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Abstract:

The thesis is concerned with the use of family imagery in monumental sculpture commissioned from the major London workshops in the mid-eighteenth century. It explores the interaction of the many factors which dictated the way in which the family might be represented in monumental sculpture. The interests of the competing London workshops in producing images which established their fame and increased their profits are studied in conjunction with the interests of the patronage in furthering personal and family reputations.

The thesis evaluates the contribution that work upon the social history of the eighteenth century family can make to our understanding of the development of monumental imagery. I investigate the many levels of problems associated with using an art form as a source of "data" in the formulation of social history and the potential of the analysis of artistic images to question, or confirm, the validity of theories of family history.

The central objective is to enquire into the reasons why the London market in monumental sculpture thrived and expanded in the first half of the eighteenth century. Much of the analysis is directed at revealing the fundamental reasons which caused patrons to order monuments. Changes in funerary culture are measured in terms of the proportion of monuments commissioned to mark, for instance, the elevation of a family to the peerage, or a bereaved husband's grief for his wife. I conclude that the great majority of monumental sculpture commissioned from London workshops throughout the period was concerned with matters of inheritance and property; marking the end of dynasties, the gratitude of those inheriting land, and the establishment of new families upon country estates. The demand for images marking the transfer of property and the passage of titles and honours is shown to have dominated the sculpture market in the first two decades of the period and, despite a strong cultural reaction against formal dynastic sculpture in the 1740s and 50s, continued to have a commanding role in the success of the London workshops.
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If we may measure the importance of an artistic form to a society by the crude index of the sums of money which members of that society were prepared to pay for it, it is clear that funerary sculpture was of much consequence. A wall monument of moderate size with a figurative element such as Henry Cheere’s (1703-81) monument to Magdalene De Carteret (Jersey, St Helier, erected 1751) cost three hundred pounds. For this sum a contemporary could purchase in London two “genteel post chariot(s)” fully painted with family arms, mahogany fittings, lamps and bridles for six horses and have forty pounds to spare. A large composition such as Michael Rysbrack’s (1694-1770) monument to the Foley family (Great Witley, Worcestershire 1733-39) reportedly cost two thousand pounds; a greater sum than that paid for masonry work at Appledurcombe House, one of the largest classical mansions built in the early eighteenth century. The production of funerary sculpture, in the estimation of contemporaries such as George Vertue and Jean André Rouquet, dominated the thriving sculpture workshops of mid-eighteenth century London. Despite this, monumental sculpture remains one of the least explored fields in the history of arts and manufactures of the eighteenth century.

This thesis is, however, written at a time when the study of eighteenth century sculpture and monumental sculpture is far from dormant. The excellent documentary and recording work of the generation of scholars beginning with Katherine Esdaile and Rupert Gunnis and concluding with Margaret Whinney, M.I. Webb and John Physick is now being added to and radically

---

1 Philip de Saumarez left (PCC 1748, 26) instructions in his will for £300 to be paid out for a monument to Magdalene De Carteret. A letter from George Durell to Matthew De Saumarez (reviewed in chapter 1, p. 45) of April 18th 1751 states that the “monument will be sent over in June” by Henry Cheere.


4 Vertue, Notebooks, vol. III, p. 146. These comments on the financial rewards of the production of funerary sculpture are quoted in chapter one p. 53. Rouquet, 1755, p. 64.
revised. New methodologies of study have been introduced by such scholars as Malcolm Baker, David Bindman, Nicholas Penny and, concentrating upon the seventeenth century, Nigel Llewellyn, which have begun to challenge the way in which monumental sculpture was seen and presented by the previous generation. Revisions are being made through the attachment of a new importance to three main areas of study: that of the techniques and conditions of production; the social function of monuments; and the effect of social change upon their imagery. It is the objective of this thesis to integrate the study of all these areas; to look at imagery in terms of an interplay between the social and economic conditions of production and the ideals, beliefs, and social requirements of the patronage.

This thesis is concerned with the imagery of the family in funeral monuments. It centres upon those topics which have concerned those working upon the history of family life in the period: inheritance, marriage, private life, affection, respect, domestic virtue and heraldic display. Monuments are, however, complex objects and it is frequently impossible to look at them from one standpoint of social history alone. It is necessarily difficult to limit or define what constitutes family imagery in monumental art. It is not possible to isolate a corpus of specifically relevant works as it is, for instance, in the discussion of the military monument. Family matters were frequently presented in a manner which fused them, often indissolubly, with important matters of political, economic or military history. Although very few monuments can be dissociated from the concept of "the family" there are varying degrees to which the subject of the family was made manifest. Compositions in which entire domestic groups are presented, such as the monuments erected to the families of the Earls Kildare (Henry Cheere, Dublin Cathedral, 1743-6), Foley (Michael Rysbrack, Great Witley, 1733-39) and Shelburne (Peter Scheemakers, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire c.1753), have an obvious bearing upon the subject. However many bust monuments and single statues are just

---

3 Esdaile, Roubillic, 1928.
Esdaile, Church Monuments, 1946.
Gunnis, 1953.
Physick, 1969.

Bindman, Consolation, 1986.
Penny, Church Monuments, 1977.
Penny, Mourning 1981.
as much the product of "the family"; few clients were willing or able to part with the sums required to produce life-size family groups and thus sought to represent their families with a statue or bust. Even professional allegories can relate to the concept of the family. This was inevitable in a society where a profession was frequently a joint family concern, and relatives sought social promotion on the basis of the posthumous professional reputation of a family member.

At the core of my study are broad surveys of the kind of family circumstances which initially caused patrons to commission monumental sculpture. Changes in funerary culture are measured in terms of the relative importance of certain types of commission. Observations of the variations in the numbers of, for instance, male relatives inheriting estates, or bereaved husbands seeking mementos of their wives, are used to evaluate the changing character of the market which the major London workshops served. However my aim is not only to chart, but to explain the developments of monumental fashions. Quantitative analysis is, therefore, combined with the investigation of the social conditions which led to sectors of society becoming preoccupied with certain types of funerary imagery. To this end I investigate the degree to which the major historical theories concerning the forces of change in the ethos of eighteenth century family life - such as have been constructed by Lawrence Stone or Randolph Trumbach - can help to explain broad changes in funerary fashion.\(^7\)

The workshops of the mid-eighteenth century cannot be seen to have served passively the changing demands or fashions of "society". The study of the imagery of the family in the monumental art at this time is not simply a matter of charting what clients required but observing how the sculptors manipulated or stimulated these requirements. Thus it is neither possible nor desirable to separate the analysis of the patronage from the discussion of the business methods and techniques of production employed by the London workshops. The intense competition for trade and the commercial stratagems used by workshop masters are a major theme of well informed contemporary commentaries upon the eighteenth century profession. George Vertue's observations upon Michael Rysbrack and Peter Scheemakers (1691-1781) are, like those of J.T Smith upon the sculpture trade in the late eighteenth century, dominated by candid references to commercial competition.\(^8\) Both commentators give the strong impression of a profession in which the making of money was a prime motivation and in which the commercially naïve would not survive.

A characteristic of the London profession in this period was the growth in its social status. One of the characteristics of this development was that workshop masters increased their ability to control their market and manipulate their appeal to particular sectors of it. Henry Cheere, for instance, reinvested his business profits into the cultivation of a network of social connections which enabled him to expand his market in funerary monuments amongst London's professional classes. There was a clear relationship between a workshop's chances of commercial survival or expansion, and the ability of those designing monuments to evaluate the social composition of their market and exploit the characteristic requirements or predispositions of certain types of clientele. The design of monuments, from their depiction of the family to their assortment of decorative embellishments, to some degree reflect the workshop master's attempts to remain in profit or expand his production by exploiting the tastes and predilections of certain sectors of his potential market.

Much recent study of monumental sculpture has stressed the view that its production was part of the industry of death and its imagery functioned within the death rituals of contemporary culture. This is not as obvious a matter in the early and mid-eighteenth century England as it is in other periods and countries. The subject of death was treated obliquely in monuments of our period; in the majority of monuments it was enough to record that the commemorated individual or family group was dead without any additional reflection upon mortality or loss. It is a matter of interest, and some apparent irony, that the demand for monuments should reach unparalleled heights in a society which seems for the most part to have regarded the imagery of death itself as unpalatable. Grisly images of death passed out of fashion along with other themes which had been popular within late seventeenth century funerary culture such as scenes of bereavement and Christian salvation or resurrection. An article on monuments and epitaphs published in the Connoisseur of 1755 (no.73) lamented the passing of the age of "our pious forefathers" who were:

"...contented with exhibiting to us the usual emblems of death; the hour glass, the skull and the crossed marrow bones."

Only in the 40s and 50s when, under the influence of such factors as the popularity of the "graveyard school" of poetry, did skulls and grave clothes, and scenes of bereavement become

---

9 See Chapter one, pp. 68-80.

10 Monuments began to be seriously discussed as aspects of death or funerary culture by Philip Aries (Images of Man and Death, Harvard, 1985). This has been implied by the placement of drawings, videos and models for monuments amongst other products of the funerary trades in the recent (1992) Art of Death exhibition at the Victoria and Albert Museum (catalogue Llewellyn, 1991).
once more a subject for a few notable pieces of monumental sculpture most of which were
commissioned from L.F. Rouibiliac (fl.1736-61). My aim is to plot the subtle and enigmatic
network of connections between the development of monumental art and changes in attitudes
toward death and death ceremonial.

11 Discussion of the transition of towards themes of death and loss in the funerary sculpture of the 1740s and 50s
has been initiated by David Bindman (Consolation, 1986, pp. 25-45.)
INTRODUCTION

Monuments and their associated inscriptions are a major source of material for the study of social change in family life. Changes in the forms of monuments and inscriptions have been used to chart the development of family life from Imperial Roman society to that of seventeenth and eighteenth century Britain. Lawrence Stone has made a number of notable uses of the medium in his work upon the "Family, Sex and Marriage" in our period and the preceding century. As with the use of all types of "data" in the writing of social history of the family, from diaries, to novels or poetry, particular attention must be given to the understanding of the medium - its conventions and conditions of production - before its application to the debate. Whether analyzing the application of the social history of the family to monumental sculpture, or testing its theories, it is necessary to be aware of the particular problems both of the major theories and of using sculpture as a source.

Since this thesis is concerned with the development of the family monument over four decades, to a degree in comparison with the previous and following fifty years, it must relate itself in particular to recent theories of change or development in family life. Historical work of this type has, unfortunately, been limited to a few major works. The most ambitious works in this area were published by Lawrence Stone, The Family, Sex and Marriage and Randolph Trumbach, The Rise of the Egalitarian Family. Both of these works depict the history of "the family" as a process of progression towards "enlightened" values. John Scott's review of Stone's book in the periodical Social History makes it clear that, despite the neutrality of its title it is a "whig history". Trumbach's work, published after Stone's, moves towards the same conclusions. As his title suggests, Trumbach is arguing, in a forthright manner, that there was a progression toward "egalitarian" values in family life.


As Scott points out, Stone’s argument that there was a gradual development from an "open lineage family" to a nuclear family" bonded by the values of "affective individualism" is theoretically crude. Scott notes that:4

The tone, conceptual language and mode of analysis are sociological and quantitative. Stone consistently talks of variables, of categories and of 'ideal family types'. In each period quantities of affect are measured. We are told that in the sixteenth century, 'the total amount of affective feelings was limited'..... By the eighteenth century declining death rates, romantic novels and a host of other influences increased the total 'amount of affect' among the elite. Base economic motives for marriage disappeared and were replaced by emotional considerations. There were some drawbacks, but in sum the evolution was positive:

'The distribution of ties, like that of power, is something of a zero sum game, although affect, unlike power, changes in quantity over time.'

Unfortunately fundamental criticism of Stone’s theories is largely limited to cursory articles such as Scott’s. Works published before Stone’s "Family, Sex and Marriage..." by Peter Laslett and E.A. Wrigley suggest that his theories of progression might be overstated but they cannot claim to have his scope or depth of statistical analysis.5 J.C.D. Clarke has stressed his fundamental objections to some of Stone’s basic assumptions, mainly concerning the decline of hierarchy.6 Clarke’s own analysis of what he interprets as "Eighteenth Century Society" is so limited to the theory and practice of political debate as to provide little other than sabre rattling from the political right against Stone’s liberal values. It is difficult, therefore, for the historian of the visual imagery of the family to resort to any truly cohesive alternative social models to those of Stone and Trumbach.

The conceptual crudity of Stone and Trumbach’s works, inevitable in their massive chronological scope, makes them difficult to use as an accurate model for a thesis concerning the analysis of a forty-year period. Inevitably we are drawn into a more detailed analysis of "society" largely overlooked by Stone, his contemporaries and critics; issues such as

4 ibid., p. 514.

5 P. Laslett, The World We Have Lost, London, 1965
determining how the perception of "the family" varied from one political circle to another. Large scale generalisations concerning family life tend to obscure the rich variety of domestic behaviour present in a society. As Scott points out, "the notion that there was, historically, a family" is one of the central problems of Stone's work. It is, indeed, one of the inevitable and thorny issues in any historical investigation of the changing ideals of family life.

The study of the memorials of families from a wide variety of social spheres, professions, and political affiliations brings us into confrontation with theories which, like Stone's, generalise about family life. On the other hand monumental sculpture and its associated inscriptions can be seen to reflect certain major "sea changes" in the history of family life. In the 1740s there were, for instance, significant shifts towards erecting monuments to commemorate particularly tragic bereavements, such as occurred at the deaths of young wives or children. At the same time a type of inscription began to flourish which referred directly to personal separation and which employed broken language and hyperbolic terms to express unbearable emotion. The question is, of course, whether these trends or "fashions" in funerary culture actually reflected changes in the way "the family" felt towards each other.

The study of monumental art brings the historian into areas of family history which have been neglected by social historians; issues such as the contemporary notion of "ancestral piety" or the social codes concerning "gratitude" to one's relatives. Ideas of hierarchy, formality, propriety and fixed obligation have not been central to the discourse upon the values and practices of Georgian family life. Stone's and Trumbach's theories of the advance of a nuclear family - which is construed as a relaxed informal domestic unit bonded by affection rather than obligation - have tended to obscure the significance of codes of respect and hierarchy.

Moreover, there has been a tendency to set up polarities between ideas of "affection" and those of formality and hierarchy. The dynamic of Lawrence Stone's theoretical position tends to depict these as contradictory forces. There is no reason why formality and tenderness should be considered incompatible. One of the characteristics of Georgian funerary art was, indeed, to combine the visual symbols of affection with those of hierarchy and formal dynasticism. This was done with such regularity as to indicate that there are basic problems with the social theories which separate them. It will be pointed out, however, that much funerary sculpture was based upon generic types which addressed the particular obligations of inheritance.

7 Scott, pp. 513-16.
8 See chapter six, pp. 288-290.
9 See Chapter two, pp. 89-154.
These combined ideals of "public" and "private" obligation in a manner much dependant upon prototypes in the classical monumental and epigraphic tradition. Thus the mixture of formal and affective terms needs to be considered as part of the established tradition of the medium in much the same way as triumphal imagery. In this period monumental sculpture was an art form much associated with the making of certain formal statements; it developed its own dynamic as a formalised method of expressing "tribute" within family groups at times of inheritance. It cannot, therefore, provide an accurate reflection of the formality of family life.

Clear differentiation between the analysis of how individuals expressed themselves within their cultural environment and how they actually felt, is essential to the comprehension of family imagery in monumental sculpture. It would be naive for the historian to extrapolate upon the matters of how a patron or patrons actually felt about the decease of a relative from the evidence of the imagery of a monument and its inscription. Case studies frequently suggest that we cannot adequately predict the elements of a composition which communicated domestic feeling. A good example to illustrate this is the monument to Elizabeth, wife of Justinian Isham of Lamport in Northamptonshire which was erected by Edward Stanton in 1714. (ill. 1) The sculptor was part of the generation of London workshop masters which immediately proceeded ours but, as the best documented family monument of the early eighteenth century, it merits particular notice.

A large body of letters has survived in the Lamport collection which record Isham's attempts to have his sons, who were then living in London, intervene in the production of the monument and his own dealings and disputes with Stanton. Isham's tremendous pains of bereavement are evident in all his letters. Those written to his sons concerning the monument are signed "your poor unhappy father". Although it should be acknowledged that these phrases can be seen in terms of the epistolary conventions of the day and are not in themselves certain indications of profound feeling, the sincerity of such phrases is suggested by certain details within the letters. Dealings with his tailor for mourning clothing, conducted at the same time as the negotiations over the monument, (August 10th 1713) record that Justinian had "fallen away pretty much" in his grief and was unable to fit many of his clothes. Despite this, Isham was keen not to over stress the power of his feelings in the design of the monument or inscription. Three months after he had commissioned the monument (March 17th 1713) he wrote to his son concerning the inscription revealing that he had:

---

10 See Chapter two, pp. 197-109.

11 Northamptonshire Record Office, Isham Papers, IC. 2388-2408.
Justinian wrote continually to his sons and Stanton concerning minor adaptations to the inscription and sent it around for review to some of his friends. Details of the inscription, such as Isham's decision to refer to himself as her "spouse", because "the poor woman was like to call me by that name" (April 12th 1713), were discussed with great attention to decorum and the inflections of meaning within phraseology. His deliberations were so cautious that eventually the only signs of his affections were to be interpreted from a series of subtle nuances in his departure from what he considered conventional.

The fussy attention to detail and continual change of plan caused Stanton to become distinctly irritable with his patron. He began to correct Justinian's use of language concerning architectural terms and refused certain adaptations to the composition. A dispute arose concerning the use of a black band of marble around the inscription. Black inscription tablets or the presence of black upon them was a feature of mid-seventeenth century monuments. Isham, who was not aware of monumental fashion, requested black marble as a symbol of his grief. A letter addressed to his son, Justinian, on the 2nd of March 1713 reveals that he was in dispute with Stanton who was reluctant to use black marble. Stanton's letter to Justinian of March 11th 1713 showed he was firm in his resolve that:

Black will not be in any other part of ye monument neither would I have used any black without your directions for black is seldom used."

