are changing. The Public Monuments and Sculpture Association's massive project to record, in digital and printed form, all of the public sculpture in the United Kingdom reasserts sculpture's cultural value. 'Mapping the Practice and Profession of Sculpture in Britain and Ireland 1851–1951' is another wide-ranging initiative to gather information relative to sculpture production from diverse, often untapped, sources. Recent publications by David J. Getsy and Malcolm Baker, an exhibition by Jason Edwards, together with the expanded edition of *A Biographical Dictionary of Sculptors in Britain, 1660–1851*, signal a renewed interest in the sculpture of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Britain.⁷ Likewise, the increasing inclusion of women sculptors in reference works such as the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, *Dictionary of Women Artists*, *Encyclopedia of Sculpture*, and *Biographical Dictionary of Scottish Women* indicates a growing scholarly awareness of them.

7 David J. Getsy, *Body Doubles: Sculpture and the Pursuit of a Modern Ideal in Britain c. 1880–1930* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2004); Malcom Baker, *Figured in Marble* (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2000); Jason Edwards, *Sculpting the New Man: Alfred Gilbert, 1882–c. 1895* (Leeds: Henry Moore Institute, exh. cat., 2006); Emma Hardy, Ingrid Roscoe and M. G. Sullivan, *A Biographical Dictionary of Sculptors in Britain, 1660–1851* (London: Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art and Henry Moore Foundation, 2009).

The time is ripe for a more comprehensive examination of these female sculptors which will expand our knowledge and nuance our understanding of women's experience in the Victorian art world. *Genteel Mavericks* undertakes to relocate the professional women sculptors both within that art world and at the centre of the debate about women and employment which preoccupied the larger society. Though their names may not be familiar now, during their careers they were neither shadowy nor peripheral figures – this is not a tale of unrealized potential due to social restrictions. It would be inaccurate to see the women sculptors as an embattled minority. Rather, they are noteworthy for their resourcefulness and resilience in dealing with impediments to their progress.

To bring them back to light, *Genteel Mavericks* begins by exploring the female sculptors' personal histories. As Janet Wolff argues, it is not enough simply to locate them in their social and historical milieu, although this must not be ignored. In order to have a rounded understanding of their contribution as artists, it is necessary to consider the 'specific personal, familial and biographical influences' that led them to become professional sculptors.⁸ The choices they made and, hence, the positions they took up rest upon such information. Part I is concerned with their personal experiences, particularly those relating to the adoption and pursuit of sculpting careers. An obvious starting place is the influence that families had upon their work. Chapter 1 considers how the female sculptors maximized the benefits and mitigated the difficulties posed by their families of origin and of marriage, or the arrangements they made as spinsters. Chapter 2 addresses how they were trained and the ways in which they ran their businesses, with special attention to the balance struck between domestic and professional obligations. Chapter 3 concentrates on how they publicized themselves, in a culture that prized female self-effacement, and who they turned to for assistance in mapping out their careers. The last chapter in this section identifies the women's personal convictions and characteristics. Wary of the 'cult of genius' associated with biography (a concern that I

8 Janet Wolff, *The Social Production of Art* (London: Macmillan, 1981; 2nd edn, 1993), 20.

share), feminist scholars have concentrated instead on artists' works and viewers' responses to them. Useful as this strategy has been, it leaves some gaps. Apart from the obvious difficulty of commenting on lost oeuvres, this approach does not counteract the tendency to treat women artists of the nineteenth century as a homologous group. The aim of this chapter is to present these sculptors as self-conscious agents and to reinstate something of the identities that distinguished them.

Part II is concerned with the public's perception of the women sculptors as mediated through art criticism and literary portrayals of the period. These very different sources offer an understanding of the female sculptors' professional status and their currency as role models in popular publications. Chapter 5, 'Critical Appraisals,' assesses the contribution made by colleagues, art institutions and art critics to the women sculptors' reputations. Of these contributors, it was the critics who had the greatest influence, both reflecting and shaping public opinion. The quality of their judgements is scrutinized in turn. Chapter 6 examines representations of women sculptors found in essays, advice literature and works of fiction. The final chapter draws together the two strands, the women's experience and the way they were perceived, to assess the impacts that they had upon the Victorian art world and nineteenth-century culture.

Why have Grant, Durant, Hill and Thornycroft been chosen as the focal group of this study? There are several reasons. They were the best known British female sculptors of the nineteenth century; indeed, some of their contemporaries considered them to be pioneers. Together their careers spanned the whole of the Victorian era with the bulk of their production occurring between the 1850s and 1880s, a period of significant development in sculpture. Their works appeared regularly at the premier exhibitions in Britain and, on occasion, in France and the United States. All of them were awarded important public commissions and three were engaged by Queen Victoria to execute private works. Finally, from the proceeds of their work they were either wholly self-supporting or substantial contributors to their household income. These were self-consciously professional sculptors.

