Thomas Brock and the Critics - an examination of Brock's place in the New Sculpture movement

Volume 1

by

John Anthony Sankey

Submitted in accordance with the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Leeds
Fine Art Department

September 2002

Acknowledgements

I owe special thanks to Ben Read, my supervisor, whose remark that Brock was 'grossly understudied' first encouraged me to undertake this thesis.

Among the many individuals who have given me helpful advice and information are John Archer, Philip Attwood (British Museum), Joanna Barnes, Heather Birchall, Mary Clark, Wendy Cook, Tim David, Adrian Glew, Melanie Hall, Reg Holloway, Alison Inglis, Duncan Jones, Caroline and Malcolm Jarrett, Alexander Kader, Danny Katz, Mary Kelleher (Royal Dublin Society), Peter Lloyd (Uppingham School), Mark Pomeroy, Paula Murphy (University College Dublin), Adeline van Roon, Valerie Scott, Peyton Skipwith, Timothy Stevens, Mark Stocker, Marjorie Trusted, Philip Ward Jackson, Julia Walker-Smith , Signe Westergaard-Neilson and Stan Whatmore.

I am also grateful to the British School at Rome, Cambridge University Library, the Churchill Archive Centre, the Conway Library, the Corporation of London Record Office, the Courtauld Institute, Dublin City Archives, the Henry Moore Centre for the Study of Sculpture, Leeds University Library, Leicester University Library, the London Library, London University Library, Melbourne Art Gallery Library, the National Art Library, the Natural History Museum, the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek Copenhagen, the Public Record Office, the Royal Academy of Arts, the Royal Institution, the Royal Society of British Sculptors, the Tate Gallery, Trinity College Dublin Library, the Victoria State Library (Melbourne), the Westminster Art Reference Library and the Worcester Porcelain Museum.

Quotations from the Royal Archives in Windsor Castle are by gracious permission of Her Majesty the Queen.

My deepest gratitude is to my wife who typed this manuscript and gave me unfailing support throughout.

Abstract

The Victoria Memorial is one of London's best known landmarks, yet its sculptor Thomas Brock (1847-1922) has not been seriously studied. This thesis considers his works in the context of the New Sculpture movement.

Brock worked for eight years in the London studio of John Henry Foley, and a further eight completing Foley's unfinished commissions. Meanwhile his own distinctive style was developing, and he was one of the first of his generation (which included Hamo Thornycroft and Alfred Gilbert) to show French influence in such works as *Hercules strangling Antaeus* (1869), the *Snake Charmer* (1877) and *A Moment of Peril* (1880), which was purchased by the Chantrey Fund and helped secure his election as an ARA.

A close relationship with Frederic Leighton was established during this period; Leighton modelled his *Athlete wrestling with a Python* in Brock's studio and made use of Brock's expertise in bronze work. When elected RA in 1891, Brock's diploma work was a bronze bust of Leighton and he later executed the Leighton Memorial in St Paul's Cathedral (1902).

Although his ideal marble statues *The Genius of Poetry* (1891) and *Eve* (1898) won the praise of the critics, Brock concentrated more on meeting the growing demand for commemorative statues and busts. His style was vigorous and realistic, with an eye for detail and attention to surface, finish and the overall harmony of the sculpture, its pedestal and the proposed site. He was particularly successful with his portrayal of Queen Victoria, his statues for Hove and Worcester being replicated in a dozen cities in Britain and the Empire.

In his most important work, the Victoria Memorial, Brock incorporated many New Sculpture allusions. Although it has received a mixed critical reception over the years, as a popular public monument it has stood the test of time. The artistic and technical merits of its sculptor deserve to be more widely recognised, as does his contribution to the New Sculpture movement generally.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS IN VOLUME 2

Works are by Thomas Brock unless otherwise indicated

Queen Victoria
88. Belfast
89. *Shipbuilding*
90. Birmingham
91. Brisbane
92. Calcutta
93. Carlisle
94. *Commerce*
95. Hove
96. *Empire*
97. Liverpool
98. in studio
99. London
100. Worcester
101. *Raikes, Robert*
102. *Ramsden, Gwendolen*
103. *Rathbone William* (with Foley)
104. *Charity*
105. *Commerce*
106. *Education*
107. Rome Exhibition 1911
108. *Royal Scots Fusilier*
109. *Russell of Killowen, Lord*
110. *Saint George*
111. *Saint Michael*
112. *Salmacis*
113. *Seely, Capt. Charles*
114. *Snake Charmer*
115. *Song*
116. *Squire, Peter*
117. *Tate, Henry*
118. *Temple, Richard*
119. *Thring, Edward*
120. Titanic Memorial
Victoria Memorial
121. aerial view
122. general view
123. *Agriculture*
124. *Army*
125. *Art & Science*
126. *Doves*
127. *Justice*
128. Lamp post
129. *Manufacture*
130. *Motherhood*
131. *Peace*
132. *Progress*
133. *Queen Victoria*
134. *Queen Victoria* detail
135. *Triton Fountain*
136. *Triton* detail
137. *Truth*
138. *Victory*
139. Brock's model
140. Stevens' model
141. Webb's design
142. *Spy* cartoon
143. *Victory* in studio
144. *Webb, Aston*
145. Wellington War Memorial
146. *Wilson, Erasmus*

Coins and Medals

147. 1893 Coinage designs for obverse
148. 1893 Coinage designs for reverse
149. 1897 Jubilee medal
150. 1897 Jubilee medal for Mayors
151. RA Medal - Edward VII
152. RA Medal - George V
153. RA Gold medal reverse
154. E.M.Beloe medal obverse
155. E.M.Beloe medal reverse

Works by other sculptors

156. Birch, C.B. *Queen Victoria*
157. Boehm, J.E. *Queen Victoria*
158. Carpeaux, J-B. *Neapolitan Fisherboy*
159. Dalou, A-J. *Charity*
160. Foley, J.H. *General Outram*
161. Ford, E.O. *Folly*
162. Frampton, G. *Edward Neale*
163. Gilbert, A. *Mother and Child*
164. *Saint George*
165. *Study of a Head*
166. *Queen Victoria*
167. Leighton, F. *Athlete wrestling with a Python*
168. Marochetti, C. *Isambard Brunel*
169. Noble, M. *Queen Victoria*
170. Ottin, A-L-M. *Indian Hunter*
171. Rodin, A. *Eve*
172. Thornycroft, H. *Edward I*
173. *General Gordon*
174. *Mower*
175. *Putting the Stone*

Foreword

In the first decade of the 20th century Thomas Brock was one of Britain's leading sculptors. His public statues could be seen in many cities at home (London, Belfast, Birmingham, Carlisle, Leeds, Liverpool and Worcester) and as far afield as Bombay, Brisbane, Cape Town, and Katmandu. His selection, without competition, to design and execute the national memorial to Queen Victoria in 1901 was virtually unchallenged. His colleagues unanimously elected him as their President when the Society of British Sculptors was formed in 1905. Oxford University gave him an honorary degree in 1909 and King George V knighted him in 1911 on the steps of the Victoria Memorial. Yet within a few years of his death he was virtually forgotten - overshadowed, like other British sculptors of the period, by Auguste Rodin and his successors.

It was not until the 1980s that there was a revival of interest in late Victorian sculpture. This focused mainly on Alfred Gilbert, who received 'a measure of attention which though possibly commensurate with his quality, leaves little room for the solider achievements of Thomas Brock and Hamo Thornycroft'.[1] A biography of Thornycroft by his daughter was published in 1982,[2] but no comparable study of Brock has so far been made.

This thesis will attempt to make good the deficiency by presenting a survey of Brock's life and a detailed account of his works. Previously unpublished letters and documents from the Royal Archives (by gracious permission of Her Majesty the Queen), the Dublin City Archives and the records of the Royal Institution demonstrate that Brock played a much greater role in completing the Albert Memorial, the Daniel O'Connell Monument and the Faraday statue in London in Dublin than has previously been acknowledged.

The typescript of an unpublished life of Brock by his son Frederick in the National Art Library gives useful information about Brock's personal life, career and methods of work, although its accuracy cannot always be relied upon.[3]

---

[1] Benedict Read *Victorian Sculpture* Yale University Press, New Haven & London 1982 p. 3
[2] Elfrida Manning *Marble and Bronze* 1982
[3] National Art Library Mss. 86 ZZ 110

The reports of the Belt v. Lawes trial, the archives of the Royal Academy and correspondence in the Copenhagen Glyptotek give fresh information on the extent of the collaboration between Brock and Frederic Leighton. Office of Works papers in the Public Record Office and the Esher papers in the Churchill Archive Centre show the importance of the relationship between Brock and Lord Esher in the construction of the Victoria Memorial. The Hamo Thornycroft Archive in the Henry Moore Centre in Leeds and the records of the Royal Society of British Sculptors throw fresh light on Brock's relations with Hamo Thornycroft, George Frampton, William Goscombe John and other contemporaries who were part of the dramatic developments in British sculpture of the period, generally referred to as the New Sculpture.[4]

The arrangement of the thesis is as follows. The Introduction explains the nature and importance of the New Sculpture movement. The first ten chapters are broadly chronological, and cover Brock's career until his election as a Royal Academician in 1891. Chapter 11 describes Brock's role in founding the Royal Society of British Sculptors. The next five chapters are thematic, examining in turn his church and war memorials, his representations of Queen Victoria and his equestrian and portrait statues. The Victoria Memorial is examined in four chapters, and the concluding chapter provides a critical assessment of Brock's work and his place in the New Sculpture movement. Included as appendices are brief surveys of Brock's chairmanship of the Faculty of Sculpture at the British School at Rome and of his coins and medals.

For reasons of space, it has not been possible to mention every work by Brock in the main text. However, the thesis includes a comprehensive catalogue of his works, many of them listed for the first time. Photographs of the majority of these works and relevant works by other sculptors are included in the Annex, printed as a separate volume.

---

[4] Susan Beattie *The New Sculpture* Yale University Press, New Haven & London 1983

Introduction: The New Sculpture

The New Sculpture was a term first coined in 1894 by Edmund Gosse, the art critic, to describe the renaissance in English sculpture in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.[1] According to him, the starting point of the New Sculpture was Frederic Leighton's *Athlete wrestling with a Python* (plate 167), exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1877.[2] Its naturalistic modelling and sheer physical energy made a dramatic contrast to what a critic in the previous year had called 'the inanities now seen in marble and plaster within the Royal Academy'.[3]

Gosse, in attempting to define the New Sculpture, explained that it was:

> a highly vitalised art developed, not around the individuality of a single man, but around a theory of execution clearly perceived and consistently adhered to by a group of men of various talent, alike only in this, their loyalty to a common ideal [the reform of English sculpture].[4]

Later writers also found a precise definition rather elusive. Professor Janson suggested that it was never meant to be a label for a style, except in the very loose sense of 'anything different from what had been possible before the 1870s'.[5] More recently Michael Hatt described it as 'a notoriously vague and contested notion'.[6]

Gosse summed up the vital impulse of the new movement as 'carrying out with careful sensitive modelling a close and reverent observation of nature'. The New Sculpture presented 'under an exact and individual form, the human body as it exists before our eyes'. He found these qualities in Leighton's *Athlete*, a work of 'extraordinary novelty and vitality'. with 'varied and appropriate' surfaces and 'fresh and picturesque' attitudes and expressions.[7]

Gosse claimed that the inspiration for the New Sculpture was 'unquestionably the French School of the last generation', although it had been difficult to 'melt the ice of English conventionality' until the appearance in the Royal Academy during the early

---

[1] *Art Journal* (*AJ*) 1894 p. 138
[2] ibid p. 140. In Gosse's article the work was referred to as *Athlete strangling a Python* and as *The Athlete and the Python*, but the more usual title is *Athlete wrestling with a Python* (shortened to *Athlete*)
[3] *Saturday Review (SR)* 10 June 1876 p. 746
[4] *AJ* 1894 p. 138
[5] H. W. Janson *Nineteenth Century Sculpture* London & New York 1985 p. 240
[6] M. Hatt 'Thoughts and Things: Sculpture and the Victorian Nude' in *Exposed - The Victorian Nude* Exhibition Catalogue Tate Britain 2001 p. 44
[7] *AJ* 1894 pp. 311 & 140

1870s of works by Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, Albert-Ernest Carrier Belleuse and Aimé-Jules Dalou. Dalou was particularly influential as he spent nearly ten years in London, teaching at the National Art Training School (now the Royal College of Art) and the South London Training School in Lambeth.[8]

It may well have been Dalou who saw Leighton's small plaster model of the *Athlete* and encouraged him to execute the work full-size in bronze.[9] Leighton had not attempted any work of this scale in bronze before, so he sought the technical advice of Thomas Brock, a pupil of John Henry Foley, and used his studio to model the *Athlete*. Brock had attracted Leighton's attention with his *Hercules strangling Antaeus* (plate 53), which:

> possessed the vigorous vital qualities of French work ... in the fine treatment of surface and detail, it is already masterly, and remarkably free from the fatal Foley smoothness.[10]

In his description of the New Sculpture, Gosse concentrated his attention on the ideal works exhibited in the Royal Academy and the Grosvenor Gallery by young sculptors like Brock, Hamo Thornycroft and Alfred Gilbert. Inspired by Leighton's example, these works combined naturalism, realism and close attention to surface and tended to be nude masculine figures of two types, which have been described as 'Herculean brawn' and 'Apollonian beauty'.[11] Brock's *Moment of Peril* (1880/1) (plate 70) and Thornycroft's *Putting the Stone* (1880) (plate 175) were examples of the former, while Alfred Gilbert's *Perseus Arming* (1882) and Brock's *The Genius of Poetry* (1891) (plate 42) typified the latter. It was not long before ideal female counterparts began to appear at the Royal Academy. Some were solemn and full of symbolism, like Gilbert's *Offering to Hymen* (1884), and Onslow Ford's *Singer* (1889). Others were frolicsome, even frivolous, like Leighton's *Needless Alarms* (1886).

One of the features of the New Sculpture identified by Gosse was the more effective use of bronze, prompted by recent technical advances in bronze casting. A new foundry at Thames Ditton, opened in 1874, was used by Leighton for his *Athlete*. Some works were exhibited at the Royal Academy as statuettes, such as Brock's *Snake Charmer* (1877) (plate 114) and Gilbert's *Icarus* (1884). Others were exhibited life-size and then

---

[8] J. M. Hunisack *The Sculptor Jules Dalou: Studies in his Style and Imagery* New York and London 1977 pp. 180-1

[9] Read 1982 p. 289

[10] E. Gosse 'Living English Sculptors' in *Century Magazine* Vol. 26 1883 p. 45

[11] Hatt p. 40

reproduced in statuette form, such as Thornycroft's *Mower* (1884) (plate 174) and Leighton's *Sluggard* (1886). In the case of Brock's *Eve* (1898) (plate 30), the original life-size statue was in marble and was subsequently reproduced as a bronze statuette in various sizes.[12]

Many of the statuettes were cast by the lost wax process, which gave a better quality of detail and surface finish and enabled works of art to be sold to the public at a lower price. *Icarus* was the first important example of the use of this process in England, and was soon followed by Onslow Ford's *Folly* (1886) (plate 161).[13]

From the mid-1880s a new tendency began to manifest itself. Gilbert's *Enchanted Chair* (1886) and Clarence Tomb (1892) pushed realism to the limit and moved towards an increasingly fantastical and symbolist style. Influenced by the paintings of George Frederick Watts and Edward Burne Jones and by French symbolism, Gilbert and his followers employed exotic figures, semi-precious stones and unusual materials to express ideas and emotions. Notable examples were George Frampton's *Mysteriarch* (1892) and *Lamia* (1899) and Harry Bates' *Pandora* (1890) and *Mors Janua Vitae* (1899) in which the fragile figure of *Life* in ivory contrasts sharply with the threatening presence of *Death* in dark-hued bronze.

While Thornycroft, Brock and Onslow Ford kept closer to the realist manner, they were not unaffected by symbolism. Thornycroft's *Gordon* (1888) and Brock's *Eve* (1898) have meditative, even melancholy qualities, and Brock was sufficiently influenced by symbolism to decorate the pedestals of both *Eve* and *The Genius of Poetry* with motifs in the symbolist manner.

Gosse was disillusioned by this trend towards symbolism, which was far removed from his concept of sculpture as 'a close and reverent observation of nature'. He ended his account of the New Sculpture in 1894 on a rather pessimistic note:

> the great movement begun in 1879 [sic] has now worked itself into an almost quiescent state ... No very young man seems to be carrying the New Sculpture on any further than its founder [Leighton] brought it.[14]

Two years later Leighton died and the era of academic works of the *Athlete* type was coming to an end. William Goscombe John's *Joyance* (1899) and Alfred Drury's

---

[12] see p. 134
[13] *AJ* 1894 p. 280
[14] *AJ* 1894 p. 310

Morning and *Evening* (1899) were virtually the final flourish. Marion Spielmann's exhibition of statuettes 'Sculpture for the Home' (1902), intended to popularise the works of the New Sculptors was later described as 'a retrospective and almost posthumous survey'.[15]

The symbolist tendency also proved to be relatively short-lived. Harry Bates and Onslow Ford died prematurely (Bates in 1899 and Ford in 1901, both aged 49) and the New Sculpture's most original, if erratic, talent, Alfred Gilbert, departed into self-imposed exile in 1901. While the production of ideal works diminished, the Edwardian era saw an increased demand for public monuments, especially commemorative statues of the late Queen and memorials to the South African war:

> The demise of Symbolist sculpture in Britain coincided with the triumph of Edwardian imperialism in both sculpture and architecture. There was no place here for the introspective and personal and it was the more confident work of sculptors such as Thornycroft and Mackennal which took greatest advantage or this brief episode of rich patronage.[16]

Brock was another sculptor who benefitted from this Edwardian boom. The 'episode' was not as brief as Upstone suggests - Brock's bronze equestrian statues of Edward VII (for New Delhi and Sydney) (plates 28 and 29) were not completed until 1921, a year before his death, and one of the last works of the New Sculpture, Gilbert's Alexandra Memorial was completed in 1928.

Respect for the New Sculpture faded quickly in the 1920s. The Tate Gallery catalogue for 1929 considered Leighton's *Athlete* to be:

> dead and uninspired. Verily the whirligig of time brings its revenge, and what was considered one of the finest works of art procurable fifty years ago... is now regarded with boredom.[17]

It was not until 1982/3 that interest revived with two major studies - *Victorian Sculpture* by Benedict Read and *The New Sculpture* by Susan Beattie. Read broadly agreed with Gosse's view that Leighton's *Athlete* had marked the beginning of the new phase in English sculpture, although he stressed the influence of Foley, passed on by Brock.

Read broadened the definition of the New Sculpture beyond the Salon works on which Gosse had concentrated his attention. He pointed out that these constituted only a

---

[15] L. Handley-Read Introduction to *British Sculpture 1850-1914* exhibition catalogue Fine Art Society 1968 p. 15

[16] R. Upstone 'Symbolism in Three Dimensions' in Wilton, A. & Upstone, R. (ed.) *The Age of Rossetti, Burne Jones and Watts: Symbolism in Britain 1860-1910* exhibition catalogue Tate Gallery 1997 p. 92

[17] J.B. Manson Tate Gallery Catalogue 1929 p. 158

small proportion of the output of the New Sculptors, who earned their livelihood and enhanced their reputations from public monuments. The positive effect of the New Sculpture on the quality of such monuments was particularly marked in bronze statuary:

> the standing bronze figure is treated in a wholly different way... a subtler handling of the material, a more variegated treatment of mass in general and in detail, to give a livelier effect of reflected light and texture.[18]

Although Read was referring specifically to Onslow Ford's *Sir Rowland Hill* (1881), his remarks were equally relevant to Brock's *Robert Raikes* (1880) (plate 101) and *Sir Bartle Frere* (1888) (plate 37) and to Hamo Thornycroft's *General Gordon* (also 1888) (plate 173). In contrast to the realist style of these statues, Alfred Gilbert experimented with the unusual in his public monuments, examples being his use of aluminium for *Eros* (Shaftesbury Memorial, unveiled 1893) and his elaborate figure of *Queen Victoria* (1887) (plate 166).

Read discerned New Sculptural qualities in three of Brock's monuments in particular - the Leighton Memorial, the *Black Prince* and the Victoria Memorial. The Leighton Memorial (1902) in St Paul's Cathedral was 'perhaps the most poignant of the New Sculpture's funerary monuments', the figure of *Sculpture* (plate 66) holding in her hand a miniature of Leighton's *Sluggard* 'perhaps symbolising the art of sculpture flexing itself for renewed activity after a long time in the shackles of convention'. The *Black Prince* (unveiled 1903) (plate 16) demonstrated the application of New Sculptural qualities to a work of massive scale,

> formulating striking detail work in bronze, not with the delicate intricacy of Gilbert or Frampton, which would be lost at that height, nor certainly with the flashy trickiness of, say, Marochetti's *Richard Coeur de Lion*, but with a studied firmness of power that is most effective.[19]

Read's assessment of Brock's Victoria Memorial (unveiled 1911) (plate 122) was:

> The monument is in its way one of the supreme achievements of the New Sculpture, redolent throughout with features and reminiscences essential to its whole nature; or of the movement, at least in its establishment format, lacking the extremes of finesse of Gilbert's decorative fantasy or Frampton's craftiness.[20]

Among these 'features and reminiscences' Read noted echoes of Stevens, Dalou, Gilbert and Thornycroft, while the reliefs of mermaids and tritons showed 'the subtlety of material handling and space gradation so characteristic of the New Sculpture'.

---

[18] Read 1982 p. 292
[19] ibid pp. 330-1 & 364
[20] ibid p. 377-8

Susan Beattie, unlike Read, considered that the inspiration for the New Sculpture came from Alfred Stevens, not Leighton, whose *Athlete* had 'many obvious allusions' to the allegorical figures on Stevens' Wellington Monument.[21] She also criticised Leighton's *Sluggard* (1886) as a 'feeble variation' on the theme of Rodin's *Age of Bronze* (1882).[22] She did not refer to Leighton's collaboration with Brock, whom she described as:

> an 'establishment' sculptor. Highly competent but seldom inspired... Only occasionally, as in *Eve* ... did he succeed in fully identifying with the new movement.[23].

Beattie argued that Gosse's obsession with ideal works had led him to a 'fundamental misinterpretation' of the New Sculpture.[24] In her view, its principal achievements were in the field of architectural sculpture, notably Harry Bates' work for the Institute of Chartered Accountants, George Frampton's for Lloyds Registry and Alfred Drury's for the War Office.[25] She stressed the importance of symbolist influences in the 1890s, but noted a tendency towards the turn of the century for symbolist ideals to be compromised by 'the uneasy alliance of sentiment and sensuality' in works like William Colton's *The Girdle* (1898) and Henry Pegram's *Fortune* (1900).[26] In her opinion:

> The four years from 1898 to 1901 may be shown, with unnerving ease, to have contained not only the greatest achievements of the New Sculpture movement but [also] the forces and events which contributed most insidiously to its decline.[27]

In fact, many of the New Sculptors produced some of their best works in the years after 1901, including Thornycroft's memorials to Gladstone (1905) and Curzon (1910) and Brock's statue of Queen Victoria for Hove (1901) (plate 95), his Leighton Memorial (1902) (plate 62) and his *Black Prince* for Leeds (1903) (plate 16). Beattie made only brief references to Brock's *Black Prince* and the Leighton Memorial, but was scathing in her criticism of the Victoria Memorial as nothing more than 'an astonishing assemblage of echoes of the monuments of others'.[28]

It is clear from this brief account that the critics have had widely differing views on Thomas Brock and his significance to the New Sculpture. Brock executed

---

[21] Beattie p. 3
[22] ibid p. 150
[23] ibid p. 241
[24] ibid p. 5
[25] ibid pp. 72, 106 and 117
[26] ibid pp. 179-80
[27] ibid p. 231
[28] ibid p. 230

comparatively few ideal works, and virtually no architectural sculpture. His place in the New Sculpture movement must therefore be judged rather by his portrait busts (such as his Diploma bust of Leighton), his commemorative statues and his public monuments. He combined the New Sculpture qualities of realism, artistic modelling, attention to surface and technical mastery of his materials (marble and bronze) with increasing use of friezes, bas-reliefs and free-standing allegorical figures.

The most extensive and dramatic use of the latter was in the Victoria Memorial, on which his reputation to a great extent depends. The two most comprehensive surveys of Victorian sculpture differed significantly in their critical assessment of the Memorial. Read praised it as 'in its way one of the supreme achievements of the New Sculpture'[29] while Beattie called Brock 'the great plagiarist of the New Sculpture'.[30]

This thesis will examine these and other critical comments against the background of Brock's life and works and assess his place in the New Sculpture movement.

---

[29] Read 1982 p. 377
[30] Beattie p. 230

Chapter 1: The Early Years

Thomas Brock was born in Worcester on 1 March 1847. His parents were William and Catherine Brock, and he was named Thomas after his maternal grandfather Thomas Marshall, a Court Embroiderer in the reign of George III. Brock's father ran a small but reasonably successful decorating business. In the 1861 census he described himself as a 'Master Painter employing two boys', living with his wife Catherine (aged 38), daughter Mary Jane (aged 16) and son Thomas (aged 14) at 5 Sidbury Place, Worcester.[1]

Thomas was sent to the local school, run on strict lines by a Mr Hyde. At the age of ten, he showed more interest in drawing and painting in watercolours than in academic studies, and his father allowed him to enrol as a part-time pupil at the Government School of Design at Worcester, which he attended after school hours.[2]

The first Government School of Design had been opened in Somerset House in London in 1837 to train students from the age of twelve upwards in design and its application to manufacture. Similar schools were established in the provinces, the Worcester one being opened in 1851.[3] One of the first pupils was Benjamin Williams Leader, later RA. The chairman of the governing committee was the Earl of Dudley, himself an art collector; and other committee members included Sir Charles Hastings, founder of the British Medical Association, and the managing directors of the two main porcelain makers in Worcester, Richard Binns and George Grainger.[4] Brock did well at the School, winning six medals and, in January 1863, a book prize for applied design presented by the Earl of Dudley.[5]

Young Thomas may have inherited his artistic inclinations from his paternal grandfather Joseph Hale Brock, who had worked in the William Duesbury Porcelain Factory in Derby. There he married Sarah Furniss and had three sons - Joseph, John and William. He moved to Worcester with his family in the 1820s and was employed as a designer in Grainger's Porcelain Factory. Brock in later life spoke of his grandfather as an exceedingly capable and gifted man, and one of his earliest works was a plaster

---

[1] 1861 census ref. X900.4003 BA 7427
[2] *Morning Post* 3 March 1913: Interview with Sir T. Brock
[3] Q. Bell *Schools of Design* 1963 p. 102
[4] R. W. Binns *Worcester China: a Record of the Work of Forty-Five Years 1852-97* 1897 p. 124
[5] Brock later executed busts of Binns (plate 15), Dudley and Hastings

medallion of Joseph in his seventies.[6] Another connection with the local porcelain industry was Brock's uncle Joseph, who followed his father into Grainger's in 1847 and worked there for 44 years, retiring in 1891 as foreman of the decorating department.[7]

China and porcelain had been manufactured in Worcester since at least 1752, when Lund and Miller established the Worcester Tonquin Manufacture, transferring their business from Bristol. In August 1788 King George III and Queen Charlotte visited the retail shop in 45 High Street Worcester, and bought several items; thereafter the firm described themselves as 'Manufacturers to Their Majesties' and added a crown to their mark. In 1840 the firm was taken over by Chamberlain's, a rival factory; but although they exhibited at the Great Exhibition of 1851, their display was relatively small and their affairs were obviously at a low ebb. In 1852 two new partners, William Kerr and Richard Binns, renamed the firm Kerr and Binns and declared their intention to 'exalt the name and enhance the reputation of Worcester porcelain'.[8] Binns introduced the production of Parian ware to Worcester. This form of porcelain had been particularly popular since 1846, when the Art-Union of London had started commissioning limited editions of figures by well-known sculptors like John Gibson and John Henry Foley.[9]

A more important innovation by Binns was the production of porcelain decorated in imitation of the famous Limoges enamels. This was a difficult technique, involving painting in white enamel on a dark background. In 1854 Binns showed specimens of his 'new invention' to Prince Albert. The Prince bought all the items offered and Queen Victoria subsequently ordered a complete dessert service in the same style on a turquoise ground. The Prince Consort lent items from the Royal collection to Worcester with the advice: 'Let your artists study the works of the Old Masters, and when they have become imbued with their spirit, let them design for themselves'. These and other instances of Royal favour encouraged Binns to seek permission to rename his firm 'The Worcester Royal Porcelain Company' in 1862, when Kerr retired; and the company thereafter traded under this name.[10]

In 1859 Kerr and Binns asked the School of Design whether there was a youth there who would like to be apprenticed to them. In Brock's own words,

---

[6] F. Brock: Typescript biography of Sir Thomas Brock in National Art Library 86 ZZ 110 p. 8
[7] Worcester Porcelain Museum Wages Book
[8] J. and M. Cushion *A Collector's History of British Pocelain* Antique Collectors Club 1992 p. 345
[9] B. Read 'Parian and Sculpture' in Atterbury, P. (ed.) *The Parian Phenomenon* 1989 p. 40
[10] G. A. Godden *Encyclopaedia of British Porcelain Manufacturers* Barrie and Jenkins 1988 pp. 460-2

> I was eager to offer myself, but my parents at first opposed me, as it had always been intended that I should succeed to my father's business. However, I was able to overcome their objections, and in due course I was apprenticed to the art of modelling, or 'sculpture' as it was called in my indentures. What I really loved at the time was drawing; but modelling was of course a branch of art, and anyhow I was only too glad to say adieu to the dreary scholastic routine, which I abhorred.[11]

Brock began his apprenticeship with Kerr and Binns on 1 March 1859, his twelfth birthday. He was apprenticed to 'learn that branch of their art or trade of porcelain manufacture called sculpturing' for seven years, during which time he was required to faithfully serve his masters, keep their secrets and gladly do their lawful commands. The twelve year old Brock was also required not to commit fornication, contract matrimony, play at cards or dice tables or haunt taverns and playhouses.[12]

The first entry for Brock in the Wages Book is dated 6 August 1859, when he was paid £1-1s-6d per week. He worked in the modelling department with James Hadley, who was then 22 years old.[13] It was said that young Brock was not too popular with Hadley, who regarded him as a possible rival who might supplant him when he had completed his apprenticeship.[14] It was probably while working in Worcester that he began the bust of his employer Richard Binns, which he later exhibited at the Royal Academy.

By the time his apprenticeship ended in 1866, Brock had decided to leave the porcelain industry and seek employment as a sculptor in London. His older sister Jane, who was already living in London and beginning a career as a concert singer, is said to have encouraged him in this direction. Although his father still had hopes of his son joining the family business, he did not stand in his way. He happened to be working at Witley Court for the Earl of Dudley at the time, and mentioned his son's plans to his employer. The Earl, who as chairman of the governing body of the School of Design was aware of the young man's talents, promptly arranged to meet Brock at the Star Hotel, Worcester and gave him a letter of introduction to John Henry Foley.[15]

Brock recalled in later life his first encounter with the Irish-born sculptor, then at the height of his fame. With 'the fearlessness of youth', he sought and obtained an interview in Foley's studio at 10 (later 30) Osnaburgh Street (just east of Regents Park), taking

---

[11] *Morning Post* 3 March 1913
[12] Brock p. 6
[13] Worcester Porcelain Museum Wages Book
[14] Brock p. 10
[15] *Worcester Echo* 23 August 1922

with him some examples of the work he had done at Worcester (cups, saucers, vases and so on). When he saw the colossal works on which Foley was engaged, such as the massive equestrian statue of General Outram (plate 160), he felt 'absolutely overwhelmed'.[16]

Foley received Brock in a kindly manner but regretted that he had no need of further assistants, and Brock went away feeling he had been over-ambitious. He was staying with his sister Jane and went back to her to report his failure, but she refused to accept defeat and persuaded him to try again. Brock duly returned to Osnaburgh Street the next day, and waited until Foley came out of the studio for his customary afternoon walk. This time he did not seek paid employment, but simply asked to be allowed to enter the studio and give his services for nothing in return for the experience gained. Although Foley did not normally take pupils, he agreed to accept him on these terms. The Osnaburgh Street studio was to be Brock's place of work for over fifty years.[17]

Brock had made a shrewd choice in seeking to work under the guidance of John Henry Foley. Foley stood out from his contemporaries for the quality of his public statues, for the naturalism and realism of his work and his treatment of detail in contemporary costume. While other sculptors often found it hard to obtain commissions, Foley had more work than he could conveniently handle.[18]

Foley's principal assistants at this time were Charles Bell Birch, Samuel Ferris Lynn and Francis Williamson.[19] Charles Lawes joined the studio shortly after Brock, paying Foley a fee to receive training, and Richard Belt became a junior assistant in 1869.[20] There was a hierarchy of labour in the studio and Brock, as an unpaid junior, was at first given the more menial tasks. This did not continue for very long. In his spare time he worked on the model of a small figure, which caught Foley's eye. He sent for Brock and told him that if he could model as well as that he was wasting his time in the outer studio; his proper place was in the main studio. He was now paid two pounds a week and was no longer dependent on his mother's subvention of £5 a month.[21]

---

[16] *Morning Post* 3 March 1913
[17] Brock pp. 15-16
[18] B. Read on 'J.H. Foley' in *The Connoisseur* No. 18 (August 1974) p. 262
[19] Read 1982 p. 69. George F. Teniswood was never a pupil of Foley, although he was a close friend and later became his executor (see p. 29)
[20] *Times* 23 June 1882 and 30 November 1882 (Belt v. Lawes trial evidence)
[21] Brock p. 17

On 4 December 1867 Queen Victoria visited the Osnaburgh Street studio. It is unlikely that Brock was presented to her, but he may well have seen her as she inspected the various works. She was accompanied by her daughter Princess Louise, then 18 years old. The Queen wished to see how Foley was progressing with the marble statue of the Prince Albert (plate 5) commissioned by Cambridge University. She wrote in her Journal:

> Foley has fine things in his studio and his clay model for dear Albert's statue for Cambridge is remarkably fine and dignified and he seemed to understand so readily and intelligently any little remark I had to make..... Mr Foley is a man of much talent. [22]

On 5 May 1867 Brock enrolled at the Royal Academy Schools on the recommendation of Foley, who had himself been a student there thirty years earlier. Competition to enter the Schools was keen - from 97 applicants, 73 were admitted as probationers, of whom eleven were sculptors. From these, 37 students were finally selected, of whom only four were sculptors.[23]

At the time Brock entered the Schools, the quality of sculpture shown at the Academy Exhibitions was poor. A critic commented on the 1867 Exhibition:

> The sculpture room is generally looked upon as the least satisfactory part of the Academy, partly because the room itself is but a cellar, and partly because the works exhibited do not adequately represent the resources of our English School. That School too has its avowed shortcomings ... the present collection is about the worst ever seen. It may be an honour to have died a patriot, but surely it becomes little short of a dishonour to live again in marble or bronze. [24]

To make matters worse, Foley had not exhibited since 1861, after a dispute over the placing of his works.[25]

In May 1868 Brock, giving his address as 10 Duke Street, Portland Place, exhibited his first work at the Royal Academy, a portrait bust in plaster of his former employer, Richard Binns FSA. An engraving of this bust in the archives of the Worcester Royal Porcelain Company shows a rather conventional bearded gentleman wearing a toga - one of the relatively few examples of Brock using classical rather than contemporary dress in a portrait bust (plate 15). It was the last annual exhibition to be held at the Academy's old premises in Trafalgar Square.

---

[22] RA Queen Victoria's Journal for 4 December 1867
[23] Royal Academy Annual Report 1867
[24] *Art Journal (AJ)* 1867 p. 171
[25] J. Turpin on J.H. Foley in *Dublin Historical Record* Vol. XXX11 No. 2 March 1979 p. 44

1868 ended on an encouraging note for Brock, as he was awarded two Silver Medals for his work in the Academy Schools, one for the best model from the Antique, the other for the best restoration of a portion of the Parthenon frieze. The standard of teaching in the Schools began to improve when the Academy moved from Trafalgar Square to Burlington House in November 1868. Frederic Leighton, elected RA in 1868, was appointed one of the Visitors to the Schools in 1869 and took a keen interest in the teaching of sculpture. Brock later recalled first meeting Leighton at the Schools, when he 'formed a friendship with that remarkably gifted man which I was privileged to enjoy to the day of his death'.[26] A fellow student was Hamo Thornycroft, who entered the Schools in June 1869, also on the recommendation of Foley. Three years younger than Brock, Thornycroft was also to be a life-long friend (and occasional rival).

At the 1869 Academy Exhibition Brock submitted two works - a bust of Ernest Hart and an 'ideal' figure of a young lady which he entitled *Salmacis* (plate 112), the nymph who loved Hermaphroditus (son of Hermes and Aphrodite) so intensely that their bodies were joined in one. The Academy catalogue referred to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*:

> *Now gathered flowers that grew about her streams,*
> *And then by chance was gathering as she stood*
> *To view the boy.*[27]

Salmacis is bare to the waist, her only garment being a robe loosely draped around her hips and held in place by a band or sash. As Ovid describes, she is gathering flowers; she holds one in her right hand and there are flowers by her feet. Brock showed his talent for realism in the folds of the robe, the detailing of the hair and the delicate poise of the left hand with upraised finger. She looks to the left, as if some sound had startled her.

Ideal statues of young ladies, with various classical names, were a favourite theme for sculptors at this time - 'Nymphs and goddesses supplied excellent opportunities for demonstration of the nude or near nude form'.[28]

Salmacis attracted the attention of the *Art Journal*, which published an engraving with some weighty comments on how to depict ideal subjects suggested by a Greek or Roman author. The sculptor must endeavour to form his model on the same lines as those employed by the great artists of old and Mr Brock, 'a rising sculptor of great

---

[26] *Morning Post* 3 March 1913
[27] Dryden's translation of Book IV
[28] Read 1982 p. 199

promise, has evidently worked in this direction' In attitude and expression his figure of Salmacis was exceedingly animated; there was much elegance in the arrangement throughout, while the modelling of the flesh was 'firm and truthful'.[29]

The allusion to the 'modelling of the flesh' was a discreet reference to the fact that *Salmacis* was in a state of undress. While nude or semi-nude statues had become acceptable in London circles by 1869, some justification of *Salmacis* was thought necessary in Brock's home town of Worcester:

> *Salmacis* is rather a warm subject... and one not to descant upon at length; but it is classical, and that should be enough. Swinburne made it disgusting. Ovid tells the story simply and touchingly. Mr Brock has caught the spirit of the greater master. He gives us all the grace and beauty of the poet's conception without any of the grossness. I would sooner be a poor man and the author of that exquisite model than be a millionaire without the sense to appreciate it.[30]

The critic Edmund Gosse, writing some thirteen years later, noted that while Brock had attracted some notice with his pretty female figure, *Salmacis* 'possessed too much of that smoothness of surface and ineffectual ideality which were the bane of the school of Foley'.[31]

At a period when uncommissioned ideal works often failed to sell, Brock had the satisfaction of seeing *Salmacis* purchased by his former employer the Worcester Royal Porcelain Company for £350. From 1875 the Company produced reduced versions in three sizes: 24 in (62 cm), 15 in (38 cm) and 10 in (25 cm) in Parian ware, signed by Brock; an example was shown at the Paris Exhibition of 1878.[32] Brock (or the company's modeller) made some changes, presumably to make it less vulnerable to breakage (plate 11).[33] The rock against which *Salmacis* stood was transformed into a tree stump with two branches to support her right and left hands - the flower in the right hand, the delicate pose of the left hand and the flowers at the base were all removed. Moreover, the Worcester models were coloured: 'This Parian figure is a good example of an added tint used to highlight the body; in this case, the figure is draped in a pale green robe'.[34] As the Worcester Royal Porcelain Company thought the original title too

---

[29] *AJ* 1870 p. 316
[30] Brock p. 23, quoting from an unidentified Worcestershire newspaper
[31] Gosse 1883 p. 45
[32] Worcester Porcelain Museum, letter of 13 September 2000 from W. Cook to J. A. Sankey
[33] H. Sandon *Royal Worcesster Porcelain from 1862 to the Present Day* Barrie and Jenkins Third Edition 1978 plate 29
[34] Cushion p. 326

obscure, the statuettes were sold under the name *Bather Surprised* - or as printed in one auction catalogue, *Rather Surprised*![35]

On 10 August 1869 Thomas Brock married Mary Hannah Sumner, only child of the late Richard Sumner of Nottingham and Mary Sumner (neé Hardstaff) in the parish church of Cossington; in Somerset. Mary had met Brock when he was taking part in a rowing regatta; she was seventeen years old.[36] The young couple moved to 15 Fitzroy Road, Primrose Hill and the 1871 census records them as living there with Brock's mother-in law (Mary Sumner), a domestic (Emma Skills) and a visitor (Thomas Bickerton, a fellow sculptor). Their first child, Thomas Gilbert, was born later in 1871.[37]

In November 1869 Brock completed his studies at the Royal Academy Schools by winning a Gold Medal for the best historical group in sculpture. The set subject was *Hercules strangling Antaeus*, a theme depicted in an antique group in the Palazzo Pitti, Florence.[38] Hercules, on his journey back from the Hesperides, encountered the giant Antaeus and wrestled with him. Gaia, the Earth Goddess, was the mother of Antaeus and he was invincible so long as his feet touched the ground. Hercules sapped the strength of the giant by lifting him in the air - and this is the moment portrayed by the sculptor (plate 53).

Brock's main rival for the Gold Medal was his fellow student Horace Montford; and the competition was so keen that unusually - if not uniquely - two Gold Medals were awarded. Charles Landseer, Keeper of the Academy Schools, reported that 'the very creditable competition in Sculpture was so marked as to result in the awarding of a second Gold Medal, the merits of the two being so nicely balanced'.[39] Brock may be regarded as having won by a short head - while he and Montford each received a Gold Medal and two books (Joshua Reynolds' *Discourses* and John Flaxman's *Lectures*), Brock was also awarded a £25 scholarship for two years.

The *Illustrated London News*, which rarely took note of works by students, published an engraving of *Hercules strangling Antaeus*, with the comment:

> It is not always that the prize group modelled in the Academy School of Sculpture can bear the test of severe criticism so well as this really admirable group by Mr T. Brock. The spirit of the conception, the knowledge of anatomy, displayed under difficult conditions of composition and action, would not discredit an experienced sculptor of established position;

---

[35] *Antiques Trade Gazette* 20 November 1993.
[36] Brock p. 24
[37] 1871 Census Records, Parish of St Pancras RG10/207 Folio 6 Schedule 23
[38] F. Haskell & N. Penny *Taste and the Antique* Yale University Press 1981 p. 232
[39] R.A. Council Report 1869

> and as the work, we understand, of quite a young student, it is therefore highly praiseworthy and full of promise. [40]

Brock and Montford exhibited their respective versions of *Hercules strangling Antaeus* at the 1870 R.A. Exhibition. The *Art Journal* praised the Montford group as 'very highly to be esteemed - the style and handling we seldom see surpassed in the present day' while Brock's version went unmentioned.[41]

Brock must have been disappointed by the reception given to *Hercules* and it failed to find a purchaser - perhaps the subject was too familiar (from the works of Pollaiuollo and others) or too indelicate (two nude men wrestling). It was never cast in bronze or marble, but fortunately the original plaster version, painted black, has survived. More important for Brock than the absence of a mention in the *Art Journal* was the verdict of Frederic Leighton, who spoke of Brock's work in the highest terms.[42] The concept of a nude, muscular figure fighting for his life may well have influenced Leighton's painting *Hercules wrestling with Death for the body of Alcestis* (1871) as well as his bronze sculpture *Athlete wrestling with a Python*, often regarded as the starting point of the New Sculpture. [43]

Gosse was also impressed by *Hercules strangling Antaeus*:

> This group has a singularly modern air, that is to say, it bears much more the impress of 1880 than of 1870. In a time when nobody in England thought about the French, when perhaps Mr Brock had never visited the Salon, it possessed the vigorous vital qualities of French work... The group is much more than a mere academic study; in its science, in the fine treatment of surface and detail, it is already masterly, and remarkably free from the fatal Foley smoothness.[44]

Gosse, writing in 1883 with the benefit of hindsight, was commending Brock for displaying 'the vigorous vital qualities of French work' (later identified with the New Sculpture) even before the dramatic appearance at the 1871 and 1872 Royal Academy Exhibitions of French sculptors who had taken refuge in London from the riots and disturbances in Paris. In 1871 Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux exhibited *Ugolin, La Jeune Fille à la Coquille* and *Le Pêcheur Napolitain* (plate 158), which caused the *Art Journal* to comment that 'For modelling, action, character, in short for Art-treatment, works of

---

[40] *Illustrated London News* (*ILN*) 1 January 1870 p. 32
[41] *AJ* 1870 p. 171
[42] Brock p. 23
[43] see p. 77
[44] Gosse 1883 p. 45

equal merit have seldom been seen within our Academy'.[45] Aimé-Jules Dalou, who exhibited for the first time in 1872, made regular appearances at the Royal Academy and his *Charity* (plate 159) was commissioned by the City of London in 1877.

After winning a Gold Medal and attracting the favourable attention of Frederic Leighton, Brock might have been expected to consolidate his reputation by exhibiting further ideal works. In fact he exhibited nothing in 1871 and 1872. The main reason was probably the dramatic increase in his workload in Foley's studio. Charles Birch, Foley's principal assistant, had left in 1869, as had Charles Lawes, and Brock had been appointed principal assistant in 1870. At the same time, Foley himself was absent from the studio for nearly nine months following an attack of pleurisy, caused by a chill he caught while working on the Albert Memorial.[46] Gosse later commented that the atmosphere of Osnaburgh Street seemed to have crushed Brock's young ambition 'as completely, for the time being, as Hercules subdued the presumptuous Lybian [sic] giant' i.e. Antaeus.[47]

In 1873 Brock returned to the Royal Academy with a plaster bust of his master, John Henry Foley. For once, Brock's timing was at fault - if he had exhibited the bust in 1875, after Foley's death, it would have attracted much attention. As it was, it passed unnoticed, and Brock never reproduced it in marble or bronze. It was not until 1877, when the completion of the Albert Memorial had revived interest in Foley, that the *Art Journal* decided to publish a full page engraving (plate 36), noting that Brock modelled this 'striking and lifelike' bust 'solely for the pleasure of doing it'.[48] *Foley* wears a rather large and floppy artist's hat with tassel, on which the *Art Journal* commented 'we should have preferred it, however, without the cap he wore in the studio, which certainly detracts from the dignity and expressiveness of the face'.

At the 1874 Royal Academy Brock exhibited a life-size ideal group in marble. It was entitled *Hereward the Wake* and was accompanied by a quotation from Charles Kingsley's novel. Hereward, dressed in Anglo-Saxon costume with helmet and elaborate leggings, is shown descending a staircase holding a maiden in his arms. The whereabouts of the original work is unknown, so it can only be judged from the full page engraving (plate 54) which appeared in the *Art Journal* with the comment:

---

[45] *AJ* 1871 p. 179
[46] Read 1982 p. 50
[47] Gosse 1883 p. 45
[48] *AJ* 1877 p. 316

> Instead of referring to the old and, it may almost be said, worn-out themes of classic story for a subject, Mr Brock has here found one in the Rev. Charles Kingsley's romantic tale of *Hereward the Wake, or the Last of the English.* A few words respecting Hereward are necessary to render intelligible the sculptor's work.

The *Art Journal* explained that Hereward was depicted in the act of rescuing Alftruda, daughter of Gilbert de Ghent, from a monastery in Peterborough which was being attacked by the Danes. Such an explanation was necessary because the group might otherwise be mistaken for an Anglo-Saxon version of the *Rape of the Sabines.* The *Art Journal* continued:

> Unarmed, for Hereward appears to have laid his weapons aside to allow free use of his arms, his eyes are sternly set on the contest going on below as he carries the timid and shrinking girl, clinging close to her stalwart deliverer.

Having thus tactfully pointed out Brock's failure to give the warrior a sword or even a dagger, the *Journal* then drew attention to the awkward pose of hero and maiden:

> The action in itself is opposed to all sculptural grace, but the artist has given to it much pictorial expression, and this is as much as the subject will admit. Both figures are well modelled and are very delicately chiselled.

In its assessment of the Academy Exhibition as a whole, the *Art Journal* concluded:

> Mr Brock does not fear to deal with the most energetic attitudes, and it must be confessed the result goes far to justify his courage. This work succeeds in spite of the disadvantages and difficulties suggested by its subject, and it may, in fact, be reckoned one of the best specimens of English sculpture which the Academy can show. [49]

The *Illustrated London News* also published an engraving of *Hereward* with the comment:

> his deeds of knight-errantry, in fighting the stoutest oppressors and rescuing the fairest damsels, are not unfit themes for artistic treatment. Mr Brock... has rendered one action of Hereward's in a vigorous and characteristic manner. [50]

Another observer who took a favourable view of *Hereward* was Hamo Thornycroft, whose own *Warrior bearing a Wounded Youth from Battle,* which won the RA Gold Medal in 1875, had echoes of *Hereward.* He noted in his diary that the *Saturday Review* had failed to notice this work 'by our cleverest young English sculptor, Mr Brock, or the figure by Maclean, but they simply abuse and say that sculpture goes worse and worse'.[51] Thornycroft was no doubt annoyed that in the same article the *Saturday Review* had referred to the 'steady plodding talent' of the equestrian statue of Lord

---

[49] *AJ* 1874 p. 226
[50] *ILN* 5 December 1874 p. 544
[51] Thornycroft Archive J(a) 185-6

Mayo, and mocked it as 'not unworthy of a place on the top of chimney clocks'.[52] *Mayo* was a work on which he and his father had collaborated.[53] *The Saturday Review* became far less critical of Thornycroft after Edmund Gosse's articles began to appear in 1879.[54]

A few months after the 1874 Exhibition, Brock's career was to be dramatically changed by a totally unforeseen event - the death of his master and employer John Henry Foley.

[52] *Saturday Review (SR)* 27 June 1874 p. 811
[53] Manning p. 206
[54] M. Stocker 'Edmund Gosse on Sculpture' in *University of Leeds Review* Vol. 28 (1985/6) p. 285

Chapter 2: Foley's Will

In August 1874 John Henry Foley was persuaded, against his usual inclinations, to stay on late at a wedding party. He caught a chill, and in his weakened state (following his pleurisy in 1871) died on 27 August 1874 at the age of fifty six.[1]

When Foley was advised by his doctor that he was near death, he sent for a solicitor and for a document he had prepared previously marked 'Terms of my Will'. This document provided that William Egley, James Radford and George Teniswood were to be his executors and that all sums paid by committees or individuals on account of works left unfinished should be refunded to those committees or individuals, less the value of the work already done. £1,000 was left for a Gold Medal for sculpture at the Slade School of Art, to be awarded annually, and the original models of his works were to be given to the Royal Dublin Society. The remainder of the estate was to be invested, with half the income going to his wife and half to his sisters Jane and Louisa; on their death, the capital sum would be donated to the Artists' Benevolent Fund. The draft of the Will also stated 'I desire that my two assistants, Mr Brock and Mr Dewick, finish all my works now in progress according to the models'.

The solicitor read the draft Will over to Foley, who asked that two changes be made: the bequest to the Slade School was deleted, because that institution already had sufficient funds, and the name of Charles Bell Birch was added to those of Brock and Dewick. Foley's sister Jane then reminded him that he had expressed an intention earlier that day to leave £800 to Brock (who was present in the room) 'in consideration of the services to be discharged by that gentleman' as well as a legacy of £100 to each of his two nieces. The solicitor suggested that, as Foley was weakening, he should sign the Will without further changes and that a codicil could be added later. Foley signed, with the solicitor guiding his hand; the nurse and the solicitor signed as witnesses. Foley died a few minutes later, before the codicil could be added.[2]

Although at first sight Foley's intentions might seem to have been reasonably clear, the Will turned out to present a veritable minefield of problems which would take years to resolve. One possible cause of delay and disagreement was quickly removed when

---

[1] Turpin p. 48
[2] *Times* 5 November 1875

two of the three executors declined for personal reasons to act, and this left George Teniswood as sole executor. Teniswood, a friend and contemporary of Foley, was a minor artist who exhibited twelve paintings of landscapes by moonlight at the Academy between 1863 and 1874. According to Brock's son:

> That gentleman was a painter - by no means a capable one - and such knowledge as he possessed of the sculptor's art, acquired through his close friendship with Foley, could have been but superficial. He treated Brock badly all through.[3]

As he was not a sculptor and had never worked in Foley's studio, he relied entirely on Brock for artistic and technical advice where sculptural matters were concerned.

The validity of the Will was immediately contested by some of Foley's relatives (his brother, a nephew and a niece) who had been omitted from it.[4] The case of 'Teniswood versus Foley' was eventually heard in the Probate and Divorce Division of the High Court in November 1875, over a year after Foley's death. Sir J. Hannen, the presiding judge, pronounced the Will valid, saying that there could be no doubt of the competency of the testator to understand what was being done and to affix his signature. The omission of the proposed legacies to Brock and the two nieces did not affect the issue. Probate was granted to Teniswood, as sole executor, on 23 November 1875.

Nevertheless, the legal wrangles continued. Two more relatives of Foley, his sister Sophie Burby and his nephew John Edward Foley, brought a case against Teniswood (as executor) in the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice in 1876[5]. The Vice Chancellor, Sir Charles Hall, gave judgment on 16 December 1876 that 'divers inquiries and accounts' be made and taken for the purpose of administering Foley's estate and executing the trusts of his Will.[6] These inquiries and accounts were still continuing in late 1878, but by then Teniswood had found it possible to get the Court of Chancery to approve his actions on an ad hoc basis.

The provision of Foley's Will which most affected Brock was that directing that he, Dewick and Birch finish 'all works in progress, according to the models'. As the leading sculptor of his day, commissions had poured into Foley's studio; yet his failing health since 1871 meant that a number were unfinished at the time of his death, including:

1. bronze statue of the Prince Consort for Kensington Gardens
2. marble statue of the Prince Consort for Cambridge

---

[3] Brock p. 40
[4] The Teniswood v. Foley case was reported in the *Times* (4, 5 and 6 November 1875)
[5] Letter from C.W. Hird to J. Litton of 19 October 1876 in Royal Dublin Society archives.
[6] Dublin City archives Ch 6/17 (Report of the O'Connell Monument Committee 15 August 1882 p. 23)

3. marble statue of Michael Faraday for the Royal Institution
4. marble statue of William Rathbone for Liverpool
5. bronze equestrian statue of Lord Canning for Calcutta
6. bronze statue of Henry Grattan for Dublin
7. bronze statue of the Earl of Rosse for Birr Castle, Ireland
8. marble statue of Dr William Stokes for Dublin
9. bronze equestrian statue of Field Marshal Lord Gough for Dublin
10. Irish National Memorial to Daniel O'Connell.

Two other statues, those of Sir Benjamin Lee Guinness and General 'Stonewall' Jackson, were also in the studio but were virtually ready for despatch.

Brock's claim to complete this formidable list of works was strong. He had been working in Foley's studio since 1866 and had been principal assistant since 1871. He had been involved in the design, modelling and execution of all the works concerned. He had been the first sculptor named in Foley's Will; he would (if Foley had lived long enough to sign the codicil) have received £800 in consideration of the services he was to undertake; and he was determined to take on the task for the sake of Foley's reputation and his own.

His claim was not challenged by William Dewick, the second sculptor named by Foley, who had joined Foley's studio a year after Brock and had been Brock's deputy since Brock's appointment as principal assistant.[7] He seems to have been content to continue in this role after Brock took over Foley's studio; in November 1879 he wrote two letters to the O'Connell Committee for Brock's signature, and in July 1880 wrote a further letter which he signed 'Yours faithfully for T.B., W.G. Dewick'.[8]

The other named sculptor, Charles Bell Birch, was not disposed to play second fiddle. He was fourteen years older than Brock, had been Foley's principal assistant from 1859-69 and considered that he had the right under Foley's Will to assist in the completion of the unfinished works on the same terms as Brock. He wrote to Teniswood on 7 November 1874, pointing out that the last-minute addition of his name to the Will most distinctly signified Foley's confidence in his (Birch's) professional ability and complaining that Brock (by right of possession or accidentally) was actually doing work of which he (Birch) was entitled to have a third share[9].

---

[7] *Times* 6 December 1882

[8] Dublin City Archives Ch 6/12/99, 100 & 111

[9] The texts of twelve letters (commencing in November 1874 and ending in January 1876) between Birch and Teniswood and their respective solicitors, were privately printed (presumably by Birch); a copy is in Dublin City Archives Ch 6/2/445

Birch was well informed; Brock had indeed started work on some of the unfinished statues. A Buckingham Palace official had visited the Osnaburgh Street studio in September 1874 and agreed with Teniswood that the casting of the bronze statue of Prince Albert should go ahead, using Foley's model, and the first section was cast under Brock's supervision in November 1874.[10]

To judge from surviving correspondence and from the subsequent course of events, it would seem that Brock and Teniswood may have agreed on an informal division of labour while Foley's Will was still before the Courts. Teniswood handled the correspondence and encouraged those who had commissioned works from Foley to agree to the works being completed on an 'at your own risk' basis until probate was granted. Brock took charge of all the artistic and technical work in the studio, working with little or no remuneration as Teniswood had no access to funds from Foley's estate until probate was granted. This situation lasted throughout 1875.

Neither Brock nor Teniswood wanted any involvement by Birch. At first Teniswood delayed any formal reply to Birch's letter on the grounds that nothing could be done while the Will was before the courts. Birch returned to the charge after probate was granted in November 1875, urging that 'due respect should be paid to the dying wish of the testator and common justice to myself' and expressing the hope that he could 'act in harmony' with Teniswood and Brock. For good measure he wrote to the Lord Mayor of Dublin (a member of the O'Connell Monument Committee) 'to counter the impression that Mr Brock was specially charged by Foley to complete his unfinished works'.[11]

Teniswood's solicitors now produced the ingenious argument that Foley's death had in fact terminated <u>all</u> outstanding commissions and contracts, and that no effect could be given to Foley's desires as to the completion of such works without further arrangements being made with the committees which had commissioned the works. When Birch protested at this interpretation of the Will, Teniswood's solicitors replied in December 1875:

> Your client knew that some of the works were being proceeded with and he also knew that it was being done at considerable risk as the right of the Will to Probate was being disputed; and had he ever expressed any desire to share in that risk Mr Teniswood would have been willing to avail himself of your client's assistance. Your client cannot now assist on equal terms with Mr Brock, for Mr Brock has always assisted and your client has not.[12]

---

[10] see p. 37
[11] see p. 45
[12] DCA Ch 6/2/445

However, Teniswood indicated that he was now willing to employ Birch on the same terms as those on which Foley had employed him six years previously i.e. £6 a week, hours from 10 to 5, subject to a week's notice on either side.

Birch's solicitor not unreasonably replied that it was an insult to offer an artist of established reputation such terms of employment, and proposed that the dispute be referred to arbitration. Teniswood declined to accede to this proposal in January 1876 and Birch apparently decided not to press the matter further.

Despite this dispute, there seems to have been no breach between Birch and Brock. Birch signed a joint letter with Brock and Lawes in connection with the Belt affair in 1881, and gave evidence helpful to Brock in the Belt v. Lawes case.[13] Nor did his career suffer from his failure to secure a share in completing Foley's works - he was elected ARA in 1880, three years before Brock.

Brock, in cooperation with Teniswood, thus became the sole sculptor responsible for completing Foley's unfinished works. Brock was initially content to keep a low profile, not least because it was important to reassure the various memorial committees that they were receiving (and paying good money for) a genuine work by John Henry Foley and not a substitute by a relatively unknown young sculptor called Thomas Brock.

While Brock was therefore prepared to forego public recognition of his role in completing Foley's works, he was not prepared to see Teniswood unjustly claim the credit for himself, as his participation was purely legal and secretarial. Matters came to a head in the summer of 1876 after the Queen had thanked Teniswood for his role in the completion of the Albert Memorial.[14] Brock wrote to Teniswood in the following terms:

> The Will distinctly expresses Mr Foley's desire that his work should be completed by myself, not by the executors, and as you must be aware, the credit attaching to this position is the stake for which I contend, and for which I have made no inconsiderable pecuniary sacrifice. In the case of the Albert statue, not only have you consented to accept an acknowledgement from the Queen, but have thought it necessary to publish the fact in a manner that deprives me of all credit or even association with the work in the public mind.
>
> Mr Garvey understood you to be the sculptor who actually completed the Rosse Statue. The Rev. Mr Daniel (Sec. O'Connell Committee) yesterday said that the general impression of the majority of the committee was that you were the senior assistant of Mr Foley, though they were surprised that your name did not appear in that connection.
>
> I have therefore, once and for all to request, that you will immediately fulfill your promise to publish such a statement as shall establish my position beyond question, and that I shall be

---

[13] see p. 97
[14] see pp. 38-9

> put into direct communication with the various committees in all matters relating to the procedure of the work.
>
> It remains only to add that after much consideration my final resolution is taken, that unless you should see fit to concede these points, I must, after the completion of the work immediately in hand, decline to take up anything else and retire altogether. [15]

This letter had the desired effect. In respect of the Prince Albert statue for Cambridge and the Faraday statue, Teniswood sent a statement to the committees concerned along the lines requested by Brock.[16] In addition Brock exhibited bas reliefs from the pedestal of the Rathbone Memorial and the head of *Lord Gough* at the Royal Academy in 1877 and 1878, thus establishing that he (not Foley) was the author of these works. In the latter year he signed a contract in his own name to complete the O'Connell Monument and formally took possession of Foley's studio in Osnaburgh Street (hitherto he had been working there on an informal basis). [17] Teniswood continued to send correspondence as executor as late as 1879, but Brock's status was now assured. He never forgave Teniswood for his behaviour over the Albert Memorial, and is reported to have said 'I want to forget that I ever had anything to do with him'.[18]

---

[15] Brock p. 41
[16] see pp. 40 and 59
[17] see pp. 50-1
[18] Brock p. 41

Chapter 3: The Albert Memorial

The most important of the unfinished works in the Osnaburgh Street studio was the seated bronze figure of Prince Albert, the central feature of the Albert Memorial. Foley had been given the commission in 1868, after the death of Carlo Marochetti, and had prepared a full scale model by June 1870. By 1874 Prince Albert had been dead for over twelve years, and officials at Buckingham Palace, reflecting Queen Victoria's own concerns, were anxious to avoid any further delay in the completion of the Memorial. Those principally involved were Mr Doyne Bell, Secretary to the Privy Purse; Sir Thomas Biddulph, Keeper of the Privy Purse; and Mr (later Sir) Charles Newton, Keeper at the British Museum and technical adviser to the Queen.

On 31 August 1874, within four days of Foley's death, Bell wrote to Biddulph:

> I shall endeavour to find out what arrangements he [Foley] had made for completing the other works in his studio and whether he left any special instructions with regard to the statue... the completion of the statue will undoubtedly require careful supervision and the exercise of much judgment, and at my last interview with Mr Foley we were discussing the question of gilding and erection on the pedestal. He said 'I must finish it completely in my studio, as I could not bear the exposure of any out-of-doors work; the doctor has told me that a return of my former attack will be fatal' - and so it has happened. [1]

On 23 September 1874 Bell reported that Teniswood, Foley's executor, was 'one of the few artists who were on intimate terms with Mr Foley and had known him for more than twenty years'. According to Teniswood, Foley had been conscious to the last and he had given instructions to his assistants respecting works in his studio. 'He desired three of them to complete works in hand, but with regard to the statue of the Prince had not said anything'. It is interesting that Teniswood gave a rather misleading impression about Foley's last wishes on the Albert statue. In fact, Foley had made no distinction between the Albert statue and the other unfinished works. Nor did Teniswood give the names of the assistants - Bell had to request this information later.[2]

Bell's report continued:

> The head and hands had already been finished and chased under his personal supervision and but little chasing will be required for the other portions ... The present operations are now in the charge of the founder, and until the two masses of the body are cast the sculptor will have nothing to do. One leg has been rejected by Mr Foley but that will cause little if any delay as far as the foundry is concerned. Still it will be necessary to ascertain how far the remodelling

---

[1] RA Add.H2/4446

[2] RA Add.H2/4451 & 4458

of it had been carried out by Mr Foley. What I would propose would be that Mr Newton and myself should meet Mr Teniswood at the studio and examine and note down all the portions of the statue and models that are there, and then go to the foundry and make a similar examination ... my present impression is that although Foley has not been spared to finish it, the statue is artistically complete, and even if it should be desirable, which I hardly think will be necessary, to appoint another sculptor to supervise it, such supervision will be more precautionary than involving any active operations ... an accident to the largest mould at the foundry ... will cause a delay of three or four months.

Gilbert Scott was also concerned. He asked Bell on 30 September 1874:

who is to direct and superintend the chasing and finishing off of the Bronze Statue? Mr Armstead's statues were executed by Messrs Elkington and are very excellent in their finish, but Mr Philip's were I think executed by Mr Prince and have not struck me as so well finished by a great deal. Now, so far as I have heard Mr Foley's statue is in the hands of the Founder last named, but in any case it would demand much care and skill.[3]

Bell and Newton visited Foley's studio at Osnaburgh Street and Prince's foundry in Southwark on 7 October 1874. In a letter to Sir Thomas Biddulph, Newton reported that he and Bell had been

quite satisfied with the casting and chasing of the head and hands. A young Frenchman was working on one leg. Two great pieces of body had yet to be cast, and it was desirable that one person conversant with the technical details of casting and chasing bronze statuary should constantly watch the progress of the work.[4]

It was the task of the sculptor (or his assistant) to ensure that the 'artistic form' of the wax-covered mould was satisfactory before casting, and to undertake or supervise the chasing (finishing) of the statue after casting. Feeders and risers had to be removed, core-support holes plugged, defects filled, surface detail sharpened and all visible evidence of seams or joints removed.[5] On 23 October 1874 Bell made a further report to Biddulph:

Mr Foley's assistants, who had had opportunities of examining in the studio works which Mr Foley had received from various founders, might possibly have sufficient knowledge to pronounce whether a casting was good or bad, but it would be more satisfactory even if it was not imperative that a decision on such a point should carry weight and must proceed from some person of known experience and position in the art world ... Teniswood saw the force of this.

.... I cannot speak too highly of his [Teniswood's] pleasant manner ... we are most fortunate in having to deal with so high-minded and straightforward a gentleman.[6]

---

[3] RA Add.H2/4452. Henry Hugh Armstead executed *Astronomy, Chemistry, Medicine* and *Rhetoric* for the Albert Memorial; John Birnie Philip *Geology, Geometry, Philosophy* and *Physiology*

[4] RA Add.H2/4461

[5] D. James 'The Statue Foundry at Thames Ditton' in *Foundry Trade Journal* 7 Sept. 1972 pp. 279-89

[6] RA Add.H2/4465

Evidently what Teniswood lacked in technical knowledge he made up for in charm.

In fact, Teniswood soon had to acknowledge his dependence on Brock. On 25 October 1874, replying to a question from Bell about the casting process, he simply forwarded a letter which the foundry owner had previously sent to Foley and added:

> In reference to the joining of the various parts of the bronze figure, Mr Brock informs me the large parts are to be bolted and screwed, the joints for which he himself made in the model, in addition to having worked upon it in conjunction with Mr Foley throughout the whole of its progress.

Moreover, in response to a request from Bell for the name of the young Frenchman at Prince's foundry, Teniswood replied on 10 October 1874 that 'The only person in Osnaburgh Street who could have given me that information is absent from illness. I have however written for it.'[7] It would not be unreasonable to assume that Brock was the 'only person'.

Bell and Newton summed up their impressions in a joint report to the Queen's Private Secretary on 29 October 1874:

> Mr Foley had agreed to deliver that statue complete, gilt and fixed on the pedestal at the Memorial for the sum of £10,000. It appears that in his will Mr Foley had expressed his desire that his three assistants should finish all his works ... Mr Brock, the assistant who worked especially on the Prince Consort's Statue, is an intelligent young man but it is not clear what duties he could be called upon to perform with regard to the metal statue, as with the exception of the work of the chaser ... all the operations now to be carried out rest with the founder ... [Teniswood] seems inclined to ask some sculptor of acknowledged position to assist him [in judging the quality of the casting].[8]

Following this report two sculptors, Henry Hugh Armstead and Henry Weekes, nominated respectively by Buckingham Palace and Teniswood, were appointed to certify (for a fee of 100 guineas each) that the casting to be carried out by Prince's Foundry was up to standard.[9]

Although it must have been disappointing for Brock that more senior sculptors had been appointed over his head, he remained a key figure in the day-to-day progress of the work. When Bell wrote to Teniswood about insuring the work being done at the foundry, he added 'I should be obliged if you would permit Mr Brock or some other person equally qualified to accompany the surveyor.' On 19 November 1874 Bell wrote to Newton that:

---

[7] RA Add.H2/4467 & 4460
[8] RA Add.H2/4477/9
[9] RA Add.H2/4488 & 4489

> a large mass from waist to plinth (three and a half tons) has been cast. Mr Brock (Foley's assistant) whom I saw yesterday said that it appeared to be most successful ... if there is no accident we may certainly expect to have the statue up by the end of next May or the beginning of June.

In a further letter to Newton three days later, Bell wrote 'at any rate we can only guess how far Foley would have chased the various surfaces and his assistant Mr Brock might be able to furnish some information on this point'.[10]

On 25 February 1875 the *Daily News* reported that the casting had been successfully completed at Prince's foundry. 'The casting of the figure involved the moulding of sections comprising over a thousand nicely-fitting pieces of carefully-prepared material'. Armstead and Weekes, in a joint report of 1 March 1875, certified that the casting was satisfactory.[11] Newton, who accompanied Armstead and Weekes on their visit to the foundry, reported to Biddulph:

> Mr Brock, Mr Foley's principal assistant, who worked on the model of the Prince Consort under his direction, was present at our meeting and gave us much valuable information as to Mr Foley's views and intentions with regard to the finishing, the surface of the bronze and other details. It will be desirable that the final chasing and the union of the joints by which the several parts of the statue are to be put together should be carried out under Mr Brock's supervision as far as possible.[12]

The crucial importance of Brock's role had at last been recognised.

At this delicate moment, Mr Prince, the owner of the foundry, died, and hopes of completing the work by May faded. In response to an enquiry by Bell about lack of progress, Teniswood wrote on 15 May 1875 to assure him that 'Mr Brock or myself will constantly visit the foundry' and followed this up with a letter reporting that:

> the fitting together of the various portions of the figure will be the next step, and will be effected under the personal superintendence of Mr Brock'.[13]

Doyne Bell himself visited the foundry on 28 July 1875 and reported to Biddulph that welding was proceeding - a slow and tedious process. He decided to visit the foundry again on 18 October, and Brock, in the absence of Teniswood, wrote to him assuring him that everything would be ready for his visit: this appears to be the only letter written

---

[10] RA Add.H2/4484, 4496, 4502
[11] RA Add.H2/4519
[12] RA Add.H2/4520
[13] RA Add.H2/4538

by Brock relating to the Albert Memorial in the Royal Archives. On 19 October Bell reported to Biddulph that he had found the statue in perfect condition.[14]

The move of the statue took place on 20 November 1875, the route from the foundry in Ewer Street in Southwark being via Union Street, Charlotte Street, Blackfriars Road, Westminster Bridge Road, Westminster Bridge, Victoria Street, Stockbridge Terrace and Grosvenor Place, entering Hyde Park through Apsley House Gate. In a memorandum dated 20 November 1875, Doyne Bell wrote:

> The workmen with Mr Brock (Foley's assistant) were engaged during the whole of last night in removing [the statue] into the street and it was not until seven o'clock this morning that it was raised by screwjacks and safely placed on the trolley ... The statue was drawn by six very powerful grey horses.

The trolley left Southwark at 11.10 am and arrived at Hyde Park at 12.40 p.m., a distance of four and a half miles. Bell, Brock and Teniswood walked with it the entire distance.[15]

Brock then supervised the raising of the statue, first to the podium and then to its pedestal, on 24/25 November and the work of gilding began in December. The statue was not formally unveiled, but the scaffolding and tarpaulins were removed and it was open to public view in March 1876, four years after the inauguration of the Memorial itself.[16]

On 17 December 1875 Teniswood seized the opportunity to send Bell a set of photographs of the newly-installed statue, with a request that they be laid before the Queen. On 1 March 1876 the Keeper of the Privy Purse wrote to Teniswood

> I have received the Queen's Command to forward to you the accompanying copy of the history of the Memorial with her Majesty's signature on it. I am to desire your acceptance of it and to thank you for the obliging manner in which you have all along acted as Executor to Mr Foley, with reference to the completion of the important work now so successfully brought to a conclusion.[17]

Teniswood replied to Sir Thomas Biddulph's letter acknowledging the Queen's most gracious present and message:

> So unexpected by me was any such mark of Her Majesty's approval of my share in the completion of the statue of the Prince Consort (left unfinished by my friend Mr Foley) that I

---

[14] RA Add.H2/4548, 4580, 4586
[15] RA Add.H2/4619
[16] RA Add.H2/4620 & 4626
[17] RA Add.H2/4624 & 4650

> am at a loss for words to convey my deep sense of the high honour conferred on me by Her Majesty's most generous notice.[18]

Brock's reaction to Teniswood's behaviour has already been described in the previous chapter. However, Teniswood's role was unwittingly exaggerated in an article about the Albert Memorial in the *Art Journal.* This stated that:

> On Mr Foley's decease, in 1874, the casting of the remaining portions of the work, by Prince and Co., Southwark was resumed under the responsibility of the sculptor's friend and executor Mr G. F. Teniswood. [19]

This statement has been taken at its face value and has misled art historians about the respective roles of Teniswood and Brock - the record can now be put straight.[20]

The second statue of the Prince Consort in Foley's studio was intended for Cambridge University. When Foley died in August 1874 the marble statue itself was ready but work on the pedestal and its medallions was delayed because of disagreement over the site. Teniswood was keen to clear the studio of finished works and in July 1875 asked if the Albert statue could be sent to Cambridge as soon as the Royal Academy's posthumous exhibition of Foley's works was over.[21] Dr. James Cartmell, chairman of the memorial committee, was adamant that the statue should not be delivered to Cambridge until the pedestal and its three medallions were also ready. In November Teniswood informed Cartmell that two of the circular relievos (medallions) were 'quite completed' in the marble and the third was actively progressing, and sought instructions on the wording of the inscription.[22] It was not until 31 July 1876 that the statue and pedestal (plate 5) finally arrived in Cambridge.[23] The formal unveiling by the Prince of Wales took place on 22 January 1878.

Brock never claimed to have played a role in the execution of the statue itself, which was completed in 1870, before he took over as Foley's chief assistant. However, the pedestal and its three medallions were executed after Foley's death, and the *Cambridge*

---

[18] RA Add.H2/4652
[19] *AJ* 1877 p. 120
[20] Brock's role is recognised in C. Brooks (ed.) *The Albert Memorial* Yale University Press, New Haven & London 2000 p. 197
[21] CU Archives 0.1.14.11 xii: Teniswood's letter of 27 July 1875 to Cartmell
[22] ibid 0.1.14.11 xv: letter of 16 November 1875 to Cartmell
[23] R. Willis & J. W. Clark *Architectural History of the University of Cambridge* Cambridge 1886 Vol. III p. 224

Chronicle states explicitly that the medallions 'were executed from Mr Foley's designs by Mr Brock, under the superintendence of Mr G. F. Teniswood'.[24]

In 1865 the memorial committee, when approving Foley's design for the statue and its pedestal, suggested that the latter should be decorated with three marble medallions with allegorical figures depicting Law, Moral Philosophy and Natural Philosophy. Depicting Law would be 'easy'; Moral Philosophy would be represented by History (a figure holding a scroll), while Natural Philosophy would have a figure holding a retort or an alembic representing Chemistry, the subject which the Prince most cared for.[25]

It is not clear whether these suggestions were formally adopted by the memorial committee or passed on to Foley. Certainly by the time of the unveiling the members of the committee had forgotten what the three medallions were meant to represent and asked Teniswood for an explanation. In reply, he sent an apologetic covering letter disclaiming any detailed knowledge and enclosing a memorandum, which we can surmise was written by Brock.

According to the memorandum, the female figure on the right holding a scroll of music 'in the act of notation,' her left arm resting on a lyre, represented Art (plate 6). The front medallion, a female figure holding a book with one hand and a fascis with the other, represented Literature (plate 7). At her feet are an owl and a scroll, behind her is a globe. The left medallion, a female figure deep in thought, an 'anatomical subject' (a corpse) awaiting dissection on her right and an animal's skull on her left, represented Science (plate 8). In his covering letter, Teniswood commented that the central medallion suggested Learning in its widest sense rather than merely Literature, but he was unable to say why Science was represented by Anatomy or Art by Music (rather than Painting).[26]

There is certainly something unusual about the medallions. The symbolism is obscure, which is not normally the case with Foley or Brock, and the figures are more Gibsonesque and formally classical than (say) the *Rathbone* plaques (plates 104-106), which Brock was executing at about the same time. It seems possible that Foley gave less attention to the medallions than to the statue itself, and delegated the designs to a

---

[24] *Cambridge Chronicle* 26 January 1878
[25] RA R4/126 letter of 26 February 1865 from F. W. Gibbs to Sir Charles Phipps
[26] C. U. Archives O.1.14 xvii letter of 25 January 1878 from Teniswood to Cartmell

junior assistant (not Brock); and that when Brock took over these rather inadequate models in 1874, he felt unable to change them.

In 1956, at the request of the Fitzwilliam Museum., the Council of the Senate decided to remove the statue from the entrance hall of the Museum to an isolated site in a wooded area on the Madingley Hall estate, overlooking a small lake. This decision ignored a Senate resolution of 1863 that the statue be erected 'in some conspicuous place in the University' and the pledge of the University Chancellor at the unveiling in 1878 that the statue would be among the University's 'most valued possessions'.[27] Not only is the uncovered marble statue being damaged by exposure to every form of weather, but it is unprotected against vandalism. It is to be hoped that the Cambridge University authorities find a more suitable location before it deteriorates even further.