Justinian's concern to commemorate his wife lovingly was partly reflected in his attention to detail. He was particularly concerned, for instance, that the inscription should be cut in a way which meant it was not worn away quickly. The original contract (completed March 16th 1713) was signed with the proviso that:12 "Ye said table should be cut deep with such inscription as he shall direct". In the final stages of the monument's construction Justinian checked up on such details, attempting to secure proper standards of workmanship as a tribute to his wife. The monument itself, which was designed partially from Justinian's sketches, appears today to be a conventional mural monument with the pair of attendant weeping putti. Isham's description of his wife's character combines many of the conventional phrases seen in upon other works of the period and, no doubt, in common use by less sincere mourners.

than he. Only the last passage of the inscription dedicating the monument which declares the monument to be a memento of "the deep impression a loss so piercing made upon a most mournful and disconsolate widower", gives a clear indication of the depth of sentiment seen in Isham’s private letters.

It would not, probably, occur to the modern observer to look for such signs as the use of black marble and the depth of cutting in the inscription as indications of the patron’s feelings. The Isham monument was by no means unusual in this regard. The family of Captain William Cust, who according to surviving correspondence were deeply affected by his death, channelled all of their feelings of loss into a punctilious concern that the bust upon his monument (erected Grantham, Lincolnshire 1749) should be a good likeness. The sculptor, Henry Cheere, was made to repeat his terracotta sketches of William’s bust more than three times in order to achieve the chosen effect for the funeral monument erected at Grantham. On July 18th 1747 Peregrine Cust wrote from the family house in Downing Street to his family in Lincolnshire that he had:

.....been to see Cheere, the statuary, who has two busts of my late brother, both unlike, he is making a third from Sir John’s picture which does not promise to be like.

There is, however, little in the design of the bust within its monumental setting or within the tone of the inscription to indicate profound emotion.

The expression of emotion in funerary sculpture was very much determined by what “society”, both in the sense of an immediate social milieu of the patron and of culture at large, considered decorous. Not only can we detect the growth of nationally pervasive fashions in funerary culture, but, as we shall see in our discussion of the monuments of the Knight/Eliot/Craggs or Pusey/Bouverie kinship groups, the development of particular conventions of expressing grief within groups of friends and relations. The image and inscription of the monument to Elizabeth Isham not only represented Isham’s feelings concerning the death of his wife, but also the tailoring of those emotions to the anticipated approval of the friends and relations to whom he wrote for advice on phraseology. His reticence concerning the use of too "fulsome" a mode of "expression" reflects his sense of


14 See Chapter 6, pp. 292-294.
decorum; not only what pleased his tastes, but seemed judicious to him in his experience of other monuments and the context of the society in which he lived.

"Fulsome expression" was becoming less expected of men in the period Isham was writing than it had been in the previous five decades. Isham was old fashioned not only in his desire for black marble but in the very type of monument he was erecting. He was probably the only husband to commission a metropolitan monument explicitly and solely for the commemoration of a wife in the period 1712-1740. This type of monument had, however, been relatively common during his youth in the late seventeenth century. Isham, therefore, can be said to have communicated his particular grief by the very fact he erected such a monument against the trend.

The monument was the result of a triangular relationship between patron, sculptor, and an expected audience. The sculptor, who was concerned that his image should not be construed as old fashioned by his expected audience interacted with the patron who was concerned, in turn, that his monument should not contain expressions which might embarrass him in the eyes of what he considered might be his audience. Both men's choices were motivated by their perception of what had been, and was in their own times, an appropriate set of symbols for communicating the sentiments of mourning.

As Samuel Johnson wrote in an essay on epitaphs published in the Gentleman's Magazine of 1740, monuments and inscriptions were commonly considered to owe "their beauty to their propriety"; skill in the composition of funerary art was considered a matter of extracting from epigraphic tradition a set of formulae which, in the author's considered judgement, answered the demands of propriety set by his own times. Johnson's adroit comments provide a useful framework for the comprehension of mid-eighteenth century monumental art; a period in which the personal expression of individual patrons was in most cases to be seen in the choice, or re-working of, established epigraphic formulae which had been sanctioned by reference to scholastic tradition. As Johnson indicates by choosing most of his examples of appropriate epitaphs from his reading of Roman literature, the epigraphic traditions and monumental conventions of classical antiquity had a particularly pervasive role in funerary culture of the period. Elements of these traditions appealed to some social circles more than others and rose

---

15 See pp. 273-276

16 Johnson's Essay on Epitaphs was published anonymously in the Gentleman's Magazine 1740, pp. 593-596. It was reprinted in Johnson, 1792, vol. 2, pp. 270-80. Comments on "propriety" are concentrated upon page 275.
in and out of favour in accordance with how they satisfied notions of propriety in a changing social climate.

The mechanisms which connected the progress of funerary culture and monumental fashion to social change are by no means easy to trace or define. The history of the genre of monuments erected by bereaved husbands to which the Isham monument belonged provides many good examples of these problems. Vogens for such monuments came and went; the genre had a strong revival to fashion in the mid 1740s after thirty years of pronounced unpopularity. This increase in the number of men prepared to lament publicly the death of their wives cannot be taken as evidence of a sudden growth in the tendency of husbands to love and passionately mourn their wives. The explanation of this phenomenon lies more clearly in the growth in the influence of sentimental literature and the popularity of the "graveyard school" of writers than the inexorable growth in the incidence of "companionate marriages" which Lawrence Stone argues to have occurred in the period. Many inscriptions show the influence of what has been demonstrated to be the definitive style and vocabulary of sentimental and "graveyard school" literature which was growing in popularity in the 40s and 50s.

The problems which arise from attempts to determine the fundamental derivation of funeral fashions are frequently complex and perplexing. Janet Todd has argued with some validity that the growth in the popularity of sentimental literature, and the family values of literature of this type, is only explicable through the acceptance of Stone's theories. The "affective" family, she suggests, gave rise to the fundamental social conditions which ensured the popularity of sentimental literature. It can be argued that the fashions of monumental art influenced literature. The literary reaction of the Graveyard School of writers in the 1740s and 50s against great dynastic monuments can, for instance, be considered a backlash against the preoccupation with dynasticism, land and status which typifies monumental sculpture in the 1730s. These complex issues are, of course, tied to the general problem of how we differentiate between social customs in the expression of emotions and the realities of how

---

17 see pp. 273-294.
18 Stone, 1978, pp. 217-253
19 See the discussion of the inscription to the William Young monument (Rysbrack, Chartham, 1751) on pp. 288-289
20 Todd, Sensibility, 1986, p. 16.
people felt. This is an intrinsic problem in the use of "data" in the study of the history of domestic life which Stone himself appreciated and, as Scott points out, found difficult to negotiate.22

It is both the most obvious and most important characteristic of funerary sculpture that it deals with the creation of certain fictions whose relationship to what might be historically perceived as "real life" is fascinating because it is at best tangential. It is an essential property of the Georgian monument, and one most enjoyed by contemporary critics, that "reality" and fiction formed uneasy bedfellows within it. Amongst those monuments most concerned with establishing the moral virtue of a family group is at least one, the Dormer monument at Quainton in Buckinghamshire (Rysbrack ?, 1726-31) which was created in the shadow of public corruption charges against both the deceased and his relations who erected the monument.23 It was not, as Samuel Johnson's essay on inscriptions and monuments candidly admitted, permissible to base the monumental and epigraphic hyperbole upon lies but it was equally not expected that it should be based upon the truth.24 The tendency of monumental sculpture to wrap up life in a series of rhetorical statements, and well worn moral topoi is its strength as well as it weakness as a historical source. Whilst it is a precarious means of evaluating how individuals felt and acted, it is an excellent measure of how they would have liked society to construe their feelings and actions.

The sincerity of family emotions depicted in funerary sculpture is one of the most difficult things to measure. The interpretation of statements of "love" in inscriptions, or the conventional postures of weeping widows and bereaved husbands, is one of the most thorny problems to arise when analysing the meaning and function of funerary sculpture. Even in an age when critics sought out the sordid truth behind monumental pomp, many commentators looked no further than a monument's public claim to represent a state of domestic felicity. The London Magazine of 1763 was very touched by what it saw as the spirit of maternal love

---

22 Scott, p. 515.

23 See pp. 184-189.


"Though a sepulchral inscription is professedly a panegyric and, therefore, not confined to historical impartiality, yet it ought always to be written with a regard for truth. No man ought to be condemned for virtues which he never possessed but whoever is curious to know his faults must enquire after them in other places; the monuments of the dead are not intended to perpetuate the memory of crimes, but to exhibit patterns of virtue."
which had caused the monument to Roger Townshend (Thomas Carter, 1763) in Westminster Abbey (ill. 2) to be commissioned:\textsuperscript{25}

The neatness and elegance of that which celebrates Roger Townshend pleases me much, and in reading the inscription (which I am apt to think was dedicated by the Right Hon. Lady who placed this tribute of love to her deceased son) I know not whether I was more affected by the sentiments of maternal kindness it conveyed or the patriotic warmth I felt from the just compliment paid to my country on the success of the late war.

However Horace Walpole, who had made preparatory drawings for the monument for presentation to Lady Townshend, suspected that the patron had not loved her son. He wrote to Lord Strafford on September 13th 1757:\textsuperscript{26}

"She (Lady Townshend) affects grief but not so much for the son she has lost as for the other (George) she may lose. Poor Roger for whom she is not concerned has given her a hint that her hero George is mortal too."

On the same day he wrote to Conway with some sarcasm:\textsuperscript{27}

"My Lady Townshend, who has not learned enough to copy the Spartan Mother, has lost her son at sea."

Despite this, Walpole sent a proposal for a monument to Lady Townsend with a proposed epitaph which was probably too inept to be used on the final monument:\textsuperscript{28}

"Loved son Adieu.
Tho' from a mother's eye fond tears may call
She thanks you that without bash they fall.

\textsuperscript{25} The \textit{London Magazine} 1763, p. 493.
\textsuperscript{26} Walpole, vol. 35, p. 294.
\textsuperscript{27} ibid., vol. 38, pp. 27-28.
\textsuperscript{28} ibid., vol. 40, 166-7, vol. 13 p. 34.
These excerpts from Walpole’s correspondence point again to the problems of our sources. Horace Walpole’s letters are full of vitriolic and inconsistent statements and it is difficult to know whether private comments represent a fair appraisal of how Lady Townshend reacted to her son’s death. They do, nevertheless, provide some indication that the Connoisseur of 1755 (no. 73) was acting with some justification when it advised its readership to distrust the sincerity of sentiments of family affection which were to be read upon the monuments in Westminster Abbey.

The imagery of the executed monument, which was designed by Robert Adam under Lady Townsend’s personal instruction, showed Roger dying at Ticonderoga and handing on his command to his brother George shortly before the fall of Quebec. It would not be unreasonable to suggest that this imagery was chosen to bring attention to the real object of the mother’s affections and add to the chances of his promotion at a time when he was under severe criticism for his conduct at the siege of Quebec. It is significant that the author of the comments in the London Magazine was predisposed to interpret the monument as a testimony of a mother’s grief. The author was writing in a period shortly after the erection of Roubiliac’s monument to Joseph and Elizabeth Nightingale (Westminster Abbey, 1757-1761); a period in which it was expected that the emotions of the crowds coming to Westminster Abbey should be engaged in a sympathetic discourse with the bereavement of a noble family. Similarly Walpole’s unexecuted monument indicated that there had been a change in monumental fashion. However insincere, Walpole’s epitaph was typical of its time; more intimate, lachrymose, and sentimental than one which would have been applied to a military monument in the 1720s or 30s. The Townsend monument was in itself an unreliable measure of a particular family’s feelings towards each other, but it tells us much of the changing expectations of the expression of family feeling as an abstract social ideal.

The problems of discerning the meaning of monumental sculpture are rendered particularly difficult by the fact that it is frequently impossible to talk of a particular patron’s intentions.

---

29 The imagery of the monument and documents relating to it are discussed in J. Fleming, Robert Adam, Luc-Francois Breton, and the Townsend Monument in Westminster Abbey, Connoisseur, CL, pp. 163-171.

30 References to the controversy concerning George Townsend’s conduct at the siege of Quebec may be found in the Gentleman’s Magazine, 1760, p. 507-8. An attack on Townsend accusing him of sending Wolfe to his death is entitled “Extracts from a letter to an Honourable Brigadier General” (pp. 507-508). A vindicatory reply follows immediately afterward (pp. 508-511).

31 The tendency of the Crowds of Westminster Abbey to cry at the sight of monuments during the 1760s is recorded in Grosley’s recollections of a trip to the Abbey of 1765: J.A. Grosley, A Tour of London, or New Observations on England and its Inhabitants, Dublin, 1772, vol 1, p. 225.

32 See my comments on the monuments to Captain Grenville and General Wolfe in Chapter six, pp. 80-81.
Where extensive evidence exists the indications are that Georgian family monuments were not commissioned and designed for a client, but for a whole group of individuals. Family monuments were frequently not only about the values of a family but the creation of a family; designed to further the reputation not only of the deceased, or a particular patron, but of entire family groups. The involvement of many family members in the design of a monument clouds the perception of what it was intended to mean or how it was to function. The design of a monument was frequently the product of a consensus of opinions which makes it very difficult to discern who was the controlling influence. It is even harder to establish the intentions of an extended family when they commissioned a monument, than it is to establish the intentions of an individual or institution.

A good example of this family group patronage can be taken from the unpublished letters of the De Saumarez family concerning the erection of a monument to Captain Philip De Saumarez of Guernsey in Westminster Abbey (Cheere, 1749-54) (ill. 3). The most remarkable of the letters was sent from Philip Dumaresqu, one of the family’s Jersey cousins, to Matthew De Saumarez. The letter was sent from Dumaresqu’s London residence to Saumarez Manor in Guernsey and concerns a discussion of the monument which took place in the house of the closely related Durell family of Jersey in Old Palace Yard, London. It is dated August 1754, some four and a half years after the monument was originally contracted, and explains the reasons for delays in the addition of the inscription to the monument.33

Dear Brother

I dined on Friday last at our friend (illegible) Durell with your sisters and Captain Philip Durell and the topic of conversation turned to the inscription you intend putting on your Brother Phil’s monument which was highly disapproved of as such reflections would tend to some animosities between us and our naval friend’s and Lord Anson who is a true friend to your Brother Tom and also has declared his intentions of being so to your family on the deceased’s account: for you must observe that what ever honour an Officer gains in the discharge of duty, that honour devolves to the Commander in Chief, who is to be supposed to be the man that hath made the depositions by which such an advantage is gained. Therefore if the inscription was to be put up as it now stands in Cheere’s hands, it would be ridiculed by

33 The De Saumarez papers remains in private hands in Saumarez Manor, Guernsey, and are not adequately indexed.
all the world, as well as that of Sir Thomas Hardy's and would destroy the intention of such a monument, for our friends are of the opinion that the least said on the occasion the better, for if you mention the Isle of Tinian tho' they have not done him the justice deserved during the course of that Voyage yet the world will have recourse to that book and will say it is a puff from his relations, which I am persuaded would always avoid any ostentatious reflections. I must now tell you that with the approbation of our friends I have drawn up some heads which I intended laying before Dr Sharpe and after that to send to you for your approbation but unluckily the Dr was out of Town and will not return till he has paid a visit to Judge Le Cocq at Alderney and from thence to the Lieutenant Bailiff of Jersey and by means of the Judge you might get it perfected very soon...

The first thing to notice in this letter is the number of individuals concerned in this monument: Matthew De Saumarez, Philip Dumaresqu, the Durell family, the mysterious "naval friends", the relations of the Jersey Admiral Sir Thomas Hardy whose monument was erected by Cheere in Westminster Abbey in the early forties, Dr Gregory Sharpe (who was the Treasurer of the Middle Temple and had dealings with the legal administration of the Channel Isles), Judge Le Cocq (who was a relation and Governor of Aldemey) and the Lieutenant Bailiff of Jersey.  

The family dispute referred to in Dumaresqu's letter was precipitated by Matthew De Saumarez's determination to mention an incident off the Isle of Tinian in which Philip De Saumarez had saved a part of Anson's fleet that had gone adrift at night. The suggestion was that Anson had been saved by one of his Captains. After the return from the voyage around the world Anson succeeded through legal action in claiming a great part of the share in the massive haul of privatered treasure which his Captains and subordinates had expected as a reward for their perils. Philip De Saumarez's papers reveal that he was angered and disappointed with Anson's role in the affair. A laudatory account of Anson's conduct upon the voyage was being prepared in his ship's Chaplain's memoirs which are referred to by

---


Dumaresqu as "that book". The book naturally played down De Saumarez's role in the Tinian affair.\textsuperscript{36}

Matthew De Saumarez, who paid for the monument and had final say in the designs, was obviously still aggrieved with Anson in 1754. An account of the incident at the Tinian Islands was not struck out of the inscription. A draft copy of the inscription which was written by Matthew De Saumarez has the word Tinian forcibly underlined.\textsuperscript{37} (ill. 5) It is reasonable to assume that Matthew had originally intended to erect the monument as a means of vindicating Philip and annoying Anson. Philip Dumaresqu and Captain Durell were ambitious Naval officers who wanted to use the monument to improve rather than lose their reputations in London's Naval circles. Matthew Saumarez was a lawyer rather than a naval man who spent much of the year in Guernsey and did not depend on pleasing London patrons.\textsuperscript{38}

Dumaresqu's assertion that the monument of Philip De Saumarez "would be ridiculed by all the world, as well as that of Sir Thomas Hardy's and would destroy the intent of such a monument" is particularly interesting. It would appear from this comment that those involved in the erection of the Saumarez Monument had also been responsible for the erection of the monument to Admiral Thomas Le Hardy, a relation of the Durells, Dumaresquqs and De Saumarezs. (ill. 4) There was an implicit understanding that both of the monuments were intended to promote the family reputation. Anything, however, that made the monuments appear to be an obvious "puff" of the family was to be avoided. The compendious inscription of the earlier monument traces Hardy's family back to its service under Henry VII in Jersey. It was in danger of being interpreted by London society as a crass attempt by a provincial Channel Island family to gain ascendency in London circles. This is, indeed, exactly what the Hardy monument was, and what the urbane relatives of Matthew were trying to disguise when erecting the second monument. Whilst Matthew would not shift from his initial desire to "puff" Philip as the saviour of the fleet at Tinian he was wary of repeating the pompous tone of the Hardy inscription. His final draft of the inscription shows the words "families of antiquity and repute in these parts" to have been excised. (ill. 5) The form of the Saumarez monument was probably influenced by the desire that it should not be perceived as a "puff". The whole tone of the De Saumarez composition, which was as charming and delicate as the

\textsuperscript{36} R. Walter, \textit{A Voyage Around the World in the Years, MDCCXLJIIJ,IV}, 3rd edition, London, 1758, pp. 409-446.