Much of what we know about them comes from their letters and diaries and those of their loved ones; these provide important but sometimes

patchy details about their lives and work. To enhance our understanding of their experiences, I include references to contemporary women sculptors who conducted careers in other countries or achieved recognition as amateurs. Among them are: Mary Lloyd, amateur sculptor and companion of British feminist Frances Power Cobbe; Isabella Gore-Booth, a Scots-woman whose professional aspirations were hampered by family demands; Harriet Hosmer and her American compatriots; the German Elisabet Ney; the Duchess of Castiglione Colonna ('Marcello'), a Swiss national who sculpted in Paris; and Félicie de Fauveau from France. Information about them complements and corroborates the available evidence.

A word about the ideology of separate spheres as an organizing principle in the study of Victorian gender relations is necessary. During the late twentieth century, scholars issued cogent challenges to the use of what had become an all-encompassing theory of social segregation.⁹ As such, it obscured more than it explained. However, although unsatisfactory as a heuristic device, the language of separate spheres had considerable currency in the nineteenth century, enduring, with modifications in response to social and political changes, throughout Victoria's reign. To dismiss it utterly would be to err in the opposite direction. It is better understood as one among several competing discourses of femininity current in the period. Thus, terms from the discourse of separate spheres jostle with those of other ideological positions throughout this study.

I take a feminist approach informed by Linda Alcoff's theory: whatever a woman's historical and cultural context, she can use the position she occupies within that context as a platform from which to instigate change.¹⁰

- 9 Amanda Vickery, 'Golden Age to Separate Spheres? A Review of the Categories and Chronology of English Women's History,' *History Journal* 36/2 (1993): 383–414; Linda K. Kerber, 'Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman's Place: The Rhetoric of Women's History,' *Journal of American History* 75 (June 1988–March 1989): 9–39; Janice Helland, *Professional Women Painters in Nineteenth Century Scotland: Commitment, Friendship, Pleasure* (Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate, 2000).
- 10 Linda Alcoff, 'Cultural Feminism Versus Post-Structuralism: The Identity Crisis in Feminist Theory,' *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 13 (Spring 1988), 405–436.

The overriding emphasis in *Genteel Mavericks* is upon the art of negotiation. However powerful Victorian culture was, it was neither monolithic nor static. The female sculptors were able to achieve many of their aims by turning the changing circumstances within that culture to their advantage. By subtly re-interpreting social conventions or exploiting new developments which had not yet acquired a gendered association, they circumvented the obstacles in their way. Although family considerations and social expectations placed undoubted constraints upon each of them, nevertheless these sculptors were in charge of piloting their own careers.

PART I

Personal Experiences

Family Matters

As the primary and perhaps most enduring contributor to an individual's identity, the family is a vital place to begin an examination of the personal experience of the female sculptors. Given Victorian conventions this is doubly advisable. Until roughly 1880, when work and educational opportunities for women expanded, the overwhelming majority of middle and upper-middle-class women lived in the families of their childhood or marriage. Young girls were characteristically educated at home by their parents or governesses, although for some, home-schooling was augmented by sporadic short-term boarding-school attendance.¹ Consequently, the family bounded its daughters' experience and mediated the world to them much more than it did with sons, who were ordinarily educated outside the household or trained in the family business. According to Philippa Levine, '[f]requently that meant also that the choices [daughters] made were heavily reliant upon family obligation and opinion.'² Yet, it would be a mistake to assume that girls' lives were sealed off from external influences. Travel, access to books and periodicals, involvement in benevolent work, and contact with extended kin and family friends contributed breadth to their lives.³

With adulthood came considerably more personal choice. A Victorian woman could elect to marry, remain in her parents' home, or set up

1 Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes. Men and Women of the English Middle Class 1780–1850* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 290–293; Philippa Levine, *Feminist Lives in Victorian England: Private Roles and Public Commitment* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 131.

2 Levine, *Feminist Lives*, 29.

3 Davidoff, *Family Fortunes*, 291; M. Jeanne Peterson, *Family, Love, and Work in the Lives of Victorian Gentlewomen* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 41–45, 133–138.

housekeeping with adult siblings, other relatives, or friends. While any of these options might have significant effects upon her experience, marriage had by far the most profound implications. By entering into this practically indissoluble contract, she forfeited a host of rights. In the eyes of the law she ceased to exist as a person; consequently she could not enter into other contracts, possess property in her own right or keep the income from her labour. Remedial legislation enacted up until the late 1870s effected little real change.⁴ Furthermore, marriage usually brought with it the added responsibility of children.

Nevertheless, these external factors did not preclude the possibility of substantial autonomy within marriage. Presumably, a woman who already had embarked upon a career would take into consideration a suitor's willingness to facilitate her work when deciding whether to marry him. Certainly, some husbands and wives worked together as a team or accommodated each other's separate occupations. The arrival of children inevitably affected working arrangements but, with the help of servants, did not automatically curtail the woman's career.