[27] Read 1982 p. 3

Chapter 4: The O'Connell Monument

The Irish National Memorial to Daniel O'Connell has been described as 'the most important sculptural commission of the nineteenth century in Ireland'.[1] The award of the commission for the O'Connell Monument to Foley had been controversial. Although he was born in Dublin and generally regarded as Ireland's most eminent sculptor, his father had been born in England and he himself had lived and worked in London from the age of 16. It was asserted that Foley's Irish nationality 'begins and ends with his name', and that the Monument 'should be sculpted by none other than Irish hands'. The O'Connell Monument Committee only approached him in October 1865 after a competition to find a more truly Irish sculptor had attracted some 60 entries, all of which were rejected as unsuitable.[2]

Foley was originally asked to execute the figure of O'Connell only, with an architect designing the monument as a whole - similar to the procedure adopted for the Albert Memorial. Foley rejected this as 'an experiment in which for the sake of my reputation I could take no part', because 'the admixture of the various peculiarities of several artists must terminate in a mass of incongruities'.[3] Eventually the committee agreed that Foley should design and execute the entire monument (plate 76). The base of the monument would have the arms of the four provinces (Connaught, Leinster, Munster and Ulster) on its sides and four 10 ft (3.05 m) high Winged Victories on pedestals at its four angles, symbolising O'Connell's qualities of Courage, Eloquence, Fidelity and Patriotism. On this base a circular pedestal or drum would bear a carved frieze depicting Irishmen of all creeds and classes with the figure of Erin (plate 77), trampling chains underfoot and pointing upwards to the 12 ft (3.66 m) figure of O'Connell[4]. The committee approved the model in 1867 and agreed a fee of £10,000, of which £2,000 was paid to Foley in advance. The balance would be invested and would be paid to him on completion together with the interest thereon.[5]

---

[1] P. Murphy 'J. H. Foley's O'Connell Monument' in *Irish Arts Review Yearbook* Vol. 11 (1995) p. 155
[2] H. Potterton *The O'Connell Monument* Gatherum Series No. 4 Cork 1973 p. 4
[3] Dublin City Archives (DCA) Ch 6/1, letter from Foley 14 October 1865
[4] The design and symbolism of the monument are discussed in Murphy 1995 pp. 155-6
[5] DCA Ch 6/1, minutes of meeting on 13 December 1867

In August 1871 four members of the committee visited Foley's studio in London. They were not satisfied with progress so far made and asked him to meet the whole committee in Dublin. Foley told the committee that he had been engaged on the memorial since December 1867, but had been unable to work for nine months in 1870/1 because of illness. The central pedestal or drum was most advanced, with eleven of the sixteen principal figures nearly completed. Modelling of the heads of the four Victories, and work on the head of O'Connell, was under way. He assured the committee that the monument was 'the principal work of my life' and warned that a really good work of art could not be produced without a great deal of patience. The National Memorial to Frederick the Great in Berlin had taken 20 years, but he hoped to complete the O'Connell Monument in less than a third of this time (i.e. 6-7 years). He could have finished it in three to four years, but he would not have put his name to such a work.

When a committee member said he wanted to see the monument finished before he died, and asked whether priority could be given to this over other commissions, Foley replied that 'the artist who spends all his time at one work is not likely to produce as good a work as the artist who turns for relief from one subject to another'. However, he would try to complete the monument in 1874 - six years from the commencement of work.[6]

On 29 August 1874 George Teniswood, as Foley's executor, wrote to inform the committee of Foley's sudden death. The committee expressed its condolences and asked how matters stood over the monument. Before Teniswood could reply Charles Foley, the sculptor's brother, wrote to say that the models and designs were so minutely finished that the modelling of the larger works from them was not a work of great difficulty. However, it required an artist of repute to see the beauties of the small models and reproduce them in the large; and he offered his services in this regard.[7]

The committee now decided to seek a legal opinion from learned counsel (Mr. J. B. Murphy). His advice was that 'if all the artistic part of the work had been completed, or substantially so, and that nothing remains to be done but what is mechanical, the representatives of the late Mr Foley [i.e. the executors] may be entitled to proceed with the monument'; if not, the committee should get back its £2,000 advance to Foley. However, it

---

[6] ibid. minutes of meeting 8 August 1871
[7] DCA Ch 6/1, letter of Charles Foley dated 10 October 1874

appeared from the brother's letter that the work already done was of such character and value that the committee might find it advantageous to come to an arrangement with Foley's representatives which would prevent litigation or hardship on either side. In other words, better for the committee to put more money into a nearly complete work of art and finish it, rather than pull out and have a collection of useless fragments of a monument on its hands.[8]

In the light of this advice, the committee sent Sir John Gray and the Rev. O'Rourke to London in November 1874. They reported that they had been received with great courtesy by Teniswood. The full size model of the statue of O'Connell had been completed by Foley; and a few weeks before he died he had put the finishing touches to the head. However, the feet 'where the trousers fell on the boot' needed more work. The drum with its frieze had also been completed except for the undercutting of some of the figures in high relief. Of the four Winged Victories only the heads had been modelled by Foley. O'Rourke suggested that while Brock might be very competent to complete the work, 'it was the duty of the committee to have the progress [sic] of finishing the monument supervised by some artist of experience and ability'. One committee member suggested that the best course would be to select one of the sculptors named in Foley's Will, but another member recalled the committee's previous decision that as much of the work as possible should be in Irish hands.[9]

Teniswood wrote on 19 February 1875 to say that he was now sole executor, the others having withdrawn. So far as the choice of sculptor was concerned, he was careful to list all three named in Foley's Will, noting that Brock had been Foley's principal assistant for some years; that Dewick 'had been engaged in the studio for several years'; and that Birch 'was formerly with Mr Foley, but not of late years'. In a further letter Teniswood noted that the grant of probate had again been unexpectedly delayed through no fault of his.[10] He did not mention that the difficulty was due to Foley's relatives continuing to contest the Will.[11]

This was the situation when the committee met on 1 September 1875. *The Times* reported:

---

[8] ibid. report of Legal Sub Committee, 27 October 1874
[9] ibid. report dated 9 November 1874; minutes of committee meeting of 16 February 1875
[10] ibid. letter of 19 March 1875
[11] see p. 29

> The O'Connell Committee have renewed their efforts to get the monument completed. Their negotiations with Mr Teniswood have not yet led to a satisfactory result. Some members complained that Mr Birch, whose name had been mentioned in Foley's Will as his principal assistant in finishing the work, had not been retained for that purpose by Mr Teniswood and that probate of the Will had not yet been taken out. Other unfinished works of Foley were being proceeded with, while the O'Connell monument was untouched. In the case of the other works, Mr Teniswood explained that the committees had made advances of money. The Lord Mayor [of Dublin] observed that the committee had been advised not to make any advance until the probate of the Will had been obtained, so that the executors would be legally authorised to deal with them.[12]

Not only was this report inaccurate in suggesting that only Birch was mentioned in Foley's Will, but it omitted the crucial, if rather surprising, decision taken by the committee to leave the choice of sculptor to Teniswood.[13] This was presumably to avoid further arguments in the committee itself, and also because of the 'cloak controversy' (see below).

Unaware of this decision, Charles Birch wrote to the Lord Mayor of Dublin on 3 November 1875 restating his claim to complete the O'Connell Monument.[14] If Birch had been Irish, this might have made a difference; as it was, his pleas were ignored.

Meanwhile, the question of O'Connell's cloak had been raised by members of O'Connell's family. They claimed that he rarely wore a cloak, and that viewed from the back the cloaked figure would be unsatisfactory. Against this, it was argued that Foley had, as instructed, prepared a full size model with a cloak and O'Connell with a cloak was better than no O'Connell at all. In August 1875 Teniswood was asked to send to Dublin the two sketch models prepared by Foley and showing O'Connell 'draped' and 'undraped'. One committee member, Sir Dominic Corrigan, insisted that:

> The uncloaked figure conveys more the impression of O'Connell. It represents the defiance which always characterised him, and reminds me of Sheil's description of him - shouldering his umbrella like a pike and stepping out as if he would kick Protestant ascendancy before him.[15]

The committee voted on 19 November 1875 by 7 to 3 not to have a cloak; but reversed this decision on 28 December 1875. A final vote on 14 January confirmed that the cloak would be retained.[16]

---

[12] *Times* 4 September 1875
[13] *Freeman's Journal* 2 September 1875
[14] DCA Ch 6/1, minutes of meeting on 19 November 1875
[15] Brock p. 39
[16] DCA Ch 6/1, minutes of relevant meetings

On 30 November 1875 Teniswood informed the committee that probate had at last been granted; but because of the cloak controversy it was not until February 1876 that a subcommittee was set up to resume negotiations with Teniswood over the contract. Agreement was quickly reached that the contract with Foley had ended with his death and that a new contract should be drawn up, setting a time limit for completion of the monument. Although Brock's name was not specifically mentioned, there seems to have been a general assumption that he would be the sculptor chosen.

Hopes of early progress were soon dashed. In March 1876 Teniswood was forced to suspend discussions because of a fresh legal challenge to Foley's Will by his sister and his nephew.[17] The lack of progress finally led Edmund Dwyer Gray, editor of the *Freeman's Journal* and secretary of the committee, to complain to Teniswood. In his reply, Teniswood went over to the attack:

> Had the O'Connell Committee acted on my willingness to proceed with the work on the death of Mr Foley, as other Committees did, the monument might by this date have been very far advanced towards completion; but it was only in March last, on the close of the 'cloak' controversy, that the basis of terms for completion were forwarded to me. How far I have striven to meet the wishes of the various Committees of Mr Foley's unfinished commissions is evidenced by the numerous works that have been satisfactorily completed since his death, among which four important statues have been erected in Ireland viz. those of Grattan, Guinness, Lord Rosse and Dr. Stokes. Hence it will be seen that whilst works were progressing, for the completion of which their respective Committees empowered me to proceed, the O'Connell Committee was standing still.[18]

This letter from Teniswood was rather disingenuous. It is true that he had suggested in September 1875 that the committee should advance money so that work on the monument could proceed on an informal basis while the legal problems were sorted out. On the other hand, Teniswood himself had been responsible for suspending discussions in March 1876 after the fresh challenge to Foley's Will. In fact, the committee had very little choice - they were unable to change sculptor or studio at this stage in view of the substantial sum of money already spent. After a delay for reflection, they decided to send some of their members to Foley's studio in February 1877 to resume negotiations for a new contract.

---

[17] see p. 29

[18] ibid. letter of Teniswood to Gray of 14 July 1876

Most of Foley's other unfinished works had by now been completed and Brock and Teniswood were keen to get the O'Connell contract signed. Immediately after the committee members' visit, Teniswood wrote to Gray on 24 February 1877:

> The administration of the estate is in the hands of the Ct [Court] of Chancery. I cannot therefore say whether it will order the completion of the mont [monument]. If the Court sanctions its completion I shall be happy to give my best attention to its progress. If the Ct does not sanction the estate finishing it, the Committee will I presume arrange with another artist.
> Before your meeting, Mr Brock purposes to see you privately in Dublin, in order to propose for the work in the event of its being placed in other hands. I need not say Mr B. has completed a large number of works since Mr Foley's death - and in all cases most satisfactory [sic] to the Committees. Be so good as to say shall Mr B. visit you or not.[19]

In addition to this boost from Teniswood, Brock had evidently made a good impression on the members; they reported to the main committee on 13 March 1877 that 'the monument was still in good condition, quite as sound as ever it was, but it kept Mr Brock, the talented assistant of Mr Foley, who since his death had completed nearly all his works, constantly at work, or [it] would long ago have dropped into pieces. But even with his almost hourly care it could not last for ever'. Teniswood had assured them that the Chancery proceedings were not being taken by anyone wanting to have a hand in the completion of the work (i.e. Birch), and that he could get the Court's permission to proceed with the new contract.[20]

The committee secretary saw Brock privately on 19 September 1877 and recorded four points:

- there was no chance of the Court of Chancery reviving the original contract
- Brock was anxious to complete the monument
- he would do it for £10,000 or £10,500 but could not start before November
- if a new contract had to be made, it must be made with Brock, or the old design and model must be abandoned.[21]

Problems over the appointment of new trustees and arguments over the terms of the new contract meant that over fifteen months passed before the full committee was presented with the final version of the contract on 13 June 1878.[22]

---

[19] DCA Ch 6/12/10
[20] DCA Ch 6/1, minutes of Special Committee on 13 March 1877
[21] DCA Ch 6/10/18
[22] DCA Ch 6/17, final report of the O'Connell Monument Committee 15 August 1882

The contract was an agreement between three parties - Teniswood, Brock and the committee. Its main provisions were that Brock would complete and erect the monument in accordance with Foley's models; that he would receive the sum of £10,500, to be paid in instalments as the work proceeded; that Teniswood (as Foley's executor) would retain the £2,000 previously paid to Foley; and that Brock and the committee would renounce any claim to this latter sum.

Section 6 of the contract specified that the fee would be paid to Brock in instalments as follows:

> £800 on confirmation of the contract by Court of Chancery (at which point Brock could commence work)
> £800 on completion of the circular relief (drum) ready for casting;
> £1,600 on casting the circular relief;
> £800 on completion of the figure of O'Connell ready for casting;
> £800 on casting the figure
> £800 on completion of the four Winged Victories ready for casting;
> £800 on casting of the above figures;
> £1,200 on delivery of the stonework for the monument at site;
> £2,900 on the monument being completed and ready for unveiling

A number of potential snags had been ironed out in correspondence between Brock and Gray before the committee meeting. The committee wanted to specify that the monument should be cast in 'best bronze'. Brock was at first disposed to object to the adjective 'best', which was not normally used in contracts. He told Gray on 5 June 1878 that 'it is quite impossible for a fine cast to be made from common metal' and that for the sake of his reputation he would ensure that the foundry used only the best metal. He hoped the committee would credit him with 'a desire to act fairly in this matter'.[23]

When it turned out that the committee were concerned at the use of 'old gun metal', Brock assured Gray on 11 June 1878:

> I always intended using the best metal obtainable - with regard to the proportions of the material, will you allow me to point out that old gun metal is considered the finest of all for figure casting, and the great difficulty is to obtain a sufficient supply, hence the necessity for mixing with it an equal quantity of new bronze composed of 90% copper and 10% tin.....P.S. The great statue of Prince Albert in Hyde Park was cast entirely from old 9 pounder guns which the Government sent us.[24]

---

[23] DCA Ch 6/12/45
[24] DCA Ch 6/12/48

Old gun metal from melted down cannon was popular with Victorian sculptors as it was of excellent quality and also reduced the cost of the statue if the War Office could be persuaded to donate the cannon. The statue of Field Marshal Lord Gough, also intended for Dublin, was 'cast from the cannon taken by the troops under his command' according to the inscription on its base.[25] There was no question of a donation in the case of the O'Connell Monument, but it is possible that the committee objected to the use of old gun metal because its militaristic associations were not appropriate for the peace-loving Irish patriot. Brock's reference to the use of gun metal for the equally peace-loving Prince Albert was therefore intended to reassure the committee.

Another point at issue was the choice of the sculptor to certify the work. Brock proposed William Calder Marshall, an old friend of Foley, on the grounds of his knowledge of Foley's style, his great experience as a senior member of the RA, and the fact that he had advised the Vice Chancellor of the Court of Chancery on technical aspects of Foley's Will.[26] However, the committee preferred Armstead, no doubt because he had certified the Albert Memorial casting. Brock accepted Armstead, who was to be paid 175 guineas in three instalments for his work.[27]

A third problem was the insurance of Brock's life - having lost one sculptor (Foley), the committee were fearful of losing another. They therefore required the deposit of a policy of insurance on Brock's life for £1,000, as well as a bond for £1,000, both guaranteed by Mr William Brock, his father, described as a 'gentleman of means'. Although Brock senior was said to have been disappointed when his son chose sculpture as his profession, rather than entering the family business, he must be given full credit for standing by him after he had retired and was at an age (55) when he might well have wished to avoid a financial commitment of this size.[28]

A critical factor for the committee was the question of time. The monument had first been conceived in 1862; the foundation stone had been laid in 1864; and Foley had been commissioned in 1867. Hopes that the task would be completed by the centenary of O'Connell's birth (1875) had been dashed by Foley's death. Now members of the committee

---

[25] see pp. 64-5
[26] DCA Ch 6/12/47
[27] DCA Ch 6/1, committee minutes of 13 June 1878
[28] DCA Ch 6/12/66,69 & 71, letters from Murphy (lawyer) to Gray of 15 & 22 July and 10 August 1878

wanted a firm date for completion. Gray had foreseen this, and sought Brock's views. Brock replied on 18 April 1878: 'I shall use my utmost endeavours to have the work erected ready for unveiling in three years from the date of my signing the agreement'. He had already entered into an arrangement with Teniswood for the retention of the Osnaburgh Street studio, and he did not anticipate any problem from the Court of Chancery.[29] When pressed further by Gray, he replied 'I really cannot see how I can specify dates even approximately as the payment [of instalments] will depend so much on the progress made at the Foundry and quarries'.[30]

When the committee met on 13 June 1878, Gray said that Brock could not bind himself to time, as progress depended on so many circumstances; but he had calculated that the monument would be erected within three years. The best stimulus for progress was the fact that £2,900 (28% of Brock's entire fee) would not be paid until the monument was ready for unveiling. In other words the payments Brock would be receiving would only just cover the costs of executing the work, and his profit would not come until the work was completed.

Gray noted that the draft contract did not have the flaw present in the Foley contract i.e. the provision that he would receive any interest earned on the £10,500. He did not want to say anything derogatory of Foley, or insinuate that he created any intentional delay, but it must be remembered that the longer the delay was, the more money Foley made. Brock, on the contrary, would only receive a total of £10,500, the interest being reserved to pay for the foundations of the monument and other (e.g. legal) expenses; and he would therefore have the incentive to work quickly to receive his profit.

Even at this late stage some members of the committee still hankered after the appointment of an Irish sculptor, but Brock had his supporters. Professor Kavanagh expressed his confidence in Brock by saying that 'the wide world would have nothing to approach, not to say surpass, the O'Connell Monument ... There was but one living man to carry out the design, and that was Mr Brock'. He was surprised to find that it would take three years to complete, but artists were not to be pressed, and the committee could afford to wait a little longer, having now waited for sixteen years since they first met. Mr Lane Joynt said that Brock was not hampered, as Foley was, with a great many other commissions

---

[29] DCA Ch 6/12/38, Brock's letter of 18 April 1878
[30] DCA Ch 6/12/47, Brock's letter of 7 June 1878

for all parts of the world - 'Mr Brock had his name and reputation to make'. He had completed, with great skill and genius, the works that Foley had left unfinished, and could apply almost all his energy to the O'Connell Monument. The draft contract was then agreed.[31]

The Court of Chancery duly approved the contract and Brock reported to Gray on 11 October 1878 that he was now making steady progress with the monument and would be glad to receive his initial payment of £800.[32] In August 1879 he felt confident enough to raise once more the thorny question of O'Connell's cloak:

> I presume myself to be at liberty to re-arrange the cloak (as I am convinced Mr Foley would have done in working it out) in order to get rid of the exceedingly heavy and unnecessary mass, objectionable in several views, but most strikingly in the back, where it effectually [sic] conceals the entire figure. I do not propose to dispense with the cloak, which is necessary to prevent baldness of effect on large work, but simply instead of rigidly and blindly following the original sketch, to dispose it in such a way as to show the figure to greater advantage and produce [a] lighter and more agreeable outline.
> This is a matter which surely may safely be left to a Sculptor's judgment, but I shall be glad to be informed of the Committee's view before deviating from Mr Foley's sketch model in order to prevent any cavil and dissatisfaction hereafter.[33]

Brock was promptly summoned to meet the committee in Dublin on 4 September 1879. He told them that Foley

> just previous to his death, instructed me to cut away the cloak so as to rearrange it.
> Unfortunately he died before it could be completed, and I hope the Committee will give me liberty to do what I think best in this matter. It is simply a question of details, nothing more.

After some debate the committee thought it would be unwise to impose any restrictions on Brock so far as the details of the cloak were concerned and authorised him to 'make such modification in the drapery of the statue as in his discretion as an artist that he might think desirable for the improvement of the general effect'.[34]

The *Art Journal* approved of the change:

---

[31] *Freeman's Journal* 14 June 1878
[32] DCA Ch 6/12/76
[33] DCA Ch 6/12/93
[34] DCA Ch 6/17, final report of O'Connell Monument Committee p. 26

> When we first saw the design 'in the raw', we strongly objected to its [the cloak's] overpowering effect, and Foley entirely agreed with us... he would surely have done that which his successor proposes to do. That it ought to be done there is no question. [35]

Armstead, the sculptor appointed to certify that the various stages of the work were being satisfactorily completed, fortunately took the same view. In a letter dated 5 June 1880, he wrote:

> The general effect and outline of the statue appear to me good. Mr Brock intends to make one or two slight alterations - slight as to labour involved, but important for the ultimate effect of the work in bronze when seen against the sky. The arrangement of the cloak was different from that in Mr Foley's sketch model - Mr Brock informs me that the alteration was made in consequence of a desire expressed by the Committee. I think the arrangement comes out very well and in one important view will allow the figure to be seen more clearly. Mr Brock has evidently paid great attention to the likeness and the head, in expression, is very vigorous. [36]

On the whole, Armstead thought the committee would like the figure, and he certified that Brock should now be paid the £800 due for the completion of the statue for casting.

Brock had his own reasons for welcoming Armstead's recommendation. He wrote to Gray:

> On receipt of his official report... may I ask that you will be good enough to take the necessary steps to secure an early payment of the next instalment due to me under the agreement. Having carried out concurrently with the large statue, and already cast in plaster, two of the seated figures [the Victories] (on which I am not entitled to draw until the whole four are completed), I have incurred very large expenses and find myself rather pressed for ready money. [37]

Armstead's references to Brock's 'great attention to the likeness and the head' refer to the fact that the head of O'Connell as now seen on the monument is entirely the work of Brock, not Foley. The *Melbourne Advocate*, quoting the *Freeman's Journal*, reported:

> the figure [of O'Connell] has now not only been successfully cast but the work of chasing is almost completed ... There has been a further alteration to the lower folds of the cloak, and the heavy cape has been dispensed with; otherwise the statue generally follows the original design. When Foley died he had modelled the head in clay, but in the time which has since elapsed it actually crumbled to pieces. It was for years kept intact by daily saturation, and enveloping it in wet muslin, and in the end copper wires were fastened round portions of it to keep the clay together. It shrank to such diminished proportions, however, that Mr Brock was obliged to set to work at a new head, and the result is most satisfactory. [38]

---

[35] *AJ* 1879 p. 272
[36] Quoted in *Freeman's Journal* 21 June 1880
[37] DCA Ch 6/12/106, Brock's letter of 5 June 1880
[38] *Melbourne Advocate* 14 January 1882

There was one final crisis before the monument could be unveiled. Though Brock had refused to give a time limit for completion, he had said that he would use his utmost endeavours to have the work ready for unveiling in three years from the date of the new contract (June 1878). In the light of this, Gray politely enquired in January 1882 whether the monument could be unveiled in April 1882. This provoked a strong rejoinder from Brock.[39] Gray's letter, he wrote on 12 January 1882:

> occasions me much concern owing to the extraordinary misapprehension which still appears to exist as to the time when the O'Connell monument may be completed. ... I distinctly explained that I could only undertake that my individual portion of the work (the modelling of it) should be completed by the end of April; but that beyond that I was entirely at the mercy of the foundry and could not possibly fix a time when the metalwork [i.e. casting] would be finished.[40] As an instance of this uncertainty, I may say that the large statue of O'Connell, which has been in the founder's hands no less than eighteen months, is just completed. Unfortunately he is the only one in England who devotes himself exclusively to Art Work, and to have bound him by contract to execute the work within a given time, it would have been necessary for me to pay a very enhanced price (to compensate him for putting aside other orders).

Brock could not afford this, and advised Gray that, even under favourable circumstances, the end of August (1882) would be the earliest date by which the last of the *Victories* could be sent over to Dublin.

In April 1882 the company organising the Irish Exhibition made a formal request that the monument be unveiled on 15 August 1882, the opening day of the Exhibition. Brock was consulted, and replied on 1 May 1882 that the foundry gave no hope of having all four *Victories* completed by that date, owing to the great amount of work in moulding these large figures and pressure of work for the Royal Academy. He could promise delivery of two of the four by 15 August, and suggested that plaster casts of the last two should be placed on the monument (at an additional cost of £100) until the bronze castings were ready. The question therefore was whether the committee would be willing to undertake that outlay (£100) to secure the advantage of the monument presenting a finished aspect and so afford an opportunity of being judged as a whole.[41]

The committee was in a quandary. The Lord Mayor urged that by uniting both ceremonies (the exhibition opening and the monument unveiling) on 15 August, 'public

---

[39] DCA Ch 6/12/120
[40] The foundry was Drew of Thames Ditton (*Builder*, 10 December 1881 p. 143)
[41] DCA 6/17, final report of the Monument Committee pp. 27-8

convenience and greater éclat must be the result', and it seemed best to accord with the wishes of the trades societies and others likely to take part in 'this patriotic demonstration'. Reluctant to see the monument unveiled without the *Victories*, the committee played for time by asking Brock if he could guarantee that all four would be in place by 1 November 1882. The Lord Mayor himself visited the Thames Ditton foundry with Brock on 25 May; and on 27 May, under fresh pressure from the trades societies, the committee finally decided upon 15 August as the date, if necessary with only two *Victories* in their place; plaster casts of the others should not be ordered because of the risk of vandalism. When Brock wrote on 18 July that the second *Victory* could not possibly be ready by mid-August, the committee deemed it advisable to postpone the installation of any of them until the four were completed.[42]

While the committee were disappointed that the monument would be unveiled in an incomplete form, they consoled themselves with the thought that a similar problem had occurred with the Albert Memorial ten years previously, when it had been unveiled without the central figure of Albert. At least in the case of the O'Connell Monument,

> the principal figure - the statue of the Liberator- has long been finished. As a work of art, it stands unrivalled. In every detail, full of power and grace, of expression and eloquence, the magic touch of the master hand governed by the great Irish sculptor is discovered.[43]

The unveiling duly took place on 15 August 1882 before a vast crowd of more than 100,000. The day was made a public holiday, businesses were closed and the procession to the monument was four miles long. The most prominent guest was Charles Stewart Parnell, released from prison in May; he stood on the platform between the Lord Mayor of Dublin and Brock. The first speaker was Dwyer Gray, secretary of the O'Connell committee and High Sheriff of Dublin. He attributed the long delay in completion not only to the tragic death of Foley but also to the nature of the work itself ('A conception so elaborate is not to be completed in a day'): Gray noted that while Foley 'lived long enough ... to complete the most important part of the monument and to stamp on the remainder the impress of his radiant genius, ... a most gifted and competent artist for the completion of the work was found in the person of Mr Brock, who has inherited so much of the genius, the grace and the

---

[42] ibid p. 29
[43] ibid p. 20

power of his dead master'. Although the absence of the four *Victories* took something from the beauty and completeness of the monument, the committee felt it important to take advantage of the opening day of the National Exhibition to have the monument unveiled.

The Lord Mayor, receiving the monument on behalf of the Corporation and people of Dublin, gave credit to the original members of the committee for entrusting the work to Foley, despite pressure in other directions. He added that all who looked at the statue could not do otherwise than agree with the High Sheriff (Gray) in commending the manner in which Mr Brock had completed it, and (he might safely say) realised the ideal of his great master. 'The statue will be a lasting proof of the towering genius of Foley and it will connect inseparably with this work the rising fame of his distinguished pupil.' Parnell's speech, greeted with continual cheers, was notable for its brevity and moderation.

The day ended with a dinner which Brock recalled as being of the 'most extravagant description... the wit was as sparkling as the wine and equally plentiful'. Towards the close of the feast Brock, who all his life was a moderate drinker, 'began to feel the need for exercising care'. When he showed signs of hesitation as a certain bottle was passed to him, one of his hosts remarked 'Sure, Mr Brock, you'll not be for letting that bottle pass you, for the like of what's inside it you may never taste again', while another gentleman added sotto voce: 'And it's poorer maybe the revenue is, by the duty on it'.[44]

One person with strong views on the decision to unveil the monument before the *Victories* were in situ was Foley's sister Jane, whom Brock had invited to the ceremony. She wrote on 21 September 1882:

> You cannot think how annoyed I have been at your permitting the O'Connell Monument to be uncovered in such an incomplete, mutilated form, destroying the whole effect of it and robbing it of its fair proportions. When two of the Victories were finished why not have had them placed in front so that that view of the monument at least might be complete? But I can readily understand your pandering to the opinion of our fine Lord Mayor, who knows much more about baking a loaf of bread than he does of Art. My dear brother would never have submitted to anything of the kind. His friends here are greatly surprised at you, for thousands will have seen it who in all probability will never behold it again. I am not at all satisfied with the cloak. I think it much too heavy, particularly the back view on the right side of the figure.

---

[44] Brock p. 45

> With kind regards to Mrs Brock, and many thanks for the nice seat you obtained for me on the platform. [45]

Brock's reaction to this letter is not recorded.

The last meeting of the committee took place on 20 July 1883, after the four *Victories* had been placed on the monument. Armstead's concluding report (23 June 1883) stated:

> The entire work appears to me most satisfactory. Mr Brock had modelled and carried out Mr Foley's design with remarkable vigor [sic] and great ability and with the utmost care as to sound and good bronze casting and well-executed masonry.

The committee authorised the final payment to Brock, bringing the total paid to £10,500, and passed the following resolution:

> That the warm thanks of this Committee be conveyed to Mr Thomas Brock ARA for the admirable and eminently successful manner in which he carried out the work of the National Monument to O'Connell and completed the great design of his illustrious master, Mr Foley.[46]

While it is difficult to assess the precise contribution that Brock made to the design and execution of the O'Connell Monument (plate 76), it is clear that it was much greater than most art historians have so far recognised.[47] Brock was already working in Foley's studio in 1866/7, when the O'Connell Monument was being designed; he became Foley's principal assistant in 1871, when work was proceeding on the central drum. There is a remarkable similarity between the pose of *Erin* (plate 77), with right arm raised and index finger pointing aloft, and Brock's *Richard Baxter* (plate 12); the right hand of the latter was said to have been modelled by Brock's wife Mary.[48] The figure of O'Connell, with major changes to the cloak and with the head having to be executed again from scratch, clearly owes more to Brock than to Foley in its final form. The four *Victories,* showing *Courage* strangling a serpent (plate 78), *Eloquence* holding a scroll (plate 79), *Fidelity* accompanied by an Irish wolfhound (plate 80) and *Patriotism* with shield and sword (plate 81), must be regarded as almost entirely Brock's work.[49] The figures are among the best he ever executed and the

---

[45] ibid pp. 39-40

[46] ibid p. 45. Brock had been elected ARA in January 1883 (see Chapter 9)

[47] Brock is not mentioned at all in A. Crookshank's *Irish Sculpture from 1600 to the present day* Dublin 1984, P. Herbison's *Irish art and architecture* Dublin 1975 or P. Murphy's three articles (see bibliography). J. Hill's *Irish Public Sculpture - a History* Dublin 1998 relegates Brock to a footnote p. 260 n. 49

[48] Brock p. 35

[49] P. Murphy 'The O'Connell Monument in Dublin: the political and artistic context of public sculpture' *Apollo* March 1996 p. 24 points out that Foley's original design for the *Victory* figures may have been

symbolism was to influence his later works such as *Justice* and *Truth* on the Victoria Memorial (plates 127 & 141) and on the Gladstone Memorial in Liverpool (plates 48 & 49).

One critic who had no doubt about the extent of Brock's contribution was Marion Spielmann, who wrote:

> when Brock was still a young man he had produced a monument of an important and elaborate character. This is his 'Daniel O'Connell' in Dublin, in which he showed a richness of design and a certain stateliness of line and character that might be based upon foreign monuments we know abroad, yet still impresses us as one of the finer out-of-door monuments in Great Britain.[50]

The tributes paid to Brock by the Lord Mayor of Dublin and the secretary of the committee, who knew better than most the extent of Brock's responsibility for the monument in its final form, are further confirmation of Brock's contribution to a great work of art.

There is a postscript to the story of the O'Connell Monument. In 1875 a group of Irish Catholics in Melbourne decided to commemorate the centenary of Daniel O'Connell's birth (1775) by erecting a statue and the Archbishop granted them a site in the Cathedral precincts. Fund-raising proceeded slowly and it was not until 1886 that sufficient money had been collected. As Brock had recently (1882) completed the O'Connell statue in Dublin, the memorial committee had no hesitation in signing a contract with him for a life-size bronze statue (plates 74 & 75).

With his usual economy of effort, Brock replicated the Dublin figure and had it cast by Compagnie des Bronzes in Brussels - the base of the statue bears their mark and the date 1888.[51] It arrived in Melbourne in August 1890 and was unveiled by the Premier of Victoria (Sir Brian O'Loghlen) on 30 May 1891. It was one of the first public statues in Melbourne.[52]

---

inspired by Christian Rauch's *Victory Walhalla* shown at the Great Exhibition in London 1851 and in Dublin 1865

[50] M. H. Spielmann *Journal of the Society of Arts* (Vol. LIII) 10 March 1905 p. 422

[51] J. A. Sankey 'The Story of a Statue' in *Kairos*, Melbourne Vol. 6 No. 6. 6-13 April 1997 pp. 12-13

[52] R. T. Ridley *Melbourne's Monuments* Melbourne 1996 pp. 20, 37

Chapter 5: *Faraday* and *Gough*

While Brock was supervising the completion and installation of the Prince Consort statues in 1875 and 1876, he was also working on several other Foley commissions, including the statue of Michael Faraday, the eminent scientist. Faraday had died in 1867 and his friends considered it appropriate for a public memorial to be erected. The Government was approached, but the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Robert Lowe) replied on 5 May 1869:

> I do not in the least doubt the signal merits of Faraday, and I hope that a monument may be erected worthy of so great a man; but I cannot consent to appropriate public funds towards the monument of a private citizen, however illustrious. I do not make this rule; I find it.[1]

Following this refusal, a public meeting was held on 21 June 1869 at the Royal Institution of Great Britain in Albemarle Street, London, with the Prince of Wales in the chair. It was decided that a suitable monument would be provided by public subscription with a maximum per person of five guineas, and that a memorial committee be set up. The Prince of Wales headed the subscription list and contributions were received from as far afield as New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania. The committee decided that a marble statue be erected in the British Museum and that Foley should be the sculptor.[2]

On 24 March 1873 Foley confirmed that the sketch (small size) model of the statue was ready and that work on the full size model was in progress.[3] This was the state of affairs when Foley died in August 1874.

The next item on the Royal Institution's files is a letter of 13 November 1876 from Teniswood to the Institution's Secretary which reads:

> As sole executor to the late Mr Foley RA I have the pleasure to inform you of the completion of the Faraday statue... I should esteem as a great favour your appointment of a day in order that I may submit the work to the representatives [of the Institution] sooner rather than later.

---

[1] RI/F IIa (references to the Faraday statue are from the archives of the Royal Institution (RI), London unless otherwise indicated)
[2] Minutes of meetings on 8 November and 13 December 1869
[3] RI/F IIa,49

Although Brock's name was not mentioned, it is clear from later correspondence that it was he who had brought the statue to completion. Teniswood's desire to keep Brock out of the correspondence could not be sustained. When the committee pressed him for technical details, such as the origins of the statue, the choice of site and the object in Faraday's hand, he had to confess his unfamiliarity with the statue and admit that Brock, not he, was completing the work.[4] He wrote to the committee on 12 February 1877:

> I beg to say that there is little I can supply you with in reference to the Faraday statue, as you are doubtless much better informed on all relative to the motive for its execution, choice of position and the nature of the instrument held in the left hand, and more than all with the opinions of his friends and admirers as to the general merit of the work. The only notes I can offer you are subjoined.

The attachment read:

> The commission for the work was placed in the hands of the late J. H. Foley RA in the year 1870, who prepared a very careful sketch model of the figure and executed an admirable bust as his study for the head of the statue. The full size model was not far advanced at Foley's death in 1874, but has since been completed, and the work executed in marble to the fullest satisfaction of the committee, by Mr Brock, principal assistant to Foley at the time of his decease.[5]

After this, Brock dealt directly with the memorial committee. When they invited Faraday's widow to view the work, she asked her niece Jane Barnard to undertake this task. Jane visited the Osnaburgh Street studio a few days later and wrote to the secretary of the memorial committee on 21 November 1876:

> It seems to me that there is a want of animation especially about the eyes and brow. The wrinkles in the corner of the eyes, often called crowsfeet, and those across the brow were very marked in my uncle and I think gave much character to the face. Mr Brock thinks these might be more clearly defined and also that the eyes might have more life given to them. I think also the lower parts of the cheek are heavy but I see that marble cannot take the lights and shades that the clay, or even the plaster, does .... [on the location of the statue] she [my aunt] desires me to say that her feelings are against its being placed in any church and she feels a preference either for the British Museum or South Kensington; at the same time, she does not wish to express herself strongly, for she feels it belongs to the committee and the subscribers to settle its destination.

The memorial committee agreed that Brock should make the suggested changes to the statue, and that it should 'for the time being' be placed in the entrance hall of the Royal Institution. It was installed there in March 1877.

---

[4] The 'object' was an electro-magnetic coil
[5] R. I. Teniswood file f. 57

The statue depicted Faraday standing, wearing the gown of a Doctor of Civil Law of Oxford University and holding an electro-magnetic coil in his left hand - the latter a typical Foley/Brock detail (plate 32). The *Illustrated London News* noted that it was 'universally admired as a work of art and as a faithful likeness of the great philosopher', adding that the Royal Institution was a most suitable place for the statue, as it was in the Institution's laboratory that Faraday had pursued his fruitful researches and made his important discoveries.[6]

The authorities at the Royal Institution eventually reached the same conclusion; they decided in May 1884 that the Faraday statue should remain at the Institution; that a suitable pedestal should be designed by Brock; and that a marble bust of Faraday should be executed for the National Portrait Gallery (plate 33). Brock received 90 guineas for the marble pedestal, which was installed in February 1886, and 100 guineas for the bust, which was presented to the National Portrait Gallery by a 'Committee of Gentlemen' (plate 34).

Sir William Pollock, who headed this anonymous Committee of Gentlemen, wrote that 'the bust would represent [Faraday] at a much later period and when the face and head had gained a great development'.[7] Thus Brock's bust is not an exact replica of the statue: 'he has given Faraday's face a more animated expression, and has altered the folds of the drapery'.[8]

In 1931 a plaster cast of the statue was made to commemorate the centenary of Faraday's discovery of electromagnetic induction and was the centrepiece of an exhibition in the Albert Hall. In 1989 two replicas of the statue in bronze were commissioned by the Institution of Electrical Engineers. One was erected in the Thames Embankment Gardens, not far from Brock's *Robert Raikes*, the other outside the Institution's offices in Stevenage.[9]

In contrast to the national fame of Faraday, William Rathbone was not well known outside his native city of Liverpool, of which he had been Mayor in 1837-8. He had succeeded his father as head of a prosperous firm trading with North America, and devoted

---

[6] *ILN* 10 March 1877 Supplement LXX p. 233
[7] NPG archives, letter of 25 May 1884
[8] R. Ormond *Early Victorian Portraits* Vol. 1 1973 p. 169, Brock's original drawing is in the R. I. archives.
[9] Institution of Electrical Engineers *Newsletter* 16 November 1989

much energy to such causes as Catholic emancipation, famine relief and education of the poor.[10]

Within weeks of his death in 1868, a memorial committee decided to erect a marble statue in Sefton Park, near the family home, and Foley was approached. He warned the committee that because of pressure of work he would not be able to complete the statue within the three years requested, and might probably require even a little longer. In view of his great reputation, this condition was acceded to. In fact, he had only completed a plaster model when he died six years later. Brock was then asked by the committee to complete the statue from Foley's model and also to design a pedestal with appropriate bas-reliefs. The committee approved Brock's designs - the bronze reliefs were considered 'suitable allegorical expressions of the character of the man we are commemorating, and they adorn and add to the value of the monument as a work of art of which the town of Liverpool may long feel justly proud'.[11]

Brock completed the 9' 6" (2.9 m) marble statue by the end of 1875 and the 15 ft (4.6 m) granite pedestal with its bronze relief panels (each 37" x 33" (94 cm x 84 cm)) by the end of 1876. The monument was unveiled by James Aikin, chairman of the memorial committee, on New Year's Day 1877.[12]

The statue shows Rathbone standing, bareheaded and with a firm stance (plate 103). The conventional 'coat and trousers' style is improved by the cape draped loosely over the shoulders as in the O'Connell Monument. Brock used the finest Sicilian marble, which gave the statue the local nickname 'The White Man'.[13] Each of the three bronze plaques on the pedestal, depicting the three principal aspects of Rathbone's life - Commerce, Education and Charity - has five or six figures in high relief, wearing classical costume. *Commerce* (plate 105) shows a bearded merchant and his assistant being offered samples of cloth by an Arab trader; a young clerk, his ledger on his knee and pen in hand, sits in the foreground to the left, while to the right two porters load bales. The masts and rigging in the background, and an anchor in the foreground, emphasise that it is a dockside scene. The whole is a lively reference to Rathbone's trading company.

---

[10] T. Cavanagh *The Public Sculpture of Liverpool* Liverpool University Press 1997 p. 186
[11] *Liverpool Mercury* 2 January 1877
[12] *AJ* 1877 p. 87
[13] *Liverpool Evening Express* 5 May 1953

Education (plate 106) shows a seated mother helping a young child to read; two young men stand reading another book together, while a third reads from a scroll. This refers to Rathbone's help in founding the Mechanics' Institute. In the background a large terrestrial globe stands on a pile of books. In *Charity* (plate 104), a bearded man in flowing robes offers a loaf of bread to a kneeling woman with a baby at her breast. Behind her stands an old man, supporting himself on a staff and holding the hand of a waif-like boy, while another mother and baby wait. A young man stands holding a large basket with more loaves. This plaque refers to Rathbone's role in distributing Irish famine relief. In all three reliefs the features of the figures are very expressive, and there is a remarkable dignity and tranquillity, which is very appealing.[14]

As part of his strategy to ensure that he, rather than Teniswood, received the credit for completing Foley's works, Brock exhibited plaster models of the three plaques at the Royal Academy in 1877 and 1878 (the originals were installed on the monument before its unveiling on 1 January 1877). *Education* was stolen in June 1987. The other two plaques were removed to safe storage shortly afterwards, but not before the upraised arm of the woman at the centre of *Charity* and the head of one of the porters in *Commerce* had been broken off.

These three plaques, with their wealth of detail and precision of execution, invite comparison with the bronze reliefs on the 'drum' or central section of the O'Connell Monument, which was completed at about the same time. Brock evidently felt that classical dress was more appropriate than contemporary costume in depicting allegorical themes. It was not until his *Shipbuilding* (plate 89) and *Spinning* for the Queen Victoria statue in Belfast (unveiled in 1903) that he represented allegorical figures in contemporary working dress, to be followed later by the blacksmith and peasant girl (*Manufacture* and *Agriculture*) for the Victoria Memorial (plates 129 & 123).

Brock's plaques were criticised by *The Builder*, which commented that they were designed 'in the high relief peculiar to the time' which had none of the variation so successfully employed in French work of the same period. They also exhibited a lack of scale, 'suggesting little figures rather than life-size ones modelled to a small scale.[15] Stevens

---

[14] Cavanagh pp. 187-8
[15] *Builder* 28 January 1916 p. 82

on the other hand compared Brock's 'large bombastic plaques' with the small and 'very modest' reliefs on George Frampton's statue of Rathbone's son (unveiled in 1901). These were modelled in low relief, the scenes becoming almost impressionistic in effect.[16]

In fact the size of the plaques seems appropriate for such a large monument, which is over 24' (7.5 m) high. Far from being bombastic, each plaque conveys an atmosphere of serenity and dignity - the merchant in *Commerce* thoughtfully stroking his beard, the mother in *Education* patiently teaching her child, the rich man in *Charity* handing bread to the hungry.

An interesting feature of these plaques is that they were among the first items cast by the newly-opened bronze foundry of Cox and Son at Thames Ditton, and were exactly contemporaneous with Leighton's *Athlete* (see Introduction). Brock, even at this early date, demonstrated the New Sculpture's attention to modelling, surface and texture, making skilful use of the medium (bronze) to convey precise details. In *Commerce* for example, the expressions on the faces of the young clerk and the trader offering his wares show Brock's skill as a portraitist, while details of the binding on the bales of cargo and the ship's rigging, the anchor and the mooring post are most carefully observed. *Charity* is notable for the striking portrait of the young boy gazing disconsolately at the onlooker. The combination of Foley's rather conventional marble statue and Brock's eloquently humane plaques has been described as 'a most precise testimony of the succession from one generation to another in the mainstream development of Victorian Sculpture'.[17]

The other major works left unfinished at Foley's death were two equestrian statues. The *Art Journal* for 1878 reported:

> Mr Foley's equestrian statue of Lord Canning, finished by Mr Brock, is now en route for Calcutta. The full-sized model of the equestrian statue of Lord Gough for Dublin, left unfinished by Mr Foley, has also been completed by Mr Brock and is now in the hands of the bronze founder. The horse in this group is a replica of the charger in the Lord Hardinge statue at Calcutta.[18]

---

[16] T. Stevens 'George Frampton' in P. Curtis (ed.) *Patronage and Practice: Sculpture on Merseyside* Liverpool 1989 p. 80
[17] Read 1982 p. 365
[18] *AJ* 1878 p. 62

Charles Canning, son of the former Prime Minister George Canning, had been appointed Governor General of India in 1856, just before the Indian Mutiny. His wise policy of promoting reconciliation after the Mutiny, rather than retaliation, earned him the nickname 'Clemency Canning'. After his death in 1862, a memorial committee was set up and Foley was commissioned to execute an equestrian statue of Canning for India. He had only completed an 18 in. (46 cm) sketch model when he himself died. It was agreed that Brock would complete the full-size statue on the basis of Foley's model, and Brock wrote in the following terms to the memorial committee on 9 October 1876:

> Mr Teniswood tells me that he has informed you that in consequence of Chancery proceedings he will not be able to enter into any contract with you respecting the Canning pedestal, and recommends that I should undertake the matter myself. [19]

The statue was delivered to Calcutta in 1878, and the names of Foley and Brock appear on the base.[20]

Field Marshal Viscount Gough was an Anglo-Irishman who joined the British army at the age of fifteen and fought in Wellington's Peninsular campaigns, in China and in India. He died at the age of 90, and as Field Marshals never formally retire, he was said to have served his country for 75 years.

On 21 May 1869, a memorial committee was set up in Dublin and asked Foley to execute an equestrian statue in bronze. Foley replied on 25 August 1869 that he would gladly undertake the commission for the 'minimum sum' mentioned by the committee if he could be supplied with eight tons of gun metal, which the Government might well donate in view of the long and valuable services of Gough to his country.[21]

When a request was put to the Government for a donation of gun metal, the War Office tried to raise a charge of £70 a ton. Irish MPs protested angrily that gun metal had been given gratis for Prince Albert's statue in Kensington Gardens and Viscount Hardinge's statue in Calcutta and demanded to know why there was discrimination against Gough. Robert Lowe, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, recalled his ruling the previous year in the case of Faraday [see page 58], but the Irish MPs insisted that there was no comparison

---

[19] Brock p. 75
[20] ibid p. 38
[21] *Gough: Statement of proceedings taken to erect the Gough Equestrian Statue* Dublin 1879 p. 1 and Hill pp. 107-8

between a civilian and a military hero who had captured 536 brass cannon in his campaigns. Gladstone, the Prime Minister, happened to come into the Chamber at this moment. Sensing that a row was about to break out, he overruled the Chancellor and agreed to a free gift of the metal for the Gough statue.[22]

Work on the statue had not proceeded very far when Foley died in 1874, and it fell to Brock to prepare the full-scale model of the statue for casting. As with other unfinished statues, George Teniswood, Foley's executor, handled the correspondence with the memorial committee, and Brock was determined that Teniswood should not receive the credit for completing the statue when all the sculptural work had been done by himself. He had good reason to be concerned. In February 1878 Teniswood had sent to the memorial committee 'a full plan, per scale, showing exactly the dimensions of the base, and height of the pedestal, on which the Statue would stand', giving the impression that he had prepared these, when it was Brock who would have done this sort of work.

Brock therefore exhibited his *Study for the head of Lord Gough* at the Royal Academy Exhibition in 1878, and his role in completing the statue was fully acknowledged in *The Times*:

> Lord Gough's statue, which was originally sketched by Foley and has been finished by Mr Foley's pupil and chief assistant Thomas Brock, was on Saturday [12 October] cast in bronze at Messrs Masefield and Co's foundry, Manor Street, Chelsea ... the large model from which the casting has been made is entirely the work of [Foley's] skilful successor Mr Brock.... the bronze for the main portion was successfully poured into the mould through about 80 pipes.[23]

The last hurdle was the selection of a site for the statue. In 1872 the Dublin Corporation allotted space in Foster Place, but Foley and the memorial committee wanted somewhere more important. The O'Connell Monument (also by Foley and Brock) had a prominent site just north of the new Carlisle Bridge, so the memorial committee in January 1878 requested a site just south of the same bridge. The Dublin Corporation agreed this in principle in July 1878, but the City Engineer said the site would not be available for another eighteen months. The statue was now ready for despatch, and Teniswood told the memorial committee that the early delivery of the statue was indispensable under an order of the Court of Chancery in London, in the suit there pending on Foley's assets. He warned the committee that they

---

[22] *Times* 23 July 1870. For the use of gun metal in casting, see p. 49.
[23] *Times* 15 October 1878

would have to take over the cost and responsibility of retaining the statue in London, and expressed the hope that the Dublin Corporation would 'bear the expense of erecting the foundation and free Mr Foley's assets therefrom'.[24]

A compromise was finally reached by the allocation of a site in Phoenix Park, well away from *O'Connell* and the city centre. The mounted figure of Gough is depicted in the cuirass and uniform of honorary Colonel of the Royal Horse Guards (plate 50). On his breast are the Orders of St Patrick, the Bath and the Star of India. He is looking resolutely ahead, holding the reins in his left hand and his Field Marshal's baton in his right. 'The face modelled by Mr Brock is that of a gallant commander, and the portrait has earned the warm commendations of those who knew the late Viscount'.[25]

The massive (15 tons) group of horse and rider, 15 ft (4.6 m) high on its 9 ft (2.8 m) pedestal, was unveiled by the seventh Duke of Marlborough, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, on 21 February 1880. This date chosen was the thirty-first anniversary of the battle of Gujerat (India), one of Gough's celebrated victories. Sir Winston Churchill, the Duke's young grandson, described the unveiling in his book *My Early Life.* His memory failed him in one respect - the ceremony took place in 1880, when he was six, and not in 1878.[26]

In his speech after the unveiling the Commander of the British forces in Ireland, General Sir John Michel, said 'I now surrender [this statue] to the safeguard of Ireland's sons. Keep it, Irishmen, as an everlasting memento of your glory. Treasure it as a sacred deposit'.[27] Unfortunately General Michel's words went unheeded, and in due course the Gough statue became a particular target for Irish nationalists. On Christmas Eve 1944 the head was sawn off and later recovered from the River Liffey. On 5 November 1956 the right hind leg of the horse was blown off, and on 23 July 1957 the whole statue was toppled from its pedestal after a larger explosion.[28]

The pieces of the statue were collected and stored at the former Royal Hospital at Kilmainham. Various requests were made for the statue, including one from the Royal Irish

---

[24] *Gough* pp. 3-4 and P. Murphy *The Politics of the Street Monument* Irish Arts Review Yearbook Vol. 10 1994 p. 206
[25] *Times* 15 October 1878
[26] W. S. Churchill: *My Early Life* 1930 p. 1
[27] R. S. Rait: *Life and Campaigns of Viscount Gough* 1900 p. 348
[28] Read 1982 p. 40

Fusiliers, which had been commanded by Gough at the battle of Barossa in 1811. This application was rejected. Not only was the idea of the statue going to Gough Barracks in Armagh (north of the border) unacceptable, but the Fusiliers wanted to dismember it, as they only had room for the head and torso.[29]

In 1967 the Irish Government decided that *Gough* could be sold on condition that the purchaser removed the embarrassing piece of sculpture from Irish soil. Accordingly in 1986 the statue was sold to an Irish businessman, Robert Guinness (no relation to the brewing family) for a nominal sum.[30] There were protests from the heritage lobby when the sale became known, but the Irish Government felt that any attempt to re-erect the statue on a Dublin location might provoke further attacks, and that it would be more prudent to let it go. It was moved to England, restored by John Lunn and Son and now stands in the grounds of Chillingham Castle, Northumberland.[31]

Three other Foley statues destined for Ireland were completed by Brock in 1875. Brock referred to two of these (*Rosse* and *Stokes)* in his evidence at the Belt v. Lawes trial:

> I completed the statues of Lord Rosse, Doctor Stokes, Lord Canning (equestrian) and Lord Gough, the O'Connell monument and various smaller works.[32]

The Royal College of Physicians in Dublin commissioned a marble statue of Dr William Stokes while he was still alive. Foley's statue is a conventional one, showing the eminent physician standing bare-headed in the robes of a Regius Professor, and was unveiled by the Duke of Leinster on 16 March 1876. The only hint of Brock's involvement is when the *Irish Daily Express* stated that the work came 'from the studio' of the late lamented Foley.[33]

Confirmation of Brock's role in completing the bronze statue of the Earl of Rosse at Birr (ninety miles west of Dublin) comes in his indignant letter of 1876 to Teniswood (quoted in Chapter 2) where he states 'Mr Garvey understood you to be the sculptor who actually completed the Rosse statue'. Foley's name appears on the base of the statue, with the date 1875, the year after Foley's death. It seems likely that, as with the figure of Prince Albert,

---

[29] Public Works Department Archives, Dublin 796/74: letter of n/d January 1962 from Lieut. Col. P. Marjoribanks-Egerton to the Director of the Eire [sic] Board of Works
[30] *Irish Times* 10 September 1986
[31] P. Underwood (ed.) *Public Sculpture in North East England 2000* pp. 22-4
[32] *Times* 6 December 1882
[33] *Irish Daily Express* 17 March 1876

Foley left a completed (or nearly completed) model and Brock supervised the casting at the Masefield foundry in Chelsea. The statue was unveiled by Lady Rosse (the Earl's widow) on 21 March 1876.

Although Brock did not claim publicly to have done any work on Foley's statue of Henry Grattan, he was involved in its completion. Foley had been given the commission for a standing figure in bronze of the Irish statesman in 1869. In October 1874, two months after Foley's death, his executor Teniswood wrote to the joint secretary of the Grattan memorial committee in Dublin:

> Anticipating the desire of the committee for information on the condition of that grand work, I am happy to be able to inform you of the completion of the full size model, Mr Foley having worked on it so immediately prior to his last illness as to have left it requiring only a slight cleaning up in some of the minor parts. Under these circumstances, by which, fortunately, the authenticity and ascription of the statue is fully insured [sic], I presume your committee would desire it to be placed without delay in the hands of the bronze founder for casting.[34]

John Vereker, Crean's co-secretary, now took over the negotiations with Teniswood. It was agreed that the statue would cost £1,200 (one third more than Foley's *Burke* and *Goldsmith*) and that the pedestal would be made in Dublin. Vereker visited London in February 1875 and saw Brock at the Osnaburgh Street studio. He wrote to Teniswood:

> I certainly anticipate that the Committee will take upon themselves the execution of the pedestal upon the terms arranged.... between Mr Brock and me.[35]

Teniswood confirmed the agreement made by Vereker and Brock and the plaster model was sent for casting. In fact, the foundry took less time than expected and the statue was successfully cast on 31 March 1875. The foundry would not release the statue until its bill (£250) was paid, and Teniswood, having no access to Foley's funds, had to get this money from the memorial committee. Eventually the statue was sent to Dublin in November 1875 and Teniswood received full payment in December.[36]

The statue was unveiled by Lady Laura Grattan, the statesman's daughter-in-law, on 6 January 1876.[37] Although Brock was undoubtedly involved in the casting of the statue and

---

[34] J. Vereker: *Origin, Progress and Completion of the Grattan Statue 1881* (MS 1703 in Library of Trinity College Dublin: 62r-63r: letter from Teniswood to Crean of 13 October 1874

[35] ibid 80r-v letter from Vereker to Teniswood of 19 February 1875

[36] ibid 84r-85r, 83r, 101r-v and 99r

[37] *Dublin Daily Express* 7 January 1876

its despatch to Dublin, he evidently did not regard this as significant as his involvement in *Rosse* and *Stokes*.

In May 1878, while preparing *Gough* for the foundry, Brock was asked to execute two more equestrian statues. In a letter to the secretary of the O'Connell memorial committee about finalising the contract for *O'Connell* he wrote: 'You will ... understand my anxiety for a settlement, when I tell you that I have just received a commission to execute two bronze equestrian statues for India, which I cannot commence until I know whether I am to remain here [in the Osnaburgh Street studio] or not'.[38]

The two statues were those of Jang Bahadur Rana, first Maharajah of Nepal and Prime Minister of that country from 1846 to 1877, and his younger brother Rana Udip Singh, who succeeded his brother as Maharajah and Prime Minister in 1877 and commissioned the statues. It seems likely that Brock received the commissions because of Foley's reputation for equestrian statues.

Nepal was of great importance to Britain because of its strategic position between India and China and the Maharajah Jang Bahadur was knighted by Queen Victoria for helping the British Army during the Indian Mutiny. The Prince of Wales (later Edward VII), who had visited Nepal in 1877 and went tiger-shooting with the Maharajah, came to Brock's studio in 1880 to see the statues before despatch to India.[39]

The two statues (plates 71 & 72), each weighing over seven tons, were drawn hundreds of miles on poor roads over difficult mountainous country, and were said to have been the largest objects ever transported to Nepal in this way.[40] They were unveiled by the Maharajah Rana Udip on the Lundikhel, the military parade ground of Kathmandu, in April 1885.[41] Sadly Rana Udip was assassinated later that year by his nephew in a local coup.

Although Brock is said to have used horses from the cavalry barracks in nearby Albany Street as models for these statues, there can be little doubt that the Jang Bahadur statue was inspired by Foley's *Outram* of 1873 (plate 82). The Maharajah is shown in the same dramatic contrapposto as Outram, turning round in the saddle and with drawn sword in

---

[38] DCA Ch 6/12/40: letter to E. Dwyer Gray of 15 May 1878
[39] Brock p. 75
[40] R. Izzard *The Innocent on Everest* p. 68
[41] *Times* 20 April 1885

hand. Just as Foley had used *Hardinge*'s horse as a model for *Gough*, so Brock evidently felt that *Outram*'s horse would serve well for the rather flamboyant Jang Bahadur, who is said to have jumped his horse from the top of a 200 ft tower in Kathmandu (the Maharajah was unscathed, but the horse was killed).[42] The two Nepalese statues are competent monuments but lack the originality and panache of Brock's later equestrian works - the *Black Prince* for Leeds and the statues of Edward VII for Delhi and Sydney.[43]

[42] Izzard p. 68
[43] see Chapter 15

Chapter 6: The *Snake Charmer* and the *Athlete*

In 1873 Brock received his first public commission - a marble statue of the Presbyterian minister Richard Baxter. Baxter, known for his defence of religious liberty and freedom of speech, had lived and preached in Kidderminster from 1641-1660. A committee of citizens decided to erect a memorial to him and invited Brock and Francis Williamson (a former assistant in Foley's studio) to submit designs for the Baxter statue - possibly Foley had been approached and had decided to pass the commission to his assistants in view of the pressure of other work.[1]

Williamson, who was some fourteen years older than Brock, was certainly keen to win the Baxter commission: Samuel Lynn, who had also formerly worked for Foley, wrote to Brock on 3 July 1873:[2]

> I want to put you on your guard. Frank Williamson is doing all he can to get the Baxter. He called in here the day before yesterday and told me so. If what he says is the truth, from having the commission to do the statue of Dean Milman, the Bishop of London has used his influence on the Bishop of Worcester, and Lord Rosslyn is working [sic] Lord Dudley for Frank. He has a great number of Deans and Church swells working for him, all through having the Milman to do. He has also got the A.B.[Archbishop] of Canterbury working for him through the Hon. Mr [sic] Norton and the Bishop of London - so look sharp. With kind regards to Mrs Brock.[3]

In September 1873 the memorial committee voted by twenty votes to two in favour of Brock's design. On 24 September 1873 an article criticising the models submitted was published under the heading 'Fancy Statuary' in the *Worcestershire Chronicle* and Brock was provoked to reply:

> Sir,
>
> Under the heading "Fancy Statuary" there appears in your issue of the 24th a long paragraph severely reflecting on the models submitted to the committee of the Baxter memorial at Kidderminster, on the 16th ult., respecting which I must ask to be allowed to say a few words.
>
> The writer has laboured to be very facetious at the sculptors' expense, and I will do him the justice to admit that, had his premises been sound, his remarks might have been just; but, unfortunately for their force and relevancy, they proceed upon an entirely erroneous assumption

---

[1] Brock p. 30

[2] ibid p. 31

[3] Henry Milman was Dean of St Paul's 1849-68. As Kidderminster was in the diocese of Worcester, the Bishop of Worcester and Lord Dudley could be expected to influence the choice of sculptor. Williamson exhibited busts of the Countess of Rosslyn and the Hon. Mrs Norton at the Academy in 1873. Mrs Norton, a well-known novelist, was estranged from her husband and it seems likely that the letter referred to her rather than him.

"evolved out of his internal consciousness," and (following his own idea) I must add that whatever there may be "immensely droll" in the matter attaches not so much to the artist - who by study of the works of an author conscientiously seeks to qualify himself to depict his true character - as to the person who launches his criticism against the conception and intentions of that artist, as expressed in a sketch, which he (the critic) has confessedly not even seen. Why has it been so confidently assumed that either artist would adopt any other than the natural and obvious course? and, in defiance alike of conscientious study, historical accuracy, honesty of purpose, or even common sense, propose to set up "a sham and nothing better" to "promulgate and hand down a falsehood to posterity." In spite of the conclusion drawn by your correspondent, I venture, sir, to affirm that, in reading the description of the models given in the paragraph (quoted, I think, sir, from the *Kidderminster Advertiser*), and which seems to have inspired these polite suggestions; anyone at all acquainted with sculpture would see at once that a portrait statue in its true sense and nothing else was intended. There have been allegorical representations, there have been statues erected in which, while the head has been made a portrait of the living man, the costume has been treated in the classical manner (and very incongruous they look) but who ever heard of the converse treatment? In this instance there is abundant authorities [sic] for the costume, which it is acknowledged has been followed; "the tall gaunt and somewhat emaciated figure of the man is described in the biography of eminent Englishmen" and sufficient materials exist for a portrait. For my own model I used an engraving from the picture in the vestry of the Independent Chapel at Kidderminster, and one from R. White's portrait (referred to by your critic), and I contend that the likeness obtained was adequate to the purpose of a sketch. In carrying out the work I shall, as stated to the committee, avail myself of whatever authorities [sic] I can obtain, whether in the British Museum, National Portrait Gallery, or elsewhere. It will be my endeavour to make the statue the most accurate "presentment" of the man attainable, and I have no hesitation in saying that my competitor, Mr Williamson, would have done the same. The confidence of the committee is at all events sufficiently expressed in the giving of the order, and I hope that your correspondent may be able to dismiss his apprehensions.

As, however, through the medium and under the influence of your journal, the idea of "fancy statuary" has been widely circulated, and is calculated not only to excite distrust of my capacity, and the judgment of the committee, but, what is of more importance, by anticipation to bring the memorial itself into derision, I trust, sir, you will considerately give the same publicity to this letter and oblige,

Your obedient servant, Thos. Brock

10 Boscobel place, Alpha road, St John's Wood, Sept. 27, 1873

In publishing the letter the editor added the following note:

Of course, if the statue is to present a likeness of Baxter, copied from the best extant portraits, our remarks fail to have application. But not a word about this was said before.[4]

This letter deserves to be quoted in full because it is the first of his letters to survive and sets out his views on portrait statues. Three points stand out. First, his determination that *Baxter* should be 'the most accurate "presentment" of the man attainable', not an ideal portrait or an allegorical representation. Second, his insistence that the costume, in this case

---

[4] *Worcestershire Chronicle* 1 October 1873

the everyday dress of a seventeenth century clergyman, should be authentic and historically accurate. Third, his defence of his competitor Francis Williamson, demonstrating a solidarity with a fellow sculptor which was to lead eventually to his becoming co-founder and first president of the Society of British Sculptors.

The statue was described in the same newspaper in the following terms:

> Mr Brock proposed making the figure of Sicilian marble or bronze, 10ft in height, with a granite pedestal, Gothic in design, of 22ft. The draping consists of the skull cap, the tight cassock, and the loose preaching robe worn in the times during which BAXTER lived. The model represents BAXTER as standing near a small pedestal on his left, the right hand raised and pointed heavenward. The *pose* is very natural and easy; and the facial expression as [sic] admirably characteristic of the deep piety and energy of character which are to be found in the writings and doings of BAXTER. A tall, gaunt man, with a soft sorrowful countenance, but out of which gleam a strong intellectual capacity and mental energy which threaten to overwhelm the strength of his emaciated frame.[5]

The statue in its final form was in marble and the granite pedestal was 12 ft (3.66 m) (plate 12). Brock's young wife is said to have been the model for the upraised right hand.[6] The statue was unveiled on 28 July 1875 by Mrs Philpott, wife of the Bishop of Worcester.[7] Edward Bradley, a popular writer of the time, wrote that the statue had far surpassed all his expectations and did Brock infinite credit.[8]

Brock exhibited the full-size plaster model of *Richard Baxter* at the 1874 Royal Academy. The *Art Journal* did not mention *Baxter*, but published an engraving of it the following year, describing Brock rather patronisingly as 'one of Mr Foley's clever pupils'.[9] The *Saturday Review* commented:

> More energetic than artistic is Mr Brock's "Model of the Statue of Richard Baxter..." The style may be said to be "non-conformist", as is the subject; in its vehemence it does not conform to established law and order. But the action arrests attention; one hand rests on the Bible, the other is raised, as sometimes in pictures of St. John the Baptist when exclaiming "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand". A certain breadth and rudeness in the treatment do not militate against the theme. [10]

---

[5] ibid 24 September 1873
[6] Brock p. 35
[7] *ILN* 7 August 1875 p. 133. Brock later executed Bishop Philpott's memorial in Worcester Cathedral.
[8] Brock p. 37; Edward Bradley (1827-89) was living at Kidderminster. He wrote *The Adventures of Mr Verdant Green, an Oxford Freshman* and published articles under the name Cuthbert Bede.
[9] *AJ* 1877 p. 184
[10] *SR* 10 June 1876 p. 747

The young sculptor in his mid-twenties would no doubt have regarded these remarks as high praise. Brock clearly intended to represent Baxter as ready to challenge the establishment vision of law and order where human rights were threatened. The fact that the statue was described as 'more energetic than artistic' coupled with the reference to John the Baptist indicated that Brock had captured Baxter's evangelical zeal. Its vigour marked a welcome change from the blandness so common in public statues of the time.

At the Academy Exhibition of 1875 Brock submitted a plaster maquette of Edwin Field and a pair of ideal statues in marble of the nymph Oenone and her lover Paris. *Oenone* and *Paris* were classical subjects of the same type as *Salmacis* (exhibited in 1869)[11]. Alfred Tennyson had written a well-known poem entitled *Oenone*, which Brock quoted in his catalogue description of the two statues:

Hitherto came at noon
Mournful Oenone, wandering forlorn
Of Paris, once her playmate of the hills and

Beautiful Paris, evil-hearted Paris
Leading a jet-black goat white horn'd, white hooved,
Came up from reedy Simois all alone.

It is difficult to comment on the merits of *Oenone* and *Paris* because there were no contemporary illustrations and their present whereabouts are unknown. Gosse later referred to them as 'two graceful Tennysonian statues in marble'.[12] Brock produced no more of these classical figures until *The Genius of Poetry* in 1889.

By contrast *Edwin Field* was a typical 'coat and trousers' standing figure of which two half-size statuettes in plaster survive (plate 35).[13] It seems likely that it was entered for a competition for a statue in the Law Courts; Thomas Woolner was successful, and Brock's full-size statue never materialised.

1875 was a difficult year for Brock. With probate still not granted on Foley's Will, he was working without pay while completing the Prince Consort statue. Birch was still contesting Brock's sole right to complete the Foley works, and it was not certain that Brock

---

[11] see p. 21
[12] Gosse 1883 p. 45
[13] In Dr Williams Library, Gordon Square, London and in a private collection. R. Ormond and M. Rogers (ed.) *Dictionary of British Portraiture* Vol. 3 1981 p. 68 incorrectly describes this work as a bust

would be able to take over the Osnaburgh Street studio. His fourth child (Catherine) was born in September, and such was his financial situation that he had to borrow £24.10.0 from Richard Belt, a former assistant in Foley's studio, in December 1875.[14]

Matters began to improve in 1876. Probate of Foley's Will was granted, and although the Will was still contested, Teniswood could make and receive payments with the approval of the Court of Chancery. During the year, the Albert Memorial was completed, *Grattan, Rosse* and *Stokes* were unveiled and Birch gave up his attempt to share the task of completing the other Foley works. Brock's financial problems must have abated, as he decided to enrol in the Artists' Rifles, a volunteer unit which included several Academy members. He was undoubtedly encouraged to do this by Frederick Leighton, who was gazetted as Lieutenant Colonel and Commanding Officer of the Artists' Rifles in 1876. The improvement in Brock's financial situation was timely for another reason; his fifth child, Hugh James, was born on 14 November 1876.

In its description of the sculpture at the 1876 Academy, the *Saturday Review* said: 'The present collection is one of the worst ever seen'.[15] The 'inanities now seen in marble and plaster' included William Calder Marshall's *Pygmalion* and John Bell's *Peace* for the new Foreign Office building, mocked as symbolising 'peace at any price'. The *Art Journal* was also caustic about the general standard ('The sculpture need detain us but a short time').[16] Woolner's *Kingsley* was compared unfavourably with Richard Belt's version, which the *Art Journal* described as a work of undoubted merit, adding that Belt was being badly treated by the Academy. It only emerged later that Brock had been responsible for any 'artistic merit' that the Kingsley bust possessed.[17]

The *Art Journal* had to concede that one work was of an unusually high standard, noting that *Valour crushing Cowardice* by Alfred Stevens was 'perhaps the most powerful group the English School ever produced'.[18] This work, part of the unfinished Wellington Monument for St Paul's Cathedral, was exhibited posthumously a year after Stevens' death. Beattie insisted that the origins of modern English sculpture should be identified in the work

---

[14] *Times* 6 December 1882
[15] *SR* 10 June 1876 p. 746
[16] *AJ* 1876 p. 263
[17] see p. 95
[18] *AJ* 1876 p. 263

of Stevens rather than in 'the contemporary romantic-realist sculpture of France', which Gosse claimed to be the inspiration for Leighton's *Athlete wrestling with a Python.* Indeed she expressed surprise that 'Leighton's dependency on and many obvious allusions to the Wellington Monument figure groups went entirely unremarked'[19]- a view which few art critics have shared.

The significance of *Valour crushing Cowardice* was overshadowed by the dramatic appearance at the 1877 Academy of Leighton's *Athlete wrestling with a Python.* This depicts a naked man of splendid physique grasping a python by the neck with a rigidly outstretched right arm, while his left arm grapples with the python's coils. Man and snake are momentarily balanced in their life-or-death struggle; there is a sense of great force and tension. It was widely (if not universally) recognised as a major event in British art and later seen as the beginning of a sculptural revival. The *Art Journal* congratulated Leighton on achieving a success in sculpture unprecedented in the history of art in England, although the tribute was somewhat diluted by associating in this praise *Marie Antoinette* and *La Garde meurt et ne se rend pas* by Lord Ronald Gower.[20] It described the *Athlete* as:

> nobly classic in feeling, yet full of such realistic detail as modern anatomical knowledge demands ... Larger experience in modelling might, here and there, have given greater appearance of mere surface-freedom; but no increase of manipulative practice would have added to [its] grandeur and completeness.[21]

The *Saturday Review* was more reserved: it gave pride of place at the Exhibition to *Courage Militaire* by Paul Dubois, and regretted the absence of 'any inventive work of startling excellence'.[22] While Leighton's *Athlete* was a fine work, there were certain faults in the design - 'the pose of the left arm seems to us unhappy'. The most the *Review* could say of the *Athlete* was that 'however many holes may be picked in the work, it must, we think, be admitted that it combines strength with beauty in a rare degree, and that the Academy has done wisely in purchasing it out of the Chantrey Fund'.

---

[19] Beattie p. 3

[20] P. Ward-Jackson 'Lord Ronald Gower, Gustave Doré and the Genesis of the Shakespeare Memorial at Stratford-on-Avon', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* Vol. 30 1987 pp. 162-3 suggests that Gower was considerably helped by 'ghosts' in executing these works (see Chapter 8)

[21] *AJ* 1877 p. 185

[22] *SR* 23 June 1877 p. 767

The Times showed remarkable prescience in commenting: 'whether we look at the action or the anatomical details of this figure, we must at once admit it to a place among the few great English works in bronze or marble'.[23] *The Times* was right in its assessment of the importance of the *Athlete*. As Read noted:

> This work was taken in its own time, and has been ever since, as a breakthrough in British sculpture and in particular as the harbinger of a movement called 'The New Sculpture'.[24]

Hitherto Leighton had been known as a painter rather than a sculptor and this was the first work in bronze he had shown at the Academy. Its appearance was therefore both a surprise and something of a mystery. As the *Saturday Review* noted, Leighton had 'tried his hand at the chisel after long devotion to the brush'.[25] Leighton subsequently explained that he had started making small models of figures to assist him in the composition of paintings like the *Daphnephoria*, and a French sculptor (Dalou or Legros) had encouraged him to try his hand at a full-scale work.[26]

So far as subject matter was concerned, Leighton, as a Visitor to the Academy Schools, was familiar with Brock's group *Hercules strangling Antaeus* (plate 53) with its realistic portrayal of powerful nude bodies locked in a life-or-death struggle. Brock's work could well have influenced Leighton, because, as Read points out:

> ... this was about the time when Leighton began to formulate his own muscular Hercules in action for his painting *Hercules struggling with Death for the Body of Alcestis*.[27]

The idea of the python might have come from Bosio's *Hercules fighting Achelous in the form of a serpent* (1824).[28] Leighton invariably referred to the statue as the '*Python*' (rather than the '*Athlete*'), possibly indicating that he thought the snake more important than the man; and there is no doubt that the snake theme appealed to the public.

Whatever the inspiration for the *Athlete*, there is no doubt that Leighton modelled and completed the statue in Brock's studio - initially at 10 Boscobel Place and, after Foley's

---

[23] *Times* 5 May 1877
[24] Read 1982 p. 289
[25] *SR* 5 May 1877 p. 549. In preparing the clay model for casting in bronze Leighton is unlikely to have used a chisel, a tool normally associated with work in marble
[26] Read 'Leighton as a sculptor: Releasing sculpture from convention', *Apollo* February 1996 p. 65
[27] Read 'Leighton and Sculpture', *Frederic Leighton 1830-1896*, exhibition catalogue RA 1996 p. 86
[28] Janson p. 240

death in 1874, in Osnaburgh Street. The fact that Leighton had not only used Brock's studio but had received 'technical' assistance from him only became widely known during the Belt v. Lawes trial in 1882.[29] In answer to a question by a member of the jury, Leighton replied: 'It is usual in our studios that we receive some help. I received the help of Mr Brock in bringing out the Python'. In reply to another juror, he insisted that whatever help Brock had given 'the artistic individuality of the work [was] wholly mine'.[30]

Leighton began work on the statue in 1874. He invited Mrs Emilia Pattison to see the model, warning her that the *Athlete* was 'in a mere state of *ébauche* and without his snake looks too ludicrous for anything'.[31] At one stage the proportions of the figure were miscalculated and rather than waste time trying to alter the model, Leighton 'at once destroyed the whole thing and began afresh from the beginning'.[32] A further delay occurred when Brock moved from Boscobel Place to Osnaburgh Street in late 1876 or early 1877. The model was cast by Cox and Sons of Thames Ditton, whom Brock had recently used for his *Snake Charmer* and the *Rathbone* plaques.[33]

Referring to the Leighton/Brock relationship a few years later, Gosse wrote:

> One of these studios [in Osnaburgh Street] is let by Mr Brock to Sir Frederick Leighton, who when he indulges in his favourite art of sculpture, leaves his lovely mosque in the Melbury Road for an asylum where he, as the poet Gray puts it in one of his letters, can be happy and dirty to his heart's content.[34]

Leighton probably decided to work in Brock's studio and to seek his technical advice and assistance because of Brock's mastery of detailed and highly finished works in bronze. In discussing the Brock/Leighton connection, Benedict Read has written:

> I do not believe that this was fortuitous: Foley, as I have tried to demonstrate, was one of the few Victorian sculptors, if not the only one, who had made more than a gesture towards naturalism and realism in his work.... attempting - and this above all is important here - to render in bronze a more than superficial acknowledgement of what the substance of nature provided. It was on the completion of works embodying these principles that Brock was engaged at the time, and it was

---

[29] see p. 97
[30] *Times* 13 December 1882
[31] L. & R. Ormond *Lord Leighton* Yale University Press 1975 p. 93
[32] R. Ormond 'An Athlete Wrestling with a Python' in *Frederic Leighton 1830-1896* exhibition catalogue Royal Academy of Arts 1996 p. 182
[33] see p. 62
[34] Gosse 1883 p. 46

thus wholly appropriate to Leighton's requirements for Brock to complete at full scale in bronze a manifesto of naturalistic rendering.[35]

Commenting on an allegation of 'ghosting' in 1892 relating to Charles Birch and Adrian Jones, M. H. Spielmann, editor of the *Magazine of Art,* was confident that Brock's assistance to Leighton had not gone beyond legitimate bounds:

> When Sir Frederick first took to sculpture, his own studio was unfitted for the exercise of that art and he availed himself of the hospitality of Mr Brock's. No-one who knew not merely Sir Frederick's talents, but his independent spirit, would think it likely that he would brook, much less accept, such assistance.[36]

Brock himself never suggested that his role in the execution of *Athlete wrestling with a Python* was any more than that described by Leighton. Brock's son noted that

> Of course all sorts of things were whispered about Leighton's sudden wooing of the sister Art. These came to Brock's hearing, and when one day he told Leighton what was being said, the latter replied: 'They may say what they please. These studios are big enough for you and me'.[37]

Leighton showed his contempt for the rumours by continuing to use Brock's studio for his sculptural work, including *The Sluggard* and *Needless Alarms* and the marble version of the *Athlete*.[38]

At the same 1877 Academy, Brock exhibited a half life-size bronze statuette entitled the *Snake Charmer* (plate 114) . This ideal work had been shown the previous year at the Centennial International Exhibition in Philadelphia by Cox and Sons, the founders, as an example of fine work in bronze.