\textsuperscript{37} Many drafts of the inscription are preserved in the Saumarez Archive at Saumarez Manor.

\textsuperscript{38} The extent to which Matthew De Saumarez was actively involved in Channel Island administration in revealed the surviving papers concerning his administration of the island at the Greffe, St Peter Port.
Hardy monument was sonorous and grave, was intended to be as far away from the pompous military monument as the designer could make it.

Henry Cheere may also have had a decisive role in the erection of the monuments. Captain Philip Durell, who inspected Cheere’s clay model and sent drawings to Matthew for approval, was a personal friend and neighbour of Cheere’s at Old Palace Yard in Westminster. It is significant that, although Admiral Hardy had died in 1732, his monument was not erected till some ten years later; it seems less than coincidental that the approximate time of the commission was when Cheere and the Durells moved into Old Palace Yard. Like the French speaking families of the Channel Islands, Cheere, whose name is sometimes spelt De Chaire, was of French Huguenot stock. The tone of the surviving letters between Matthew De Saumarez and Cheere suggests that they were already long standing friends at the commission of the monument to Philip. Clapham Parish, where Cheere was born and where his father was a prosperous merchant, was an enclave for Guernsey Huguenot families such as the Dobrées and the Durells. The Cheere family may well, indeed, have been one of the many Huguenot families who spent some time in Guernsey in the process of emigration from France.

There is, therefore, a possibility that the Durells moved near to Cheere on the basis of a long-standing family association. It seems very likely that it was living upon Deanery property and next to a notable sculptor which gave the family the idea of promoting their City reputations through the erection of monuments in Westminster Abbey. There was obviously a good deal of confusion as to how this could be done. Philip Durell was amongst those who, in the case of the Saumarez monument, attempted to stop Matthew De Saumarez from mentioning the Tinian incident. This indicates that when he was overseeing the design of the monument he was not thinking of the same set of functions as Matthew had done when he approved the drawings in Guernsey. Beyond this there is the problem of what Cheere saw as the purpose of the monument. Cheere, as a family friend, may well have had a central role in persuading

39 The relationship between Philip Durell and Cheere is discussed in detail in chapter one, p.69.
40 The monument is mentioned as one of the newly erected monuments engraved by Gravelot for a new edition of Dart’s Westminster Abbey in the London Evening Post of February 8th 1743. Malcolm Baker (Baker, Sir Henry Cheere, 1986, p. 148) records that the “fine” for the monument was paid to the Dean and Chapter in 1738.
42 Cheere’s blood relationship to the important Huguenot families of Tainturier and De Chardin is discussed on p. 69 000.
43 In one letter, for instance, Cheere regretfully turns down an invitation to visit Saumarez Manor.
the family to use monuments in this way and probably knew that the compositions he designed had this covert purpose. He may also have persuaded his friends to erect the monuments in order to promote his workshop products. In the next chapter we shall see that Peter Scheemakers used his social contacts to secure contracts for monuments in the Abbey which enabled him to capitalise upon their public exposure.

The papers relating to the De Saumarez monument, an apparently simple and charming work, tend to cloud rather than clarify the issue of who was in charge of its production. The problem of determining who dictated the content of the inscription and meaning of work remains unresolved. Was it Philip Durell, who signed the contract and inspected the model, or Matthew De Saumarez, who paid Cheere’s bills? The monument was not a product of a simple relationship between sculptor and client but the result of a form of power struggle between a number of competing interests who struggled for ascendancy. It is ultimately impossible to define with any certainty who was responsible the original idea of making the monuments, who dictated their form, or how their function related to the interests of any particular individual involved.

As Malcolm Baker’s work upon the Shelburne monument has shown, when a monument was commissioned with money bequeathed in a will the problems of defining who the patron was, or in whose interests a monument was made, are even greater. There is an additional web of problems: matters such as defining the legal roles and authority of the executors or dealing with the possibility that the design had been established in advance by the deceased. Whilst acknowledgment of these levels of complexity is vital to the study of funerary sculpture, their importance should not be overestimated. Despite the complex matters of patronage, and perhaps because of their very complexity, monuments were frequently designed to symbolise certain abstract notions of the patronage process. These abstractions were often based around the representation of the relationship between the donor of money for the monument and the deceased.

A distinction should be drawn between the patronage of a family monument and its donation. Whilst the patron who signed the contract might be a legal agent or an executor, he or she approached the sculptor with money donated in a specific set of family circumstances. These

---

44 A letter from George Durell on behalf of Philip Durell to Matthew De Saumarez of April 18th, 1751 concerning the fulfilment of the contract for the monument is quoted on p. 45.


46 See pp. 84-154.
circumstances might be honouring a bequest left by a widow heiress to commemorate her husband, or acting upon the instructions of a childless gentleman who wished the end of his direct line to be commemorated with some final statement.

Monuments created under very different patronage conditions but similar conditions of donation frequently use the same "type" of design. A common basic design was, for instance, used in Rysbrack's Edward Eliot monument (St Ger mains, Cornwall 1723) (ill. 6), which was erected by his widow during her life-time, and Cheere's monument at Condover in Shropshire (1744) (ill. 7), which was erected at the bequest of a widow under the patronage of her son-in-law. The prototype upon which the design of both monuments was based was the Duke of Buckingham's family monument in Westminster Abbey (ill. 8); a monument which made popular a formula that combined a "weeping widow" donor figure with a reclining figure of her deceased husband. The similarity in the design of these works stemmed from the common conditions of their original donation, which can be described as "donated by a bereaved widow who virtuously lamented her husband's decease". This abstraction of donor types was applied to many other areas of monumental design. Basic similarities between the way in which the money was initially donated to erect works such as the Shelburne (Scheemakers, High Wycombe, c.1753) (ill. 9), Foley (Rysbrack, Great Whitley, 1733-9) (ill. 10) and Maynard (Stanley, Little Easton, Essex c. 1747) (ill. 11) monuments account for a noteworthy similitude in their form and function.

In the complex conditions of joint patronage and legal representation in which monuments were commissioned, it was easier for the sculptor and client alike to simplify his task to the representation of certain formulaic "types" of donation; to focus on the idea of how a monument had been donated and to set out to produce an appropriate type of image. The act of donation in eighteenth century funeral monuments was a way of communicating certain abstract virtues; a set of moral codes concerning how the motivations of the donor were to be understood. The construction of fictional ideas of donation were at least as important a part of the mid-eighteenth century monumental sculpture trade as fictional conceptions of the life and achievements of the deceased. Whilst we should not necessarily believe the section of the inscription which states that a certain individual was solely responsible for erecting a monument, it is important that the monument was designed to exhibit this. Devices such as the grieving widow figure used in the Eliot and Candover monument were created to symbolise just such fictions.

The commission of both of these monuments is discussed in detail on pp. 135-136 and pp. 295-298.

See pp. 130-132.
One of the most important issues in defining the function of a monument is the analysis of inscriptions. As we have seen in the cases of the De Saumarez and Isham monuments the phraseology of inscriptions could be the subject of much concern. The great majority of contemporary antiquarian and press sources gave more attention to inscriptions than they did to the sculpture. Despite this, inscriptions, which are the necessary accompaniment of every monumental image, are amongst the least used sources of evidence in the interpretation of his imagery. The total lack of any serious concern with inscriptions in the work of Esdaile, Webb, and the majority of recent commentators upon Georgian monumental sculpture, represents a dismissal of one of the basic characteristics of the medium; that it was the interaction of word and image. The way in which the observer was to construe the image was frequently dictated by the inscription. Quite apart from the complex issues of the style and imagery of inscriptions, it was the wording of such things as the dedication of the monument, or the order in which deceased individuals were mentioned, which allowed the observer to come to a basic comprehension of the sculptured image.\textsuperscript{49} The inscription, both through its factual content and literary style, frequently offered the contemporary a means of decoding what he saw above.

Like the images themselves, monumental inscriptions were largely based upon the manipulation of certain formulae. The clichés of inscription writing were a source of much parody. The \textit{Universal Museum} of 1762, for instance, offered its readership a selection of glowing phrases suitable for the male and female monument from which an inscription could be compiled in an assembly kit manner.\textsuperscript{50} Whilst it is essential to acknowledge that even the best inscriptions, fashioned by literary figures such as Pope and Bolingbroke, are based around certain rhetorical formulae, this does not make them irrelevant to the study of funerary sculpture. The question becomes why one type of literary formula was thought appropriate for combination with an image which was itself based upon a set of visual formulae. Similarities or, indeed, disparities between the tenor of inscriptions and the visual language of the sculpture are vital to the understanding of the levels of common intention between patron and designer.

One of the basic problems with this type of analysis is that the composition of the inscription was often intended to be seen independently of the monument. The origins of this problem lie in the subject of the increased use of the periodical press for the "puff" of monuments. Inscriptions, particularly political ones such as those drawn up by Bolingbroke for the

\textsuperscript{49} This approach to the analysis of monumental sculpture has been made by Baker, \textit{Foley Monument}, 1987.

\textsuperscript{50} The \textit{Universal Museum of Knowledge and Pleasure}, 1762, p. 147.
monument to Daniel Pulteney and Lord Huntingdon (Ashby-de-la-Zouche, erected 1749), were published and disseminated widely in the press.\footnote{There is a review of this monument on pp. 190-191.} It is questionable whether such inscriptions had a well-considered relationship to the monumental imagery with which they were ultimately seen. In many circumstances the monument was commissioned, and the inscription composed, in such dislocated circumstances, and with so many individuals involved, that it would have been impossible to integrate word and image in any sophisticated way.

Events surrounding the creation of Roubiliac's monument to the Duke of Argyll\footnote{Political interpretations of the Duke of Argyll's death can be seen in: the \textit{Gentleman's Magazine} 1743, pp. 550, 607, 1749, p. 76; the \textit{London Magazine} 1743, p. 514, 1749, pp. 95, 144, 239, 297.} (Westminster Abbey, erected 1749) provide a good illustration of such difficulties. They demonstrate the extent to which a family could lose control of the meaning of a monument due to a dislocation of their interests from those of the inscription writer. Whilst it is unquestionable that Duke of Argyll died a hero of the political opposition having been dismissed from his command by Walpole, it is a matter of some doubt as to whether his monument was intended to incorporate opposition propaganda.\footnote{A short political biography of John Campbell appears in Romney Sedgwick, vol. 1, p. 523. David Bindman will refer to the political meaning monument in his forthcoming book on Roubiliac.} David Bindman has argued that the monument itself, with its relief allegory on patriotism, was actually constructed under the direction of John Campbell, a government supporter; it was thus not likely to have been specifically intended as a piece of opposition propaganda.\footnote{Whitehead's politics are discussed in a biography printed in the \textit{Gentleman's Magazine} 1776, pp. 46-51.}

Despite this, the family employed Philip Whitehead, a poet and journalist of well known Tory persuasion, to write the inscription.\footnote{The article on the Argyll monument appears in the \textit{Old England} of October 28th 1749. The association of this periodical with Whitehead is discussed in M.C. and R.R. Battestin, "Fielding, Bedford, and the Westminster Election of 1749", \textit{Eighteenth Century Studies}, 1977-78, pp. 143-185.} It appears that through doing this the family itself lost full control of what the imagery was to mean. The monument was glowingly reviewed in a whole article in the \textit{Old England} of October 1749, a Tory newspaper which appears to have been working in co-operation with Whitehead on an issue of the paper of October 9th 1749.\footnote{The article on the Argyl monument appears in the \textit{Old England} of October 28th 1749. The association of this periodical with Whitehead is discussed in M.C. and R.R. Battestin, "Fielding, Bedford, and the Westminster Election of 1749", \textit{Eighteenth Century Studies}, 1977-78, pp. 143-185.} The general thrust of the article being that the monument provided an excellent example of patriotism in a society which sorely needed this type of brave military leadership. It attempted to initiate a debate as to whether more politically controversial inscriptions not chosen by the family were actually not more appropriate than that which appeared upon the monument. The article may well have been a medium through which Whitehead registered his complaints at
having earlier, more controversial, drafts of the inscription suppressed. The publication of the articles coincided with the Pelham Party’s drawing up of peace terms which the “patriot” opposition considered a capitulation. The famous firework display to promote the Peace in London was being constructed from October to December 1749.56

The deceased Duke’s family may not have agreed with the way the monument was used. A review of Whitehead’s poetical works published in 1776 gave a clear indication that the family were not happy with the way the inscription had been exploited. The editor recorded that, after the erection of the monument, Argyll’s widow had instructed that Whitehead’s name be excised from the base of the inscription tablet.57 Whitehead himself wrote a verse, which was published alongside his inscription, attacking the political forces which he considered to have been working upon the Dowager Duchess to cause her to do this.58

Beyond the issue of the dislocation of interests between inscription writer and “patron” is a set of problems concerning the dislocation of image and inscription. As the documents concerning the erection of the De Saumarez and Isham monuments show, inscriptions were frequently not composed at the time a design was agreed upon. If an understanding had developed between patron and designer at the outset, and careful attention was given to integrating the process of inscription writing and design, a degree of harmony could, nevertheless, be attained. There are however cases reviewed in this thesis where the general tone of family sentiment indicated by the language of the inscription does not seem to be consistent with the image which the sculptor has made. Scheemakers, in particular, continued to use composition types developed in the 1720s for the commissions of the 50s. He framed inscriptions written in the “language of sensibility”, which were commonly used by writers in the 50s, with imagery which had originally graced a more emotionally reserved inscription type popular in the 20s and 30s.59 Designs which exuded the cold, formal classicism of the previous generation were simply reapplied to inscriptions referring to such emotive issues as a woman’s yearning for reunion with her husband in the grave.60 This mismatch of literary

56 The completion of the fireworks for the Peace was announced in the Mitre and Crown, or Great Britain’s True Interest, 1749-50, p. 409.

57 E. Thompson, The Poems and Miscellaneous Compositions of Paul Whitehead with Some Explanatory Notes upon his Life, London, 1776, p. XXVI.

58 ibid., pp. 177-78.

59 See p.306.

60 See p. 306.
and visual genres invites the question of how in the process of manufacture the expression of
the patron's family emotions and sculptor's image could become patently disjointed.

The history of monumental sculpture is that of the genesis, metamorphosis, and decline of
certain generic "types" of image. Monumental sculpture in this period can be seen in terms
of the reworking of certain visual formulae: weeping widows, reclining statesmen, professional
allegories or military triumphs. Every notable survey of monumental sculpture, from Esdaile
to Aries and in turn to Nigel Llewellyn, has had to deal with the problem of constructing a
typology with which to rationalise the common denominators in their material.61 Esdaile in
her survey of English Church monuments 1510 to 1840 divided up her material firstly into
"Types and influences" and secondly into "Types portrayed, with notes on costume".62 The
first categorisation is exceedingly difficult to follow or define, the second divides monuments
in accordance with the profession of the individuals commemorated. Nigel Llewellyn in his
The Art of Death has attempted, with far more cogency, to define "kinds of monuments".63
Whilst it should be appreciated that Llewellyn also took on the very difficult task of dealing
with a massive chronological span, his typology begins to ask more sophisticated questions.
He referred to monuments in terms of "a complex of signals" and has asked questions about
the way in which the generic posing of figures communicated ideas about how and why the
monument was made. His comments on the monument to Lord Teynham at Lynsted (erected
c.1622), are illuminating:64

"A simple index throughout the monument links the dead with the horizontal
and the living with the vertical; priority is accorded to the male in terms of
heraldry and visibility"

As the use of the word "index" implies, Llewellyn appreciates that this composition was a
standard means of communicating ideas through the posture of figures. The formulae he
speaks of continue to operate in the eighteenth century. Llewellyn's methodology has moved
from a system of classification to one of the interpretation of the meaning of symbols through
classification.

---

61 Aries, Images of Man and Death, pp. 31-94, 176-183.
62 Esdaile, Church Monuments, 1946, Chapters 2 and 7.
64 ibid., p. 115, fig. 66.
The contribution of this method of analysis is the appreciation that when repeated the visual formulae of monumental sculptors developed a series of established meanings. Monumental sculpture can be seen in terms of "a complex of symbols" the meaning of which was sometimes better defined than others or, on occasion, became obscured in the process of reproduction. It is implicit in the repetition of visual symbols that there is a point at which this process becomes language. Indeed a shared "language" of monumental symbols and postures was developed by the competing London workshops. Whilst this period witnessed the flourishing in many provincial cities of many high quality workshops, such as the Patys of Bristol or that of Prince Hoare of Bath, there was not a single influential generic type which originated from the provinces. It was in London alone, and amongst the four major workshops of Cheere, Rysbrack, Scheemakers and Roubiliac, that the "language" of monumental sculpture was created. Without a degree of common language the designers of monuments could not communicate the meanings which their clients intended and their clients' monuments could not be understood by their contemporaries. Thus the shared visual formulae created in the London workshops played a significant part in ensuring their success. Even a sculptor such as Roubiliac, much praised for the "invention" of his designs, worked within this metropolitan language and was admired by his contemporaries for the way he played with its vocabulary.

The metropolitan trade can be said, therefore, to have relied on the production of "commercial types"; successful images, the repetition of which could ensure a measure of financial success. The success of the metropolitan profession in the manipulation of the popularity of certain compositions, such as those seen by the crowds at Westminster Abbey, can, indeed, be used as a measure of its growing status and autonomy. The study of typology in monumental sculpture involves the complex issues of how the "trade's" production of certain visual formulae related to the requirements of their clientele and the way the clientele expected these formulae to function. In the second chapter I will test the degree to which the "commercial types" used by sculptors relate to the type of family circumstances in which monuments was commissioned: whether, for instance, monuments which were designed for widows who had been left substantial bequests, or gentlemen who knew they represented the last of a family line, have certain topological similarities. I will, in short, be negotiating the problems of the relationship between generic form and generic function; whether we can improve our understanding of the meaning of certain types by noting the similarities in the circumstances of their use.
It is difficult to make convincing statements concerning the particular meaning or function of a monument without giving consideration to the primary conditions of its production; without ascertaining whether, for example, the image was chosen from a number of pre-arranged designs or conceived for a specific client and situation. Apparently simple matters such as the price paid for a monument had a vital role in dictating the form and function of family imagery. More complex matters such as the sculptor's status within society, or his power to control his patron's choice of imagery and dictate which type of patron he might appeal to, are of equal importance.