Those who remained spinsters had a different constellation of advantages and disadvantages. Legally, the 'feme sole' [*sic*] had the same rights as a man to own and use property, enter contracts, and serve as an executor over the property of another. On the other hand, she was often pitied or marginalized for her inability to fulfil the maternal destiny that was deemed to be the crowning achievement of womanhood. Another substantial drawback was the threat of financial insolvency as women characteristically were paid less than men. However, as the century progressed a growing number of professional women and women's rights activists deliberately chose the unencumbered single life.⁵

By interacting with the circumstances, values and personalities of her childhood family, each of the sculptors forged a sense of self and established

4 These are the laws of coverture. Levine, *Feminist Lives*, 88–89, 113–114; Mary Lyndon Shanley, *Feminism, Marriage, and the Law in Victorian England 1850–1895* (London: Tauris, 1989), 8; Olive Banks, *Faces of Feminism: A Study of Feminism as a Social Movement* (Martin Robinson, 1981; reprint, Oxford: Blackwell, 1993), 35–36.

5 Levine, *Feminist Lives*, 45–47; Pat Jalland, *Women, Marriage, and Politics 1860–1914* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986), 280, 287.

a basis for relating to the world. We will look at the birth families of Durant, Grant, Hill, and Thornycroft noting the occupational, religious, social and political niches they occupied. This will allow us to map each family's particular location within society, identify the specific economic and ideological environment to which each sculptor was exposed and observe where these families overlapped or differed from one another. At a deeper level, we will focus on the relationships between the members of each family and their sculptor daughter, paying special attention to how they facilitated or impeded her professional aspirations.

Adult living arrangements will be subjected to similar scrutiny. These are of considerable significance as they fix the emotional and social milieu in which the bulk of each woman's career was conducted. We will consider how the members of each sculptor's household contributed to her success along with how she managed the difficulties and benefits that her marital status posed to her work.

In Childhood

Middle- and upper-middle-class families exhibited widely differing child rearing practices in keeping with their particular political, philosophical and religious concerns. Based on accounts of the childhoods of notable women, we know that families varied considerably in their expectations for and of their daughters. The disparate experience of two cousins, Florence Nightingale (1820–1910) and Barbara Leigh Smith (later Bodichon, 1827–1891), is illustrative of this. Nightingale's upper-middle-class family was strictly opposed to her wish for professional work. After years of struggle, her father relented, granting her an ample living allowance and permitting her to do some nursing work at a facility for sick ladies.⁶ By contrast, Leigh Smith's interest in painting was cultivated by her father (the Radical MP for Norwich) who provided private lessons and further training at the Bedford

6 Levine, *Feminist Lives*, 29; Martha Vicinus and Bea Nergaard, eds, *Ever Yours, Florence Nightingale: Selected Letters* (London: Virago, 1989), 3, 178.

College for Ladies. Upon reaching age twenty-one she received an annual allowance of £300 as did each of her siblings regardless of gender.⁷ While some families paved the way for their daughters' careers, others littered their paths with obstacles.

Three of the sculptors in this study were born into comfortably well-off households. Mary Grant (1831–1908) came from the highest status background, being the granddaughter of the Seventh Earl of Elgin and Eleventh Earl of Kincardine (see fig. 1). Her parents were Lady Lucy Bruce and John Grant of Kilgraston, a Scottish laird who had trained at Sandhurst, served with the Grenadier Guards and filled the roles of Deputy Lieutenant and Justice of the Peace for county Perth.⁸

Susan Durant's (1827–1873) father, George, was a prosperous London silk broker with roots in Devonshire (see fig. 2). Also born in Devon, her mother, Mary Dugdale appears to have had gentry connections – the Dugdales at Wroxall, Warwickshire.⁹ Other family members attained landed status through the accumulation of wealth. Uncle Richard Durant purchased the Sharpham Estate, Devon, in 1842. There he established himself

- 7 Levine, *Feminist Lives*, 29; Jacqui Matthews, 'Barbara Bodichon: Integrity in Diversity (1827–1891)', in *Feminist Theorists: Three Centuries of Key Women Thinkers*, ed. Dale Spender (New York: Pantheon, 1983), 90–92. John Crabbe, 'An Artist Divided: The Forgotten Talent of Barbara Bodichon,' *Apollo* 113 (1981), 311. Levine, *Feminist Lives*, 16. Pam Hirsch, 'Barbara Leigh Smith Bodichon: artist and activist,' in *Women in the Victorian Art World*, Orr, 170.
- 8 Sydney Checkland, *The Elgins, 1766–1917: A Tale of Aristocrats, Proconsuls and their Wives* (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1988). Delia Gaze, ed., *Dictionary of Women Artists* (London and Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1997), s.v. 'Grant, Mary,' by Helen Smailes.
- 9 Susan Durant usually signed her works 'Susan Durant Durant' and her will is in that name, but her signature on a commission contract with the Corporation of the City of London is Susan Dugdale Durant. Comptroller City of London Deeds, Box 118, Number 41. Susan Durant to Emma Wallis, 24 August [1870], Windsor Castle, Royal Archives, Durant Papers, typescript copy of RA VIC/Add X2/212 D/12; L. G. Pine and F. S. A. Scott, eds, *Burke's Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Landed Gentry*, 17th edn (London: Burke's Peerage Ltd., 1952), s.v. 'Dugdale of Wroxall Abbey, Warwickshire'. E. Walford, *The County Families of the United Kingdom*, 6th ed. (London: Robert Hardwicke, 1871), s.v. 'Dugdale, James'.