In a catalogue note for the Philadelphia Exhibition, Professor Walter Smith wrote:

> Observe the ease and gracefulness of the pose. One arm is raised, the hand holding a wand round which the snake is twined. The man's head is bent backwards as he watches the reptile, while in the other hand he holds the small pipe, just removed from his mouth, by which he has created the charm. The left foot, placed firmly on the ground, supports the weight of his body; the other, resting lightly upon the lid of the closed basket, suggests the idea that the snake on the wand is but one of several - the others being confined in the basket.
>
> The figure is in a sitting posture, yet there is no relaxation to the muscles. We can see that the man is on the qui vive, though the moment chosen is one when he naturally would be perfectly

---

[35] Read 1982 p. 291
[36] A. Jones *Memoirs of a Soldier Artist* 1933 p. 207 quoting interview published in *The Morning* (sic) on 2 August 1892
[37] Brock p. 47
[38] see p. 124

> motionless. Herein lies one of the greatest merits of the work in a purely artistic sense. To attempt to convey a sense of motion in a statue or carving is not good art. Movement belongs entirely to the domain of the painter.[39]

The *Snake Charmer* was quite unlike Brock's previous ideal works. Whereas *Hercules*, *Salmacis* and *Hereward* were neo-classical in inspiration, the *Snake Charmer* showed the influence of Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux's *Le Pêcheur Napolitain* and the French School generally in its poise, delicacy and use of bronze to express character and 'colour'. The *Snake Charmer* even wears the characteristic 'Neapolitan shorts'. Although virtually unnoticed at its first appearance, it has a claim to be the first ideal bronze work of the New Sculpture in statuette size, predating Hamo Thornycroft's *Putting the Stone* (plate 175) by three years.

Brock showed the warmth of his relationship with Leighton by christening his fifth child (born 24 August 1880) 'Frederick'. He also exhibited a bronze bust of Leighton at the 1881 Academy.[40] The bust showed Leighton's head and neck only, undraped and classical in style (plate 60). With his splendid bearded features, *Leighton* looks more like a Greek god than a Victorian artist. The *Art Journal* considered it deserving of attention, but Gosse thought it 'distinctly disappoints'.[41] It was the first bronze bust exhibited by Brock at the Academy.

---

[39] Walter Smith: *Masterpieces of the Centennial International Exhibition*: Vol. II (Industrial Art) Philadelphia 1876 pp. 15-16

[40] Not to be confused with the well-known Diploma bust of 1893 (plate 61)

[41] *AJ* 1881 p. 231, *SR* 18 June 1881 p. 782

Chapter 7: *A Moment of Peril*

1878 marked a further improvement in Brock's fortunes. The signature of the O'Connell Monument contract in June gave him firm possession of the Osnaburgh Street studio, which he renovated in October; and this massive work, plus three equestrian statues (*Gough* and two *Maharajahs of Nepal*) meant that he had well-paid commissions for the next few years. Reporting the signing of the *O'Connell* contract, the *Art Journal* noted that Brock would be paid £10,500 for his work, and commented that this was 'not by any means a large sum considering the size and character of the monument'.[1] The election of his friend and mentor, Frederic Leighton, as President of the Royal Academy on 13 November 1878 gave promise of a higher profile for sculpture in the Academy.

Other sculptors were losing no opportunity to keep in the public eye and Brock's preoccupation with completing Foley's works meant that he risked losing ground in the keen competition for Associate status. Joseph Edgar Boehm had been elected ARA in January 1878 and at the Academy Exhibition that year his equestrian statue of the Prince of Wales was praised as being 'in such gallant guise as only the late John Foley could have equalled' - somewhat galling for Brock, who must have hoped that he rather than Boehm would be seen as Foley's heir.[2] However, Boehm (born 1834) was of the previous generation - Brock had more reason to be concerned about competition from his younger contemporary Hamo Thornycroft.

In 1879 Edmund Gosse began to comment on the Academy Exhibitions for the *Saturday Review*. As Stocker has pointed out,[3] Gosse was a close friend of Hamo Thornycroft and spared no effort to further Thornycroft's career. In his first article Gosse praised the 'relatively high' standard of the exhibition and mentioned in particular Hamo Thornycroft's *Stepping Stones* and Charles Birch's *Dying Trumpeter*.[4] Dalou's merits were still not fully appreciated; Gosse considered his busts of Mr and Mrs Poynter vivacious and elegant; but that his talent was limited, as was shown by the 'unfortunate' bas relief entitled

---

[1] *AJ* 1878 p. 186
[2] *AJ* 1878 p. 199
[3] Stocker 1985/6 pp. 285-6
[4] *SR* 7 June 1879 p. 709

Bacchanalia. The *Art Journal* critic, on the other hand, considered *Bacchanalia* to be the 'supreme piece of sculpture' at the Exhibition.[5] Brock submitted three works - a marble statuette entitled *Our Boy*[6] and two portraits of minor worthies (a statuette of W.H.Cookson and a testimonial bust of Jerome Murch, seven times Mayor of Bath). Not surprisingly, they went unmentioned by the critics.

If Brock was to press his claim for ARA status, he needed to produce something more substantial for the Academy, and this is precisely what he did at the 1880 Exhibition. He submitted an ideal group (in plaster) entitled *A Moment of Peril* (plate 70), described by the *Art Journal* as follows:

> The incident is a striking one. An Indian on horseback has been suddenly attacked by a large snake, which seizes the horse by one of the forelegs and crushes the limb until the horse falls back on its haunches. The Indian raises his spear to endeavour to slay the deadly enemy, and his calmness in the "moment of peril" bodes ill for his assailant.[7]

Although Birch's *Lieutenant Hamilton VC* had the place of honour in the Central Hall, Gosse considered that Brock's *A Moment of Peril* was better in every respect, remarking that: 'There is a wild air of horror and suspense about the face of the Indian that gives great value to this spirited composition, which should without delay be executed in bronze.'[8]

Gosse's suggestion that *A Moment of Peril* should be executed in bronze was promptly taken up by Brock. Normally a sculptor hesitated to incur the expense of casting if no commission was in prospect (Boehm's *St George and the Dragon*, exhibited in plaster at the 1876 Exhibition, was not cast until 1884/5, when it was sold to Melbourne). Brock received some verbal (and possibly financial) encouragement from Leighton, who as chairman of the trustees of the Chantrey Fund would have known that a bronze statue would be considered for purchase by the Fund, whereas a plaster model would not.[9] When the bronze version was submitted to the 1881 Academy Exhibition, it was given the place of honour in the Central Hall and promptly purchased for the nation by the Chantrey Bequest for two thousand guineas, the same price as paid in 1877 for Leighton's *Athlete*.

---

[5] *AJ* 1879 p. 125
[6] *Our Boy* can probably be identified with *Child picking flowers* (plate 21) in the Walker Art Gallery
[7] *AJ* 1883 p. 16
[8] *SR* 12 June 1880 p. 757
[9] In evidence to the Select Committee of the House of Lords on the Chantrey Fund in 1904, Brock said that if it had not been for the kind help of members of the Academy, he could not have put *A Moment of Peril* into bronze (Minutes of Evidence taken on 12 July 1904, p. 56)

In his comments on the plaster version of *A Moment of Peril*, Gosse made the rather enigmatic comment that it 'would be worthy of great praise if it were thoroughly original'.[10] He later explained this more fully in his survey of the New Sculpture movement:

> the recognition of the new sculpture by the President and Council of the Academy did not go far, for the two works selected for purchase under the terms of the Chantrey Bequest were an old fashioned group by an elderly sculptor [Calder Marshall] who had known more skilful days, and *A Moment of Peril* by Mr Thomas Brock (b. 1847). This latter artist was presently to 'find salvation', but at that time he was still in bondage to the practice of Foley, whose favourite pupil and accredited successor he was. In this his great bronze of a Red Indian fighting a snake he had followed Sir Frederick Leighton's *Athlete* closely, and at the same time, the equestrian statue of *Outram* by his late master, Foley. When we think of what Mr Brock was eventually to do, the clumsiness of his work of this period is extraordinary. [11]

Marion Spielmann disagreed with Gosse's view that in *A Moment of Peril* Brock was still 'in bondage' to Foley. On the contrary, he considered that *A Moment of Peril* marked Brock's transition from the school of Foley:

> he had the rare courage, and elasticity of mind and spirit, to modify his style in accordance with the newer current of artistic thought and feeling, and so developed, he left his master far behind.

The group was fine and scholarly, violent in action and passionate, but also 'in a measure, romantic and anecdotal'.[12] Alexander Kader agreed with Spielmann and described *A Moment of Peril* as: 'One of the first manifestations of the ideals expressed in the *Athlete* among the younger generation'.[13]

A Moment of Peril was one of the first works to follow the example of Leighton's *Athlete*. This is particularly evident in the detailed modelling of man, horse and python, and the combination of romanticism and realism in the depiction of a life-or-death struggle. Brock may have been paying homage to his two mentors, Foley and Leighton, but his choice of subject possibly owed more to Auguste-Louis-Marie Ottin's *Indian Hunter attacked by a Boa Constrictor* (1857) (plate 170).[14] Nor were the two Chantrey purchases as perverse as Gosse suggests; they could be seen as a tactful move by Leighton and his colleagues to

---

[10] *SR* 12 June 1880 p. 757
[11] *AJ* 1894 p. 202
[12] Spielmann 1905 p. 421
[13] A. Kader 'Athletes, adolescents and antique drapery: Some critical and sculptural responses to Leighton's sculpture 1890-1930', Barnes, J. (ed.), *Leighton and his sculptural legacy*, exhibition catalogue, Joanna Barnes Fine Art 1996 p. 14
[14] Ottin's statue was exhibited at the Salons of 1846 (plaster) and 1857 (bronze). It was purchased by the French government in 1858 and is now at Fontainebleau

strike a balance between the 'old sculpture', represented by the 68 year old Calder Marshall's *Prodigal Son*, and the 'new sculpture' represented by the 34 year old Brock's *A Moment of Peril.*

Brock included it among the ten works he chose to have listed in *Who's Who* and which he presumably regarded as his best. He demonstrated his affection for the statue, as well as his business acumen, some thirty years later when he persuaded Carl Jacobsen, the Danish brewing millionaire, to purchase a replica. On 12 July 1910 he wrote to Jacobsen:

> Since your call this afternoon I have considered the question of a bronze replica of my equestrian group 'A Moment of Peril' and I desire to say that I am prepared to undertake such a reproduction, executed in the best possible way, for the sum of £800. In naming such a moderate sum I have taken into consideration what you told me as to the amount at your disposal for the purchase of sculpture being somewhat limited. [15]

Jacobsen accepted these terms and the bronze group now stands in the grounds of Rosenberg Castle, Copenhagen.

A Moment of Peril was the centrepiece of the Worcestershire Exhibition (1882) and was later shown at the Royal Jubilee Exhibition in Manchester (1887); the Earls Court Exhibition (1897); the Royal Academy Winter Exhibition (1944) and the Royal Academy Bicentenary Exhibition (1968). It now stands in the garden of Leighton House, Kensington.

Chantrey purchases belong to the Tate Gallery, whose 1929 catalogue referred to *A Moment of Peril* in these terms:

> Although he was essentially academic, [Brock] showed remarkable vigour and a sense of material beyond the ordinary. He would have been a greater sculptor had he lived a little later and been subject to modern feeling and development. His bronze group showed an interest in movement which was something new in 1880. [16]

A Moment of Peril helped to re-assert Brock's position among the younger generation of sculptors and strengthen his claim to election as an Associate. Hamo Thornycroft, although three years younger, had been elected ARA in 1881, and Brock wrote to him on 27 January 1881:

---

[15] Archives of Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen
[16] Manson pp. 158-9

> Naturally I should have preferred being myself the lucky man. Nevertheless I can honestly say that the members of the Academy could not have selected a better man than yourself or one more calculated to do honour to their Institution.[17]

This generous letter marked the beginning of a friendly correspondence which continued until Brock's death. Twenty nine of Brock's letters to Thornycroft, the last dated 31 October 1920, are preserved in the Henry Moore Institute, Leeds.

Brock's claim to be considered among the leading figures of the New Sculpture was confirmed by his next major work - not an ideal group but a public monument. Following the favourable reception of *Richard Baxter* in Kidderminster, Brock was given the commission for a commemorative statue of *Robert Raikes* in London.

Robert Raikes, a Gloucestershire printer and journalist, had established the first Sunday School in 1780, and the National Sunday Schools Union decided to mark the centenary of this event. Brock was commissioned to execute a statue of Raikes in bronze for £1,200, subscribed by Sunday School teachers and scholars. The site chosen was a prestigious one, in the newly opened Thames Embankment Gardens. [18] A full-size model of the statue was exhibited at the Academy in May 1880, and the statue itself (plate 101), cast by Drew and Co. of Thames Ditton, was unveiled by the Earl of Shaftesbury on 3 July 1880.

Raikes is shown standing, bare-headed, wearing eighteenth century costume with his right forefinger pointing downwards at a Bible he is holding in his left hand. It is a

> a lively yet respectful centenary portrait. Raikes was a plump, fashionable eighteenth century gentleman, his brown wig sporting a double row of curls.... Brock, however, has curbed the paunch and the curls and given Raikes a more serious look appropriate to the founding father of a national institution.[19]

In his speech at the unveiling, the Earl of Shaftesbury drew attention to the juxtaposition of the statue with Cleopatra's Needle, which had been erected shortly before:

> In the latter we see the sign of darkness, of ignorance - a state of things in which there is no knowledge of God, no hope of redemption, no hope for the future, nothing for time, and if possible, still less for eternity; while the statue just unveiled speaks in exactly the opposite direction - of light and hope, peace and eternity.[20]

---

[17] Thornycroft Archive C93
[18] P. W. White *On Public View* 1971 p. 183
[19] J. Blackwood *London's Immortals* 1989 p. 311
[20] Brock pp. 59-60

Raikes was the third statue to be unveiled in the Embankment Gardens, the others being *Sir James Outram* by Matthew Noble (unveiled 1871) and *Isambard Kingdom Brunel* by Carlo Marochetti (unveiled 1877). Brock's skill as a portraitist distinguishes *Raikes* from the other two. He may have somewhat idealised his subject (as he was later to do with Queen Victoria) but he gave *Raikes* features which are full of character. In comparison, the faces of *Brunel* (plate 168) and *Outram* are dull and stolid. The details of *Raikes*' costume, particularly the knee breeches, are delicately modelled, whereas *Outram*'s uniform and *Brunel*'s 'coat and trousers' are clumsy by comparison. Finally, the gesture of the hand pointing to the open Bible, while not novel, gives *Raikes* more animation. As Read has pointed out, 'the New Sculpture had manifested itself in the area with Brock's *Raikes*'.[21]

Edmund Gosse had a high opinion of *Raikes*. He praised the statue as being 'as good as anything of the kind which we possess in England';[22] and in an article on 'The Future of Sculpture in London' he referred to 'such good recent works' as the *Lord Herbert* of the late Mr Foley and the *Raikes* of his 'accomplished pupil' Mr Brock. Gosse considered that, with names such as Armstead, Woolner, Boehm, Thornycroft and Brock before them, 'memorial committees should be able to form some notion of the style and qualifications of the competent sculptors now working in London'.[23]

Brock must have been heartened to find himself listed by Gosse with two RAs (Armstead and Woolner) and two ARAs (Boehm and Hamo Thornycroft). At the election in January 1882 for an Associate to replace Boehm, who had been elected RA, Brock received an encouragingly large vote. An architect, George Bodley was elected, so Brock had not lost any ground to other sculptors.

Meanwhile, the citizens of Kidderminster had decided to honour Sir Rowland Hill, inventor of the Penny Post, with a commemorative statue. Following his success with *Richard Baxter*, Brock was given the commission and the marble statue was unveiled on 22 June 1881.[24] The statue is of the conventional 'coat and trousers' type (plate 58). *Hill*

---

[21] Read 1982 p. 355
[22] Gosse 1883 p. 45
[23] *Magazine of Art (M of A)* 1881 p. 281
[24] *Times* 23 June 1881

stands, hatless, his right hand grasping the lapel of his frock coat while his left hand rests on a pedestal, over which is draped a flowing cloak.[25]

Brock and Onslow Ford had both exhibited statues of Rowland Hill at the RA Exhibition in 1882, thus giving an opportunity to make a direct comparison of work by the two sculptors. Gosse found neither effigy was very 'inspiriting', but considered that Brock's was the more natural in pose.[26] *The Builder* agreed that Brock's was the better work - he had obviously aimed at giving as much ease and grace of line to the figure as the difficulties of the costume would allow him. When seen in a more unconfined manner in the open air, it would be adjudged to be more successful than the average of portrait statues.[27]

While public monuments were important to Brock's career, the main source of his income continued to be portrait busts, at which he was adept. However, as Richard Belt cynically pointed out, the difficulty was to get the commissions.[28] One particularly rich vein which Brock mined over a twenty year period originated with a commission from the Dowager Marchioness of Westminster in 1880, and no fewer than ten busts can be linked to this first commission, plus one marble bas relief and two public statues.

Lady Elizabeth Leveson Gower, daughter of the first Duke of Sutherland, had married Richard Grosvenor, Lord Belgrave, in 1819. Her husband became the second Marquis of Westminster in 1845 and died in 1869. The youngest of their thirteen children, Lady Theodora, married Merthyr Guest in 1877. Guest was the second son of Sir Josiah John Guest, the wealthy owner of the Dowlais Iron Works in South Wales, and the Dowager Marchioness went to live with her son-in-law and daughter at their house at Inwood, Dorset after their marriage. Brock's busts of the Marchioness and her son-in-law were shown at the 1881 RA exhibition. Gosse considered that the *Marchioness of Westminster* was better than *Merthyr Guest* which 'scarcely supports Brock's reputation'.[29] As Guest was a typically full bearded Victorian gentleman, Brock might have found the task of presenting an interesting portrait bust beyond even his capabilities.

---

[25] Ormond 1973 p. 226 lists this statue as a bust
[26] *SR* 10 June 1882 p. 731
[27] *Builder* 27 May 1882 p. 631
[28] see p. 96
[29] *SR* 18 June 1881 p. 782

Brock also executed a bust of Lady Theodora Guest, daughter of the Marchioness. He was not used to moving in high society, and the series of sittings must have been an interesting experience. He found the Marchioness 'a most charming old lady' (she was then over 80) but her daughter proved more difficult. Brock visited their Dorset home on several occasions and letters were exchanged. Brock's epistolary style was always formal, but Lady Theodora Guest carried formality to the extreme. Brock later humorously described their relationship as follows: 'I found it as difficult to forget that she was a Marquis's daughter as she did'.[30]

It was probably through the Marchioness of Westminster that Brock received the commission to execute a recumbent marble effigy of her cousin, the Rev. Granville Leveson Gower, for the church of St James, Titsey, Surrey; a bust of her grandson, Sir John Ramsden (1891); a bas relief of his wife, Lady Gwendolen (RA 1891); and a bust of lady Gwendolen's father, the 12th Duke of Somerset (1892). The most interesting of these works is the marble bas relief of Lady Gwendolen (plate 102). When exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1891, it attracted the attention of *The Builder*, which commented that the work was 'peculiarly treated and effective' with the profile 'undercut so as to stand out against a dark shadow outlining it'.[31]

The Marchioness's son-in-law Merthyr Guest, whose father had been MP for Merthyr Tydfil, is likely to have recommended Brock for a series of portrait busts in South Wales. These were *H. Rhys* (RA 1883), chairman of the Merthyr Tydfil Board of Guardians; *(Sir) William Menelaus* (RA 1885), general manager of the Dowlais Iron Works; *W. Thomas Lewis* (RA 1885), owner of the Rhondda Valley Coal Mines and his wife, *Mrs Lewis* (RA 1885); and *Frank Treharne James* (RA 1891), treasurer of Merthyr Tydfil Hospital and later mayor of that town. Brock also executed a bronze statue of Sir Thomas Lewis for Merthyr Tydfil General Hospital after his knighthood (RA 1899). A replica of this statue was erected in Aberdare in 1913, after Lewis was ennobled as Baron Merthyr of Senghenydd.

---

[30] Brock p. 65

[31] *Builder* 6 June 1891 p. 444

Chapter 8: Belt versus Lawes

In August 1881 *Vanity Fair* published an article entitled 'Mr Belt'.[1] This was to lead to the celebrated lawsuit of Belt versus Lawes in which Brock, although not a defendant, was deeply involved, and which could have seriously jeopardised his career.

Richard Belt was born in 1852. He first met Brock in Foley's studio, where he was employed as a junior assistant in 1869/70. He then went to work in the studio of Charles Lawes, who had been a pupil of Foley in 1868/9. While working with Lawes, Belt exhibited busts of Mr and Mrs Nicholls and of Dean Stanley at the Royal Academy. In 1874 Belt sued the Watcombe Terracotta Company. Brock and Lawes gave evidence at Belt's request. According to *The Times*:

> Belt, a modeller of statues, made what was stated to be a most artistic statuette of Dean Stanley, worth £80, and sent [it] to the defendants to copy. The latter acted so negligently that they destroyed the original and rendered it valueless. Verdict of £50 for Belt by consent.[2]

At the 1876 Academy Exhibition Belt's *Dean Stanley* was considered by the *Art Journal* to be superior to Thomas Woolner's version, and in 1877 Belt attracted public attention by beating not only Woolner, but also Edgar Boehm, Auguste Rodin and Alfred Gilbert, in a competition for a statue of Lord Byron.[3] This led to further commissions from the Lord Mayor of London and from Queen Victoria herself.

The *Vanity Fair* article, after noting that Belt was the 'fashionable sculptor of the day', asked whether he really was the author of the works that bore his name. The article alleged that Belt was a 'sculpture-broker', who presented to the public, as his own, work that had invariably been designed and executed by other hands than his:

> After leaving Mr Lawes's studio in 1875, Mr Belt began in business on his own account. He published as his own work a statuette of Dean Stanley, of which a good deal has been lately heard. This statuette however was worked up for him by Mr Brock, as Mr Brock himself declares. In like manner, the memorial busts of Charles Kingsley and of Canon Conway, which also pass as the work of Mr Belt, were in fact invested by Mr Brock - as Mr Brock himself declares - with whatever artistic merit they possess. Mr Brock, equally with Mr Lawes, declares that Mr Belt was himself incapable of doing anything in the shape of artistic work.
>
> In 1876 Mr Belt took into partnership Mr Verhyden. Verhyden states that the drawings which procured for Mr Belt the Conway monument (the bust of which was, as already stated,

---

[1] *Vanity Fair* 20 August 1881 p. 112

[2] *Times* 11 June 1874

[3] *Times* 29 November 1882; White p. 155; R. Dorment *Alfred Gilbert, Sculptor and Goldsmith* exhibition catalogue Royal Academy of Arts 1986 p. 98

worked up by Mr Brock) were his, and not Mr Belt's at all. Mr Verhyden further declares that he (Mr Verhyden) and not Mr Belt entirely modelled the sketch which enabled Mr Belt to gain the victory over all the artists of the day in the Byron competition; and that he (Mr Verhyden) also entirely modelled the Byron statue itself.

In short, we are assured that all Mr Belt's works from the year 1876, when he began business on his own account, up to the year 1881, were executed by Mr Brock and Mr Verhyden.[4]

The article concluded by noting that Belt had just received from the Queen a commission to execute a statue of Lord Beaconsfield, and questioned whether 'Her Majesty's choice of an artist is really warranted'.

This article gave rise to a lively correspondence, including the following letter dated 1 September 1881 from Brock:

Sir, - In your notice of the career of Mr Belt, which appeared on the 20th ultimo, and to which my attention has just been directed, an inaccuracy of statement occurs which I must ask you to allow me to correct, as it conveys an erroneous impression relative to my connection with him.

After he left Mr Foley's studio he asked me to go and see some models he was attempting, and it is perfectly true that, at his earnest and pressing solicitation, I worked at different times upon his statuette of the late Dean Stanley, and the busts of Canons Kingsley and Conway, but this was only done in a friendly way, just as I might have done in the hope of assisting any young beginner. Mr Belt had not then received any commission for these works. I of course never accepted any remuneration from him, nor should I have yielded to his importunities to touch upon his models had I imagined the misrepresentations to which he afterwards resorted.

The following paragraph however is misleading in the inference it carries:- 'In short, we are assured that *all* Mr Belt's works from the year 1876, when he began business on his own account, up to the year 1881, were executed by Mr Brock and Mr Verhyden'.

Here I am classed with Mr Verhyden, who regularly executed Mr Belt's work for payment for several years; whereas all the assistance I rendered him was limited to the works specified, and under the conditions already stated.

Since 1876 my connection with Mr Belt has entirely ceased.

I offer no observations on the continuous imposture alleged to be practised on the public; that, I think, sufficiently speaks for itself. - I am, Sir, yours faithfully, Thos. Brock.[5]

Thus Brock, far from dissociating himself from the accusation that Belt was an impostor, simply wished to make it clear that his assistance to Belt was unpaid, and limited to works executed prior to 1876. He also signed, with Birch and Lawes, a letter of guarantee to the proprietor of *Vanity Fair*, presumably to protect the journal from any libel charges.

---

[4] *Vanity Fair* 20 August 1881 p. 113. Although the *Vanity Fair* article and Brock's letter of 1 September 1881 both use the form 'Verhyden' the correct spelling is 'Verheyden'

[5] *Vanity Fair* 3 September 1881 p. 140

On 24 September 1881, Charles Lawes wrote to the Lord Mayor of London, referring to reports that the Corporation were considering commissioning Belt to execute certain works of sculpture. In this connection, he drew the Lord Mayor's attention to the *Vanity Fair* article and noted there had been no denial or refutation of the charges therein contained.[6]

According to his son, Brock found the whole business 'distasteful in the extreme', and it was only after much pressure that he agreed to give his support to the *Vanity Fair* article. Belt and he had been friends, and 'nothing could be more painful ... than publicly to impugne [sic] the professional conduct of a brother artist'. He also feared, correctly as it turned out, that any law suit would prove injurious to sculptors as a body.[7] Presumably he hoped that the *Vanity Fair* article would be sufficient to deter Belt from further 'passing off' and that he would not risk a law suit.

However, Belt felt confident enough to bring an action against Charles Lawes for libels contained in the *Vanity Fair* article and in his letter to the Lord Mayor of London. He probably sued Lawes alone because Lawes was wealthy and had compounded the libel by writing to the Lord Mayor. The case was heard in the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice. The judge was Baron Huddleston and there was a special jury. Sir Hardinge Giffard QC (later Lord Halsbury) was principal counsel for the plaintiff, while Charles (later Lord) Russell QC and Richard Webster QC (later Lord Alverstone) were principal counsel for the defence.

In his biography of Charles Russell, Barry O'Brien wrote:

> The trial began on June 22 [1882] and lasted for forty three days, ending on December 29. It was the talk of the town, the principal topic of conversation, as the *Times* said, 'at every dinner table and in every club'. The fashionable world supported Belt; the artistic, Lawes.[8]

Sir Hardinge Giffard opened the case for the plaintiff. The action had been brought to vindicate Belt's character as a sculptor and a man of honour. By his merits he had acquired a large reputation which had unluckily excited the envy of others, who had taken united action against him.

> Mr Belt did not complain of too severe criticism as an artist, but of the imputations of falsehood, fraud, imposture and dishonour, which, unless they were true, were calumnies of the grossest kind, for which the utterers ought to pay damages. Out of the 85 works claimed by the plaintiff, the defendant charged imposture in some 40. But what became of the

---

[6] *Times* 22 June 1882
[7] Brock p. 70
[8] R. B. O'Brien *Life of Lord Russell of Killowen* 1901 p. 149

remaining works? To whom were they to be attributed? Fortunately, a number of eye-witnesses would be called who saw Mr Belt at work, and him alone.[9]

Belt was the first to give evidence. Describing his work in the studios of Foley and Lawes, he claimed to have worked as a modeller on the Albert and O'Connell memorials and other well-known works by Foley. He specifically denied that Brock (or anyone else) had 'worked up' or finished the busts of Mrs Nicholls, Canon Kingsley and Dean Stanley. He noted that Brock and Lawes had appeared as witnesses on his side in the Watcombe Terracotta Company Case (see above) and had made no claim at the time that the Kingsley bust was by Brock. He agreed that Brock had made some suggestions about the Stanhope bust, but denied asking Brock to help him on a bust of Samuel Plimsoll. He also claimed that Brock's visits to his studio were not to assist his work but to borrow money. He had not asked Brock to go into partnership with him and had not promised to find commissions if Brock would execute them.[10] In subsequent cross-examination, Belt admitted that he had promised the secretary of the Plimsoll memorial committee an 8% payment if he was awarded the commission.[11]

An important witness for the defence was the Belgian sculptor François Verheyden, who had been named in the *Vanity Fair* article as the real sculptor of most of Belt's work, including *Byron*. Verheyden, quoting from a diary, gave a detailed account of work done for Belt and payments made; and the counsel for the plaintiff devoted much time to disputing the authenticity of the diary. Verheyden's wife, who also gave evidence, claimed that, after defeating Boehm and Woolner in the Byron competition, Belt had given Verheyden £340 (10% of the fee of £3,400) to pay him for his design.[12]

Lawes then gave evidence. He explained that, when working in his studio, Belt had 'made himself useful' mixing plaster, mending broken clay or plaster, setting up the irons and putting the clay roughly on the irons... 'He would do small mechanical pieces of modelling e.g. cupids with bows and arrows and bracelets on female figures. He was never engaged as a modeller'. Lawes said he recognised Brock's hand or style in *Kingsley* and *Conway*; the coat and hair of *Plimsoll* were evidently Brock's work, and the drapery of *Stanley* was in Brock's style.[13]

---

[9] *Times* 22 June 1882
[10] *Times* 22 and 24 June 1882
[11] *Times* 15 December 1882
[12] *Times* 17 and 29 November 1882
[13] *Times* 30 November 1882

Describing the origins of the *Vanity Fair* article, Lawes said that he and Bagenal (the author of the article) had contacted several leading sculptors (Edgar Boehm, Charles Birch, Count Gleichen and Bruce Joy, in addition to Brock) to demonstrate that there was a strong feeling in the profession about Belt's behaviour.. He gave his own version of the professional view: 'Supposing that a young artist did get his work embellished by a superior hand, to get on and get a livelihood, artists would think nothing of it; but to use other men's work as a rule, and to go in for competitions with other men's skill, is quite another thing'.[14] Under later cross-examination, Lawes admitted that he had received some assistance himself from Brock, who had 'laid in some rushes' on *The Bathers* without payment. 'There is a great deal of difference, taken together, between what Brock did for me and what he did for Belt... I designed and modelled my work, Belt did neither.' He had dismissed Belt on 20 January 1875 for improper behaviour over a £5 cheque, but he had not wished to make this public.[15]

A number of workers from Foley's studio were then called. Mr Brown, a pointer and mason, said Belt had worked on crockets, leaves and bust pedestals. He had never seen him model in clay. Mr White, a sculptor, said Belt was called the 'crocket weaver', a slang term. He mixed paste and plaster for Foley, but White had never seen him modelling. Mr Bastain, a sculptor's assistant, said Belt had worked for him as hammer man for some iron work on the Albert Memorial- 'He blew the bellows and handed me the big hammer' (Laughter). It was utterly untrue to say that Belt had done the same sort of modelling for Foley as Brock and Dewick. Cross-examined by the assistant counsel for the plaintiff, Bastain said 'Your boy, Mr Pollard, may bring your brief here, but he does not make the speech for you' (Laughter).[16]

Mr Dewick said he was a modeller and a student at the Royal Academy Schools. Belt worked on ornamental works and crockets, but nothing connected with the human figure; he had not the slightest knowledge of modelling. Belt had once asked him to look at a model at his home - 'it was the most crude thing imaginable. He called it Lord Beaconsfield, but it was impossible to tell who it was... I could not see any artistic merit in it'.[17]

---

[14] *Times* 1 December 1882 p 8
[15] *Times* 8 December 1882
[16] *Times* 6 December 1882
[17] ibid

On the twenty seventh day of the trial (5 December 1882) Brock was called to give evidence. After describing his own career as a sculptor, he said that Belt had worked in Foley's studio for 14 months on simple tasks like carving crocket leaves for a bust pedestal or the star of an order for a bust. He did not do any figure or bust modelling and was not a 'pupil' of Foley. Belt was discharged in 1870 as Foley had no further use for him.

Brock said that he had called on Belt in the studio of Charles Lawes. Belt was modelling statuettes of Gladstone and Disraeli and asked Brock to show him where they were 'wrong'. He did so, and judged that Belt had no skill in modelling. In 1875 he had been shown, in Mrs Nicholls' house, a bust of Mrs Nicholls, which Belt said had been carved by Cicorini. Mrs Nicholls stood beside the bust and Brock marked in pencil those parts which required remodelling.

Belt had also asked Brock to show him where *Kingsley* was wrong. Brock worked on it 'many times. The bust is mine as it is now - as to artistic merit'. He also worked for an hour and a half on the Stanley statuette in Belt's studio, rearranging the drapery. Later Belt brought this statuette to Brock's studio in Boscobel Place and Brock 'worked up the head and gave it artistic merit - any that it possesses'. Belt had also offered Brock five guineas for a morning's work on a statuette of Plimsoll. Brock said that he did not want Belt's money, but would work on it for an hour or so. He continued:'the figure did not stand well and the coat was wrong. I said that I could not improve it materially without nature [sic], and he offered to sit and he did 'pose' for it in a light coat... I worked over the whole figure... the merit of it is mine'. He could also truly say that he was responsible for the artistic merit of the Conway bust.

Brock insisted that he did not stipulate or receive any payment for this work; he only helped Belt as he would do 'for any other beginner'. If visitors came to Belt's studio while Brock was engaged on a work, Belt asked him to step into the back studio; this happened once or twice. He had borrowed money from Belt on one occasion - £24.10s at the end of 1875 when he was 'hard up' in consequence of the delay in proving Foley's Will. The money was repaid on 1 January 1876. He had agreed to be a witness in the Watcombe Terracotta case, but only to show that it was unnecessary to destroy the original model of the Kingsley statuette in making a terracotta replica - nothing was said about artistic merit or value.

Brock recalled complaining to Belt in April 1876 of the difficulty in getting commissions because he could not come to an understanding with the Foley trustees. Belt suggested that they enter into a partnership saying 'I can get the work and you can execute it'. When Brock said that he could not agree to this, Belt had said 'you may think you are going to get commissions by working hard in the studio; you are mistaken; you must put a fine coat on your back and go out into society'. Brock asked 'Who is to do the work if I go out?' to which Belt replied 'Any one can do the work, the difficulty is to get the commissions'.

Under cross-examination from Sir Hardinge Giffard, Brock said he had been on friendly terms with Belt until 1876, but had not seen much of him since then. He claimed that he had not been aware that the disputed busts of Mrs Nicholls, Dean Stanley and Canon Kingsley had been exhibited by Belt under his own name at the RA exhibitions in 1873, 1875 and 1876, even though Brock himself had exhibited works in those years. Brock said that it was 'customary for a young hand who is learning to walk to receive help from older men. When they wish to compete with their fellows they must run alone'.[18]

Under further cross-examination, Brock said that in his letter to *Vanity Fair*, he was careful only to refer to works as to which he felt perfectly sure as to the amount of work he had done. Having since seen all the works in court, he now saw that he had done more than he had previously said.

> Every sculptor has assistants who 'work upon' busts, but not in the way I worked at these. I draw a distinction between 'working upon' a bust and 'investing it with artistic merit'... It is not the time taken, but the quality of what is done. In one hour a superior artist can make a crude work assume an artistic shape with a few touches.[19]

Referring to the Stanley bust, Brock said

> I considered that it was the work of a beginner - a young man - and under those circumstances I did not think it ~~was~~ a scandalous imposture. But a young man ought not to do it all his life.

At the end of the cross-examination Brock was asked about the statement in the obituary of John Henry Foley in the *Morning Post* of 4 September 1874 that 'pupils had issued from [Foley's] studio trained to perpetuate his independent style', and that Belt was among Foley's 'favoured pupils' and a 'rising sculptor' like Lawes, Birch and Brock.

---

[18] ibid

[19] *Times* 7 December 1882

Brock said that he had laughed at the notion of Belt, who was never a pupil of Foley, being put into the same category as Birch and himself. The writer of the obituary (Humphries) had written this because he was a friend of Belt.

Charles Birch then gave evidence. He had worked in Foley's studio from 1859 to 1869 as principal assistant, and in Lawes' studio from 1873 to 1876. He had helped Lawes with *Female Figure and Cupids* (RA 1873), but did not invest them with artistic merit - 'we did not agree in our artistic views, he and I'. Belt was employed as a studio assistant, not as a modeller. He had been in partnership with Belt for a while, during which he [Birch] executed some medallions and a bust of Lord Russell. Belt was a tradesman not an artist.[20]

Birch said he had known Brock's work since 1866 - 'it is very marked; no other English sculptor has it'. He recognised it in the Kingsley and Conway busts and in *Lord Stanhope*. There was a great deal of Brock's work in the coat, head, trousers and feet of the Plimsoll statuette. In the drapery of *Dean Stanley*, the peculiarity consisted in the arrangement and treatment of the folds - it was not hard to detect Brock's work there.

Under later cross-examination, Birch said there was a mutual arrangement between Kummer (a Belgian sculptor), Belt and himself, under which he and Kummer would model and Belt would 'get rid' of the work. The arrangement ended over the matter of Lawes' cheque.

Paul Kummer said he had worked in the studio of Lawes from September 1873 to December 1874; in the evenings he worked with Birch in the studio of Belt. He had worked on the Lord Russell bust, which Birch had finished. He had roughed up the drapery on the Stanley statuette, and Belt told him that Brock had also worked on it, which had 'much annoyed' him (Kummer). He had subsequently worked for Brock from 1878 to 1882.[21]

The highlight of the trial was the appearance in court of Sir Frederic Leighton, since 1878 President of the Royal Academy. Leighton was at the height of his powers and was a well-known public figure. The defence 'took a very bold course, and subpoenaed practically all the members of the Royal Academy, both artists and sculptors, without taking from them any proof of their evidence'. The intention was to produce an

---

[20] *Times* 9 December 1882
[21] ibid

overwhelming mass of expert opinion to demonstrate that Belt could not possibly have produced all the works attributed to him.[22]

Leighton said that he was the author of the *Python* and that he not infrequently used clay modelling to help with the drapery in his paintings. It required considerable artistic skill to model a bust; a bust which was a likeness was not necessarily an artistic production - far from necessarily so. He continued:

> On looking through the busts I distinctly recognised the hand of Brock in Kingsley's bust and another, in a less degree; in the Stanley statuette as to drapery i.e. as to its arrangement more than actual carrying out in work. In the Plimsoll statuette I made the same spontaneous remark... 'Surely that must be by Brock!' No one had suggested anything whatever directly or indirectly... My observation was entirely spontaneous, I have known Brock's work intimately for 12 years. I have sat to him and have a high opinion of his skill. (The Kingsley bust was put up in court) I recognise peculiarities of execution on this, as I do a handwriting.[23]

On the Plimsoll statuette, Leighton considered the general look and arrangement were Brock's, but could not commit himself to saying that it was wholly his. The Stanley statuette recalled Brock's style very strongly, as did the treatment of *Conway*'s eye. His style was less marked in *Lord Stanhope*, although he saw traces of it there.

Under cross-examination Leighton said that it was impossible that five busts attributed to Belt 'should be the production of the same mind and hand'. *Kingsley* and *Rous* had very marked characters absolutely distinct one from the other. The artist who produced *Kingsley* could not have produced *Rous*. These two were works of art and immeasurably superior to *Robinson*, *Ellis* and the *Duchess of Sutherland*. Leighton added that 'there was a very strong feeling against Mr Belt in the artistic world. I believe so now more strongly since this trial has gone on'.[24]

In answer to a question by the jury, he confirmed that: 'It is usual in our studios that we receive some help. I received the help of Mr Brock in bringing out the *Python*'. Questioned further, he said:

> I received such assistance from Mr Brock, as follows:- I had made a highly-finished sketch in clay. I put it into the hands of Mr Brock, who caused it to be set up, and descended to various operations for which so skilled a sculptor is not required, but in all cases performing such offices as left the artistic individuality of the work wholly mine. (Applause in court, which was immediately suppressed.) The sketch was in clay... [the work] was carried out

---

[22] Lord Alverstone (Charles Webster) *Recollections of Bar and Bench* 1914 p. 106
[23] *Times* 12 December 1882
[24] *Times* 13 December 1882

> entirely in Mr Brock's studio, but set apart and isolated in a room I had taken for the purpose.[25]

William Calder Marshall in his evidence stated that prospective students at the RA Schools had to submit a model and anatomical drawings. After three months' probation, another model and set of drawings must be submitted. The usual course was seven years. Belt had only attended sixteen sessions at the Royal Academy Schools between 1873 and 1875; a man could acquire no artistic knowledge whatever with so few lessons. His independent opinion was that the works produced in court were not by one hand, but by at least five or six hands. He was not sufficiently acquainted with Brock's work to speak to it.

In reply to the judge, Calder Marshall said that the *Rous* was remarkable but the *Kingsley* was the best of the busts exhibited in court - it was by a man of great practice and facility in modelling. In reply to a juror, he said that artistic merit in a bust consisted in agreeable light and shade and in the treatment of the hair and the features. [26]

In his evidence, Hamo Thornycroft agreed that it was quite impossible that all the works were by one hand. A sculptor's individuality in a bust showed itself in the result of actual touch, the treatment of the planes of the flesh forms and in the treatment of the eye and the hair. *Kingsley* was distinctly not by the hand of any of the other busts. *Rous* was the best, then *Kingsley*, then the others. A person of Belt's age could not have so fallen off as to create *Kingsley* and *Rous* five years ago, and then create the other three busts (*Ellis, Robinson* and the *Duchess of Sutherland*). He continued:

> I am acquainted with Mr Brock, and know his style. I recognise his handiwork on some of the works here, especially on the Conway bust. I see a certain fleshiness, and a slight irregularity of surface on flesh, and something in the modelling of the ear, and a sharpness in the nostril. I have no doubt that Mr Brock worked on this bust. I recognise his work also in the *Kingsley*, though not so strongly. I see the same character in the ear, and the same firmness of touch. I have no doubt that Mr Brock worked on this bust. I recognise his work also in the drapery of this statuette (*Stanley*); it is according to Foley's school. I do not recognise it so strongly in the *Plimsoll*. His style seems apparent in the looseness and freedom of the coat. I have no assistance in modelling. I have assistance in pointing and carving. No sculptor points himself.

Questioned by prosecuting counsel, he said that his bronze founder, Mr Moore of Thames Ditton, had told him that Belt had more assistance than was considered proper for a sculptor. [27]

---

[25] ibid
[26] ibid
[27] ibid

At an earlier stage in the trial, it had been agreed that Belt would execute under supervision a bust of Pagliati, which would then be compared with another Pagliati bust which Belt claimed as his own work. The two busts were produced in court on 15 December, and the defence counsel called eighteen Royal Academicians and ARAs (Alma Tadema, Armstead, Birch, Boehm, Calderon, Dobson, Frith, Herbert, Horsley, Leighton, Calder Marshall, Millais, Ouless, Pickersgill, Poynter, Riviere, Thornycroft, Wells and Yeames) to assert that the two busts were by different hands. Despite this impressive unanimity, Belt declared 'My hand alone touched that bust, my mind alone conceived the composition thereof'. As *The Times* noted:

> A muffled murmur of applause from the rear of the court greeted this reply, which was given with dramatic intonation and emphasis. His Lordship exhibited annoyance at the impropriety of the demonstration.[28]

With the evidence at last completed, Mr Webster summed up the case for the defence. Belt had used his persuasive powers to win commissions while the work was done by others, which he then 'palmed off' as his own. It was clear from Verheyden's diary and the payments made to him that he had been responsible for the Byron statue and other works. In all, 45 out of the 53 works examined in court had been proved to be the work of other hands than Belt's. He was sure that the jury would do their duty as the guardians of public honesty and protectors of a noble profession.[29]

Sir Hardinge Giffard, for the plaintiff, said that Belt had been unfairly and unjustly libelled by the *Vanity Fair* article. Belt admitted receiving some advice and help from studio assistants, but this was common practice in the profession. The payments to Verheyden were mainly for drawing lessons, and were far too small (£15 per bust plus 10% commission) for complete works, as had been alleged. Even if the Academicians had not agreed that the two Pagliati busts were by Belt, at least they recognised that the second bust had artistic merit. The libel was a conspiracy by Lawes, who was jealous because Belt was more successful than he was.[30]

Baron Huddleston summed up on 21 December, the fortieth day of the trial. After denying that he had any prejudice in favour of the plaintiff (as one of the defence counsel had implied) the judge noted that the very fact that Belt had been admitted to the RA Schools showed that he had some knowledge of drawing and modelling. Lawes himself

---

[28] *Times* 16 December 1882
[29] *Times* 18, 19 and 20 December 1882
[30] *Times* 20 December 1882

had failed the Academy's drawing test. As for Brock, he was virtually a defendant as shown by the document of guarantee he had signed (with Lawes and Birch). His artistic merits were undoubted, and the judge endorsed Sir F. Leighton's words about him. 'But Mr Brock is a mortal, and subject to all the failings of humanity, and he is in conflict with other witnesses as to Mrs Nicholls' bust'. If Brock's evidence was shaken on this point, did it not shake reliance on his evidence in a great many other matters? So far as Dean Stanley's bust was concerned, the question was, why had he allowed the bust to be exhibited in the Royal Academy as Belt's work along with his own?[31]

The judge noted that Leighton had resented, 'and reasonably so', a question put to him as to whether Brock had helped him with the *Python*. Leighton need hardly have been galled at the suggestion, as he (the judge) had dismissed it as 'paltry'. But Belt took the same line as Leighton when admitting that he had received assistance, stating that the design and finish were his. And the allegations about the *Python* showed that 'even the chastest and most immaculate are not sheltered from the shafts of envy'.[32]

Recalling that Calder Marshall and Hamo Thornycroft had differed in their assessment of the relative merits of the Kingsley and Rous busts, the judge said:

> Far be it from me to say that any of these eminent artists intentionally speak falsely, but this and such like discrepancies aptly illustrate the danger of placing too implicit a reliance on eccentric opinion... if all the scientific experts in the world say, in the face of credible testimony of eyewitnesses, that [a bust] was not the work of the reputed author, with great respect to them, I should reject their evidence of opinion. ...

Finally, the judge told the jury:

> If you consider that the defendants have only just failed in substantiating their defence, and that practically some doubt as to the authenticity and originality of the plaintiff's work still exists, you will probably give your verdict to the plaintiff with only nominal damages. If, however, you are of the opinion,... that this is an attempt..... to blast the prospects and to destroy the rising reputation of a young artist, and poison against him the fountain of his fortune... by the instillation of false and wicked reports, then I unhesitatingly inform you that you are entitled to give the plaintiff... compensation for the outrage to which he has been subjected with no niggard hand.

The jury took the hint, and after a recess of only 35 minutes gave their verdict in favour of the plaintiff with damages of £5,000 - the highest damages ever awarded for libel, as the *Law Journal* observed. Belt was carried shoulder-high from the court by his cheering supporters.[33]

---

[31] *Times* 22 December 1882
[32] *Times* 23 December 1882
[33] *Times* 28 December 1882

The artistic community were outraged by the verdict. Hamo Thornycroft wrote on 28 December 1882 to his sister Agatha:

> I have just read something that makes me boil with rage - Baron Huddleston's conclusions of his summing up of the Belt trial. He has shown a darkness and ignorance of art matters that is only equalled by the general public. The whole profession of artists have been insulted by him in a way not to be forgotten. The opinion of such idiot swells as Lord Clarence Paget and Elliot Yorke is taken as worth more in a question of art than the men who have made a long life study of art and are at the head of the profession and considered so throughout Europe, namely the members of the Academy...We fight against ignorance all our lives.[34]

In its editorial comment after the verdict, *The Times* noted that: 'The learned Judge characterised their evidence [of the Academicians] as 'theoretic opinion'; doubted whether, even as opinion, it was not of less value than that of intelligent amateurs; and declared that it ought not to weigh for a moment against the evidence of the eye-witnesses who had seen Mr Belt at work'. The trial would not discredit the Royal Academy, but it might tend to draw earnest young artists away from the practice of sculpture, which was a hard profession because of our climate and the very small demand for public statuary. *The Times* concluded:

> The one class of work which pays the sculptor is portraiture; but artists are already saying that the best sculptors will retire from portraiture altogether if they find that the public are content with mere likenesses. As hardly any sculptor can live by ideal works alone, there may thus be an end of the higher kind of sculpture in England...rather a lamentable outlook for a country that boasts of its civilisation.[35]

The case of Belt versus Lawes was not yet over. Lawes appealed to the Divisional Court in January 1883 on the grounds that the judge had misdirected the jury and the damages were excessive. On 16 December 1883 Lord Coleridge, Mr Justice Denman and Mr Justice Manisty gave the contestants a choice - either the verdict could stand with damages reduced to £500 from £5,000, or there would be a re-trial. Belt's counsel was willing to accept the lower damages, but Lawes unwisely refused.[36] The case then went to the Court of Appeal, and on 17 March 1884 the Master of the Rolls, sitting with Lord Justices Baggallay and Lindley, again found in Belt's favour and reinstated the damages at £5,000.[37]

The verdict proved a Pyrrhic victory for Belt. A week later, Lawes petitioned for bankruptcy on the grounds that he could not meet the £5,000 damages plus costs

---

[34] Thornycroft C/T-[H] 18
[35] *Times* 1 January 1883
[36] *Times* 17 December 1883
[37] *Times* 18 March 1884

(£5,000). His petition was granted on 15 January 1885.[38] This in turn forced Belt into bankruptcy in February 1886; and to add to his woes he was accused of obtaining money under false pretences. The prosecution was led by Sir Charles Russell, QC, one of the defence counsel in the original case and now Attorney General; and in March 1886 Belt was sentenced to 12 months hard labour.

In an editorial, *The Times* commented:

> It is impossible not to regard his [Belt's] decline and fall without a certain - we will not say sympathy but - pitying regret. The result of the present trial will of course confirm the view of those who have always maintained that his whole art was a fraud... At all events, he was a man who somehow or other managed to give a great deal of pleasure to a number of more or less fastidious people. His gifts were quite considerable enough to have carried him far, had nature but endowed him at his birth with some scraps or shreds of principle.[39]

Commenting on Belt's downfall, Thornycroft recorded in his diary:

> one would think that the authorities of the City of London would have learned a lesson by the result of the late trial of their favourite sculptor (R Belt) and would not continue in their old lines of action. But no. Today I received a letter from the Comptroller of the Guildhall asking if I was willing to compete with Mr Brock for a bust of Alderman Carden... I declined and felt inclined to tell them that perhaps their protégé Mr Belt would be willing if the jail authorities would allow him - but I refrained.... there is unfeigned satisfaction in art circles at the result of the said trial - the public begin to think that perhaps the artists were right in the famous Lawes versus Belt trial.[40]

Edmund Gosse gave his own views on the Belt affair some years later:

> this picturesque and absurd tradition of the 'ghost', the unseen Italian who entered the studio at night when the foppish and incompetent pseudo-artist had shown his clients into the street... was fairly coped with and exposed...[41]

Gosse's references to a foppish sculptor and an unseen Italian hardly fit Richard Belt, a working class lad who had made good, and the Belgian Verheyden. However, the description did match Lord Ronald Gower and his Italian 'assistant' Madrassi, who had helped Gower with his *Marie Antoinette* and *La Garde meurt et ne se rend pas* (RA 1877). Gower's 'retirement' after the completion of the Shakespeare memorial in 1888 might well have been hastened by the Belt affair.[42]

Gosse's final verdict was positive:

> The Belt trial, miserable and lamentable washing of dirty linen as it was, came at the right time. It attracted strong public attention to the art just at the moment when there was something for the world to look at. It enlightened a vast number of people, superficially, no

---

[38] *Times* 16 January 1885
[39] *Times* 13 March 1886
[40] Thornycroft J/1 entry for 25 March 1886
[41] *AJ* 1894 p. 203
[42] Ward Jackson 1987 p. 161

> doubt, but effectively, in the mysteries of sculpture... It did more, it united the jealous and suspicious confraternity of sculptors into closer and kinder relations against the common enemy, against the fashionable imposter and his 'ghost'. The year 1882 closed in melancholy fashion for the sculptors; the case seemed to have been decided against them... After twelve years we can look back to that miserable episode, and see that it was all working out to the betterment of the status of our sculpture.[43]

Accusations of 'ghosting ' continued to be made in the aftermath of the Belt v. Lawes case. There were allegations that the equestrian group *Duncan's Horses*, exhibited at the RA in 1892 by Adrian Jones, a virtually unknown sculptor, had been 'ghosted' by Charles Birch, in whose studio Jones worked. Once again, it was Charles Lawes who publicised the charge, but this time he quickly withdrew and no legal action followed.[44]

An interesting aspect of the press coverage of the Adrian Jones affair was that it found Leighton and Brock taking different lines. Brock said that the Belt case had convinced him that any attempt to decide artistic disputes of this kind by legal process injured the whole profession of sculptors. However if the matter involved the honour of the profession, he thought it a pity that some means had not been devised whereby 'corporate action' could be taken to prevent even the 'veriest shred' of suspicion of ghosting.[45] Frederic Leighton, on the other hand, rejected any suggestion that the Royal Academy Council might take such action. 'If we once turned our Council Room into a court of arbitration, we should be sitting from one year's end to the other, settling disputes relating to authorship'.[46]

There was a further echo of the Belt affair in 1893, when the *Magazine of Art* reported that it was proposed to establish a Society of Sculptors. Those who used 'ghosts would be excluded and the 'ghosts' themselves would be elected members of the Society in their own right.[47] It took over ten years for a Society of Sculptors to be set up and by then 'ghosting' was no longer an issue.

---

[43] *AJ* 1894 p. 203
[44] A. Jones *Memoirs of a Soldier Artist* 1933 pp. 87-92 and Appendix I
[45] ibid pp. 214-7
[46] ibid p. 228
[47] *M of A* February 1893 p. xxii

Chapter 9: From Associate to Academician

The Belt v. Lawes trial had been a harrowing experience for Brock; he had been given a gruelling cross-examination by Sir Hardinge Giffard and the judge had cast doubts on his reliability as a witness. The one redeeming feature was the willingness of so many Academicians, led by Leighton, to back him in court; and they now confirmed their support by electing him an Associate of the Royal Academy on 16 January 1883, less than three weeks after the trial ended. The connection between the trial and his election was clearly made by Frank Dicksee, a painter friend of Brock who was later himself to be President of the Academy. He wrote to Brock:

> Allow me to offer you my sincere congratulations on your election. It was a double pleasure to me to assist in the matter. In the first place I knew I was voting for the right man, and secondly it was a satisfaction to register a protest against the result of the Belt trial.[1]

The system of voting in Academy elections was a complex one. At the election in January 1883, fifty five Academicians and Associates took part, and two vacancies, which were voted on separately, had to be filled. The first vote, known as a 'Scratching', was held to determine which of the thirty four candidates could obtain four or more votes. The result was:

B. Leader	8 votes
A. Moore	8
R. Macbeth	7
T. Brock	6

Seventeen other candidates received 25 votes between them.[2]

These four names were then submitted to a vote, known as the 'Blackboard', to decide which two candidates should go forward to the decisive ballot. The result was:

Leader	19 votes
Macbeth	14
Brock	12
Moore	10

---

[1] Brock p. 69

[2] Royal Academy Archives 403A

The third vote, called the 'ballot' and using a ballot box, had the following result:

Leader	32 votes
Macbeth	23

Leader was therefore elected an Associate.

The whole procedure was then repeated for the second vacancy, with the following results:

Scratching

T. Brock	12
R. Macbeth	10
A. Moore	8
J. Linton	4

(12 other candidates received a total of 21 votes).

Blackboard

Brock	24
Macbeth	12
Moore	12
Linton	7

As there was a tie for second place, a 'tie-breaker' vote was taken

Macbeth	32 votes
Moore	23

In the final ballot, the result was:

Brock	34 votes
Macbeth	21

Brock was therefore elected an Associate.[3]

Associateship of the Royal Academy was instituted in 1769 and the first elections were held a year later. In 1883 the Associates numbered thirty. An Associate could not be a member of the Council of the Academy, but could take his turn as a Visitor of the Academy Schools, join the Academicians in judging prizes and awards and (as noted above) vote in elections for new Associates. While not required to deposit any work on election, an Associate was expected to send a work to the annual exhibition. Most important of all, only those already Associates were eligible for election to be full Academicians.

Gosse later described Brock's election in these terms:

---

[3] Brock's self-portrait bronze bust (plate 19) possibly celebrates his election

> Mr Brock was thus the second man to enter the Royal Academy under the banner of the New Sculpture [the first being Hamo Thornycroft, elected two years earlier]. He had had much to unlearn.[4]

He recalled that Brock had been the cleverest and the most persistent of the pupils of Foley; and in his desire to be loyal to the memory of Foley, he had hesitated in adopting new methods. Gosse conceded that Brock had occasionally shown in ideal works a style of his own, 'displaying a sweetness gained, however, by what would be called softness and breadth'. But now, in the face of all the fine things seen in London, and with considerable courage in a man approaching his fortieth year, 'Mr Brock threw all these traditions aside and joined the younger artists without any compromise with his past'.

Gosse probably overemphasised Brock's stylistic debt to Foley and underestimated his susceptibility to French influences. The realistic modelling of human anatomy and the dramatic action in *Hercules strangling Antaeus* (plate 53) owed more to French romantic realism than to Foley, and this was also true of the *Snake Charmer* (plate 114) and *A Moment of Peril* (plate 70). By these works, Brock showed himself to be a man of the New Sculpture. Spielmann commented:

> had he continued as he began he would have been a second Foley; developing as he did, he has left his master far behind'.[5]

It is interesting that Gosse overstated Brock's age - he was only 35 when elected ARA, not 'approaching his fortieth year' - presumably to draw a contrast between an older sculptor set in his ways and the 'younger artists'. Brock was born in 1847, Hamo Thornycroft and Harry Bates in 1850, Onslow Ford in 1852 and Alfred Gilbert in 1854. It was true that Brock had emerged on the scene before any of the others; but in 1883 they were all in their late twenties or early thirties and would have thought of themselves as contemporaries, in contrast to the older generation represented by William Calder Marshall (born 1813), Thomas Woolner (1825), Henry Armstead (1828) Charles Birch (1832) and Edgar Boehm (1834).

Nevertheless, Gosse was right to make the point that in the five years after *A Moment of Peril* and his election as ARA, Brock failed to match the work of Hamo Thornycroft, Alfred

---

[4] *AJ* 1894 p. 277

[5] M. H. Spielmann *British Sculpture and Sculptors of Today* 1901 p. 26

Gilbert and Onslow Ford, all of whom displayed at this period a greater sense of style and innovation. In the six Academy exhibitions from 1883 to 1888 Brock showed fifteen works - three portrait statues, ten busts, one equestrian statuette and one medallion - but only two of these (the Longfellow bust and the Bartle Frere statue) were of important public figures, and there were no 'ideal' works which would catch the eye of the critics or excite the public imagination.

One reason for Brock's caution (or lack of enterprise) may have been at least partly financial. The Brocks now had seven children ranging in age from 12 to less than one year. Their eldest daughter, Jessie, had died early in May 1883 and shortly afterwards the family moved to Home Lodge, The Avenue, Brondesbury, an expanding suburb near Kilburn in northwest London.

Meanwhile an architect friend from Worcester, W. C. Styche, built them a new house nearby called Worcester Lodge, to which they moved in 1885.[6] It cost £5,000, a considerable sum in those days - presumably bought on the strength of the fee for the O'Connell monument in Dublin (finally completed in 1883) and the prospect of more commissions as a result of his election as ARA. Brock's need of a steady income may have been the reason why he concentrated on commissions for minor worthies rather than spending time on ideal works which might not find a purchaser.

How this affected Brock's public image can be seen in the Academy Exhibition of 1884, described by Gosse as the annus mirabilis of English sculpture.[7] For once the *Art Journal*[8] and the *Magazine of Art*[9] were united in praising Thornycroft's *Mower* (plate 174), Gilbert's *Icarus*, and, for good measure, Rodin's *Age of Bronze*, described by *The Builder* as one of the finest and most original works at the exhibition 'once its intention is grasped'.[10] In the face of such competition Brock's three works - his Longfellow bust for Westminster Abbey, a model of his statue of Sir Richard Temple for Bombay, and a marble bust of the Secretary General of the Baptist Union, Rev. Samuel Booth - attracted little attention.

---

[6] Brock pp. 77-8
[7] *AJ* 1894 p. 281
[8] *AJ* 1884 p. 244
[9] *M of A* 1884 p. 351
[10] *Builder* 20 June 1884 p. 925

Henry Longfellow, the American poet, had died in 1882 and a group of his English friends and admirers set up a committee under the chairmanship of the Prince of Wales to raise funds for a commemorative bust. The Dean of Westminster gave permission for a marble bust to be placed in Poets' Corner between *Chaucer* and *Dryden*. A complaint that Poets' Corner should be reserved for English-born poets was ignored.[11] The names of sixteen sculptors were submitted to the committee, and it was decided to select one by ballot - thus Brock obtained the commission.[12] The bust was unveiled on 1 March 1884 by the Subdean of Westminster in the presence of the Foreign Secretary (Earl Granville) and the American Minister, James Russell Lowell, himself a poet.[13] Dr W. C. Bennett, secretary of the memorial committee, said that the bust suggested the intellectual power and the kindly nature of Longfellow. He added that Sir Frederic Leighton, in writing to regret his inability to be present, commented that Mr Brock 'had acquitted himself most admirably of his task'.[14] Longfellow's two daughters, also present at the unveiling, had seen the bust in Brock's studio earlier and thanked him for 'giving to the world such a perfect and beautiful likeness'.[15]

Brock's bust (plate 68) showed the magnificently bearded poet wearing the robes of a professor of Harvard University. Brock's gift for realistic and sympathetic portraiture is well displayed, the thoughtful eyes and wrinkled forehead being particularly evident. Although Gosse had considered the bust to be 'large, even too large' when exhibited at the Royal Academy, its size was entirely appropriate for its dignified setting in Poets' Corner.[16]

Another work exhibited by Brock at the 1884 Academy was a marble statue of Sir Richard Temple, an Anglo-Indian administrator. Educated at Rugby, he joined the East India Company at the age of 21 and rose to be Governor of Bombay from 1877-80. On his retirement, the citizens of Bombay raised money for a commemorative statue in marble and Brock was awarded the commission. Temple was an extraordinary-looking man, with a

---

[11] *Builder* 11 November 1882 p. 616
[12] Brock p. 85
[13] *Times* 3 March 1884
[14] Brock p. 62
[15] A full-size bronze replica (plate 68) of the marble bust was cast by Elkington and Co in 1884. J. Barnes (ed.) *Leighton and his sculptural legacy* exhibition catalogue Joanna Barnes Fine Art 1996 p. 32
[16] *A.J* 1894 p. 281

nose of Cyrano de Bergerac proportions, an awe-inspiring moustache and an extremely long neck. One day he remarked to Brock at the studio:

> I am told that people refer to me and my wife as Beauty and the Beast. I can't understand why they should, for I consider my wife a very beautiful woman.[17]

It had not occurred to him that she was in fact the Beauty.

Temple stands proudly with right foot forward (plate 118). Brock did full justice to his subject's flowing moustache and the face was said to be an excellent likeness - *The Builder* noted how Brock had conveyed 'Temple's strongly marked personal character'.[18] Brock avoided the 'coat and trousers' problem by clothing *Temple* in the flowing robes of a Knight Grand Cross of the Star of India, a device which he was to repeat four years later with his *Bartle Frere* (plate 37). Gosse declared it to be the best portrait statue in the Exhibition - 'a very spirited production'.[19]

Brock and Temple got on well together, and it seems likely that Temple recommended Brock for the statue of Bartle Frere (a previous Governor of Bombay) and for monuments to Archbishop Frederick Temple (1886) and Thomas Hughes (1899) at Rugby, his old school. Brock subsequently received commissions for five more marble statues for Bombay:

Nusserwanji Maneckji Petit (commissioned 1895)
Sorabjee Shapoorjee Bengalee (exhibited at RA 1898)
Sir Cowasjee Jehangir (RA 1915)
Sir Dinshaw Manockjee Petit (RA 1916)
Baron Sydenham of Combe (RA 1918)

After the excitements of 1884, the Academy Exhibition of 1885 was something of an anti-climax. As Gosse put it: 'In 1885 the natural reaction took place. The show of sculpture at the Royal Academy was disconcertingly dull, and there were not Job's comforters wanting to announce immediately that the new school was already in decadence'.[20] Brock sent in five marble busts (*Sir Erasmus Wilson, Mr and Mrs Thomas Lewis, Mr Menelaus* and *Captain Hanham*) all of which were competent but none

---

[17] Brock p. 66
[18] *Builder* 20 June 1884 p. 95
[19] *SR* 24 May 1884 p. 678
[20] *AJ* 1894 p. 281

remarkable. Gosse commented that the busts were no more than 'workmanlike' and asked: 'when are we to see some more ambitious sculpture from Mr Brock?'[21]

The Academy came to life again in 1886, giving 'full proof, if proof were wanted, of the vitality of the New Sculpture'. Leighton took the headlines with two works in bronze, his first since the *Athlete - The Sluggard* and the statuette *Needless Alarms*. Gosse considered that the influence of the French, and Thornycroft's *Teucer*, had been strong on *The Sluggard*: 'nothing could be modelled more closely in accordance with the principles of the new school'.[22] Both *The Sluggard* and *Needless Alarms* were, like the *Athlete*, executed in Brock's studio in Osnaburgh Street.[23]

Brock himself exhibited a bronze statue of Sir Erasmus Wilson, who had become well-known for paying for Cleopatra's Needle to be brought to London. A distinguished surgeon and an expert on skin diseases, Wilson was ahead of his time in advocating the practice of a daily bath and recommending the curative effects of sea bathing. Brock depicts him in his robes as president of the Royal College of Surgeons (plate 146), standing in a thoughtful pose with arms crossed and holding a book in his left hand. The statue was unveiled by Sir James Paget outside the Royal Sea Bathing Hospital at Margate on 25 May 1886.[24]

Gosse considered Brock's 'stately bronze' to be the most important example of iconic sculpture at the 1886 exhibition,[25] while *The Builder* referred to a fine and dignified example of portrait sculpture - Wilson's official gown furnished the sculptor with a means of giving a broad drapery effect to the figure.[26] *The Art Journal* thought that: 'The head was powerful and striking, but surely the feet were a trifle large and the whole figure, possibly, a little too massive'.[27] It is possible that the critic, confronted by a bulky *Wilson* at eye-level in the Academy, was forgetting that the statue was intended for an open air site on an 8 ft (2.4 m) pedestal. Brock was always very careful to establish the correct relationship between statue, pedestal and site. According to his son:

---

[21] *SR* 20 June 1885 p. 824
[22] *AJ* 1894 p. 281
[23] Read 'Leighton as a sculptor', *Apollo* February 1996 p. 66
[24] James Paget., Vice Chancellor of London University, was later a member of the memorial committee which selected Brock as sculptor for the Richard Owen statue.
[25] *SR* 28 June 1886 p. 882
[26] *Builder* 22 May 1886 p. 740
[27] *AJ* 1886 p. 331

> With him composition construction and movement came first always. ... 'I don't want to put my nose against a work to see how it was done...The general effect is really all that matters'. This view he held so strongly that to him a pair of Opera Glasses were an indispensable part of a sculptor's studio equipment. Through the wrong end of these he was continually regarding his own work.[28]

Wilson was also commemorated by a marble bust with plinth and niche in the Erasmus Wilson room of the Royal College of Surgeons. Commissioned by the College in May 1885, the bust was executed by Brock and installed in 1888 after being shown at that year's Academy. Brock was paid £220 for the bust and £100 for the niche.[29]

An important work not exhibited at the Royal Academy was a bronze statue of Colin Minton Campbell, who had been managing director of the Minton pottery and porcelain company at Stoke-on-Trent. When he died in 1885, a memorial committee decided that a statue should be erected in his memory and several sculptors, including Brock, Williamson, Woolner and Thornycroft, were invited to compete. The design submitted by Brock was unanimously approved by the committee in October 1885 and the statue was completed a year later.[30]

The Duchess of Sutherland unveiled the statue on 1 January 1887. She and her husband, the third Duke of Sutherland (a nephew of Elizabeth, Marchioness of Westminster), lived at Trentham Hall, near Stoke and had been friends and patrons of Campbell.[31] 'A cheer greeted the revealing of the monument and indicated its recognition by the crowd. Her Grace seemed to be particularly struck with the faithfulness and remarked audibly that the likeness was admirable - excellent'.[32]

The bronze figure, 8 ft (2.4 m) tall, stands on a 9 ft (2.7 m) pedestal of grey Cornish granite (plate 20). *Campbell* is bare-headed and wears everyday dress. His right hand rests upon a tazza which lies on its side on an enriched tripod, with storks at the angles and floral decorations on the panels, indicative of his connection with porcelain manufacture. The attitude of the figure is easy and natural, and 'a characteristic pose of Mr Campbell' is reproduced by the partial insertion of the left hand in the trousers pocket.[33]

---

[28] Brock p. 152
[29] W. Le Fanu *Catalogue of the Pictures in the Royal College of Surgeons* 1960 p. 76
[30] *Staffordshire Sentinel* 1 January 1887
[31] J. Jones *Minton - the first two hundred years* Swan Hill Press Shrewsbury 1993 p. 139
[32] ibid
[33] ibid

Although basically a 'coat and trousers' statue, the New Sculpture influence is evident in Brock's skilful use of bronze to produce the Minton tripod and tazza and the folds of the clothing in precise detail. Read has commented:

> It is possible to see in a naturalistic detail like the veined hand of the ostensibly humdrum public memorial statue by Brock to Colin Minton Campbell ... a testimony to the similarly featured *Athlete*, a small echo of confirmation of Brock's more formal testimonies to his master, the portrait bust of Leighton of 1892... and the Leighton memorial in St Paul's Cathedral, London.[34]

At the luncheon which followed the ceremony, Captain Edwards-Heathcote MP proposed a toast to 'The Artist'. He said the cheers of the crowd, who had known Mr Campbell well, were a remarkable verdict on the artistic merits of the work. The result was the more remarkable because Mr Brock had never met Mr Campbell and had nothing but photographs to guide him. He hoped that Mr Brock might at some time immortalise other eminent citizens in the neighbourhood (laughter and applause)[35].

In his reply, Brock said the task of executing the statue had been peculiarly agreeable to him because in early life he was engaged in modelling porcelain, which caused him to take a keen interest in the progress of the pottery industry. It was therefore with the greatest pleasure that he received the commission to execute the memorial to one who had done so much to elevate that art in England and who by his industry, energy, great artistic taste and judgment had secured for the pottery of Stoke a worldwide reputation.

In commemoration of the event, a Parian statuette (19 in, 48 cm) was produced by the Minton China Company (figure no. 501), modelled by T. Longmore on 27 May 1887.[36] This was in fact one of the last Parian figures produced by the company. The popularity of Parian ware, production of which had begun in 1826, had peaked in 1851 when Minton had some 300 different models. 150 models were designed in the seventeen years to 1867, but only 50 more in the seventeen years up to 1884. Two named figures in Parian were produced after 1884 - Colin Minton Campbell (no. 501) in 1887 and the explorer Henry Stanley (no. 502) in 1890, the year when production ceased.[37]

---

[34] B. Read 'Just what was it that made Leighton's sculpture so different, so appealing? *Leighton and his sculptural legacy* exhibition catalogue J. Barnes Fine Arts 1996 p. 10

[35] Strangely enough, a marble bust of an unknown gentleman, signed by Brock and dated 1888 (plate 119), was discovered in 1998 in the cellar of the Stoke-on-Trent library, just opposite the *Campbell* statue

[36] Jones p. 127-9

[37] ibid p. 330

At the 1887 Academy Brock exhibited a plaster bust of Professor John Marshall and an equestrian statuette in bronze of Sir Jervoise Clarke Jervoise. However, neither of these caught the eye of the critics, who were more interested in *Post Equitem Sedet Atra Cura* by Alfred Gilbert (elected ARA in January 1887) and Thornycroft's *General Gordon*.[38]

John Marshall (1818-91), Professor of Surgery at University College Hospital and Professor of Anatomy of the Royal Academy 1873-90, was one of the first to demonstrate that cholera could be spread by means of drinking water. Brock's plaster model (dated 1887) is in the hospital library, a bronze bust is in the Royal Institution and a marble bust (RA 1891) is in the Royal College of Surgeons, of which Marshall was president in 1883.[39] The bust was considered by Gosse to be an excellent likeness.[40]

Brock also exhibited a medallion of Peter Squire, now in the British Museum. This was a reduced version of the larger (12 in, 30.5 cm) bronze bas relief, set in a marble plaque (plate 116) and unveiled two years earlier at the headquarters of the Royal Pharmaceutical Society. Squire had been appointed Chemist and Druggist to the Queen in 1837, the first pharmacist to be attached to the Royal Household. He was a founder member of the Pharmaceutical Society and published *A Companion to the British Pharmacopoeia* in 1864. By the time of his death twenty years later, this book had gone through eleven editions and over 50,000 copies had been sold.[41]

The plaque was unveiled on 20 May 1885 by Sir Spencer Wells, Surgeon to the Queen. Wells commented on the striking likeness of Squire 'in the full vigour of life'. Brock had never met Squire, but had based his portrait on photographs and the painting in the Society's Council Room.[42] Brock was later to execute similar medallions of Joseph Christie the auctioneer (1897) (plate 22), Lord Lister (Westminster Abbey 1912) and Dr Thomas Jex-Blake (Rugby Chapel 1918, Wells Cathedral 1920).

Sir Jervoise Clarke Jervoise (1804-89) was MP for South Hampshire 1857-68 and a member of the Hambledon Hunt for many years.[43] The present whereabouts of the bronze

---

[38] *M of A* 1887 p. 383, & *Builder* 9 July 1887 p. 53
[39] Le Fanu p. 53
[40] *SR* 23 July 1892 p. 103
[41] *Pharmaceutical Journal* 7 April 1884, pp. 421-3
[42] ibid 25 May 1885 p. 952
[43] J. F. R. Hope *A History of Hunting in Hampshire* 1910 p. 156

equestrian statuette of him exhibited in 1887, with the quotation 'Yonder he goes', is unknown. No picture was published, but the *Saturday Review* commented that Brock had struggled 'rather unsuccessfully with the mysteries of the top hat'.[44] There is in a private collection a splendid silver cup with an inscription recording that it was presented to Sir Jervoise by members of the Hambledon Hunt on 28 April 1884 to celebrate his 80th birthday. The cup is surmounted by a small (4.5 in, 11 cm,) statuette of Sir Jervoise on horseback, in top hat and hunting dress. 'Yonder he goes' is the cry when the fox is sighted breaking cover, the horse stands motionless at the moment before the hunt goes in pursuit. There is a photograph of Sir Jervoise in just such a pose, and Brock may well have based his statuette on this. The silver cup figure was probably a reduction of a plaster maquette, which Brock later decided to cast in bronze and show at the Academy.[45]

One of Brock's most important public commissions was the statue of Sir Bartle Frere, Governor of Bombay 1862-7 and Governor of Cape Colony and first High Commissioner for South Africa 1877-9. In this last post he was held responsible for the outbreak of the Zulu War and was recalled by the Gladstone administration. Many believed that it was the imperialist policy of the previous (Disraeli) government which had really been to blame, and that Frere had been unfairly treated. These included the Prince of Wales, who had been a friend of Frere since his Indian tour of 1877-8. When Frere died in 1884, the Prince chaired the memorial committee which selected Brock to execute a bronze statue for a site in the Thames Embankment Gardens.[46] The fact that Sir Richard Temple was a member of the memorial committee may have influenced Brock's selection. A public subscription for a memorial quickly raised £12,000. Brock's fee was £3,000 and the balance was used to establish scholarships at the three universities which had awarded Frere honorary degrees - Cambridge, Edinburgh and Oxford.[47]

When the statue was shown at the Academy in 1888, Claude Phillips considered that the robes were 'ineffectually composed and unnecessarily devoid of style'.[48] On the other hand *The Builder* commended *Frere* as the best of the portrait statues, noting that the head was a

---

[44] *SR* 9 July 1887 p. 42
[45] information from present owners
[46] *Builder* 12 July 1884 p. 72
[47] *Times* 6 June 1888
[48] *M of A* 1888 p. 366

good one (for Brock).[49] Gosse was the most enthusiastic, describing it as vigorous and picturesque, the best public monument of the year after Gilbert's *Queen Victoria*. However, he added 'are not the legs a little too exuberant in development?'[50]

The statue was unveiled on 5 June 1888 by the Prince of Wales, who referred to Frere as a highly esteemed and dear friend.[51] The Prince, who was accompanied by the Princess of Wales and their daughters Victoria and Maud, made a special point of commending Brock on his work.[52] Thornycroft sent Brock his prompt congratulations. Brock duly acknowledged these, and in turn sent Thornycroft congratulations on *General Gordon* (plate 173).[53]

The bronze statue is 11 ft (3.07 m) tall on a 14 ft (4.26 m) pedestal of Cornish granite (plates 37 & 38). *Frere* is standing, bareheaded, wearing the robes and collar of a Knight Grand Cross of the Order of the Star of India over the uniform of a Privy Counsellor and holding a scroll.. A large bronze plaque (plate 39) on the pedestal shows *Patriotism*, a lady in classical dress with a sword pointing downwards in her left hand and an olive branch in her right hand. At her feet is a laurel wreath, and behind her is a shield inscribed 'Pro Patria'. The whole represents 'victory achieved, peace sought and readiness to maintain honour with the sword'.[54] The words 'India' and 'Africa' are inscribed on decorated plaques on the left and right sides of the pedestal. The casting was by Moore of Thames Ditton.