The focus of this chapter is on the development of manufacturing processes and business methods. Like many other luxury products the demand for monumental sculpture was expanding in mid-eighteenth century London. Growth in the size and wealth of the "polite" population of the City meant that business methods were increasingly geared toward exploiting the potential for the expansion of profits and ensuring survival within conditions of tough commercial competition. Higher profits were, in turn, partly responsible for an improvement in the social status of the profession within the London community; a development which radically altered many educated people's expectations of monumental sculpture.

This chapter is based upon the analysis of the career of Sir Henry Cheere (fl. 1728-65), the sculptor and workshop master who became a Baronet through his services to the City. The sculptor's techniques of production and business methods will be compared with those of the other great London workshops. M.I. Webb has described Cheere as a "tycoon" of the profession. He amassed a fortune in excess of one hundred thousand pounds largely by taking full advantage of the expanding London market in funerary monuments. In the last
two decades of his career he was, essentially, a manager who exploited City contacts to obtain commissions for a group of workshops and subcontracted master craftsmen. He had an active interest in manufacturing industry, expressed in an important speech to the Society of Arts and Manufacture delivered in 1756, which makes the analysis of his career a good point of departure for the discussion of the business methods employed by the metropolitan trade in the period.4

Generic types, repeated designs, serial manufacture, and hackneyed formulae.

The increasing incidence of the reproduction of designs by certain London workshops was a development which can be related to the emergence of what has been termed "proto-industrial" manufacturing methods. Henry Cheere's frequent re-use of workshop designs bears an obvious relation to his interests in the growth of "industry" and artisan trades such as carriage building and toy making which were stated in his speech to the Society of Arts and Manufacture.5 He first began to repeat designs in the last decade of his career; in the period between 1755 and 65 when he was an active member of the Society of Arts and Manufactures. Whilst his funerary monuments of the period 1728-40 were mostly large "one-off" commissions, his later designs seldom included elements which were not repeated. Two seated female Virtues of Faith and Hope were, for instance, used in a number of important compositions: the monument to Dr Thomas Cheyney (d.1760) at Winchester Cathedral (ill. 12), the Polhill monument at Otford (1757), the Dean Wilcocks monument at Westminster Abbey (erected 1761), and the Jane Bridges Rodney monument at Old Ashford (d.1757). These figures appear to have been made from the same template but in a variety of differing sizes; encouraging the assumption that a great deal of use was made of a master's model which was simply squared up into whatever scale required.

Like all his major competitors, Cheere based many of his compositions on those which had become popular in Westminster Abbey. As we shall see below, this type of repetition reached new heights of popularity in the period between 1723-45.6 There were important differences

---

4 Cheere's speech to the Society was transcribed by Dr Templeman and is preserved with his transactions for the period 1754-6 in the Royal Society of Arts Archive.

5 See below for analysis of Cheere's speech, pp. 66-67

6 See pp. 67-68
between the repetition of designs, as used in the later workshop of Cheere, and the use of
generic formulae based upon the monuments of Westminster Abbey. The former type of
repetition is best seen as a workshop master’s attempt to increase the efficiency of his
production, whilst the latter can be understood as a result of the workshop master’s stimulation
or exploitation of his clients’ enthusiasm for a popular composition: where the first might
embrace the concept of novelty in design, the second was not conducive to such development.
For reasons to be discussed shortly, these two types of repetition had very different patterns
of historical development. The re-use of compositions first seen in Westminster Abbey was
a phenomenon common to all the workshops in the 1720s to 50s but of diminishing
importance after this date; whereas the re-use of workshop designs was only of major
significance in the production of Cheere and Robert Taylor’s workshops during the late 50s.

It was possible for a sculptor to repeat his own designs whilst reacting against the
conventionality of funerary art. Although Roubiliac sought to distinguish his production from
his competitors by not re-using generic types of design such as the posture invented by Guelfi
for the monument to James Craggs (Westminster Abbey, erected 1726), he was not unwilling
to repeat parts of his own designs. The re-use of the figure of the mourning widow of the
Shannon monument (Walton-upon-Thames, 1756-59) (ill. 13) in that to George and Anne
Lynn (Southwick, 1760) (ill. 14) was clearly based upon the re-use of a workshop model in
the manner of Henry Cheere, his former employer. Both compositions were designed as a
response to what was perceived to be the clichéd conventions of monumental sculpture.⁷
Roubiliac was, therefore, receptive to methods of cutting costs of workshop production and
yet sought to stay clear of patent formulae; he partook in the trade methods of his competitors
and yet achieved a reputation for being superior to them.

Although Roubiliac was willing to repeat certain parts of his designs he resembled
Scheemakers and Rysbrack in so far as he did so rarely. Cheere and his pupil Robert Taylor
(1714-1788), who also began to repeat workshop designs after 1755, were the only sculptors
to exploit such production methods, which implies that they had a more radical attitude to
manufacturing processes than their predecessors or direct competitors.⁸ It is no coincidence

⁷ The relationship of the design of the monument to Earl Shannon and George Lynne to monumental
convention is discussed on pp. 367 and chapter 6, pp. 468.

⁸ Robert Taylor produced a series of monuments including a putti sitting upon an altar structure with skulls
and symbols of virtue at its feet all of which were made between 1755-65.
Elizabeth Townsend, Thorpe, 1755.
Joseph Townsend, Honington, 1763.
Theophilus Salwey, Ludlow, 1760.
Edward Hunter, Maidstone, 1757.
George Gordon, Rochester, d. 1739 but erected later.
that both men received Baronetcies for their services to the City and maintained close links with its business and manufacturing communities. In order to introduce this number of repeated designs Cheere and Taylor must have developed new ways of controlling the choices made by their clients. Only by carefully limiting choice, or being exceptionally good at persuading clients of the benefits of a particular iconographic device, could they guide clients towards designs which they had already used. In order to study their successes in streamlining production, therefore, we must examine the whole subject of how contemporary London sculptors presented their clients with a choice of preparatory drawings or models.

Malcolm Baker has shown that there were many different ways in which clients and sculptors could gain previews upon which to base their choice of design. 9 A few large contracts such as the Shelburne monument were the subject of competitive contracts in which several sculptors produced designs upon certain set subjects. 10 The great majority of family monuments appear to have been produced by a chosen sculptor who offered his client a number of alternative designs. There were various ways in which the workshop masters did this. According to Malcolm Baker, these seem to have varied in accordance with the workshop master's ethnic origins. 11 Roubiliac seems to have relied largely on the production of a series of clay modellos, whilst Rysbrack produced a series of alternative drawn designs and clay modellos of the separate elements of the chosen composition. 12

We can address the problem of how the different workshops managed to influence or dictate the choices of their clients by looking at the process of presenting a series of numbered drawings. A proportion of the drawings for family monuments of Cheere, Rysbrack and Robert Taylor still have numbers showing that they were part of such a series. It is difficult to tell whether these series were drawn up for particular commissions to give the client a number of choices or were available in the workshop to be placed before the client so that he might make his choice in the modern manner of proffering a wallpaper pattern book. Much of the evidence suggests the former.


11 op. cit., p. 67.

12 ibid., pp. 66-67.
A bound book of Henry Cheere's designs for fireplaces has survived but there is no direct evidence of pattern book methods being used in the production of funerary monuments. Although it is possible that the same design was used in a number of different projects, it is more likely that a fresh set of drawings was produced for each commission. Two surviving designs for Rysbrack's Watkin Williams Wynn monument (Ruabon, erected 1751) are numbered 4 and 6. Both of the drawings have details appropriate for this project alone and seem to suggest that the sculptor made a different series for each commission. The analysis of the workshop practices of Cheere's pupil, Richard Hayward (reviewed below) shows that even the commission of a minor mural monument required an original set of drawings.

It is, therefore, questionable whether the production of series of drawings had any role in reducing the workshop masters' labours and streamlining production. One might even interpret such drawings as the workshop masters' attempts to impress clients with a greater range of choices in a competitive market. Rysbrack's production of great quantities of alternative designs cannot be explained as a means of limiting the client's choice. A series of letters concerning Rysbrack's presentation to Edward Lyttleton of "boxes" of numbered designs for fireplaces (designed for Teddesley Hall, Staffordshire in December 1759) give the impression that the sculptor was attempting to indulge his client with a variety of ideas, rather than attempting to limit his choice. Cheere and Taylor who repeated far more designs may have used such sets of drawings as a means of limiting the choice of a client to a few ideas which the workshop had used before; giving the impression that his client was able to make his own choice, while ensuring that his workshop would actually construct the piece from a number of models already in use.

Even Cheere, the sculptor most in tune with large scale manufacturing techniques, was merely streamlining the production of "one-off" commissions rather than abandoning this for "off-the-peg" methods of bulk production. Documents relating to the production of the Cust and De Saumarez monuments show that even works of modest scale took considerable amounts of individual planning. Cheere, as we have seen, made no less than three terracotta busts of William Cust before the family was satisfied. Letters concerning Philip De Saumarez's monument also indicate a very labour intensive working method. George Durell writing to

14 Physick, 1969, pp. 94-95. fig. 61.
15 See pp. 1300.
16 Webb, Michael Rysbrack, 1954, pp. 195-6, 204-205.
Matthew De Saumarez (April 18th, 1751) on behalf of his brother Philip mentions a "plan" and a "model".17

"Yesterday I received of Apr 8th instant and as my brother Phil is not in town nor cannot tell when he will come could not send you an original agreement as there were but two executed vs one for himself and one for Mr Cheere, but I have myself taken a copy of the original which in my opinion answers the same purpose as it were exactly copied, in regard to the plan of ye monument mentioned in ye said agreement it is exactly the same as you carried to Guernsey, I have otherwise seen the model which is exactly from the said plan."

The letter writer mentions two contracts, both of which would probably have had a drawing attached. There was a "model", which we can assume to have been clay which was made after the final drawing for the monument which Matthew Saumarez had taken to Guernsey. Cheere probably presented a series of at least three drawn designs to Matthew De Saumarez from which he made his final choice. The sculptor, therefore, provided at the very least six drawings and a clay model and there may well have been other stages of production. A portrait of Philip De Saumarez was sent from Guernsey for Cheere to base his portrait relief upon.18 This suggests that, as in the case of the monument to William Cust individual terracotta portraits were made for the perusal of the family.

To assume that the production of workshop types was necessarily cheaper or more efficient ignores the complexity of production processes. We can suppose that Charles Polhill (jnr) of Otford (Charles Polhill (snr), erected 1757) (ill. 15) and William Turner of Kirkleatham (Cholmley Turner, erected 1761) (ill. 16), who chose identical poses for costly life size monumental images from the Cheere workshop, also went through this complex process of choice and were offered a number of terracotta designs.19 If a complete terracotta model was expected for such commissions then there was no saving to be incurred by the sculptor.

---

17 De Saumarez Archive, Saumarez Manor (unnumbered). Addressed from Dartmouth Street, April 18th, 1751.

18 A letter relating to the sending over of a portrait for Cheere to model a bust was in the Saumarez Manor archive but is now mislaid. Reference to it is made in: H. De Saumarez, Captain Philip Saumarez 1710-1747 and his Contemporaries, Guernsey, 1936 p. 14.

19 Cheere’s monument to Charles Polhill (snr) was commissioned by his nephew Charles Polhill (jnr) in 1757. Sevenoaks Public Library, U.1007/ E 74.

The sculptor’s monument to Cholmley Turner was commissioned by, his brother William Turner and paid for in 1761. The discovery of a bill of £262 is mentioned in J. Physick ed., Sculpture in Britain 1530-1830, London, 1988, p. 457.
through the supply of a repeated design. It may be that workshop efficiency was improved by the fact that assistants became experienced at carving this type of figure. The repetition of component parts of works may also be explained by the fact that in certain cases clients expected a terracotta model of only the main components of a monument. This can be seen in the contract of December 1730 between Peter Scheemakers and Isabella, widow of Montagu Garrard Drake (ill. 17) in which it was stipulated that, after an initial down-payment for the original design had been made, there was to be a further payment of: 20

".....one hundred and five pounds as soon as the model of the principal figure of ye said monument is made in clay".

Economies could be made if the monument was compiled out of elements for which terracottas had already been made. Another possibility is that, whilst terracotta sketches were designed to give an impression to the client, accurate templates were stored in the workshop. The employment of designs which had been made popular by their production in other workshops, such as Cheere's early re-use of the Craggs composition in his monument for Robert Davies (Mold Parish Church, c.1728), was not a means of reducing costs. It is difficult to think of any way in which these complex processes of production could be made any cheaper by the reproduction of a design which the workshop had not invented in the first place.

Not all reproduction of compositions was motivated by the commercial interests of the workshops. The erection of monuments like, or the same as, that of a friend or relation had its origins in contemporary funerary ritual. It was considered a tribute to a deceased friend or relation to request to have one's funeral conducted in precisely the same way as theirs had been. The wills of Frances Hastings (d.1751) and Anne Hastings (d.1755), who were shown as matching figures to the left and right of their sister Elizabeth Hastings in Scheemakers' monument (Ledsham, c.1755) (ill. 18), demonstrate that the latter copied verbatim the instructions for burial used in her sister's will. 21 In chapter six I will review a number of wills in which specific requests were made that complex funerary rituals should be carried out in exactly the same way as those arranged for a deceased relative. 22 On occasions these

---

20 Buckinghamshire Records Office, Drake Papers, D/R/10/11 & 11A.

21 Frances Hastings PCC 1751, 49
Anne Hastings PCC 1755, 92
The similar passages occur at the beginning of the wills.

22 See pp. 291 - 296.
instructions led to the commission of identical monuments. Sir Brownlow Sherrard of Lobthorp (d.1736) requested in his will that he be buried in the family vault at North Witham Church:

".....with my brothers and in the same manner as I did my brother Sir Richard....As to my monument I would have it done the same as I put up for my brother Sir Richard".

The evidence of burial documents surviving in Lincolnshire Record Office suggests that Brownlow Sherrard's monument was not only made to the same design as his brother's but by the same workshop, that of Christopher Horsenaile.

Many similar or identical designs, though transported to estates many miles apart, were the result of close friendships or family relationships. Cheere constructed two monuments of exactly the same design for Lady Jane Coke of Sunbury in Middlesex (d.1761) (ill. 19) and Lucy Skipworth of Metheringham (d. 1763) (ill. 20) in Gloucestershire. The will of Lady Jane Coke reveals that Lucy Skipworth was a close friend to whom she had bequeathed five hundred pounds. It is probable that acquaintances would have understood that the same artist and same composition had been employed to commemorate the friendship of the two women. Cheere also used an identical polychrome architectural mounting for the bust monument at Otford church to David Polhill (erected 1757) (ill. 21) and that of Baron Carpenter (d. 1749) at Owlesbury in Hampshire (ill.22) The patron of the latter was Carpenter's widow, Elizabeth, a member of the Petty family into which David Polhill's daughter was married. The incumbent of Otford church at the time was also a member of the Petty family and a friend of David Polhill. Scheemakers was involved in similar commissions. The monument to Michael Newton (d.1743) of Heydour (Lincolnshire) (ill. 23) was precisely the same as one

23 B. Sherrard, PCC 1736, 42.
25 J. Coke, PCC 1761, 8.
L. Skipworth, PCC 1763, 87.
26 The similarity of the compositions is noted in Physick, 1969, pp. 126-7, fig. 89.
commissioned by Newton himself in 1728 in memory of his uncle, Michael Warton (Beverly Minster) (ill. 24).  

Some clients requested the reproduction of monuments first seen in Westminster Abbey. The will of Mary Martin (d.1764), for instance, reveals that before her death she had requested Robert Taylor (ill. 25) to make her a monument based upon the design of a monument within the Abbey with which she was familiar:

"I have ordered and desire a monument to be erected in memory of Robert Crosse and his son Thomas Crosse who were dear to me. Mr Taylor has been ordered to make it and put it up in the same way as Mrs Rowe has done in Westminster Abbey."

The monument (erected Nettlecombe Parish Church in Devon and now exhibited at the Victoria and Albert Museum) (ill. 26), was a re-working of that in memory of the poet Nicholas Rowe which was erected by his widow in 1743. The design, however, relates more closely to a surviving preparatory drawing for the monument which Taylor may have known (ill. 27). The manner in which Mary Martin writes of the Rowe monument, not referring to it as the monument to the poet as was customary, but that erected by Mrs Rowe, suggests it was possible that she had some personal knowledge of the patron. She was certainly closely familiar with the Abbey. The Crosse family, of which Mary was a member, were well known residents of St Margaret's and St John's Westminster. There were two Crosse family memorials in St Margarets. A monument to Sir John Crosse (Henry Cheere, 1762) was erected by his widow free of all the vestry's customary charges which were waved in acknowledgment of the deceased's services to the Westminster area. In her will Mary Martin requested that after her death an achievement be raised near her pew in the church.

---

28 M. Warton, PCC 1725, 76. The inscription states that the monument was erected by Michael Newton. The relationship between the two men is recorded in Romney Sedgwick, vol. 2, p. 523.

29 M. Martin, PCC 1765, 265.

30 The erection of the Rowe monument (formerly of unknown date) was announced in the London Magazine 1743, p. 303.


32 The involvement of the family in the combined vestries of St Johns and St Margarets is recorded in the combined vestry books. Two monuments to the Crosse family were erected in St Margarets Westminster during our period. The vestry's gift of the wall space for the monument to Sir John Crosse is recorded in the vestry Minutes. Westminster Public Library. E. 2421, 27th July 1762.
Although London itself was expanding, its elite social circles were relatively small. Many repetitions of compositions were probably the result of friendships formed between patrons whilst residing in the City. A good example of this can be seen in the design of Rysbrack’s monument to Edward Eliot and his widow at St Germains (erected 1723). The composition is plainly an adaptation of that used by Peter Scheemakers for the monument to the family of the Duke of Buckingham (1720-23) in Westminster Abbey. Rysbrack’s monument, erected at about the same time as the one at Westminster was finished, was the first composition to be directly inspired by it. We know from Pope’s letters that the poet and his friend the painter Charles Jervas were involved to some extent with the creation of the designs for the Westminster Abbey monument. Pope appears to have been responsible for the distribution of engravings made of the monument at the time of its erection. One of these was requested by another of the poet’s friends, John Knight. He was married to the sister of Edward Eliot’s widow, Elizabeth Eliot (née Craggs), who was the patron of the monument at St Germains. Elizabeth Eliot is known to have been a close friend of Pope and, when moving in the poet’s circle, may have become familiar with Lady Buckingham herself. It would seem reasonable to postulate that the monument at St Germains was made with the engraving in the possession of John Knight in mind and was a product of the social familiarity between those involved in the two monuments.