Frere was unveiled four months before Thornycroft's *General Gordon*, and these statues are among the first major public monuments of the New Sculpture. Read notes that: 'All the reliefs display the New Sculpture's characteristic accomplishment of handling bronze in this form to good effect'.[55] Both statues were cast in bronze, which allowed more realism in the depiction of head and hair, facial expression and the details of the respective uniforms. *Frere*'s stance is formal and dignified, while *Gordon* is more informal, deep in thought with chin resting on hand. Each statue stands on a high pedestal topped with an intricately carved frieze, a feature of the New Sculpture. The unusual pointed headdress of *Patriotism* is

---

[49] *Builder* 9 June 1888 p. 407
[50] *SR* 2 June 1888 p. 656
[51] J. Macaulay (ed.) *Speeches and Addresses of HRH the Prince of Wales 1863-88* 1889 p. 337
[52] *Times* 6 June 1888
[53] Thornycroft C94 (9 June 1888) and C94A (17 October 1888)
[54] *Builder* 9 June 1888 p. 420
[55] Read 1982 p. 345

reminiscent of that worn by the Statue of Liberty by F. Bertoldi, erected in 1885, three years earlier.

Thomas Woolner exhibited two portrait statues at the 1888 Academy - one of Stamford Raffles, the other of the Bishop of Manchester - and some critics decided to compare his work with Brock's *Frere*. Claude Phillips said it was not possible to say much in praise of Woolner's two statues, and that Brock's *Frere* was 'somewhat more distinctive'.[56] *The Builder*, after praising *Frere* for its lack of affectation, added 'The same cannot be said of *Sir Stamford Raffles* by Woolner, which is posé to a degree'.[57]

Having his own works compared unfavourably with the much younger Brock must have been galling for Woolner, particularly as he had previously executed a statue of Frere for Bombay in 1872 and might reasonably have expected to be given the commission for the London statue.[58] He had been elected RA in 1875 to fill the vacancy left by Foley and regarded himself in some ways as Foley's successor. He had secured two of the commissions originally intended for Foley: *John Stuart Mill* (Thames Embankment) and *Queen Victoria* (Birmingham)[59] and may well have thought that more of Foley's work should have gone to him rather than Brock. To rub salt in the wound, Brock had beaten him for the *Colin Minton Campbell* commission.

Whatever the cause, it appears that the bitterest antipathy existed between Brock and Woolner and neither made any attempt to conceal their mutual dislike. One Sunday evening Brock and his wife were being entertained by Seymour Lucas, a fellow ARA, and his wife.[60] Woolner and his wife happened to call; on entering the drawing room, he shook hands with the Lucases and Mrs Brock, then sat down without a glance in Brock's direction. After a brief stay, he made his farewell, again completely ignoring Brock's presence. After the Woolners' departure, Seymour Lucas remarked to Brock: 'How you sculptors love one another'.[61]

---

[56] *M of A* 1888 p. 366
[57] *Builder* 19 June 1888 p. 407
[58] Curiously, R. Ormond (ed.) *Dictionary of British Portraiture* Vol. 3 p. 73 attributes the London statue to Woolner, not Brock
[59] Read 1982 p. 75; G.T. Noszlopy *Public Sculpture of Birmingham* Liverpool University Press 1998 pp. 142-3
[60] John Seymour Lucas 1849-1923, painter, ARA 1886, RA 1898
[61] Brock p. 51

Another artist whose relations with Brock were less than cordial was John Millais. Before his election as ARA, Brock had visited the studio of a fellow-artist. Millais had also been invited to the studio, and Brock's friend insisted that Brock remain so that he could meet Millais. The latter, then at the height of his fame, duly arrived and the artist asked if he might introduce Brock to him. Millais was silent for a moment, and then said: 'I came to see your pictures, not to meet your friends'.[62]

A second snub occurred after Brock had been elected ARA. He called at Millais' house in accordance with the custom whereby new ARAs paid their respects to Academicians. When the butler informed Millais of Brock's arrival, Millais sent word back that he was 'engaged'. The reason for Millais' behaviour is unknown, although his close friendship with Woolner might have prejudiced him against Brock. By a strange paradox, Brock later received the commission to execute the Millais memorial statue.[63]

Among the works shown by Brock at the 1888 RA Exhibition was a marble bust of Sir Isaac Pitman, the inventor of shorthand (plate 86). This had been commissioned by Pitman's friends and admirers and was presented to him on 28 September 1887 during the International Shorthand Congress being held in London. The bust was 'by general consent admitted to be a faithful likeness and an admirable specimen of Mr Brock's art'.[64]

In accepting the bust, Pitman said: 'I have some hesitation in deciding which is the man and which is the image. I must really appeal to Mr Brock (Mr Brock answered with a smile). I think this (pointing to the bust) must be the man, such as he ought to be for purity and beauty, and this (pointing to himself) the imperfect image. I only wonder how my friend Mr Brock could have made such an image from such a subject'.[65]

On 22 February 1889 a group of friends and subscribers, with Jerom Murch[66] as treasurer, presented Pitman with a marble replica of the bust for the Reading Room of the Bath Royal Library and Scientific Institution. On 12 August 1889, another replica was unveiled at the Canadian Shorthand Society of Toronto by Mr Thomas McGillicuddy.[67]

---

[62] ibid p. 49
[63] see p. 200
[64] A. Baker *Life of Sir Isaac Pitman* Bath no date p. 257
[65] ibid p. 258
[66] Brock's bust of Murch, seven times Mayor of Bath, had been exhibited at the RA in 1879, and Murch may possibly have introduced Brock to Pitman
[67] Baker p. 270

Brock continued to be an active member of the Artists' Rifles, which he had joined in 1876.[68] He was an excellent shot, and was awarded a cup with the following inscription:

> To record the unbroken series of Victories gained by the Artists' Shooting Team in the season of 1880. This cup was given for competition among the Individual Members by William Boutcher, Captain of the Team, and was won by Thos. Brock, 1880.[69]

Most members of the Artists' Rifles remained privates; Brock, rather exceptionally, was commissioned as a 2nd Lieutenant in March 1881 and promoted to Lieutenant the following July. His keenness was further shown when he presented his regiment with a shooting prize in the form of a bronze tazza (13 in, 33 cm diameter), decorated with a complex scene of the Muses entertaining the Gods of Olympus. Signed by Brock, it was awarded to A. Billson, The Artists' Rifles, in 1888.[70]

In 1889 Brock executed a large terracotta medallion showing the badge of the Artist's Rifles for the facade of the regiment's new headquarters in Duke's Road, Euston. The badge depicted Mars, god of war, with the visor of his helmet lowered and Minerva, goddess of the arts, with her visor raised, together with the regimental motto 'Cum Marte Minerva'. The building was opened by the Prince of Wales on 25 March 1889.[71]

The medallion was one of the few pieces of architectural sculpture by Brock. Referring to it, Susan Beattie wrote:

> Brock has an important place in the stylistic development of the so-called New Sculpture movement in the 1880s and 1890s, but appears to have taken no part - except in this instance - in the revival of interest in architectural sculpture which was the movement's most significant aspect.[72]

Although on the surface things were going well for Brock, he was by now in acute financial difficulties. Apart from the Queen's Golden Jubilee statue for Worcester and *Lord Angus* for Douglas, there was a dearth of important commissions after *Bartle Frere* in 1888. The expense of building and running his new house (Worcester Lodge) in London, plus educating his large family, proved too much for him to manage. His solution was to move

---

[68] see p. 75
[69] Brock p. 53. Brock exhibited a marble medallion of Mrs Boutcher at the 1880 Academy
[70] J. L. Naimaster 'A Brock Bronze' *Mars and Minerva* Vol. 2 No. 11 November 1969 pp. 46-7
[71] *Builder* 21 December 1889 p. 442 and *ILN* 30 March 1889 p. 391
[72] Conway Library: manuscript note by Susan Beattie commenting on memorandum of - April 1988 by Andrew Saint on possible listing of 17 Duke's Road.

temporarily to Bedford in the autumn of 1889.[73] His eldest son, Thomas, had left school, but his five other sons (William 15, Hugh 12, Harold 10, Frederick 9 and Charles Edmond 7) attended Bedford School. His elder daughter, Catherine (14) attended Bedford High School and the younger daughter, Edith, was only two years old. Brock spent his weekdays at the Osnaburgh Street studio and visited Bedford at the weekends. Worcester Lodge was rented out, and two lodgers were taken in at Osnaburgh Street. For a time Brock also ran evening classes at the studio for up to twenty pupils. His son rather bitterly commented 'to such straits had he, a member of the Royal Academy, been reduced'.[74]

By 1890 Brock had been an ARA for seven years. Charles Birch was senior to him, but Brock had good prospects of election when the next RA vacancy occurred. The main contender was not Birch but Alfred Gilbert. Although only elected ARA in 1887, his remarkable talents had already made him a well-known figure. There was therefore great interest when two vacancies unexpectedly occurred among the sculptor RAs - William Calder Marshall resigned on grounds of age and Sir Edgar Boehm died of a heart attack at the early age of 56.[75] Gosse speculated that the two vacancies in the ranks of the Academy:

> will, as seems natural, be filled by Arthur Gilbert and Thomas Brock, who are the most prominent Associate sculptors. With two new ARAs, the new school will be absolutely dominant.[76]

In fact, only one vacancy was filled when Academicians and ARAs voted on 21 January 1891. It was a close contest between Brock and Gilbert, with Brock slightly ahead. The details of the voting were:[77]

First Scratching		Second Scratching		Ballot	
T. Brock	17	T. Brock	22	T. Brock	29
A. Gilbert	14	A. Gilbert	19	A. Gilbert	24
A. Gow	8	A. Gow	5		
C. Birch	5	J. McWhirter	5		
J. McWhirter	4	C. Birch	4		
Others	6				

Gosse commented that the Royal Academicians were always much affected by the work shown by an artist in the exhibition immediately preceding an election, and suggested that

---

[73] Brock's family lived in three houses in succession between 1889 and 1893 - 5 Ashburnham Road, 15 Conduit Road and 75 Foster Hill Road (Bedford School Archives)
[74] Brock p. 94
[75] M. Stocker *Royalist and Realist* 1988 pp. 41-4
[76] *SR* 20 December 1890 p. 704
[77] Royal Academy Archives 403A

Brock owed his promotion (over seventeen ARAs senior to himself) to the impression made by *The Genius of Poetry*. Brock, though in full sympathy with the 'new school of sculpture', had been tied down for years to the burden of completing Foley's works. All that was long past and Gosse welcomed Brock as 'a conscientious and intelligent artist, whose help will be much valued in the Councils of the Royal Academy.'[78]

The *Magazine of Art* in a rather less friendly comment said:

> In Mr Brock we have a legitimate successor to Sir Edgar Boehm, whose superior in art he is; but a still more talented sculptor among the Associates was passed over. No doubt it can be urged that Mr Gilbert can wait; but if the Academy is to represent the best art of the country, considerations of age should exert no influence.[79]

If 'age' was indeed the overriding consideration, the Academy would have elected Charles Birch, who had been an Associate since 1880. He was now overtaken by Brock, who was seen as a representative of the New Sculpture, just as Brock had been overtaken by the younger Hamo Thornycroft (elected RA in 1888). Brock had been ARA since 1883, whereas Gilbert had been an Associate only since 1887. Gilbert in any case did not have long to wait - he was elected RA the following year.

Brock's family was living in Bedford when the telegram announcing his election as an Academician was wired to the local railway station and brought round by the stationmaster. 'You are the bearer of a piece of very good news,' said Brock's son William as he gave the stationmaster a small present, 'Mr Brock's been elected'. 'I am glad to hear it,' was the reply, 'Liberal or Conservative, sir?'[80]

---

[78] *SR* 29 January 1891 p. 107
[79] *M of A* 1891 p. xvii
[80] Brock p. 89

Chapter 10: Diploma Bust and Ideal Works

As a newly-elected Academician, one of Brock's main duties was to serve on the Council, which was responsible for the direction and management of the Academy. The Council comprised the President and ten members; members served for two years, and five retired each year to preserve continuity. One member of the Council was always a sculptor; and if the normal rotation did not produce a sculptor member, then a sculptor was specially elected as an additional member of the Council, with the right to express an opinion but not to vote.[1] Between 1892 and 1916, Brock served four terms of two years on the Council (1892-3, 1900-1, 1908-9 and 1915-6). In 1907 he served as the 'additional' member of the Council to represent sculptors.

The sculptor RAs in 1891 were a select band - Thomas Woolner, Henry Armstead, Hamo Thornycroft and Brock. Thomas Woolner died in 1892 and their number was increased with the election of Alfred Gilbert in 1892 and Onslow Ford in 1895. An important responsibility for Brock, as Council member, was to serve on the Committee of Arrangement for the Oil Paintings at the RA Summer Exhibition, usually known as the Hanging Committee. This comprised five painters, one architect and one sculptor. Their task was an onerous one - in 1896, for example, over 12,400 works were submitted, of which about 2,000 were accepted for exhibition.[2] A drawing by Reginald Cleaver of the 1892 Hanging Committee (plate 51) showed Leighton (as PRA) in the centre, with Brock on his right and Millais on his left.[3] A decade later Brock was probably hoping for something similar when Sir Hubert von Herkomer announced that he would be painting the members of the 1907 Rotal Academy Council. The outcome caused Brock great annoyance.

Herkomer made a careful preliminary sketch of his painting (plate 52) and invited Brock to his studio to see it. The sketch showed the PRA (Edward Poynter) and the other nine members of the Council seated, together with the Secretary of the Council, Frederick Eaton. Behind this array of artistic talent stood a solitary figure, meant to represent Brock. Herkomer explained that as Brock was not a full member of the Council, but was brought in

---

[1] S. C. Hutchison *History of the Royal Academy 1768-1986* 1986 p. 116
[2] ibid p. 123
[3] NPG 4245

as an additional non-voting member to represent the sculptors, he should not be placed 'actually among the others'. Brock was angry, because he considered that Herkomer's decision to leave the only sculptor RA standing behind the painter RAs, and occupying a less important position than the Secretary, to be a slight upon the profession of sculptor. Brock gave Herkomer only one sitting, and he is depicted in the attitude of a 'very bad-tempered man to whom the business of judging works of art is utterly distasteful'.[4]

In early 1892, shortly after he began his first period as a member of the Academy Council, Brock, Armstead, Thornycroft and two ARAs (Birch and Onslow Ford) signed a petition asking the Council to raise the age limit for sculpture students from 23 to 25, and this was agreed.[5] Later in the same year Brock drew attention to the excessive heat in the Sculpture School as a result of the gas lighting and proposed that 'the experiment of electric lighting' be tried. The Council agreed, and found the new system so effective that it was progressively installed in other parts of the Academy.[6]

Leighton presided over meetings of the Council and of the Hanging Committee, and his friendship with Brock continued. *The Sluggard* and *Needless Alarms* (RA 1886) were modelled in Brock's studio, and when Carl Jacobsen, the wealthy Danish brewer, commissioned a marble version of the *Athlete wrestling with a Python* in 1887, Brock's studio was again used.[7] Leighton attempted to persuade Jacobsen to accept a bronze version, like the original, but eventually agreed to provide a marble replica.[8]

Leighton told Jacobsen on 24 July 1888 that he had 'succeeded in obtaining a most beautiful block of marble' for the statue, and that having modelled the support which a marble statue required 'I have put the work in hand; the roughing out has been begun some little time already'. Much of the carving was done by Frederick Pomeroy, but it would be surprising if Brock did not make some contribution, particularly as it was Leighton's first marble statue.[9]

---

[4] Brock pp. 213-5. Brock's son, possibly reflecting his father's views, noted that when Herkomer, a naturalised Englishman, received a British Knighthood, 'he immediately reaffirmed his loyalty to the Fatherland - an instance of mercurial alliegance [sic] reminiscent of the famous Vicar of Bray' p. 164
[5] RA Council Report for 1892
[6] ibid 1893
[7] E. Staley *Lord Leighton of Stretton* 1906 p. 145
[8] Leighton's letters of 3 Nov. and 16 Dec. 1887 in the archives of the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen
[9] R. Ormond 'Classicism 1866-80', *Frederic Leighton 1830-96* exhibition catalogue Royal Academy of Arts 1996 pp. 182-3

When informing Jacobsen that the statue was nearly ready, Leighton wrote 'I shall when it is completed, have devoted nearly three months of my own labour to the marble, which, as you are experienced in such matters, you will know is more than the majority of sculptors give to the carving of their statues'.[10] The three months mentioned by Leighton represent just one tenth of the time (thirty months) that the statue was being carved in Brock's studio. It was Brock who arranged its transport to Denmark, after it had been shown at the Academy.[11]

Article III of the Instrument of Foundation of the Royal Academy of 10 December 1768 provided that, before receiving his Letter of Admission to the Academy, a newly elected member had to deposit at the Academy, to remain there, a 'picture, bas relief or other specimen of his abilities'.[12] The Letter of Admission became known as the Diploma and the work deposited as the Diploma Work. For his Diploma Work, Brock decided to execute a bronze bust of Sir Frederic Leighton wearing his badge of office as President of the Royal Academy.[13] Immediately after his election he wrote to Leighton to ask him to sit for the bust. Leighton replied on 31 January 1891 that he could not give a sitting at that time, but sent a photograph instead. The difficulty in getting the extremely busy Leighton to sit for him continued to cause Brock problems. On 18 July 1891 he wrote to the Royal Academy that 'although the model is considerably advanced I find it impossible to get it finished and cast in bronze within the six months allowed' and he asked for extra time to complete it.[14]

Matters did not immediately improve. On 17 November 1891 Brock wrote to the Academy again:

> In consequence of Sir Frederic Leighton being away on the Continent during the autumn vacation, I have been unable to take the sittings necessary for the completion of his bust... I have therefore ventured to send you as a temporary substitute a marble bust of your late Professor of Anatomy John Marshall, which I trust will not only be sufficient evidence of my skill but also an object of interest to the members of the Academy during the time it is in your keeping... no effort on my part will be spared to complete my diploma work as speedily as possible.[15]

---

[10] letter of 8 December 1890, archives of Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek
[11] Ormond 1996 p. 183
[12] Hutchison p. 246
[13] Brock had exhibited a bust of Leighton at the 1881 Academy (plate 60)
[14] Royal Academy Archives RAC/1/BR23
[15] ibid RAC/1/BR24

In view of the prolonged delay Brock hoped to exhibit the plaster model at the 1892 Academy, but the rules forbade this:

> Through an unfortunate misunderstanding, Mr Brock's most interesting work does not find a place in this year's Academy exhibition ... his Diploma work - his portrait bust of Sir Frederic Leighton - cannot be admitted. It is a rule at Burlington House - and compared with the rules of the Royal Academy the laws of the Medes and Persians were quite lax - that a Diploma Work must be exhibited in the material in which it is intended to be when finally placed in the Gallery. The moment the work in question enters the doors of the Royal Academy it becomes the property of that body, and cannot under any pretext be removed. Mr Brock, unaware of this regulation, hoped to be able to exhibit a plaster cast of Sir Frederic's portrait and to have it subsequently cast in bronze. This being impossible, the bust remains perforce in the sculptor's studio.[16]

Brock finally submitted the bronze bust on 3 April 1893, more than two years after his election, and it was shown in the 1893 Academy Exhibition.

The Leighton bust (plate 61) is one of Brock's best works and certainly his finest in bronze. It shows the bearded Leighton with head held high, wearing the robes of a Doctor of Civil Law at Oxford University with the chain of office and badge of the President of the Royal Academy. The bust brilliantly catches Leighton's panache and charisma, and Brock's carefully observed representation of Leighton's features and the detailed rendering of the Presidential badge of office are typical of the best of New Sculpture portraiture. Leighton himself wrote: 'the portrait is, I think, admirable both as a likeness and as a work of art'.[17]

Hamo Thornycroft praised it as 'the finest bust of our time',[18] and Gosse was also enthusiastic:

> Among the portrait busts the first place must unquestionably be awarded to the diploma bronze by Mr Brock of Sir Frederic Leighton, a head very alert and distinguished in expression, beautifully handled and hitting the exact mean between the romantic and the realistic manner.[19]

George Dunlop Leslie wrote:

> The best idea of Lord Leighton's personal appearance can be formed, no doubt, from Sir Thomas Brock's magnificent bronze bust; for although Watt's portrait of him in the gown of the Dilettanti Society .. has much of the dignity of his character and is fine in colour, the neck is I think rather too thick and the head has not the fine balance on the shoulders or the manly bearing that the bust renders so admirably. The bust too, showing every view of his fine head, is equally remarkable as a likeness either in full face or in profile.[20]

---

[16] *The Royal Academy of 1892* p. 12
[17] Carlsberg Archives: letter of 7 December 1891 to C. Jacobsen
[18] Manning p. 134
[19] *SR* 1 July 1893 p. 13
[20] G. D. Leslie *Inner Life of the Royal Academy* 1914 p. 185

The Royal Academy of 1892 said:

> Mr Brock's task was no easy one, but he has surmounted every difficulty, and the result is, in our opinion, a strikingly successful portrait of his distinguished sitter. And this, we believe, is the opinion of Sir Frederic Leighton himself.[21]

Some critics were less complimentary. Claude Phillips hinted that the bust idealised Leighton, remarking on 'thoroughness of execution at the service of a not very personal conception, to which this able artist has accustomed us'.[22] *The Builder* noted that the bust was 'conspicuous and perhaps somewhat too much marked by a kind of super-magnificent bravura of style and character' - not realising that this was precisely the effect that Brock was aiming to achieve.[23]

The Leighton bust was extremely popular. Apart from the original in the Academy, full-size replicas can be found in the Athenaeum Club, the Arts Club and the headquarters of the Artists Rifles (SAS). Brock himself gave one to Leighton House in 1897, and he directed that the original plaster model be given to the National Portrait Gallery after his death. The Leighton Fund presented one to Scarborough, Leighton's birthplace, in 1916; it now stands in Scarborough Town Hall. Brock also made a number of small scale versions in bronze, several of which he sent to brother artists; one example is in the Royal Collection. There are also said to be up to a hundred plaster models of the bust.[24]

The bust was exhibited on numerous occasions, including the RA Winter Exhibition 1897, Earls Court 1897, Paris 1900, Glasgow 1901 and Edinburgh (RSA) 1903.

Leighton himself was responsible for Brock receiving a commission for a marble version of the bust. Dr Carl Jacobsen, the patron of the Copenhagen Glyptotek, liked to place a portrait of the artist concerned next to his work; and after the *Athlete wrestling with a Python* had been completed, he asked Leighton if a suitable bust was available. Leighton replied:

> With regard to your interesting scheme of placing the effigies of the sculptors together with their works, I write to say that my friend and colleague Mr Thomas Brock RA, the author of several important public works in portraiture, is at present making a very fine bust of me (in Doctor's robes - Oxford) as his diploma work for the Royal Academy. - it is I think an admirable likeness as well as a fine work. I do not know whether the laws of the Academy permit of a work of this

---

[21] *The Royal Academy of 1892* p. 12
[22] *M of A* 1892 p. 137
[23] *Builder* 24 June 1893 p. 480
[24] Brock p. 222

> class being duplicated, but I will ascertain on my return in November [1891] and will then without in any way committing you let you know what the cost would be. [25]

After his return from his visit to the Continent, Leighton wrote on 18 November 1891 to say that the Council of the Academy had no objection to a reproduction of the bust being made, and adding

> I have ascertained from Mr Brock himself that the price he would charge for the reproduction of this bust in marble would be 150 guineas. I should explain that the bust is not merely a head, but shows the robes of a DCL of Oxford.

Brock wrote to Jacobsen on 30 December 1891, thanking him for the commission and promising to do his best to finish the marble bust by the end of May 1892, only five months later. He must have had his tongue in his cheek when he wrote this, for even he did not work at such a pace. On 16 August 1892, he apologised for the delay, 'caused principally by the difficulty I have experienced in getting the necessary sittings from Sir Frederic, owing to his many engagements during the London season'. It was not until 13 June 1893, eighteen months later, that Brock was able to tell Jacobsen that the bust was finished and packed ready for transmission to Copenhagen.

With his letter of 16 August to Jacobsen, Brock cannily enclosed a photograph of *The Genius of Poetry* (plate 42) and offered to execute a replica for the Glyptotek - 'to have a work of importance in so renowned a collection would indeed be a distinction, and one I should greatly value'. Jacobsen duly commissioned a marble replica of the statue. In 1910 he visited London and Brock persuaded him to purchase (for £800) a bronze replica of *A Moment of Peril*.[26] Once more, the Brock/Leighton nexus had borne fruit.

The ultimate fate of the statues was rather unexpected. None is actually in the Copenhagen Glyptotek. *The Genius of Poetry* is in an outpost of the museum at Valby, some kilometres north of Copenhagen; *A Moment of Peril* is in the grounds of the Rosenberg Castle in Copenhagen; and the Diploma bust of Leighton is in England. In 1972 a London dealer discovered it in the cellars of the Glyptotek, still in its original packing case, having never been put on display. The dealer persuaded the museum authorities that, if they

---

[25] Carlsberg Archives: Leighton's letter of 26 September 1891
[26] ibid: Brock's letters of 12 and 14 July 1910

had not unpacked it after eighty years, they probably did not need it, bought it and subsequently resold it to an English collector, who still owns it.[27]

Another example of Leighton proposing Brock for an important commission was the Queen Victoria statue for the Royal Exchange. In 1890 he recommended Boehm, Thornycroft or Brock as suitable for the task. Boehm was appointed but died later that year and Thornycroft was then given the commission. Leighton made amends by recommending Brock for *Sir Richard Owen* and for the Bishop Hervey memorial.

On another occasion Leighton demonstrated his friendship in an even more direct way. According to Brock:

> I greatly needed a holiday, and Leighton... asked with the greatest delicacy whether I was short of money. I evaded the true answer. Leighton noted it, and taking a sheet of ordinary writing-paper, he wrote an order upon his bank - 'Pay Bearer £ -., Frederic Leighton' - and tossing the scrap over to me, picked up his hat and disappeared. Two days later, he returned to my studio. 'What, not gone yet, old man? Be off, I say, tomorrow and make no mistake.' .. giving me a look which I dared not resist, he wished me a pleasant journey. I went next day as ordered. [28]

Brock did not say when this incident occurred, but it could well have been at the beginning of his 'lean period' (1889-90) when Leighton was working in Brock's studio on the marble version of the *Athlete* for Copenhagen.

The long-standing friendship and close association of Leighton and Brock is one of the more surprising features of English sculpture in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, because the two men were so different in background and character - Leighton the lover of the social scene and a brilliant linguist and Brock, who left school at 12 and generally avoided the higher reaches of society. Their friendship was founded on mutual respect for each other's professional skill, artistic gifts and dedication.

Brock was said to have been considerably influenced by Leighton's views on art, but he commented in later years that the influence was not a good one - for 'consummate draughtsman though Leighton showed himself to be, there was apparent in almost all his works a certain coldness and lack of movement'. Brock considered Leighton a greater

---

[27] Information from Mr Daniel Katz
[28] Staley pp. 183-4

sculptor than painter, and believed that if he had devoted more time to sculpture he would have been ranked highly among 'modern' sculptors.[29]

How far Brock's *Hercules strangling Antaeus* influenced the style of Leighton's *Athlete*, and how far his modelling skills and expertise in bronze affected the actual form and appearance of the statue is impossible to say. What can be said is that the remarkable relationship played a significant part in the birth of the New Sculpture, and that the name of Brock will always be associated with that of Leighton in this context.

In the 1891 Academy Brock exhibited his first ideal work in marble since *Oenone* and *Paris* in 1875. This was *The Genius of Poetry* (plate 42), previously shown at the Academy in plaster in 1889. *The Genius of Poetry* was in some ways a reversion to neoclassicism - a handsome young man, almost naked, standing 'in a graceful attitude of reverie' with a lyre slung from his shoulders.[30] The young man was evidently Orpheus, son of Calliope, the muse of epic poetry, who had been taught by Apollo to play the lyre with such skill that wild animals, trees and even rocks listened to his music. When his wife Eurydice died and entered the Underworld, Orpheus followed her and so charmed Hades and Persephone with his music that they agreed to release her on condition that he did not turn to look at her. His love for Eurydice made him forget this condition and look back, thus losing her for all time. A mystic religion called Orphicism was founded on the basis of works attributed to him.

The statue was intended to appeal at two levels - the Orpheus of song and poetry who charmed the birds from the trees, and the Orpheus of the Underworld and mystic religion. George Watts had exhibited a painting entitled *The Genius of Greek Poetry* at the Grosvenor Gallery in 1881, and it is probably not a coincidence that Brock chose an almost identical title for his statue. He may have been giving his own interpretation, in the spirit of the New Sculpture, to a concept expressed by Watts in the symbolist manner. The New Sculpture influences can be seen in particular in the handsome features, the elegant, even languid, pose, the treatment of the drapery and the vigorous carving on the pedestal with the heads of a youth and an old man emerging from swirling lines (plate 43).

Gosse had praised *The Genius of Poetry* when it had been shown in plaster in 1889:

---

[29] Brock p. 47
[30] *SR* 26 June 1889 p. 785

> It is very remarkable to see Mr Brock throwing off completely his old Foley tradition and working in this modern and conscientious style. The treatment of the flesh is exquisite... It is a very remarkable production, full of charm and distinction. We hope Mr Brock will be encouraged to execute it in marble.[31]

When the marble version duly appeared in 1891, Gosse commented that William Goscombe John's *Morpheus* would have been the finest statue of the year if it had not been equalled in modelling, and surpassed in style, by Brock's *The Genius of Poetry.* Even better in marble than in plaster, it was most carefully composed and most delicately carved.[32] He gave the work his final seal of approval in 1894:

> In the Royal Academy of 1889, Mr Brock came to the front as he had never done before with a noble statue of 'the Genius of Poetry'. Here, for the first time, Mr Brock may be said to have bidden final farewell to his old 'broad' Foley tradition. The modelling of the flesh was learned, without any loss of freshness and delicacy; not Barrias nor Dubois could have produced a more workmanlike pair of legs than those of this beautiful work.[33]

Claude Phillips described *The Genius of Poetry* as 'an admirably balanced and exquisitely harmonious figure'.[34] The marble gained added dignity and grace, as compared with the earlier plaster model. On the debit side, Phillips did not find 'anything absolutely genial [sic] or new' in the concept of the statue, and it was harmonious only when seen from the front and sides. However, it was clearly Brock's magnum opus to date; and he concluded that as a decorative performance of the monumental order, it had few parallels in modern British sculpture, belonging as it did to a category of art for which 'there is necessarily, in England, but little encouragement'. Marion Spielmann considered *The Genius of Poetry* to be graceful, reposeful and sculpturesque, surpassing *A Moment of Peril* in technical quality and refinement of taste.[35]

Brock was fortunate in finding purchasers for *The Genius of Poetry.* Mr Stephen Holland bought the marble statue for £2,000; Colonel Walter Harding bought the original plaster model; and Brock persuaded Mr Carl Jacobsen to buy a full size marble replica for his Copenhagen Glyptotek.

---

[31] ibid
[32] *SR* 27 June 1891 p. 778
[33] *AJ* 1894 p. 307 - possibly a reference to *Le Chanteur florentin* by Paul Dubois
[34] *M of A* 1891 p. 402
[35] Spielmann 1905 p. 421

It is clear that *The Genius of Poetry* was a success in its own day - the verdict of Gosse and Spielmann, the prompt election of Brock to be a Royal Academician, and the statue's speedy sale all confirmed this. However, *The Builder* may well have had a point when it referred to 'a very dyspeptic-looking *Genius*' and considered that the young man was a rather Byronic and theatrical figure, self-conscious in his attitude.[36]

At the 1891 Academy Brock exhibited a companion statue to *The Genius of Poetry*, a female figure entitled *Song* (plate 115). It failed to win critical approval. Gosse thought that it lacked the charm of *The Genius of Poetry*,[37] and Claude Phillips commented that while there was much to admire in the torso and limbs, it was 'emphatically not a performance making any deep impression by reason of elevation or distinctiveness of conception'.[38] It did not find a purchaser and was never executed in marble.

Despite his election as RA, Brock's financial difficulties continued - according to his son, his bank pass books for 1891 - 1893 made painful reading.[39] Confirmation of Brock's shortage of commissions came in his letter to Hamo Thornycroft of 29 December 1891: 'Very many thanks for your kindness in mentioning my name in connection with the proposed bust of *General Outram*. I hope something will come of it, as I am not at all busy'.[40]

Brock's lack of work may have prompted him to accept an invitation by the Royal Academy Council to serve as one of the British representatives on the committee of the Chicago Exhibition with Edward Poynter. Poynter was eleven years older than Brock and Principal of the National Art Training School in Kensington.[41] Brock and Poynter had worked together in 1892 on the designs of the new coinage,[42] and they became even better acquainted in the course of the leisurely sea voyage to and from the United States in 1893. Brock confided that he was short of work. According to Brock's son, Poynter remembered this and called at Brock's studio after their return to England. He mentioned that he was on the committee to select a sculptor for a memorial to Sir Richard Owen for the Natural

---

[36] *Builder* 1 June 1889 p. 405 and 1 June 1891 p. 444
[37] Gosse 1894 p. 307
[38] *M of A* 1891 p. 142
[39] Brock p. 93
[40] Thornycroft C95
[41] In 1894 Poynter became Director of the National Gallery and in 1896 President of the Royal Academy
[42] see Appendix B

History Museum and promised to support Brock's selection 'because he knew that no man was better fitted to undertake the work'.[43] In due course the commission was awarded to Brock. However, it was Leighton, not Poynter, who was on the committee to choose a sculptor for the Owen statue and it is possible that Brock's son was confusing the *Owen* commission with the later commission for a bust of Sir William Flower, Owen's successor as Director of the Natural History Museum, in which Poynter was involved.[44]

Brock's son claimed that the *Owen* commission was a turning point for Brock - 'from that moment he never looked back'.[45] The years 1896-1900 were to bring a stream of important commissions - four statues of Queen Victoria; memorials to Leighton, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Bath and Wells and the Bishop of Worcester; three other portrait statues; ten busts, including *Henry Tate* (plate 117), and *Lord Derby* (plate 25); and a marble medallion of James Christie, the auctioneer (plate 22), which is still used as the company's trade mark, although the medallion itself was destroyed when Christie's was bombed in 1940.[46]

At the 1899 Academy Brock exhibited his next ideal work after *The Genius of Poetry* and *Song* - a statue entitled *Eve* (plates 30 & 31). This was a new departure for him - his previous ideal figures of women had been drawn from classical or neoclassical sources (*Salmacis, Oenone, Song*). *Eve* was a familiar, if not too familiar, subject, and it required courage and confidence to enter this crowded field. Just as Watts' painting *The Genius of Greek Poetry* may have given Brock the concept for his statue on a similar theme, so Watts' massive painting *She shall be called Woman* may have inspired Brock's *Eve*. Watt's painting was a controversial one; when he submitted it to the Hanging Committee in 1892, they were unhappy about it - as Leighton told Watts privately, there was 'inequality in its execution and lack in places of completeness' i.e. it was unfinished. Watts protested, and eventually Leighton arranged for the painting to be hung in an advantageous position.[47]

---

[43] Brock pp. 95-6
[44] see p. 193
[45] Brock p. 97
[46] W. Roberts *Memorials of Christies* Vol. II Bell 1897
[47] A. Wilton & R. Upstone (ed.) *The Age of Rossetti, Burne Jones and Watts: Symbolism in Britain 1860-1910* exhibition catalogue Tate Gallery 1997 pp. 265-7

Brock was the sculptor member of the Hanging Committee and would thus have been well aware of the painting and the controversy it had aroused. He would probably have also heard that Edward Burne Jones had referred to Watt's trilogy as 'three whacking Eves which I can't abide'.[49] Burne Jones' distinctly unwhacking ideals of womanhood were probably closer to Brock's own perceptions, and he may have felt inspired to make his own version of *Eve* to counter that of Watts. Thus the *Manchester Guardian* was wide of the mark when it said:

> *Eve*, a delicate and beautiful figure of Womanhood, said all the accepted things which go to make up a conventional portrait of womanly modesty and charm but did not, like that great conception of Watts, with which it was contemporary, show any connection with modern emotion or thought.[50]

It was precisely because Brock did not share Watts' vision of *Eve* that he decided to give an alternative rendering, which was in his terms entirely modern in emotion and thought. He may also have been reacting against the *Eve* of Rodin, modelled in 1887 as part of the *Gates of Hell.* Brock had great respect for Rodin's 'executive skill', but 'regarded with considerable suspicion the leaving of parts of a figure unfinished or merged in the marble'.[51]

In *Eve* Brock produced for the first time a completely nude figure, with no drapery or other device to cover her. Her head is bowed, as if in shame; her hair falls in long tresses around her face, casting a shadow; her left arm is stretched across her chest, with her left hand above the right breast in a graceful but rather protective gesture; her right hand hangs loosely, almost limply, by her side. Her left leg is slightly bent at the knee, her right leg is straight, giving the impression she is remorseful but not cowed. She stands on a rocky pedestal around which is coiled a large snake, an allegorical detail which explains who the statue represents as clearly as a nameplate.

Eve proved to be a popular work. *The Times* considered it the finest figure Brock ever produced, both as regards beauty of modelling and expression of sentiment.[52] M. H. Spielmann wrote:

---

[49] M. Lago (Ed) *Burne Jones talking* 1982 p. 130
[50] *Manchester Guardian* 23 August 1922
[51] Brock p. 152. Paradoxically the marble version of *Eve* in the Tate has a rather clumsy marble support behind the right leg, invisible from the front but noticeable from the rear
[52] *Times* 26 May 1899

> Nothing could well be more touching than this fair, shamed woman - not endowed with that perfection of beauty which is the conventional rendering of the First Mother; nor yet the gross peasant which art-Anarchists have sought to present her; but just one of ourselves in figure and nature, more exquisite in feeling than in person, yet that person beautiful with the beauty we see around us, with the consciousness of her wrong-doing in her heart, and head bowed with the weight of remorse at the sentence she has drawn upon her offspring. [53]

Subsequent writers have also been positive in their criticism. The 1929 Tate Gallery Catalogue commented that 'Brock had a sense of grace as well as vigour, as his figure of *Eve* shows'.[54] Jeremy Cooper wrote that *Eve* 'succeeded in fashioning that delicious combination of naturalism and spirituality found at the core of the New Sculpture'.[55] Susan Beattie, not one of Brock's greatest admirers, noted:

> Among the few works by Foley's pupil Thomas Brock which belong within the mainstream of the New Sculpture movement is *Eve* of 1898. Though encumbered by the title given to so many voluptuous figures in the Paris Salons, it is free from arch allusion, as tentative, subjective and poignant as Alfred Gilbert's early statuettes.[56]

The work exhibited at the Royal Academy was a life size (69", 1.75 m) plaster model, and in 1922 this was offered by Frederick Brock (Brock's son and executor) to, and accepted by, the National Museum of Wales. A recommendation by William Goscombe John that a bronze replica should be cast from the model at a cost of £125 was not implemented.[57]

Eve was shown at several international exhibitions, including Paris (1900), where Brock was awarded the Medal of Honour, the Royal Scottish Academy (1903), the St Louis Exhibition (1904) and the Glasgow Exhibition (1913).

Other versions exist. A marble statuette of *Eve* was sent to the Dublin Exhibition (1907), and this could be the 35" (89 cm) marble version sold at auction in 1985. A bronze statuette of similar size is in the Harris Art Gallery at Preston. A 16" (40.6 cm) plaster model, cast from a sketch model, was given to Sir Walter Lamb, Secretary of the Royal Academy, by Frederick Brock in 1922, and left by Lamb to the Academy in 1928.

---

[53] Spielmann 1901 p. 30
[54] Manson p. 159
[55] J. Cooper *Nineteenth Century Romantic Bronzes* David and Charles 1976 p. 70
[56] Beattie pp. 176-7
[57] National Museum of Wales File 23-182: Frederick Brock's letter of 27 February 1923 and William Goscombe John's letter of 'Whit Monday' (presumably 1923)

Small-scale bronze replicas were produced for sale to the public, following the example of other New Sculptors like Thornycroft and Gilbert. The catalogue of The Fine Art Society exhibition *Sculpture for the Home* in 1902 offered these replicas at 175 guineas each.[58] Brock presented similar statuettes to several friends, including Lord Esher, who told his son that *Eve* was 'very nude and pretty',[59] Colonel Walter Harding (who commissioned the *Black Prince*) and Rudyard Kipling, who wrote:

> I have just come up to town for a few hours and have found that beautiful bit of work which your generosity has sent to me. It is splendid. I am taking it down this afternoon to my home where it will be a chief treasure for me and my children.[60]

Henry Tate, who had given the National Gallery of British Art to the nation in 1897, commissioned a marble version of *Eve* and presented it to his new gallery shortly before his death.[61] Brock had recently completed a bronze bust of Tate (plate 117), commissioned by an 'association of gentlemen', including Sir William Agnew and Sir Edward Poynter, in July 1897.[62] This bust was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1898 and then presented to the new gallery 'in recognition of Henry Tate's services to British art'. A replica was unveiled by Lady Tate outside the Tate Central Library in Brixton on 11 October 1905.[63]

Despite the praise which was heaped on *Eve* when it first appeared, and the fact that it was presented by Henry Tate himself to his new gallery, the Tate curators have consistently undervalued this work. For most of the twentieth century it was kept in storage, and even when a special exhibition on the Victorian Nude (*Exposed*) was mounted in 2001, no place could be found for this remarkable statue. It was not until 2002 that *Eve* finally emerged from her long exile to be placed in the Tate Modern's exhibition 'The Upright Figure', together with Rodin's *La Muse*, Renoir's *Venus Victorious* and Maillol's *Venus with a Necklace* .

Brock exhibited only one more ideal work at the Academy after *Eve* - a marble bust, *Contemplation*, in 1903. Its present whereabouts are unknown, and no photograph appears

---

[58] Beattie pp. 199 and 261. Thornycroft's *Bather* was priced at 150 guineas while Gilbert's *St George* was 300 guineas

[59] M. V. Brett *Journals and Letters of Reginald, Viscount Esher* 4 vols. 1934-8 vol. 2 p. 314 (letter of 7 November 1901)

[60] Brock pp. 82 and 222

[61] M. Chamot *Tate Gallery - British School* 1953 p. 26

[62] Tate Gallery Archives: Brock's letter of 7 July 1897 to Sir W. Agnew

[63] *ILN* 21 October 1905 p. 567

to exist. This is unfortunate, as it was well received by the critics - *The Builder* described it as a beautiful and expressive female head crowned with masses of hair,[64] and the *Art Journal* considered it to be one of the best busts of the year.[65] The *Magazine of Art* said it showed charm of feeling, though the features might appear to some a trifle heavy.[66] It was later exhibited at the Royal Scottish Academy (1908) and at the War Fund Exhibition (1915). For the last twenty years of his life, Brock's ideal statues appeared not as salon works for the Academy but as allegorical figures on monuments such as the Victoria Memorial and the Gladstone Memorial in Liverpool.

---

[64] *Builder* 20 June 1903 p. 623
[65] *AJ* 1903 p. 182
[66] *M of A* 1903 p. 436

Chapter 11: The Royal Society of British Sculptors

In the early 1880s the Belt v. Lawes trial and the fiasco of the Blackfriars Bridge competition caused a number of sculptors to consider forming a society to protect their interests.[1] Charles Lawes, the defendant in the Belt v. Lawes trial, wrote to Brock:

> What about the memorial [petition] to Mr Gladstone, and how about memorializing the corporation about Blackfriars? Birch is a little quieter, but he would sign if it were got up. He is in favour of starting a Sculptors' Association. I think it would be an admirable thing. He says he would give his name as willing to receive applications.
>
> You and Thornycroft should do the same, and I and Marshall Wood [sic for 'would']. I say that the only qualification should be a small entrance fee and to have exhibited sculpture at the R.A. If you are in favour of the project please let me know.
>
> We ought to have a meeting. I am sure Marshall would head the affair, and I would act as Secretary for a time.[2]

Brock gave a careful and considered reply, indicating that the Belt affair had left its mark:

> I concur generally in the sentiments expressed in the memorial to Mr Gladstone you sent for my perusal, but think it would be far more likely to have weight if presented by an organized body of sculptors fairly representing the profession than if merely signed by a few isolated names - for which reason I think its presentation should be deferred until more combined action can be taken.
>
> The same argument in my view applies to the suggestion to memorialize the corporation in the Bridge matter, which I think in existing circumstances would be quite useless.
>
> I entirely agree with Birch's idea, and am strongly in favour of forming a Sculptors' Association, which if properly worked might be productive of much good, and probably be the means of checking the impostures that now so injure the profession.
>
> Your proposed qualifications for membership, however, appear to me far too easy, and would not of themselves exclude Belt and others of his stamp.
>
> There certainly should be a meeting called to ascertain the feelings of the profession as a whole, and if the idea be favourably received a committee might forthwith be appointed to fix the qualifications for membership etc., and start the thing.
>
> If you can get Marshall, whom you seem so confidently to reckon on, and other members of the Academy, to take the matter up, I will add my name to a requisition calling a meeting, and attend, so as to discuss fully the aims and methods of the proposed Association.[3]

---

[1] see p. 180

[2] Brock p. 209. Although neither Lawes' letter nor Brock's reply are dated, they were probably written in 1883, after Brock's election as ARA. William Calder Marshall was the senior sculptor RA

[3] ibid p. 210

Nothing came of this idea at the time, probably because of the formation of the Art Workers Guild (AWG) in 1884 with the objective of bringing together architects and sculptors. Among the AWG's early members were Hamo Thornycroft and Onslow Ford (elected in 1884), Harry Bates and William Frith (1886), George Frampton and Frederick Pomeroy (1887), Alfred Gilbert (1888) and Thomas Stirling Lee (1889). Onslow Ford was Master of the Guild in 1895, Lee in 1898, Frampton in 1902 and Pomeroy in 1908[4]

Brock was one of the few leading sculptors who did not join the Art Workers Guild. There is no indication that he was opposed to the Guild as such, but it clearly did not satisfy his desire to have a society devoted exclusively to the interests of sculptors.

In 1893 *The Magazine of Art*, under the heading 'A Society of Sculptors', announced that a movement was afoot to establish a society which would be independent of the Royal Academy and dedicated to the promotion of the dignity and excellence of the art of sculpture. Whereas the Royal Academy could only admit six or seven sculptors, the new society would include every sculptor considered by his fellow-workers as a worthy craftsman.[5]

Despite this confident prediction, it was the International Society of Sculptors, Painters and Engravers which next appeared on the scene, in 1898. Its founder members included Alfred Gilbert, its first president was the painter James Whistler, and its main function was to mount alternative exhibitions to those of the Royal Academy. When Whistler died in 1903, the French sculptor Rodin was elected president; and it was possibly this factor, as much as anything else, which finally persuaded British sculptors to 'get their act together'.

Rodin was a well known figure in London. In 1901 a Rodin Statue Fund, to which Brock subscribed, purchased a bronze replica of *John the Baptist*, which Rodin unveiled in the Victoria and Albert Museum in 1902. In January 1904, immediately after his election as president of the International Society, Rodin came to London to assume his responsibilities, and there was a risk that, with Rodin at its helm it would attract more sculptor members.

Brock was reserved in his attitude to Rodin's work. His son recalled his standing for a long time in silence before Rodin's *Danaide* in Paris and then saying: 'a dangerous

---

[4] Beattie pp. 240-252 lists AWG members
[5] *M of A* February 1893 p. xvii

influence'.[6] However, his personal relations with Rodin were amicable. He accompanied Rodin on his visit to the National Art Training School in Kensington in 1904, when both sculptors were 'acclaimed with enthusiasm'.[7] There are two Christmas cards from Brock in the Rodin Museum and Rodin later gave Brock a small bronze statuette. Rodin expressed his opinion of the Victoria Memorial to Edward Poynter in 1910, but we do not know what it was, as Brock's son tantalisingly wrote: 'There is no need to repeat it here'. It was evidently favourable, because Rodin's few words 'meant more, very much more [to Brock] than the highest honour that could have been bestowed upon him'.[8]

Derwent Wood, one of Brock's former pupils, held a small meeting of sculptors in his studio in the autumn of 1903, followed by a larger meeting in November 1903.[9] On 11 January 1904 Brock, Frampton, Goscombe John and 'practically all the leading London sculptors' decided to establish a Society of British Sculptors.[10] While the *Daily Telegraph* reported that the new body would in no way be antagonistic to any existing institution, *The Builder* considered that the Society was needed because the Royal Academy was really an Academy of Painting. Both journals indicated that Brock was likely to be the first President and Harold Pegram wrote to Hamo Thornycroft:

> I hope the new Society may do something for our art. Brock will make an excellent Pilot with his pluck and common-sense. He was quite admirable at the meeting the other night.[11]

The Art Journal welcomed the new Society, as a way of improving the status of the profession. A sculptor earned considerably less than a painter similarly circumstanced, as the costs of material and outlay were sometimes half the aggregate amount of a commission and the price obtainable for a sculpture was often lower than for a painting. There was ample work for the proposed Society to do, not least in the field of copyright.[12]

Brock, Frampton and four members of the Art Workers Guild (William Frith, Frank Lynn Jenkins, William Reynolds Stephens and Derwent Wood) formed a provisional committee to draw up a draft Declaration which would establish a Society with the aim

---

[6] Brock p. 152
[7] *AJ* 1904 p. 71
[8] Brock p. 132
[9] Beattie p. 134
[10] *Daily Telegraph* 27 January 1904
[11] Thornycroft C462; letter of 17 January 1904
[12] *AJ* 1904 p. 70

of maintaining and protecting the interests of sculptors and elevating the status of the profession. The Declaration was signed on 13 December 1904 by the six committee members plus Thomas Stirling Lee, David McGill and Sir Charles Lawes-Witteronge[13].

The provisional Council held its first meeting on 10 January 1905, with Brock as temporary chairman.[14] Brock set a brisk pace - it was decided to apply for a Board of Trade licence under the Companies Act; to appoint a paid Secretary (Percy Edsall) with offices at 149 The Strand; and to have Messrs Coutts as bankers with Lawes-Witteronge as Hon. Treasurer.

The Society's first Annual General Meeting was held on 13 February 1905 and Brock was elected President.[15] It was decided to offer membership to the remaining RA sculptors (Armstead, Gilbert and Thornycroft); the ARAs (Colton, Drury, Goscombe John, Pegram); five members of the Art Workers Guild (Henry Fehr, Roscoe Mullins, Frederick Pomeroy, Albert Toft, Bertram Mackennal); and to James Havard Thomas, John Tweed and John Singer Sargent.

The recruiting drive was partly successful - those present at the next Council meeting on 2 March 1905 included Drury, Goscombe John, Pegram, Pomeroy and Thornycroft; Colton joined later. Armstead, Gilbert and Sargent declined and were elected honorary members. In a fit of enthusiasm the Council decided not only that Scottish and Irish sculptors could be members, but also (on the proposal of Lawes-Witteronge) lady sculptors - a revolutionary proposal indeed. A further 38 names were also proposed for membership.

At its meeting on 3 April 1905 the Council was in a more cautious mood. Invitations to nineteen of the 38 potential new members were withdrawn, and the decision that lady sculptors should be eligible for membership was rescinded. Even so, by the time of the Special General Meeting on 22 May 1905, the membership had reached 51.

One of the first initiatives taken by the Society under Brock's presidency was to petition the London County Council about the holding of a major exhibition of sculpture in London.[16] The petition, signed by the twelve members of the Council (the nine

---

[13] Charles Lawes inherited his father's baronetcy in 1900 and changed his surname to Lawes-Witteronge.

[14] RSBS (Royal) Society of British Sculptors Minute Book All further references in this Chapter are to the appropriate Minutes unless otherwise stated

[15] *Builder* 18 February 1905 p. 187

[16] *Times* 23 February 1905

founding members plus Goscombe John, Pomeroy and Thornycroft) noted that the art of sculpture had been sadly neglected and most inadequately represented. The sculptors of Great Britain had therefore formed themselves into a Society to remedy this past neglect. The Society now sought the aid and cooperation of the LCC to bring together works executed in the last 25 years to enable the public at large to have some idea of the 'wonderful' progress made during that period. It was only by the assistance of a representative body like the LCC that sculpture could be fostered and encouraged, and the Society requested the use of a site and temporary buildings for a sculpture exhibition.[17]

The LCC were sympathetic and offered a site in Aldwych, but this turned out to be unavailable and other venues were considered, including the Princes Skating Club in Knightsbridge. However, the problem was resolved by the Government's decision to sponsor a Franco-British Exhibition as a manifestation of the Entente Cordiale. In a letter to Hamo Thornycroft of 18 July 1906, Brock wrote:

> The forthcoming Franco-British Exhibition which it is proposed to hold in London in 1908 will, I think, solve all our difficulties with regard to an Exhibition of Sculpture. I have been invited to join the Art Committee as President of the Society of British Sculptors, and I propose to ask the Committee to leave all matters relating to Sculpture in the hands of myself and the Council of our Society.[18]

The Council therefore decided on 5 November 1906 to give up the idea of an LCC-supported exhibition, and money already collected from members was returned.

The other main initiative by the Society in its early days was to ensure that sculpture was being given due prominence by provincial art galleries. At the Council meeting on 3 July 1905 it was resolved to warn the Liverpool authorities that members of the Society would not exhibit at the forthcoming art exhibition in the Walker Art Gallery unless there was a more effective and efficient exhibition of sculpture - and to copy this warning to sixteen other provincial galleries.

Unlike Jericho, the walls of Liverpool did not fall at the first blast of the Society's trumpet, and the Walker Art Gallery declined to alter its arrangements.[19] As a goodwill gesture, Liverpool invited Brock to send a work to the next exhibition in autumn 1906, but he declined and the boycott continued. In August 1909, after he had resigned as President, he wrote to the Society urging that the boycott should continue. The Council

---

[17] *Builder* 3 March 1906 p. 220 supported this proposal
[18] Thornycroft C109
[19] *Annual Register* 1905 p. 97

accepted his advice and Pegram resigned from the Council in protest. It was not until May 1912 that Frampton, by then President of the Society, reported that he had an amicable meeting with the Liverpool authorities and the boycott was lifted. Brock was present and did not dissent.

In a more positive vein, the Council under Brock's chairmanship in November 1906 asked Stirling Lee to draft proposed rules for sculpture competitions and a suggested form of agreement between a sculptor and his client. These drafts were approved by the Society's Annual General Meeting in February 1907 and 1000 copies of the Competition Regulations were printed and given a wide distribution. Brock kept a close eye on the conduct of competitions. In July 1907, when the Welsh South African War Memorial Committee in Cardiff proposed the Earl of Plymouth as sole assessor, the Council insisted that the assessors should include at least one professional sculptor, and Frampton was accepted as the Society's representative.

The preparations for the Franco-British Exhibition at Shepherds Bush occupied the Society throughout 1907. Brock and Frampton jointly arranged the sculpture. As well as works by living sculptors, Armstead, Boehm, Leighton, Bates, Ford, Foley, Stevens and Watts were represented. Princess Louise was invited to send a work. Brock sent his plaster model of Gainsborough and his model of the Victoria Memorial.[20] He reported to the Council in November 1908 that the Exhibition had been visited by nearly three and a half million people, and that there could be no doubt that the appreciation of British art in sculpture had been greatly enhanced by the admirable display. Edward Poynter, Chairman of the Exhibition Committee, wrote a special letter of thanks to Brock and Frampton for arranging the sculpture section so successfully.

At the Council meeting on 1 June 1908, Brock asked that he might be relieved of his office of President as he felt that he had neither the time nor the strength to adequately discharge the duties devolving upon him, in addition to his legitimate work as an artist. It had never been his intention or desire to hold the office permanently, nor did he think this would be a good thing for the Society. His health had seriously broken down earlier in the year, and he was giving up, as far as possible, all committee work so that he might devote his undivided attention to the Victoria Memorial.[21] The Council asked Brock to remain in office until the next annual general meeting, by which time they hoped that a

---

[20] *Architectural Review* (1908) p. 111

[21] Society of British Sculptors Council Minutes 1 June 1908

plan might be devised by which, without making serious inroads into his time, Brock's association with the Society might be somewhat closer than that of an ordinary member.

Lawes-Witteronge and Frampton were proposed for the Presidency at the Council meeting on 1 February 1909. At the next meeting (1 March) Frampton withdrew and Brock handed over to his old friend Lawes-Witteronge. During his four years in office he missed only four out of 44 Council meetings - a remarkable record considering the pressure on him to complete the Victoria Memorial. His continued association with the Society was ensured by his election as Treasurer.

Soon after Brock had handed over the presidency, an unfortunate dispute arose between him and William Goscombe John. Goscombe John had been commissioned by Liverpool City Council to execute an equestrian statue of King Edward VII.[22] It was proposed to place the statue on a pedestal at the south end of St George's Hall, which would involve the removal of a wall and its replacement by a flight of steps. There was no controversy about the actual statue, but the proposal to alter St George's Hall aroused local opposition. The editor of the *Liverpool Courier* asked Brock for his views, and Brock replied in characteristically forthright language in a letter dated 11 November 1910:

> It is difficult for me adequately to express my feelings in regard to the proposal which is being made to cut into the base of St George's Hall at the south front, and to erect there a memorial to the late king. That such a proposal should seriously be considered seems to me incredible, and I sincerely trust that the people of Liverpool will strenuously resist it. The St George's Hall is universally considered to be one of the finest modern buildings in Europe. Its grandeur arises to a very great extent from the nobility of its proportions and the simplicity and purity of its style. To interfere with one single line of it would be to spoil the whole.
>
> To me the placing of a monument upon the south end of its base must constitute not only a glaring incongruity but an act of unpardonable disrespect to the memory of the great architect who designed the building; while the memorial itself, thus attached to and a part of a vast edifice, would possess an insignificance which, as I think all will agree, such a memorial should not possess.
>
> In conclusion, I can only repeat the hope that the people of Liverpool will do everything in their power to prevent this most unworthy suggestion from being carried out.[23]

Goscombe John not unnaturally took exception to this, and on 6 December wrote a letter of protest to Charles Lawes-Witteronge as President of the Society of British Sculptors, which included the following:

---

[22] Cavanagh pp. 140-3

[23] *Builder* 3 December 1910 p. 701 & Brock pp. 127-8

> ... I have to make a serious protest concerning the uncalled for action of a member of our council, Mr Thomas Brock, R.A. in publicly taking part in the controversy concerning the memorial committee's intentions, without first ascertaining from the sculptor concerned the true facts of the case.
>
> ... This scheme which Mr Brock stigmatizes as so unworthy, viz., the cutting into the base or podium upon which St George's Hall stands was part of the original intention and design of the architect Elmes and Cockerell, and for which their drawings exist.
>
> ... That this new trouble should have taken place in Liverpool is doubly regrettable, showing as it does a want of unity in our ranks, for our Society has already enough difficulties there, to which I need not refer. I may however add that this fresh evidence of hostility on the part of a prominent member of our Society to the Corporation of Liverpool can only add additional bitterness to an already unfortunate state of affairs.
>
> In conclusion I would again express my extreme regret at having to make this grave protest and complaint against the action of one who has done so much for our Society; but I feel strongly that if individual members are to take part publicly in newspaper controversy against schemes already entrusted to brother members, the influence of the Society of British Sculptors for good must be seriously undermined.[24]

At its meeting on 9 December 1910 the Council decided to forward Goscombe John's letter to Brock without comment. Brock replied direct to Goscombe John, emphasising that his concern was for the correct siting of the statue, and that he had no criticism of the statue itself:

> ... Let me say at once that I am painfully surprised you should have expressed yourself in the way you did. Your letter to the Council contains not only a most ungenerous suggestion but also an inference which is quite unworthy of you.
>
> ... In my letter to the Liverpool Courier the only reference made to the King's memorial was that in which I said that in my opinion the attaching of a sculptural monument to the base of a high edifice would give it (the monument) an insignificance which such a work should not possess.
>
> Surely if you will consider this a moment you will realise that in writing thus I was as much concerned for the advantageous placing of your work as I was for the integrity of the St George's Hall being preserved.
>
> Let me say in conclusion that never will I allow considerations of fellowship, or even of friendship, to stand in the way of just and impartial criticism when the welfare of art demands that that criticism should be given. [25]

King Edward VII died in 1910 and was succeeded by George V. At the suggestion of Lawes-Witteronge, the Council agreed to petition the new King to grant the Society the title 'Royal'. The petition noted that the Society had recently had responsibility for the sculpture section of the Franco-British Exhibition, and was to have the same function

---

[24] Brock pp. 129-30

[25] ibid p. 131. The Great War caused the project to be shelved. When the scheme was revived in 1919, Liverpool City Council rejected the St George's Hall site and the statue was finally erected on Pier Head.

for the International Exhibition in Rome in 1911. It had secured for its members far more generous treatment from exhibiting bodies than had hitherto been accorded to them, and its regulations and conditions for public competitions for sculpture were now invariably adopted. A mark of Royal favour would not only greatly add to the Society's dignity and influence but would also further the development of its functions and powers. The title 'Royal' was duly granted in 1911.

Lawes-Witteronge's Presidency was cut short by his sudden death on 6 October 1911 and Brock was elected temporary President on (now Sir William) Goscombe John's nomination - a sign that there was no ill-will between them.[26] In November 1911 Sir George Frampton was elected President of the (now) Royal Society of British Sculptors (RSBS), and Brock was re-elected Treasurer[27].

Following the election of Frampton, Brock was less assiduous in his attendance at Council meetings (five out of fourteen in 1912-13). Thus he was not present when the unfortunate dispute arose over the commissioning of statues for Cardiff City Hall - a dispute which was to lead to the resignation of two of the Society's most illustrious members (Sir George Frampton and Sir William Goscombe John) and the unexpected resumption of the Presidency by Brock.

In November 1912 an anonymous donor (later revealed to be David Thomas, a wealthy coal owner and the future Lord Rhondda) offered to give ten marble sculptures to decorate Cardiff City Hall. A local committee was established and the RSBS was asked to advise on the holding of an open competition to select the ten sculptors. The President (Frampton) named a Welsh sculptor, James Havard Thomas, as the Society's representative on the committee.[28] Some time afterwards it became known that the idea of an open competition had been dropped and that ten sculptors (T. M. Crook, Ernest Gillick, Goscombe John, David McGill, Henry Pegram, Frederick Pomeroy, Henry Poole, Havard Thomas, Alfred Turner and John Tweed) had been awarded the commissions.[29]

A group of RSBS members, led by Paul Montford and Francis Derwent Wood, were extremely angry at the cancellation of the competition and demanded an explanation. At

---

[26] RSBS Special Council Meeting 9 October 1911

[27] Goscombe John was knighted on the occasion of the Investiture of the Prince of Wales (23 July 1911). Frampton had been knighted in 1908.

[28] F. Pearson *Goscombe John* National Museum of Wales 1979 p. 15

[29] Beattie p. 134

a Council meeting on 13 November 1913 the unfortunate Havard Thomas said that the anonymous donor had wanted certain well-known sculptors to execute the statues, but he (Thomas) had pointed out that they were unlikely to agree to take part in an open competition. As a result, the donor had cancelled the competition and awarded the commissions to the sculptors he himself had chosen. A majority of the Council approved the actions of Havard Thomas, but Derwent Wood, Montford, Lynn Jenkins and Arthur Hodge resigned from the Council in protest and decided to appeal to the membership at large.

An extraordinary general meeting was held on 27 January 1914 and passed a vote of censure on the President and the Council. At a further meeting on 27 February 1914, Brock, as one not directly involved, tried to find a compromise. He was criticised by Havard Thomas, and after a 'vitriolic' attack by Montford on the President (Frampton) twelve members of the Society walked out of the meeting. Six of these (Frampton, Gillick, Goscombe John, McGill, Pomeroy and Havard Thomas) later sent in their resignations from the Society.[30]

The Builder commented that generous actions such as that of Mr David Thomas in offering statues of celebrated Welshmen to adorn Cardiff Town Hall were comparatively rare. It was therefore a pity that the procedure adopted to carry this public-spirited intention into effect had led to such a sharp division of opinion among RSBS members that the President and Council had resigned.[31]

At a Council meeting on 20 April 1914, Brock was elected President in place of Frampton, and three of the most vocal critics (Paul Montford, Arthur Hodge and Derwent Wood) were elected to the Council. The fact that Brock was ready to serve with the 'rebels' may indicate that he did not have too much sympathy with Frampton and the others who had resigned. He does not seem to have made any special efforts to heal the rift ; under his presidency only Pomeroy, a former pupil, resumed membership.

Pomeroy rejoined the RSBS in 1919, McGill in 1923. Havard Thomas died in 1921. At an extraordinary general meeting of the RSBS on 22 January 1926 it was decided to rescind the resolution of 27 January 1914. 'By doing so, they [the Members] desire to clear from any implied charge of dishonourable intention the then president and the Council... the Members present cast no reflection upon either its proposers or

---

[30] Pearson p. 15

[31] *Builder* 24 April 1914 p. 489

supporters'. This resolution was sent to the former President and the two Council members who had not rejoined viz. Sir George Frampton, Sir Goscombe John and Ernest Gillick. Goscombe John rejoined in 1928 and Gillick in 1938. Frampton died in 1928 without resuming membership.

The RSBS continued to function during the war years; of the 43 Council meetings, Brock missed only seven. The Society supported the War Fund Exhibition of Sculpture held in January - February 1915. One third of the proceeds went to the British Red Cross and the St John Ambulance Society; one third to the Artists Benevolent Fund; and one third to the artist himself. Brock exhibited his marble bust *Contemplation* (RA 1905), while his sons Edmond and William exhibited three oil paintings. The Exhibition was a success; over 8,000 visitors paid to enter, and £6,000 was raised by the sale of works.

A similar exhibition was organised by the department store Waring and Gillow in 1916 - they offered Brock the use of a gallery free of cost to the sculptors on condition that Queen Mary would open it. When approached, the Queen asked who was responsible for the exhibition, and as soon as Brock's name was mentioned she said: 'If Sir Thomas Brock is a member of the committee, that is sufficient' - and at once consented to open the exhibition.[32]

In 1918 Oxford University asked the Society for advice on the curriculum for art studies. A subcommittee was established to draft a reply and Brock asked his son Frederick, described by his father as 'a literary man', to revise the draft. At the Council meeting of 19 November 1918 W. Reynolds Stephens, Vice President, took the chair in Brock's absence. He felt that Frederick's redraft had altered the sense of the sub-committee's views, and preferred the original draft. However, Brock had made it clear in conversation before the meeting that he would not contemplate any amendment to his son's draft - it was to be accepted (or rejected) as it stood. The Council voted to adopt it, but felt it necessary to add that the Vice-President was considered to have acted quite properly in bringing the matter before the Council.

Although trivial in itself, the incident showed that relationships were becoming strained, particularly between Brock and his Vice-President, and that Brock's long presidency might be reaching its end. After one acrimonious meeting a member of the

---

[32] Brock pp. 171-2

Council is said to have exclaimed to Brock 'You talk to us as though you were talking to children'.[33]

It was against this background that Reynolds Stephens launched a manifesto for reform in February 1919 in a four page open letter to all members of the Society.[34] In an obvious reference to the Cardiff statues dispute and other arguments in the Council, he regretted that the Society's corporate life was spoilt by jealousies, grumbling and even quarrelling. Timidity and inaction had been far too prevalent; instead of asserting itself publicly and promptly, the RSBS had almost always stood aloof or taken a half-hearted and tardy part.

Few public men had even heard of the Society's existence. The Society should insist on having at least two members on any national committee dealing with sculpture, medals, etc. It must also heal up past sores and invite ex-members to forget past misunderstandings. 'We must show we have virility and energy now, or we might as well wind up the Society and save our subscriptions'.

Reynolds Stephens made four specific proposals for action. First, the excellent rules making for greater democracy and efficiency passed some years before should be put into effect. Second, there should be an 'upper house' of elected Fellows who would be the recognised leaders of the Society. Third, the Society should organise its own exhibitions of its members' sculpture. Fourth, lady sculptors should be admitted.

The Council meeting on 25 March 1919, with Brock in the chair, 'took note' of the Reynolds Stephens memorandum and agreed that the Society should disclaim any responsibility for it. But Brock's days as President were clearly numbered. An uneasy truce seems to have continued over the next twelve months, with Brock taking the chair at only six of the twelve meetings. His last meeting as President was on 17 March 1920, when he handed over to William Colton. But Colton's Presidency was even briefer than that of Lawes-Witteronge in 1909/11, for he died in November 1921 after only 20 months in office. Reynolds Stephens' hour had come; he was appointed Temporary President on 21 November 1921, and confirmed as President shortly thereafter. One of the first acts of the Council under his leadership was to admit women members to the Society. The 'peaceful revolution' in the Society's affairs had begun.

---

[33] ibid p. 163

[34] A copy is in the RSBS archives

Although Brock must have been unhappy at the tactics adopted by Reynolds Stephens and the washing of the Society's dirty linen in public, he probably accepted that the time had come for a change of leadership. He was 73, and his health was no longer what it had been. The Society continued to treat him with great respect and affection. When he submitted his resignation from the post of Treasurer in July 1922, saying that he was 'far from well'; the Council asked him to continue for a further year, on the understanding that the day-to-day work would be done by a deputy. A month later, on 22 August 1922, he passed away.

As soon as news of his death reached the Society, Reynolds Stephens approached St Paul's Cathedral to arrange his burial there, but was told that this was not possible as the building was 'showing serious cracks'. The Society sent a wreath to Brock's funeral at Mayfield and was represented at his memorial service in St James's Piccadilly.

Brock had been President of the RSBS for over ten of the Society's seventeen years of existence. Despite the criticisms by Reynolds Stephens, he had done much to raise the profile of the profession and give it a corporate voice. The rules for sculpture competitions were widely used; and the Society played a major role in the Franco-British Exhibition of 1908 and the Rome International Exhibition of 1911 (see Appendix A).

It was unfortunate but perhaps inevitable that the RSBS had split over the Cardiff statues issue. In a Society whose members were inevitably competing against one another for commissions, it was not surprising that such a dispute should have arisen. Nor was it surprising that the strain of the war years, and the fact that Brock himself was seventy in 1917, caused some loss of 'virility and energy' (to quote Reynolds Stephens) in his last years of office. But the Society had been built by Brock on sure foundations, and continues to flourish to this day.

Brock gave practical expression to his deep attachment to the RSBS by leaving it £500 in his Will - the only specific legacy outside his circle of family and servants. The Council used some of Brock's legacy to purchase a badge of office for the Society's President. A splendid badge was in due course designed by Richard Garbe ARA at a cost of £148, inscribed 'Memorial to Sir Thomas Brock KCB RA First President of the Royal Society of British Sculptors founded 1904'.

Chapter 12: Church Memorials

In the course of his career, Brock received some twenty commissions for memorials in cathedrals or churches. The first was a bust of Longfellow in Poets' Corner at Westminster Abbey (1884).[1] Three year later, Brock completed a memorial for St Paul's Cathedral commemorating Sir Harry Parkes.

Parkes joined the Consular Service in his youth, was awarded the KCB at the early age of 34, and was Minister to Japan from 1865 to 1872. Brock's head and shoulder bust, described as an excellent likeness, is set in an elaborate marble surround (plate 84). *Parkes* wears diplomatic uniform with the star and sash of a GCMG and the badge of a KCB. The monument was erected 'by friends and brother officers' and was unveiled by a colleague, Sir Rutherford Alcock, in 1887.[2]

It is interesting to compare the Parkes memorial with George Frampton's memorial to Edward Vansittart Neale, unveiled five years later (plate 162). Both are in the crypt of St Paul's and both are by New Sculptors. *Parkes* shows Brock's skill as a portraitist, the face with a dignified but resolute expression and the uniform and decorations skilfully carved. The Renaissance-style framework to the bust and the marble niche are well balanced and the inscription neatly carved in the cartouche beneath. In contrast Frampton's *Neale* looks startled, the angel stands rather awkwardly behind the head, the lettering is obtrusive and the frieze sketchy.

Brock's next church memorial was the life-size marble statue of the Reverend Edward Thring, headmaster of Uppingham School for thirty four years. *Thring* (plate 119) is seated and wears an academic gown. Brock's care over details is seen in the cascading folds of *Thring*'s academic gown, the mortar-board at his feet and the realistically carved book with his right forefinger keeping his place, as if he has just paused from reading to greet a visitor.[3]

---

[1] see p. 108

[2] S. Lane Poole & F. V. Dickins *Life of Sir Harry Parkes* 1894 pp. 353 & 431; St Paul's Cathedral Chapter Minutes 28 February 1887

[3] *Prince Albert* on the Albert Memorial also uses his forefinger as a bookmark - the book being the catalogue of the Great Exhibition of 1851.

The fanlike decoration of his high-backed chair, with its echoes of the Renaissance, is typical of the New Sculpture.

Thring was exhibited at the Academy in 1892; the *Art Journal* and *The Times* agreed that is was an excellent piece of conventional, but thoroughly appropriate, work.[4] The *Saturday Review* considered that *Thring* had great merit; the head was a little hard, the feet needlessly ugly, but the disposition of the drapery was good.[5] The statue was placed in an extension ('galilee') of the chapel, completed in 1890. The galilee cost £895; the statue £1,000; and the pedestal £120. The unveiling by Mrs Thring took place on 1 November 1892 before a large assembly of pupils and dignitaries.[6]

This was the first of five seated portrait statues by Brock; his later ones were *Bishop Philpott* (1897), *Lord Russell of Killowen* (1904), *Sir Dinshaw Petit* (in Bombay) (1916), and *Queen Victoria* on the National Memorial.

Henry Philpott was Bishop of Worcester for thirty years (1860-90), and it came as no surprise that Brock was awarded the commission for a commemorative statue - he was a Worcester man and had recently brought honour to his birthplace by being elected RA.

Philpott is one of Brock's finest works. The Bishop is seated on a marble throne, bareheaded and in ecclesiastical vestments, leaning slightly forward with his right arm outstretched bestowing his benediction (plates 84 & 85). Brock's skill as a portraitist is again in evidence here, and the finely carved episcopal chair adds dignity and authority. M. H. Spielmann commented that Brock had executed not only a striking likeness but also an admirable and characteristic pose, solving 'the eternal problem of the upraised arm'. The treatment of the drapery was admirable and refined with its shallow depressions, without black holes of shadow, and its expressive crispness of the edges.[7] Arnold Wright, one of Brock's assistants, said 'I have looked at that figure hundreds of times and wondered how

---

[4] *AJ* 1892 p 242, *Times* 28 May 1892

[5] *SR* 23 July 1892 p. 103

[6] A hymn was specially written for the unveiling. It began: *Today with rev'rent love we meet, Around the sculptured stone, Our Master once again to meet, And almost heard his tone*

[7] Spielmann 1905 p. 421

that outstretched arm was ever done'.[8] Brock was particularly successful in catching Philpott's ascetic, even gaunt, features.[9]

Bishop Philpott was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1896 and a photograph was published in *Royal Academy Pictures*.[10] *The Builder* considered it to be better than Hamo Thornycroft's *Sir Stuart Bayley*, because Brock had the flowing ecclesiastical robes to help him and had used the chair to assist the decorative effect of the composition.[11] *Philpott* bears comparison with Gilbert's *James Joule* - two New Sculpture versions of a seated figure, with Brock's kind but firm bishop contrasting with Gilbert's scientist deep in thought.

Philpott was unveiled by the Earl of Coventry (Lord Lieutenant of Warwickshire) in Worcester Cathedral on 5 September 1897, to the satisfaction of the *Worcester Diocesan Yearbook*:

> Thomas Brock was the sculptor - a selection of peculiar fitness, for he is a Worcester man and personally acquainted with his subject. The statue as a work of art is in every way worthy of the sculptor's high reputation and has been much admired.

On 9 June 1894 Lord Arthur Charles Hervey, fourth son of the Marquess of Bristol and Bishop of Bath and Wells for a quarter of a century, passed away, and the Lord Lieutenant, the Earl of Cork and Orrery, at once called a public meeting to consider the form a memorial might take. The Lord Lieutenant had seen Sir Frederic Leighton a few weeks earlier and Leighton had named Brock as 'exceptionally happy in posthumous work of the kind now required'. He said that Brock's fees would be as follows:

For a kneeling figure on a low plinth	£1,000
For a recumbent figure on a handsome marble plinth	£1,260
For a Bishop enthroned on a 3 ft 6 in marble pedestal	£1,300.

The Chapter decided to award the commission to Brock and chose a recumbent figure. They managed, however, to reduce the fee to £950.[12]

---

[8] Brock p. 118

[9] The Rev. Francis Kilvert (*Kilvert's Diary* ed. W. Plomer London 1977 Vol. ii 44) tells the story of a child who asked 'Is the Bishop a spirit?' 'No, the Bishop is a very good man but he is not exactly a spirit yet. Why do you ask?' 'Because' said the child gravely 'his legs are so thin, I thought no-one but a spirit could have such very thin legs'.

[10] *Royal Academy Pictures* 1896 p. 7a

[11] *Builder* 20 June 1896 p. 526

[12] Wells Cathedral Chapter Minutes, 2 July 1894 pp. 71-2

Some members of the Hervey Memorial Committee were evidently not convinced that Brock was the right man. On 24 October 1894 Hamo Thornycroft wrote in his diary:

> Several visitors came, including my Lord Orrery and Sir R. Paget and his son. They are on a committee to place a statue of the late Bishop of Wells in that cathedral and seem anxious that I should execute it. This is odd, for as soon as I heard that my friend Brock desired to have the commission I at once wrote and said that they could not do better than give it to him. And, a couple of months later, one of the committee writes to ask my opinion as to whether a Mr Pegram is capable of executing such a work as they require. Within a fortnight the committee comes to me - or rather the chief men on the committee have done so - though I have only recommended others! How it will end will amuse me, for I have left off looking after commissions for many years. [13]

Despite these manoeuvres Brock retained the commission and on 27 May 1895 the Dean reported that he had received from Mr Brock a small clay model of the proposed monument. At the same meeting, the Dean reported that John Loughborough Pearson RA, the architect, had submitted designs for the 'architectural accessories', including a gothic-style sarcophagus, and proposed that a full-scale wooden model should be made.[14] The Chapter referred the matter to the Hervey Memorial Committee, which met in July and approved Brock's model and Pearson's design for a sarcophagus.[15]

On 4 August 1897 the monument (plate 55) was unveiled by the Earl of Cork and Orrery, in the presence of the bishop's widow, the Archbishop of Canterbury (Frederick Temple) and several other bishops. The recumbent figure is of the finest Carrara marble lying on a sarcophagus of Derbyshire alabaster, with plinth of red marble. The pallet on which the figure lies is a monolith of semi-transparent alabaster of extreme beauty. Lady Arthur Hervey was said to be 'thoroughly satisfied with the likeness and the whole work'.[16]

Hervey is bareheaded and wearing bishop's robes. His head rests on a cushion, his hands are crossed on his chest and his feet rest on a crouching lion cub (plate 56). His crozier lies by his side, held under his left arm. The two winged cherubs at his head (plate 57) are beautifully carved and add a charming dimension to the statue. The monument has been described as 'one of the finest and most sumptuous, in a restrained way, of all late Victorian

---

[13] Thornycroft Archives Th/LL 35
[14] Wells Cathedral Chapter Minutes, 27 May 1895 pp. 118-9
[15] ibid 27 July 1895 p. 123
[16] Wells Cathedral Fabric Record Book p. 26

tombs'.[17] Arthur Mee wrote that the figure of *Hervey* was 'as beautiful as anything from mediaeval days, with stone flowing like fine linen'.[18]

Edward Benson, Archbishop of Canterbury since 1882, died in 1896. In January 1897 a memorial committee, chaired by the Prince of Wales and including the new Archbishop, Frederick Temple, decided that a suitable monument in Canterbury Cathedral should be the first objective, with the completion of Truro Cathedral (founded by Benson) as the second objective. The monument should be 'rather simple' to leave sufficient funds for the works at Truro.[19] Brock's marble effigy was exhibited at the Academy in 1899. The face, partly modelled from a death mask, was described as the best likeness of the late Archbishop.[20]

As with the *Hervey* memorial, Brock was required to work with an architectural associate, Thomas Jackson RA, who designed the elaborate pedestal and surround. Jackson's design, Early English in character and bearing a general resemblance to Archbishop Peckham's tomb in the Martyr's Chapel, was approved by the Dean and Chapter in December 1897.[21]

The monument (plate 13) was unveiled by Queen Victoria's daughter-in-law, the Duchess of Albany, on 8 July 1899.[22] Shortly afterwards, Benson's widow wrote to Brock:

> It is a most wonderful delight to us. The marble is I think even more beautiful than the clay, and the thought of such a perfect likeness, so full of dignity and beauty, going down to all ages is a deep comfort to me.
>
> I am not quite clear about the blue and gold background. Do you like it? And the tomb altogether?[23]

In fact, Brock did not like the blue and gold background or 'the tomb altogether' and Jackson knew this. Brock attached great importance to the siting of each statue, the height of the pedestal and the overall appearance from all angles. He therefore preferred to take complete responsibility for a monument and not to have to work with an 'architectural associate'. Successive memorial committees had imposed one on him - Sidney Smith for the

---

[17] L. S. Colchester *Wells Cathedral* 1982 p. 96
[18] A. Mee *The King's England: Somerset* 1968 pp. 274-5
[19] *Builder* 23 January 1897 p. 71
[20] A. J. Mason 'Archbishop Edward Benson' S. Lee (ed.) *Dictionary of National Biography, First Supplement* Vol. I 1901 p. 179
[21] *Builder* 18 December 1897 p. 528
[22] *ILN* 15 July 1899 p. 48
[23] Brock p. 124

Harris Memorial, J. L. Pearson for *Leveson Gower* (1895) and *Hervey* (1897) and Thomas Jackson for *Benson* (1899). The Benson memorial was the last straw and thereafter he made a point of informing memorial committees that unless a monument was entrusted entirely to him he could not undertake it. Brock thus, rather belatedly, followed the example of his old master, Foley, who declined to work with an architect on the O'Connell Monument because 'the admixture of the various peculiarities of several artists must terminate in a mass of incongruities'.[24]

A notable difference between the Albert and Victoria Memorials was that an architect (Sir Gilbert Scott) designed the former with the various sculptors working under his direction, whereas Brock designed and executed the latter without any architectural assistance. The only occasions after 1900 when Brock did work in association with an architect was with Sir Aston Webb on the Stock Exchange War Memorial, Admiralty Arch and the Royal Coat of Arms for the façade of Buckingham Palace.[25]

At the Royal Academy of 1897 Brock exhibited a recumbent figure of Mrs Emily Seely under the title *Effigy of a Lady*.[26] The monument is in St Paul's Church, Daybrook (Nottinghamshire), which was built by her husband at her suggestion. *Mrs Seely* wears a dress and cloak, her hands clasp a lily, her head and feet rest on cushions. The figure lies on a marble sarcophagus in gothic style, set in a niche with canopy in the same style.

Sir Luke Fildes RA wrote to Brock on 7 April 1897:

> ... rarely, perhaps never, have I seen a piece of sculpture that has given me so much delight as your recumbent figure in the R.A. It is to me the most pathetic figure in plastic art - precious and exquisite in every way.[27]

Sir William Richmond RA wrote on 31 April 1897:

> I cannot refrain from expressing to you personally what I have already expressed among our friends and colleagues, my entire admiration for your beautiful recumbent fugure [sic] of a lady in this year's R.A.
>
> I am not easily pleased as you know either by my own efforts or by modern efforts in sculpture as a rule; but I find in your work refinement, noble feeling and chaste beauty of workmanship that I wholly admire.

---

[24] see p. 42

[25] see pp. 167 and 249

[26] Some twenty years later, Brock had the sad privilege of executing another marble effigy for the Seely family - a memorial to Mrs Seely's grandson, and Lord Mottistone's son, Charles Grant Seely, who was killed in the First World War aged 23, see p. 166.

[27] Brock p. 150

> Go on, my dear Brock, upon such noble lines, and you will leave English art the richer.[28]

The *Magazine of Art,* commenting on the 1897 Academy, noted that it was the work of Brock and others which gave character to the Exhibition and rendered it not unworthy of the artistic achievement of the century.[29]

Frederic Leighton died on 24 January 1896, just three weeks after he had been created a Baron in the New Year's Honours. His body lay in state in the Central Hall of the Royal Academy; at the head of the coffin was Brock's Diploma bust standing on a white marble pedestal draped in black crepe.[30] He was buried in St Paul's Cathedral, and there was lively speculation about who should execute a suitable monument. A design by George Frampton was published in the *Art Journal* and it was later announced that Sir William Richmond had been commissioned to produce a wall plaque for £2,000.[31] Hamo Thornycroft wrote in his diary on 11 December 1896:

> As regards the proposed monument to Leighton in St Paul's, many artists are somewhat angry, at least sculptors will be, for it turns out that the painter Richmond and the Rev. Dean have arranged it between themselves that he (Richmond) shall make the monument! As there are several sculptors living who would make a fine work, notably Gilbert, Brock or Bates, it is scarcely a work to put in the hands of a novice. Brock's bust of Leighton is the finest bust of our time, and he should have made the monument, if not Gilbert. The only good thing which may come of it [Richmond's execution of the Leighton Memorial] may be that Richmond's hand may be stayed for a time from covering the grand work of Wren with colour where Wren would not wish it - on the walls of his great work.[32]

Richmond had recently executed some controversial mosaics for St Paul's Cathedral, which led to Thornycroft's outburst. Although primarily a painter, he had done several sculptures and could hardly be described as a 'novice'. However, it was the President of the Royal Academy rather than the Dean of St Paul's who would have the decisive voice in the selection of the sculptor for Leighton's memorial; and here Fate, or rather Death, intervened in Brock's favour.

Leighton's immediate successor as President was Sir John Millais, who was not particularly well disposed towards Brock.[33] He died after only a few months in office and

---

[28] ibid pp. 150-1
[29] *M of A* 1897 p. 48
[30] Hutchison p. 131
[31] *AJ* 1897 pp. iv & 324
[32] Thornycroft LL-J folio 49
[33] see p. 117

his successor, Edward Poynter was one of Brock's strongest supporters. Thus it was Brock who received the commission in February 1897. Instead of a wall plaque as envisaged by Frampton and Richmond, the monument was to be free-standing, with a recumbent figure of the deceased. Rather surprisingly, it was the Dean who insisted on this type of monument:

> The Dean of St Paul's, I am told, is responsible for the recumbent statue of Leighton. I understand he refused permission for the erection of any other kind of monument in the Cathedral.[34]

It is pleasant to record that Richmond evidently bore no grudge. Shortly after the Leighton commission had been awarded to Brock, Richmond wrote to congratulate him in the warmest terms on his *Effigy of a Lady* at the 1897 Academy, as noted above. Nor was this the only sign of friendship and respect. In 1911, after the unveiling of the Victoria Memorial, Richmond (who himself received the KCB in 1897) wrote:

> I send you my hearty greetings on the accomplishment of a great and noble work. The knighthood of the arts is a greater honour than any bestowed by kings.[35]

Brock's full size plaster model of the Leighton Memorial (plate 62) was exhibited at the Royal Academy Summer Exhibition in 1900. The *Magazine of Art* described it as a

> superb monument, one of the most admirable ever executed in this country... true alike in design and proportion, and noble in expression, it is a worthy memorial of the great President, painter and sculptor, whose portrait is pathetically [sic] rendered with equal delicacy and truth.[36]

The Builder gave a full description:

> In the lecture room the most important work is Mr Brock's very fine monument to Lord Leighton; it is called rather inaccurately 'Tomb of Lord Leighton', which of course it is not, though adopting the old Renaissance sarcophagus form. The figure of Leighton, with beautifully modelled head and the drapery severely treated in nearly straight lines, reclines on the top of the sarcophagus, the convex underside of which is decorated with conventional foliage carving after the Italian manner, but rather broader and freer in treatment than we usually find in Renaissance examples; below this is a square-lined plinth on which is relieved an inscription panel, and at the two ends are seated figures, the one symbolising Painting, the other Sculpture, the latter bears a model of one of Leighton's sculptures, 'the *Sluggard*.' These figures are not great, not Michelangelesque, so to speak, but they are very graceful in line, and contrast well with the remainder of the monument, which is to be executed in marble and bronze for St Paul's Cathedral. Did the sculptor design the architectural details? If so, he understands that part of the business better than most of his craft, there is nothing to complain of here, at all events.[37]

---

[34] Thornycroft C 102: Brock's letter of 6 March 1897
[35] Brock p. 233
[36] *M of A* 1901 p. 480
[37] *Builder* 7 July 1900 p. 3. Brock designed the architectural details himself

The monument was unveiled on 19 February 1902 by Poynter.[38] The *Art Journal* noted:

> The whole composition was nobly conceived, and there is a dignity about the finished work which properly accords with Leighton's characteristics'.[39]

M. H. Spielmann wrote:

> It is not easy to over praise this fine work. In proportion, in harmony of line, and in silhouette; in conception, in detail, in decoration, in spirit, it is not very far from perfect. The effigy shows Leighton asleep, alive to all who knew him. The sarcophagus, fine in shape and in decoration, which supports him, with figures personifying his arts, Painting and Sculpture, at head and foot - surely this is a monument in which the great President would have himself rejoiced; for all is beauty, repose and peace.[40]

D. S. MacColl was less enthusiastic:

> [The Leighton Memorial] was a work whose general ordonnance was above the average of modern sculpture. There were no glaring architectural faults, such as occur too often in our sculptors' work. The portrait of Lord Leighton, like the recent bust of the Queen, was also respectable. But the writer's recollection of the architecture and sculpture alike would not allow of any warmer epithet. The emblematic figures had an unoccupied, academically-born air; they were not essentially knit to the sarcophagus, and the detail of acanthus on the latter was both slack and dry. The design had nothing that could be called inspiration, nor the execution nerve.[41]

More recent critics have expressed differing views on the Leighton Memorial's merits. Benedict Read wrote:

> perhaps the most poignant of the New Sculpture's funerary monuments is that to Lord Leighton in St Paul's Cathedral, by Brock. Here the man to whom the movement owed so much lies in effigy, mourned at one end by an allegorical figure of Painting; at the other by a figure representing Sculpture, holding in her hand a miniature of Leighton's *Sluggard*, ... perhaps symbolising the art of sculpture flexing itself for renewed activity after a long time in the shackles of convention - this being Leighton's particular historic contribution to the art in this country.[42]

On the other hand, Susan Beattie complained that 'the motif of the two brooding, flanking statuettes, first borrowed by Gilbert from the vocabulary of Alfred Stevens, had become part of the common language of the New Sculpture. Its repeated occurrence in memorial statuary... stretched to monumental size as in Thomas Brock's Leighton Memorial ... eventually roused critics to protest'. She claimed that *Sculpture* echoed the 'grave head

---

[38] The monument was cast by Compagnie des Bronzes, Brussels (P-P. Dupont and C. Huberty 'Les fonderies de bronze' in *Sculpture belge au 19me siecle* Brussels 1990 p. 249)
[39] *AJ* 1902 p. 126
[40] Spielmann 1901 p. 26
[41] *Architectural Review* 1901 Vol. 10 p. 83
[42] Read 1982 p. 330-1

and pose of Stevens' *Valour*' and added that 'Brock's severe limitations as a modeller are exemplified here, however, in the deadened surfaces of [*Sculpture*'s] neck and forearm, unworthy of comparison with the work of Alfred Stevens and Harry Bates'.[43]

Beattie's criticism of the 'brooding, flanking statuettes' is wide of the mark. Brock intended to execute a monument in Renaissance style as a worthy tribute to a Renaissance man, Frederic Leighton. As Read noted, this was New Sculpture's commemoration of the man who had sparked it into life with his *Athlete*. Brock did not need to borrow anything from Stevens or Gilbert. He adopted the classic Renaissance sarcophagus format, possibly inspired by Vasari's tomb of Michelangelo in Santa Croce, Florence. Just as Vasari showed the figure of *Sculpture* holding a model statue in her hand, so Brock placed in *Sculpture*'s hand a small version of Leighton's *Sluggard*, neatly recalling not only Leighton's prowess as a sculptor but also Brock's role in this.[44]

Beattie also suggested that Gilbert's *Study of a Head* (1883) (plate 165) introduced to England the hair-concealing bandeau, worn by Antonin Mercie's *David* and derived ultimately from Michelangelo, and that this had brought about a 'new outlook' in sculpture. She claimed that Brock's head of *Sculpture* for the Leighton Memorial confirmed the truth of this statement - 'There can be few idealised female portraits in late Victorian sculpture that do not owe something, directly or indirectly, to Gilbert's *Study*'.[45]

In fact it is *Painting* (plate 64), not *Sculpture* (plate 66), who wears a scarf or bandeau not unlike Gilbert's boy in his *Study of a head.*[46] Similar bandeaux can be found on Brock's *Snake Charmer* (plate 114) and his *O'Connell Victories* (plates 78 to 81), well before Gilbert's version. Perhaps Brock influenced Gilbert rather than the reverse.

There are two replicas of the head of *Painting* extant, one in marble (22 ins, 55.9 cm), the other in bronze (15 ins, 37.5 cm). The marble version (plate 65) was shown at the New Zealand International Exhibition at Christchurch in 1907, described in the catalogue as *Study of a head for the Leighton tomb; lent by the artist* (no. 901). It was purchased for £150 by

---

[43] Beattie pp. 213 & 223. Thornycroft also is criticised for his 'constant reference to [Stevens'] *Valour* and *Truth*' in his Gladstone memorial

[44] When a cast of *The Sluggard* was sent for auction at Sotheby's, the fact that it was signed by Brock and not Leighton baffled the cataloguers until they were reminded of the Leighton monument. (Sotheby's Lot 124, 12 May 1995, sold for £3,000)

[45] Beattie p. 141

[46] *Sculpture* wears a Renaissance-style hat with ear flaps

the Art Gallery of New South Wales.[47] The smaller bronze version was sold by Christies on 11 December 1979 for £900. It was described as *A Study of Eleanor Burton*, said to be Brock's model for the head of an angel on the Victoria Memorial. In view of the date and provenance of the two versions, the former account (that it relates to the Leighton Memorial rather than the Victoria Memorial) seems likely to be true. There is no reason to doubt that the model was Eleanor Burton, as it was her grand-daughter who sent the work for sale.

The model for *Sculpture* was Mary Lloyd, who was Leighton's model for *Atalanta, Lachrymae* and (possibly) *Flaming June*.[48] Brock used her for *Sculpture* because it was said that no statue could be a complete tribute to Leighton's memory without her. She also claimed that she was the model for 'Brock's statue of *Justice* for the Royal Exchange'. In fact, Brock did not execute any statue for the Royal Exchange, but he did execute a female figure of *Justice* for the Gladstone monument in Liverpool (plate 48), which bears a marked resemblance to *Sculpture*.

In 1909 the Public Orator of Oxford University, when presenting Brock for the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Civil Law, referred to the Leighton Memorial in these words:

> If an example of his work is to be chosen, what better might we select from the fruits of his genius than that very beautiful effigy of the late Lord Leighton which is now in St Paul's Cathedral? There lies the most distinguished painter, depicted in such a way that his virtues, charm, dignity, persuasiveness of tongue and subtlety of intellect still seem to flourish. The marble sleeps; but beneath the closed lids we can believe that the eyes still shine.[49]

The Leighton Memorial was literally, as well as metaphorically, a labour of love for Brock, as his fee was several hundred pounds less than the final cost of the work. Brock at one point thought of reducing the height of the plinth, as it seemed a 'trifle too high', and his friend Val Prinsep offered to meet any extra cost. 'As to the expense, I will see to that gladly, if you will kindly let me know when the deed is done'. In the event, no alteration was made to the original design.[50]

---

[47] *Art Gallery of New South Wales Quarterly* Vol. 13 No. 2 1972
[48] M. Postle 'Leighton's Lost Model' in *Apollo* February 1996 pp. 67-9
[49] *Times* 24 June 1909
[50] Brock p. 177

Chapter 13: War Memorials

Brock's first monument with a military subject was his memorial to Lieutenant Colonel James Galbraith in the Church of Ireland church at Clanabogan, County Tyrone (Northern Ireland). Erected in 1886 on the south wall of the chancel, it takes the form of a marble bas-relief with the inscription:

> In memory of James Galbraith, Lieut. Colonel Commanding the 66th Royal Berkshire Regiment... Killed in Action July 27th 1880 at Maiwand, where his body rests. ...last seen on the nullah bank kneeling on one knee with a Colour in his hand, officers and men rallying around him and on this spot his body was found

Beneath the plaque is the regimental badge and motto 'Faithful unto Death'.[1]

The battle of Maiwand during the Second Afghan War was one of the worst defeats suffered by the British Army. An Anglo-Indian Brigade of 2,500 men was surrounded by an Afghan army of some 7,900 men. The Berkshire Regiment made a fighting withdrawal, and a small group of survivors made a desperate last stand on the bank of a stream (nullah). This is the scene depicted by Brock (plate 41).

The carving is so meticulous that individual officers and NCOs can be identified. Brock was also accurate over details of their uniforms and equipment. Colonel Galbraith wears khaki-covered helmet, dyed white drill 'frock' jacket and trousers and field boots with spurs. His sword has the 1845 pattern blade, and he wears a Sam Browne belt which, though not officially approved, was preferred by officers to the regulation waist-belts; with the special type of water-bottle used in India.[2]

Brock's next war memorial was a statue of the Earl of Angus at Douglas, Lanarkshire, which commemorated the raising of the Cameronians in 1689. Richard Cameron, a Scottish schoolmaster, had led the Covenanters against King Charles II and was killed by English soldiers in 1680. In 1689 the surviving Covenanters were summoned to a meeting in Douglas Parish Church on 31 March 1689 and voted in favour of fighting for King William III. The Earl of Angus (the 18 year old son of the Marquis of Douglas) was asked to be the first Colonel of the new regiment. On 14 May

---

[1] T. W. Benson *Clanabogan Parish Church -a short description* Derry (no date). p. 4. Brock's studio also executed the lectern

[2] M. Barthorp 'Some Aspects of Maiwand' in *Military Illustrated* No. 17 (Feb/Mar 1989) pp. 20-9

1689 the Earl raised his standard in a field on the outskirts of Douglas and formed the Angus Regiment of 1,200 men.[3]

In 1692 the Angus Regiment was sent to the Netherlands to assist King William in his fight against the French. Lord Angus himself was studying at Utrecht, and sought his father's permission to join his regiment. On 3 August 1692 he was killed at the battle of Steenkirk, fighting at the head of his troops.[4] In 1751 the Angus Regiment was renamed the 26th Regiment of Foot. In 1782 this became the 26th (Cameronian) Regiment; and in 1881 the 26th was joined with the 90th Regiment to become The Cameronians (Scottish Rifles).

In 1889 a group of officers of the former 26th (Cameronian) Regiment decided to commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of the regiment's formation with a 'fitting and permanent' memorial. A sum of money was collected and a competition held. John Tweed (then 19) submitted a sketch model, but the commission was awarded to Brock.[5]

Brock exhibited a plaster model in the Royal Academy in 1890. The bronze statue (plate 9) was cast by Singer of Frome in 1891 and unveiled on 8 September 1892 by the Earl of Home. It stands on a prominent open site just outside Douglas, overlooking the surrounding countryside. It was by way of being an ideal subject, because Brock had no contemporary portraits to work from. He took great care with the detail of the contemporary costume. *Lord Angus* has a tricorn hat set rather jauntily on his head; he wears a heavily embroidered frock coat and stout military boots. With his right hand he points towards the field where the regiment was first raised, while he holds a sword aloft with his left hand as a rallying signal, calling the Covenanters to arms.[6]

The memorial committee drove a hard bargain for this, Brock's first statue in Scotland, and it 'proved anything but a profitable undertaking, the commission money for so large a work being little more than half of what it should have been'.[7]

The example of the Cameronians was followed ten years later by another Scottish regiment. In 1898 a group of serving and retired officers of the Royal Scots Fusiliers, which had in 1873 become the county regiment of Ayrshire, decided that those who had

---

[3] *The Covenanter* (Journal of the Cameronians) Summer Number 1971 pp. 33-7
[4] William Fraser *The Douglas Book* Edinburgh 1885 pp. 461-3
[5] L. Tweed *John Tweed* 1936 pp. 23-5
[6] The pose, with outstretched right arm, was similar to *Richard Seddon* see p. 205.
[7] Brock p. 92

fallen in battle since then should be commemorated by a memorial which would be 'a fitting and lasting adornment' to the ancient and historical town of Ayr.[8]

Brock's memorial (plate 108) took the form of an 8 ft (2.4 m) bronze figure of a private soldier in full marching order, standing in a defiant attitude. His right hand grasps his rifle, which rests with its butt on the ground, bayonet fixed, and his left fist is clenched. He is bare-headed - his busby can be seen at his feet, having fallen off in the heat of the battle. As with the Galbraith memorial, Brock paid great attention to details such as the ammunition pouches and waterbottle.

The statue was exhibited at the Royal Academy Summer Exhibition in 1902, when the *Magazine of Art*, obviously hoping for an 'ideal' work, commented that the Royal Scots Fusilier was a vigorous figure in the style of memorial most appreciated abroad [sic] for military purposes. However, the soldier was too like a man, and his rifle too rifle-like, to allow the sculptural idea to emerge freely.[9]

The Builder took a similar line. The figure was 'spirited and Scotch enough', a Burns in military uniform, and was recognisable and intelligible as a military memorial. However, the statue was sentiment rather than art, and the representation of boots and other accoutrements in sculpture, even in bronze, was unappealing. 'Such things have to be done occasionally to meet popular wishes, but one can only condone them, not sympathise with them'.[10]

Local opinion had no problems with the statue's realism. The *Ayr Advertiser* reported that

> Those qualified to judge agree in the opinion that the statue is a most excellent piece of work, well moulded, bold in design and thoroughly typical of the regimental motto 'Touch me not with impunity', which the sculptor had evidently set himself to interpret in bronze.

At the unveiling ceremony on 1 November 1902, Colonel E. Browne (chairman of the memorial committee) congratulated Brock for sparing neither time nor trouble to execute a really fine work of art. Some people were averse to spending money on memorials, and considered that public funds should be directed solely to hospitals and similar institutions. Such institutions were valuable; but surely works of art had their uses too.

---

[8] *Ayr Advertiser* 6 November 1902
[9] *M of A* 1902 p. 399
[10] *Builder* 31 May 1902 p. 534

> For who will deny that they educate and enrich the minds of youth, engendering a spirit of veneration and a desire to emulate noble deeds and personal sacrifices undergone by their countrymen in times of stress and danger? Thus the dead in the service of their country are made alive again on the canvas of the painter, in the marble and bronze of the sculptor. In another moment the typical soldier of your own regiment, in fighting kit, moulded in accurate proportion to the point of a needle, will be unveiled to your view in all his strength and beauty. The pose of the figure is resolute and spirited; not aggressive, but ready and strong. This, I hold, should ever be the attitude of the British nation towards the nations of the world. (Cheers)

The statue was then unveiled by the Earl of Eglinton and Winton, the Lord Lieutenant. [11]

The London Stock Exchange commissioned Brock to design a memorial to those who had died in the South African War. It took the form of a bronze bas relief set in an ornate marble surround with a classical broken pediment on top, Corinthian columns on either side and the badge of the Stock Exchange at the base. The bas relief depicted cavalry charging into action with field guns of the Royal Artillery giving covering fire. Above was a plaque supported by two angels, their heads bowed in mourning, with the inscription:

War in South Africa 1899-1902
In memory of Members and Clerks of the
Stock Exchange who died for their country

Below the bas relief were listed twenty three names, headed by Lt. Colonel F. H. Hoskier, Third Middlesex Artillery Volunteers.[12] The bas relief was destroyed by bombing in 1940, only the plaque remains.

In 1902 Brock was asked to execute the South African War Memorial for Wellington College, as he had been responsible for the bust of Archbishop Benson in the College Chapel. He consented to take it in hand, despite pressure of work from the Victoria Memorial.[13]

The memorial is a marble plaque (plate 145) on the wall of the Chapel. It is flanked by two freestanding bronze figures, a knight with sword and shield and a female saint holding a cross, representing *Courage* and *Faith* respectively, and crowned by a bronze angel, over the words 'Heroum Filii' (Sons of Heroes), while at the base is the legend 'South Africa 1899-1902'. It was unveiled by King Edward VII on 17 June 1907, in the presence of Queen Alexandra and the Prince of Wales (later George V). Brock was also there.

---

[11] *Ayr Advertiser* 6 November 1902
[12] J. Gildea *For Remembrance - South Africa 1899-1902* p. 139
[13] *Wellington Year Book* 1902 p. 40

The memorial shows New Sculpture influence in the bronze angel hovering over the whole monument and the two bronze saints, particularly the Donatello-like saint in armour, on which Brock was to model his much larger figure of *St Michael* (plate 111) for the Stock Exchange 1914-1918 Memorial. The fan-like decoration over the heads of the saints, reminiscent of the Thring memorial, was later replicated in the Victoria Memorial.

Another work in the category of war memorials is that to Brigadier General John Nicholson, hero of the Indian Mutiny (plate 73). Brock was commissioned to execute the bronze statue in 1902 on the recommendation of Sir Edward Poynter PRA, after Hamo Thornycroft declined.[14] It commemorates Nicholson's heroic actions in 1857, when he commanded the troops which stormed Delhi and was killed fighting on the ramparts.[15] *Nicholson* wears military uniform with drawn sword in his right hand. In the heat of the battle, his hat has fallen from his head and he stands defiantly awaiting the final onslaught.

When *Nicholson* was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1904, M. H. Spielmann commented that the statue was 'vigorous in the fashioning and violent in action'.[16] *The Builder* noted that it was 'the kind of thing that Mr Brock does better than anyone else'. The head was fine, but perhaps rather too gentle in expression for one who was such a determined fighter; and Nicholson's beard was fuller and squarer. However, as a memorial statue it was a fine piece of work.[17]

The statue was unveiled in New Delhi by the Viceroy (the Earl of Minto) in April 1906. After Independence it was removed from its plinth in Nicholson Gardens and placed in store until 1960, when it was purchased by Nicholson's old school, Dungannon Royal College in Northern Ireland.

A rather different work was Brock's monument in Belfast to the victims of the *Titanic* disaster, which although not a war memorial is not out of place in this chapter. The White Star liner, built in the Harland and Wolff shipyard at Belfast, sank on its maiden voyage on 15 April 1912. Over 1,500 lives were lost, of whom 22 had a direct connection with Belfast. Within three weeks, it was decided that a public memorial

---

[14] *Pioneer Mail and Indian Weekly News* 21 July 1905 p. 10

[15] Queen Victoria awarded him the equivalent of a posthumous KCB and he was the subject of Hesketh Pearson's *The Hero of Delhi* (1939).

[16] *M of A* 1904 p. 108

[17] *Builder* 18 June 1904 p. 652

should be erected in memory of 'those who acted so nobly in the tragic circumstances attending the loss of the Titanic... to tell succeeding generations of their heroism and devotion to duty'.[18]

A sum of £1,000 was quickly raised and Brock, who was well known in Belfast for his statues of Queen Victoria (1903) and Sir Edward Harland (1903), was asked to design a suitable memorial to join them outside the City Hall. His plaster model was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1916, but completion of the marble statue was delayed by the 1914-1918 War, and it was not erected in Belfast until 1920.

The 12 ft (3.7 m) high group stands on a 10 ft (3 m) granite pedestal (plate 120). It depicts an ideal figure of a lady in classical dress, a laurel wreath on her head and another in her outstretched hand. At her feet two sea-nymphs support a drowning seaman or passenger - one nymph, with a very contemporary (1916) hair style, raises her left hand as if seeking help from the main figure. The symbolism is not immediately apparent. As the declared purpose of the Titanic memorial committee was to commemorate the heroism of those who died, the female figure probably represents *Fame* and the laurel wreath indicates that by their devotion to duty the crew members had won eternal recognition.[19]

The Builder was not happy about the Titanic Memorial:

> The composition is highly complex and is not given strength by any really strong basic lines. The contours, too, are meaningless, and the whole thing fails to impress because the eye is allowed to wander about from one little point of interest to another.[20]

The memorial was unveiled by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Field Marshal Viscount French, on 25 June 1920. Brock was unable to attend due to ill-health. Although many tributes were paid to those who had died in the Titanic, only the chairman of the memorial committee seems to have commented on the monument itself, which she thought 'beautiful'.[21]

Brock was nearly 70 when he executed this memorial and it is not one of his most successful works. It shows the New Sculpture in decline - obscure symbolism, lack of coherence and an absence of a real feeling for a major marine disaster.

---

[18] S. Cameron *Belfast Newsletter* 1995 pp. 12-14
[19] *Fame* has been misprinted as *Thane* in some official Belfast City publications
[20] *Builder* 5 May 1916 p. 329
[21] S. Cameron pp. 4-5

Brock's first Great War memorial was commissioned in 1917. Lieutenant Colonel the Hon. Guy Victor Baring, fourth son of Lord Ashburton and MP for Winchester, was killed in September 1916 while commanding the 1st Battalion Coldstream Guards at the battle of the Somme. Brock's memorial in Winchester Cathedral takes the rather unusual form of a half life-size marble statuette (plate 10). *Baring* is standing, in full service uniform with Sam Browne belt, breeches and puttees. He holds his army cap by its peak in his right hand and grasps his walking stick in his left hand, and has a cape (or groundsheet) draped over his left arm. The statue stands in a marble niche with a New Sculpture shell pattern between two Corinthian columns, reminiscent in style of the Wellington College War Memorial. His family coat-of-arms is placed above and his sword rests horizontally below.[22]

Brock's second Great War memorial was of Captain Charles Grant Seely, who was killed in Palestine in 1917 at the age of 23. The recumbent figure in marble shows the young officer in army uniform, his hands resting on his sword and his feet crossed like a Crusader (he died in the Holy Land) (plate 113). It was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1921. Brock also executed the marble and alabaster sarcophagus, on which there are two relief panels showing the British Military Cemetery at Gaza and a view of Jerusalem, as well as armorial shields with the family and regimental arms. The memorial stands in St Olave's Church, Gatcombe (Isle of Wight) and was unveiled by Princess Beatrice on 30 September 1922 - one month after Brock's own death.[23]

Brock's son Frederick believed that the memorial to Charles Seely, the last piece of sculpture finished by Brock, was one of his best works. For many years he had wished to execute an ideal work under the title of *The Enigma*, in the form of a sleeping youth - sleeping the sleep of death. Because of the pressure of other commissions, he was never able to do this. However, in the sleeping figure of the young soldier Brock expressed something of what he had hoped to achieve in the ideal work. When Sir Charles and Lady Seely asked him to execute the tomb of their eldest son, Brock seized the opportunity to symbolise the splendid sacrifice made by so many in the war and to depict 'the solemnity, the stillness and the peaceful look of death, of representing his sleep not as an endless one but one from which in God's good time he would awake'.[24]

---

[22] R. Goldsmith *Military Memorials of Winchester* Winchester 1974 p. 19
[23] Brock p. 250-1
[24] ibid p. 249

There is a rather sad epilogue. A soldier named Kerley was killed at Gallipoli in 1916 and the shock led to his sister being placed in Whitecroft, a mental home quite close to Gatcombe church. When the handsome monument to the deceased son of the local squire appeared in Gatcombe church, and Private Kerley did not receive a similar mark of appreciation, the sister perceived this as a form of injustice and decided to take matters into her own hands. She escaped from the mental home and attacked the statue with an iron bar, breaking off the nose. The statue has remained in this vandalised state ever since - an enigma in a sense not foreseen by Brock.

In 1919 Brock was invited to provide the sculpture for the Stock Exchange War Memorial designed by Sir Aston Webb - one of the few occasions when he willingly collaborated with an architect.[25] A marble plaque was flanked by life-size bronze figures of *St Michael* (plate 111) and *St George* (plate 110). These are among Brock's best works. Like the statue of *Courage* on the Wellington College War Memorial (plate 145), they show the influence of Donatello but avoid the rather effeminate appearance of some New Sculpture warrior saints such as Alfred Gilbert's *St George*. The memorial was unveiled by the Earl of Balfour on 27 October 1922, eight weeks after Brock's death.[26] The bronze figures survived the bombing of the Stock Exchange in the 1939-45 war, although Webb's architectural setting was destroyed.

Brock's last war memorial was for Queen's University, Belfast. In March 1919 the University Services Club decided to commemorate those who had fallen in the war by a symbolic statue, with the cost (£4,294) raised by public subscription. Brock's sketch model of a Winged Victory sustaining a stricken youth was approved by the committee shortly before his death in 1922. Arnold Wright, his principal assistant, was responsible for preparing the final version in bronze (plate 87), which was unveiled on 21 July 1924 by the Duke of York (later George VI).[27] Wright also completed the Godman and Salvin plaque in the Natural History Museum (1923) and the Lister Memorial (plate 67) in Portland Place, unveiled March 1924.

Brock's plaster model for a proposed Welsh National War Memorial in Cathay Park, Cardiff was offered to the National Museum of Wales by his son Frederick after Brock's death, together with a model of *Eve*. The Keeper (O. Williams) praised the artist's

---

[25] ibid pp. 258-9
[26] *Times* 28 October 1922
[27] R. Marshall *History of Queen's University Services Club 1916-68* Belfast 1968 pp. 14-17,24

sketch design, which although not carried beyond the stage of initial conception, nevertheless displayed 'all the grandeur of form and proportion' which would have been a striking feature of the finished work had it been carried out.[28]

In December 1915 the heavy loss of life suffered by the British Army focused public attention on the general question of war memorial design and *The Times* asked Brock for his views. He gave the reporter a hard time, saying that the first business was to finish the war; until then, it seemed 'useless to discuss mere questions of art, and foolish to consider memorials of a victory not yet won'. Even when reminded that monuments to individuals were already being erected, Brock doubted whether guidance would be much use. 'There are men among our students and workers - architects, sculptors, metal workers, artists and craftsmen of all kinds - quite capable of giving a noble and artistic turn to the outburst of feeling which rightly desires to express itself in material memorials. If the country but knows enough to demand the right thing and to go to the right men, the men are there. If anyone fails, it will be the public, not the artist'.[29]

However, the formation of the Civic Arts Association on the initiative of Lord Beauchamp in February 1916, and its decision to hold a war memorial competition with Frederick Pomeroy and Thomas Stirling Lee as judges, caused Brock to revise his views.[30] At a meeting of the Royal Society of British Sculptors in May 1916 he proposed that the 1917 Royal Academy Winter Exhibition should be dedicated to designs for war memorials. Members of the Society were asked to reserve their efforts for this exhibition and not to support the competition being organised by the Civic Arts Association.[31] At a subsequent meeting of the Society's Council, Brock explained that the dominant note in the Academy exhibition would be monumental designs for war memorials, although small figures or groups, if in harmony with their surroundings, would not be excluded. The Council passed a unanimous vote of thanks to Brock 'for the valuable services he had rendered to sculptors in obtaining for them an opportunity of the greatest importance to their profession'.[32]

At the 1917 Winter Exhibition, whose official title was 'The Exhibition of Graphic Arts', some one hundred sketch models of memorials of all kinds were shown. Rather

---

[28] National Museum of Wales, Acc. 23-182 of 22 January 1923
[29] *Times* 29 December 1915
[30] *Builder* 4 February 1916 p. 109 and 12 May 1916 p. 351
[31] Royal Society of British Sculptors (RSBS) Minute Book 15 May 1916
[32] ibid 15 June 1916

surprisingly, Brock submitted his model of the Leighton Memorial (plate 62), originally seen at the 1900 RA Exhibition. Despite its not being a war memorial, *The Builder* considered it the finest work in the exhibition:

> there is nothing which is equal in merit to Sir Thomas Brock's beautiful sketch model for the tomb of Lord Leighton, which conveys the impression of resfulness and dignity as a tomb should. We do not recall anything the veteran sculptor has carried out which does him greater credit than this memorial to a fellow artist and friend. [33]

Following this exhibition, the RA Council appointed a special committee to draw up guidelines on war memorials. It comprised two sculptors (Brock and Thornycroft), two architects (Reginald Blomfield and Aston Webb) and two painters (Frank Dicksee and Charles Sims) with the PRA (Edward Poynter) as Chairman. Its report, published in April 1918, was a model of brevity and clarity, and made suggestions (rather than laying down rules) on choice of sculptor, selection and layout of site, types of material, scale and lettering. The emphasis should be on simplicity and proportion - it was the imaginative and intellectual quality of the work which gave it its final value, rather than cost or profusion of detail.[34] This practical and open-minded approach, and the absence of any specific aesthetic directives, was a welcome change from the rigid academic prescriptions which might have been expected from such a committee in pre-war days.[35]

---

[33] *Builder*2 February 1917 p. 82

[34] ibid 12 April 1918 p. 222

[35] Mary Anne Stevens on 'A Quiet Revolution: The Royal Academy 1900-1950', *The Edwardians and After* exhibition catalogue Royal Academy of Arts 1988 p. 20

Chapter 14: Portraits of the Queen - the Empire at its zenith

Queen Victoria's Golden Jubilee prompted a surge in public monuments, and the *Art Journal* rather cynically observed that 1887 would be a year of thanksgiving for sculptors, as more than 25 statues of the Queen had been commissioned.[1] Among the works by New Sculptors was Alfred Gilbert's flamboyant bronze statue for Winchester (plate 166), with the *Queen* seated on an elaborate throne, swathed in voluminous robes and with a large but fragile crown suspended somewhat precariously over her head. Onslow Ford (Manchester) and George Frampton (Leeds and St Helens) followed Gilbert's lead, without the suspended crown. Brock, competing for the Worcester commission, offered a more restrained design in marble.

In November 1886 the High Sheriff of Worcester called a meeting to discuss how best to commemorate the Queen's Jubilee. The Bishop of Worcester, Dr Philpott, proposed that a statue should be erected and sent a £50 donation.[2] The idea of a statue was approved at a further meeting in January 1887, and a memorial committee was set up. Five sculptors sought the commission: Edgar Boehm's proposal to supply a replica of his Windsor statue was rejected and Brock was selected. He agreed to execute a marble statue for £1,600, but would reduce this sum by £100 if subscriptions fell short.

In January 1890 the memorial committee, having visited Brock's studio, approved his sketch model of the statue, but suggested that the pedestal should be more ornamental. Brock prepared a design for a decorated pedestal and wrote to the committee:

> Feeling that I could still further improve the design, and being extremely anxious that the model should be in every way worthy of the Queen and of the country, I set to work again and produced the final sketch now submitted, which I venture to think is by far the most satisfactory of them all, and certainly the one I should prefer to rest my reputation upon.

As the revised design in marble and with bas reliefs would have raised the total cost to £2,000, the committee reluctantly decided to adhere to the more economical version.

Brock now started work on a 17 ton piece of Carrara marble, reducing it to a statue of nine tons (plate 100).[3] The statue was 10 ft (3 m) high and stood on a 13 ft (4 m) pedestal. The *Worcester Herald* described it thus:

---

[1] *AJ* 1886 p. 350

[2] The Bishop, whose wife unveiled Brock's *Baxter* in 1875, may have influenced the choice of Brock

[3] *Worcester Herald* 8 November 1890

> The figure of the Queen, which is marked by great dignity and majesty, is arranged in full regal state. She is crowned, and wears a robe which falls to the ground at the back, and in the front is open, showing the dress. An embroidery of roses relieves the plainness of the robe, and in the front of the skirt of the dress there is a light decorative combination of the rose, the thistle, and the shamrock. On her breast the Queen wears the ribbon and badge of the Garter, and in her hands she holds the sceptre and the orb. The statue is a distinctly striking one, full of life and evidently the work of truly artistic hands.
>
> ... The face is a speaking likeness. The sympathetic, yet distinct firmness of the Queen's mobile lips, the somewhat mournful tenderness of her expressive eyes, and the rounded softness of her hair across the temples, are reproduced with wondrous fidelity.[4]

The statue was unveiled by the Lord Lieutenant (Earl Beauchamp) on 6 November 1890, in the presence of thousands of spectators, including Brock, his wife and Richard Binns, his former employer at the Worcester Royal Porcelain Works. Lord Beauchamp expressed great satisfaction that the sculptor was a native of Worcester, and at the conclusion of the ceremony 'three cheers were given for her Majesty by the military forces; and for Mr Brock by the whole of those present'.[5]

Brock's Worcester statue marked an important development in the iconography of the Queen. He sought to create an image, rather than a photographic likeness. He had to conceal Victoria's rather dumpy stature and to avoid making the Queen appear too young - or too old. His objective was to produce a dignified and graceful work, which would be seen as a realistic representation of the Queen as a person, not as an ideal figure. He depicted Victoria in a regal pose, with a serene expression. He solved the question of costume by clothing her in the full robes of the Order of the Garter, and showed his eye for detail in the rich embroidery of the Queen's gown, the tassels of her Garter robes and the decoration on her orb and sceptre.

He was the first, or one of the first, sculptors to show the robes trailing over the pedestal. Another original touch was to give the monarch more dignity by changing the proportions of the figure, adding length from the waist downwards, and raising the statue on a substantial pedestal. He thus struck a happy medium between the elaboration of Gilbert, Ford and Frampton and the rather pedestrian versions by sculptors of the old school like Matthew Noble (plate 169), Charles Birch (plate 156) and Edgar Boehm (plate 157). As Elizabeth Darby pointed out,

---

[4] ibid 8 March 1890

[5] ibid 8 November 1890

> The gentle contrapposto of the figure, and the deep folds of the cloak and skirt, also impart grace and lightness to the statue, which contrasts with the static heaviness of the images by Birch, Boehm and Williamson.[6]

Brock's version may not have been as original or as inventive as Alfred Gilbert's statue of the Queen at Winchester, but it corresponded much more closely to the popular perception of the sovereign.

The citizens of Cape Town also decided to commemorate the Jubilee with a marble statue of the Queen. The committee first approached Edgar Boehm, but Brock undercut him by offering a full size replica of the Worcester statue for the bargain price of £1,000. It was unveiled by the Governor, Sir Henry Loch, on 21 January 1890 - some ten months before the Worcester statue.[7]

The Queen's Diamond Jubilee in 1897 prompted an even greater demand for commemorative statues than the Golden Jubilee. On 13 November 1896 a Diamond Jubilee memorial committee was established in Belfast and Brock was invited to submit a sketch model. His design, based broadly on the Worcester statue and costing £5,000, was approved by the committee on 1 September 1897.[8] The statue was to be of Sicilian marble, 11 ft high (3.35 m) (twice life size) standing on a 14 ft (4.27 m) carved and moulded pedestal of Irish limestone (plate 88).

The most striking difference from the Worcester version was the addition of three allegorical figures in bronze depicting the major benefits Victoria's reign had brought to Belfast - *Education*, a child reading, *Shipbuilding*, a workman holding the hull of a ship (plate 89), and *Spinning*, a girl in peasant costume. Gilbert had incorporated symbolic statuettes on his Winchester monument, but large-scale figures as now designed by Brock for the Belfast memorial had not previously been used on monuments to the Queen. Whereas the allegorical figures on the O'Connell Monument in Dublin were in classical dress, the figures representing *Shipbuilding* and *Spinning* wore contemporary working dress, the first time Brock had adopted this style. This more naturalistic modelling had echoes of A-J. Dalou's *Charity* (plate 159), which had been a formative influence on the New Sculpture, and Hamo Thornycroft's *Mower* (plate 174).[9] The

---

[6] E. Darby *Statues of Queen Victoria & Prince Albert: a Study in Commemorative and Portrait Statuary 1837-1924* PhD Thesis London University 1983 p. 323
[7] *Guide to Capetown* 1891 p. 49
[8] *Builder* 11 September 1897 p. 209
[9] Darby pp. 353-4

statue was unveiled by King Edward VII on 27 July 1903 and the King was presented with a silver replica 15" (38 cm) high made by Gibson and Co.[10]

In June 1897 Birmingham City Council accepted an offer by William Henry Barber to pay for a statue of the Queen in memory of his father. Barber specified that the statue should be by Thomas Brock and be 'similar to that subscribed for by the citizens of Worcester to celebrate the 50th year of Her Majesty's reign, and to that more recently subscribed for by the citizens of Belfast to celebrate the forthcoming Diamond Jubilee'.[11] It was the fourth of the 'Worcester' type and cost £2,000 (plate 90).

The statue, in Sicilian marble and standing on a 12 ft (3.66 m) pedestal of Cornish granite in front of the Council House, was unveiled by the daughter of the Lord Mayor, Alderman Samuel Edwards, on 10 January 1901.[12] The statue suffered from pollution damage over the years, and in 1951 the City Council accepted an offer by the Birmingham Civic Society to make a grant of £800 to have it restored by William Bloye, cast in bronze by H. H. Martyn and Co. of Cheltenham, and re-erected on a new pedestal of Cornish granite. The actual cost of the bronze casting was £1,826, and the pedestal cost £500.[13] The restored statue was unveiled by Princess (later Queen) Elizabeth on 9 June 1951.[14]

A marble statue was also commissioned by the Junior Constitutional Club of London in 1897. This was simpler and smaller (6 ft 6 in, 2 m) than the Worcester one, and 'the technical skill and command of three-dimensional form [are] ably demonstrated in the deep undercutting of the projecting folds of the imperial cloak'.[15] It was unveiled by the Prime Minister (Lord Salisbury) on 5 February 1902, and now stands in Carlton House Terrace (plate 99).

The fourth of the Diamond Jubilee statues, and the only one in bronze, was commissioned by Hove at a cost of £3,000 (plate 95). A public meeting on 9 April 1896 decided to commemorate the Diamond Jubilee of Queen with a statue which should be 'a work of art'.[16] An executive committee was appointed to choose the sculptor and to decide on the form and location of the statue.

---

[10] *ILN* 8 August 1903 p. 204
[11] Birmingham City Council: Minute 17,354 pp. 681-2: letter to Lord Mayor, 17 June 1897
[12] G. T. Noszlopy *Public Sculpture of Birmingham* Liverpool University Press 1998 pp. 145-6
[13] Birmingham City Council: Public Works Committee Report 4 July 1950 pp. 156-7
[14] *ILN* 16 June 1951 p. 989
[15] Darby p 387
[16] *Hove Echo* 16 April 1896

The committee commissioned Brock to 'design a Memorial Statue of large proportions and of the highest class'. Accordingly, Brock made the figure of the Queen taller (13 ft, 3.96 m) than the Worcester version (10 ft, 3.05 m). The impression of height is further increased by placing the statue on an ornately decorated bronze base set on the 14 ft (4.26 m) pedestal. Her head faces forward rather than turning to one side, giving a more restful image; and she wears a rather larger veil, with no widow's cap. The dramatic folds of the Garter robes are more voluminous that in the Worcester statue and increase the statue's monumentality. Elizabeth Darby's verdict is that the

> statue is impressive and awe-inspiring. More than a mere likeness of Queen Victoria, it conveys an idea of the magnitude of the British Empire at its zenith.[17]

Significantly, the orb is surmounted by a *Winged Victory* symbolic of imperial power and majesty. While it is possible that Brock was inspired by the figure of Victory on the orb of Alfred Gilbert's seated *Victoria* for Winchester, the device had earlier been used by Canova in his *Napoleon as Mars the Peacemaker* (Apsley House).[18] When a small (13 in 33 cm) bronze statuette of Gilbert's *Victory* came up for sale at Christie's in 1905, Brock recommended that it should be purchased for the Victoria and Albert Museum:

> I consider it a very beautiful work ... This figure has evidently been cast under Mr Gilbert's supervision and therefore has additional value.[19]

Brock's design included four bas reliefs on the pedestal. This suggestion had been turned down by the Worcester committee on grounds of cost, but the Hove committee were more concerned to obtain a work 'possessing the highest artistic merits'. They not only approved the bas reliefs, but also decided that the statue and reliefs should be in bronze (rather than in marble), and the pedestal in granite, to ensure that it would be 'of the most permanent and imperishable nature'.[20]

When the concept of a statue was approved in April 1896 the chairman of Hove Council had referred to 'the extraordinary developments in arts and science, in trade and commerce ... [and] the education of the poorest' during Victoria's reign. Brock adopted these themes for three of the bas-reliefs, which depict *Art and Science, Commerce* and *Education.* Never afraid to re-use one of his own conceptions, he based his designs for *Commerce* and *Education* on the Rathbone plaques (plates 105 & 106). He retained the

---

[17] Darby p. 379

[18] R. Dorment *Alfred Gilbert, Sculptor and Goldsmith* exhibition catalogue Royal Academy 1986 p. 128

[19] Victoria and Albert Museum Register No. 1030/1905, quoting Brock's letter of 13 December 1905. Brock recommended that the Museum bid up to 200 guineas (£210), but the Museum paid only £131.5/-

[20] *Order of the Unveiling Ceremony,* issued 4 February 1901 (Hove Public Library)

rather formal imagery and classical dress of the earlier plaques, but the Hove figures were in lower relief, giving an impressionistic image more typical of the New Sculpture.

The plaque depicting *Empire* (plate 96) in the place of honour at the front of the pedestal is the most interesting of the four. The central seated female figure represents the ideal of imperial rule. The scales of justice rest on her lap, indicating that the Queen's Dominions were ruled with fairness and equity. She is flanked by four standing male figures - on her right, *Canada* and *Australia* in working dress, the former holding an axe, the latter wearing a bush hat. On her left, representing *Asia* and *Africa*, a Parsee wearing traditional dress, and peering from behind, almost obscured by the Parsee, an African. While the symbolism is clear, the whole composition is rather overcrowded.

It was wise of Hove to decide that their statue be cast in bronze. Not only did this give Brock an opportunity for greater detail in robes, decorations and other accoutrements, but it also provided added durability for a statue exposed to the elements - the site chosen was on the sea front.

The Queen died on 22 January 1901 and the statue was unveiled on 9 February 1901 by the Mayoress of Hove in a subdued ceremony just three weeks later.[21] The fact that it was the first statue to be unveiled after the Queen's death attracted considerable attention, and five more cities (Agra, Brisbane, Carlisle, Cawnpore and Lucknow) ordered replicas.

The citizens of Carlisle decided on 12 February 1901 to erect a memorial statue to the late Queen, and on 12 March 1901 voted £1,500 for this purpose. The memorial committee visited Hove and reported that Brock's statue was full of grace, dignity and majesty and a good personal likeness of the late Queen.[22] They also visited Brock's studio and Brock went to Carlisle in August 1901 to view possible sites. In 1902 the Mayor and three other donors gave £400 for the same four bas-reliefs (plate 94) as Hove to be placed on the pedestal. The bronze statue (plate 93), 13 ft (3.96 m) high on a 15 ft (4.6 m) pedestal of grey Aberdeen granite, was unveiled on 7 July 1902 by Prince Christian of Schleswig Holstein, Queen Victoria's son-in-law.[23]

In September 1901 a memorial committee in Cawnpore (India), headed by Alexander M'Robert, owner of the Cawnpore Woollen Mills, commissioned a bronze replica of the

---

[21] *Builder* 23 February 1901 p. 179. Plates 93 & 94 show a statue identical to the Hove one.
[22] *ILN* 12 July 1902 p. 52
[23] *Builder* 19 July 1902 p. 61

Hove statue, although the Queen wears a diadem, not a crown.[24] The same four bas-reliefs as on the Hove statue were placed on the 18 ft (5.5 m) pedestal, which was made locally of Orchha stone from a design by Brock. The statue arrived in July 1903 and was unveiled by the Lieutenant Governor, Sir James La Touche, on 27 January 1904.[25] A similar bronze statue was commissioned by Lucknow, and installed on a granite pedestal in Victoria Park.[26]

Meanwhile in Agra the memorial committee were anxious not to appear simply to be copying Cawnpore and Lucknow. After discussions with Brock, it was agreed in early 1902 that a bronze replica of the Hove statue would be supplied for £1,500 on a 14 ft (4.26 m) pedestal of Carrara marble. However, the setting would be quite different. The statue would be flanked by allegorical winged figures depicting *Truth* and *Justice*, and the pedestal would have only one bas-relief, depicting *Empire*. The whole monument was set in an ornamental pond, with bronze shell fountains designed by Brock - an idea undoubtedly suggested by his proposed scheme for the Victoria Memorial in London, which had been made public a short time before.

It was also typical of Brock to suggest the inclusion of *Justice* and *Truth* on the memorial. Work on the Gladstone memorial for Liverpool was proceeding in Brock's studio at this time, and it is clear that the Agra figures were based on the Liverpool ones (plates 48 & 49): another instance of Brock's cost-effectiveness. He may also have enjoyed the irony of Queen Victoria and Gladstone, whose relations were notoriously difficult, sharing the same virtues. The Agra statue was cast at the Thames Ditton foundry; Brock's fee was £1,500.[27] It unveiled by the Prince of Wales (later King George V) on 18 December 1905.[28]

Brock had one other Indian commission at this time, for Bangalore. The memorial committee first considered establishing a technical institute, but after a public meeting in May 1902 it was decided to have a statue. However, instead of a bronze statue of the Hove type, the Bangalore committee ordered a marble replica of the Worcester statue,

---

[24] M. A. Steggles *Statues of the Raj* BACSA (British Association for Cemeteries in South Asia) 2000 p. 194. Brock later executed busts of M'Robert and his wife

[25] *Times* 16 February 1904

[26] Steggles p. 194

[27] ibid p. 196

[28] Darby p. 399

11 ft (3.35 m) high on a 13 ft (3.96 m) pedestal. It arrived in India in July 1905 and was unveiled by the Prince of Wales on 5 February 1906, eight weeks after the Agra statue.[29]

The citizens of Brisbane. Australia, had established a committee in April 1901 to erect a memorial to the late Queen. In September 1903 a representative group in London, including Brock's friend Frank Dicksee, were asked to recommend a suitable sculptor.[30] Brock, Frampton, Thornycroft and Derwent Wood were invited to submit proposals and Brock was awarded the commission in March 1904, possibly because he was able to offer a bronze statue similar to Hove's at a bargain price of £1,000 (reduced from £1,500). He was reluctant to start work until he received the first instalment of the purchase money (£500) as was the recognised custom. When the amount expected was not forthcoming, he sent a gentle reminder.[31] The statue (plate 91) was shipped to Brisbane in December 1905 and unveiled by the Governor of Queensland, Lord Chelmsford, on 23 June 1906.[32]

Michael Hedger, an Australian writer, has suggested that the statue echoed Bertram Mackennal's *Queen Victoria* at Ballarat, and was a replica of the original in Portsmouth.[33] As Brock's statue was not unveiled until 1906, while Mackennal's statue was installed in Ballarat in 1900, it is not surprising that Hedger saw echoes of Mackennal in Brock. However, Brock's original (Hove) design dates from 1897, and any 'echoes', intentional or otherwise, are from Brock to Mackennal. Brock was not responsible for the Portsmouth statue, which was by Alfred Drury.

In 1901, Brock executed a marble bust of Queen Victoria for Christ Church, Oxford, which was exhibited at the Royal Academy that year. Replicas of this bust are in Christ's Hospital, Horsham and the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool (plates 97 & 98). M. H. Spielmann had the following comment on this work:

> one of the noblest, most dignified and exquisite works of its class in England - full of tenderness, delicately and lovingly rendered. Carried so far that the marble almost breathes, it remains sculpture, free from trick. And the whole is a most finished and beautiful rendering of the Queen at her best - elegant, thoughtful, wise and solemn.[34]

---

[29] *Times* 6 February 1906
[30] *Brisbane Courier* 7 September 1903
[31] ibid 10 June 1904
[32] ibid 25 June 1906
[33] M. Hedger *Public Sculpture in Australia* Roseville, New South Wales 1995 p. 90
[34] Spielmann 1905 p. 422

On 20 January 1914 Lord Curzon commissioned a standing marble statue of the young Queen wearing her Coronation robes for the Victoria Memorial Hall in Calcutta. King George gave permission for Brock to base his work on Chantrey's bust of the Queen in Windsor Castle.[35] Brock, now 67, said that he hoped to complete the work before January 1917.[36] This deadline slipped due to the war, and it needed special intervention by Curzon to get the necessary marble from Italy.[37] It was not until November 1919 that Brock showed his statue to V. J. Esch, the superintendent architect of the Memorial Hall. Esch commented that the cheeks were far too puffy and high, that what showed of the foot was very large indeed, and that Brock had forgotten the wedding ring on the Queen's hand. Brock 'attended to these details' and the statue (plate 92) was despatched to India in October 1920.[38]

The Prince of Wales (later Edward VIII) opened the Memorial Hall on 28 December 1921, 'its greatest and most happily chosen ornament' being the white marble statue of Queen Victoria as a young, graceful woman.[39] *Murray's Handbook* says 'Passing through the Queen's vestibule into the Queen's Hall under the dome, one sees the dignified statue of Queen Victoria at the age when she ascended the throne; this gives the keynote to the whole edifice'.[40] Even Lord Curzon, notoriously difficult to please, seems to have been satisfied by the outcome; he wrote: 'The exquisite white marble full-length statue of Queen Victoria, executed by the late Sir Thomas Brock RA,... stands in solitary beauty under the dome'.[41]

Brock executed fourteen statues of Queen Victoria. Of these, twelve were standing figures, six in marble, for the Constitutional Club London, Worcester, Cape Town, Belfast, Birmingham and Bangalore; and six in bronze, for Hove, Carlisle, Cawnpore, Agra, Lucknow and Brisbane. There were also the Chantrey-based figure of the Queen at her accession for Calcutta and the seated figure of the Queen Empress for the Victoria Memorial, London. Brock was 40 when the first statue of Victoria was commissioned by Worcester (1887); he was 74 when the last was unveiled in Calcutta (1921).

---

[35] Edward VII had suggested to Curzon in 1904 that the statue should be modelled on Princess Louise's statue in Kensington Gardens, but Curzon evidently had other ideas (Darby p. 384)
[36] *Times* 18 May 1914
[37] Brock p. 256
[38] Darby p. 384
[39] *Daily Telegraph* 29 December 1921
[40] Quoted in V. S. Naipaul *The Overcrowded Barracoon* 1984 pp. 55-6
[41] Lord Curzon *British Government in India* 1925 p.200

The impact of the New Sculpture on such a well-established field as that of statues of the Queen was necessarily limited. Memorial committees were normally conservative in outlook and keen to have a traditional monument rather than anything unduly novel or controversial. Within these limits, Brock succeeded in raising the artistic standard of royal iconography in his Golden Jubilee statues.

When a further demand for royal statues was created by the Diamond Jubilee, Brock was quick to recognise that patriotism and pride called for a large, bolder figure with imperial attributes (such as the *Winged Victory* on the orb) and a higher pedestal decorated with plaques symbolising the Empire and the achievements of Victoria's reign. By the time of the Queen's death in January 1901, the Worcester and Hove statues had established Brock's reputation as an accomplished and reliable maker of royal monuments and helped to ensure his selection as the sculptor of the Victoria Memorial.

Alfred Gilbert and George Frampton added a new dimension in terms of composition, materials and conception to their statues of Queen Victoria, but there was a tendency to over-elaboration in their treatment, with decorative accessories which were subject to damage by weather and acts of vandalism. While their images were inventive and evocative, the works of Brock, Thornycroft, Mackennal and Drury were equally impressive but more solidly constructed and thus more durable.[42]

---

[42] Darby p. 390

Chapter 15: Equestrian Statues: *Edward the Black Prince* and *Edward VII*

In 1880 the City of London Corporation announced an open competition for equestrian statuary to be placed on four plinths of Blackfriars Bridge. Brock had considerable experience in executing equestrian statues, including *Canning* and *Gough*, the two *Maharajahs of Nepal* and *A Moment of Peril*, and entered the competition, for which a total of forty nine entries were received. An advisory panel comprising Leighton, George Frederick Watts, William Calder Marshall and Horace Jones (the City of London architect) proposed in December 1881 that modest prizes be awarded to seven competitors, but decided not to recommend any of the designs, or the sculptors themselves, for the actual work. [1]

The saga continued through 1882 and 1883, and in the spring of 1884 the Bridge Committee visited the studios of some 12 sculptors including Brock.[2] Seven sculptors were invited to submit sketch models of equestrian statues one eighth full size: they were two RAs (Henry Armstead and Sir Edgar Boehm); three ARAs (Thornycroft, Birch and Brock); John Adams Acton; and Richard Belt, still a favourite of the Corporation despite the Belt v. Lawes lawsuit. Brock submitted a model of King Edward III.[3] This showed the king in armour and wearing a crown, with a banner in his right hand (plate 26) somewhat in the fashion of Emanuel Frémiet's *Joan of Arc*.[4]

In February 1886 the selection committee narrowed the field to four - Armstead (*Edward III*), Birch (*Henry V*), Boehm (*Richard I*) and Thornycroft (*Edward I*) (plate 172). Despite the fact that Armstead's *Edward III* had been selected, Brock asked (in vain) that he should be allowed to resubmit his *Edward III* or offer another design.[5] His plea was ignored, and in July 1886 the four sculptors provisionally selected were

---

[1] Beattie p. 41
[2] Bridge House Estates Committee minutes Vol. 10: Brock's letter of 28 February 1884
[3] Not Edward VI, as stated in Beattie p. 42
[4] L. Parkes: *Art in the City of London* p. 150
[5] Bridge House Estates Committee minutes Vol. 11: Brock's letter of 21 May 1886

confirmed. Six months later the City of London Corporation decided to abandon the whole idea of statues and to erect lampstandards, much to the fury of the sculptors.

Meanwhile Sir Edgar Boehm was winning most of the commissions in this field, with the *Prince of Wales* for Bombay (1878), *Lord Napier* for Calcutta (1880), *St George and the Dragon* (1876 plaster, 1885 bronze) for Melbourne and the *Duke of Wellington* for Hyde Park Corner (1884). Nor did matters improve for Brock after Boehm's death in 1890, as two New Sculptors were given equestrian commissions - Onslow Ford for *Field Marshal Lord Strathnairn* (1891) and Harry Bates for *Lord Roberts* (1894). Brock's opportunity finally came in 1896 when he was chosen by Colonel Walter Harding to execute a bronze equestrian statue of the Black Prince for Leeds City Square.

Walter Harding was a wealthy businessman who founded Leeds Art Gallery and commanded the Leeds Artillery Volunteers - hence his title of 'Colonel'. He was determined that the site in the centre of the city left vacant by the demolition of the Old Cloth Hall should become a square of which Leeds would be proud, properly planned and embellished with statuary[6]. At its meeting on 23 March 1896, the Leeds and Yorkshire Archaeological Society proposed that the main feature should be a pack-horse ridden by a cloth merchant, symbolic of the importance of this trade to Leeds.[7] However, Colonel Harding wanted the central figure to be an emblem of those manly and useful virtues which make a patriot and a gentleman. In the absence of a local hero who met these criteria, national figures were considered, such as Henry V, Simon de Montfort and Edward I.[8]

A design for City Square prepared by the Leeds City Architect and exhibited in May 1896 had for its central feature a mounted figure resembling Thornycroft's model of Edward I (for the Blackfriars Bridge Competition), which had been exhibited at the Leeds Spring Festival the previous year.[9] However, Harding decided on the Black Prince in view of the Prince's role in the defence of parliamentary institutions as a

---

[6] G. Black: 'City Square and Colonel Harding', *Thoresby Society Journal* Vol. 16 Part II 1974 pp. 106-7
[7] *Builder* 28 March 1896 p. 278
[8] Leeds City Library: *The City Square Statues* (undated pamphlet)
[9] B. Lewis 'The Black Prince in Leeds City Square' *Leeds Art Calendar* No. 84 1979 p. 21

complement to his warlike deeds.[10] In December 1896 it was announced that Brock had been chosen as the sculptor, and his model, one sixth actual size, was exhibited at the Leeds City Art Gallery in the same month. There was some criticism of the work's 'prettiness and swagger', so Brock modified his design, making the horse heavier and tying the tail in a knot.[11]

Brock's son states that his father did the entire 'building up' of the statue with his own hands, rather than entrusting this task to assistants, that he prepared the model in plaster rather than clay, and that he spent three years on the massive statue.[12] Frederick Brock was not a sculptor himself and some of his technical comments need to be treated with caution. Statues were normally modelled in clay so that alterations could easily be made, after which a plaster model was cast from the clay. There would seem to be no particular reason why Brock should have altered the procedure in this case.

The casting was done in Brussels by the Compagnie des Bronzes and the heavy crate was shipped from Antwerp to Hull by the Wilson liner *Otto*, then by canal barge by the Aire and Calder Navigation Company to Leeds. Despite clear instructions that the crate should be stowed upright, it arrived in Hull on its side. An inspection confirmed that no damage had been done, and the crate was then lowered into the barge. Colonel Harding, always a stickler for correct procedure, noticed that the horse and rider faced towards the stern of the vessel, and demanded that the crate be raised and reversed. The problem was solved more simply by turning the barge around.[13]

The *Black Prince* (plates 16 & 17) was installed in City Square on 31 August 1903. He is in chain mail armour, his helmet surmounted by a coronet, a long sword in its scabbard by his left side and a shorter sword in its sheath to the right, based on Brock's study of the Black Prince's effigy and accoutrements in Canterbury Cathedral. Around the top of the pedestal, which is of polished granite, is a frieze of shields showing

---

[10] The inscription on the pedestal of the statue reads: Edward Prince of Wales, surnamed the Black Prince, the Hero of Crecy and Poitiers, the Flower of English Chivalry and Upholder of the Rights of the People in the Good Parliament

[11] Black p. 110

[12] Brock pp. 122-3

[13] I. Broadhead 'A Right Royal Caper' in *Canal and Riverboat* October 1991 pp. 22-3

alternately the Royal Coat of Arms and the three ostrich feathers of the Prince of Wales. On each side of the pedestal are two large bronze bas-reliefs of complex battle scenes with figures in high and low relief. One depicts a land battle (plate 18), usually assumed to be the battle of Crecy at which the 16 year old Prince famously won his spurs, but which could equally represent the battle of Poitiers, when he was personally responsible for the victory and captured the King of France (John II). The other depicts a naval battle, often referred to as the battle of Sluys. As this took place in 1340, when the Prince was only 10 years old, it seems more likely that the relief depicts the sea-fight of Winchelsea (otherwise known as the battle of L'Espagnols-sur-Mer) in 1350. At the four corners of the pedestal are leopard's heads.

Around the base of the pedestal is an intricately carved bronze scroll with the names of eight of the Prince's contemporaries. Two were comrades in arms and fellow Garter Knights - Sir John Chandos and Sir Walter de Manny. William de Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester, sided with the Black Prince in the 'Good Parliament', and Jean de Froissart chronicled his main battles. Harding himself explained that Jacob van Artvelde was included because he was a 'democratic ruler of the Flemish states' who had great influence on King Edward III and encouraged weavers, fullers and dyers of earth to come to the West Riding of Yorkshire, thus laying the foundations of the great wool trade on which the prosperity of Leeds was based.[14] Bertrand du Guesclin was the most famous French opponent of the Black Prince - twice captured by him, and twice released after payment of a large ransom, he was largely responsible for finally driving the English out of Gascony. The inclusion of Geoffrey Chaucer and John Wycliffe is a little more quixotic, and reflects Harding's enthusiasm for mediaeval history rather than any direct link with the Prince.

The formal opening of the new square, and the presentation of the *Black Prince* and other statuary to the City of Leeds, took place on 16 September 1903. Some 100,000 people attended the ceremony, at which Brock was present. During the civic luncheon which followed, Harding said:

---

[14] *Leeds Mercury* 17 September 1903

> the little careers of us provincials soon pass and are utterly forgotten; and you will forgive me if I do feel some pride that my humble name may be remembered rather longer than it otherwise would be, merely because it is associated with that of Mr Brock on that noble monument.[15]

He quoted from a letter from Sir Edward Poynter which described the *Black Prince* as 'the finest equestrian statue of modern times in this or in any other country'. Another speaker, Sir Henry Irving, read a telegram from George Frampton, describing the statue as 'a very great and a very noble work'.

Hamo Thornycroft, who might at one point have expected to receive the Leeds commission himself, generously wrote to Brock on 21 October 1903: 'There is nothing grander in England, and I am proud that it has been done by an Englishman'.[16] The *Magazine of Art*, in its review of the 1902 Academy Exhibition at which a full size plaster model was shown, said:

> Mr Brock is the doyen among the exhibitors of note. The great statue of Edward the Black Prince erected in the quadrangle is a work of colossal size and makes a considerable impression. The armed warrior standing in his stirrup, as was the fashion of riding in those days, is imposing in his attitude, and the horse is admirably and freely modelled. This is what Marochetti aimed at doing in his *Richard Coeur de Lion* but failed.[17]

The *Art Journal* noted:

> Almost inevitably the horse reminds us of Verrocchio's splendid creation in Venice - this although in detail the two animals have little in common. The horse of the Black Prince moves forward with simple dignity; it is a serious and interesting effort of a kind markedly more satisfactory than that of the prancing steeds, unvital, unrealised, of too many of our monuments.[18]

More recently, Read commented that:

> in the sculpture of City Square, set up in 1903, Leeds must be almost without rival for an effective demonstration of contemporary work. The centrepiece is the massive equestrian statue of the Black Prince... This is by Brock and in the main figure in particular he demonstrates the application of New Sculptural qualities to a work of this scale, formulating striking detail work in bronze, not with the delicate intricacy of Gilbert or Frampton, which

---

[15] Brock p. 121
[16] ibid
[17] *M of A* 1902 p. 399
[18] *AJ* 1902 p. 219

> would be lost at that height, nor certainly with the flashy trickiness of, say, Marochetti's *Richard Coeur de Lion*, but with a studied firmness and power that is most effective.[19]

A note of dissent was sounded by *The Builder*. The influence of Verrocchio was evident in the statue's 'largeness' and dignity of manner, and from the rider's firm seat and proud attitude. However:

> As a monumental work there is dignity enough in it, and it would certainly look well in the middle of a public square; but we cannot say that it interests us very much.[20]

In similar vein Claude Phillips, art critic of the *Daily Telegraph*, wrote that 'it represented the high water mark of accomplished mediocrity'.[21] According to his son, this remark annoyed Brock very much. When he next met Phillips he told him point-blank what he thought about his remarks:

> He was not a man who made use of strong language, but he would express himself so forcibly, especially when he suspected another to have been guilty of insincerity, that the person confronted could not have been more embarassed [sic] had he peppered him with epithets of the most unparliamentary kind... No man likes to be asked in the presence of others to explain a public criticism of a work of art, especially when his interrogator is an artist of eminence and the author of the work in question.

Claude Phillips apparently took Brock's 'counterblow' in a sportsmanlike way, and the two were afterwards quite friendly. He is said never to have criticised any of Brock's works again publicly and in his obituary of Brock twenty years later he described the *Black Prince* as 'imposing'.[22]

In her comments on Harry Bates' equestrian statue of Lord Roberts, Susan Beattie concludes:

> As the reception of Bates's work suggests, the idea of the composite monument, combining reportage with 'high' art, had gained a firm hold on the public imagination. An interesting example of its application is the planning of Leeds City Square as a sculptural enclave.[23]

However, it is going too far to suggest that Bates' *Roberts* had a direct influence either on the design of the *Black Prince* or on the planning of Leeds City Square. Brock's

---

[19] Read 1982 p. 364
[20] *Builder* 31 May 1902 p. 534
[21] Quoted in Brock p. 122
[22] *Daily Telegraph* 23 August 1922
[23] Beattie p. 222

design was produced in the same year that Bates exhibited his model of *Roberts* and was very different in style and concept. Moreover *Roberts* stood in lofty isolation, whereas the *Black Prince* was the central point in a circular layout, involving eight figures representing *Morning* and *Evening* by Alfred Drury and statues of prominent Leeds citizens.

If the *Black Prince* has echoes of other sculptors this is partly because the number of different poses a horse and its rider can strike are strictly limited. Brock ruled out a dramatic pose as in the *Moment of Peril* (plate 70) or the contrapposto of the *Maharajah Jang Bahadur* (plate 71), and chose instead the dignified movement of *Canning* or *Gough* (plate 50). Nor does the *Black Prince* brandish a sword, like Marochetti's *Richard Coeur de Lion*, or a banner, like his own *Edward III* (plate 26) and Frémiet's *Joan of Arc*. The rather unusual sweeping gesture of the right arm is that of a statesman as much as a general, and reflects Edward's dual character as military hero and supporter of parliamentary democracy.

On 28 September 1903, Harding wrote to Brock:

> Thank you very much for your most kind letter enclosing receipt in full for £4,866, which with the £200 for the Burlington House plaster brings the cost to me [to] £5,066 which I have most willingly paid. I am quite conscious that financially it has been a poor business for you. On the other hand, it is a work that will sustain your fame long after we both have passed away.[24]

Brock executed two more equestrian statues in the last decade of his life - memorials to Edward VII in India and Australia. As these were only completed in 1921, and were never exhibited in England, they have tended to be overlooked.

The relationship between Edward VII and Brock covered some thirty years from 1881 to 1910. Edward was honorary chairman of four memorial committees where Brock was chosen to be the sculptor - *Henry Longfellow, Bartle Frere, Richard Owen* and *John Millais*. He also unveiled four of Brock's works - *Bartle Frere, Mars and*

---

[24] Brock p. 82. The *Black Prince* won the unusual accolade of a poem in *Punch* 'Lines to a statue at Leeds by Evoe' (Edmund Knox), 26 July 1911. The fact that the poem referred to the bronze statue as being 'Hewn out of silent stone' suggests that Knox did not examine it too closely

Minerva on the Artists Rifles Drill Hall, *Queen Victoria* in Belfast and the South African War Memorial at Wellington College.

Edward VII visited the Osnaburgh Street studio on at least six occasions. In 1881, as Prince of Wales, he went to see Brock working on the equestrian statues of two Maharajahs of Nepal. After becoming King, he visited the studio in May 1901 to see the preliminary model of the Victoria Memorial, and again in June and December 1902 to see how work on the final model was progressing. In 1904, as chairman of the Millais memorial committee, he visited the studio to inspect the statue (plate 69) and remarked that the artist's palette in the left hand was somewhat too large. Brock started to explain why he had made it that size (it was based on Millais' own palette), but a Gentleman-in-Waiting lightly touched his arm. Brock took the hint, and told the King that he would bear his comments in mind. The King noted the episode with some amusement, and said with a chuckle as he left the studio 'I see Mr Brock is no courtier', which Brock took as a compliment. Before one of his visits the King made it clear that he did not want his presence to cause extra work, nor did he expect the whole place to be immaculate. 'Don't tidy your studios up so much, Mr Brock. Let me see the marble chips lying about'.[25] His last visit was in March 1909, but he continued to follow progress on the Victoria Memorial closely, and expressed concern when he saw Brock climbing on the high scaffolding.[26]

In 1909 Brock was commissioned by some of the King's friends including Lord Esher to execute a marble bust. On 7 February 1910 he wrote to Esher's secretary:

> I shall be glad if you would kindly inform Lord Esher that I am making good progress with the bust of King Edward in the marble, which has turned out spotless and is of extremely fine quality. I hope to have the bust finished in about two months.[27]

Edward VII died in May 1910, before the bust was completed. The new King, George V, visited Brock's studio to see the plaster model. He expressed great

---

[25] Brock pp. 65, 75, 170, 188
[26] see p. 232
[27] Churchill Archives Centre CAC ESHR 7/14 Letter from Brock to Quick

appreciation of it, and said it was an admirable likeness of his revered father.[28] The bust was exhibited at the 1911 Academy and presented to King George V as a coronation gift by Lord Esher and his colleagues. The King wrote to Esher on 23 June 1911:

> I am touched that the thought of my beloved father, who for so many years regarded you as a personal friend, should have prompted your choice of the present you have so kindly given me on my Coronation Day. This likeness of him will be a precious and lasting possession, for which I desire to express to you my most sincere thanks.[29]

The bust is now in the Royal Collection. It shows King Edward's head and shoulders; he wears the collar and robes of the Order of the Garter and the insignia of the Royal Victorian Chain. Brock's son noted:

> There is a slight suggestion of swagger in this bust; some people have also detected a suspicion of cynicism lurking beneath the expression of good humour... Those who knew King Edward well have given us to understand that genial of nature though he was there were times when he could be a little satirical.[30]

Brock noticed that the King had a habit of drawing himself very erect, especially when about to move. This may have been responsible for the set of the shoulders and the slight uplift of the head as seen in the bust. When a friend of Brock commented on the remarkable likeness achieved, despite the fact that Edward VII never sat for him, Brock replied: 'He sat to me more often than you think. He may not have been aware of the fact - I hope he wasn't - but I had ample opportunity for studying his countenance' - an allusion to the times that the King visited his studio.[31]

In 1913 the Trustees of the British Museum, who included Brock's friends Lord Esher and Sir Edward Poynter, agreed to order a bronze replica of the marble bust of Edward VII at a cost of £288.8s, subject to George V granting permission.[32] This was given and the bust was unveiled by the King at the opening of the Museum's new Edward VII gallery on 7 May 1914, when Brock was presented to His Majesty.[33] The

---

[28] *Pall Mall Magazine* 1911 p. 857 which incorrectly reports that the bust had been commissioned 'by a few personal friends' of George V (instead of Edward VII)
[29] CAC ESHR 6/5
[30] Brock p. 248
[31] ibid. Edward VII offered to sit for Brock in 1902 for the RA Gold Medal portrait, but the sitting did not take place. The RA Gold Medal is described in Appendix B (plate 151).
[32] British Museum Standing Committee Minutes for 24 May 1913 p. 3,088
[33] *Times* 8 May 1914

bust was described as having a serious and dignified air; the turn of the head endowed the work with a degree of liveliness often found in Brock's work.[34]

In his biography of Lord Esher, James Lees Milne wrote:

> In 1913 copies of Thomas Brock's bust of King Edward were ordered and presented to the ten men most honoured by the King's friendship. They were Crewe, Horace Farquhar, Arthur Sassoon, Redesdale, Cassel, Carrington, Rosebery, Devonshire, Soveral and Esher.[35]

These ten gentlemen were probably the ones who originally contributed to the cost of the bust presented to King George. However, there is no independent confirmation of this story and if ten replicas had in fact been made, it seems likely that one or two at least would have appeared on the art market. It is possible that Lees Milne was misled by a reference to the bronze replica made for the British Museum.