Analysis of the relative importance of Westminster Abbey as a forum for monumental design provides a useful point of departure for the discussion of "society’s" attitude to generic types of monumental design. Adam White has noted that the Abbey monuments were becoming a "power house" of compositions for monuments in the country estates from the early seventeenth century onward. Indications are that the types of composition first developed for monuments in Westminster Abbey were becoming increasingly important to the trade in the first half of the eighteenth century. The standing cross-legged pose of the Craggs

33 The Latin inscription states that Eliot's widow erected the monument in 1723.


35 ibid., vol. II, pp. 217. Pope to Jacob Tonson, February 1723: "Knight has writ to me for prints of the Duke's monument."


monument, for instance, was used no less than eleven times between its completion in 1723 and the year 1760. Monuments erected in the Abbey were, to a greater degree than before, the origins of the generic formulae used in family monuments in country estates. The composition of a weeping widow looking over a reclining spouse first employed in England by Scheemakers, Delveau and Plumier in the monument to the family of the Duke of Buckingham (c.1721-1723) in the Chapel of Henry VII was re-used eight times in the subsequent three decades.

A rough indication of the increase in the number of people visiting Westminster Abbey may be gained from a survey of the number of surviving guides and commentaries upon the Abbey and the monuments. The British Museum's holdings of such material indicate that there was a rapid growth in the popularity of the Abbey in the period after 1740. Whilst the monuments in Westminster Abbey paid for their high exposure through a myriad of jokes about them, favourable comment also led to unparalleled levels of social admiration. Vertue recorded that the critical acclaim accorded to Scheemakers' Shakespeare monument (erected 1741) caused such an upturn in his trade that it seriously interfered with the profitability of Rysbrack's workshop. It is tempting to posit that the growth in use of designs first seen at Westminster Abbey was directly proportional to the growth of "polite" town housing in the city and the increasing popularity of the Abbey as a place of recreation. It is probable that at least part of the reasoning behind substantial country gentry families such as the Saviles of Methley (Charles and Alethea Savile, Scheemakers, 1741-59) or the Owens of Condover (Roger and Catherine Owen, Cheere, erected 1744) ordering re-workings of

---

39 Robert Davis (Cheere, Mold, 1728), Charles Polhill (Cheere, Otford, 1757), Cholmley Turner (Cheere, Kirkleatham, 1761), George Cooke (Cheere, Belhamonds, 1744-49), Rowater Vernon (Cheere, Hanbury, 1740) Marwood Turner (Scheemakers, Kirkleatham, 1740), John Dutton (Rysbrack, Sherbourne, 1749), William Powlett (Rysbrack, West Grinstead, 1747), Daniel Dodson (William Woodman, the younger, Cheshunt, 1741), Thomas Maynard (Charles Stanley, Hoxne, 1742), Lord Maynard (Charles Stanley, Little Easton, 1746)

40 Edward Eliot (Rysbrack, St Germains, 1723), Robert Jennens (anon, Acton, 1725), Lord Dysart (anon, Helmingham, 1729), Montague Garrard Drake (Scheemakers, Amersham, 1730-1), Lord Newhaven (Cheere, Drayton Beauchamp, 1732-5), Susannah Thomas (Cheere, Hampton, 1733), Roger Owen (Cheere, Candover, 1744), Charles Savile (Scheemakers, Methley, 1743-59).

41 1700-1720, 4 guides, 1720-40, 4 guides, 1740-60, 10 guides.

42 The English tendency to make jokes about monuments in Westminster Abbey is discussed in, Grosley, A Tour Through London, vol. 1, p. 225.


Westminster Abbey monuments was the attraction of appearing in touch with the "polite" standards of the metropolis.

Although the Craggs, Shakespeare and Buckingham monuments had an unparalleled influence they were the last compositions to spawn so many imitations. No composition erected in the Abbey or at St Paul's after 1750 left such a trail of imitations and re-workings upon country estates. The monuments to Philip De Saumarez (Cheere, erected 1754), Joseph and Elizabeth Nightingale (Roubiliac, erected 1761), or Edward Vernon (Rysbrack, erected 1763) were not the source of a "type" of design which could be repeated in country churches. The demand for designs derivative of those seen in Westminster Abbey did not, as the will of Mary Martin testifies, completely halt in the later two decades of our period, but it did decrease dramatically. The tendency of early eighteenth century patrons to commission re-workings of Abbey monuments was not related in any simple way to the popularity of the compositions. The value which London society placed upon freshness of composition had a far greater role. During the 1750s and 60s the emphasis of many London periodicals' criticism of monumental sculpture switched to the admiration of "invention" in the design of monuments. The esteem in which the qualities of "invention" or "imagination" were held in the last ten years of our period had direct correlations with the decline in the importance of Westminster Abbey as a source of types for family monuments.

The varying degrees to which the "trade" exploited compositions which were first seen at Westminster Abbey can be seen as a good measure of its movement towards autonomy. The growth in the use of compositions first seen in the Abbey in the early and mid-eighteenth century was a result of an increase in the ability of the workshops to exploit a forum for the exhibition of their work. This allowed workshop masters to dictate fashions. Gaining a measure of control of the pace of fashion had a major role in ensuring that workshop masters became wealthy independent businessmen. Vertue tells us, in a statement no doubt influenced by personal antipathy, that Scheemakers had actually stimulated interest in the project to set up a monument to William Shakespeare (erected 1741) in order to promote his business:

"At the bottom of this contrivance some friends of Mr Scheemakers who first proposed it for him to be the sculptor and no one else....this artful subtil...management, for only he was proposed prevented any other competitor not

---

45 See pp. 100-562.
only that but upon conclusion of it, and the good success of the statue, giving
him so much reputation - to put him on a level with any other subject."

Despite Vertue’s assurances that these types of practices defined the money-grubbing Scheemakers from the altruistic Rysbrack, those less sympathetic to the latter noted that he used the same ploys. In 1741 Samuel Richardson described the prominent way in which Rysbrack signed the Milton monument (erected 1737) in Poets’ Corner as a "fine engrafting work"; an insinuation that the sculptor was attempting to raise his own reputation by associating his name with a publicly acclaimed genius. Cheere also manipulated the Abbey as a forum to stimulate business. He succeeded in getting himself appointed as official sculptor to the Dean and Chapter and leased a yard at the East end and North side of St Margarets Westminster which allowed his workshop to be directly adjacent to the Abbey itself. He probably favoured such sites because they allowed him to capitalise upon the curiosity of those who visited the Abbey to see the monuments. The consequence of these successful commercial ploys was a rise in the status of the profession and the establishment of market conditions in which more was expected of the sculptor as a creative figure; quality became increasingly associated with a genius for creating original designs. Thus the system of repeating successful designs became outmoded partly because of its own success.

Whether it was the patronage or whether it was the trade which controlled the need for conventional types of composition, the mere dependence of the monumental sculpture trade upon the repetition of established types profoundly affected the perception of the trade. The tendency of certain sectors of the trade to supply well tried formulae with the strict limitation of cost, allowed it to be perceived by contemporaries as little more than a purveyor of a luxury commodity related to the funerary trade. The application of visual formulae to certain set family situations bore a strong resemblance to the practise of other funerary trades such as the undertaker or heraldic painter. These trades were, as Julian Litten establishes, attempting with little success to become more respectable in this period. Unlike the sculpture profession, they did not have generally acknowledged aspirations toward being

---


48 Cheere’s becoming "carver" to the Abbey in 1742 is discussed in: Baker, *Sir Henry Cheere*, 1986, p. 145. The renewal of Cheere’s lease for land around the Abbey is recorded in the St Margarets Vestry Minutes of October 1743, E. 2420 and July 1758, Westminster Public Library E. 2421.

49 The similarity of the trade of the monumental sculptor and heraldic painter is discussed in chapter two, pp. 22-23.

considered amongst the liberal arts. Vertue’s criticism of the sculpture trade’s dependence upon monumental commissions was that it was ignoble as it supplied gratuitous, unquestioning pomp. For Vertue the domination of the sculpture trade by the production of monuments was an unfortunate result of the rule of a market which applied itself to the exploitation of human failings:51

"Therefore we may observe as those works of monuments are the best paid of any works of painting, portraiture, Landskips, conversations ....the professors of real merit will come over and study to excel for such profits and rewards....it may be concluded that, so long as that vanity or humour remain in the mind of noble and wealthy persons ,- there will be works done hereafter - of the same kind."

That this impression was to some degree justified can be seen from documents relating to a monument for the family of William Barrell Mapingberd of South Ormsby in Lincolnshire. Three numbered drawings for the monument survive along with a covering letter from the sculptor, Richard Hayward (dated 1st April 1762) (ills. 29-31).52 The sculptor’s covering letter, sent on account of the patron being in Lincolnshire and unable to discuss the monument at the workshop, reproduces some of the typical elements of a negotiation between workshop master and client for a modest family monument. Richard Hayward (1728-1800) was a pupil of Henry Cheere who for much of his career sub-contracted to the Cheere workshop. The letter records the type of negotiation which he learned from his master who used similar numbered drawings.53 However his master, who was probably educated at Westminster school, was, from the evidence of his letters, much more literate.54


52 Lincolnshire Record Office MM7/1A/15-17

53 Hayward’s relationship to Cheere’s workshop is discussed in, Webb, Henry Cheere Sculptor and Businessman, pp. 232 and 274.

"Sir

Agreeable to your desire when in London I have inclosed you my thoughts upon a family memorial, as to the exact expense I cannot well determine unless I could tell the material to be used, whether Marble or Portland stone, you was speaking of. I will suppose these of no 1 to be all of Portland stone, except the scroll inscription and that to be wight marble, the whole height about 8 feet in proportion wider than might be executed for about £50, supposing the boy marble with a lamp and scroll £60 the whole marble £80. No 2 all Portland stone except the table for the inscription £35, the whole to be marble £70, supposing in about the same proportion with the other. The small round design about 2 feet ten inches in diameter will come to £20, I have drawn in to go over the top a gothic arch but will do equally well in any other situation. I should be glad to hear your opinion of them at the proper opportunity.

I am Sir

Your obedient servant

Richard Hayward.

Hayward seems to have considered that cost would be the most important factor in dictating his client’s choice. The three drawings represent a well articulated price range within the wall tablet type of monument; at the top of the market was a floor based design which included a figure, the intermediary was also floor mounted but was purely architectural, the lowest was wall mounted and little more than a frame for an inscription. Larger figurative works could also be designed in accordance with a defined price range. Statues were omitted from well-known proto-typical compositions, or busts used rather than life-size figures, in order to limit the cost of monuments.55

The metropolitan sculpture profession in our period stood at a fascinating impasse; the large scale production of certain visual formulae reached new heights of efficiency, whilst sectors of the critical audience, and certain of the sculptors, began to react against the predictability of the trade. The contemporary notion that the trade was producing pompous formulae "by the yard" was the basis of much of the humour in the literary discussion of funeral monuments. The most famous joke at the expense of this aspect of the trade appears in Hogarth’s image

55 For a description of these methods of production see, pp. 000.
of the sculptor's yard in his *Analysis of Beauty* (Plate no. 1, 1753) (ill. 32) which is often interpreted as a parody of one of the yards at Hyde Park Corner. The monument of a judge (numbered 48) was shown being constructed in the workshop; attention was drawn to the expected clichés of such a monument by the replacement of the customary foliage of the Corinthian Order with wigs and hats. Behind this (numbered 19) a pompous statue dressed in a ridiculous combination of antique and beau attire brandishes a baton in his right hand directly in front of a more orthodox classical statue which holds a similar baton in his left hand, giving the impression of a never-ending stream of pompous formulae.

Whatever the contemporary caricature of the profession, no London workshop at the period traded in empty formulae. The criticisms of an article in the *Universal Magazine* of October 1752 on rendering the sculpture trade "more useful to Society" concentrated upon the tendency of sculptors to use Roman military garb without discrimination as a form of pompous uniform for all substantial deceased. The author ridiculed the sculptor who felt obliged to flatter his client with the gratuitous use of this type of dress:56

"He dresses his citizen in a military vestment, with his arm bare as a Roman general...."

This was a parody rather than accurate criticism of the trade. A survey of life-size monumental figures used in the period shows that the designers of monuments were very thorough in this regard. No citizen without some military or militia service appears in the cuirass.57 This attention to historical detail can be observed in Rysbrack's composition of the three Dukes of Beaufort (Badminton, 1746-66) (ill. 33). Two of the figures wear the costume of the private

---


57 Life-size figures in cuirass erected in the period who are not well-known military commanders:

- Lord Lexington, Kelham, Palmer, 1723: Captain of a troop of Horse and Gentleman of the Horse to Princess Anne of Denmark.
- Second Duke of Ancaster, Edenham, Cheere, 1746: Lord Lieutenant of Lincolnshire.
- Arthur Moore, Great Bookham, Carter, 1746: Paymaster to her Majesties Land Forces under Marlborough.
- Lord Dysart, Helmingham, ?, 1729: Lord Lieutenant and Vice Admiral of Suffolk.
- Lord Uxbridge, Hillingdon, Cheere, 1743: Yeoman of the Guard to Queen Anne.

Like the Badminton monuments distinctions are made between the citizen and soldier. On the right the figure of Charles Petty, who raised a Regiment of Dragoons, wears a cuirass on the centre the first Earl, who had no military or militia involvement, is dressed in a toga.
citizen, one the cuirass. This identifies the figure in the cuirass as the second Earl (d.1714), who according to the inscription served in Queen Anne's "Honourable Band of Gentleman Pensioners". The third (d.1745) and fourth (d.1756) Dukes who had Jacobite sympathies did not wish to associate themselves with the Hanovarian militia.58 It was in the interests of the workshop master, as well as the client, to consult carefully on issues of family history and to tailor the use of convention to particular circumstances. The metropolitan sculpture workshops were scrupulously accurate in the application of formula to the facts surrounding the relationship of the donor to the deceased.59 Peter Scheemakers in particular appears to have rationalised these formulae in strict accordance with cost; a carefully stratified product line was provided in which predictability appears to have been a veritable characteristic of his business.60 The continuing success of Scheemakers' workshop is a good reminder that, even in the 1740s and 50s, there was a large conservative sector of the purchasing public for whom predictability was a positive attraction.

Roubiliac's success as a designer of monumental sculpture was particularly dependent upon the exploitation of a popular discontent with the visual formulae employed by his profession. His avoidance of mechanistic workshop practices, such as producing series of numbered drawings, may have helped him to establish his name amongst the discerning critics of the trade.61 He sought to create compositions which were seen to be an intellectual commentary upon the symbols of the funerary trade; the obligatory trappings of Roman military triumph, weeping widows, heraldic devices, and undertaker's props. Thus he placed himself above the "mechanick" trade in fame by wittily jumbling and re-evaluating its symbols and by so doing increased his appeal to those discerning patrons who sought to mark themselves out for sponsoring a genius superior to the trade.

Roubiliac's style was, at least partially, defined by the nature of the metropolitan trade which he sought to break into in the late 1730s. It was sound commercial sense to produce works which profoundly questioned the formulae and large scale production methods of his financially powerful competitors. Throughout his career he benefited from the tendency of

58 The inability of the third and fourth Earls to serve in the militia as had their father in discussed in E. Cruickshanks, Political Untouchables. The Tories and the '45, London, 1979, p. 38.

59 A full discussion of the appropriate use of visual formulae can be seen in chapter two, pp.

60 There is a full discussion of the relationship of Scheemakers' workshop methods to the predictability of his designs in chapter two, pp.


56
London critics to regard his monuments as a refreshment to a bored palette. A review of Roubiliac's monument to Lord Shannon at Walton-upon-Thames which was published in the *London Magazine* of December 1759 demonstrates that a sympathetic response could be expected for novel designs which challenged the established visual conventions of monumental sculpture.62 The review ended with an abrupt statement that "the name is Roubiliac" which suggests that it was probably a "puff" paid for by the sculptor. Thus it probably indicated how the sculptor wished certain challenging characteristics within his work to be understood:

"The design of the monument is new, and in a taste equally great and pleasing. As heroes of old were buried upon the scene of the action, the statue of Lord Shannon is supposed erected upon the field; and surrounded with the emblems of war. In the background, instead of the unmeaning load of marble usual upon these occasions, there is raised here a tent and on a distant tree are hung the trophies of honour."

The reference to an "unmeaning load of marble" is a criticism of the heaps of Roman triumphal symbols - clubs, cuirasses, fâces, and antique helms - which were habitually employed upon military monuments such as that to the Duke of Buckingham (Westminster Abbey, c.1720-23). The Buckingham monument was, indeed, the basis for a series of designs containing the device of the grieving widow admiring her husband in military triumph. Roubiliac probably sought to provide a witty commentary on this rather stuffy and formulaic prototype. The classical conventions of triumphal imagery were reinterpreted in a witty way by grasping the intellectual roots of classical tradition rather than trotting out its visual symbols. He exhibited his knowledge of the history of how Romans buried their military dead and set up triumphs on the battlefield, but abandoned the customary visual formulae associated with these ideas. Scholarly tradition was given a new immediacy of meaning by the employment of an unconventional modern idiom to express it.