On 30 July 1910, three months after the King's death, Brock received a commission from the All-India Memorial Committee for an equestrian statue of Edward VII for Delhi. The agreed fee was four thousand guineas (£4,200), despite the fact that Brock had received a higher fee (£4,866) for the *Black Prince* ten years earlier.[36]

The sketch model for the statue was completed before King George V visited India in December 1911.[37] He laid the foundation stone and recorded the event in his diary:

> At 3 pm we drove with escorts to the King's Garden, where I laid the first stone of the plinth of Papa for the All-India Memorial...the statue is to be made by Brock and will be equestrian. The site is a beautiful one.[38]

The King was given a silver model (plate 27) of the proposed statue, which is now in the Royal Collection. Brock's design showed King Edward seated on his favourite charger Kildare, wearing Field Marshal's uniform and doffing his plumed hat. Although some critics thought that the sight of a European in India wearing no hat out of doors in the heat of summer would be considered remarkable, the All-India Committee did not wish the design to be altered:

---

[34] A. Dawson: *Portrait Sculpture in the British Museum 1675-1975* 1999 p. 70
[35] J. Lees Milne *The Enigmatic Edwardian* 1986 p. 207
[36] M. A. Steggles: *The Empire Aggrandized; A Study in Commemorative Portrait Statuary exported from Britain to her Colonies in South Asia 1800-1939* (unpublished PhD thesis, Leicester 1993) p. 41
[37] *Historical Record of the Imperial Visit to India 1911* (1914) p. 204
[38] Royal Archives (RA) Diary of King George V, Friday 8 December 1911

> such a defiance of the sun's power would it was thought impress the people of India...The ruler of the British Empire could properly be shown doing what no other Englishman would do.[39]

While Brock worked with his usual thoroughness on the massive statue, the Viceroy of India (Lord Hardinge) was becoming impatient. He wrote to Lord Stamfordham, the King's Private Secretary, on 26 July 1913:

> I wonder whether it will be possible for you to write a line with the King's authority to Sir T. Brock to hurry him up with the preparation of the statue of King Edward, the All-India Memorial, that is to be put up in Delhi. Both last year and this year again I have sent members of the All-India Committee to interview TB and to get him to push on with the completion of the statue a.s.a.p.but my efforts have so far been of little avail.
>
> It is now already 3 years since the order was given to him, and it really looks to me as though it will not be completed, unless he is induced to hurry up, for at least another two years. I personally am most anxious to unveil the memorial myself out of respect to the memory of King Edward, who was always so kind to me, and in consequence of the King having laid the foundation stone in my presence... I think it is v. likely that if HM would show some interest TB would accelerate his efforts, which I am given to understand are v. deliberate and slow.[40]

It is not known what, if any, action was taken by the Palace on this letter. Certainly no love was lost between Brock and the Viceroy. Apart from Lord Hardinge's impatience, he seemed reluctant to accept that the outbreak of the Great War in 1914 meant an end to all bronze casting 'for the duration'. When, after the war, Hardinge was invited to inspect the completed statue before its despatch to India, the now ex-Viceroy declined, pleading pressure of other engagements. Brock was not impressed, particularly as King George and Queen Mary found time not only to see the plaster model in Brock's temporary studio at Shepherd's Bush, but also to inspect the completed statue (plate 28) at Burton's Foundry, Thames Ditton.[41] The King recorded in his Diary on 28 May 1921:

> May and I motored to the foundry near Kingston, where Sir Thomas Brock showed us his statue of papa which is going to Delhi.[42]

---

[39] Brock p. 245
[40] RA George V P52/41
[41] Brock p. 171
[42] RA Diary of King George V, entry for 28 May 1921

On 15 February 1922 the statue was unveiled in Delhi by the young Prince of Wales. *The Times* reported: 'The bronze equestrian statue is distinctly good and the whole spectacle was very striking'.[43]

The travels of this statue were not yet complete. After India became independent in 1947, it was removed from the King's Garden and put into storage. In 1969 it was purchased by a Canadian businessman, Harry Jackman, for $10,000 and taken to Canada.[44] After some debate, it was accepted by the City of Toronto and erected in Queen's Park, where it now stands. Jackman was reported to have said 'I was not really after Edward VII, I was after a great horse'.[45]

In June 1913, while working on the Delhi statue, Brock received a request from the Australian Government that he should execute an equestrian statue of Edward VII for Sydney. The request was forwarded by his friend Edward Poynter, who wrote:

> Let me urge you not to refuse to undertake this commission. You will make a splendid thing and it will have a grand position in the chief city in Australia.[46]

It was at first thought that Brock would be unable to undertake the work (he was now 66), and that instead he should serve on the committee to select a sculptor. But after members of the Sydney memorial committee had come to London and met Brock, they decided that they would prefer him, despite the likelihood of delay. He accepted the commission; but the Great War intervened, and the statue was not cast until 1921. It was unveiled on 24 May 1922 (Empire Day) by the Governor of New South Wales, Sir Walter Davidson.[47] The site chosen is a splendid one, on a high point of the city giving excellent views from all sides.

The 17 ft 6 in (5.3 m) bronze statue (plate 29) stands on a 22 ft 6 in (6.8 m) high trachyte pedestal. The cost of the statue, landed in Sydney, was £6,000. It shows the King in Field Marshal's uniform, like the Delhi statue, but Brock resisted the temptation

---

[43] *Times* 17 February 1922
[44] *Toronto Telegram* 26 May 1969. J. Ardiel *Sculpture/Toronto: An Illustrated Guide to Toronto's Historic and Contemporary Sculpture* Leidra Books, Toronto 1994 p.102
[45] *Toronto Star* 20 February 1986
[46] Brock p. 244
[47] *Sydney Herald* 25 May 1922

simply to replicate the Indian version. Whereas in the Delhi statue the King carries his Field Marshal's hat, in the Sydney statue he wears it, with a mass of plumes ruffled in the wind, and he holds a baton. The gait of the horse is quite different from the Delhi version, with the horse pawing the ground rather than moving forward. The pedestal has bas-reliefs at either end, with pairs of allegorical female figures representing *Peace and Progress* and *Empire and Unity*. Like the bas-reliefs on the pedestal of *Queen Victoria* in Hove, the figures are in classical dress and give an impressionistic image typical of the New Sculpture style at the turn of the century.

These last three equestrian statues are among his finest and most original works. He resisted the temptation to 'cut corners' by adapting his unsuccessful model of Edward III for the *Black Prince* or by using the same pose of horse and rider for both statues of Edward VII. Among the more obvious differences, the Sydney *Edward* looks to the left, while the other two look to the right; the Delhi *Edward* is bare-headed, while the other two wear military headgear; the *Black Prince* makes a sweeping gesture with his right hand, while the two *Edwards* hold a field marshal's baton (Sydney) or hat (Delhi). The horses of the *Black Prince* and the Delhi *Edward* are moving forward in stately fashion, while that of the Sydney *Edward* is held in check.

Although the Delhi *Edward* has been moved to a Canadian park, the other two are still sited in their original locations, placed on decorated pedestals high enough to give a monumental effect and to deter vandalism, while not so high as to prevent their details being seen. They are striking examples of Brock's artistic and technical skills.

Chapter 16: Portrait Statues - from *Richard Owen* to *James Cook*

By the time he was elected RA in 1891, Brock had completed nine portrait statues, the most notable being *Bartle Frere* (1888) and *Lord Angus* (1891). He then experienced an uncharacteristic lack of commissions, and was greatly relieved when he was asked to execute a statue of Sir Richard Owen, first director of the Natural History Museum and inventor of the word 'dinosaur'. Leighton was a member of the Owen memorial committee and may well have recommended Brock, although Poynter could also have played a role.[1]

Brock's full size model was shown at the 1895 Royal Academy exhibition and approved by the Museum's Council in July 1895. It was cast by J. W. Singer of Frome in 1895 and installed in the Central Hall of the Museum in mid March 1897.[2] There appears to have been no formal unveiling, but later in March the Trustees inspected the statue and accepted it in trust for the Nation, noting that it would 'add conspicuously to the adornment' of the Central Hall.[3]

The 7 ft (2.13 m) bronze statue (plate 82) depicts Owen in old age, skull cap perched on his head and a keen but humorous look in his eyes, wearing his academic robes as Hunterian Professor of Anatomy and a rather battered pair of shoes. He holds a fossil bone in his left hand, probably the femur of a moa (dinornis elephantopas), the great wingless bird of New Zealand, which Owen had skilfully reconstructed from this single bone.[4]

A. L. Baldry, writing on 'Drapery in Sculpture' commented that the treatment of *Sir Richard Owen* was an interesting compromise between ancient robes and the modern suit. The character and constitution of the garment was studied thoughtfully, and with a truly artistic desire to make the most of the subject.[5] Spielmann also praised the drapery, which showed the same admirable and refined treatment as *Bishop Philpott* (plate 85), as well as Brock's complete mastery of figure and, above all, of character.[6]

---

[1] see p. 131
[2] Natural History Museum (NHM) Letterbook Vol. 19/279 Letter from Charles Fagan to Percy Sladen (Secretary of the Owen Memorial Committee)
[3] ibid Vol. 19/435 Letter of 10 May 1897 from Fagan to Sladen
[4] *Times* 30 March 1897
[5] *AJ* 1909 p. 257
[6] Spielmann 1905 p. 421

Owen confirmed Brock's talent as a portraitist and his mastery of bronze casting, both features of the New Sculpture. Brock regarded *Owen* as one of his best portrait statues and the plaster model was one of two (the other being *Gainsborough*) which the Royal Academy decided to accept as a gift from the sculptor's executor after Brock's death. Both models were destroyed in 1950.[7]

Thomas Hughes, Liberal MP and author of *Tom Brown's Schooldays*, died in 1896. A committee of Old Rugbeians commissioned Brock to execute a marble statue for £1,000. The statue was unveiled outside the school library by Frederick Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury and a former headmaster, on 11 June 1899.[8]

Hughes was Brock's first marble statue for an outside site since *Rowland Hill* (1881) and *Queen Victoria* at Worcester (1890). He returned to the traditional 'coat and trousers' style and the school magazine considered *Hughes* to be:

> one of the few successful statues in present-day European costume ... the pose is dignified but easy, and the face happily suggests the character of the man who, impatient of sham, yet schooled himself for charity's sake to tolerate the intolerable.[9]

Brock included a tribute to his subject's success as an author by giving *Hughes* a book in his left hand and a quill pen (frequently stolen) in his right. The large stetson hat which rests by *Hughes*' right foot is a good-humoured reference to the model settlement he unsuccessfully attempted to establish in Tennessee.

William Gladstone, four times Prime Minister, died on 19 May 1898. The next day the House of Commons passed a resolution that a monument to Gladstone should be erected in Westminster Abbey.[10] A National Memorial Fund was later established, which commissioned Gladstone monuments for London, Edinburgh and Dublin. In 1899, the cities of Liverpool (Gladstone's birthplace) and Glasgow followed suit. Brock received the commissions for the Westminster Abbey and Liverpool statues, while Hamo Thornycroft was awarded Glasgow and the National Memorial in London.[11]

If Brock was disappointed not to win the National Commission for London, he did not show it. He wrote promptly to Thornycroft on 20 February 1899 to express his most

---

[7] Brock p. 96; information from RA curator
[8] *Builder* 23 October 1897 p. 326
[9] *Meteor* 11 July 1899 pp. 85-6
[10] *Hansard* 20 May 1898 col. 216
[11] Read 1982 p. 379; Manning p. 202

sincere congratulations, adding 'I am sure you will do full justice to the 'grand old man'. In answer to a previous query from Thornycroft about completion dates, he wrote:

> I always find it best when urged to name a date for completion to say that I hope to finish in about a couple of years, but that as I have other work in hand it is a little difficult to pledge oneself exactly. Further that delays may arise in the matter of founding which cannot be foreseen. I do not think it advisable to name too long a time, otherwise they get frightened.[12]

Later Thornycroft wrote that he had heard that Brock had been given the precise measurements of Gladstone's head by Francis Galton, a cousin of Charles Darwin and an expert on 'eugenics'. Brock replied on 15 June 1901:

> Pray forgive the delay in sending you the measurements of Gladstone. I now have the pleasure of enclosing a copy of Mr Galton's letter which may prove helpful. I was aware that Gladstone had lost the first finger of his left hand, but the hand looked so queer without it that I thought I might be permitted in that particular to depart from the truth, especially as he himself did everything he could to prevent the disfigurement being noticed.[13]

As Brock had not known Gladstone personally, he asked the artist Harry Furniss, well known for his *Punch* drawings, to come to the studio and give his views on the clay model of the statue. Furniss suggested that he could demonstrate Gladstone's style better by actions than by words. He then gave a brilliant impersonation of Gladstone's delivery and speech, with Brock closely following every gesture and movement. As soon as Furniss had finished his impromptu performance, Brock

> turned to the model, cut the throat across, thrust the head back; then seizing some clay raised both shoulders, after which he forced the elbows in - thus in the space of a few minutes completely altering the general appearance of the figure.[14]

Brock's marble statue for Westminster Abbey (plate 44) was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1902. Gladstone stands bareheaded and wears the robes of Chancellor of the Exchequer. His right hand grasps his lapel and his left hand holds a sheaf of papers. He is looking slightly to the right; his expression firm and resolute, even stern. Gladstone's son Herbert, himself a politician, wrote to Brock on 31 March 1903:

> I must write a line to thank you for your very fine statue of my father. I have looked at it from all points of view and in different lights, and in every way it is worthy of its place in the Abbey.[15]

Brock's excellence as a portraitist is nowhere better seen than in his *Gladstone*. It was a particularly difficult challenge as the features of Gladstone were well known to the

---

[12] Thornycroft C 94b
[13] ibid C105
[14] Brock pp. 179-80
[15] ibid p. 178

public from photographs. That he was successful in capturing Gladstone's characteristic expression is clear from the tributes paid by Herbert Gladstone and others. He avoided the 'coat and trousers' problem by clothing Gladstone in his robes as Chancellor of the Exchequer. These he took particular care to depict as accurately as possible, but even this upset one critic:

> the admirable statue of Mr Gladstone in his robes is one of the most sincere and earnest of the sculptor's figures - natural, modern yet traditional in its style - with however somewhat too much actuality in the accessories.[16]

The statue was installed in the Statesmen's Aisle of Westminster Abbey on 28 March 1903 between John Gibson's *Peel* and Edgar Boehm's *Disraeli*. *The Builder* considered that *Gladstone* 'is the best statue in the transept, and shines conspicuous [sic] by contrast with Boehm's commonplace and badly posed *Disraeli*'. The head was fine, dignified and earnest. Moreover, Brock had posed the figure finely and taken advantage of the gown to get a broad effect. Altogether, it was a fine and interesting addition to the national Valhalla.[17]

The Times considered the likeness extremely good and the monument to be worthy of its position in the Statesmen's Aisle.[18] This, the last vacant position for a standing figure in the north transept, was earmarked by Dean Stanley over twenty years previously for a monument to Gladstone. However, it seems that Brock was not happy with the position assigned and had suggested an alternative site, a suggestion which the Abbey authorities declined to accept. As a result, Brock is said to have refused to sign the statue by incising his name on the base, despite requests by the Abbey that he should do so.[19]

Although the Parliamentary resolution had specifically stated that the statue should have an inscription 'expressive of the Public Admiration and Attachment, and of the high sense entertained of his Rare and Splendid Gifts, and his Devoted Labours in Parliament and in Great Offices of State', the pedestal had no inscription at all when the statue was first opened to public view. One was later added in the following rather curt terms:

> Erected by Parliament. The Right Honourable William Ewart Gladstone.
> Four times Prime Minister. Born December 29 1809. Died May 19 1898.

---

[16] *M of A* 1902 p. 399
[17] *Builder* 4 April 1903 p. 355
[18] *Times* 30 March 1903
[19] Brock p. 174

This was hardly the glowing eulogy Parliament had anticipated, and presumably reflected the declining interest in Gladstone five years after his death.

Brock's second statue of Gladstone was for the city of his birth, Liverpool. Although there was already a statue of him by John Adams-Acton in St George's Hall dating from 1870, there was a feeling that this was inadequate commemoration of so notable a figure and that another memorial in a more prominent position was required. A public meeting was held on 13 March 1899, and by 29 November 1899 not only had £5,000 been collected but Brock was in Liverpool Town Hall to show photographs of his proposed memorial. A site in the newly constructed St John's Gardens was agreed in July 1901, after the Corporation Surveyor had concluded that Brock's memorial would be 'a magnificent work of art' which would fully merit a central position.[20]

Brock's memorial comprised a 10 ft (3.05 m) statue of Gladstone in bronze, standing on a 20 ft (6.09 m) pedestal of granite (plates 45 & 46). The pose is similar to the marble statue in Westminster Abbey - Gladstone's right hand grasping his lapel and a bundle of documents in his left hand, as if delivering a speech - but he is dressed in a frock-coat. Behind is an ornamental pedestal with a cloth draped over it, while four massive folio-size books are stacked on the ground.

The influence of the New Sculpture can be seen in the two supporting figures, winged and female, sitting on either side of the pedestal. This was not a New Sculpture invention, but was a device frequently used by Renaissance sculptors in public monuments and revived by New Sculptors such as Bates, with his figures of *War* and *Victory* on the memorial to Lord Roberts. Brock employed the same device with his allegorical figures of *Painting* and *Sculpture* on the Leighton memorial.

In the Gladstone memorial *Justice* (plate 48) has the traditional pair of scales and a sword, while *Truth* (plate 49) has the Book of Knowledge and a laurel wreath. Unlike the well known figure on top of the Old Bailey, with scales and sword held boldly aloft to indicate that guilt will be fairly determined and swiftly punished, Brock's *Justice* trails the scales rather languidly on the ground and rests the sword peacefully on her lap, indicating a more merciful and compassionate view.

At the time he was working on the Gladstone memorial, Brock was preparing the models for his Victoria Memorial. It is interesting that *Truth* and *Justice* occupy a

---

[20] T. Cavanagh *Public Sculpture of Liverpool* Liverpool University Press 1997 p. 175

similar position on both works, i.e. to the left and right of the main pedestal; and the sword and scales of *Justice* are treated in a similarly informal manner. With characteristic economy of effort, Brock incorporated replicas of the Gladstone memorial's *Truth* and *Justice* in the monument to Queen Victoria in Agra (India).

At the rear of the pedestal is a bronze bas-relief entitled *Brotherhood* (plate 47), showing three figures in classical dress - a statesman in a toga shaking hands with a labourer, stripped to the waist and carrying a spade, while a third figure looks on. A second bas-relief entitled *Progress* was originally intended for the front of the pedestal; in the event this was replaced by a simple inscription. The memorial was unveiled on 16 July 1904 by Earl Spencer, leader of the Liberals in the House of Lords. Brock was among those present, and Spencer said:

> It is the work of a great sculptor, and after seeing it, I venture humbly, in your name too, to congratulate Mr Brock on the excellence of the work he has done. Not only is it a good likeness, but it is an admirable work of art.[21]

Hamo Thornycroft adopted an approach similar to that of Brock (a central standing figure with supporting allegorical figures) for his London monument to Gladstone. Brock's version possibly shows more deftness in architectural design, with the wings of the seated *Justice* and *Truth* drawing the eye up to the figure of Gladstone; Thornycroft's four groups of *Aspiration, Brotherhood, Courage* and *Education* are separated from the central pedestal and this tends to distract attention from the statue. James Pittendrigh McGillivray attempted to remedy this problem in Edinburgh by having standing figures (*Faith, Fortitude, Measure* and *Vitality*) at the four corners of the pedestal to form a link with two larger seated figures representing *Eloquence* and *History*.[22] However, the addition of youths carrying scrolls inscribed in Greek made the overall effect crowded rather than impressive.

Lord Russell of Killowen died in 1900. Brock knew him well: as Charles Russell QC he had been one of the two defending counsel in the Belt v. Lawes trial of 1882. He subsequently became Attorney General in the Liberal Government and in 1894 was appointed Lord Chief Justice, the first Roman Catholic to hold this post since the Reformation. After his death in 1900, his old colleague, Richard Webster (the other

---

[21] *Liverpool Mercury* 18 July 1904
[22] Read 1982 p. 382

defending counsel in Belt v. Lawes), succeeded him as Lord Chief Justice with the title of Baron Alverstone.[23]

Alverstone was chairman of the Russell memorial committee, and may have influenced the selection of Brock to execute a statue in the Law Courts. Brock wrote to Alverstone:

> It is very gratifying to learn that the committee have entrusted to me the task of executing the statue of the late Lord Chief Justice. I am conscious I owe the commission to your kind interest.[24]

As usual, he was concerned to get the details absolutely right. On 5 May 1901 he wrote to Alverstone again:

> I have abundant material for the portrait but would be glad to have the robe and wig. Old ones would be better for my purpose. I am progressing with a small sketch model.

On 19 March 1904 Brock wrote that he had nearly finished the statue and hoped to show it at the Royal Academy if the Council agreed. Alverstone visited the studio on 22 March and on 25 March permission was given.[25] The Office of Works' agreement was also sought under the Public Statues Act 1854 to erect the statue in the Law Courts.[26] There was a last minute hitch when the Office of Works wished to change the site from the east side of the Great Hall of the Law Courts to the north-east corner; Brock considered this most unfortunate, as the head of the statue would be turned to the wall instead of looking across the Hall as intended, and the base of the pedestal would have to be reworked.[27] The problem was settled to Brock's satisfaction by moving the site to the north-west corner.

The statue was unveiled on 11 January 1905 by the Earl of Halsbury, the Lord Chancellor.[28] This was hardly the choice Brock would have made. Halsbury, then known as Sir Hardinge Giffard, had led the prosecution at the Belt v. Lawes trial and had subjected Brock to a fierce cross-examination. At the unveiling he gave an eloquent address on the merits of Lord Russell, but offered no opinion on the merits of the statue.[29]

---

[23] Frederick Brock states that his father executed a statue of Alverstone for the Law Courts, but its present whereabouts are unknown (Brock p.64)
[24] National Art Library 86WW9: Brock's letter to Alverstone of 27 February 1901
[25] ibid: letters of 5 May 1901, 4 July 1901, 4 August 1902, 19 & 25 March 1904
[26] PRO WORK 20/56: letter of 10 October 1904 on Millais file
[27] National Art Library; Brock's letter to Alverstone 15 November 1904
[28] *Builder* 21 January 1905 p. 69
[29] *Times* 12 January 1905

Brock's statue shows *Russell* seated in an elaborately carved chair (plate 109). *Russell* leans slightly forward, his head cocked as if listening to an argument by learned counsel; his expression is firm but kindly. He wears a full-bottomed wig and the robes and chain of office of the Lord Chief Justice. His right hand, holding a sheaf of papers, rests on the arm of his chair; his left hand rests on his knee. Brock's eye for detail is revealed in the carving of the wig, the chain of office, the decoration of the chair and the robes, which fall in folds over the steps of the pedestal.

At the RA Exhibition in 1904 the statue attracted the favourable notice of Spielmann, who wrote :

> The portrait statues are headed by the seated Lord Chief Justice Russell by Mr Brock, a masterly work, full of dignity and fine in arrangement, while presenting a lifelike and sympathetic portrait of the man... it is difficult to believe that the heroic Nicholson, of Delhi fame, vigorous in the fashioning and violent in action, is by the same hand that wrought the suave and gentle marble figure of Russell.[30]

The Builder agreed that Brock's 'dignified figure...was a very fine example of portrait sculpture, with the head carved in that broad manner, not weakened by over-finish, in which Mr Brock excels.[31] *The Times* gave a judicious verdict:

> Time and repeated observation alone will justify an opinion of the artist's success in obtaining a likeness. Few men had greater varieties of expression; but generally it may be said that the judge was widely different from the advocate, so visible were the evidences of self-restraint; and the sculptor has undoubtedly with much success presented the mellowed and gentler aspect which characterised Lord Russell on the Bench.[32]

The Russell Memorial Fund collected £3,200, of which £900 came from Russell's friends in the United States. Brock's fee is not known, but after it was paid, there was enough money left over to commission two busts of Russell from him - one for Newry in Northern Ireland (Russell's birthplace), the other for the New York Bar Association - and to endow a bed at the St John and St Elizabeth hospital in London.[33]

There is a curious footnote to the history of the Russell statue. In 1938 a Carlo Magnani wrote to the Natural History Museum offering to clean their statues. He claimed to have executed the Museum's *Thomas Huxley* for Onslow Ford (spelt Aslow Fort by Magnani), and also the 'very similar' *Lord Russell* for Thomas Brock. Apart from the fact that both *Huxley* and *Russell* are seated in ornate chairs, there is not much

---

[30] *M of A* 1904 p. 412. For *Nicholson*, see p. 164
[31] *Builder* 18 June 1904 p. 652
[32] *Times* 12 January 1905
[33] ibid 31 March 1903

similarity between them; perhaps Magnani sculpted the chairs.[34] In view of Brock's well-known dislike of 'ghosts', he is unlikely to have given Magnani any tasks of 'artistic merit'.

Sir John Millais had been elected President of the Royal Academy in succession to Lord Leighton on 20 February 1896. He was already a sick man. and died on 13 August 1896. The vote for Millais as President had been virtually unanimous (23-1); the selection of his successor was more difficult. In the first and second ballots, Edward Poynter received less votes than Briton Riviere, and it was only at the third and final ballot that Poynter pulled ahead to win by 19 to 16.[35]

A Millais memorial committee was set up with the Prince of Wales (later King Edward VII) as chairman and Poynter as joint secretary. The committee was informed by the Dean of St Paul's that although Millais had been buried in the crypt there was no space for a memorial to him in the Cathedral itself.[36] Poynter proposed that a statue be erected in a prominent position in front of the new Tate Gallery at a cost of £1,500-£2,000.[37] The location was particularly appropriate as Millais had been a close friend of Sir Henry Tate and had taken a leading part in Tate's plans to create a National Gallery of British Art.[38] Brock was given the commission, almost certainly on the recommendation of Poynter.

The Prince of Wales (now Edward VII) took a close interest in the progress of the Millais statue and visited Brock's studio in 1904 to see the model.[39] This Royal connection proved helpful when Brock innocently wrote to the Office of Works to ask what foundation would be required for a statue weighing 16 tons (with pedestal). The Office of Works replied that no one had informed them of the proposed statue; that official permission was required under the Public Statues Act of 1854; and that they would need to be assured that sufficient funds were guaranteed for its maintenance.[40]

---

[34] Natural History Museum Archives; letter of 29 December from C. Magnani to the Director. In the letter Magnani also claimed to have executed Brock's bust of a Director of the Museum, Sir William Flower. Perhaps he carved *Flower*'s orders and decorations

[35] Hutchison p. 132

[36] *Builder* (1 March 1902 p. 206) complained that Leighton had a sumptuous monument in a most prominent position in St Paul's while Millais, who was unquestionably the greater artist, had no memorial in the Cathedral at all

[37] ibid 11 February 1899 p. 152

[38] J. G. Millais *Life and Letters of Sir John Everett Millais* 1899 Vol. 2 pp. 369-70

[39] see p. 187

[40] PRO WORK 20/56: Letters of 10 October 1904 and 31 October 1904 from Brock to Secretary, Office of Works

On 19 November 1904 Edward Poynter and Peter Reid (as joint secretaries of the memorial committee) wrote to the Office of Works explaining the origins of the statue and noting that the site outside the Tate had been approved by the chairman of the memorial committee, the King himself. While their funds would cover the erection of the statue, there would sadly be nothing left over for its maintenance. On learning that the King was involved, the Office of Works swiftly agreed to the statue being placed in front of the Tate Gallery and to waive maintenance charges.[41] Brock told Hamo Thornycroft the 'people at the Office of Works' had made him go down 25 feet, which Brock evidently thought excessive, and that while excavating the last five feet the pumps had to be kept going.[42]

Despite the Royal patronage, there was no formal unveiling ceremony when the statue was installed in November 1905. Noting that Brock himself would unveil *Millais*, the *Pall Mall Gazette* commented that it was 'a breezy statue, representing the man in the characteristic attitude in which we all knew him'.[43] *Millais* stands 10 ft (3.05 m) high on a 12 ft (3.66 m) stone pedestal (plate 69). He wears a jacket, waistcoat and trousers with a casually tied cravat and a handkerchief in his top pocket. In his right hand he holds a brush; in his left a rather large artist's palette - criticised by King Edward for being too large, but almost certainly based on Millais' own palette. A typical Brock detail is the unusual artist's stool with drawers behind Millais' right leg, while the decorative frieze with shells around the top of the pedestal is characteristic of the New Sculpture's emphasis on the 'idea of the pedestal as sculptural counterpoint'.[44]

Despite his fame as an artist, and that he not only helped in founding the Tate Gallery but recommended the Millbank site, *Millais* has never been treated with much respect by the Gallery in front of which he stands. Norman Reid made two attempts to have him removed. As Deputy Keeper of the Tate in 1953 he proposed to replace him with Rodin's *John the Baptist*. The Office of Works cautiously replied that they had no other suitable site; and that in any case the suggestion to move the statue would attract criticism from admirers of Millais, and possibly even from original subscribers to the Millais Memorial Fund. [45]

---

[41] PRO ibid: letter from Poynter and Reid of 19 November 1904; letter from Office of Works to Poynter of 14 June 1905

[42] Thornycroft C107, Brock's letter of 24 November 1905

[43] *Pall Mall Gazette* 23 November 1905

[44] Beattie p. 206

[45] PRO WORK 20/354: letter of 17 July 1953 from Reid to Gilbin & 19 August from Gilbin to Reid

Reid's second attempt was in 1964, over ten years later. Writing as Director of the Tate, as if for the first time, he suggested that *Millais* be removed or lowered to ground level. This time he found a slightly more sympathetic ear, after a junior Ministry of Works official had noted that the statue was 'undistinguished'. When the Ministry suggested a move within the Tate's grounds, Reid rejected the idea:

> We regard Millais' presence in front of the Tate as positively harmful in the sense that he represents a Victorian attitude which we by no means find sympathetic. [46]

This outburst prompted the Ministry to approach the Westminster City Council about moving *Millais* to a nearby public garden. Westminster replied that the garden concerned was too small, but added that if a larger piece of land could be given to them, they would allow the Tate to exhibit large open air sculptures. The Ministry of Works judged that Westminster was simply trying to acquire more land - an official minuted that they had not in fact offered to take the *Millais* and wondered whether the statue might be offered to Southampton, Millais' birthplace.[47] This suggestion was not pursued. Instead the Ministry of Works suggested to the Tate that the matter might be left until a decision was taken on the Tate's request for a new building. Reid replied that the Tate would wish to remove 'sculpture and pediment' (presumably he meant 'statue and pedestal') whether or not there was a new building. In the event, nothing happened.

The fact that *Millais* continued to stand defiantly in front of the Tate was mainly due to the protection which the Public Statues Act afforded him. However, in 1996 English Heritage (successor to the Ministry of Works) decided to hand responsibility for the statue to the Tate authorities. In November 1999 the statue was removed from its prominent position in front of the Tate and re-erected (after cleaning) on a less prestigious site at the rear of the gallery.

While working on the *Millais* statue, Brock's received a commission for the statue of another artist, *Thomas Gainsborough.* Henry Vaughan, one of the founders of the Burlington Fine Art Club, was a keen collector of works of art by English painters. He died in 1899 and under his will left £1,000 for a statue of Gainsborough to be presented to the Tate Gallery. The *Art Journal* wondered how Rodin would tackle such a task,

---

[46] ibid letters of 29 October & 18 November 1964 from Reid to Newis, &17 November 1964 from Newis to Reid

[47] ibid letter of 15 January 1965 from Barrow (Works) to Dawtry (Westminster), 27 April 1965 Dawtry to Barrow

and speculated that Alfred Drury might be chosen.[48] In the event, Brock received the commission, probably due to his reputation as a safe pair of hands and to the benevolent interest of Poynter.

Brock exhibited the 7 ft (2.13 m) marble statue at the Royal Academy in 1906 (plate 40). An early catalogue of the Tate Gallery has the following description:

> Heroic size statue. The painter stands looking towards the spectator's right. He wears a wig, long-skirted coat, knee breeches and buckle shoes. His right hand rests on some papers, placed on a pedestal which is decorated on three sides with cartouche and wreath. His left hand holds a palette and brushes and a roll of music, to indicate Gainsborough's passion for that other art.[49]

Edwin Austin Abbey described *Gainsborough* as 'a very beautiful statue by Tommy Brock',[50] and Hamo Thornycroft, with his usual courtesy, wrote to Brock to congratulate him. Brock replied with equal courtesy:

> I am so glad you like my Gainsborough. The subject strongly appealed to me and I am indeed pleased to hear from you that you think I have been successful.[51]

When *The Builder* reviewed the 1906 Academy Exhibition, it commended *Gainsborough*'s fine and energetic head but added that the statue would have looked better in bronze than marble.[52] These words were prophetic, as a bronze replica was commissioned by the Leighton Fund and presented to the RA in 1939.[53] This can be seen, prominently displayed, on the left side of the main staircase of the Royal Academy. It was cast by A. B. Burton from the original plaster model, which was shown in the Franco-British Exhibition in 1908 and given to the Royal Academy by Brock's executors in 1922.[54] In contrast to his prominent position in the Royal Academy, the Tate curators have for many years exiled their *Gainsborough* to warehouse storage.

One of the few commissions Brock accepted between 1906 and 1911, when he was heavily engaged on the Victoria Memorial, was the statue of Sir Henry Irving. The great actor had died in 1905 and a memorial committee was set up with the actor Sir John Hare as chairman. Brock was commissioned in March 1907.[55]

---

[48] *AJ* 1900 p. 95

[49] Tate Gallery catalogue 1907 p. 31

[50] E. A. Abbey's letter of 9 May 1906 to Augustus St Gaudens quoted in E. V. Lucas *E. A. Abbey* 1921 Vol. II p. 421, the only known occasion when Brock is referred to as 'Tommy'.

[51] Thornycroft C 108: Brock's letter of 16 April 1906

[52] *Builder* 14 July 1906 p. 34

[53] Hutchison p. 159

[54] Report of the RA Council 1922. The plaster model was destroyed in 1950.

[55] *Builder* 23 March 1907 p. 354

Brock's bronze statue stands some 10 ft (3.05 m) tall on a 3 ft (91.4 cm) base, mounted on a ten foot granite pedestal (plate 59). *Irving* is bareheaded, striking a typical actor's pose with his right hand on his hip as if about to declaim. His left hand holds a script and he wears the gown of a Doctor of Letters of Cambridge University over a frock coat. Brock resisted a suggestion from Lord Beauchamp, the First Commissioner of Works, that Irving should be depicted in theatrical costume.[56] No doubt he wanted to avoid appearing to copy Onslow Ford's earlier (1882) marble statue of Irving dressed as Hamlet. The bronze base is handsomely decorated in New Sculpture style, and the site, adjacent to the National Portrait Gallery is excellent, much frequented by artists.

Brock was present at the unveiling on 5 December 1910 by Sir John Hare. Irving's son Henry recalled the triumphs and the difficulties which his father had faced; and said that 'it was as master of his fate and captain of his soul that the sculptor has graven an image'.[57]

An indication of the change in the public attitude towards commemorative statues was given by Hamo Thornycroft in an after-dinner speech to the Royal Society of British Sculptors in February 1925, three years after Brock's death:

> There are those, I fear, who think our art valueless. The other day I saw it suggested, in rather important type, that all London's statues should be carted to Land's End and thrown over the granite boulders into the foaming sea. What a tragic burial. Sir Thomas Brock's 'Irving' was named and my poor 'Oliver Cromwell'...[58]

Brock would have liked Thornycroft's reference to 'rather important type'.

In July 1911 Brock received a commission to execute a bronze statue of Richard Seddon for the New Zealand Government at a cost of £2,500. The final choice of sculptor lay between Brock and George Frampton, who had carved the memorial bust of Seddon for St Paul's Cathedral two years earlier. Brock was preferred to Frampton because he was 'the man of the moment, having just completed the Victoria Memorial; impressively consistent and convincing..[his] sense of compositional balance is second to none and his penetration of character unfailing'.[59]

Seddon was Prime Minister of New Zealand for a record thirteen years. He died in 1906 while still in office, on board ship after an official visit to Australia - his farewell

---

[56] Blackwood p. 138
[57] *Times* 6 December 1910
[58] Manning p. 190
[59] M. Stocker 'A Great Man and a Great Imperialist: Sir Thomas Brock's statue of Richard John Seddon' in the *Sculpture Journal* No. 1 (1997) p. 47

(and unwittingly prophetic) telegram to the Premier of Victoria 'Just returning to God's own country' has become famous. The delay between Seddon's death in 1906 and the commissioning of Brock in 1911 was due in part to the fact that the Parliamentary Buildings in Wellington before which the Seddon statue was to stand were largely destroyed by fire in 1907.

Sir Joseph Ward, Seddon's successor as Prime Minister, met Brock in London and asked whether a marble statue would be cheaper than bronze. Brock replied that the cost would be the same, but that £200 could be saved if the pedestal ornaments were omitted (they were retained). In November 1912 Brock said that ten months would be needed to make the full size clay model and have it cast in bronze. As usual, there was some delay in the foundry, and the statue was not ready for shipment until July 1914. With the outbreak of war, it finally arrived in February 1915. It was unveiled by the Governor General, the Earl of Liverpool, on 26 June 1915.[60]

Brock's statue does full justice to Seddon's massive figure (he weighed some 20 stone). He wears frock coat and trousers and stands with his right hand raised, as if making a speech, while holding a sheaf of papers in his left hand. Behind his left foot is a symbolic pile of books, over which is draped a flag. The memorial breaks no new stylistic ground and must rank as typical rather than remarkable. The accurate likeness was admired; Brock is said to have used a photograph of Seddon addressing a meeting in 1905, and to have had advice from Mrs Seddon when she visited London in 1912.[61]

Seddon's pose with upraised hand, which might seem a typical, even hackneyed, stance for a political figure, was not one often used by Brock. His statesmen were normally depicted in reflective mood - *Gladstone* grasps his lapel, *Daniel O'Connell* holds a sheaf of papers. Stocker compares *Seddon* with *Richard Baxter*, but *Baxter* points heavenwards, whereas *Seddon* is making an expansive gesture. A closer comparison is probably *Lord Angus.*[62]

Brock's last major public sculpture was also one of his best known - *Captain James Cook* by Admiralty Arch. The suggestion that Cook should be commemorated was put forward by the Premier of New South Wales, Sir Joseph Carruthers, in a letter to *The*

---

[60] *Wellington Evening Post* New Zealand 28 June 1915
[61] Stocker 1997 p. 48
[62] see p. 160

Times.[63] The idea was taken up enthusiastically by the British Empire League, and the Prince of Wales (later George V) consented to be chairman of the memorial committee.[64]

On 9 March 1911 Lord Beauchamp, the First Commissioner of Works, sent a memorandum to King George V reporting that the memorial committee had applied for a site for the statue and that a suitable location would be the west (Mall) side of Admiralty Arch. Beauchamp recommended that this site should be allocated on two conditions; first, that the model of the statue should be approved by His Majesty, second, that the sculptor should be Thomas Brock. He explained:

> It appears very necessary to make the latter condition for, as Mr Brock is doing the sculpture on Admiralty Arch, there would be a risk of a great lack of harmony, and indeed of real discord, if the statue were entrusted to anybody else.[65]

The King approved this recommendation and the Secretary to the Office of Works wrote to Herbert Samuel, Postmaster General and chairman of the executive committee for the Cook Memorial:

> Although he is not personally a great admirer of Mr Brock, he [Lord Beauchamp] felt bound to recommend to His Majesty that this could only be done on condition that the sculptor employed should be Mr Brock, in order to bring the monument into harmony with the sculpture of the building; and in this suggestion the King entirely concurs.[66]

On 16 March 1911 Samuel replied to McDonnell that he had 'informally arranged' with Brock that he should undertake the work, and this was reported some weeks later by *The Times*. This provoked an irate letter from Sir Gervase Beckett MP, protesting at the Office of Works' 'dictating' that Brock be the sculptor.[67]

On 28 May Samuel wrote to McDonnell about Beckett's 'truculent' letter, and a few days later *The Times* reported:

> We have reason to believe that it was not the Office of Works which suggested the Mall site but the [Memorial] Committee - which had earlier contemplated Sir Thomas Brock as a possible sculptor. The Committee had therefore readily accepted the Office of Works "suggestion" of Brock, Gervase Beckett being the only dissentient.[68]

---

[63] *Times* 14 November 1908

[64] *Manchester Courier* 25 March 1909

[65] PRO WORK 20/79: memorandum by Lord Beauchamp 9 March 1911. The 'sculpture on Admiralty Arch' probably referred to the large bronze group to be placed on top of the Arch, later cancelled for financial reasons, rather than *Gunnery* and *Navigation*.

[66] ibid letter of 15 March 1911 from Schomberg McDonnell to Herbert Samuel

[67] *Times* 20 & 27 May 1911

[68] ibid 5 June 1911

Beckett wanted John Tweed, a pupil of Rodin, to execute the *Cook* statue, and the Office of Works may have been nervous that Tweed might create a *Balzac*-type figure and upset the dignity of The Mall. This was the third time Brock and Tweed had been rivals - the first being for the Royal Scots Memorial in Ayr (1898), which Brock had won. The second was the completion of the Wellington Memorial in St Paul's, when Edward Poynter was keen that Brock should be appointed. He wrote to the Prime Minister (Arthur Balfour) in 1902:

> Brock, who did the monument to Leighton, is to my mind the *only* man who could carry out Stevens' work (but I shall perhaps be thought to have an axe to grind when I put his name in). Leighton, I am sure, would have thought the same, Gilbert unfortunately now being impossible.[69]

Despite Poynter's intervention, Tweed was given the *Wellington* commission.

Brock won the third contest, for the Cook statue. However, Tweed was given a consolation prize - his *Cook* was commissioned by Beckett for Whitby, Cook's home port and Beckett's constituency. Tweed completed his statue well before Brock's was ready - it was unveiled in October 1912.[70] Any fears of what Tweed might produce proved to be unfounded - his depiction of *Cook* was entirely conventional.

In February 1912 Samuel took Brock's model of the statue to the Palace for the King's approval[71] and in February 1914 he showed the King a photograph of the completed statue and asked him to perform the unveiling. The King decided to delegate this task to his uncle, Prince Arthur, Duke of Connaught.[72] *Cook* was unveiled on 7 July 1914 and Prince Arthur congratulated Brock on the success of the statue, 'which in every sense of the word was an addition to the statuary of the metropolis' (a slightly ambiguous compliment).[73] Those present included the First Lord of the Admiralty, Winston Churchill, some thirty four years after he had attended the unveiling of *Gough* in Dublin.

Brock's statue (plate 23) is 9 ft (2.74 m) tall on a 12 ft (3.66 m) pedestal of Hopton Wood stone. The statue weighs one and a half tons, the pedestal 20 tons.[74] *Cook* wears the uniform of a Royal Naval captain, with tricorn hat. His left hand holds a chart, his right hand a telescope. The hilt and scabbard of his officer's sword can be seen under his

---

[69] Tweed pp. 121-2 and J. Physick *The Wellington Memorial* HMSO 1970 pp. 108-117
[70] Physick pp. 154-5
[71] Royal Archives RA GV 2090(9)
[72] PRO WORK 20/79 Samuel's letters of 14 and 27 February 1914 to Earle
[73] *Times* 8 July 1914
[74] PRO WORK 35 pp. 295-6

uniform coat. He stands before a capstan and his left foot rests on a coil of rope - a detail considered by some to be unseamanlike. This statue is notable for the character and expression of the face, the relaxed but disciplined stance, the symbolism of the accoutrements (map, telescope, rope) the accuracy of the uniform, the quality of the finish and the appropriateness of the site adjacent to Admiralty Arch. The decorative designs on the top of the pedestal, with ship's prows on either side, a wreathed globe in front, swags around the statue's base and a frieze of scallop shells and acanthus leaves around the pedestal itself, make this one of the most elaborate executed by Brock - a final New Sculpture flourish.

In addition to his fourteen statues of the Queen and his six recumbent effigies for church memorials, Brock executed twenty eight portrait statues for public sites. Thirteen were in marble, the first being Richard Baxter (1875) and the last Baron Sydenham (1918). Fifteen were in bronze, the characteristic medium of the New Sculpture, the first being Robert Raikes (1880) and the last Captain Cook (1914). Brock's perceptiveness and skill, his ability to combine an accurate likeness with a feeling for character and individuality, give him a claim to being the leading portraitist of his time.

Chapter 17: The Victoria Memorial - Conception

Queen Victoria died on 22 January 1901. Within a fortnight consideration was being given to what form a memorial might take and Viscount Esher, Permanent Secretary to the Office of Works, wrote in his diary:

> A Memorial is on foot for the Queen... A committee [is] projected, on which it is suggested I should serve... I suggested Queen Victoria's Schools to train boys for the Army at Edinburgh, Dublin, Melbourne, Quebec and Calcutta.[1]

On 10 February 1901, Esher had a new idea:

> I have made another suggestion for a Memorial to the Queen. To buy Osborne from the King and to keep it as a shrine, uncontaminated by *domestic* use, and to fill it with *memorials* of the Queen. This might appeal to the coloured imagination, as it certainly would to the Oriental mind. It would have a good practical effect on the King's future financial position.[2]

A committee was appointed on 19 February 1901 by the new King, Edward VII to consider an appropriate memorial to the Queen's memory. The chairman was the Prime Minister (the Marquis of Salisbury) and the twelve members included the Leader of the House of Commons (Arthur Balfour), the Leader of the Opposition (Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman), the First Commissioner of Works (Aretas Akers-Douglas) and the Lord Mayor of London as Treasurer.[3] Sir Arthur Bigge, formerly Private Secretary to the Queen, was initially named as secretary of the committee; but within a few days he was appointed Private Secretary to the Prince of Wales (later King George V) and Esher was made secretary in his place.

The committee got down to business right away, probably to pre-empt extravagant or impractical proposals from Press and public (including Esher's own pet schemes). It decided, subject to the King's approval, that the memorial be architectural, not utilitarian; that it should include an effigy of the Queen; that it should be in London; and that it should be funded by subscriptions from all parts of the Empire, rather than by Government grant.

These proposals were immediately approved by the King, and at their second meeting the committee appointed an executive committee comprising the President of the Royal Academy (Sir Edward Poynter), the President of the Royal Institute of British Architects

---

[1] CAC ESHR Journals 2/10 3 February 1901
[2] ibid 10 February 1901
[3] PRO WORK 20/20: Report of Queen Victoria Memorial Committee (VMC) March 1911 p. 1

(Sir W. Emerson), Lord Windsor and Mr. (later Sir Sidney) Colvin (British Museum) with Viscount Esher as chairman.[4] In December 1901 the responsibilities of the general and executive committees were effectively transferred to a small ad hoc committee specially appointed by the King to supervise the actual construction. This committee, also under the chairmanship of Esher, was generally referred to as the Victoria Memorial Committee (VMC).

Lord Esher was the common thread running through all these bodies, first as Permanent Secretary to the Office of Works and (from 1902), as Deputy Constable of Windsor Castle. This latter post gave him unrestricted access to Edward VII, to whom he was a trusted adviser and confidant.[5] Esher played a leading role in the conception and construction of the memorial and supported Brock consistently through the various stages of execution until its unveiling in 1911. The other key member of the memorial committee was Sir Schomberg McDonnell, who succeeded Esher as Permanent Secretary to the Office of Works.[6]

At the executive committee meeting on 25 February 1901 most members favoured a proposal by Richard Allison, a young official from the Office of Works, to create an open space resembling a French 'place' outside Buckingham Palace. The statue of Queen Victoria would be seated under a canopy. The Mall would be re-aligned, and a ceremonial arch would be erected at its eastern end, opening onto Trafalgar Square.[7]

When these recommendations were considered by the general committee on 1 March, with the Prime Minister in the chair, they were more cautious. While they agreed that the memorial should include as its most prominent feature a statue of the Queen, the choice of a site was left open, with a location in the neighbourhood of Westminster Abbey or the Palace of Westminster being suggested as an alternative to Buckingham Palace.

It is possible that the inclusion of a Westminster site was prompted by a letter from George Shaw Lefevre, a former (Liberal) First Commissioner of Works. He recalled that the Golden Jubilee Committee in 1887 had suggested that a Memorial Chapel be built in

---

[4] *Builder* 13 April 1901 p. 359

[5] J. Lees Milne, *The Enigmatic Edwardian* London 1986 passim

[6] Sir Schomberg McDonnell (1861-1915), Private Secretary to the Marquess of Salisbury 1900-2, Secretary to the Office of Works 1902-12.

[7] VMC 1911 p. 2 and M. H. Port *Imperial London: Civil Government Building in London 1850-1915* New Haven and London 1995 p. 24

Old Palace Yard and connected to the Abbey by a cloister. Queen Victoria had replied that she was already committed to the proposed Imperial Institute as the main feature of the Golden Jubilee commemoration, and added (with a possible trace of irony) that a Chapel would be more appropriate after her death.[8]

Any dispute about the site was promptly settled by the King, who from the outset took a close personal interest in all matters connected with the memorial. On 4 March, accompanied by the Leader of the House of Commons (Balfour), the First Commissioner for Works (Akers Douglas) and Lord Esher, he made a tour of inspection through the Parks, the Palace of Westminster and Westminster Abbey and discussed on the spot the merits of the various proposals.[9]

The King finally decided in favour of a site in front of Buckingham Palace. This was duly noted by the executive committee on 11 March 1901, which agreed that the Monument to be erected on the site should include a statue of the Queen (no mention of a canopy); that an Arch commemorative of the progress of Art, Science etc. during the Queen's reign should be erected at the eastern (Trafalgar Square) entrance of The Mall; and that the Monument and Arch should be part of an 'architectonic scheme', involving 'a modification of The Mall in order to centre the avenue of trees with the proposed Monument and Buckingham Palace', this would give an opportunity to adorn the Avenue with sculptural groups.[10]

Although Esher's original ideas had been different, he was now completely converted to the Mall scheme. He wrote to his son Maurice on 11 March 1901:

> I carried my scheme unanimously for the Queen's Memorial in the Mall....He [the King] was delighted to get the thing settled on these lines... I suggested he should give a sub. to the Memorial himself - he thought it a good idea.[11]

The King was as good as his word. At a fundraising meeting in the Mansion House on 26 March the Lord Mayor of London announced that His Majesty would contribute 1,000 guineas towards the fund and that the proposed scheme for placing the memorial in front of Buckingham Palace had the King's entire approval.[12]

---

[8] *Times* 6 March 1901: the letter was dated 28 February and had probably been seen by the committee before their meeting
[9] *Times* 5 March 1901
[10] VMC 1911 p. 3
[11] CAC ESHR 7/14
[12] *Times* 27 March 1901

With the Victoria Memorial Fund duly launched, Lord Esher wrote on 26 March to five architects (Rowand Anderson, Sir Thomas Drew, Ernest George, Thomas Jackson RA and Aston Webb ARA) inviting them to prepare a design for the architectonic treatment of The Mall. At the same time, he informed the Lord Mayor of London that the executive committee had requested Mr Thomas Brock RA to prepare a design for the group or groups of statuary which were to form the memorial to the Queen. It was 'not beyond reasonable expectation' that Mr Brock, in collaboration with the architect ultimately selected, might produce a memorial worthy of Queen Victoria and the capital of the Empire.[13]

The executive committee had decided that it was unnecessary to hold a competition to select a sculptor. Such competitions, as had been seen from the Blackfriars Bridge fiasco, not only meant delay but also controversy.[14] When Sir Edward Poynter, a member of the executive committee, was asked for his opinion, he replied: 'There is only one man for such a work, and that is Mr Brock'.[15] The Brock/Poynter friendship, cemented seven years previously on the long voyage to the USA, had once more borne fruit.

Brock's own account of his selection was given in an interview to *The Times* some ten years later:

> I believe that a meeting of the Executive Committee, after the preliminaries had been arranged, decided unanimously to ask me to undertake the work. I was sent for by Lord Esher and informed of their decision. They thought that they might thus get a work which would have more harmony and rhythm than they could expect if a number of sculptors were engaged upon it. I felt great diffidence in undertaking the commission, fearing that I might not be able to do justice to so great a theme; but I thought that at least I could try.[16]

The selection of Brock as sculptor was given a cautious welcome by *The Times*. While there was not a great choice of sculptors, Brock had considerable experience and could be relied upon to produce a work of 'suitable monumentality and restraint'. Brock 'did not share the enthusiasm of Gilbert and Frampton for decorative and colouristic effects, and his style always remained broad and sculpturesque'.[17]

The *Annual Register* commented that the selection of Brock as the sculptor did not meet with unqualified approval. No one questioned his inventive and executive skill, but

---

[13] ibid 5 April 1901
[14] see p. 180
[15] Brock p. 186
[16] *Times* 15 May 1911
[17] ibid 27 March 1901

in view of the renaissance of sculpture in England it was unfortunate that no other artists were invited to submit designs for the monument.[18]

The Builder was the most outspoken. It could hardly be maintained that Brock was the leading genius in English sculpture. While he had a special reputation for portrait statues, it was questionable whether such a statue was an advisable element in such a memorial. The French favoured symbolical figures accompanying a bust or medallion, raising the monument to the level of a poetic conception. Alfred Gilbert's *Fawcett* in Westminster Abbey was an admirable example on a small scale.[19]

However, Brock found a forthright champion in Richard Edgcumbe, who had been secretary of the ill-fated Byron Memorial Committee twenty five years earlier. In his view, competitions were futile, harmful and offered no criterion for merit. He was personally glad that Brock had been selected - 'He is a man of genius, and he has won his position by merit. That he will do well, no one can for a moment doubt; but to suppose he will please everyone is of course ridiculous'.[20]

Brock was in fact a logical, if not inevitable, choice. Selection for a national commission of this importance was clearly limited to sculptors with established reputations, almost certainly members of the Royal Academy. There were only five sculptor RAs (Armstead, Brock, Ford, Gilbert, Thornycroft). Armstead was 72 and virtually retired (he died in 1905); Ford died later in 1901. Gilbert blotted his copybook with the King and Queen Alexandra over the Duke of Clarence's tomb and left London for Bruges in October 1901. The choice really lay between Brock and Thornycroft, both at the peak of their powers, experienced in monumental sculpture and dependable. Brock probably had the edge because he had a longer track record than Thornycroft in representations of the Queen - his Golden Jubilee statue for Worcester, his Diamond Jubilee statue for Hove and his successful designs for the 1893 coinage. Thornycroft, on the other hand, had only executed one statue of Victoria, for the Royal Exchange and he was busy completing *King Alfred* (for Winchester) and other commissions.

There is no suggestion, either in his journal or his correspondence, that Thornycroft was in any way upset by the selection of Brock. When Brock's sketch model was put on

---

[18] *Annual Register* 1901 p. 84
[19] *Builder* 13 April 1901 p. 359
[20] *Times* 10 April 1901

display, Thornycroft wrote promptly to congratulate him. Brock replied on 2 November 1901:

> Your kind words are indeed a great encouragement to me. I have been much worried at the exhibition of my little rough sketch, which I never intended the public to see. It was not carried far enough for the lay mind to realize the effect I had in view. I do hope the committee will now leave me alone.[21]

When selecting Brock, the executive committee had suggested that he might wish to visit other countries before starting work on his own design. In Brock's words:

> It was intimated to me that the Committee would like me to travel for a year and examine the great examples of the monumental sculpture of Europe. I felt, however, that if I were to do so before having determined on a general scheme I should be somewhat bewildered on my return, and that the result would not embody the expression of my own personal feelings. This being so I decided to proceed with my model, which was done to a very small scale, but was sufficient to convey a fair idea of my proposals.[22]

Unlike many of his contemporaries, Brock had never studied in Paris or Rome and his only overseas visit had been to the Chicago Exhibition in 1893. However, there is ample evidence from his works that he was well aware of what was happening on the continent. The massive memorial to Victor Emmanuel in Rome was under construction, and was precisely the kind of monument that was likely to 'bewilder' him.

Once appointed, he quickly set to work. His preliminary sketch model, in clay, some 30" (76 cm) high, was completed in the studio of Worcester Lodge (his house in Brondesbury) in three days of intensive labour.[23] The model was then transferred to his Osnaburgh Street studio for inspection by the King. Sir Arthur Ellis, Comptroller of the Lord Chamberlain's Department, wrote to Brock on 14 May 1901:

> The King proposes to come (with me) on Friday afternoon to see the sketch of the Q's [sic] memorial which my colleagues tell me is <u>such a success</u>, and which I am so anxious not only to see but to congratulate you upon.
> I will let you know later the exact hour. In the meanwhile, please consider that the visit is quite unofficial and private.
> Ld. Esher and Mr B. Mitford will meet H.N.[sic, H.M. intended] at your studio. No one else please. It will probably be about 4 pm.[24]

Brock later recalled the visit thus:

> The fact that it [the model] had so far reached maturity became known almost accidentally to King Edward, who paid me the honour of a visit to my studio to inspect it. His Majesty was

---

[21] Thornycroft C 104
[22] *Times* 15 May 1911
[23] Brock p. 188
[24] ibid p. 172. Bertram Mitford, Secretary to Office of Works 1874-6, created Baron Redesdale in 1902.

favourably impressed by the conception and made certain critical suggestions to which I deferred and which I embodied in the Memorial as it exists today.[25]

The King regarded the model in silence for some time and then approved it with the words 'That is to be the monument'.[26]

An objection to the location of the memorial immediately outside the Palace gates was now raised by the King's sister and caused him to have second thoughts. Princess Louise, herself a sculptor of some ability, was upset that she had not been consulted at any stage and decided to throw a spanner in the works. Esher wrote a private letter to Francis Knollys in July 1901 saying that her objections were 'founded upon fears that to form a 'place'for a statue in front of the Palace will lead to the gathering there of 'mobs' and the creation of a second Trafalgar Square', and he asked Knollys to speak to the King.[27] Esher also lobbied Arthur Balfour and other members of the memorial committee.[28] Evidently Knollys was able to reassure the King, as nothing more was heard of Princess Louise's objections, and Esher wrote on 28 August:

The K [sic] thought that the monument itself should be in the centre of the 'Place'.[29]

Nevertheless, Louise was so angry with her brother over this affair that the King later complained to Esher that he had not seen her for nine months.[30]

On 30 June 1901 the sketch model, now cast in plaster, was sent to St James's Palace, together with the proposals by the five architects for the whole Mall scheme. After the King had inspected the designs, the executive committee recommended on 15 July that Brock's sketch model be accepted 'subject to such modifications as may be necessitated by the Memorial Scheme as a whole', that Aston Webb's plan for the general treatment of the space in front of Buckingham Palace be accepted subject to certain changes; and that consideration of the remainder of The Mall scheme be postponed until the amount of the public subscription was known. The general committee approved these recommendations, and Brock's model and Webb's design were placed on public view at the Foreign Office.[31]

---

[25] *Times* 15 May 1911
[26] Brock p. 188
[27] RA Esher W38 (11); Francis Knollys, Private Secretary to Edward as Prince of Wales and King 1870-1910, and to George V 1910-12, created Baron (1902) and Viscount (1911).
[28] J. Wake *Princess Louise* 1988 p. 247
[29] RA Esher W38 (17)
[30] G. Plumptre *Life of Edward VII* 1995 p. 212
[31] *Times* 27 July 1901

So far as Brock's design was concerned, *The Times* commented:

> no man can form a final judgment upon so vast an architectural and sculptural group from a small clay sketch model measuring, perhaps, twenty inches high. But, at least, one can form an opinion of the ideas meant to be expressed... and, so far as these go, Mr Brock's plan promises well. It is simple, dignified and characteristic; it tells its own story in language that all can understand, and that all recognize as appropriate; and Mr Brock may be trusted to carry out in a manner that will not be common-place his conception of those common virtues of Justice, Truth and Love, which he had rightly chosen to symbolize Queen Victoria. The architectural proportions of the memorial, which are artistically quite as important as the sculpture, seem to be admirable.[32]

The Builder agreed that the model promised well, with its generally pyramidical composition, but considered that there ought to be a larger and more complete model before the final commission was awarded. In France, this would be a matter of course; in England it was considered too much trouble and expense.[33]

In view of the public interest, Esher decided to ask Brock and Webb to construct a larger scale model. He wrote to Ponsonby: 'It will cost about £300 but I think it is worth the money in dealing with so complicated a matter'.[34] Esher's proposal led to a misunderstanding with the King, who had previously asked for a small model for his own use. The King's Equerry, Arthur Davidson, wrote to Esher on 4 September 1901:

> The King desires me to write with reference to the model he wishes to be made of the proposed memorial at Buckingham Palace. His Majesty says that £300 is far too much to pay for what he wants, and that £25 to £50 ought to be ample.
>
> All he wishes for is an ordinary cardboard plan, made roughly according to scale, of which the height of Buckingham Palace would be about 4 inches and the rest in proportion.
>
> The King purposely does not wish it to be too elaborate as he wants to be able to shift the various objects about in order to judge different effects of it.
>
> It is in fact to be the sort of cardboard model that one see in toy shops, only to be rather more according to scale.[35]

Esher cleared the matter up with a letter of 8 September 1901 to Davidson:

> Please tell the King that the model plan of the Memorial which is under discussion with Brock and Webb was originally considered with a view to satisfying the public demand for information and it was thought we might exhibit it in the Academy next year.[36]

The larger model was exhibited at St James's Palace from 1 November to 7 December 1901, where it was seen by some 10,000 people. Brock's new model was

---

[32] ibid

[33] *Builder* 3 August 1901 p. 95

[34] RA Esher W38 (18), letter of 1 September 1901; Ponsonby was Asst. Private Secretary to the King

[35] CAC ESHR 5/13

[36] RA Esher W38 (23)

very similar to that shown to the press in July, but Webb had modified his original design, which had merely given an artist's impression of the monument. The revised design (plate 141) showed a larger monument which more closely resembled Brock's sketch model.[37]

Dugald MacColl described Brock's monument as:

> a grandiose and elaborate affair, involving much architectural as well as sculptural design... its main lines and proportions are open to the criticism that they promise little concision and force. A scheme so big calls for the trained genius of an architect as well as of a sculptor; and one fears that there will be a frittering away of effect, an accumulation of fairly good details, and no more. These details sum up mentally into an apotheosis of the Queen, but do not deliver their single blow plastically... [the Queen] will have to dispute precedence with her own Virtues, and be crushed beneath by her own Victory.

To emphasise his point, MacColl commended a design by Alfred Stevens for a Memorial to the 1851 Exhibition (plate 140), with the Queen perched on top, as 'a model surely to learn something from, if not to attempt its carrying out'.[38]

The only feature unreservedly commended by MacColl was the choice of Portland stone for the architectural parts, as 'nothing gives more satisfactory effects in London air, and its bleached and black surfaces are the characteristic colour of our London monuments'. Paradoxically, the one major change Brock made when construction began was to use Pentelic marble from Greece instead of Portland stone - perhaps he wished his monument to avoid the 'bleached and black' appearance described by MacColl. When the memorial was given a thorough inspection by the Ministry of Works in July 1939, the architect reported that the marble was evidently more durable than Portland stone.[39]

MacColl was not the only person to have his own ideas about the design of the memorial. Brock was incensed that Rowand Anderson, one of the five architects asked to submit an 'architectonic scheme', had commissioned Messrs Farmer and Brindley to prepare a sketch model of a suitable monument, which he had placed in position on his plan, even though he knew that Brock had already been appointed as sculptor.[40] John Adams Acton sent his proposal direct to Lord Esher; it showed the Queen in her coronation robes, while from the utmost jewel in her crown a great light was to radiate at night and lesser lights from her other jewels. The whole was to be mounted on a huge pedestal, the interior of which was to form a treasure-house for the mementoes of her

---

[37] *Times* 31 October 1901
[38] *Architectural Review* Vol. 10 (1901) p. 83
[39] PRO WORK 20/235 - Memorandum of 4 July 1939 by P. Heasman
[40] Brock p. 189

reign and a Valhalla for the names of the glorious dead.[41] The architect George Frederick Bodley proposed that the statue of the Queen could be placed on an island in St James's Park lake.[42] None of these suggestions was taken seriously by the memorial committee which remained firmly committed to Brock's design.

Esher visited the Osnaburgh Street studio again in November 1901, and it is clear that a friendly relationship had been established. On 7 November he wrote with evident pleasure to his son Maurice:

> [Brock] has given me two little works of his. One a bust of Leighton the artist, the other a statuette of 'Eve' - very nude and pretty. If I get anything out of the wreckage of Uncle Wilford's estate, I shall make him do me a bust of my father. He has done a splendid one of Lord Russell of Killowen from a photograph.[43]

At its meeting on 9 December 1901, the general committee authorised Brock and Webb to prepare estimates for the memorial within a limit in the first instance of £175,000. This could be increased later, with the King's approval, to the full total of the amount subscribed by the public. The general committee and the executive committee were then dissolved and an ad hoc committee was appointed by the King to superintend the carrying out of the work. The ad hoc committee originally comprised Lord Esher, Lord Windsor, Lord Redesdale and Sir John Stirling Maxwell. When the Liberal Government was formed in 1906, Lewis Harcourt joined the committee as First Commissioner of Works, but the King directed that Lord Windsor (created Earl of Plymouth in 1905) should remain a member in his personal capacity.[44]

Brock now prepared a more elaborate plaster model to a scale of one tenth full size (8 ft, 2.44 m, high). In June 1902 the King came to Brock's studio and sat in front of the model. After minutely examining every detail, he expressed his entire approval.[45] It was then that he realised the magnitude of the work and asked how long it would take to complete. When Brock mentioned ten years, the King replied 'Why, we shall all be in our graves by that time'.[46] This sadly proved to be an accurate prophecy, at least as far as the King was concerned.

---

[41] A. M. W. Stirling *Victorian Sidelights* 1954 p. 260
[42] *Times* 12 April 1901
[43] Brett pp. 313-4; Brock had small scale replicas of *Leighton* and *Eve* cast in bronze to give to friends. His marble statue of *Lord Russell* was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1904.
[44] VMC 1911 p. 5
[45] H. M. Cundall *Pall Mall Magazine* Vol XLVII June 1911 p. 850
[46] *Times* 15 May 1911

A formal contract was now drawn up and signed by Esher and Brock on 21 June 1902.[47] For a commission of this size the contract was a simple and concise document, which left a good deal to the discretion of the sculptor. In particular, no time limits were set, either for the completion of particular stages or for the final handing-over. Brock himself said: 'no artist could have been accorded greater freedom or treated with more complete confidence than I have enjoyed at the hands of the Memorial Committee'.[48] The main provisions of the contract were:

- Brock would 'regularly and without delay' execute the Monument according to the model design,
- the statue of the Queen and the three main symbolical groups would be executed in the best and hardest Sicilian marble;
- all the other figures would be executed in bronze and the figure of Victory would be gilded;
- the basins, steps and plateau would be executed in finely dressed granite and the other architectural portions in the finest Portland stone;
- the Memorial Committee would cause the site to be prepared and the foundation laid and would provide a supply of water to the basins;
- Brock would erect the Monument but would not be responsible for the solidity of the foundations or for any consequences arising from want of sufficient solidity;
- Brock would be paid £100,000 as follows: £10,000 immediately on account of the design and preliminary expenses, £80,000 in instalments of not less than £2,000 as the work progressed, and the balance of £10,000 on completion and erection of the Monument;
- in the event of his death or incapacitation by illness, Brock would be at liberty to nominate W. Goscombe John or some other sculptor to complete the Monument;
- should such a nominee be unwilling to undertake the task, the Memorial Committee would be at liberty to make other arrangements for the completion of the Monument;
- for this purpose, the design of the Monument would be considered to be the property of the Committee, and Brock or his legal representative would be entitled to £10,000 as commission for his design out of any money received.

---

[47] PRO WORK 20/20
[48] *Times* 15 May 1911

It is interesting that the contract nominated William Goscombe John as the first choice to complete the memorial in the event of Brock's death or incapacity. Goscombe John had been one of Brock's students in the Royal Academy Schools from 1884-6. Although he had exhibited regularly at the RA from 1886 onwards, he spent a good deal of time abroad (including visits to Rodin's studio) and was only elected ARA in 1899. His *Duke of Devonshire* had won a Gold Medal at the Paris Salon of 1901 and Brock may have spotted his potential. The fact that he was preferred to George Frampton, who had been elected ARA five years earlier, might indicate that Brock considered Frampton's work to be rather too unconventional. It is also possible that Goscombe John's selection owed something to his friendship with the Earl of Plymouth, who became First Commissioner of Works in 1902 and was thus a member of the memorial committee.[49] In the event, Goscombe John's services were not required.

On 17 December 1902 Edward VII paid another visit to Brock's studio.[50] Esher wrote to his son Maurice on 17 December:

> To-day I went to Buckingham Palace and waited for the King. He came down about 11.30 and we drove together to Brock's studio... We spent about three-quarters of an hour with Brock and Aston Webb - the architect - looking at every detail of the fine model of the Queen's memorial. The King has no knowledge of art, but his strong sense enables him to form correct judgments.[51]

It was agreed that work on site should begin on 21 July 1903 and by mid-October the first portion of the scaffolding had been set up.[52] M. H. Spielmann, in a lecture to the Royal Institution on 18 January 1904, announced that he had been fortunate at the last moment to persuade Mr Brock - 'much against his will, he feared' to allow him to have a photograph of the memorial taken for the purpose of his lecture. He also revealed that Brock, as a precaution against eventualities and in case Fate should prevent him finishing his work, was first completing his model for the whole undertaking before he began 'a single touch' of the actual work itself. Spielmann then projected his picture of the model on the screen for all to see and made the following assessment:

> Mr Brock had judged soundly in deciding to follow traditional lines for this great work, for this was not the occasion to make experiments, or to run risks by striking out in new directions. Although the general idea was based on tradition, the work was not only personal to the sculptor but thoroughly modern in treatment.[53]

---

[49] F. Pearson *Goscombe John* National Museum of Wales 1979 pp. 10-13
[50] *Times* 18 December 1902
[51] Brett p. 372
[52] PRO WORK 20/20 and *ILN* 24 October 1903 p. 626
[53] *Times* 19 January 1904

Esher wrote to Francis Knollys on 24 February 1904 that the new model was 'wonderfully fine' and continued:

> Brock says that in two years - the time which the King named - the basin and lower figures of the whole monument will be in position. The central portion will take longer. I shall have designs for lamps ready for the King to see in a few weeks. In short, very great progress has been made, and if Brock were to die tomorrow, the work could be completed precisely as he has designed it, so thorough is the detail of his work.[54]

Knollys replied on 26 February 1904:

> The King would like to go to Brock's studio tomorrow to see the model for Queen Victoria's Memorial. HM quite approves of your proposal that it should be exhibited in Westminster Hall.
>
> P.S. The King will take you with him to Brock's studio... will you let him know of HM's intended visit please.[55]

A meeting of the memorial committee took place on 12 August 1904.[56] Esher was in the chair, and those present were Brock, Aston Webb and Lord Windsor. Brock's design for the large lampposts around the memorial was approved, and he was asked to prepare a design for the smaller lamp-posts along The Mall. The committee also agreed to his proposal that Pentelic marble from Greece be used for the central column instead of Portland stone, subject to a report from the British Legation in Athens on the financial status of the Greek company providing the marble.

When the British Legation reported favourably on the local company, the King approved the use of Pentelic marble and asked about the effect on the cost. McDonnell assured him that Brock had agreed to work for a fixed sum[57]. On being told by Brock that he had decided to execute the memorial in marble, Esher said: 'You will never do it for the money'.[58] Events proved him right; in 1910 Brock had to ask the committee for an increase in the contract price.

---

[54] R A Household Papers Vol. 19 (1830)
[55] CAC ESHR 10/47 (Knollys Vol. I). The model was in fact exhibited at the Royal Academy
[56] PRO WORK 20/20
[57] ibid, McDonnell's letter of 24 August 1904 to Esher
[58] Brock p. 82

Chapter 18: The Victoria Memorial - Construction

The large (8 ft 2 in, 2.5 m, high) model of the Victoria Memorial (plate 139) was the principal feature of the Winter Exhibition in the Central Hall of the Royal Academy from January to March 1905.[1] The model, being to one-tenth scale, represented a total height of 82 ft (25 m) from its base to the head of Victory. It comprised:

(i) a marble statue of the Queen, enthroned and draped in Robes of State (plate 133 & 134);

(ii) three marble groups representing *Justice* (on the Queen's left), *Motherhood* (facing the Palace) and *Truth* (to her right) (plates 127, 130 & 137);

(iii) on the apex, a gilded bronze figure of *Victory*, with bronze figures of *Constancy* and *Courage* beneath (plate 138);

(iv) above the two fountain basins, massive bronze groups representing *Power* (two seated figures symbolising the *Army* and *Navy*) and *Intelligence* (two figures symbolising *Art* and *Science*) (plate 125);

(v) on the plinths flanking the basins, four bronze lions with standing figures representing *Peace* and *Progress* (plates 131 & 132) and *Agriculture* and *Manufacture* (plates 123 & 129).

In addition to these fifteen large statues or groups, the monument incorporated:

(a) four marble ships' prows, bearing trophies, at the four corners of the central pedestal;

(b) two marble eagles emblematic of Dominion on the cornice of the pedestal, one over the Queen, the other facing the Palace;

(c) four bronze fountains in the form of antique heads discharging water into two basins on either side of the central pedestal;

(d) two bronze reliefs of a Triton (plates 135 & 136) and a Sea Nymph respectively, below the groups representing *Power* and *Intelligence*, also discharging water into the basins;

---

[1] A Spy cartoon of 21 September 1905 shows Brock in his studio with the model (Plate 14)

(e) on the retaining wall behind the basins, marble friezes of Tritons and Sea Nymphs symbolical of the British people as Children of the Sea.[2]

A comparison between this model and the smaller scale sketch model shown to the press and public in 1901 reveals the following main changes:[3]

- the four winged griffins on plinths are replaced by four groups, each comprising a standing allegorical figure accompanied by a lion
- the retaining walls behind the basins are decorated with marble reliefs depicting the British people as Children of the Sea, instead of bronze bas reliefs illustrating the progress of mankind during the Queen's reign;
- the two bronze groups representing *Power* and *Intelligence* rest on curved pediments, rather than the pediments being behind and above the groups;
- the central column to be constructed of Pentelic marble instead of Portland stone.

Minor changes included:

- *Justice* and *Truth* had no wings on the earlier model, and the seated woman beside *Truth* was originally reclining;
- in the *Motherhood* group, the standing child was originally in the mother's lap
- Queen Victoria's sceptre, originally held upright, rests in the crook of the Queen's arm;
- the central section is taller, with the double-headed capitals on the columns becoming single and with two eagles added above the Queen and *Motherhood*;
- ships' prows added to the four angles at the base of the pedestal (in the 1905 model, two of these were to bear trophies suggestive of the Army and Navy, and two fruit and flowers, suggestive of Commerce and Prosperity - on the actual monument, all four prows are decked with swags and oak leaves).

Although the list of changes appears impressive, there was very little difference in substance and concept from the smaller model originally seen in 1901. The *Saturday Review* offered rather caustic comments:

---

[2] Royal Academy Council Report for 1905 pp. 55-6
[3] Darby pp. 426-7

> The whole scheme that includes this group is like the design of a committee, and if we can imagine a committee designing a monument, Mr Brock's model is very much what one would expect as the result of their labours. ...The design, then, has no one prevailing plastic idea. Its parts, in Mr Brock's hands, will not lack a certain level of ability and skilful workmanship, and the various clauses and amendments will be drafted into as smooth and inoffensive a combination as the fundamental confusion admits of; but the very enclosing lines of wall look, in their flaccid forms, as if they had been sat on by a committee. [4]

However, H. M. Cundall in the *Art Journal* took a more positive view:

> The great work on which Mr Brock is now devoting his energies will far surpass anything he has yet attempted both in grandeur and design; and when erected... it will be the finest memorial group in London and well worthy of the great and good Queen... The whole scheme is a grand work of noble conception and with a beautiful harmonising outline. The figures, whilst retaining to a certain extent the severe form of the classic school, have the movement of the great masters of the Renaissance period, without too much of that realism which is being foisted upon us at the present day; and the ornament, whilst being bold in design, is kept in a subservient position throughout. [5]

Meanwhile, Brock was wrestling with the practical difficulties of constructing so large a monument. One of these was studio space. The Osnaburgh Street studio was too small, and Brock received permission from the Office of Works in 1906 to erect a temporary studio in Regent's Park, about half a mile from Osnaburgh Street. The wooden building, which cost Brock £1,000, aroused some local opposition. Lewis Harcourt, First Commissioner of Works, assured Sir William Collins (the local MP) that the building would be removed as soon as work on the Victoria Memorial was completed, and that in the meantime he would endeavour to make the building 'as little unsightly as possible'.[6] To this end, the Office of Works planted hops, Virginia creeper and actinidia chinensis around the building, for which they charged Brock £13.6s.0d.[7]

Two years later, Brock sought permission to double the size of the building. When this was refused he had to rent a further studio in Percy Road, Shepherd's Bush in 1908. While he had to pay for the Regent's Park building himself, it was agreed that the rent for the Shepherd's Bush studio would be paid by the Victoria Memorial Fund.[8] Modelling was done at Osnaburgh Street, and the temporary studios were devoted chiefly to the pointing and carving of the marble.[9] Brock later complained that his

---

[4] *SR* 18 March 1905 p. 342
[5] *AJ* 1904 p. 199
[6] Parliamentary Question 16 May 1906
[7] PRO WORK 20/19: minutes of 28 May and 12 July 1906
[8] PRO WORK 20/101: accounts dated 17 May 1924
[9] Brock pp. 193-4

labours were considerably increased by having to supervise work in three separate studios.[10]

Another problem facing him was the shortage of skilled workers in marble. On 11 February 1907 Esher sent a memorandum to the King, informing him that Brock:

> is experiencing some difficulty in getting the marble delivered from Sicily, but he hopes that the base of the monument will be in position next autumn.
>
> Viscount Esher has received complaints about the use of Italian workmen for the delicate and highly skilled work of marble working by compass. Unfortunately it is necessary to use Italians for this work, as only a very few Englishmen are qualified to handle artistically the very hard Sicilian marble of which the statues on the memorial are made.[11] The Trades Unions seem to think that this marble can be worked like the soft stone to which they are accustomed. [12]

When Lewis Harcourt asked Brock why more men were not working on the memorial to make greater progress, when so many were unemployed. Brock replied rather tartly:

> I think you will agree that none but first class craftsmen should be employed on a Memorial of this importance, and such men are not usually found in the ranks of the unemployed. The view I take is not so much that the work should be hastily done as that it should be well done - a view which I am however forced to believe is not, as I should have imagined it would be, one which is universally held.[13]

However, the foreign worker controversy did not go away. In a further report to the King in June 1908, Esher wrote:

> In view of certain criticisms which have appeared, and of a Petition presented to Your Majesty, signed by large numbers of working men, praying that the marble work in connection with the Queen Victoria Memorial should be entrusted to British workmen, Mr Brock was asked to explain to the Committee the technical reasons which made it necessary to work the Carrara marble masonry in Italy, reasons which appeared to the Committee satisfactory and conclusive. ...It may be observed that the whole of the granite has been worked in Great Britain by Your Majesty's subjects.[14]

In the same report, Esher noted that:

- the foundations and core of the Memorial itself had been finished to the base of the statue of the Queen, and the marble masonry of the basins, retaining wall and flanking pedestals, together with the marble and bronze reliefs, were in position;
- the marble group of Justice was entirely finished, and considerable progress had been made with the statue of the Queen and the group of Motherhood;

---

[10] Cundal 1911 p. 852

[11] The marble masonry for central pedestal, flanking pedestals, retaining walls, arches, fountain basins and basin beds was worked in Italy. The pieces were prepared in the order in which they were required and shipped to England as soon as a full consignment was ready (Brock pp. 194-5)

[12] Brett pp. 221-2

[13] Brock pp. 200-201

[14] PRO WORK 20/21: memorandum dated 24 June 1908

- Brock now had three studios at which 'this great work, which monopolises all his time', was being carried on;

The accounts attached to the report showed that Brock had been paid £50,813 on account by 12 June 1908 and the Memorial Fund totalled £357,929.[15]

From time to time Brock had to call on his friends to help. On 7 January 1908 he wrote to Hamo Thornycroft:

> Could you lend me a jack for a few days to help to pick up a large block of Sicilian [marble] (25 tons). The ground outside the studio is rather soft and it will require three jacks to lift the marble and I have only two available. Please forgive me for troubling you.[16]

Meanwhile, Brock had been exhibiting various parts of the memorial at the Royal Academy. In 1906 he sent in a bronze fountain panel and *The Builder* commented:

> In purely sculpturesque quality Mr Brock's relief of a nymph and triton is the finest thing of the year, though it can hardly be said to express an idea at all; it simply captivates by its grandeur of line and fine modelling. If it is a specimen of the decorative sculpture which is to adorn the Victoria Memorial, we may look forward to the erection of a great work of art in front of the Palace.[17]

When *Motherhood* (plate 130) was exhibited in 1907, *The Builder* was more reserved. While the work was fine as a sculptural composition, the head of the principal figure seemed deficient in expression. However, the ample drapery was very finely treated; In comparison with its broad simplicity, the drapery of Albert Hodge's figure of Science (for the Victoria Memorial in Dublin) looked very bustling.[18]

At the 1909 Academy Exhibition it was the turn of *Justice* (plate 127). *The Builder* at last was enthusiastic - the work was:

> The most important sculpture of the year, in regard to subject, execution and distinction... There is a fine sweep of line in the composition and a fine idea conveyed in it, for Justice is represented not as the avenging but as the protecting power.[19]

On 2 March 1909 Edward VII paid his fifth visit to the Osnaburgh Street studio to see how the memorial was progressing.[20] He was accompanied by the Permanent Secretary to the Office of Works, who wrote to Brock:

---

[15] ibid

[16] Thornycroft C 110

[17] *Builder* 14 July 1906 p. 34

[18] ibid 22 June 1907 p. 744

[19] ibid 26 June 1909 p. 751

[20] *Times* 3 March 1909. Previous visits were on 14 May 1901, in June 1902, 17 December 1902 and 24 February 1904

> I was so sorry that the rapidity of our departure from your studio on Tuesday rendered it impossible for me to tell you how much I enjoyed my visit, or how deeply impressed the King was with the beauty and charm of your splendid work.[21]

On 24 May 1909 the wooden hoarding around the base of the memorial was removed and the public were able to see for the first time the basins, fountains, sculptured reliefs, paving, steps and plateau, as well as the bronze lampposts (plate 128) which Brock had also designed. A statement by the memorial committee noted that the marble statues of the Queen, Justice and Motherhood were complete in Brock's studio and that the plaster model of Victory (plate 143) was at the foundry ready for casting in bronze. The part of the memorial now open to the public comprised 1,000 tons of marble and over 800 tons of granite. The four fountains used 108,000 gallons of water per hour, pumped by engines especially erected at the pumping station in St James's Park.[22]

The Times commented that Brock had been given an opportunity such as no English sculptor had ever had before, and he had risen to the height of it. The design was large, the treatment dignified and simple, worthy both of the subject and the beautiful material. Brock had decided to replace the proposed bronze reliefs, showing the development of the Army and Navy, with an allegorical marble frieze showing Children of the Sea, because he felt the original scheme would have been too crowded and a simpler design would have a better effect. The allegorical theme indicated that the power of the Empire was based on the sea and the figures of Tritons and Nereids in low relief were admirably graceful and full of movement. The article concluded:

> An idea has got abroad, even among artists, that there has been co-operation in the architectural design and detail; but this, we have the best authority for saying, is quite erroneous. Mr Brock and Sir Aston Webb have been in perfect accord throughout, but each has done his own work; and if the Mall and its beautiful gates are the architect's, the honour of having thought out and executed the Memorial is exclusively Mr Brock's.[23]

The Builder was also impressed. The effect of the white marble podium, with its beautiful texture and fine mouldings, its reliefs of nymphs and tritons and the water pouring into the basins was delightful - bright and cool at the same time. The architectural plan and detail, as well as the actual sculpture, were Brock's, and he should

---

[21] Brock p. 173; Sir Schomberg McDonnell's letter of 4 March 1909
[22] *Times* 24 May 1909
[23] ibid

be congratulated on having done better with the architectural work than sculptors sometimes do.[24]

On 23 June 1909 Oxford University awarded Brock an Honorary Doctorate in recognition of his achievements as a sculptor.[25] Speaking in Latin (and using the new pronunciation for the first time) the Public Orator noted that Brock 'by the consensus of all his colleagues' had the highest reputation in the art of sculpture. After referring to his monument to Lord Leighton in St Paul's Cathedral, Dr Holdsworth continued:

> we all hope that an even greater fame will come to him from that vast and truly regal monument on which, like a second Phidias, he is now engaged. Before the Palace of our King in London there rises a marvellous mass, raised with magnificent skill, without doubt an eternal testimony to the virtues of our never-to-be-forgotten Queen Victoria.

In conferring the degree, the Vice-Chancellor (Dr. T. H. Warren) said:

> Most skilful man, supreme master of the art of Phidias, to whose intellect and hands we owe it that the memory of our most beloved Queen shall not lack a worthy memorial, you who found a grassy approach to the Palace and left a marble one, I by the authority vested in me admit you to the degree of Doctor of Civil Law honoris causa.

For Brock, who had left school at the age of 12 with a minimum of education, this was a very great honour, and one which he valued above any other. He was particularly touched by the fact that the University, instead of waiting until he had completed his labours on the memorial, had decided to honour him at this time, as if to express their confidence in his ability to carry out his task successfully and 'to encourage him in carrying it to completion'.[26]

Brock was a modest man, and not one to make undue fuss of orders and decorations. However, one occasion at Worcester Cathedral after he had received his Doctorate gave him particular pleasure. The Lord Lieutenant of Worcester was Earl Beauchamp, a rather grand figure and a Cabinet Minister. Brock was invited to walk in the procession at his side. At the suggestion of the Dean of Worcester's sister, Brock had put on the splendid robes of a DCL(Oxon) over his evening dress. He said afterwards with a twinkle in his eye: 'As we made our way to the Cathedral I noticed Beauchamp glance at me as though he had not imagined I was such an important person'.[27]

---

[24] *Builder* 29 May 1909 p. 636; Brock had been elected an Honorary Associate of the Royal Institute of British Architects in 1908 (*Builder* 7 March 1908 p. 271)

[25] *Times* 24 June 1909

[26] Brock p. 216. The only other sculptor awarded an Honorary Degree by Oxford University between 1900 & 1920 was Rodin (1907)

[27] Brock pp. 118-9; Lord Beauchamp was First Commissioner of Works 1910-14. He did not particularly like Brock's works (see *Captain Cook*, p. 207)

Following the opening of the lower part of the memorial to the public in May, Edward VII took an even closer interest in the construction because he could now see the craftsmen at work. In July 1909 the Permanent Secretary to the Office of Works wrote to Brock:

> The King spoke to me on Saturday very urgently about the progress upon the Queen Victoria Memorial. His Majesty watches the work from his window every day, and being much concerned at what he considers a somewhat slow rate of progress, has commanded me to write and beg you to push matters on with all possible despatch.[28]

Shortly after this the King saw Brock climbing ladders high on the scaffolding around the lofty central column, and remarked 'I don't like to see Mr Brock moving about that scaffolding in the way he does. Oughtn't he to be cautioned?' On being told what the King had said, Brock commented 'I must see everything for myself'. When the massive figure of Victory (plate 143) was being fixed in position, eighty feet above the ground, his clerk of works tried to dissuade him from mounting to the topmost staging. Brock insisted on climbing the perpendicular ladder to see that everything was in order, and afterwards remarked 'I didn't so much mind the going up, but coming down wasn't pleasant'.[29]

Considering the size of the monument and the length of time it was under construction, the safety record was good - but unfortunately not perfect. Despite every care being taken, one workman lost his footing on the scaffolding and fell to his death. This was the only accident which occurred, but one which caused Brock much distress.[30]

On 10 January 1910 a meeting of the memorial committee was held - only Esher, Brock and Schomberg McDonnell were present.[31] Brock admitted that the original sum (£100,000) for which he had contracted to carry out the work was inadequate, and that if he had an opportunity of making the contract over again in the light of the experience he had acquired, he would not name a smaller figure than £125,000. At the same time, he placed himself entirely in the hands of Lord Esher and the committee; and should they see fit to hold him to his contract, he should not complain, notwithstanding personal loss to himself. On Esher's recommendation, it was agreed that the original contract should

---

[28] ibid p. 194
[29] ibid p. 205
[30] ibid p. 225
[31] PRO WORK 20/21; minutes of meeting of Victoria Memorial Committee 14 January 1910

be rescinded and that an amended contract for £125,000 should be entered into. This was not the last occasion on which the contract price would be increased.[32]

Meanwhile, questions were being asked in Parliament about the date of completion. On 7 March 1910 Lewis Harcourt said that the work would be finished in the next twelve months, although there was no actual date in the contract. The progress of sculpture was always doubtful, and it was not usual to name a date. Mr Brock had asked for ten years from the signing of the contract, and it would probably be completed in seven years - an unexampled rate of progress for a work of this magnitude.[33]

On 6 May 1910 King Edward's sad prophecy was fulfilled: he died without seeing the memorial completed. The German Emperor, William II, came to London for his uncle's funeral and asked to see how far the construction of the memorial to his grandmother had gone. Accompanied by Brock, he climbed twenty five feet up the scaffolding to see the statue of the Queen and *Justice, Truth* and *Motherhood.* After studying *Motherhood,* which was on the west side facing the Palace, the Emperor said: 'I like that. I like that very much. But why not put in its place a statue of King Edward? The monument would then serve as a memorial to him as well as to Queen Victoria'. While astonished at the suggestion, Brock kept silent. The Emperor continued: 'It seems to me a very good idea. It wouldn't affect your design at all. I'll mention it to the King'. He then moved on to inspect *Truth.* Brock was about to follow when a member of the Emperor's suite took him by the arm and said loudly in a strong German accent: 'Don't you take any notice of anything he says'.[34]

The Emperor not only mentioned his idea to King George, but also to King Edward's widow. On 2 June 1910 Brock wrote to Esher:

> Since I heard that Queen Alexandra had expressed a wish that a statue of his late Majesty should be placed on the Memorial facing the Palace in lieu of the group of Maternity, I have been hastily engaged in modelling a bust of King Edward and in preparing a sketch model of the statue. When both are a little more advanced, I shall be glad if you will kindly call and see them.
>
> Of course, I deplore the proposed departure from my original design, nevertheless I shall do my utmost to make the change to harmonize with the rest of the work [so] that the alteration shall not be felt to any marked extent.[35]

---

[32] see p. 247

[33] *Hansard* Vol. 14 (1910) col. 1283; the contract was signed in June 1902 and the memorial was unveiled in May 1911 i.e. nine, not seven, years later. However, the Victor Emmanuel Monument in Rome, for which the contract was awarded in 1884, was not completed until 1911 - 27 years later

[34] Brock pp. 206-7

[35] CAC ESHR 5/34

Esher was as unhappy as Brock about the proposed change, but had to obey the royal command. He replied rather curtly to Brock on 5 June 1910:

> The King wishes me to tell you that what he would like would be a standing figure of King Edward in the robes and dress of the Garter.[36]

Schomberg McDonnell also had doubts. He wrote to Esher on 7 June 1910:

> I had not realised that the King wanted a standing figure in the Robes and dress of the Garter. No doubt Brock will be able to achieve it, but I fear that it would add to his difficulties as all the other figures are seated. Don't you think it would be worthwhile to consult the Committee as soon as Brock's preliminary drawing is ready; they are all men of taste and His Majesty might like to have their views before he comes to a final decision.[37]

Meanwhile Brock was becoming more used to the idea, as he told Esher:

> In accordance with the wish of the King, conveyed in your letter of the 5th, I have prepared a sketch model of a standing figure of King Edward. The effect is really much better than I expected it would be and I am becoming reconciled to the change in my design.
>
> Can you kindly spare a moment on Tuesday or Wednesday to call and see it? If so, I shall be grateful.[38]

Brock's small statuette, made to the same (one-tenth) scale as the working model, was cast in plaster and placed on the model in the studio. The memorial committee did not find the effect pleasing, and shared Brock's view that to 'represent on the same monument a King and Queen separated from each other and looking in opposite directions was somewhat lacking in dignity'.[39] On 1 July King George and Queen Mary visited Brock's studio and saw the various models.[40] Shortly afterwards, it was decided, to Brock's relief, not to proceed with the German Emperor's proposal.

The final stages of construction were now complete, and all the marble statuary was in place, together with *Constancy*, *Courage* and the gilded *Victory* (plate 142). Although the six bronze groups were still not ready, it was decided to proceed with the unveiling without delay. In February 1911 Schomberg McDonnell and Brock discussed the details of the ceremony. Brock suggested that the covering should be the Union Jack, but McDonnell considered this impossible from the practical and symbolic point of view - to associate the fall of the national flag with the unveiling of a great statue of Queen Victoria would, he thought, be perfectly deplorable. Nor did McDonnell like

---

[36] Brock p. 207
[37] CAC ESHR 5/34
[38] ibid, letter of 11 June 1910
[39] Brock p. 207
[40] RA Diary of the Prince of Wales (George V) Friday 1 July 1910

Brock's alternative idea of a purple cloth - this was equally objectionable, as purple was the colour of mourning. Finally, Brock and McDonnell agreed on canvas of 'the purest white'.[41]

On 24 April 1911 the Victoria Memorial Committee submitted a lengthy report to King George giving the history of the project, noting that:

> An attempt has been made on a large scale to treat a public memorial in an architectonic spirit; and under the auspices and largely under the initiative of King Edward, the Memorial and its surroundings might be said to be the first example in recent times of Town Planning in the Metropolis.

After thanking Sir Aston Webb for the devotion he had shown in maintaining the broad lines of the original scheme and for the elaborate care he bestowed upon its details, the committee paid tribute to the genius of Mr Brock: 'The Monument itself stands as the best testimony of his work'.[42]

The unveiling ceremony took place at 12 noon on 16 May 1911 in the presence of hundreds of invited guests and thousands of spectators. King George and Queen Mary were accompanied on the dais by the Emperor and Empress of Germany, Princess Victoria Louise of Prussia, the Prince of Wales and members of the Royal Family. After Lord Esher had delivered an address, the King recalled that his beloved Father had watched over and guided the work with interest and close attention. Though, alas, not spared to see the completion of the memorial, King Edward was more than ever in their thoughts on this day. The King continued:

> The Memorial itself, alike in beauty and situation, does justice to the art of the sculptor and the skill of the architect. It now stands complete before our eyes to revive for us, and to convey to our descendants, the lustre and fame which shine upon that happy age of British history when a woman's hand held for a period which almost equalled the allotted span of human life the sceptre of Empire... I pray that this monument may stand for ever in London to proclaim the glories of the reign of Queen Victoria, and to prove to future generations the sentiments of affection and reverence which Her people felt for Her and Her memory.[43]

The Archbishop of Canterbury then conducted a short service of dedication, and the combined choirs of St George's Chapel Windsor, the Chapel Royal, Westminster Abbey and St Paul's Cathedral sang 'O God our help in ages past'. The King pressed the 'electric button' which released the white hanging in front of the statue of Queen Victoria, and the massed bands played the National Anthem.

---

[41] RA GV 2476: letter from McDonnell to Ponsonby of 14 February 1911
[42] VMC 1911 pp. 7-8
[43] George V: *The King to his People (Speeches and Messages)* 1911 p. 391

The members of the Victoria Memorial Committee were now presented to the King..

As *The Times* reported:

> Mr Brock was just passing on after his presentation when the King called him back and, calling for a sword, gave him the honour of knighthood in the presence of the thousands assembled, and in the shadow of the great work to which he has given ten years of his life.[44]

King George noted the events of the day in his Diary in a more laconic manner:

> At 12 the ceremony of unveiling Grandmamma's statue took place. William and Victoria and all the family walked in procession to the statue... Knighted Mr Brock the Architect [sic] and gave him the KCB.[45]

Brock thus joined the small but select band of RA sculptor knights of the first third of the twentieth century. Sir George Frampton (1908), Sir William Goscombe John (1911), Sir Hamo Thornycroft (1917) and Sir Alfred Gilbert (1932) were Knights Bachelor. Sir Bertram Mackennal (1921) received the KCVO. Brock was the only KCB.

---

[44] *Times* 17 May 1911

[45] RA Prince of Wales (George V), Diary Tuesday 16 May 1911

Chapter 19: Victoria Memorial: Criticism

The first reactions in 1911 to the newly unveiled monument were a combination of relief and euphoria that, after ten years of preparation and construction, the nation's memorial to Queen Victoria was now on public view. Brock's fellow sculptors and other friends were quick to offer their congratulations. Hamo Thornycroft wrote:

> I won't bother you by saying again how fine I think the work is... I have always said that the commission went to the right man, and I feel now that my opinion was justified.[1]

and noted in his diary:

> Brock's fine work was unveiled yesterday in front of Buckingham Palace. A very fine work it is. I see that he is knighted and has a KCB. He thoroughly deserves it. The English have a way of blundering in and yet giving an important work to the best man for the job.[2]

There is no hint of resentment that he himself had not been selected.

Other colleagues who congratulated Brock included Henry Pegram ('No one but a sculptor can appreciate the great difficulties you have overcome with such conspicuous success'); Frederick Pomeroy ('You have scored a triumph, and I offer you my sincere congratulations on completing what will be recognised as one of the finest sculptural monuments of the world') and Bertram Mackennal ('It gives me joy whenever I pass it'). The President of the RIBA, Sir William Emerson, wrote: 'It is indeed a grand composition and grand in detail. I have seen nothing finer in Europe.'.[3] In view of the criticisms of the *Architectural Review* this message from an architect must have given Brock especial pleasure.

Viscount Esher, who as chairman of the Victoria Memorial Committee had been so supportive of Brock throughout, wrote:

> ... most sincere congratulations upon the completion of your splendid work - the finest work produced for many a generation in this or any other country - and the recognition of it by the King. Yesterday was essentially your day as well as Queen Victoria's ...[4]

The warmest letter of all came from the American-born painter Edwin Austin Abbey:

> You can't expect to have many such days in your life, as this one, and although, being living hopeful beings - if we have souls inside us - we look forward to greater and higher things, your friends and many admirers, whom you don't know and will never see and hear of,

---

[1] Brock p. 233
[2] Thornycroft Th.LL.71, entry for 17 May 1911
[3] Brock p. 232
[4] ibid p. 238

> cannot but look upon this achievement of your life as your highest achievement and one of the great achievements in the history of British art. I send you for myself and my wife our warmest and heartiest congratulations, and may you have health and strength to go on and up, as you have pretty well always done since the day you were born.[5]

The press reception was more mixed. Among the few who gave unreserved praise was Malcolm Salaman:

> At last we may congratulate ourselves that we have, in the centre of London town, a sculptural monument of supreme importance which British art may claim with pride. The Memorial... is a work which in its unity, dignity and nobility of conception, its large simplicity and harmonious beauty of design, and its accordance with the great vital ideals of sculpture in the true structural expressiveness and the broad live modelling of natural form, is in every way worthy of its purpose as a national and imperial tribute.

Salaman conceded that other sculptors might soar to greater altitudes of idealism, strive for more realistic or emotional expression, or have a livelier, daintier fancy and a more delicate touch. But for a great monumental work of this kind it was imperative to have a grand sculpturesque imagination, the power of conceiving in noble expressive lines, true proportions and impressive masses (not falsified by undue light or shade) and a simple directness of emotional significance and appeal. Brock had been chosen because he possessed to an eminent degree this power of treating his subject and material in the large expressive monumental style; and he had fully justified the wise discrimination of the committee in entrusting to him alone the entire conception and execution. [6]

The Times described the memorial (plate 122) as:

> beyond comparison the most splendid that has ever been erected to a British Sovereign. People will, of course, find fault with it... Some will say that it is more foreign than English... that the colossal scale of the central statue does not suggest the proportions of Queen Victoria, who so wonderfully combined great dignity with a short stature. Others, again, may fail to interpret some of the symbolism, or think the gilded *Victory* [plate 138] a little too conspicuous.

The Times saw very little in such criticisms - what the Empire and its people had wanted was a great monument on a great scale. Brock could express with sufficient poetry and more than sufficient dexterity symbolic ideas which, without being commonplace, were such as the commonalty could understand. The Victoria Memorial was on the whole successful in expressing in a direct, intelligible and yet imaginative way the ideas associated with Victoria's reign.[7]

---

[5] ibid p. 200

[6] M. C. Salaman 'Sir Thomas Brock's Queen Victoria Memorial' *Studio* Vol. 53 1911 p. 29

[7] *Times* 17 May 1911

Both Salaman and *The Times* drew comparisons between the Albert Memorial and Victoria Memorial, to the advantage of the latter. Salaman considered it to be quite a lesson in artistic progress to visit the Albert Memorial with its lifeless sculpture and conventional modelling, and then go to the Victoria Memorial and realise the vitality and expressive beauty of Brock's work.[8] *The Times* noted that in the Albert Memorial, everything was sacrificed to the architecture, whereas the Victoria Memorial was architecturally simple, harmonious and right, with the details showing thought and care.[9]

The Times was less happy about the allegorical figures, and wished that for *Truth* and *Justice* (plates 137 & 127) the sculptor had chosen other types than that of the conventional angel, since an angel was 'a morphological monstrosity'; however, the wings were not prominent, and the rest of the figures were charming, though one or two required 'a little explanation'.[10]

Brock himself gave a full description of the symbolism and the precise allegorical meaning of the various figures in an interview with *The Times* on 15 May 1911:

> I felt first that I must begin by giving what I thought was the true foundation upon which the Throne must rest, and so it occurred to me that there should be a large raised platform surrounded by walls containing fountains and great basins into which the fountains discharged. This would suggest the maritime greatness of the Empire. This idea was further developed by the retaining walls being decorated by mermaids and tritons. It also appeared to me that this base should likewise be emblematic of the courage and wisdom of the people, which are suggested by the reclining allegorical figures over the fountains, on the one side representing the Navy and Army, typifying courage, and on the other side Science and Art, symbolising intelligence.
>
> To carry this idea further I placed on the pedestals flanking the steps at the front and back of the monument groups of colossal figures supported by lions - in the front, on the right a figure of Peace and on the left, a figure of Progress; and at the back, facing the Palace, figures of Labour, Agriculture, and Manufacture. These, I felt, would represent all the qualities of the nation upon which Monarchy must depend for its security.
>
> The central feature, which rises to a height of 82 ft above this foundation, I devoted entirely to those qualities which made our Queen so great and so much beloved. The statue of the Queen I placed in front, seated enthroned with Orb and Sceptre and looking towards the heart of the great city whose people she knew and loved so well. On the right of the great pedestal I placed a group of Justice, and on the left a group of Truth. I felt that she was just and that she sought the truth always and in all circumstances. At the back I placed a group of Motherhood, symbolizing her great love for her people.

---

[8] Salaman p. 29

[9] *Times* 17 May 1911

[10] ibid. Osbert Sitwell referred to 'tons of allegorical females in white wedding cake marble' quoted in C. Hibbert *A Guide to Royal London* 1987 p. 92

> Above, ornamenting the main corners front and back, I placed eagles, emblematic of Dominion, and on the superbase figures of Courage and Constancy; and rising from above on an orb a figure of Victory with outspread wings, with the right arm uplifted and holding in her left hand a palm branch.[11]

The *Morning Post* conceded that the memorial was sure to be extremely popular, as it comprised all the factors that appeal to national pride and sentiment, presented with a power hitherto absent in British monumental sculpture. However, in choosing the form of the monument Brock had set himself a task of extraordinary difficulty. The figure of the Queen was distinct and predominant, but Brock had achieved this at the expense of artistic coherence. [12]

The *Architectural Review*, which had criticised Brock's initial design when it had been put on public display in 1901, liked the final product even less. Brock, who had received an abundance of attention from those who were prepared to vilify his memorial before they had even seen it, was entitled to expect fair criticism. He had not done anything exceptional and some of the figures had the too-pervading air of the studio-model. Nor could anything be said in praise of the architectural detail, being of an Italian Renaissance type with a plethora of bad detail. However, the figure of the Queen was regal and imposing and *Courage* was 'very finely grouped, strong in its lines'.[13]

The Builder disliked the allegorical figures:

> We cannot profess to have been quite satisfied either with the central architectural feature, which is rather commonplace in design and detail, or with the marble groups which are attached to its four faces; that on the west side [*Motherhood*] is the most successful, but all of them are rather heavy in design, and want that je ne sais quoi which only French sculptors seem able to impart to allegorical designs of this kind.[14]

Roger Fry in *The Nation* referred to the memorial's turgid and flamboyant rhetoric, worn-out symbolism and laboured allegory. To add insult to injury, he asked his readers to contribute towards a proposed statue of Cézanne by Aristide Maillol which he described as 'a genuine piece of sculpture'.[15] Even George V may have had reservations - when Edwin Lutyens called on him in March 1912 to discuss the design of the new

---

[11] ibid. In the description published by the Royal Academy in 1905, presumably also written (or authorised) by Brock, the Army and Navy group is called Power (not Courage).

[12] extract from the *Morning Post* quoted in the *Architectural Review* (June 1911) pp. 356-8

[13] ibid pp. 351-2

[14] *Builder* 1 January 1915 p. 2, praising the four bronze figures added in December 1914 see p. 246

[15] quoted in Brock p. 231

buildings for Delhi, the King's referred instead to the proposed memorial to his father, saying 'I want no (qualified) Angel of Victory'.[16]

Although the memorial was criticised for its conventional imagery, there was a growing appreciation of its importance as a symbol of the monarchy. It achieved the two objectives sought by King Edward - it provided a suitable background for the pageantry that he loved, and it brought Buckingham Palace out of the seclusion of Queen Victoria's days.[17] Ian Nairn made a similar point in 1966:

> Separately, and considered in the abstract; [we see] an overloaded arch, a pleasant straight avenue, and Brock's Benefit of Edwardian pomp and circumstance at the other end. Together, and endowed with knowledge of their function... they become a great formal gesture... The Champs Elysées, and other academic layouts, come miles down the list compared with this reasonable yet dramatic gesture... not a museum piece but a living exposition of 1910, calling to the Edwardian hidden in every person's character.[18]

Jenner noted that 'pride of place in this attempt to give London a monumental avenue worthy of her imperial destiny' was the Victoria Memorial. Much disregarded in spite of its prominence, it stood not only as a symbol of British self-esteem but also as the high-water mark of London's self confidence and metropolitan aspirations.[19]

The most thorough reassessment was probably that made by Philip Ward Jackson in 1978 . He drew attention to three salient features which distinguished the Victoria Memorial as a public monument and as a work of art (plate 122). First, like the Albert Memorial:

> it allows access to the public by means of a stepped podium. It does so more invitingly [than the Albert Memorial], there being fewer steps to climb, and it has become, perhaps because of this, a signal recreational amenity.[20]

Second, whereas the total effect of the Albert Memorial eluded one from the podium because of its sheer verticality, Brock's 'more sensuous tapering stele directly communicates rhythm and proportion, as well as the invigorating sensation of proximity with over-lifesize figure sculpture'.

---

[16] C. Hussey *Life of Sir Edwin Lutyens* 1953 p. 246

[17] H. E. Wortham *The Delightful Profession - Edward VII, a Study in Kingship* 1931 p. 20

[18] I. Nairn *Nairn's London* 1966, revised 1988 p. 48. 'Brock's Benefit' refers to a display of fireworks made by Brock and Co. (no relation to Thomas Brock)

[19] M. Jenner *London Heritage* 1988 p. 243

[20] Public access was improved in 1999 by 'pedestrianising' the road between memorial and Palace

Third, Brock had been able to 'mould into a congruous silhouette Michelangelesque nudes, quattrocento thrones, and, most surprisingly, two Pompadour doves amorously entwined' behind *Motherhood* (plate 126). Ward Jackson concluded: 'Offered so much, who will complain that the allegories are hardy annuals?'[21]

Writing four years later, Benedict Read commented

> The monument is in its way one of the supreme achievements of the New Sculpture, redolent throughout with features and reminiscences essential to its whole nature; or of the movement, at least, in its establishment format, lacking the extremes of finesse of Gilbert's decorative fantasy or Frampton's craftiness.[22]

According to Read, the bronze reliefs of mermaids, the fountain-head figures and the marble reliefs of Nereids and Tritons (plates 135 & 136) showed 'the subtlety of material handling and space gradation so characteristic of the New Sculpture'. The 'reminiscences' of works by other artists - such as *Constancy* and *Courage* (Stevens), *Motherhood* (Dalou), *Victory* (Gilbert) and *Manufacture* (Thornycroft) - were thus considered by Read as a positive feature, not as a subject for criticism.

Susan Beattie took a very different line from Ward Jackson and Read. She asserted that 'the pre-war development of the public monument was carried to its logical extreme by the great plagiarist of the New Sculpture, Thomas Brock'. Her main criticism was that the images used by Brock had by 1911 been 'stretched to exhaustion' by endless allegorical monuments commemorating the South African War. She concluded:

> It is as if Brock had hoped that by marshalling all the images he most admired in memorial sculpture and enlarging them as far as space and money would allow, he could achieve the perfect monument.[23]

One of the main characteristics of the New Sculpture was the constant inter-reaction between the sculptors, as ideas or subjects suggested by one were taken up by another. Gilbert himself was 'heavily indebted' to Gustave Doré and Antonin Mercié for his *Kiss of Victory*,[24] while his *Mother teaching Child* (plate 163) had obvious links with Eugène Delaplanche's *Education Maternelle*.[25] In her description of Alfred Drury's sculptures for the War Office, Beattie noted that:

> The War Office groups illustrate the complete assimilation into their sculptor's personal style of the influences most crucial to his development: Alfred Stevens and the *terribilità* of the

---

[21] P. Ward Jackson *Courtauld Institute Illustration Archives* (Archive 4, Part 7) 1978 p. iii
[22] Read 1982 p. 377
[23] Beattie p. 230
[24] ibid p. 138
[25] Dorment (1986) p. 103

> Wellington Monument figure groups, the lyrical realism of Dalou, the symbolist images of Frampton...[and] the energy in handling three dimensional form that Drury had recognised in the work of Bates.[26]

If Drury can be praised for closely following Stevens, Dalou, Frampton and Bates, why should Brock be denounced as a plagiarist for following Stevens, Dalou and Gilbert?

Moreover, Beattie overlooked two crucial points. First, just as Brock had adapted a Renaissance model to prepare a suitable memorial for Lord Leighton, so he brought together many characteristic features of the New Sculpture for the Victoria Memorial, which he saw as embodying the sculptural revival which characterised the last quarter of her reign. It was therefore inevitable that the Victoria Memorial should have 'reminiscences' of the New Sculpture - that was part of Brock's aim and purpose.

Second, Brock not only conceived the entire design in 1901, but incorporated it in a detailed model, which was meticulously adhered to. The fact that the memorial was only unveiled in 1911 meant that allegorical and decorative ideas considered appropriate and contemporary in 1901 were ten years out of date and becoming somewhat out of fashion.

Although the general arrangement of a seated figure surrounded by allegorical groups has similarities to Gilbert's *Queen Victoria* for Winchester (plate 166), the visual impact of the Victoria Memorial is quite different. Gilbert's *Queen* represented:

> the triumph of the spiritual and secret over the physical and mundane... [it was] Baroque in the manipulation of bronze and the great sweep of drapery, Gothic in the marshalling of its detail and Donatellesque in the pathos of its statuettes.[27]

Brock's aim was different - to produce a dignified and graceful work which was a realistic portrait of the Queen as she was known to her subjects, not 'the triumph of the spiritual and secret over the physical and mundane'. His version might not have been as innovative as Gilbert's, but it corresponded much more closely to the popular perception of the monarch. Any suggestion that Brock's statue was a plagiarised version of Gilbert's is therefore unfounded.

Just as the central figure of the Queen bore the unmistakable imprint of Brock's iconography, so the subordinate figures, reminiscent though they might be of other New Sculpture imagery, were given a particular character and meaning by Brock. For example, Hamo Thornycroft had treated the theme of labour in an ideal way some twenty

---

[26] Beattie p. 117
[27] ibid p. 207

years earlier; but there was a world of difference between his *Mower* (plate 174) and Brock's burly blacksmith (*Manufacture*) (plate 129). As Beattie noted:

> Reminiscent of Meunier's labourers though the *Mower* is, Thornycroft was concerned here not so much with social comment or the dignity of labour, as with the evocation of stillness and reverie.[28]

Brock's aim was precisely the opposite - *Manufacture* was intended to represent the dignity of labour as one of the qualities upon which the Monarchy depended. The blacksmith, with his shirtsleeves rolled up and his mighty hammer ready to hand, clearly meant business - no 'stillness and reverie' for him.

In the same way his allegories of *Truth* and *Justice* (plates 137 & 127) showed several original touches. There is a dramatic contrast between the rather threatening figure of Justice, helmeted and holding a sword, and the more serene figure of Truth, holding a mirror and with her bosom bare, indicating nuda veritas (naked truth). But that is not the whole story. For all her serenity, *Truth* has the firm and steady gaze of someone who is not likely to be deceived. By her side a seated female figure pores over a long scroll - Brock described her as an 'archivist'. The implication is that our deeds are carefully recorded and it is impossible to escape the final reckoning - 'truth will out'.[29] On the other hand *Justice* has her compassionate side: her sword points downward, in defensive not offensive posture and the scales of justice are held rather carelessly by a playful cherub, a sign that the last pound of flesh will not be demanded. Significantly, *Justice* holds the hand of a weeping woman, symbolising compassion and protection for the oppressed.

Brock also demonstrated his originality in his treatment of the theme of *Motherhood*, (plate 130) symbolising 'the Queen's great love for her people'. He had first depicted a mother teaching a small child to read in his bronze bas-relief *Education* on the Rathbone Memorial (1876) (plate 106), and developed a more impressionistic version in lower relief for the *Education* plaque on the Queen Victoria statue at Hove (1901). He also designed a bas-relief for the Hove statue symbolising *Empire* (plate 96), with an ideal female figure seated on a throne and loyal subjects from Australia, Canada, India and Africa on either side. For the Victoria Memorial these two ideas were combined to

---

[28] ibid p. 150

[29] It is possible that the cherub with the sheaf (of palms or wheat) indicates 'as you sow, so you shall reap' - but this may be fanciful.

create *Motherhood* - the serene and dignified figure on an ornate chair surrounded not by adult citizens of the Empire but by young children. Thus Victoria was represented not as a stern Empress like Catherine the Great, but as a nurturing mother. The fact that Brock's *Education* on the Rathbone Memorial (1876) was earlier than Dalou's *Charity* (1877) (plate 159), and Gilbert's *Mother teaching Child* (1881) (plate 163), would seem to demonstrate the affinities between the New Sculptors and makes nonsense of the charge that Brock had simply copied others with *Motherhood* on the Memorial.[30]

It is important to counter Susan Beattie's accusation of plagiarism because her book is rightly regarded as the definitive account of the New Sculpture. She was not deliberately unfair to Brock, but was genuinely unaware of the very existence of some of his works and therefore of the extent of his involvement in the early days of the New Sculpture and his contribution to its development. This was compounded by the fact that she was much more interested in architectural sculpture (which Brock hardly touched) rather than with public statues which were Brock's particular forte. There is evidence that Beattie later modified her attitude; a manuscript note written by her in 1988 acknowledged that 'Brock has an important place in the stylistic development of the so-called New Sculpture movement in the 1880s and 1890s'.[31]

If the Victoria Memorial is viewed in the light of Brock's previous works and his declared intentions, it will be seen as an appropriate tribute to a nineteenth century monarch in a nineteenth century style. While the taste of art critics and historians ebbs and flows with the years, the Victoria Memorial remains both a potent symbol of the monarchy and a 'signal recreational amenity'. In Ward Jackson's words:

> Brock's monument belongs to the international mainstream of academic sculpture of the time. Reactionary it may be, especially when one considers what was being done by Fauvists and Cubists at the very same moment; but within its own traditionalist idiom, it is an adept piece of work.[32]

---

[30] Hunisack 1977 pp. 144-151 notes that the 'traditional allegory' of *Motherhood* was a popular theme among sculptors of the period

[31] see p. 118

[32] Ward Jackson p. iii

Chapter 20: The Victoria Memorial: Completion

Malcolm Salaman was one of the few critics commenting on the Victoria Memorial at its unveiling who noted that it was still incomplete. It lacked six major bronze groups - two would rest on the arches over the fountain basins, while four standing figures, each 11 ft 6" (3.2 m) high and with lions in attendance, were to be placed on plinths. Salaman wrote:

> All these colossal figures... are structurally fine, naturally modelled, and beautifully alive; while the sculptor is taking pains, by close observation in the lion-house at the 'Zoo', to make the lions something much more than conventionally British. When the six bronzes are finished and in place, then his complete design may be judged as a whole; at present it lacks the balancing effect of these groups.[1]

Salaman's view that the bronzes were an integral part of Brock's design and were important as a visual counterweight to the central column was not, at least initially, shared by all Brock's colleagues. When Brock reminded an (unnamed) member of the Victoria Memorial Committee that a large amount of work still remained to be done, the reply was 'Why bother? The monument is quite satisfactory as it is. You won't improve it by adding anything more'.[2]

Goscombe John told Brock that it would be a 'mistake' to place the two groups over the basins; but after they had been installed he admitted that he was wrong: 'I see now that they were essential to the completion of the design... Brock was right in this, as he was in most things'.[3] Even Aston Webb wondered whether the four standing groups (*Peace*, *Progress*, *Agriculture* and *Manufacture*) were necessary, but after they had been placed in position he agreed that they greatly assisted the whole composition.[4]

In spite of the absence of the bronze groups, Lord Esher decided that the tasks of the Victoria Memorial Committee were essentially fulfilled, and on 23 January 1914 he submitted his final report.[5] He also proposed that the memorial should be formally handed over to the Office of Works in accordance with the Public Statues Act of 1854, and this was agreed by HM Treasury on 3 March 1914.[6]

---

[1] M.C.Salaman 'Sir Thomas Brock's Queen Victoria Memorial', *Studio* 1911 Vol. 53 p. 35
[2] Brock p. 241
[3] ibid p. 242; this was a generous admission as he had crossed swords with Brock over the siting of his *Edward VII* in Liverpool (see pp. 142-4)
[4] ibid p. 242. The importance of the bronze groups can be seen from the aerial view (plate 121)
[5] *Builder* 13 February 1914 p. 162
[6] PRO WORK 20/104

It was not until December 1914 that *Agriculture* (plate 123), *Manufacture* (plate 129), *Peace* (plate 131) and *Progress* (plate 132) were installed on their plinths. It was ironic that *Peace* and *Progress*, conceived in the heady days of the Edwardian era, should be placed in position a few weeks after the outbreak of the 1914-18 war - which was no doubt the reason why there was no public ceremony. *The Times* commented that the four bronze groups were intended by Brock to symbolize the qualities of the English people - their love of peace, their desire for progress, their devoted labour. *Agriculture* was a 'superb woman, magnificently poised'. *Manufacture* was:

> a mighty smith, in an easy but commanding attitude of conscious pride in his great strength... his throat and chest are bare, his shirt sleeves rolled up, he rests easily on his mighty hammer and wears his leather apron, with pincers fastened in the belt. [7]

Agriculture and *Manufacture* were not conventional symbols, but finely realistic figures - 'the smith wears modern trousers, but Sir Thomas Brock has made a work of art of his figure'.[8] Others have noted the irony of a smith with a hammer and a woman with a sickle (symbols of revolution) advancing on Buckingham Palace.[9]

The Builder considered that the four bronze groups were 'perhaps the finest part' of the whole memorial, commenting:

> the sculptor has found just the class of subject which suits his broad and forcible style of modelling... those on the west side may be taken to symbolise Agricultural Labour and Mechanical Labour - the former represented by a noble-looking woman carrying a sheaf of corn, the other by a still finer figure of a smith, in the realistic costume of his craft, the broad apron being well taken advantage of to give a sculpturesque character to the dress. It is like one of Meunier's small bronzes of artisan figures reproduced on a colossal scale. All the figures are fine and dignified and the lions are very well treated, with sufficient variety of action to give each a separate interest, while leaving sufficient resemblance to render them all part of one comprehensive design. Altogether these four groups form a splendid addition to the monument, and tend to raise its character and effect as a whole.[10]

After the installation of *Peace, Progress, Agriculture* and *Manufacture*, two groups still remained to be placed on the memorial - *Army and Navy (Power)* and *Science and Art (Intelligence)*. Although the Army and Navy group bears the date 1916 (plate 124), it seems unlikely that it was actually cast until 1920, as all foundries were engaged on munitions production during the war and the casting of decorative statuary was virtually suspended. The foundry (Burton's of Thames Ditton) were almost certainly referring to

---

[7] *Times* 28 December 1914

[8] The model for the blacksmith was said to be the same Colorossi who had modelled for Brock's *Hercules strangling Antaeus* and Leighton's *Athlete* thirty year previously (Salaman p. 35)

[9] P. W. White *On Public View* 1971 p. 63

[10] *Builder* 1 January 1915 p. 2

both groups when they claimed in March 1919 that rises in the price of material and labour as a result of the war meant that the cost had doubled from £2,150 to £4,300. To add insult to injury, they raised a charge of £212.17s for storing the models.[11]

On 12 December 1919 Sir Lionel Earle (Permanent Secretary to the Office of Works) wrote to Esher:

> Sir Thomas Brock came to see me last Friday with a tale of woe - I am bound to say that I sympathise with him... The point is how much money has he made in profit out of the whole concern, and shall I ask him to disclose this.[12]

Esher consulted the King, and Earle consulted the First Commissioner of Works. Three days later Earle informed Brock that the King, the First Commissioner, Lord Esher and he were in entire agreement that it would be manifestly unfair to expect Brock to bear the extra cost consequent on the increased cost of labour and material. It was therefore agreed that the extra £2,150 would be met from the Memorial Fund.[13]

On 27 November 1920 Brock told Earle that he hoped the second group would be cast in eight or nine months.[14] However, the foundry still delayed and Earle enquired on 1 November 1921 whether the 'recent fall in metal prices' would mean that Burton's could reduce their charge.[15] Brock replied:

> I regret to say that I cannot hold out any hope of my being able to induce Mr Burton to accept any less for the founding of the fountain groups for the Victoria Memorial than was agreed at the end of 1919. Although I then consented to an increase of 100% on his previous quotation, and notwithstanding the fall in the price of metal, Mr Burton is continually telling me that he is losing heavily on my work and if it was not for other work in hand for which he is better paid, he would have to close his foundry.[16]

The reason for the long delay in casting the second (and last) fountain group may well have been that the Burton foundry was busy casting Brock's two massive equestrian statues of Edward VII, one for Delhi, the other for Sydney, and these were given higher priority than the completion of the Victoria Memorial. Brock died five months later, in August 1922, thus fulfilling Edward VII's prophecy that before the memorial was finished 'we shall all be in our graves'.[17]

---

[11] PRO WORK 20/104; letters from Brock to Earle 19 February 1919 and 6 December 1919
[12] ibid; letter from Earle to Esher. Earle succeeded Schomberg McDonnell in 1912.
[13] ibid; letter from Earle to Brock 15 December 1919
[14] PRO WORK 20/101
[15] ibid; letter from Earl to Brock
[16] ibid; letter from Brock to Earle dated 3 November 1921
[17] see p. 220

On 28 November 1922 Frederick Brock, now acting as his father's executor, told the Office of Works that before the last two bronze groups could be installed, certain alterations had to be made 'in accordance with the instructions which Sir Thomas Brock gave shortly before his death'. These alterations were the addition of marble 'slips' and fixing brackets to hold the two groups in position, and the provision of channels to drain rainwater away and prevent it from staining the marble arches.[18] The Office of Works consulted Sir Aston Webb, who agreed to supervise this work.

On 4 February 1924 Frederick Brock told Earle that Aston Webb had been in touch with the foundry and considered them best placed to undertake the haulage, lifting and fixing of the two groups, each weighing seven tons.[19] Burton's assured Earle direct that no crane would be used. A special cradle would be made to hold each group on the vehicle and the group would be moved on rollers from the vehicle to a wooden platform level with the marble platform of the memorial.[20] Frederick Brock told Earle on 27 February 1924 that Burton's method 'is the one I feel sure my father would have employed - although it is slow, it is the safest'. Aston Webb agreed with the foundry's proposal, prudently adding:

> Of course, I have nothing to do with the Memorial itself, which was entirely in the hands of the late Sir Thomas Brock, but his son has asked me to represent him as far as I can in this matter.[21]

On 30 April 1924 *The Times* reported that both bronze groups, *Army and Navy* to the south, *Art and Science* to the north (plate 125) had 'just' been placed in position. There appears to have been no public ceremony or announcement; the authorities no doubt wished to avoid questions about the length of time it had taken to complete a monument unveiled thirteen years earlier.

The groups themselves are fine examples of bronze casting in the best New Sculpture tradition. The four massive seated figures, two male and two female, are virtually nude, with drapery lying loosely across their lower limbs. Their reclining, relaxed poses recall figures by Michelangelo. Brock himself explained the symbolic references: *Army* holds a sword, *Navy* the hull of a ship, *Art* a palette and brushes and *Science* (rather surprisingly) a pair of dividers and a roll of plans. A massive Medusa-headed shield rests behind

---

[18] PRO WORK 20/157; letter from F. Brock to Earle
[19] ibid; letter from F. Brock to Earle
[20] ibid; letter from Burton to Earle of 20 February 1924
[21] ibid; Webb's letter of 21 February 1924 to Earle

Army, while *Science* leans on a dynamo. The symbolism has not always been clearly understood; the *Courtauld Illustration Archives* referred to *Army* as *War*, *Navy* as *Shipbuilding*, *Art* as *Painting* and *Science* as *Architecture*.[22]

In his letter to Earle of 27 February 1924, Frederick Brock wrote: 'The erection of these groups completes my father's contract with the Memorial Committee. I should be much obliged for the outstanding balance of £2,160-19s-0d'.[23] Thus concluded the saga of the construction of the memorial, twenty one years after work had begun and two years after Brock's own death.

The final accounts for the Victoria Memorial Fund dated 17 May 1924 are as follows:

	£
Payments by Office of Works	145,432
New Frontage for Buckingham Palace	63,184
'New Scheme of 26 April 1912' (water supply, Mall lighting)	20,660
Rent for Brock's Shepherd's Bush studio	3,973
'Devonshire House' Gates for Green Park	2,859
Royal Artillery Memorial	1,386
Unveiling Ceremony May 1911	2,244
'New Vista' in Green Park	805
	£240,543

The accounts do not include payments to Brock for the memorial itself. The main items were:

	£
Original Contract 1902	100,000
Amended Contract 1910	25,000
Extra cost of casting	2,150
	£127,150

Brock also received some small payments for extra expenses, but these are unlikely to have amounted to more than a few hundred pounds.[24] The Office of Works calculated in 1924 that about £600 was left in the Memorial Fund, and gave this to the Civil Service Benevolent Fund.[25]

The story of the memorial would not be complete without recording Brock's other contributions to the overall scheme - the decorative lamps around the memorial and

---

[22] *Courtauld Institute Illustration Archives* Plates 4/7/19 and 21

[23] PRO WORK 20/101

[24] For example, on 13 May 1920 (PRO WORK 20/101) he submitted a bill for extra expenses of £410.19s.

[25] PRO WORK 20/101; minute on final accounts May 1924

lining The Mall, the bronze chains (now removed), the Royal Coat-of Arms on the central facade of Buckingham Palace; the figures of Gunnery and Navigation on Admiralty Arch; and the Admiralty Coat of Arms above them.

The six large lamp standards around the memorial were specially designed by Brock. Each is crowned by a galleon in full sail and there are four dolphins on the base, which bears Brock's signature (plate 128). The decorations include symbolic oak tree branches and seaweed.[26] The designs were approved by the King in March 1903 and endorsed by the committee on 12 August 1904.[27] The lamp standards were in position when the lower part of the memorial was opened to the public in 1909.[28]

Admiralty Arch had been designed and constructed by Aston Webb as part of the grand architectonic scheme embracing the whole area between Trafalgar Square and Buckingham Palace. On 18 December 1911 the Victoria Memorial Committee noted that Brock had designed four bronze statuary groups to adorn Admiralty Arch; that King George had visited Brock's studio and approved the models, and that if Aston Webb concurred, Brock would be asked to proceed with the work as rapidly as possible for a fee of £20,000.[29]

The decision some six months later to re-face the eastern facade of Buckingham Palace at a cost of £60,000 meant that there was not enough left in the Victoria Memorial Fund to pay for elaborate statuary on Admiralty Arch.[30] The Permanent Secretary at the Office of Works broke this news to Brock and explained why he was losing his £20,000 commission. Brock, said McDonnell, 'quite understood the position'.[31] It was probably by way of compensation that Brock was given the smaller but still important commissions for the Royal Coat of Arms in the centre of the Palace facade (for a fee of £800)[32] and *Navigation* and *Gunnery* (plates 3 & 4) on The Mall side of Admiralty Arch.

Gunnery and *Navigation* are among the few examples of Brock's work as an architectural sculptor, carving a statue to complement an architect's design. His massive seated female figures are in Portland stone; *Gunnery* wears a helmet with chin strap, and

---

26 Cundall p. 848
27 PRO WORK 20/20; minutes of meeting of Victoria Memorial Committee 12 August 1904
28 *Times* 24 May 1909
29 PRO WORK 20/20; letter of 19 December 1911 from McDonnell to Sir Aston Webb
30 *Builder* 18 October 1912 p. 430 and 15 November 1912 p. 572
31 PRO WORK 19/52; letter of 11 June 1912 from McDonnell to Esher
32 PRO WORK 20/104; payment to Brock in January 1914

cradles a muzzle-loading cannon on her lap; *Navigation*, hatless, has a classical hairstyle and holds a sextant. On the whole, they do not appear to have received much (if any) critical attention until 1985, when Richard Cork launched a broadside against Brock's 'overblown figures' as typical of official taste at the time expressing little more than the stereotyped rhetoric of late British imperialism. Their inflated gestures were vacuous enough to guarantee that passers-by would not even notice, let alone be offended by, this sculptural intrusion on an important metropolitan thoroughfare. The figures were 'stock devices, intended only to reinforce the generalised sentiment of the triumphal arch they augmented'.[33]

There is more to *Gunnery* and *Navigation* than Cork admits. If, as he says, they fail to attract the attention of passers-by, then they at least achieve the sculptor's aim of blending harmoniously with the Arch itself. Rather than being 'overblown' they have a rather brutal simplicity which puts them among Brock's most 'modern' works. There is very little of the New Sculpture in *Gunnery* and *Navigation.*

One question which troubled officials from the outset was how the Victoria Memorial was to be used. Was it to be a shrine, which visitors should treat with reverence like a church, or was it to be (as it later became) a popular rallying point for viewing royal occasions? Not surprisingly, the initial view was one of extreme caution. Writing to the King's Private Secretary on 5 May 1911, a few days before the memorial was unveiled, Schomberg McDonnell expressed concern:

> If the Memorial is open from an early hour, it will be invaded by a crowd of people at the Mounting of the Guard, who, far from wishing to look at the Memorial, will turn their backs on it and will swarm up the steps in order to look into the [Palace] forecourt... Mr Brock is very concerned.... he fears an almost certain injury to the marble.[34]

The King's Private Secretary appears to have agreed with this view, and not only were posts and chains put into position to control public access, but park keepers were on duty during opening hours. These were initially set at noon to six p.m. to ensure that the monument was closed during the guard changing ceremony at eleven am. Despite these precautions, a suffragette succeeded in putting permanganate of potash into the fountains in July 1913 and in May 1914 there were reports that children were swinging on the bronze chains.[35]

---

[33] R. Cork *Art beyond the Gallery* 1985 p. 3
[34] PRO WORK 20/224; letter to Lord Stamfordham (Arthur Bigge was created baron in 1911)
[35] ibid; minute of 15 July 1913 and 15 May 1914

While officials were apparently insensitive to public opinion, the Royal Family were much more aware of the need to allow loyal subjects to see their King and Queen. In 1917, following a complaint by the Office of Works that the police had allowed public access to the memorial during two recent royal occasions, the Commissioner of Police replied:

> On 21 July 1917, a few minutes after the open air investiture in the forecourt of the Palace had begun [marking the inauguration the Order of the British Empire], a verbal message from Her Majesty the Queen was brought to the police by a page, stating that it was the King's wish that the public should be admitted to the steps of the Memorial, the better to view the ceremony. Similarly on 15 August 1917 [when the King took the salute at a marchpast of newly arrived American troops] the police were informed by the Acting Master of the Household that it was the King's Command that the public were to be admitted.[36]

These democratic gestures caused a shock wave in the Office of Works. Sir Lionel Earle wrote to the King's Private Secretary on 11 September 1917:

> In view of the possible damage that may be done to the Memorial, I think it is only right that His Majesty know of the danger that may occur through the King's proverbial kind-heartedness towards the general public.

The reply came promptly:

> The King of course recognises the danger... His Majesty however would be sorry not to allow the public to use all these vantage points - but thinks if the police were given timely notice they should be able to prevent any future damage.[37]

The principle of public access was now established, but even so was not always put into effect. During the march past by holders of the Victoria Cross on 26 July 1920, the King noticed that the memorial was closed to the public and commanded that it be opened.[38] In July 1929 the Office of Works ruled that it should always be open to the public on 'special occasions'; and when a new Permanent Secretary queried this in 1934, he was told that the police preferred to allow access rather than try to keep the public out.[39]

The final conversion of the Office of Works came in 1946, when Harold Macmillan, then a backbench MP, wrote to ask that the memorial be protected from damage by the public on the anniversary of VE Day. An Under Secretary minuted that 'a little statue

---

[36] ibid; memorandum of 5 September 1917
[37] ibid; letter of 12 September 1917 from Stamfordham to Earle
[38] ibid; letter from Commissioner of Police to the Office of Works 1 July 1929
[39] ibid; minutes of 4 July 1929 and July 1934

climbing (at least of the more robust and less valuable statues) is a traditional part of these national celebrations'.[40]

It has remained so ever since, as Steven Brindle has more recently observed:

> The Victoria Memorial scheme [Monument and Mall] remains one of the finest, perhaps the finest, piece of grand city-planning in Britain, and one of the best in Europe. The Memorial scheme greatly enhanced the architectural setting of the Crown, and it has been the essential backdrop to royal and national occasions ever since. Few places in Britain are more charged with meaning than the Monument and The Mall.[41]

---

[40] ibid; minute by Proctor of 21 May 1946

[41] S. Brindle *Sir Aston Webb and the Victoria Memorial,* English Heritage, 2000 p. 12

Chapter 21: Conclusion

Thomas Brock worked within the conventions of his age, and made no apologies for doing so. However, this did not mean that his work was necessarily 'conventional', still less that it lacked imagination and originality. In one of his earliest works, *Hercules strangling Antaeus* (1869), he endowed a familiar classical subject with what the critic Edmund Gosse described as the 'vigorous vital qualities of French work'.[1] The significance of this was the timing: *Hercules* was exhibited two years before Aimé-Jules Dalou and Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux began to exhibit at the Royal Academy. Another indication of French influence can be seen in Brock's *Snake Charmer* (1877). The style and subject matter are distinctly French and the young man's turban-like bandeau, reminiscent of Antoine Mercié's *David* (1872), predates by five years Alfred Gilbert's *Study of a Head* (1882). Whether Gilbert borrowed the idea of the bandeau from Mercié or Brock is uncertain; one thing that is certain is that Brock did not borrow from Gilbert.

Frederic Leighton was so impressed by *Hercules strangling Antaeus* that he decided to execute his *Athlete wrestling with a Python* in Brock's studio and to ask Brock for technical advice and assistance. Not only did the realistic rendering of anatomical detail of the *Athlete* recall the musculature of *Hercules*, but the modelling of the python may well indicate the hand of Brock. His *Moment of Peril* (1880), which prominently featured a python, was

> One of the first manifestations of the ideals expressed in the *Athlete* amongst the younger generation [of sculptors].[2]

Gosse suggested that Brock was slow to change his style from the 'fatal Foley smoothness' to the more realistic and naturalistic forms of the New Sculpture.[3] However, the evidence that Brock was susceptible to French influences before 1877, and his involvement in the conception and execution of Leighton's *Athlete*, indicate that he was among the originators of the New Sculpture rather than a reluctant follower.

One of the reasons why Brock has not been given a more prominent place in the New Sculpture movement was that after 1881 he produced only two important ideal works,

---

1 Gosse 1883 p. 45
2 Kader p. 14
3 Gosse 1883 p. 45

The Genius of Poetry (1889) and *Eve* (1898). While both were hailed as masterpieces by the critics (Susan Beattie acknowledged that *Eve* belonged within the mainstream of the New Sculpture movement), he was admittedly less prolific in this field than contemporaries such as Hamo Thornycroft and Alfred Gilbert.[4] Instead of ideal works, Brock made his mark with his portrait busts, commemorative statues and church memorials. He was not content simply to follow Foley's style, but captured the spirit of the New Sculpture by bringing greater naturalism and realism to his works. As Marion Spielmann wrote:

> Had he continued as he began he would have been a second Foley; developing as he did, he has left his master far behind.[5]

His *Robert Raikes* (1880) and *Bartle Frere* (1888) were, with Onslow Ford's *Rowland Hill* (1882) and Thornycroft's *General Gordon* (1888), the first examples of the New Sculpture's use of bronze to create more realistic and lifelike representations of public figures, and his bronze bust of Frederick Leighton (1893) was praised by Thornycroft as 'the finest bust of our time'.[6] Brock also continued to produce notable works in marble, including *Henry Longfellow* for Westminster Abbey (1884) and his first statue of Queen Victoria (for Worcester 1890), which struck a balance between Gilbert's flamboyant but impractical monument for Winchester and more pedestrian versions by older sculptors like Matthew Noble and Edgar Boehm.

By 1901 Brock's reputation was such that Spielmann could name him as one of the three sculptors responsible for the 'radical change' which had come over British sculpture since 1875:

> In Mr Alfred Gilbert, Mr Thornycroft and Mr Brock, British sculptors are provided with a lead that is raising them to a very high place in the schools of the nations... [a height] unhoped for, or at least wholly unexpected, thirty years ago.[7]

The Edwardian decade (1901-11), when the British Empire was at its zenith, witnessed a great demand for public monuments by the New Sculptors. Brock's best works in bronze were executed during this period, notably the *Leighton Memorial* in St Paul's, the *Black Prince* in Leeds, the *Gladstone Memorial* in Liverpool and his statues of Millais, Gainsborough and Irving. He also produced a bronze version of his *Queen*

---

[4] Beattie p. 176
[5] Spielmann 1901 p. 26
[6] Manning p. 134
[7] Spielmann 1901 p. 4

Victoria for Hove (1901), later replicated in Carlisle, Brisbane and three Indian cities. Like his marble statue of the Queen for Worcester (replicated in Belfast, Birmingham and Cape Town) his representation of the monarch was distinguished by the serenity and dignity of her features, the skilful use of robes and drapery to add height to the figure and the care taken with the proportions of the pedestal. The Hove version was larger and incorporated imperial symbolism in the bronze bas relief depicting *Empire* and the replacement of the cross on the orb by a *Winged Victory*.

With these works, and his designs for the 1893 coinage, Brock can be said to have created the definitive image of the Queen, and so was a natural choice as sculptor of the Victoria Memorial. This was (and is) the largest commemorative monument in the British Isles. Brock himself took entire responsibility for every detail - it was not the work of a committee, as one critic unkindly suggested.[8] It is remarkable that his original design, created in a few days in 1901, remained virtually unchanged, even though the actual work of construction took more than a decade.

His use of New Sculpture symbolism with the Queen-Empress, sitting in regal majesty supported by allegories of Justice, Truth and Motherhood and with a gilded Victory gleaming above, was a tribute to the achievements of British sculpture over the previous quarter century. This deliberate reminiscence has been so misunderstood that a later critic could actually accuse Brock of plagiarism - a charge which would have amazed his contemporaries.[9]

It was Brock's misfortune that between 1901 and 1911 a revolution in sculpture had taken place in Europe. The future seemed to belong to Epstein, Gaudier-Brzeska and the followers of Rodin, and there was less sympathy with what some regarded as images of Victorian pomp and circumstance. If Alfred Gilbert represented the more innovative and controversial aspect of the New Sculpture, Brock and Thornycroft represented the solid backbone of the movement. Brock's artistic virtues were a vigorous realism, great sensibility in modelling and a remarkable technical ability. His power in depicting character made him a brilliant portraitist. These qualities, combined with a masterful sense of proportion, form and design, enabled him to create some of the most impressive monuments of his time.

---

[8] *SR* 18 March 1905 p. 342
[9] Beattie p. 230

Brock's claim to recognition as a leading figure in British sculpture must rest on his greatest work, the Victoria Memorial, 'in its way one of the supreme achievements of the New Sculpture'.[10] The fact that English Heritage's recent *Guide to Public Sculpture* begins with a description of the memorial demonstrates that this 'unabashed celebration of imperial magnificence' remains, a hundred years after its conception, an established symbol of the monarchy and a popular amenity, not least for its role during the celebrations of the Queen's Golden Jubilee in 2002.[11] The sculptor may no longer be famous, but his sculpture certainly is. It is appropriate that his tomb in Mayfield churchyard in Sussex bears the inscription:

SINT MONUMENTO ARTES QUAS PROTULIT

(Let the works of art he produced be his memorial).

---

[10] Read 1982 p. 377

[11] *Guide to Public Sculpture* English Heritage 2001 p. 12

Appendix A: The British School at Rome

The British School at Rome was originally founded in 1901 for the study of archaeology.[1] Lord Esher, a member of the Royal Commission for the Exhibition of 1851 and the guiding spirit of the Victoria Memorial Committee, suggested to Brock and Aston Webb in 1910 that it would be useful to expand the School's activities by awarding scholarships for the study of architecture, painting and sculpture on the lines of the Prix de Rome.[2] The Royal Commission for the Exhibition of 1851 would provide the funds, the British School at Rome would supervise the work of the Rome Scholars, and the School itself would be reconstituted and relocated in the British Pavilion (plate 107), designed by Lutyens for the Rome International Exhibition.[3] The RSBS Council welcomed the proposal on 10 May 1911, and Brock and the President (Lawes-Witteronge) were elected to the British School at Rome Committee. Together with Stirling Lee they prepared draft rules for a competition for the sculpture scholarship. These were adopted by a special Council meeting on 25 September 1911.

The Rome Scholarship scheme was announced to the press by Lord Esher on 22 November 1911 and was warmly welcomed by Brock in a letter to *The Times*.[4] He recalled that thirty years earlier sculpture had been despised and rejected, but in recent times a decided change had come over the scene. Patronage was no longer withheld, public interest had been excited, and no branch of art was now more alive or more steadily advancing in excellence and favour. The Rome Scholarships would have far-reaching results and would improve the training of sculpture students. Although writing on his own initiative, he was sure that he was expressing the feeling of sculptors as a body.

The draft Charter of the British School at Rome was approved at a RSBS Council meeting on 6 February 1912.[5] The Royal Charter was granted on 22 June 1912 and on

---

[1] British School at Rome (BSR) archives include: (i) Minute Book of Faculty of Sculpture; (ii) Minutes of Building Sub-Committee; (iii) Lutyens letters (Box 92); (iv) letters from Faculty members (boxes 213-217); Abbey Hostel and bust (Box 99). Box 213 alone has 33 letters from Brock

[2] H. Petter *Lutyens in Italy - the building of the British School at Rome* Rome 1992 p. 18. The Royal Commission administered funds left over from the Great Exhibition of 1851.

[3] Brock's full-size plaster models of *Justice* and *Truth* (from the Victoria Memorial) were installed on either side of the main entrance to the British Pavilion

[4] *Times* 28 November 1911

[5] *Builder* 19 April 1912 p. 445 and 26 April 1912 p. 475

8 July 1912 the Faculty of Sculpture of the British School at Rome held its first meeting.[6] Brock, Frampton, Goscombe John, Mackennal, Derwent Wood, Stirling Lee and Havard Thomas attended, as well as Thomas Ashby, the Director of the British School at Rome. On the proposal of Frampton, seconded by Goscombe John, Brock was elected chairman of the Faculty.[7]

Not all sculptors welcomed the scheme. The Scottish sculptor James Pittendrigh McGillivray had been appointed a member of the Faculty but missed the first meeting. He wrote to Evelyn Shaw, the Faculty secretary, that he considered the scheme would benefit academic artists like Leighton rather than innovators like Watts or Rossetti, while the choice of Rome was an artistic snobbery. It would be better to use the money to buy works of art by young artists (under £100) and distribute them to galleries throughout the country.[8]

Before the next meeting of the Faculty of Sculpture, he wrote to Brock (as chairman) offering to resign if the majority of the Faculty did not share his views, but did not attend the meeting himself. Brock decided to take a firm line; he simply informed the meeting that McGillivray had resigned, and the resignation was accepted. McGillivray protested to the Faculty secretary (Evelyn Shaw) that this had been rather obtuse on Brock's part, but claimed he had no regrets that his connection with the scheme had been 'severed somewhat too prematurely by my impetuous friend Brock'.[9] This was one of the few occasions in his life when Brock was described as 'impetuous'.

At the same Faculty meeting (1 November 1912), it was agreed that the Scholarships should be worth £200 per annum for three years; and that candidates must be under 30 years old.[10] Brock took a close interest, offering to guarantee personally the sum of £20 towards the expenses of unpacking and repacking works sent by students in Rome for inspection by the Faculty in London.[11] He also advised Shaw to borrow turntables from Professor Lanteri at the Royal College of Art and to purchase clay from the Fulham Pottery Company.[12]

---

[6] Petter p. 25. The Faculty always met in London
[7] minutes of 8 July 1912. Brock retained the chairmanship until his death in 1922
[8] BSR Box 215 - McGillivray's letter of 30 October 1912 to E. Shaw
[9] ibid, letter of 18 November 1912 from McGillivray to E. Shaw
[10] *Builder* 15 November 1912 p. 591
[11] BSR Box 213; letter from Brock to Shaw 16 November 1912
[12] ibid, letter of 2 June 1913

The first competition was held in the summer of 1913, the subject for the final stage being a fountain with standing figure. Brock was disappointed by the small number of entrants:

> It is amazing that so few have entered and I fear there is some adverse influence at work for I cannot believe that sculpture students are so poor that not more than six can afford to take part in the competition.[13]

Despite the small number of competitors, the standard was high. On 17 September 1913, the Faculty voted unanimously to award the Rome Scholarship to Gilbert Ledward.[14]

At the ninth meeting of the Faculty on 22 April 1914, Brock was unanimously re-elected chairman for a fourth year (Frampton proposing, Mackennal seconding).[15] The competition subject for 1914 was a relief for a mantelpiece in a private concert hall, and on 30 June 1914 the Rome Scholarship was awarded to Charles Sergeant Jagger.[16] Faculty meetings were suspended during the War, and Ledward was allowed to continue with his scholarship in London until he was called up. In agreeing to this, Brock said that it was right for the Rome scholars to do military service, but they must not suffer in consequence.[17]

In May 1915 Aston Webb, chairman of the British School's Building Committee, reported that Brock had been commissioned to execute a bronze bust of Edwin Austin Abbey RA (plate 1) and that payment for the work would be a personal matter between Brock and the donor (Abbey's widow).[18] This was taken to mean that Brock was paying for the bust himself.[19] Abbey was an American artist and Royal Academician, who had been involved in the establishment of the American Academy at Rome in 1895 and strongly supported Esher's idea of enlarging the British School when it was first mooted in 1910. He died suddenly in August 1911 and Brock executed the marble headstone for

---

[13] ibid, letter of 24 February 1913; Brock may have suspected McGillivray.
[14] *Builder* 12 August 1913 p. 166; Ledward became ARA (1932) and RA (1937) and was RSBS President 1954-6.
[15] BSR Box 213; Brock's letter of 25 September 1913 to Shaw notes that he will be attending the wedding of Mackennal's daughter on 2 October 1913
[16] Jagger became ARA in 1926
[17] BSR Box 213 Brock's letter of 21 September 1914 to Shaw
[18] ibid, minutes of Building Sub Committee meeting on 15 May 1915
[19] ibid, Box 92; letter of 15 September 1915 from A. Thomas (Lutyens' assistant) to Shaw

his grave in Kingsbury (Old) Cemetery near Brock's house in Brondesbury.[20] His widow, Mrs Gerturde Abbey, donated £6,000 for a students hostel in his memory.[21]

Lutyens, who was responsible for converting the 1911 Exhibition Pavilion into accommodation for the British School, was also architect for the Abbey Hostel. His original design provided for a niche in the wall of the central studio, but it was pointed out (possibly by Brock) that a bust in that position would only be visible to those walking down the corridor of the studio block. Lutyens then designed a new setting on the north wall of the courtyard, where the bust can be clearly seen from the entrance hall.[22] Construction of the Abbey niche 'according to the design approved by Sir Thomas Brock' at a cost of £94-8s-0d was authorised on 19 October 1915.[23]

The bust of Abbey was exhibited in plaster at the Academy in 1917, and commended as a monumental figure of interest.[24] Because of the wartime metal shortage it was not cast immediately, and was then forgotten. It was nearly a year after Brock's death before Shaw wrote to his executor (his son Frederick) to enquire about it.[25] Frederick replied on 16 May 1923 that the bust had recently been cast by Burton's at Thames Ditton and that it was ready for dispatch.[26] It is not known when it arrived in Rome, but Shaw wrote to Mrs Abbey in November 1927 to assure her that the bust was displayed in 'a prominent position' outside the Abbey hostel.[27]

Faculty meetings were resumed on 26 February 1919. Sir Hamo Thornycroft was appointed to the Faculty in January 1920, and the Rome Scholarship for that year was awarded to Alfred Hardiman.[28] On 16 March 1921 Brock was re-elected chairman of the Faculty for a further year, Frampton again proposing and Ledward (now the secretary of the Faculty Board) seconding. There were a record eleven entrants for the 1921 competition. No Rome Scholarship was awarded but each of the four final candidates received a grant of £25 for their expenses.[29]

---

[20] E. V. Lucas *Edwin Austin Abbey, Royal Academician* 1921 Vol. II p. 489
[21] ibid, Box 99; letter of 23 June 1913 from Mrs Gertrude Abbey to Lord Esher. This specified that a suitable place be provided for a 'medallion'
[22] Petter p. 36
[23] BSR Building Sub Committee Report August 1918 p. 7
[24] *Builder* 11 May 1917 p. 307
[25] BSR Box 99; Shaw's letter of 7 May 1923 to Frederick Brock
[26] ibid, F. Brock's letter of 16 May and Burton's letter of 31 May 1923, both to Shaw
[27] ibid, Shaw's letter of 10 November 1927 to Mrs Abbey
[28] Hardiman was later elected ARA (1936) and RA (1944)
[29] BSR Box 358, minutes of Faculty meeting on 27 October 1921

At the next Faculty meeting on 30 November 1921, Brock reported that Esher, on behalf of the 1851 Commissioners, wanted the whole scholarship scheme to be reviewed in the light of the failure to award any scholarship in 1921 and complaints from the Edinburgh College of Art about the problems faced by Scottish students in attending a lengthy examination in London. Various suggestions for changes were advanced but the Faculty, probably reflecting Brock's views, decided to maintain the status quo. They were against any lowering of the age limit; they were against making the competitions biennial rather than annual; they were against having a single-stage open competition, preferring to retain the second 'closed' stage; and they were against reducing the length of the award as it represented a great opportunity for students to study. To sum up, they were 'not prepared to consider criticisms emanating from persons who obviously failed to understand the fundamental object of the Scholarship'. This certainly sounds like Brock speaking.

The Faculty meeting on 30 November 1921 was in fact the last Brock attended.[30] He was absent from the nineteenth meeting on 8 February 1922, and at the twentieth meeting on 19 October 1922 the Faculty minutes recorded the following:

> The Secretary having reported the death, since the last meeting, of Sir Thomas Brock, the Faculty [of Sculpture] unanimously resolved to place on record their deep sense of the great loss which they and the British School had sustained through the death of their esteemed Chairman, whose great services to the cause of sculpture included none more worthy or recognition and gratitude than his devotion to the interests of the British School at Rome. The Faculty desired that an expression of deep sympathy be conveyed to Lady Brock and the members of her family in their grievous affliction.

[30] Brock's immediate successors as chairmen of the Faculty were Sir George Frampton (1922-8). Sir William Goscombe John (1928-36) and Gilbert Ledward (1936-51)

Appendix B: Coins and Medals

The 1887 Golden Jubilee coinage had been designed by Queen Victoria's favourite sculptor, Sir Edgar Boehm, but the image of the Queen met with 'universal execration'.[1] Edward Poynter, then Director of the National Gallery, complained that the new coinage was 'conspicuously lacking in originality' and condemned the poor design of the Queen's head.[2] The Chancellor of the Exchequer (George Goschen) wrote to Sir Henry Ponsonby (Private Secretary to Queen Victoria) on 4 September 1889:

> The Queen will remember that the head which has been so condemned was the result of long consultation, and I think it was Boehm who gave it his imprimatur.
>
> If Her Majesty herself would like the question to be taken up again, I need not say that I will see to its being taken in hand energetically.