The *London Magazine* 's critique implied that "unmeaning" formulae would pass through the consciousness of the spectator without any significant effect. The words "unmeaning", and its counterpart "meaning", played an important part in the criticism of monumental sculpture in the last decade of our period. The first use of the term "meaning" occurs in the *Old England* 's critique upon the Argyll monument of October 28th 1749. Here the Duke's statue, which varied slightly but crucially from the formulaic reclining posture used by other sculptors, was described as contributing to a "meaning" portrait. The term had a useful role in defining what

---

certain critics of the early 1760s thought were the changes and advances which had occurred in sculpture during the preceding three decades. The author of a major series of articles on the monuments of Westminster Abbey in *Martins Magazine* of 1759 vigorously praised Roubiliac’s works but complained of an "unmeaning air" in Rysbrack’s monument to Lord Stanhope (erected December 1732) (ill. 34). The pompous gesture of the reclining figure dressed in Roman a cuirass was described as being:

"..... as devoid of design as penetration."

Scheemakers’ monument to Hugo Chamberlayne (erected 1731), which had at its centre a reclining statue flanked by carefully postured classical Virtues, was dismissed for having little:

".....that might appeal to the spectator’s imagination, as well as his judgement."

There was clearly a reaction in certain quarters against the use of formulaic postures and classical convention which might have appeal to the connoisseur but have little value to those wishing to be profoundly affected by the sight of a monument. This reaction against the glib use of formulae was not confined to monumental art. Gerald Newman has described a literary reaction in favour of "pots of meaning" during the forth and fifth decades of the eighteenth century. He has placed these developments in the context of broad cultural and political movements which fundamentally altered the outlook of sectors of English society. These complex changes in the social climate - changes which influenced certain sectors of society to view monumental sculpture as an art form which should profoundly affect the inner-consciousness - had important consequences for the development of family imagery.

Only the works of Cheere and Roubiliac, masters with demonstrably close links to Hogarth and the St Martin’s Lane group, fully reflect these fundamental changes in the aesthetic aims of monumental sculpture. David Bindman has noticed that a definable gulf appeared...
between the production of workshops run by masters linked to the St Martin's Lane group and those controlled by Scheemakers and Rysbrack. The St Martin's Lane orientated workshops' produced a number of monumental designs which expressed emotion in a candid manner and began to release monumental sculpture from some of the restrictions of a tradition of contrived formality. Compositions such as Cheere's monument to the nineteenth Earl of Kildare (Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin 1743-6) (ill. 35) and Roubiliac's monument to Earl Shannon (Walton-upon-Thames, 1756-9) were linked by a new sense of freedom in the way in which the postures of figures express the emotions of the bereaved. Both works emphasised the importance of freely expressed emotion and rejected pompous formulaic allusion to social status in favour of alerting the spectator to the trials of mourning and separation which were common to all humanity. As David Bindman has argued, this suggests a movement away from the idea that the profession should be geared to express the prerogatives of the erudite and class conscious aristocracy. This reaction, orchestrated by members of a group who are often characterised by their stridently bourgeois opinions, can be associated with their recorded objections to the power of the aristocratic "connoisseur" within the London market.

The movement against the use of formulae was undoubtedly connected to the growth in the social aspirations of the profession during the 1740s and 50s. The use of the term "invention" to describe the role of the sculptor in this period was indissolubly linked with the claims of the trade to rank amongst the "polite" arts. In an article of 1759 the London Courant (reprinted in the Scots Magazine) enthusiastically supported the sculptor's claim to parity with the literary genius in a commentary on the intended design of the Wolfe monument:

"Everybody knows that the chief glory of sculpture and indeed of all the fine arts, as well as poetry, is that of invention; being the first gift of heaven which characterises the first artists and distinguishes great geniuses from the mechanics of the profession."

---


67 ibid., pp. 43-45

68 Roubiliac's attitude to the "connoisseur" is best seen in verses which were posted up at the Spring Gardens exhibition in 1761. These appeared in translation in the Yearly Chronicle of 1761.

69 For the development of the view that sculpture was a polite art see; R. Campbell, The London Tradesman, London, 1747, pp. 138-141. The expansion of the trade both in terms of its social status and the amount of commissions taken by London sculptors is documented in an article upon the "polite arts" in the London Magazine 1755, p. 391.

The whole idea of the sculptor being a man capable of flights of inspiration, or works of "imagination" and "invention", equated his profession with that of creative figures of independence and high social esteem such as authors, intellectuals and composers of genius.71

As David Bindman has shown, Roubiliac demonstrated his own genius by depicting Handel (Westminster Abbey, 1761) and Shakespeare (Garrick's Garden at Twickenham, 1758) in the midst of creative reveries.72 Cheere stated this idea directly in his speech to the Society of Arts and Manufacture. He criticised the assumption of devotees of Continental art that a land traditionally associated with great literature could not excel at the visual arts:

"As if the genius of a painter was one kind of essence and the genius of the poet another, and as if the air and soil which have given birth to a Shakespeare and a Bacon, a Milton and a Newton, names which the proudest writer upon the Continent dare not mention without a note of admiration, could be deficient in any species of excellency whatsoever."

The claim of the trade for parity with poetry derives, of course, from the familiar debate upon the ordering of the arts which had its origins in writings of Pliny the elder. The demonstration of the sculptor's capacity to involve the sympathetic imagination of the spectator was an integral part of the trade's claim to a new status.

Cheere regarded the oppression of a market by the purchasing power of "tasteless connoisseurs" as the main factor inhibiting the development of creative genius in the visual arts. He was inclined to link the whole issue of a country producing creative genius with that of stimulating market conditions which would enable artists to be independent. In his speech to the Society of Arts and Manufacture he explained how, in a vigorous and prosperous society, a dynamic from within the purchasing community could stimulate the development of the arts. Cheere was, in short, suggesting that artistic excellence could be achieved by what we would now term "market forces". His ideas upon the subject of variety in artistic productions are close to what modern art history would call a theory of "image fatigue". He devoted the first part of his speech to elaborating his belief that the "curiosity" of the nation should be stimulated in order to engender a vigorous turnover of designs which would in turn

71 The nationalistic overtones of discussion of the "Sister Arts" can be seen in "a verse sung by Mr Vernon at the Entertainment given to the Governors of the Foundling Hospital to the Artists of painting and sculpture" which was published in the London Magazine 1757, pp. 558-559. This discusses the flourishing of painting, sculpture, and literature in terms of national growth.

72 I am grateful to David Bindman for having allowed me to see the manuscript for his forthcoming monograph on Roubiliac.
stimulate the market in artistic products. The "curiosity" of the customer was directly linked to their "pleasure" in purchasing; a pleasure in consumption would produce "profit" for industry and prosperity for the nation at large:

"And as curiosity is, in a manner, boundless so are the powers of the imagination too; hence the idea of excellency would be diversified into a thousand shapes; and as soon as the mind was satisfied with one pleasing object, it would be relieved by another."

Cheere's views were those of a man who understood the power of fashion and novelty in the marketplace. He was possessed of a business mind capable of grasping the concept that fresh designs could redefine society's idea of what was appropriate and thus stimulate trade in favour of what appeared novel. His comments are those of an individual who had the business acumen to exploit and abandon formulae for the sake of gaining control over the market. This passage does much to explain why Cheere was more ready than either Scheemakers or Rysbrack to change completely the way in which he worked; to abandon, for instance, the Gibbsian Classicism of his competitors in favour of Rococo designs. He produced such a bewildering variety of designs, from such variable artistic sources, that it has been most difficult to identify the products of his workshop. Cheere and Roubiliac shared little in their trading practices, but both men appear to have recognised the power of comprehending "image fatigue" in securing and stimulating business.

Henry Cheere's views upon the "powers of the imagination" were totally consistent with his impatience with connoisseurs who protested a worship of the achievements of the past. They were also consistent with the aggressive nationalism which manifested itself in his speech. There is much in the speech to support Gerald Newman's contention that "the rise of British nationalism" was engendered by a confident, xenophobic bourgeoisie who despised the aristocratic patronage system. Like Hogarth who has been taken by Newman as a symbolic figure in this movement, Cheere appeared to have an ambivalent attitude to the achievements of the past and a belief in the raw potential of his nation's "curiosity" and "imagination" to recreate and challenge the idea of the "pleasing object".

---

73 Cheere's shift from the Gibbsian to the Rococo in the 1740s has been noticed by Baker, Sir Henry Cheere, 1986, p. 159.

74 This variety of styles has been noticed by Malcolm Baker (ibid., p. 148).

In his speech to the Society Cheere referred derisively to those connoisseurs who only valued the artistic endeavour of long dead foreigners. Even the Catholic countries of Europe, which were described as the "petty states", were perceived to be more conducive to the development of the arts than the aristocratic collector:

"Whereas the whole secret lie in this: when Princes for their grandeur and Priests for their profit; have had resource for painting, the encouragement given to the professor, gave spirit to the art, and others thought it worth while to distinguish themselves in hope of receiving like reward. On the contrary those who set their hearts upon making collections only, instead of advancing the art they profess to love, or animating the professors of it, have actually helped to create the deficiency they affect to complain of. For in order to justify the excessive prices which they have been artificially induced to give for names and characters, they are insensibly led to decry and undervalue every modern performance. As a collection alone is too often sufficient to create a tasteless connoisseur, and connoisseurs, are received in the gross as the only competent judges, it will necessarily follow that it must be a painter with the Roman Catholic Saints, who are never beatified until a hundred years after they are dead - nor canonised till a hundred years more; a consecration which, in the at present undervalued if not derided state of fame and glory, cannot be esteemed a very powerful incentive."

Cheere’s impatience with the "connoisseur", and those who attempted to impose empty cannons of taste upon the arts, was linked to his muscular views upon the power of the market to change the perception of the aesthetically desirable. A thriving market which constantly redefined the idea of the beautiful and appropriate, was perceived as a desirable alternative to the stagnation of the market place in the hands of a few powerful aristocratic "connoisseurs". The sculptor's views on formulae were thus indissolubly linked with his irreverent attitude to the imposition of canons of taste.

The views aired in Cheere's speech were a familiar theme in the work of William Hogarth whom Cheere recommended to the Society.76 The painter was probably present at the delivery of the speech and may - from the evidence not only of the major themes but the blunt, irreverent tone of the piece - been partially responsible for drafting it. An important article upon sculpture and sculptural convention which has a decidedly Hogarthian tone was

---

76 RSA Archive, list of individuals recommended by Henry Cheere in the Society's Court Minute Books.
published in the *Universal Magazine* of October 1752. It was entitled *Observations on statuary, and the method of rendering this beautiful art, not only ornamental but useful to society.* The article was heavily nationalistic; its objective being to equate beauty with worthy public utility. The connoisseur was considered to be the sponsor of meaningless frivolities without obvious public utility and thus out of tune with the most robust of nationalist aspirations. Connoisseurship was considered to be a sort of national disease; a folly of the aristocracy who infected the tastes of the "scholars" and "housekeepers" who emulated them:

"....we seem to have so little regard for truth in sculpture and painting, that nothing is fashionable but what is fabulous; or, if our taste is formed by the study of history, we cannot relish it unless dashed with fiction; in so much that we are come to that pass, as not to know the true character and fashions of our own nation a century ago, by the descriptions that are given of it. Our nobles and great commanders are ashamed to be seen in English dresses at court, or at the head of their troops, but they must be drawn in the manner of ancient Greece, or else all is spoiled. Does a housekeeper, or a scholar sit for his picture? The painter instead of drawing them in their proper habits (which might serve, by way of a characteristic, to distinguish the person so dressed, and the age in which he lived) has his head so full of antiquity, that everything must be accorded the ancient taste. A gentleman must be armed with a cuirass, like a god of war, and his head adorned with a spruce, well buckled periwig. How admirably well they suit each other! He dresses a citizen in military vestment, with his arm bare as a Roman general: and a philosopher in his study must be distinguished by a cap and gown of so odd a make, that you are at a loss to know, whether he meant him for a Muscovite or an inhabitant of Tonquin."

The nationalism of the article was reflected in its enthusiasm for the modern British world; realism was equated with a patriotic confidence in one’s society. It reflected a wide-spread feeling. A decade later the *Imperial Magazine* of 1760 reported that Carlini’s design for the Wolfe monument had been rejected by the competition judges for using an excess of erudite allegorical references. The article echoed Hogarth’s jaundiced view of an art world in which

---

77 The *Universal Magazine* 1752, pp. 160-162.

78 The *Imperial Magazine* 1760, p. 244. The second objection: "Second it is too allegorical, which is unnecessary in a hero who had done so much himself, and that so much more easily understood, as well as more to his honour, than any allegory, which is a perfect riddle to all but the learned."
that which only foreign or antique art works were considered to have quality. It seems to have been designed to stimulate and defend such works as Roubiliac's monument to Earl Shannon, with its magnificent portrait of the Earl in an accurately reproduced a British military uniform of the early eighteenth century.

Unlike Rysbrack and Scheemakers, Cheere and Roubiliac were willing to produce monumental works with figures in contemporary clothing. Cheere, in fact, came under severe criticism from Sir Joshua Reynolds for producing an uncompromising image of the corpulent Duke of Cumberland in contemporary garb in the equestrian monument at Cavendish Square (donated by Colonel William Strode and erected 1770). Reynolds's criticisms were aired within his Discourses... delivered to the Royal Academy in which he argued that sculpture was a grand and formal art which abhorred the common-place. His comments seem to symbolise the clash between the values of the Academy and the bourgeois patriotic values of St Martin's Lane. This significantly affected the presentation of domestic as well as military dramas. Cheere presented the Kildare family and Roubiliac the Nightingales in contemporary clothing. The confidence engendered by civic nationalism in the 40s and 50s was intimately linked with the tendency to remove many of the insulating layers of formal classical reference from monumental design and to depict family sentiments in a frank or uncompromisingly modern idiom.

Cheere's opposition to the power of the connoisseur's market was reflected in a tendency to diminish the importance of distinctions between the liberal arts and manufacturing for profit. This challenged the connoisseur's approach which sharply distinguished the high arts from the artisan trades and mercantile practices. In his speech to the Society of Arts and Manufacture Cheere argued that the works of Correggio and Raphael and "the wooden prints, and Bellman verses that are the pride of Garrets and cellars" are the product of the same sense of human "curiosity". He suggested that when given institutional encouragement the development of the

---

79 Rysbrack and Scheemakers only departed from classical garb in monuments for historical characters such as the Earl of Somerset, a Whig hero in his youth during the late seventeenth century, (Rysbrack, Senate House, Cambridge, 1756) and Edward VI (Scheemakers, St Thomas' Hospital, 1737).


"In this town may be seen an equestrian statue in modern dress, which should be sufficient to deter future artists from such an attempt: even supposing no other objection, the familiarity of modern dress by no means agrees with the dignity and gravity of sculpture. Sculpture is formal, regular, and austere; dismisses all familiar objects as incompatible with dignity...."

The contemporary dress of the statue is also ridiculed in James "Athenian" Stuart, Critical Observations on the Buildings and Improvements of London, London, 1771, p. 18. The St Martins Lane group's preference for the depiction of military heroes in modern clothing is best seen in Francis Hayman's paintings for Vauxhall Gardens of the Surrender of Montreal to General Amhurst and Lord Clive receiving the Homage of the Nabob (1762). For praise of the use of modern dress see the discussion of these paintings in the London Magazine 1763, pp. 233-4.
"curiosity" of the nation would link and blur the distinctions between the high arts and manufacturing trades:

"From architecture and all its ornaments external and internal, from painting to sculpture, graving and chasing, planting and gardening, and all various performances in which art and genius, elegance and fancy, and accuracy of workmanship are confessedly united, it will descend to the subordinate branches of design, in utensils of all sorts, plate and cabinet work, patterns of silks, jewelling, Garniture, Carriage building and Equipage, down to Toys and trinkets, it will expect to find the same manifestation of propriety and elegance, and will reject whatsoever is apparently irreconcilable to the true standards of Beauty."

The sculptor’s desire to promote the status of apparently trivial artisan trades like toy making can be measured from the fact that he had recently recommended William Deards, London’s premier manufacturer of toys, to be a member of the Society.81 A correspondent of Josiah Wedgwood concerning his use of good quality designs for urns, he was obviously profoundly interested in the quality of early manufacturing.82 His conception of the function of the Academy of Arts, which he wished to help found, was very much influenced by his interest in manufacture. He made an interesting plea for the respect of all types of ability in the drawing school of the proposed Academy which would allow those not suited to painting and architecture to be used in manufacturing:

"That as several of the inferior parts of drawing are of great use to the manufactures of this kingdom and many of the students whose capacity or genius may not lead them to the perfect study of the Human figure: it will be necessary that some of the above mentioned professors be as well skilled in ornaments, fruit, flowers birds, beasts and co as that they may not only be able to judge, but, if necessary, to instruct the students therein."

Cheere’s later career was characterised by his reputation for design and his promotion of drawing both as an essential skill for artisan manufacturers and for the polite arts. During his membership of the Society of Antiquaries and Arts and Manufacture he became particularly

81 RSA Archive, index of persons recommended to Society by Cheere. Record of Deards’ profession is made in his obituary in the Gentleman’s Magazine 1761, p. 285.

associated with drawing and design. He was, for instance, a principal judge on many of the design competitions of the early Society of Arts and Manufacture.  

His public expression of a concern for the encouragement of the art of design during the 50s reflected a profound change in his own workshop methods. In the period before 1740 Cheere constructed monuments in accordance with the designs of architects such as Thomas Archer and Westby Gill and, as Malcolm Baker has noted, based most of his monuments upon Gibbs' designs. In the period after 1740 he began to produce distinctive Rococo designs of his own which departed from the styles of his main London competitors, Rysbrack and Scheemakers. He began to concentrate on the sale of a large number of medium cost wall mounted designs which probably enabled him to transport and erect monuments with greater cost efficiency; a shift in emphasis which enabled him to target his production at the Capital's socially aspirant "middling sort" rather than the great country aristocrats with London residences.

Cheere's rise in social standing within the City hierarchy during the 1740s and 50s - a social elevation which allowed him to gain his clients from a network of his own City acquaintances - coincided with him becoming designer of a distinctive product range. His ability to move towards a new type of business, from a small number of "one-off" commissions to a large scale production of distinctive polychrome works, demonstrated the power of a metropolitan sculptor to control his market rather than be controlled by it. Gaining autonomy over the design process can be associated with the increase in a sculptor's power over his profits and markets. Vertue talks of Rysbrack's period of working for Gibbs as a stage in the sculptor's career in which he was frustrated by a lack of fiscal and creative autonomy. His interest in "profit" and aspirations toward genius were compatible. Genius could be discerned in design although actual construction occurred in a workshop where the number of commissions made it impossible for a designer to intervene personally.