Ponsonby minuted on this letter: 'The Queen dislikes the new coinage very much, and wishes the old one could still be used and the new one gradually disused, and then a new one struck.'[3]

As Boehm had not merely given the 1887 coinage his imprimatur, but actually designed it, it was unlikely that any action to replace it would be taken while he was alive. His sudden death in December 1890 changed the situation, and in February 1891 a committee was established by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to 'examine the designs on the various coins put into circulation in the year 1887, and the improvements in those designs since suggested, and to make such recommendations on the subject as might seem desirable, and to report what coins, if any, should have values expressed on them in words and figures'. The chairman was Sir John Lubbock, a banker, and the members included Sir Frederic Leighton and Sir Charles Fremantle, Deputy Master of the Royal Mint. The committee's secretary was George Glennie, Deputy Secretary of the Bank of England.[4]

Lubbock proposed that an open competition should be held for designs of the new coinage, but Leighton opposed this on the grounds that 'good men' would not compete.[5] Instead, it was decided to invite up to eight artists to submit designs, and the list finally

---

[1] C. Oman *The Coinage of England* 1931 p. 379
[2] *Times* 25 July 1887
[3] Letters of Queen Victoria 3rd Series Vol. I edited by G. E. Buckle 1930 pp. 529-530
[4] C. E. Challis (ed.) *A New History of the Royal Mint* Cambridge 1992 p. 536
[5] M. Stocker 'The Coinage of 1893', *Numismatic Journal* Vol. 66 1996 p. 68

agreed presumably reflected Leighton's views. It comprised all seven Academy sculptors (Henry Armstead, Charles Birch, Brock, Onslow Ford, Alfred Gilbert, Hamo Thornycroft and Thomas Woolner) plus Edward Poynter, who had designed the reverse for the Ashanti War Medal twenty years previously.[6]

The competitors were asked to submit two designs for the obverse (the Queen's head) - one for the sovereign, the other for the remaining values - and separate designs for the reverses of six denominations (sovereign, half sovereign, crown, half crown, florin and shilling). Competitors were to receive an honorarium of £150, described by *The Illustrated London News* as totally inadequate.[7]

Brock accepted the invitation to participate on 30 March 1891. Like Poynter he had previous experience of working with the Mint, as he had designed the reverse of the North West Canada Medal in 1885.[8] Gilbert and Woolner declined the invitation.

Brock submitted seven designs:

In plaster

(i) Queen's head with small crown, laurel wreath and veil (plate 147 A);

(ii) Queen's head with a flatter crown and veil, no laurel wreath (plate 147 B);

(iii) sovereign reverse, with Britannia (intended also for the half sovereign)

(iv) half crown reverse, with the Royal Coat of Arms in a Gothic quatrefoil;

Pen and ink drawing

(v) crown (five shillings) reverse, with St George on foot smiting a recumbent dragon;

(vi) florin reverse, with a bolder Coat of Arms in an ornate surround (plate 148);

(vii) shilling reverse, an unremarkable design with the words 'One Shilling'.[9]

The committee met on 27 March 1891 to make a provisional selection from the large number of designs submitted (Armstead sent in six models and twelve drawings). Both Brock's heads of the Queen were chosen, one for the florin, the other for the remaining values - this reflected Fremantle's strongly held view that the florin should have a different head from the half crown to make the two more easily distinguishable. For the reverses, two of Brock's designs were chosen - the florin design for the half crown and the shilling design for the sixpence. Two of Poynter's designs - the reverse of the florin

---

[6] A. Inglis 'The Medals of Sir Edward Poynter', *The Medal* Vol. 7 Winter 1985 p. 17

[7] *ILN* 4 March 1893; Stocker 1996 pp. 69-70

[8] Brock's design showed a wreath of maple leaves enclosing the words 'North West Canada 1885'.

[9] *Pall Mall Budget* 9 February 1893 p 196

and the shilling - were also accepted. The committee decided to retain the familiar George and Dragon of Benedetto Pistrucci for the reverse of the five highest values (crown, half sovereign, sovereign, two pounds and five pounds).[10]

The committee gave no reasons for its choice of the successful designs. Stocker suggests that Brock's designs would have impressed the committee as 'dignified and distinctive'. They struck a happy medium, being more simple, sober and sensible than those of Armstead and Ford and more refined and assured than those of Birch and Thornycroft.[11]

At its meeting on 23 December 1891 the committee confirmed their acceptance, subject to certain modifications, of Brock's two Queen's heads and his florin reverse, to be used for the half crown. Brock was requested to modify the first Queen's head (with small crown and laurel wreath) on the lines of Leonard Wyon's Ashanti War Medal (1874), which showed the Queen wearing a tiara and a veil. Brock gave his own interpretation to this request; the tiara is more prominent, the veil fuller, the Queen's features are older and less idealised and her shoulders and breast are included, adorned with jewellery and the Garter Star (plate 147 D). The other design was virtually unchanged, except that the Queen's head was to be brought towards the centre and disconnected from the border. The florin design was to be modified to suit its use for the half crown and the dolphin omitted (plate 148).

On 30 January 1892 Brock submitted his revised designs to the Mint. These were approved by the committee on 10 February, and Brock expressed his delight at the news.[12] Meanwhile, the Government had decided that the new coins should bear a reference to the Queen's title of Empress of India, and Brock submitted an amended design on 9 March 1892 incorporating the letters 'IND. IMP' (plate 147 C). The complete wording finally agreed was 'VICTORIA DEI GRA. BRITT. REGINA FID. DEF. IND. IMP.' (Victoria by the grace of God Queen of Britain, Defender of the Faith, Empress of India.) (plate 147 D). This wording appears on the obverse of all values except the half crown, which has the first part of the title 'VICTORIA DEI GRA. BRITT. REGINA' on the obverse and the second part 'FID. DEF. IND. IMP.' on the reverse.

---

[10] Stocker 1996 p. 69
[11] ibid pp. 73-5
[12] PRO Mint 7/48, Brock to Fremantle 13 February 1892

It was now time to seek the Queen's approval. On 12 March 1892 Goschen sent Ponsonby the committee's report, noting that: 'immense pains have been taken. Sir F. Leighton has given his full mind to the subject'.[13] If Goschen hoped that the mention of Leighton's name might commend the designs to the Queen, he may have miscalculated. Leighton was not high in the royal favour at this time. In 1886 he had complained to Ponsonby that Francis Williamson, a favourite sculptor of the Queen, was submitting busts of members of the Royal Family for exhibition at the Royal Academy after the prescribed date, and seeking 'to obtain by Royal Command an extension of limits to which all have to adapt themselves'.[14] In 1887 Williamson again submitted a work late, a bust of the Queen herself. The Academy reluctantly accepted it, and the Queen wrote indignantly: 'Mr Williamson is a persona ingrata [sic] of Sir F. Leighton &c & not kindly & very unjustly used'.[15]

To make matters worse, the same year the Queen had suggested the creation of an Order of Merit for literary, artistic and scientific achievement, and particularly asked the Prime Minister (Lord Salisbury) to consult Leighton. Salisbury reported that Leighton was 'very discouraging' about the Order and the list of possible recipients, and had 'laid great stress upon the heartburnings the proposed proceedings were likely to produce'.[16] The Queen was not amused, and when Salisbury proposed Leighton for a peerage in the 1892 New Year's Honours, she struck his name from the list, and refused to change her mind even when Salisbury returned to the charge.[17] Leighton had to wait a further four years before the Queen relented. Created a baron in the 1896 New Year's Honours, he died three weeks later.

Whether or not the mention of Leighton affected the Queen's judgment, she did not regard the approval of the new designs to be a mere formality. She 'entirely objected' to Brock's design with crown and veil, as the crown was badly put on and the arrangement of the head-dress was not pleasing. Fortunately, she liked and approved of Brock's other (modified) design with tiara, although she thought the nose too pointed and suggested it be 'slightly rounded'. She sensibly queried the need for the florin to have a different head from the half crown, noting that the distinction must depend on the size

---

[13] Buckle Vol. II p. 105
[14] RA PP VIC 4424, Leighton to Ponsonby 26 March 1886
[15] RA Add A12/1442, manuscript note on memorandum by Ponsonby 14 April 1887 (quoted in M. Stocker 'Francis John Williamson', *Art New Zealand* no. 61 Summer 1991/2 p. 74)
[16] Buckle Vol. I pp. 280 & 389
[17] ibid Vol. II pp. 85-6

and on the design of the reverse. Her sharpest criticisms were of the reverses - Brock's coat of arms for the half crown with its roses, thistle and shamrock appeared to be 'smothered in vegetables' and Poynter's 'nosegay' for the shilling resembled a Beefeater's breastplate. Ponsonby concluded his letter to Goschen: 'I don't think she was enthusiastic for the designs'.[18]

Goschen replied to Ponsonby on 18 March 1892 in rather sycophantic terms, saying that he also preferred the tiara design and did not like the coat of arms 'smothered in vegetables'. He stressed that he himself had nothing to do with the decisions of the committee and quoted Fremantle as saying that 'Leighton's influence predominated in the artistic part'. He noted gloomily that 'there is sure to be a row one way or the other' and added: 'Perhaps I shall see Brock or I may communicate with him through Leighton as to the Queen's wish about the nose'.[19]

Goschen's concerns about a row proved unfounded. The committee accepted the Queen's view that only one design for the obverse was required and selected the tiara version which she liked. Brock altered the nose and removed the 'vegetables' from the half crown reverse by skilfully replacing the heraldic flowers with the collar and badge of the Order of the Garter, to which the Queen would find it difficult to object. The words 'half crown' were also added, following the Government's decision to include the value on all coins from the threepence to the half crown (plate 148).[20]

The new coinage was authorised by Royal Proclamation of 30 January 1893 and was generally welcomed as a substantial improvement on its predecessor. Brock's new portrait of the Queen (plate 147 D) naturally aroused the greatest interest. *The Times* noted that Brock had got rid of Boehm's crown and unduly long neck; the likeness was good and the modelling excellent, as was expected from 'so scholarly a sculptor as Mr Brock'.[21] *The Financial News* noted that in Brock's dignified effigy the precarious crown of the Jubilee coinage had been replaced by a simple coronet, and that the Queen's expression was one of matronly dignity. The new likeness was almost certain to command popular approval, and 'we shall have a decently artistic and useful coinage, fit to compare with the issues of other nations'.[22]

---

[18] ibid p 107 and PRO MINT 7/54, Observations on the New Designs for the Coinage, 18 March 1892
[19] Buckle pp 107-8
[20] *Hansard* 23 May 1892 Col. 1523
[21] *Times* 31 January 1893
[22] *Financial News* 1 February 1893

Not all comments were favourable. Wilson Steer wrote:

> Mr Brock's portrait of Her Majesty, which will be used on all denominations, is a head with some character, and certainly much more suitable in scale than that of the last coinage (1887). The workmanship is also crisper and more in keeping with the requirements of low relief. The ear-rings, necklaces and orders, however give a certain tawdry look to the design, and their omission would have added to the dignity of the head.[23]

Whether Queen Victoria was happy with her new effigy is uncertain. The *Pall Mall Gazette* reported that 'The Queen, who is hard to please in these matters was, it is whispered, greatly delighted with the final sketch submitted to her',[24] but the new Chancellor of the Exchequer (Harcout), as sycophantic as his predecessor, expressed his 'entire concurrence in Your Majesty's View that the Queen's head on the new coinage leaves much to be desired both in likeness and execution'.[25]

Brock's reverse design for the half crown (plate 148) was generally considered more successful than Poynter's designs for the florin and the shilling. The *Daily News* considered that the large, free treatment of the collar of the Garter on the half crown was sure to be admired.[26] Wilson Steer was blunter:

> Mr Poynter is less happy than Mr Brock. The florin and shilling are 'petty' in workmanship, and the design is unduly cramped... Mr Brock's reverse of the half crown exhibits a much finer sense of proportion between the design and the lettering than Mr Poynter's reverse of the florin.[27]

When interviewed about the production of the new coinage, Brock pointed out that as many as a hundred thousand coins had been got from a single die, and that under these circumstances it was inevitable that the work of the artist must suffer, if only in a limited degree.[28] In the event he was less philosophical about this - he wrote to Hamo Thornycroft on 17 February 1893:

> I am glad you like my head of the Queen. Unfortunately its appearance will be much injured by the rough way in which the coins are being turned out at the Mint. Everything seems to be done in a hurry at that place.[29]

Brock finally complained to the Mint:

> I have examined the impression of the crown obverse and it is still far from satisfactory. Several sovereigns and shillings have come to my notice and I found them in each case unsatisfactory. There is such a marked difference in the appearance of the head, even in

---

[23] *AJ* 1893 pp. 71-2
[24] *Pall Mall Gazette* 30 December 1892
[25] RA B45/61, letter of 1 February 1893
[26] *Daily News* 31 January 1893
[27] *AJ* 1893 pp. 71-2
[28] *Pall Mall Budget* 9 February 1893
[29] Thornycroft C99

> coins of the same value, that I fear some change must have occurred when making the working dies. This, added to the imperfections inherent in a hastily produced matrix, brings about a result that is sometimes too shocking. No doubt extreme pressure is being brought to bear on the Mint [to produce the new coinage rapidly] but this does not justify the use of dies confessedly imperfect. Pardon me for speaking so plainly.[30]

The reply of the Mint (if any) to these criticisms is not recorded.

The gold £5 and £2 coins were minted only in 1893. The other gold coins (sovereign and half-sovereign) were minted from 1893 to 1901 in London and also at the Mint's overseas branches in Melbourne, Sydney and (from 1899) Perth. In 1901 the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York (later George V and Queen Mary) visited the Perth Mint, and were presented with two freshly minted gold sovereigns and two half sovereigns. The Duke commented that they still bore the head of Queen Victoria, despite the fact that she had died earlier in the year. It was explained that the dies with the head of Edward VII had not yet arrived from London. The first issue of Edward VII coinage in Britain and the Empire was in 1902.[31]

The silver coinage (crown, half-crown, florin, shilling, sixpence and threepence) was also issued from 1893, but the copper coinage (penny, halfpenny, farthing) was not issued until 1895. Concern was expressed that the brightly gleaming farthing might be confused with the gold half sovereign, which was of similar size. A trial series of pattern farthings was therefore minted in 1896 with six variations on Brock's design:

(i) Head slightly smaller, lettering larger;

(ii) Head smaller still and letters completely encircling the bust;

(iii) As for (ii), but with a raised linear circle surrounding the bust;

(iv) Normal size head, with large 1/4 in figures before the Queen's face

(v) Normal head with large letter F before the face and 1/4 behind the head;

(vi) Normal head with entire field (background) stippled with raised dots.

None of these variations was of much help in distinguishing between a farthing and a half sovereign, and the insertion of a large F or 1/4 directly in front of the Queen's face would certainly have been criticised. The Mint authorities then realised that colour, rather than design, was the best way of differentiating the coins. From 1897 farthings were given a dark, almost black tone, produced by oxidisation and acid fumes.[32]

---

[30] PRO MINT 7/48, Brock to Fremantle 6 April 1893

[31] J. Melwraith and A. Harris, *Striking Gold* Perth 1999

[32] C. W. Peek *English Copper, Tin and Bronze Coins in the Imperial Mint 1558-1956* 1978 pp. 476-8

Brock ensured that his association with the 1893 coinage would be recorded for posterity by having his initials TB engraved immediately below the bust of the Queen. Over 110 million gold, 240 million silver and 240 million copper coins were minted between 1893 and 1901, so his initials appeared nearly 600 million times.[33]

The popularity of Brock's portrait of the Queen on the 1893 coinage led the Mint to use it for the Diamond Jubilee Commemorative Medal of 1897 (plate 149), with the William Wyon portrait of the young Queen in 1837 on the reverse. The gold and silver medals were minted in two sizes and the bronze in one size. They were sold at or below cost price and over 339,000 were issued:[34] The Diamond Jubilee Medal was described as 'perhaps the most artistic thing ever issued from the Royal Mint'.[35]

A special medal was issued for Lord Mayors and Mayors in England and Wales and for Lord Provosts and Provosts in Scotland (plate 150). It was diamond shaped, symbolising the Diamond Jubilee, with Brock's obverse and Wyon's reverse from the Diamond Jubilee Commemorative Medal. Fourteen gold and 512 silver medals were struck, of which seven were issued to Lord Mayors and 305 to Mayors in England and Wales.[36]

The Mint used Brock's veiled head for the obverse of the following commemorative and campaign medals. The first two bore the Queen's full title, while the remainder had the simpler wording 'Victoria Regina et Imperatrix':

(i) 1894 Visit by the Duke of York (later George V) to the Mint; [37]

(ii) 1895 Visit by the Queen of Holland to the Mint;[38]

(iii) 1896 India General Service Medal 1895. Authorised on 1 April 1896;[39]

(iv) 1896 Royal Victorian Medal. Instituted on 21 April 1896 in gold, silver and bronze;[40]

(v) 1897 Queen Victoria Medals for Royal Military College Sandhurst, Royal Military Academy Woolwich and HMS Britannia;[41]

---

[33] *Coin 1986 Yearbook* Numismatic Publishing Co. Brentwood Essex 1986 pp. 139-247
[34] L. Brown *Catalogue of British Historical Medals Vol. 3 1837-1901* 1987 p. 431
[35] H. Cole *Coronation and Royal Commemorative Medals 1887-1977* 1977 p. 12
[36] ibid
[37] Brown p. 417
[38] ibid p. 424
[39] E. C. Joslin (ed.) *British Battles and Medals* 1988 p. 177
[40] P. Hieronymussen *Orders, Medals and Decorations of Britain and Europe* 1970 p. 140
[41] Brown p. 451

(vi) 1899 Canada General Service Medal 1866-70. Authorised by the British Government on 7 January 1899 for British troops who had fought in suppressing the Fenian Raids in 1866 and 1870 and the rebellion on the Red River in 1870;[42]

(vii) 1899 Colonial Auxiliary Forces Long Service and Good Conduct Medal. Instituted in 1899 for 20 years service in the ranks. [43]

(viii) Meritorious Service Medal for New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, Victoria and New Zealand;[44]

Brock's alternative version of the Queen's head (plate 147 A), designed for the 1893 coinage but not selected, was used for three Jubilee medals. The first, in silver, with the title 'VICTORIA REGINA ET IMPERATRIX' and a view of the Imperial Institute on the reverse, commemorated the Golden Jubilee but was not issued until 1893. The other two, in bronze and with the title 'VICTORIA REGINA', showed St Peter's Church, Eaton Square and St Gabriel's Church, Warwick Square on the reverse and were issued for the Diamond Jubilee in 1897.[45]

The British Museum has an unusual medal designed by Brock in 1907. It has a profile of Edward Milligan Beloe, described as Coroner in Kings Lynn (Norfolk) on the obverse, and a perpetual calendar on the reverse (plates 154 & 155). The medal was probably commissioned by Beloe's son, who later presented it to the Museum.[46].

Royal Academy Prize Medals had, from the time of George III, borne the head of the reigning sovereign. Following the death of Queen Victoria, the Academy Council decided on 6 August 1901 to ask Alfred Gilbert to design a new obverse with the head of Edward VII. Gilbert accepted the commission on the understanding that the King would grant a sitting. Edward VII refused, probably because of Gilbert's behaviour in regard to the Clarence Tomb, but Gilbert prepared a sketch model before his departure for Bruges later in 1901.[47]

In January 1902 the commission was transferred to Brock, who was also asked to design the reverse of the gold medal for a fee of 250 guineas (including the cost of steel

---

[42] Joslin p. 146
[43] R. D. Williams *Medals to Australia* Dubbo New South Wales 1990 p. 48
[44] ibid p. 53 and British Museum 1901/1-2-17
[45] J. Taylor *The Architectural Medal* British Museum 1978 pp. 91, 176 and 180
[46] BM 1914/5-10-1. The son wrote an introduction to A. de Solemne's *Perpetual Calendar 1570* facsimile reprint, King's Lynn 1915 pp. 3-6
[47] RA Council Minutes 1900-6 xxi pp. 139-140 & 144-5, Dorment 1986 pp. 44-5

dies). Brock accepted the commission in March 1902.[48] The Council's Annual Report noted that the King had graciously consented to sit for the obverse.[49]

Edward's readiness to sit for Brock strengthens the supposition that his refusal to sit for Gilbert was personal. There is no record that the King in fact sat for Brock, who had often seen him at close quarters in his studio. Brock's design showed the King in profile, bare-headed and wearing the robes and collar of the Order of the Garter (plate 151).[50] Brock was paid £182, the remainder being withheld until he produced the design for the reverse.[51] Medals with the King's head were ready for presentation by the end of 1902 and the new head was also used for the Armitage Medal.

Brock's design of the new reverse was not submitted to the Academy Council until 1910.[52] The reason for the eight years delay is not known. Brock was heavily involved in the construction of the Victoria Memorial during this period, and it is probable that the Academy Council felt that, having put the portrait of the new King on the obverse so promptly, an alteration to the reverse was less urgent. The death of King Edward VII in May 1910 reminded Brock (and the RA Council) that the new reverse design had not been approved. At the Council meeting on 2 August 1910, Brock submitted 'a bronze gilded impression for the reverse of the Gold Medal which he had been asked to undertake in 1902'.[53]

Brock prepared at least four models for the reverse. These were 185 mm in diameter, about three times the size of the actual medal. In addition to the gilded version submitted to the Council, there are bronze versions in the British Museum (plate 153), the National Museum of Wales (donated by Sir W. Goscombe John) and a private collection. The former medal, by Thomas Stothard (1820), showed allegorical figures of *Painting*, *Sculpture* and *Architecture*. Brock gave this a New Sculpture twist, grouping the figures in an informal manner, with *Architecture* and *Sculpture* seated and *Painting* kneeling. Each has appropriate symbols - *Painting* holds artists' brushes and a large palette, *Sculpture* holds a statuette (as in the Leighton Memorial) and *Architecture*, seated on an Ionic capital, has dividers in her right hand, a roll of plans in her left and a

---

[48] ibid pp. 164, 180-1 Frank Bowcher designed a new reverse for the silver medal.
[49] RA Council Annual Report for 1902 p. 13
[50] J. Pinches *Medals of John Pinches* p. 128
[51] P. Attwood 'Three recent acquisitions by the British Museum', *The Medal* No. 12 (Spring 1988) p. 36 footnote 37
[52] Attwood p. 36 footnotes 36 & 37
[53] RA Council Report for 1910 p. 12

set-square at her feet. Behind them is a triumphal arch, the centre span of which neatly frames the statuette held by *Sculpture*.[54]

Brock's medal, with its subtle balance between asymmetrically placed figures and symmetrical architecture, owes little to Stothard and is altogether more adventurous than Frank Bowcher's design for the silver medal.[55] The RA Council approved it and asked Brock to design a new obverse with the head of George V.[56]

The Gold Medal with Brock's head of Edward VII on the obverse and his new design with the three allegorical figures on the reverse was used for only one year. From 1911 Brock's head of George V was used (plate 152), showing the King dressed as an Admiral of the Fleet. Brock's reverse continued to be used for the Gold Medal, while the Silver and Bronze Medals had Bowcher's version of the Belvedere torso until the accession of Edward VIII in 1936.[57]

The King decided that he did not wish his effigy to appear on Academy Medals, and the Council commissioned a new design by Ernest and Mary Gillick. This had a portrait of George III on the obverse, thus avoiding the need to redesign the medal each time a monarch died. At the same time both reverses (Brock's and Bowcher's) were replaced by a simple design showing a sprig of laurel with the words 'Bene Merenti'.[58]

With the exception of his portrait of the Queen for the 1893 coinage, which was also used for a wide variety of commemorative and campaign medals, Brock's work as a medallist is little known. His portraits of Edward VII and George V for the Royal Academy Gold Medals are dignified but rather conventional, and his reverse design for the Royal Academy Medals, while an interesting variation on the Stothard version, breaks no new ground. His reputation in this field will continue to rest on the 1893 coinage as 'almost the popular portrait of the Queen'.[59]

---

[54] Brown no. 4018
[55] Attwood p. 35
[56] RA Council Report for 1910 p. 12
[57] Brown no. 4017
[58] Hutchison pp. 138 & 163, Pinches p. 128
[59] *ILN* 4 February 1893

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript Sources

British Museum
Standing Committee Minutes 1913

British School at Rome
Faculty of Sculpture Papers
Building Subcommittee Papers
Correspondence with Sir T. Brock

Cambridge University Library
Prince Consort Statue papers (0.1.14)

Churchill College Cambridge
Esher [Brett] Papers (CAC ESHR)

Corporation of London Record Office
Bridge House Estates Cttee Papers

Dublin City Archives
O'Connell Monument Committee Papers (DCA/Ch6/12 & 17)

Henry Moore Centre for the Study of Sculpture, Leeds
Hamo Thornycroft Papers

Leicester University Library
Steggles, M. A., *The Empire Aggrandised: A Study in commemorative portrait statuary exported from Britain to her Colonies in South Asia 1800-1939* PhD Thesis 1993

London University Library
Darby, E. *Statues of Queen Victoria and Prince Albert: A Study in Commemorative and Portrait Statuary 1837-1924*, PhD Thesis, 1983

National Art Library (V&A)
Life of Thomas Brock by his son Frederick (MS 86 ZZ 110)
Letters from Thomas Brock to Lord Alverstone (MS 86 WW 9)

National Museum of Wales
Accessions file 23-182

Natural History Museum, London
Richard Owen Statue Papers

Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen
Correspondence with Thomas Brock

Public Record Office, Kew
Office of Works Papers (PRO WORK 20)
Royal Mint Papers (PRO MINT 7)

Public Works Department Dublin
Correspondence on Gough statue

Royal Academy of Arts
Academy Council Papers
Correspondence with Thomas Brock

Royal Archives, Windsor Castle
Prince Consort Memorial Papers (RA Add H2)
Victoria Memorial Papers (RA Esher W36)
(RA Household Papers Vol. 19)

Royal Dublin Society
John Henry Foley Papers

Royal Institution, London
Faraday Statue Papers (RI/FIIa)

Royal Society of British Sculptors
Minutes of Council Meetings

St Paul's Cathedral
Chapter Minutes 1887

Trinity College Dublin Library
Vereker, J. *The Origin, Progress and Completion of the Grattan Statue* 1881 (MS 1703)

Wells Cathedral
Chapter Minutes 1894-6
Fabric Record Book

Worcester Porcelain Museum
Wage Books

Contemporary Newspapers and Periodicals

Annual Register
Architectural Review
Art Journal
Ayr Advertiser
Builder, The
Cambridge Chronicle
Cornhill Magazine
Country Life
Daily Express (Dublin)
Fortnightly Review
Freeman's Journal (Dublin)
Illustrated London News
Irish Times
Liverpool Evening Express
Liverpool Mercury
Magazine of Art
Melbourne Advocate
Morning, The
Morning Post
Pall Mall Budget
Pall Mall Gazette
Pall Mall Magazine
Saturday Review
Staffordshire Sentinel
Studio
Times, The
Vanity Fair
Worcester Echo
Worcestershire Chronicle
Worcestershire Herald

Books and Pamphlets

The place of publication is London unless otherwise indicated.

Alverstone, Lord., *Recollections of Bar and Bench*, 1914

Baille de Laperriere, C., *Royal Scottish Academy Exhibitions 1826-1990*, Hilmarton Manor Press, 1991

Baker, A., *Life of Sir Isaac Pitman*, Bath (no date)

Barnes, J.(ed.), *Leighton and his sculptural legacy: British Sculpture 1875-1930*, exhibition catalogue, Joanna Barnes Fine Art, 1996

Barrington, Mrs R., *Life, Letters and Work of Frederic Leighton*, (2 vols.) 1906

Beattie, S., *The New Sculpture* Yale University Press, New Haven & London, 1982

Bell, Q., *Schools of Design*, 1963

Benson, T. W., *Clanabogan Parish Church - a short description*, Derry (no date)

Billcliffe, R., *Royal Glasgow Institute of Fine Arts - Dictionary of Exhibitors 1861-1989*, Woodend Press, 1990

Binns, R. W., *Worcester China: A Record of the Work of Forty-Five Years 1852-97*, Quaritch, 1897

Blackwood, J., *London's Immortals*, Savoy Press, 1989

Borenius, T., *Forty London Statues and Public Monuments*, 1926

Borg, A., *War Memorials*, 1991

Brett, M. V. (ed.), *Journals and Letters of Reginald, Viscount Esher* (4 vols.), 1934-8

Brindle, S., *Sir Aston Webb and the Victoria Memorial*, English Heritage, 2000

Brooks, C. (ed.), *The Albert Memorial* Yale University Press, New Haven & London, 2000

Brown, L., *Catalogue of British Historical Medals 1837-1901*, 1987

Buckle, G. E., *Letters of Queen Victoria*, 3rd Series Vols. 1 & 2, 1930

Byron, A., *London's Statues; A Guide to London's Outdoor Statues and Sculpture*, 1981

Carr, J. Comyns (ed.), *Worcestershire Exhibition Catalogue*, Worcester 1882

Cavanagh, T., *The Public Sculpture of Liverpool*, Liverpool University Press, 1997

Challis, C. E (ed.), *A New History of the Royal Mint*, Cambridge, 1992

Chamot, M., *Tate Gallery - The British School*, 1953

Charteris, E., *Life and Letters of Sir Edmund Gosse*, 1931

Churchill, W. S., *My Early Life; A Roving Commission*, 1930

Coin 1986 Yearbook, Numismatic Publishing, Brentwood, 1986

Colchester, L. S, *Wells Cathedral*, Wells, 1982

Cole, H., *Coronation and Royal Commemorative Medals 1887-1977*, 1977

Cooper, J., *Nineteenth Century Romantic Bronzes*, David and Charles, 1975

Cork, R., *Art Beyond the Gallery*, Yale University Press, New Haven & London, 1985

Crookshank, A., *Irish Sculpture from 1600 to the present day*, Dublin, 1984

Curzon, Lord, *British Government in India*, 1925

Cushion, J. & M., *Collector's History of British Porcelain*, Antique Collectors' Club, 1992

Dalzell, W. R., *Shell Guide to History of London*, 1981

Darke, J., *The Monument Guide to England and Wales*, 1991

Dawson, A., *Portrait Sculpture in the British Museum Collection 1675-1975*, 1999

Dorment, R. (ed.), *Alfred Gilbert, Sculptor & Goldsmith*, exhibition catalogue, Royal Academy of Arts, 1986

Fraser, W., *The Douglas Book*, Edinburgh, 1885

George V, King, *The King to His People (Speeches and Messages)*, 1911

Gildea, J., *For Remembrance - South Africa 1899-1902*, 1911

Gleichen, Lord E., *London's Open Air Statuary*, 1928

Godden, G. A., *Encyclopaedia of British Porcelain Manufacturers*, Barrie and Jenkins, 1988

Goldsmith, R., *Military Memorials of Winchester Cathedral*, Winchester, 1974

Gough: *Statement of Proceedings taken to erect the Gough Equestrian Statue*, Dublin, 1879

Graves, A., *The Royal Academy of Arts - A Complete Dictionary of Contributors and their Work from its Foundation in 1769 to 1904*, 1905
ibid *1905-1970*, ed. Wakefield, 1973

Guide to Cape Town, Cape Town, 1891

Hall, J., *Dictionary of Subjects and Symbols in Art*, 1979

The World as Sculpture, 1999

Haskell, F. & Penny, N., *Taste and the Antique*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1981

Hedger, M., *Public Sculpture in Australia*, Roseville New South Wales, 1995

Herbison, P., *Irish Art and Architecture*, Dublin 1975

Hibbert, C., *A Guide to Royal London*, Macmillan, 1987

Hieronymussen, P., *Orders, Medals and Decorations of Britain and Europe*, 1970

Hill, J., *Irish Public Sculpture - A History*, Dublin, 1998

Historical Record of the Imperial Visit to India 1911, John Murray, 1914

Hope, J. F. R., *A History of Hunting in Hampshire*, 1910

House of Lords: *Minutes of Evidence to the Select Committee on the Chantrey Fund*, 1904

Hunisack, J. M., *The Sculptor Jules Dalou: Studies in his Style and Imagery*, New York and London, 1977

Hussey, C., *Life of Sir Edwin Lutyens*, 1953

Hutchison, S. C., *The History of the Royal Academy 1768-1986*, 1986

Izzard, R., *The Innocent on Everest*, 1954

Janson, H. W., *Nineteenth Century Sculpture*, London and New York, 1985

Jenner, M., *London Heritage*, Michael Joseph, 1988

Jones, A., *Memoirs of a Soldier Artist*, 1933

Jones, J., *Minton - The First 200 Years of Design and Production*, Swan Hill Press, Shrewsbury, 1993

Joslin, E. C. (ed.), *British Battles and Medals*, 1988

Kilvert, F., *Kilvert's Diary*, ed. W. Plomer, 1977

Lago, M. (ed.), *Burne Jones talking*, 1982

Lane Poole, S. and Dickins F. V., *Life of Sir Harry Parkes*, 1894

Lees-Milne, J., *The Enigmatic Victorian*, 1986

Le Fanu, W., *Catalogue of the Pictures etc. in the Royal College of Surgeons*, 1960

Leslie, G. D., *The Inner Life of the Royal Academy*, 1914

Lucas, E. V., *Edwin Austen Abbey, Royal Academician*, 2 vols.,1921

Macaulay, J. (ed.), *Speeches and Addresses of the Prince of Wales (1863-88)*, 1889

McDonald, G., *Australian Coins and Banknotes*, Terrigul, New South Wales, 1996

Makin, W. J., *Life of George the Fifth*, 1936

Manning, E., *Marble and Bronze - the Art of Hamo Thornycroft*, 1982

Manson, J.B., *The Tate Gallery*, 1929

Marshall, R., *History of Queen's University Services Club 1918-68*, Belfast, 1968

Mee, A., *The King's England: Somerset*, 1968

Melwraith, J. and Harris, A., *Striking Gold*, Perth Australia, 1999

Millais, J. G., *The Life and Letters of Sir John Everet Millais*, Vol. 2, 1899

Naipaul, V. S., *The Overcrowded Barracoon*, 1984

Nairn, I., *Nairn's London*, 1988

Nairne, S. and Serota, N., *British Sculpture in the Twentieth Century*, exhibition catalogue, Whitechapel Art Gallery, 1981

Noszlopy, G. T., *Public Sculpture of Birmingham*, Liverpool University Press, 1998

O'Brien, R. B., *Life of Lord Russell of Killowen*, 1901

Oman, C., *The Coinage of England*, 1931

Ormond, L. and R., *Lord Leighton*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1975

Ormond, R., *Early Victorian Portraits*, National Portrait Gallery, 1973

Ormond, R. (ed.) *Dictionary of British Portraiture*, Vol. 3, Batsford, 1981

Pearson, F., *Goscombe John*, National Museum of Wales Cardiff, 1979

Peek, C. Wilson, *English Copper, Tin and Bronze Coins in the Imperial Mint 1558-1958*, 1978

Petter, H., *Lutyens in Italy - the building of the British School at Rome*, Rome, 1992

Physick, J., *The Wellington Monument*, HMSO, 1970

Pinches, J. H., *Medals by John Pinches*, 1987

Plumptre, G., *Life of Edward VII*, 1995

Port, M. H., *Imperial London (Civil Government Building in London 1850-1915)*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1995

Potterton, H., *The O'Connell Monument*, Gatherum Series 4, Cork, 1973

Rait, R. S, *Life and Campaigns of Viscount Gough*, 1900

Read, B., *Victorian Sculpture*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1982

Ridley, R. T., *Melbourne's Monuments*, Melbourne University Press, 1996

Roberts, W., *Memorials of Christie's*, 2 vols., Bell, 1897

Sandon, H., *Royal Worcester Porcelain from 1862 to the Present Day*, Barrie and Jenkins, 1972

Smith, W., *Masterpieces of the Centennial International Exhibition*, Vol. II, *Industrial Art*, Philadelphia, 1876

Solemne, A., *Facsimile reprint of Solemne's Perpetual Calendar (1570)*, with Introduction by E. M. Beloe, Thew & Son, King's Lynn

Spielmann, I., *Souvenir of British Section, Fine Arts Exhibition Rome 1911*, 1913

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

Spink, *Standard Catalogue of Coins of England*, 2000

Staley, E., *Lord Leighton of Stretton*, 1906

Steggles, M. A, *Statues of the Raj*, British Association for Cemeteries in South Asia, 2000

Stewart, A.M., *Irish Art Loan Exhibitions 1765-1927*, Marlton Publishing, 1990

Stirling, A. M. W., *Victorian Sidelights*, 1954

Stocker, M., *Royalist and Realist*, 1988

Survey of London XXXVIII, *Museums Area of South Kensington and Westminster*, 1975

Taylor, J., *The Architectural Medal: England in the Nineteenth Century*, British Museum, 1978

Tweed, L., *John Tweed*, 1936

Underwood, E.G., *A Short History of English Sculpture*, 1933

Usherwood, P. (ed.), *Public Sculpture of North East England*, Liverpool University Press, 2000

Victorian and Edwardian Decorative Art: The Handley-Read Collection, exhibition catalogue, Royal Academy of Arts, 1972

Wake, J., *Princess Louise*, 1988

Walker, W., *Guide to St Paul's, the Parish Church of Daybrook, Notts.*, 1981

Warner, M., *Monuments and Maidens - the Allegory of the Female Form*, 1985

White, P. W., *On Public View*, 1971

Williams, J., *A Companion Guide to Architecture in Ireland 1837-1921*, Dublin, 1985

Williams, R. D., *Medals in Australia*, Dubbo, Australia, 1990

Willis, R. and Clark, J. W., *The Architectural History of the University of Cambridge*, Cambridge, 1886

Wilton, A., and Upstone, R., (ed.) *The Age of Rossetti, Burne Jones and Watts: Symbolism in Britain 1860-1910*, exhibition catalogue, Tate Gallery, 1997

Wortham H. E, *The Delightful Profession - Edward VII, A Study in Kingship*, 1931

Articles published in books, journals and exhibition catalogues

The place of publication is London unless otherwise indicated

Architectural Review 'The Queen Victoria Memorial', June 1911, pp. 351-8

Armstrong, W., 'Sculpture' *Art Journal*, 1887, pp. 177-80

Attwood P., 'Three recent acquisitions by the British Museum', *The Medal*, Spring 1988, pp. 34-5

Barthorp, M., 'Some Aspects of Maiwand 1880', *Military Illustrated - Past and Present* No 17, February/March 1989 pp. 20-9

Black, G., 'City Square and Colonel Harding', *Thoresby Society Journal*, Vol. 16 Part II, 1974, pp. 106-112

Borenius, T., 'Sir Thomas Brock', Weaver, J., (ed.) *Dictionary of National Biography*, 1922-1930, Oxford University Press 1937, pp. 119-120

Broadhead, I., 'A Right Royal Canal Caper', *Canal and Riverboat*, October 1991, pp. 22-3

Builder, 'The proposed Queen Victoria Memorial', Vol. LXXX, 13 April 1901, p.359

Cork, R., Introduction to *A User's Guide to Public Sculpture*, English Heritage, 1999, pp. 12-13

Covenanter, Journal of the Cameronians, Summer Number, 1971 pp. 33-7

Cundall, H. M, 'The Queen Victoria Memorial', *Art Journal*, 1904, pp. 198-201

'The Memorial to the Great Queen', *Pall Mall Magazine*, Vol. XLVII June 1911, No. 218, pp. 847-857

Darby, E. and M., 'The Nation's Memorial to Victoria', *Country Life*, 16 November 1978, pp. 1647-1651

Dupont, P-P. and Huberty, C., 'Les fonderies de bronze', *Sculpture belge au 19e siècle*, exhibition catalogue, Brussels, 1990, pp. 248-9

Friedman, T., 'Rodin is Dead' in Knipe, T., (ed.), *Drawing in Air - Sculptors' Drawings 1882-1982*, exhibition catalogue, Sunderland, 1983, pp. 18-22

Gosse, E., 'English Sculpture in 1880', *Cornhill Magazine*, Vol. 42, 1880, p. 182

'Living English Sculptors', *Century Magazine*, Vol. 26, 1883, p. 45

'The New Sculpture 1879-1894', *Art Journal*, 1894, pp. 138-42, 199-203, 277-82, 306-11

Handley-Read, L., Introduction to *British Sculpture 1850-1914*, exhibition catalogue, Fine Art Society, 1968, pp. 3-17

Hatt, M., 'Thoughts and Things: Sculpture and the Victorian Nude', *Exposed - The Victorian Nude*, exhibition catalogue, Tate Britain, 2001, pp. 37-49

Inglis, A., 'The Medals of Sir Edward Poynter', *The Medal*, Vol. 7, Winter 1985, pp. 17-31

James, D., 'The Statue Foundry at Thames Ditton', *Foundry Trade Journal*, 7 September 1972, pp. 279-89

Kader, A., 'Athletes, adolescents and antique drapery: Some critical and sculptural responses to Leighton's sculpture 1890-1930', Barnes, J. (ed.), *Leighton and his sculptural legacy*, exhibition catalogue, Joanna Barnes Fine Art, 1996, pp. 13-22

Lewis, B., 'The Black Prince in Leeds City Square', *Leeds Art Calendar*, No. 84,1979, pp. 21-6

Liverpool Mercury 'The Rathbone Memorial', 2 January 1877

MacColl, D. S., 'The Victoria Memorial', *Architectural Review*, Vol. 10 1901, pp. 83-86

Mason, A. J., 'Archbishop Edward Benson', Lee, S. (ed.), *Dictionary of National Biography, First Supplement*, Vol. 1, 1901, pp. 174-9

Morning Post, Interview with Sir Thomas Brock, 3 March 1913

Murphy, P., 'The Politics of the Street Monument', *Irish Arts Review Yearbook*, Vol. 10, 1994, pp. 202-8

'John Henry Foley's O'Connell Monument', *Irish Arts Review Yearbook*, Vol. 11, 1995, pp. 155-6

'The O'Connell Monument in Dublin: the political and artistic context of a public sculpture', *Apollo*, March 1996, pp. 22-6

Naimaster, J. L., 'A Brock Bronze', *Mars and Minerva*, Vol. 2 No. 11, November 1969, pp. 46-7

Ormond, R., 'An Athlete Wrestling with a Python', *Frederic Leighton 1830-1896*, exhibition catalogue, Royal Academy of Arts, 1996, pp. 182-3

Pall Mall Budget, 'The New Coinage', 9 February 1893, p. 196

Pingeot, A., 'The Second Empire' in Duby, G. & Duval, J-L., (eds.), *Sculpture* Paris, 2002, p. 909

Postle, M., 'Leighton's Lost Model - The Rediscovery of Mary Lloyd', *Apollo*, February 1996, pp. 27-9

Read, B., 'John Henry Foley', *The Connoisseur*, No. 18, August 1974, pp. 262-71

'Parian and Sculpture', Atterbury, P. (ed.), *The Parian Phenomenon*, 1989, pp. 40-7

Introduction to *Gibson to Gilbert (British Sculpture 1840-1914)*, exhibition catalogue, Fine Art Society, 1992, pp. 3-8

'Just what was it that made Leighton's sculpture so different, so appealing?', *Leighton and his sculptural legacy*, exhib. cat., J. Barnes Fine Art, 1996, pp. 5-12

'Leighton and Sculpture', *Frederic Leighton 1830-1896*, exhibition catalogue, Royal Academy of Arts, 1996, pp. 81-92

'Leighton as a sculptor: Releasing sculpture from convention', *Apollo*, February 1996, pp. 65-70

Salaman, M. C., 'Sir Thomas Brock's Queen Victoria Memorial', *The Studio*, Vol. 53, 1911, pp. 29-40

Sankey, J. A., 'London's Forgotten Sculptor', *Illustrated London News*, Christmas Issue 1986, pp. 61-4

'The Story of a Statue', *Kairos Catholic Journal*, Vol. 6 No. 6, April 1997, Melbourne, pp. 12-13

'Thomas Brock and the Albert Memorial', *Sculpture Journal*, Vol. III 1999, pp. 87-92

Skipwith, P., 'Bayes and the Art-Workers' Guild', Irvine, L., & Atterbury, P.,(eds.), *Gilbert Bayes, Sculptor 1872-1953*, Shepton Beauchamp, 1998, pp. 25-9

Spielmann, M. H., 'The Queen Victoria Memorial as compared with other Royal Memorials abroad', *Journal of the Society of Arts*, Vol. LIII, 10 March 1905, pp. 409-426

Stevens, M. A., 'A Quiet Revolution: The Royal Academy 1900-50', *The Edwardians and After*, exhibition catalogue, Royal Academy of Arts, 1988, pp. 15-21

Stevens, T., 'George Frampton', Curtis P. (ed.), *Patronage and Practice - Sculpture on Merseyside*, Tate Gallery Liverpool, 1989, pp. 74-85

Stocker, M., 'Edmund Gosse on Sculpture', *University of Leeds Review*, Vol. 28, 1985-6, pp. 283-310

'Francis John Williamson', *Art New Zealand*, No. 61, Summer 1991/2, pp. 73-85

'The Coinage of 1893', *British Numismatic Journal*, Vol. 66, 1996, pp. 67-86

'A Great Man and a Great Imperialist: Sir Thomas Brock's statue of Richard John Seddon ', *Sculpture Journal*, No. 1 1997, pp. 45-50

'New Sculpture' in *Grove Dictionary of Art*, Vol. 23, 1996, pp. 33-35

Swallow, D., 'Curzon's "National Gallery": The Art Collections', *Marg*, Vol. 49 No 2, December 1997, Mumbai, pp. 48-65

Turpin, J. T., 'John Henry Foley', *Dublin Historical Record*, Vol. XXXII No. 2, March 1979, pp. 42-53

Upstone, R., 'Symbolism in Three Dimensions', Wilton, A., & Upstone, R., (ed.), *The Age of Rossetti, Burne Jones and Watts: Symbolism in Britain 1860-1910*, exhibition catalogue, Tate Gallery, 1997. pp. 83-92

Vanity Fair, Editorial on 'Mr Belt', 20 August 1881, p. 112

Victorian High Renaissance, exhibition catalogue, Minneapolis, 1978, pp. 119-121

Ward-Jackson, P., *Courtauld Institute Illustration Archives, Archive 4 Part 7 London*, 1978, pp. iii-iv

'Lord Ronald Gower, Gustave Doré and the Shakespeare Memorial', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 50, 1987, pp. 160-170

Webb, A., 'The late Sir Thomas Brock', *Builder*, 8 September 1922, p. 331

ABBREVIATIONS

AJ Art Journal

ARA Associate of the Royal Academy

AWG Art Workers Guild

BM British Museum

BSR British School at Rome

CAC ESHR Churchill Archive Centre Esher Papers

DCA Dublin City Archives

ILN Illustrated London News

LCC London County Council

M of A Magazine of Art

NPG National Portrait Gallery

PRA President of the Royal Academy

RA Royal Academy or Royal Academician, unless context indicates Royal Archives

RI Royal Institution

RSA Royal Scottish Academy

RSBS Royal Society of British Sculptors

SR Saturday Review

u/v unveiled/installed

VMC Victoria Memorial Committee

CATALOGUE OF WORKS BY SIR THOMAS BROCK

1. Works are listed in alphabetical order. The date after each title indicates the date inscribed by the sculptor or the estimated date of completion. If the work was exhibited at the Royal Academy the date is preceded by RA. If the date indicates the year of unveiling/ installation it is preceded by u/v.

2. 'Statue' indicates a standing figure.

3. 'Group' indicates two or more figures.

4. 'Effigy' indicates a recumbent figure on a tomb or memorial.

5. Where no location is stated, this means that present whereabouts of a work is unknown.

6. Works begun by John Henry Foley but completed after his death by Thomas Brock have been marked with an asterisk.

7. The foundries mentioned are:

Burton:	A. B. Burton, Thames Ditton 1897-1933
Cox:	Cox and Sons, Thames Ditton 1874-80
Drew:	Drew, Thames Ditton 1880-83
Elkington:	Elkington and Co., Birmingham
Martyn:	H. H. Martyn, Cheltenham
Masefield:	Masefield and Sons, Chelsea
Moore:	Moore, Thames Ditton 1883-97
Morris:	Morris Bronze Art, Dorset Road, Lambeth
Parlanti:	Alexander Parlanti, Parsons Green
Prince:	Prince, Southwark
Singer:	Singer, Frome (merged with Morris 1927)
Compagnie des Bronzes	Brussels

Edwin Austin Abbey (1)
u/v 1923
bronze bust
British School at Rome
cast by Burton
RA 1917 plaster

Edwin Austin Abbey (2)
1911
marble headstone on tomb
Old Church Cemetery, Kingsbury, London

Admiralty Coat of Arms
u/v 1913
Portland stone
Admiralty Arch, London

Agriculture
u/v 1914
bronze group
Victoria Memorial, London
inscribed 'Gift of New Zealand'
cast by Singer

Prince Albert (1)*
RA 1875
marble statue
Foley's statue completed by 1870
pedestal & marble bas reliefs (*Art, Literature, Science*) executed by Brock
Fitzwilliam Museum until 1956
now Madingley Hall Cambridge
u/v 22 Jan 1878

Prince Albert (2)*
u/v 1875
bronze seated figure
commissioned 1868. Foley's model approved 1870. Brock supervised casting by Prince's foundry
installed on Albert Memorial 25 Nov. 1875

James, Earl of Angus
u/v 1892
bronze statue
Douglas, Lanarkshire
cast by Singer
RA 1890 plaster

Anon I
RA 1875
marble bust

Anon II
1888 (signed and dated)
marble bust
Stoke-on-Trent Library (cellar)

Army and Navy
u/v 1924
bronze group
Victoria Memorial, London
cast by Burton

Art and Science (1)
u/v 1901
bronze bas relief
on pedestal of Q. Victoria statues at Hove, Carlisle, Cawnpore

Art and Science (2)
u/v 1924
bronze group
Victoria Memorial, London
cast by Burton

Artists' Rifles Shooting Prize
1888
bronze tazza
awarded to A. Billson 1888

Lt. Col. Guy Victor Baring
1917
marble statuette (half life size)
Winchester Cathedral

Richard Baxter
u/v 1875
marble statue
Kidderminster
RA 1876 (plaster)
maquette in Kidderminster Museum

Sir James Begbie
RA 1916
marble bust

Edward Milligan Beloe
1907
bronze medal
British Museum
portrait of Beloe on obverse, Perpetual Calendar on reverse

Sorabjee Shapoorjee Bengalee
RA 1898
marble statue
Oval Maidan, Bombay

Archbishop Edward Benson (1)
u/v 1899
marble effigy
Canterbury Cathedral
RA 1899

Archbishop Edward Benson (2)
u/v 1905
bronze bust in marble surround
Wellington College Chapel, Berks

R.. W. Binns
RA 1868
plaster bust
First work exhibited at RA

Black Prince
u/v 1903
bronze equestrian statue
City Square, Leeds
RA 1903 (plaster)
commissioned 1896. Stands on elaborate pedestal with two bronze friezes showing the Prince's victories by land and sea
cast by Compagnie des Bronzes, Brussels

Major General John Theophilus Boileau
RA 1880
marble bust

Rev. Samuel Harris Booth
RA 1884
marble bust
Baptist House, Didcot

Mrs Boutcher
RA 1880
marble medallion

Baron (Charles) Bowen of Colwood
RA 1896
marble bust
Balliol College, Oxford

Joseph Hale Brock
1865
plaster medallion
grandfather of Thomas Brock

Thomas Brock
c 1883
bronze bust
self portrait
private collection

Brotherhood
u/v 1904
bronze bas relief
Gladstone Memorial Liverpool
A labourer (with shovel) greets a politician (with scroll)

Buckingham Palace Royal Arms
u/v 1913
Portland stone
Buckingham Palace
part of refacing of Buckingham Palace by Sir Aston Webb

George Cadbury
RA 1903
marble bust
whereabouts unknown
bronze replicas at
Friends' Meeting House, Bourneville
and George Cadbury Hall, Selly Oak

Colin Minton Campbell
u/v 1887
bronze statue
Minton Factory, London Road, Stoke-on-Trent
a reduced version in Parian ware was produced by the Minton factory in 1897

*Earl (Charles John) Canning**
u/v 1878
bronze equestrian statue
completed by Brock from Foley's model
Calcutta
later moved to Barrackpore

J. Chapman
RA 1870
marble bust

Charity
RA 1877
bronze bas relief on Rathbone Memorial
Sefton Park, Liverpool (stolen 1987)
cast by Cox

Darasha Ruttonjee Chichgur
RA 1903
marble bust

Child picking Flowers
1878
marble statuette
Walker Art Gallery Liverpool
Possibly the marble statuette exhibited at the RA in 1879 with the title *Our Boy*

James Christie
1897
marble medallion
designed for Christies auction rooms and destroyed by a bomb in 1940; the portrait is still used as trademark by Christies

Sir Jervoise Clarke-Jervoise (1)
1884
silver equestrian statuette
surmounts silver cup
inscribed 24 April 1884
private collection

Sir Jervoise Clarke-Jervoise (2)
RA 1887
bronze equestrian statuette
entitled *Yonder he goes*
probably maquette for (1)

Coins
1891
designs for reverse of sovereign, crown, half-crown, florin & shilling 1891. Royal Mint adopted florin design for half-crown. For obverse (Queen's head) see *Victoria, Queen (coinage)*

Alan Cozens Hardy Colman
1898
marble bust
Norwich Castle Museum
son of Jeremiah Colman

Jeremiah J. Colman
RA 1899
bronze bust
Norwich Castle Museum
exhibited Paris 1900

Commerce (1)
RA 1877
bronze bas relief
Rathbone Memorial Sefton Park Liverpool, removed for safety in 1990
cast by Cox

Commerce (2)
u/v 1901
bronze bas relief
on pedestal of Queen Victoria statues at Hove, Carlisle & Cawnpore

Constancy
u/v 1911
bronze statue (gilded)
Victoria Memorial London

Contemplation
RA 1903
marble bust
RSA 1907 Rome 1911
War Relief Exhibition (RA) 1915

Captain James Cook RN
u/v 1914
bronze statue
The Mall, London
RA 1914

William Strickland Cookson
RA 1879
plaster statuette

Courage
u/v 1911
bronze statue (gilded)
Victoria Memorial, London

Richard Crosher
1888
marble bas relief
Emanuel Church, Loughborough

15th Earl of Derby
RA1896
marble bust
Peers' Library, Houses of Parliament
marble replica in Liverpool Town Hall

1st Earl of Dudley
1885
marble bust
Hartlebury Castle Museum, Worcester

Education (1)
RA 1878
bronze bas relief
Rathbone Memorial Sefton Park Liverpool
removed for safety in 1990
cast by Cox

Education (2)
u/v 1901
bronze bas relief
on pedestal of Queen Victoria statues at Hove, Carlisle & Cawnpore

Education (3)
u/v 1903
bronze statue
Queen Victoria Memorial Belfast

King Edward III
1884
plaster model of equestrian statue
Blackfriars Bridge competition

King Edward VII (1)
RA 1911
marble bust
Buckingham Palace
commissioned by personal friends of the King in 1910 and presented to his son (George V) as a Coronation gift 1911
RSA 1911, Rome 1911

King Edward VII (2)
u/v 1914
bronze bust
British Museum
bronze replica of (1) commissioned by Trustees of the British Museum 1913

King Edward VII (3)
u/v 1922
bronze equestrian statue
New Delhi
moved to Queen's Park, Toronto 1969
commissioned July 1910
cast by Burton 1921

King Edward VII (4)
u/v 1922
bronze equestrian statue with bronze bas reliefs *Peace and Progress* & *Empire and Unity*
Sydney, New South Wales
cast by Burton 1921

King Edward VII (5)
see *Royal Academy Gold Medal* (1)

Empire
u/v 1901
bronze bas relief
on pedestal of Queen Victoria statues at Hove/Carlisle/Cawnpore/Agra

Eve
1900
marble statue
Tate Gallery (presented by Sir Henry Tate)
RA 1898 (plaster)
exhibited Paris 1900 Glasgow 1901
RSA 1903 & 1923 St Louis 1904
Dublin 1907 Franco British Exhibition
London 1908 Rome 1911
a) full size plaster model in National Museum of Wales
b) half size bronze in Harris Museum Preston, cast by Singer
Full size plaster models formerly in RA and Glasgow have been destroyed

Michael Faraday (1)*
u/v 1877
marble statue
Royal Institution, London
usually attributed to Foley, who had only prepared sketch model when he died. Brock completed the statue in Nov. 1876
bronze replicas in Thames Embankment Gardens and at Michael Faraday House, Hills Way, Stevenage (both cast in 1989)

Michael Faraday (2)
1886
marble bust
National Portrait Gallery
commissioned 1884 by a Committee of Gentlemen

Edwin W. Field
RA 1875
plaster statuette
Dr Williams Library Gordon Square
probably an entry for a competition for the Law Courts, won by T. Woolner

Sir William Henry Flower
u/v 1903
marble bust
Natural History Museum

John Henry Foley
RA 1873
plaster bust
exhibited Glasgow 1879

Fraser -
RA 1882
marble bust

Sir Bartle Frere
u/v 1888
bronze statue
Thames Embankment Gardens
RA 1888
cast by Singer
bronze bas relief *Patriotism*

Charles Chinner Fuller FRCS
RA 1898
bronze bust
exhibited Paris 1900

Thomas Gainsborough
RA 1906
marble statue
Tate Gallery
Franco-British Exhibition 1908
bronze replica in Royal Academy
commissioned in 1939 by Leighton Fund
cast by Burton

Lieut. Colonel James Galbraith
1885
marble bas relief
Clanabogan Church, Co. Tyrone
shows battle of Maiwand (1880)

Sir Douglas Galton KCB
1902
marble bust
Shire Hall Worcester
replicas at Lotherton Hall, Leeds and
Leeds City Art Gallery

Genius of Poetry, The
RA 1889 (plaster) 1891 (marble)
marble statue
whereabouts of original is unknown,
exhibited Earls Court 1897
marble replica in the Carlsberg Museum
Valby Denmark commissioned 1892

King George V
see *Royal Academy Gold Medal* (2)

William E. Gladstone (1)
RA 1902
marble statue
Westminster Abbey (Statesmen's Aisle)
commissioned by Parliament 1899

William E. Gladstone (2)
u/v 1904
bronze statue
St John's Gardens Liverpool
flanked by winged figures of *Truth* and
Justice with plaque of *Brotherhood*
cast by Burton

Frederick Godman and Osbert Salvin
u/v 1923
bronze wall plaque with marble surround
Natural History Museum
modelled by Brock and completed after his
death by Frank Arnold Wright

*Field Marshal Viscount Gough**
u/v 1880
bronze equestrian statue
Phoenix Park Dublin 1880-1957
now at Chillingham Castle
Northumberland
Foley given commission in 1869,
completed by Brock
cast by Masefield
RA 1878 (study for head of Gough)

*Henry Grattan**
u/v 1876
bronze statue
signed 'Foley', completed by Brock
College Green Dublin
cast by Masefield

Thomas Merthyr Guest
RA 1881
marble bust

Lady Theodora Guest
1881
marble bust
wife of T. M. Guest, daughter of
Marchioness of Westminster

*Sir Benjamin Lee Guinness**
RA 1875
bronze seated figure
signed 'Foley' and completed by Brock
St Patrick's Cathedral Dublin
cast by Masefield

Gunnery
u/v 1914
Portland stone seated figure
Admiralty Arch London

Captain Hanham
RA 1885
bust

Sir Henry Harben
RA 1890
bronze bust
Prudential Insurance Co.

Sir Edward Harland Bt.
u/v 1903
marble statue
Belfast City Hall

Sir Augustus Harris
u/v 1897
bronze bust in terracotta surround
Drury Lane Theatre London

Ernest Hart
RA 1869
bust

Sir Charles Hastings
u/v 1882
marble bust
Worcester Museum/Library
presented by the British Medical Association August 1882

Hercules strangling Antaeus
RA 1870
half life size plaster
Private collection
awarded Academy Gold Medal 1869

Hereward the Wake
RA 1874
marble group
originally purchased by F. T. Rowley Hill

Rt. Rev. Lord Arthur Charles Hervey
u/v 1897
marble effigy
Wells Cathedral
sarcophagus by J. L. Pearson RA

Sir Rowland Hill
u/v 1881
marble statue
Kidderminster
RA 1882 (plaster)

Thomas Hughes
u/v 1899
marble statue
Rugby School

Sir Henry Irving
u/v 1910
bronze statue
Charing Cross Rd London
cast by Burton

Frank Treharne James
1891
marble bust
Cyfarthfa Museum Merthyr Tydfil

Sir Cowasjee Jehangir (1)
RA 1915
marble bust
Sir C Jehangir Hall Mumbai (Bombay)

Sir Cowasjee Jehangir(2)
1915
marble statue
Mumbai (Bombay)

Thomas William Jex-Blake (1)
u/v 1918
marble medallion
Rugby School Chapel

Thomas William Jex-Blake (2)
1920
marble medallion
Wells Cathedral
commissioned 1918

G. Jonson
RA 1893
marble bust
Epsom College, which also has a replica as the original had a flaw

Justice (1)
u/v 1904
bronze seated figure
a) Gladstone Memorial Liverpool
b) Queen Victoria Memorial Agra

Justice (2)
u/v 1911
marble group
Victoria Memorial London
RA 1909 (half size plaster)
full size plaster exhibited Rome 1911

Mrs Andrew Lawson
RA 1895
marble bust

Henry Lee FRCS
RA 1900
marble bust
Royal College of Surgeons
presented 11 December 1900

Lord Leighton (1)
RA 1881
bronze bust
statuette (dated 1884) in Russell Coates Museum Bournemouth

Lord Leighton (2)
RA 1893 (Diploma Work)
bronze bust
cast by Singer
full size bronze replicas in NPG, Athenaeum Club, Arts Club, Leighton House, Artists Rifles (SAS) Museum and Scarborough Town Hall
full size marble replica, formerly in Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek Copenhagen, now in private collection
full size plaster models presented to NPG and RSA
half size bronzes in Buckingham Palace, Birmingham and York Art Galleries
exhibited Liverpool 1895 Earls Court 1897 Paris 1900 Glasgow 1901

Lord Leighton (3)
u/v 1902
bronze effigy
St Paul's Cathedral
RA 1900
bronze effigy on marble sarcophagus with flanking bronze figures representing *Painting* and *Sculpture*
cast by Compagnie des Bronzes Brussels

Granville Leveson-Gower
1895
marble effigy
St James's Church Titsey Surrey

W. Thomas Lewis (1)
RA 1885
marble bust

Sir W. Thomas Lewis (2)
u/v 1901
bronze statue
Merthyr Tydfil General Hospital
RA 1899

Sir W. Thomas Lewis, Lord Merthyr of Senghenydd (3)
u/v 1913
bronze statue, replica of (2)
Aberdare Park

Mrs W. T. Lewis
RA 1885
marble bust

Lord (Joseph) Lister (1)
1912
marble medallion
Westminster Abbey

Lord (Joseph) Lister (2)
RA 1913
marble bust
commissioned by Royal College of Surgeons June 1912
plaster model exhibited RSA 1913 and left to NPG by Brock 1922

Lord (Joseph) Lister (3)
u/v 1924
bronze bust on high plinth with supporting figures
Upper Portland Place London
completed by F. Arnold Wright after Brock's death
cast by Singer 1922

Henry Longfellow
u/v 1884
marble bust
Poets' Corner Westminster Abbey
RA 1884 (plaster)
bronze replica by Elkington (1884)
in private collection

Sir Alexander M'Robert
RA 1920
marble bust
private collection

Mrs Georgina M'Robert
1910
marble bust
Aberdeen Art Gallery

Manufacture
u/v 1914
bronze group
Victoria Memorial London
cast by Singer
inscribed 'Gift of New Zealand'

Miss Maple
RA 1895
marble bust

Mars and Minerva
u/v 1889
terracotta medallion
17 Duke's Rd London NW1, drill hall of the 20th Middlesex (Artists' Rifles)

John Marshall (1)
1887
marble bust
University College Clinical Sciences Library
RA 1887 (plaster)
plaster model in University College Hospital Library

John Marshall (2)
RA 1892
marble bust
Royal College of Surgeons
bronze replica in Royal Institution

Michael Maybrick
RA 1892
plaster bust

Medals
a) N. West Canada Medal 1885 (reverse)
b) E. M. Beloe Calendar Medal 1907 (reverse & obverse, bronze)
c) see under *Victoria* for medals using Brock's Queen's head designs obverse
d) see under *RA Medals* for Edward VII & George V Academy medals

Sir William Menelaus
RA 1885
marble bust
originally in Free Library Cardiff, now in National Museum of Wales

Sir John Millais
u/v 1905
bronze statue
John Islip Street outside Tate Britain
installed 1905 in Tate forecourt, moved to present position in 2002

A Moment of Peril
RA 1880 plaster 1881 bronze
bronze equestrian group
Leighton House London (garden) on loan from Tate Gallery
cast by Singer
exhibited Worcester 1882 Earls Court 1897 RA Bicentenary 1968
purchased by Chantrey Fund 1881
bronze replica in Rosenberg Castle Gardens Copenhagen dated 1880, cast 1909

Motherhood
u/v 1911
marble group
Victoria Memorial London
RA 1907 plaster half size model exhibited RSA 1923

Sir Jerome Murch
RA 1879
bronze bust
Guildhall Bath
marble replica in Royal Literary and Scientific Institution Bath

Navigation
u/v 1913
Portland stone seated figure
Admiralty Arch

Nepal, Jang Bahadur Rana, Maharaja of
u/v 1885
bronze equestrian statue
Kathmandu

Nepal, Rana Udip Singh, Maharajah of
u/v 1885
bronze equestrian statue
Kathmandu

Brig. Gen. John Nicholson
u/v 1906
bronze statue
RA 1904
Nicholson Gdns New Delhi, moved 1960 to Dungannon Royal School Northern Ireland

North West Canada Medal
1885
reverse design

Daniel O'Connell (1)*
u/v 1882
bronze statue
Dublin
Irish National Monument comprises statue, column & four Victories
At Foley's death, column & clay model of O'Connell figure were finished; Brock completed O'Connell figure and four Victories installed 1883
cast by Drew

Daniel O'Connell (2)
u/v 1891
bronze statue
St Patrick's Cathedral Melbourne Australia
commissioned 1886
cast by Compagnie des Bronzes 1888

Oenone
RA 1875
marble statue
companion to *Paris*

Our Boy
RA 1879
marble statuette
connect with *Child Picking Flowers*

Sir Richard Owen
u/v 1897
bronze statue
Natural History Museum
RA 1895 (plaster)
cast by Singer

Roger Owen
RA 1922
marble bust

Painting
u/v 1902
bronze seated figure for Leighton Memorial
a) marble replica of head exhibited Christchurch New Zealand 1907 and acquired by New South Wales Art Gallery
b) marble replica of head exhibited Rome 1911
c) bronze replica of head sold at Christie's 1979 as 'Eleanor Burton'

Paris
RA 1875
marble statue
companion to *Oenone*

Sir Harry Smith Parkes
u/v 1887
marble bust in marble surround
crypt of St Paul's Cathedral

Patriotism
u/v 1888
bronze plaque on pedestal of *Bartle Frere*
Thames Embankment Gardens

Peace
u/v 1914
bronze group
Victoria Memorial London
cast by Singer

Sir Dinshaw Manockjee Petit
RA 1916
marble seated figure
Bhatia Bang Bombay (Mumbai)

Nusserwanji Maneckji Petit
1895
marble statue
Gowalia Tank, Cumballa Hill, Bombay

Bishop Henry Philpott
u/v 1897
marble seated figure
Worcester Cathedral
RA 1896

J. Pickering Pick
RA 1900
marble bust

Sir Isaac Pitman
1887
marble bust
Pitman Institute London
RA 1888
presented to Pitman 28 September 1887
a) marble replica in Royal Literary & Scientific Institution Bath (1889), presented by Sir J. Murch q.v.
b) marble replica in Toronto (Canada) Shorthand Society
c) maquette in Pitman Institute London

Sir Walter Prideaux
RA 1915
marble bust
Goldsmiths' Hall London

Progress
u/v 1914
bronze group
Victoria Memorial London
cast by Singer

Sir Richard Quain
RA 1897
marble bust

Queen's University War Memorial
u/v 1924
bronze group
Queens University Belfast
sketch model of a Winged Victory sustaining a youth designed by Brock in 1922, completed by F. Arnold Wright

Robert Raikes
u/v 1880
bronze statue
Thames Embankment Gardens London
RA 1880
cast by Singer
bronze replicas cast by Burton in 1930 for
a) Gloucester b) Toronto

Lady Gwendolen Ramsden
RA 1891
marble bas relief
Muncaster Castle Ravenglass Cumbria
daughter of 12th Duke of Somerset

Sir John Ramsden
1891
marble bust
Muncaster Castle Ravenglass Cumbria

*William Rathbone**
u/v 1877
marble statue
Sefton Park Liverpool
statue modelled by Foley & completed by Brock, who also executed bronze bas reliefs of *Charity, Commerce* and *Education*
RA 1877/8 (bas reliefs)

Francis Wall Mackenzie Ravenscroft
1900
bronze bust
RA 1898

H. Rhys
RA 1883
marble bust
Cyfarthfa Castle Museum Merthyr Tydfil

*Rosse, William Parsons, Third Earl of**
u/v1876
bronze statue
signed by Foley, completed by Brock
Birr Castle Offaly Ireland
cast by Masefield

Royal Academy Gold Medal (1)
1902
obverse with bust of Edward VII
RA has example dated 10 Dec. 1902
exhibited Rome 1911

Royal Academy Gold Medal (2)
1911
obverse with bust of George V
V&A has example dated 9 Dec. 1911

Royal Academy Gold Medal (3)
1911
bronze plaque design for *reverse* of RA Gold Medal
a) British Museum
b) National Museum of Wales
c) in private collection

Royal Scots Fusilier
u/v 1902
bronze statue
Statue Square Ayr
RA 1902

Baron Russell of Killowen (1)
u/v 1905
marble seated figure
Royal Courts of Justice Strand London
RA 1904

Baron Russell of Killowen (2)
1904
marble bust
Newry (NI) Town Hall
marble replica at New York Bar Association office NY

Mrs Myer Salaman
RA 1894
marble bust
exhibited Earls Court 1897

St Michael & St George
see *Stock Exchange War Memorial* (2)

Salmacis
RA 1869
marble statuette
Worcester Royal Porcelain Co. Museum
produced in Parian ware as '*Bather Surprised*'

Salvin, Osbert see *Godman, Frederick*

Science
see *Art & Science*

Sculpture
u/v 1902
bronze seated figure
for *Leighton Memorial*
a) marble replica of head exhibited RSA 1915 and Fine Art Society 1992
b) bronze replica of head exhibited at Fine Art Society 1968

Richard John Seddon
u/v 1915
bronze statue
Wellington New Zealand

Capt. Charles Grant Seely
u/v 1922
marble effigy on marble sarcophagus
St Olave's Church Gatcombe I.o.W.
RA 1921
exhibited War Memorials Exhibition 1919

Mrs Emily Seely
RA 1897
marble effigy
St Paul's Church Daybrook Arnold Notts
RA 1897 'Effigy of a lady'
Grandmother of Capt. C. G. Seely

Harry Gordon Selfridge
RA 1914
marble bust

N. Sherwood
RA 1893
marble bust

Shipbuilding
u/v 1903
bronze seated figure
Queen Victoria statue Belfast
cast by Parlanti

The Sluggard
u/v 1902
bronze statuette, held by *Sculpture*
part of Leighton Memorial
reproduction by Brock (signed) of
Leighton's *The Sluggard* (RA 1886)
sold Sotheby's 1995

Snake Charmer
RA 1877
bronze statuette
original cast by Cox and exhibited at
Philadelphia 1876
replica cast by Drew (1880)

Somerset, Edward Adolphus Seymour, 12th Duke of
1892
marble bust
Muncaster Castle Cumbria
father of Lady G. Ramsden

Song
RA 1891
plaster statue
believed destroyed in 1890s

Spinning
u/v 1903
bronze seated figure
Queen Victoria statue Belfast
cast by Parlanti

Peter Squire
u/v 1885
bronze bas relief
Royal Pharmaceutical Society London
RA 1887 (plaster)
bronze medal in British Museum

Stock Exchange War Memorial (1)
1905
London
bronze bas relief with marble plaque
bas relief destroyed in 1940

Stock Exchange War Memorial (2)
u/v 1922
London
bronze statues of St Michael & St George
part of memorial by Sir A. Webb
cast by Morris

*William Stokes FRS**
1874
marble statue
signed Foley 1874, completed by Brock
Royal College of Physicians of Dublin
u/v 16 March 1876

Baron Sydenham of Combe (1)
RA 1917
plaster bust
probably model for *Sydenham* (2)

Baron Sydenham of Combe (2)
RA 1918
marble statue
Institute of Science Malam Cama Rd
Bombay (Mumbai)

Sir Henry Tate
RA 1898
bronze bust
Tate Gallery
presented by an Association of Gentlemen
(inc. Sir E. Poynter and Sir W. Agnew) to
Tate Gallery in 1898
bronze replicas
a) outside Tate Library Brixton, gift of
Lady Tate u/v 11 October 1905
b) Tate & Lyle Head Office
plaster exhibited RSA 1903

Archbishop Frederick Temple
u/v 1905
marble bas relief
Rugby School Chapel

Sir Richard Temple
RA 1882 study for head, 1884 statue
marble statue
grounds of Byculla Museum Bombay

Rev. Edward Thring
u/v 1892
marble seated figure
Uppingham School Chapel
RA 1892

Titanic Memorial
u/v 1920
marble group
Donegal Sq. Belfast
RA 1916

Triton & Nereid
u/v 1911
bronze bas relief for fountain
Victoria Memorial London
RA 1906

Truth (1)
u/v 1904
bronze seated figure
a) Gladstone Memorial Liverpool
b) Q. Victoria Memorial Agra

Truth (2)
u/v 1911
marble group
Victoria Memorial London
full size plaster exhibited Rome 1911
bronze maquette in Victoria & Albert Museum

Sir Anthony van Dyck
1900
sketch model of proposed memorial in St Paul's prepared for RA Council but not executed

Queen Victoria (1)
RA 1901
marble bust
Christ Church Oxford
marble replicas in
a) Walker Art Gallery Liverpool
b) Christ's Hospital Horsham

Queen Victoria (2)
u/v 1905
bronze statue (Hove type)
Agra
supporting bronze figures of *Justice* and *Truth* with bronze bas relief of *Empire*
cast by Drew

Queen Victoria (3)
u/v 1906
marble statue (Worcester type)
Cubbon Park Bangalore

Queen Victoria (4)
u/v 1903
marble statue (Worcester type)
Belfast, City Hall
supporting bronze figures of *Shipbuilding. Spinning* and *Education* cast by Parlanti

Queen Victoria (5)
u/v 1901
marble statue (Worcester type)
Birmingham
recast in bronze by Martyn 1950
u/v 9 June 1951

Queen Victoria (6)
u/v 1906
bronze statue (Hove type)
Brisbane

Queen Victoria (7)
u/v 1921
marble statue of young queen
Calcutta, Victoria Memorial Hall

Queen Victoria (8)
u/v 1890
marble statue (Worcester type)
Cape Town

Queen Victoria (9)
u/v 1902
bronze statue (Hove-type)
Carlisle, Bitts Park
bronze bas reliefs of *Art & Science, Commerce, Education* and *Empire*
cast by Singer

Queen Victoria (10)
u/v 1902
marble statue
originally at Junior Constitutional Club
now at Carlton House Terrace, London

Queen Victoria (11)
u/v 1904
bronze statue (Hove type)
Cawnpore
bronze bas reliefs as at *Victoria* (9)

Queen Victoria (12)
u/v 1901
bronze statue
Hove
bronze bas reliefs as at *Victoria* (9)
first bronze statue of the Queen by Brock

Queen Victoria (13)
u/v 1904
bronze statue
Lucknow
Hove type but with tiara replacing crown

Queen Victoria (14)
u/v 1890
marble statue
Worcester
first marble statue of the Queen by Brock

Queen Victoria Coinage
1893-1901
'veiled head' design used for *obverse* of gold and silver coinage 1893-1901 and copper coinage 1895-1900

Queen Victoria Medals (1)
1894-1900
'veiled head' used for these medals:
a) Diamond Jubilee 1897 in gold, silver and bronze
b) Diamond Jubilee 1897 (lozenge shape) in gold and silver for Mayors & Provosts
c) visits to Royal Mint by Duke of York (1894) and Queen of Holland (1895)
d) prize medals for Royal Military College Sandhurst, Royal Military Academy Woolwich & HMS Britannia
e) Canada General Service Medal 1866-70
f) India Medal 1895
g) Royal Victorian Medal 1896-1901
h) Colonial Auxiliary Forces Long Service Medal 1899-1901
i) Meritorious Service Medal (New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, Victoria and New Zealand)

Queen Victoria Medals (2)
1893
alternative version of Queen's head, designed for 1893 coinage but not selected, was used for one Golden Jubilee medal with Imperial Institute on reverse and two Diamond Jubilee medals with St Peter's Eaton Square and St Gabriel's Warwick Square on reverses

Queen Victoria Memorial
u/v 16 May 1911
marble seated figure with column, fountains and 12 supporting groups
The Mall London
contract signed 1902
see *Agriculture, Army & Navy, Art & Science, Constancy, Courage, Industry, Justice, Motherhood, Peace, Progress, Truth, Victory*

*Victories (Winged)**
u/v 1883
O'Connell Monument Dublin
Winged Victories representing Victory by Patriotism, by Fidelity, by Courage and by Eloquence
designed by Foley, executed by Brock
cast by Drew

Victory
u/v 1911
gilded bronze winged figure
Victoria Memorial London
cast by Singer

Sir Aston Webb
RA 1922
bronze bust
Royal Academy reserve collection
cast by Morris
presented by Brock to RA 1922

Wellington School War Memorial
u/v 1907
marble wall plaque with bronze figures of *Courage* and *Faith*
Wellington School Chapel

Welsh War Memorial
1922
plaster sketch model
National Museum of Wales

Westminster, Elizabeth, 2nd Marchioness
1881
marble bust
mother of Lady Theodora Guest

Sir Erasmus Wilson (1)
u/v 1886
bronze statue
Margate Royal Infirmary (Royal Sea Bathing Hospital)
RA 1886

Sir Erasmus Wilson (2)
RA 1885
marble bust

Sir Erasmus Wilson (3)
RA 1888
marble bust
Royal College of Surgeons

Errata supplied by author July 2011.

- Page 73 Line 20: for '1874' read '1876'

-P.89 L.14: for Stanley read Kingsley

-P.109 L.15: for (1886) read (1905)

-P.115 L.12: for Cross read Commander

-P.151 L.10: for 1897 read 1896

-P.151 L.17: for Lord Lieutenant read Dean

-P.178 L.22: insert Junior before Constitutional

-P.216 L.20: for 15 read 25

-P.219 L.23: for June 1902 read May 1901

-P. 239 L.1: for King's read King

-P.263 L.23: for March read October