---

83 RSA Archive, Court Minute Books vol. 2 p. 11, Henry Cheere and Dalton Strang appointed judges of the Society's drawing competitions.

84 Baker. Sir Henry Cheere, 1986, p. 159 and Henry Cheere's Bust of George Pitt, Burlington Magazine, forthcoming. For Cheere's work with Westby Gill and Thomas Archer see the reviews of Cheere's monuments to Justice Raymond (Abbots Langley, 1735) and Susannah Thomas (Hampton, 1733) in chapter two, pp. OOO.

85 Cheere's attitude to the transportation and erection of sculpture is discussed in greater detail in chapter four, pp. OOO.

86 Vertue, Notebooks, vol. III, p. 17. It remains a problem for future research to ascertain why Scheemakers and Rysbrack began to rely increasingly upon the designs of architects in the later parts of their careers (Scheemakers with "Athenian" Stuart and Rysbrack with Robert Adam) after the later in particular had broken away from sharing the profits of his commissions with designers in the early 30s.
A concentration on the process of design as opposed to manual production was a characteristic of the bourgeois values of sculptors of the St Martin’s Lane circle. Roubiliac’s attitude to design was, however, very different to that of Cheere. The latter’s view of drawing or design was explicitly geared towards manufacturing processes and creating attractive and saleable compositions. Roubiliac, by comparison, saw "design" as a means of articulating intellectual concepts through a visual medium. His aim was not to produce a large product range of distinctive designs but to draw attention to himself as the conceptual thinker behind a high quality workshop. The London Magazine’s "puff" of Roubiliac’s monument to Earl Shannon, for instance, made a firm distinction between design, in which the "genius" of the sculptor was made manifest, and standards of manual workmanship. It concluded with the statement that the ideas behind the juxtaposition of the figures were a product of Roubiliac’s mastery of "design".87

“This structure shows that the arts of sculpture and design are at a considerable height amongst us; One does not know whether to admire in it, the genius of the sculptor or the execution. The name is Roubiliac.”

The emphasis of Roubiliac’s critics upon the "meaning" within his works was born of the assumption that one looked for the wit and brilliance of a sculptor in his "design". Roubiliac’s stress upon the wit and originality of his designs enabled him to be seen as the conceptual thinker at the head of his workshop articulating the "meaning" of certain epigraphic traditions. Although Cheere concentrated upon individual "design" he was less dependent upon a reputation for "meaning". Contemporaries noticed that his distinctive, oft repeated, design of the figures of Hope and Faith balancing a central motif was symptomatic of a type of sculpture which placed the demands of decorative symmetry before intellectual rigour. The unfortunate omission of Charity was noticed at the erection of the monument to Dean Wilcocks in Westminster Abbey in 1763 when humorists were given cause to wonder whether aspersions were being cast upon the reputation of the deceased.88

87 The London Magazine 1759, p. 616.

88 The erection of the monument was recorded in the London Magazine 1761, p. 163. An issue of the Magazine of two years later (1763, pp. 492-3) criticised the monument for being "neat and elegant" but an ineffective design for communicating a sense of "his Lordships merits". It records that a critic was reported to have commented upon seeing the figures of Faith and Hope that, "I do not see Charity - I suppose as he was one of our Late Bishops he had none".
The relationship with the client.

Cheere's desire to integrate the ideology and practice of artisan manufacture with that of the "polite" arts can be best explained by his social background. In the social circle of the Vestry of St Margaret's within which Cheere worked his social elevation was not altogether to be unexpected. He was trained in a sector of the Westminster workshop of Edward Stanton who himself became a militia Captain. Several members of the Tuftel family of builders, who were on the Vestry of St Margaret's and had the monopoly upon building contracts in the Abbey, rose to high ranking positions in the Middlesex militia as did Cheere. Andrews Jelfe, who supervised the building of Westminster Bridge, aspired to be a country gentleman and sent his son through the career of a gentlemen soldier. Apart from this there were a myriad of successful artisans: men such as John Snow (master brick builder), John Hickman (stone purveyor for Westminster Bridge), William Jones (master carpenter), and William Goff (upholsterer).

A measure of the patriotic mercantilism of this group can be taken from their voluntary subscription to a joint project to provide a large temporary fountain for the coronation of George III. The fountain exhibited examples of all their crafts from masonry to upholstery; even an engine maker, a member of the Vestry of St Margarets, was employed to pump the water. Cheere organised the whole project and provided the central statue which he obtained from his brother's workshop for the purpose. The Coronation fountain was to some degree symbolic of the social attitudes which prevailed in Cheere's Westminster circle. The accession of George III was greeted as the dawning of a new age of hope for the British nation in which the empire and commerce were expected to thrive. The fountain, an iconographic device

---


91 A short biography of Andrews Jelfe can be found in Colvin. 1978, pp. 456-7.

92 Expenses for the erection of the monument are recorded in the Church Warden's Accounts of St Margarets, Westminster of 1762. Westminster Public Library E 136 and E 3293/5 5-10. Expenses were claimed by: 14 Musicians; Mr Couse, Surveyor; William Jelfe, mason; John Broadbent, Engine Maker; Spinnage and Comptons, Canvas merchants; William Goff, upholster; John Cheere, statuary; William Jones, stage maker. Henry Cheere organised the project and obtained the land.

often associated with flourishing abundance, was an apt symbol of a nation thriving upon the prosperity of the different branches of trade which came together in its manufacture.

The iconography and construction of the fountain echoed many of statements which Cheere delivered to the Society of Arts and Manufacture concerning the benefits which would accrue to the nation by the encouragement of a strong manufacturing ethos:

"It is to the profit of the public that every individual should be employed and that every vein of industry and ingenuity should be opened, the circulation is then both strong and equal, and every member of the Commonwealth helps to communicate vigour to the whole."

Cheere's vigorous bourgeois ideals gave him social confidence. By creating his own group of clientele, who dealt with him upon an equal social footing, he began to escape from the vagaries of the aristocratic market in which the sculptor was necessarily subservient. The few surviving letters recording his dealings with the De Saumarez family were written in a style which suggests that, by the late forties, Cheere felt himself to be the equal of some of his clients. There are plenty of references to mutual friends and acquaintances and the sculptor at no point uses terms of address which would indicate a sense of subservience. Cheere was, in fact, more than a social equal of the De Saumarez and Durell families. Cheere rather than his neighbour Philip Durell was in a position to act as social patron; he was probably amongst those who nominated and voted for Durell as a successor to the sculptor as Church Warden of St Margaret's Westminster. The sculptor also put forward Durell, a keen amateur artist, for a place in the Society of Arts and Manufacture.

The extent to which Cheere exploited personal contacts indicates that his main role as workshop master became that of securing commissions. Cheere lived in the splendid Deanery House in Old Palace Yard where, as the diaries of one of his clients, Bubb Doddington reveal, he entertained gentlemen and literati. This ability to meet and court clients explains the fact that excellent sculptors such as Richard Hayward, William Collins and L.F. Roubiliac, worked for long periods of their careers upon commissions originally gained by him. His

---

94 Captain Durell was proposed for Church Warden of St Margarets on May 26th 1748. Vestry Minutes E. 2421.

95 RSA Archive, list of those presented to the Society by Henry Cheere in the Court Minute books. Record of Durell's interest in painting is made in the Lloyd's Evening Post, June-Dec 1761, p. 83. Durell's will (PCC 1766, 404) shows that he was an early client of Joshua Reynolds.

surviving bank accounts indicate that lump sums were paid to these sculptors, which suggests that he was not only employed them but subcontracted whole commissions out to them.\(^97\)

It is a somewhat naïve assumption of M.I. Webb in her work upon the business career of Henry Cheere that public service such as the Directorship of the Westminster Fire Office, or Free Westminster Fish Market, led eventually to his receipt of a baronetcy.\(^98\) These offices were not "sinecures", as Physick suggests, because no money was obtained from them.\(^99\) Like Cheere’s service on the Westminster bench they are the public offices consistent with a role as a principal vestryman of St Margarets. His elevation was probably a reward for his control of political interest in Westminster. There is evidence of Cheere’s social connections with the principal figures of London politics, Crisp Gasgoyne, Theodore Jacobsen, Charles Jenkinson, John Patterson, and the reforming Justices, Saunders Welch and John Fielding.\(^100\) The papers of the contested election at Westminster in 1749 show that Cheere was a political agent for the ministerial Whig party; a position which he fulfilled with the low levels of personal integrity which were required to win City elections in the period.\(^101\) He was sufficiently ambitious to work for both sides in London politics and in his capacity as J.P. for Middlesex actively supported the opposition.\(^102\) This was wise as the candidate he supported, the city lawyer George Cooke, was one of those who put him forward to deliver a speech to George III in 1760 for which he was awarded his Knighthood.\(^103\)

\(^97\) According to Cheere’s Hoare’s Bank Ledger for 1746 Hayward was not paid a regular salary but in lump sums some of which were as large as £1901. This indicates that whole commissions were subcontracted to him.

\(^98\) Webb, Henry Cheere, Sculptor and Businessman, pp. 232, 274.

\(^99\) Physick ed., Sculpture in Britain, p. 238.

\(^100\) Crisp Gascoyne, John Fielding and Saunders Welch were presented to the Society of Arts and Manufactures by Cheere. Cheere leased offices at generous rates to Charles Jenkinson in Cannon Row Westminster in which most of his Government business was transacted. (BM. Jenkinson papers, add ms 38, 308 ff. 170, 183, 38,309, f. 81.) The sculptor’s help for the Bute party and association with its principal political agent, Edward Richardson, is recorded in, N. Tucker, ed., The Jenkinson Papers, 1760-1766, London, 1947, p. 162. His association with Theodore Jacobsen is mentioned in the Society of Antiquaries, Minute books, vol VII, p. 7. (January 1752) He proposed John Patterson to be a Governor of Christ’s Hospital. Minutes of the Governor’s proceedings, 1751, Guild Hall ms, 12,806 vol. 11)


\(^102\) Further details on Cheere’s support for the Middlesex Tories can be seen in chapter four (pp. 000) in the discussion of the monument to George Cooke at Belhamonds.

\(^103\) Middlesex Record Office, Organisation of delegation to George III, 4th December 1760, MJ/OC/7/70-71.
Cheere’s bank records show that he undertook commissions for George Cooke, an antiquarian with a good collection of classical sculpture.\(^{104}\) His workshop was responsible for two monuments to George Cooke’s father (1744–9); one at Hayes Parish church (chancel, south wall), a second at the family’s estates at Bethamonds.\(^{105}\) Cheere’s workshop also provided a monument for George Cooke’s son, John Cooke of Cranbrook, in memory of his Godfather, Admiral Molloy (Shadoxhurst, 1760) (ill. 36).\(^{106}\) Fireplaces by the Cheere workshop at Langley near Norwich show that he also obtained work from William Beauchamp Proctor who held the Middlesex seat jointly with Cooke.\(^{107}\) Toward the end of his career Cheere also took commissions from friends in the City who were associated with the various societies to which he belonged. In 1761, for instance, he made a monument (Barking Parish Church) for the eminent City family, the Gascoynes of Barking, the principal representative of which, Sir Crisp Gascoyne, he had recently recommended for membership of the Society of Arts and Manufacture.\(^{108}\)

The quantity of monuments commissioned from the sculptor by his friends or relations is yet further evidence that Cheere was capable of controlling his market. From 1742–55 his workshop made no less than eight monuments for families from the Channel Islands related to the Durells who lived in a neighbouring house in Old Palace Yard and had connections with his family in Clapham.\(^{109}\) His workshop also produced two family monuments for his next door neighbours in Old Palace Yard, the three sisters of Sir Samuel Newman of Fifehead Magdalene, Dorset (Fifehead Magdalene, c.1747–63) (ill. 37). The daughters shared a pew in

---

104 A collection of sculpture is bequeathed in George Cooke’s will. (PCC 1768, 272)


106 Admiral Molloy’s relationship with the Cooke family is attested to in his will (PCC 1760, 434). Cheere presented John Cooke to the Society of Arts and Manufacture in 1761 (RSA, Archive list).


108 RSA Archive, list of individuals recommended to the Society by Cheere. The Gascoyne monument can be attributed to Cheere on the basis of its closeness to the signed monument to Charles Apthorpe (d.1758) at Boston.

109 Nicholas Dobree, (here attributed. St Peter Port Guernsey), Nicholas Le Messurier (here attributed, St Peter Port, Guernsey), John Durell (Jersey, St Helier, 1754), Magdalene De Carteret (Jersey, St Helier), John Cheere, Statue of George 11 (Royal Square, St Helier) Admiral Hardy (Westminster Abbey c. 1743), monuments to Philip De Saumarez and Philip Durell (St Andrews, Plymouth, now destroyed), Philip De Saumarez (Westminster Abbey, 1754).

For the location of the Durell and Cheere residences in Old Palace Yard see, Ratebooks of St Margaret Parish, Westminster Public Library, E. 362-268 (1740-6), and E. 369-377 (1746-52).
the gallery of St Margaret's with Henry Cheere's wife. If every street in London was to have commissioned as many family monuments as were commissioned from the row of houses adjacent to Cheere's in a fifteen year period the country's parish churches would be been unable to find room for them.

It is probable that Cheere was a good enough businessman to talk his neighbours and friends into spending their money upon monumental sculpture. He appears to have had the same persuasive ways with his relations. It cannot, for instance, be a coincidence that Cheere's cousin, Sir John Chardin, employed Cheere to construct a major monument by Cheere to his father, the explorer Sir John Chardin in Westminster Abbey (erected 1746). The Musgraves of Westmorland and Somerset, who along with Cheere were beneficiaries of Chardin's will and were related to the sculptor, also employed Cheere to erect a family monument on the North Wall of St Margaret's Westminster (erected 1765). A monument by Cheere's workshop can even be seen in the Church of White Rothing in Essex to John Maryon, the Rector who was succeeded by Cheere's eldest son, the Rev. William Cheere.

Cheere's business techniques were only a refinement of those used by the other major workshops. All the metropolitan yards established loyal groups of clients. Rysbrack was the favoured sculptor of the Bolingbroke set and aspired to a polite familiarity with some of his most notable patrons such as Sir Edward Lyttleton. Vertue tells us that when Rysbrack came to England he gradually established himself by "gaining acquaintances, friends and business." It seems reasonable to suggest that Rysbrack became a workshop master, and his main assistants such as Hangershagen remained involved in production alone, less because


113 Rev. J. Maryon, PCC 1760, 434.

114 See chapter three, pp. 70-71.

115 Rysbrack's familiar relationship with Lyttleton is recorded in his letters concerning fireplaces at Teddesley Hall. Some letters are printed in Physick, 1969, pp. 101-2.

of a difference in manual ability than because of the former's mastery of the art of conducting himself in society.

Scheemakers was also capable of maintaining the loyalty of certain clients; he made seven monuments directly associated with the patronage of Dr Richard Mead after his initial employment upon the monument to Samuel Mead (now destroyed, erected at the Temple Church in 1734) which was commissioned and designed by the Doctor. He was, if we are to believe the jaundiced view of Vertue, no less of a businessman than Cheere. Vertue states that Scheemakers progressed in the profession not as the reward of skill or genius but because of:

".....Some subtiltys nature had given... (him)....in the management of his affairs, boldness, and also always underworking others price....."

This account of Scheemakers suggests that he was, like Cheere and Roubiliac, keen to break free from the constraints of being beholden to great aristocratic clients. The main cause of Vertue's antipathy to Scheemakers was that he was "impudent" and boasted that he need not be beholden to connoisseurs such as the Earl of Oxford.

Whilst Scheemakers clearly used his business acumen to the full, it is probable that he was more reliant upon his skill of producing a grand product at a competitive price than he was upon a network of social links. Scheemakers, like Rysbrack, did not approach the matter of courting clients by attempting to become a city figure. Rysbrack and Scheemakers competed for the reputation of the premier sculptor in the antique tradition. It was a competition which Rysbrack seems to have won. James West, for instance, noted the addresses of sculptors

---

117 Scheemakers' erection of the monument to Samuel Mead is recorded as in the Grub Street Journal of September 12th, 1734. A monument to Justice Reeve (announced as erected At Windsor in the London Evening Post 1739 August 9th) was also designed by Mead and made by Scheemakers. The monument to Topham Foot (unknown date signed by Scheemakers) which stands beside this also derives from the circle of Richard Topham and Dr Mead. Lord Aubrey Beauclerk (Scheemakers, Westminster Abbey, 1740) was of a family directly related to that of Reeve, Mead and Topham. The bust to Dr Harvey at Surgeon's Hall was commissioned by Mead. (London Evening Post July 5th 1739). The Scheemakers (Westminster Abbey 1741) monument was commissioned by a group including Mead. Dr Mead's (Westminster Abbey c. 1754) own monument was made by the sculptor.


120 See chapter three, pp. 155-166
whom he intended to call upon in an account book written in the early thirties when preparing for a journey to London:121

"Mr Scheemaker second to Rysbrack lives at the Horse Ferry Westminster.
"Mr Palmer stonecutter Bedford Row near Holborne."

Rysbrack countered Scheemakers' attempts to undercut him by actively fostering the reputation that he was a "sublime genius".122 Rysbrack's cultivation of the idea that he was a genius of his art who was superior to the "mechanick" trade and thus not interested in profit was intended to attract the most socially aloof sectors of the "country" aristocracy.

Unlike Cheere who publicly embraced the concept of profitable manufacture, Rysbrack actively distanced himself from it. Whilst Cheere and Roubiliac fulminated and conspired against the authority of the "connoisseur's" market, Rysbrack was the supreme example of an artist who capitalised on it. Rysbrack's oeuvre was dominated by prestigious aristocrats whose cosmopolitan tastes had been developed through European travel; figures such as the Lords Burlington, Bolingbroke, and Bessborough and the fourth Duke of Beaufort. He was the favoured sculptor of Lord Harley who, according to Vertue, found Scheemakers insolent and proud. His character appealed to Vertue who was shocked at anything less than polite deference to the tastes of the cosmopolitan aristocracy.123 His early association with Kent and Gibbs has an important role in explaining his reliance upon the connoisseur market.124 The fact that he was introduced into the English society by working for architects who prospered under the patronage of the grand cosmopolitan connoisseurs of the Tory and "country" interest helps to explain his continual appeal to this sector of the London market.

The elevated classicism which was a trademark of Rysbrack's workshop was geared towards a role of articulating the social ideals of the great country aristocracy who had city residences.125 His use of family imagery is characterised by a keen understanding of the ideals of estate life and the ideology of the "country" interest. By comparison Cheere and, to

121 J. West, papers vol. XXI, Accompts, British Museum, add. mss. 34, 747, p. 113.
122 See chapter three, pp.-eoo. 156 - 166
124 See chapter three pp. 171 - 172 .
125 See chapter three. 155 - 207 .
an even greater extent, his pupil Robert Taylor (1714-88), gravitated towards being the monumental sculptors of City professionals with country residences. Marcus Binney has characterised Taylor’s architectural style as that of the aspiring "middling sort"; a class for which Taylor, who like his master rose to a Knighthood through a City career, had a particular understanding. Taylor’s monumental oeuvre, dominated by modestly sized down-to-earth portraits of merchants and city professionals in contemporary garb, was in many ways opposite to that of Rysbrack. As those workshop masters who opposed the domination of connoisseurs over the market, or had aspirations within London society, tended toward frank realism, those without aspirations in London society tended to provide the country gentry and aristocracy with a ready supply of elevated classical allusion. Familiarity and the existence of common social aspirations appears to have eroded the desire of sculptors and clients alike to depict deceased individuals as part of an aloof patrician race. Some of Cheere’s most incisive monumental portraits in realistic contemporary garb are of those men, such as Samuel Tufnell (Pleshy, 1758), Admiral Charles Molloy (Shadoxhurst, 1760) or Samuel Newman (Fifehead Magdalene, c.1747-63), with whom he associated in his life at Westminster.

At the time when Cheere, a man of Huguenot extraction, was busy making contacts in London’s clubs and societies both Scheemakers and Rysbrack remained deeply entrenched in the world of the emigre artisan classes of London. Scheemakers actually retired to Antwerp leaving his business in the control of his son. He had no known contact with the clubs, charities or societies which were available to prosperous Londoners. Rysbrack’s social affiliations in London society were also rather limited. He was involved in the Foundling Hospital project with Hogarth and others, but there is little else recorded. In his early career his name appears frequently in association with William Kent who designed a number of monuments for him. He is recorded in two societies of which the architect was a member; the

---


Henry Lushington, Eastbourne, 1763, An East India Merchant imprisoned in the Black Hole of Calcutta.
Richard Emmott, Colne, 1761, West Indian Merchant.

128 Samuel Tufnell was directly related to the Bricklaying, masonry and speculative building firm, the Tufnells of St Margaret, Westminster. His cousin, John Jolliffe, produced election literature for the St Margaret election campaign of 1749 for which Cheere was a political agent.

Samuel Newman was Cheere’s next-door-neighbour in Deans Yard.

Admiral Molloy of Duke’s Street Westminster was directly related to Charles and George Cooke who appear to have been personal friends of the sculptor.
list of members of the Spalding Society and in Gawen Hamilton's painting of a Society of Virtuosi (1733) where he appears in the company of Gibbs, Kent and Vertue.\textsuperscript{129}

Rather than integrating into the metropolitan environment Rysbrack appears to have run a Continental workshop upon English soil. The great majority of his known assistants, castmakers, and suppliers appear to have been of French or Dutch stock.\textsuperscript{130} He was far more reliant upon men of Dutch and French extraction than any of his competitors. Scheemakers and Roubiliac appear to have been at least partly dependant upon English assistants and Cheere is known to have relied largely upon men of English extraction such as Richard Hayward (1728-1800) and William Collins (1721-93).\textsuperscript{131} Rysbrack's will records that he left money to a whole group of Continental trade connections: Casper Hangershagen, his assistant; Peter Vandervort, a carpenter working in London; John Pierre Junior, a Parisian sculptor; and representatives of the Vannina family whom he contracted as castmakers.\textsuperscript{132}

Rysbrack's executors were both connected with the stone and marble trade. The first, John Arnold Wallinger, was undoubtedly the master of the importation firm who had supplied him with marble. This firm appears to have operated from Millbank in Westminster and was extremely successful.\textsuperscript{133} John Arnold Wallinger inherited the business from his relation, John Wallinger, who appears to have started the enterprise in partnership with William Fletcher of Westminster. John Wallinger, like Rysbrack, appears to have been of Low Country extraction

\textsuperscript{129} Owen & Woodward, p. 28.


\textsuperscript{130} Rysbrack's three known foremen were Clausen, Van Der Hagen (Vertue, Notebooks III, pp. 132, 152, IV, p. 50.) and, in the later part of his career, Hangershagen, who was left a bequest in his will (PCC 1770, 28).

\textsuperscript{131} Roubiliac is the only man of Continental origins which I know to have been employed by Cheere. A typical cross section of workers in the workshops of Henry and John Cheere which appears listed in the London Evening Post of December 12th 1751 includes no men of French or Flemish name. Henry appears to have recruited mainly by taking on apprentices from local artisan families (M.I. Webb, Henry Cheere, Henry Scheemakers and the Apprenticeship Lists, Burlington Magazine, April, 1957, pp. 115-120.) Scheemakers employed men of English derivation such as John Flaxman of York (1726-95), (Castmaker) as well and those of Flemish stock such as Joseph Nollekens.

\textsuperscript{132} M. Rysbrack, PCC 1770, 28.

The Vannina family are discussed in Gunnis, p. 408.

\textsuperscript{133} References to John Arnold Wallinger's profession are made in his will (PCC 1792, 539). He appears to have had his main premises very near to that of Peter Scheemakers at Abbington Buildings, Westminster. (The Complete Guide to all persons who have any Trade or Concern with the City of London and Parts Adjacent, London, 1758.)
and many of those mentioned in his will appear to be Dutch or Dutch Portuguese. Rysbrack’s second executor was a certain James Deveau whose relation, John Deveau (fl. 1821-36), is mentioned by Rupert Gunnis as an independent workshop master of the early nineteenth century. James Deveau’s own will shows he was either a sculptor or a practitioner of a trade directly related to it and maintained strong connections with Antwerp and the sculpture trade in France. His own executor was Joseph Wilton who was then employing Deveau’s nephew, Baptista Deveau, as an assistant.

There was an essential difference between the way in which Scheemakers and Rysbrack used the metropolis and its use by Cheere and Roubiliac. Scheemakers and Rysbrack appeared to have used the city as a lucrative and convenient workplace; an environment which offered the best supply of imported marbles and a forum in which to gain commissions from those who lived there for a part of the year. Cheere and Roubiliac gained much the same benefits from trading in London but appear to have had a far more active interest in the metropolis as a place where ideas were formed. Roubiliac’s use of London in this way, his contacts with figures such as David Garrick, John Rich, John Lockman and Jonathan Tyers will be elaborated in David Bindman’s forthcoming analysis of his career. His familiarity with the London stage had, as we shall see in chapter six, a particularly profound effect upon his attitude to monumental design. Cheere, who shared associations with the Slaughter’s Coffee House circle and St Martin’s Lane group, also took a vital interest in London’s intellectual life. Cheere was an active member of the charities of St Luke’s Infirmary for the Insane, Christ’s Hospital, and the Westminster and Middlesex Hospitals. He also left money to Matthew Duane (1707-85), the coin collector and antiquarian, who helped establish the British Museum.

134 J. Wallinger 1767, 238. It is interesting to note that Wallinger’s executor was Balthazar Burman. He was probably the son of Balthazar Burman (fl.1678-1688) or Thomas Burman (1618-1674, master of John Bushnell) sculptors of Low-Country origin of importance for bringing a Bernini influence into English sculpture.

135 Gunnis, 1953, p. 129.

136 J. Deveau 1771, 337. Deveau left money to a relation, Anthony Deveau, who, he states, was working with “Mr De Frenieux, statuary to his Royal Highness the Duke of Orleans.” This suggests important but unexplored connections between Rysbrack and one of the central figures of French sculpture.

137 Cheere’s will shows that he left bequests to Westminster and Middlesex Hospitals of which he was a Governor. He was elected Governor of Christ’s Hospital in 1747 to administer the bequests of his wife’s cousin Daniel Tainturier (PCC 1745, 63), a Huguenot counsellor at the Inner Temple. His involvement in the founding group of governors of St Luke’s Asylum is recorded in the General Advertiser, 8th April 1752.

Rysbrack and Scheemakers were Catholic whilst Cheere and Roubiliac were Protestant, which may explain their differing degrees of integration into London society. Catholicism was not necessarily a factor prohibiting involvement in the intellectual life of London, as the career of Matthew Duane, a Catholic legal conveyancer as well as one of London's most notable antiquarian scholars, shows. It might be said, however, that it was difficult for a Catholic with strong continental links to develop the type of xenophobic nationalism which was partially responsible for Cheere's strong views upon the independence of the profession and his contempt for the Continental patronage system.

Cheere's personal religious convictions and staunch protestantism had a vital role in dictating the type of imagery used in his funeral monuments. The vigorous anti-Catholicism detectable in Cheere's speech is symptomatic of the type of piety which was encouraged at St Margaret's at the time of his involvement in the vestry. The editor of Dr. Thomas Wilson's diaries (some of which were written when Dr Wilson was Cheere's rector at St Margaret's) has shown that Cheere was a personal friend of the Wilson family. Dr. Wilson was a Low Church Whig who through his father, the Bishop of Sodor and Man and a celebrated author of tracts upon family piety, had developed strong sympathies with early Methodism and Congregationalism. The sculptor's links with compassionate views upon family religion may explain his use of tender family groupings such as those which appear in the monument to Elizabeth Drake at Amersham (erected c.1757).

Cheere originated from a Huguenot mercantile family who lived at Clapham, a parish which came to be associated with the early Evangelical movement. He certainly knew and worked for the Dobrée family of Clapham who were involved in the earliest movements to spread Congregationalism in the Parish of Clapham. This parish community became identified with the "Clapham set", a notable group of the associates of the evangelical and philanthropic

---


140 ibid., pp. 1-29. The career of Bishop Wilson of Sodor and Mann is summarised in DNB, vol. LXII, pp. 139-42. He wrote many works to encourage private family devotion such as *Sacra Priviva* (published posthumously, London 1781) and *The Practical Christian*, London, 1713.

141 There is a review of the Drake monument in chapter six, pp. 000.

142 The Clapham set are discussed in the DNB biographies of Henry Venn (vol. LVII, pp. 207-208) and several members of the Thornton family (vol. LVI, pp.301-303). The Evangelical Banker, Robert Thornton, who was a contemporary of Cheere's father, was the pater familias of a family which had a significant role in the SPG and the abolition of slavery.
Thornton family. The Dobrée family of Clapham, who were closely involved with the Thornton family, originated in Guernsey as Huguenot refugees. Cheere's Congregationalist connections caused him to send his eldest son William to a Congregationalist Academy at Hoxton for training. As a stalwart member of the reformed Westminster bench and a friend of Saunders Welch, the London Judge most responsible for reform of the city's prostitutes, he was associated with a part of society which was genuinely concerned with the moral welfare of the city and nation. One of the principal movers in a group of Westminster gentlemen who attempted to have the works of Bolingbroke prohibited, he stood out publicly as a man of staunch Low Church morality and rigorous Whig opinions.

How Cheere's St Margaret's background affected his attitude to monumental design can be gleaned from his involvement with an important but little known work on Church furnishing written by Dr. Thomas Wilson. The book was written in response to a notorious legal case between the Parish of St Margaret's and the Dean and Chapter of Westminster Abbey concerning faculty permission for a Window in the East End of St Margaret's. Cheere himself had organised the transportation of the window and had his workmen instal it in the church. The Dean and Chapter had insisted upon the removal of the window on the grounds of iconoclasm. Wilson launched into an attack upon the pagan imagery of Roubiliac's monuments to Colonel Fleming (erected 1756) and General Wade (erected 1750) recently installed in Westminster Abbey with the permission of the Dean and Chapter. Dr Wilson had recently been made a member of the Society of Arts and Manufacture upon Cheere's personal recommendation which places his comments in the context of a "puff" for the Society. His

---

143 Cheere signed the accounts of St Luke's Asylum for the insane along with Peter Dobrée on February 5th 1752 (Governors' Account Books St Luke's Hospital). Peter Dobrée published a book (Prayers, Thanksgivings and Meditations to assist the devout Christian in Preparation for, and attendance at, the Lord's Supper, London, 1746) which was intended to give advice to the common people of Clapham on the sacraments, major treatise of early Congregationalism dedicated to the philanthropist Robert Thornton.

144 Matthew De Saumarez's receipt for Cheere's Philip De Saumarez monument was of May 31st 1751 and was "drawn of Mr William Dobrée" (Saumarez Manor Archive) who was churchwarden of Holy Trinity, Clapham.

145 J. Venn, Alumni Cantabrigienses, Cambridge, 1922, vol. 1, p. 328. It should also be noted that John Cheere (PCC 1787, 314) left a substantial bequest to the Independent Meeting House at Great Wild Street.

146 Cheere's recommendation of Justice John Fielding and Saunders Welch to the Society of Arts and Manufactures is recorded in the RSA Library list of those recommended by the sculptor.

147 Reads Weekly Journal, November 10th 1754.

148 Wilson, 1761.

149 Westminster Public Library, Minutes for the Committee for conducting the works in St Margaret Church, E. 2619. On the 24th of July 1758 Cheere is thanked by the committee for his work on transporting and installing the window.
comments on the potential effect upon sculpture of the Society and increased patronage of such church furnishings as monuments are, in fact, transcribed from Cheere's speech to the Society.150 The whole vestry including Henry Cheere met in 1760 to congratulate Dr Thomas Wilson and assist him in the distribution of the book.151

Wilson quoted his attack on Roubiliac's heathen imagery from the Connoisseur of 1755 (no 73); an important article upon church monuments which speaks in scathing terms of the pagan imagery of Roubiliac's monument to the Duchess of Montagu. The article was probably written by the editor and principal contributor to the Magazine, Bonnell Thornton; a man of moralistic Low Church opinions who had also been recommended to the Society of Arts and Manufacture by Cheere.152 Whilst it would be over interpreting the evidence to suggest that Cheere orchestrated the publication of these views, he can be associated with the stirring of discontent against the monuments of his London competitors and specifically his former employee, Roubiliac. In all the monuments designed by Cheere there are none of the specifically pagan allegories employed by the other workshops. Like Samuel Johnson, who admired the form and language of Roman epitaphs and yet objected to the use of phrases which suggested overtly pagan values, Cheere was willing to use classical dress and architecture in his monuments but avoided all direct reference to such subjects as Fame and Triumph.153 Thus he stood out significantly from a London trade which was much preoccupied with the re-evaluation of the Roman epigraphic tradition.

Cheere's association with the Connoisseur article was typical of what was known contemporarily as a "puff". David Bindman has pointed out the importance of the "puff" in his work upon the autonomy of the sculpture trade.154 As the author of The Man of Manners (published in 1737) asserts the use of press "puff" or "paid for paragraphs" was to be considered somewhat of a development of modern life and a new vice of London society.155 Whilst it is certain that the power of the press publicity was of major consequence to the

150 Wilson, op. cit., p. 140.

151 Westminster Public Library, Vestry Minutes, E.2421, 8th May, 1761. "The vestry resolves that unanimous thanks be and are hereby given to the Rev. Thomas Wilson for his learned and excellent treatise on Ornaments in Churches".

152 RSA Archive, list of those recommended to the Society by Henry Cheere. The sculptor's name also appears with that of Thornton in the Governors' Minutes of St Luke's Asylum for the Insane.


154 Observations on "puffing" will appear in David Bindman's forthcoming monograph on Roubiliac.

success of the metropolitan trade, it is difficult to evaluate the degree to which the press was actively exploited. The coverage of monumental sculpture in the London press presents the historian with a difficult group of sources to evaluate. It is often not possible to distinguish with any certainty a favourable review or a promotion of the interests of the patron and his family from a "puff" orchestrated by the sculptor.

An example of the problems of interpreting such sources can be drawn from a letter sent to the *London Evening Post* on January 13th 1757 concerning Rysbrack's lost monument to Governor Grenville for the Court Room of the Island of Barbados.

"Sir.

From the natural love I bear to the art of sculpture, I am frequently visiting the most renowned statuaries amongst us: but of all the performances I have seen in this way, none has afforded me the satisfaction, for its grace and just proportion as the one I lately saw at MR RYSBRACK'S of MR GRENVILLE late Governor of Barbados whose character is inscribed upon the pedestal: Upon reading it my mind was filled with the most exalted idea of the Governor's merit and I beheld with infinite delight and most sincere approbation the just sense which the legislature of that Island appears to have entertained of Mr Grenville's unequalled Administration.....(etc)"

The letter was clearly a "puff" for "MR GRENVILLE", his family and supporters, which is thinly disguised as an earnest appreciation of sculpture. The *London Evening Post* was a "patriot" opposition paper and the Grenville family generally aligned themselves with the independent "patriot" cause. There is, indeed, evidence that the monument was planned by the Governor himself in order to help to ensure the precedence of his allies in Barbadian politics after he had left the Island.156

Rysbrack's name was also printed in block capitals and his particular style of work - "its grace and just proportion" - was clearly endorsed. It may be noticed that the statue, which was intended for the Court Room in Barbados, had been set up in the workshop along with its pedestal and inscription. Instead of packing the monument up for transportation in its many component parts, it was to some degree assembled in order to attract publicity to client and

156 *A Short History of Barbados*, London, 1768, (BL. 278. c.7) pp. 70-73.
sculptor alike. Rysbrack, therefore, appears to have had some role in the publication of this letter and yet it is not at all clear whether he orchestrated it.

A concentration upon the inscription, which is such a regular feature of monumental "puffs", seems to indicate that many were orchestrated not by the sculptor but by the families of the deceased seeking to boost their corporate reputation. Like the short obituaries published in the news gobbet sections of the London press, the inscriptions of finished monuments appear to have been sent to the paper by the family of the deceased or their friends. In the last decade of the Walpole administration when factional political divisions were most pronounced, the press seldom reported on monuments of those who did not share their political persuasion. The Tory press consistently published in full the longest and most overtly political inscriptions from the monuments to those who died in opposition to Walpole or whose relatives were leaders of the opposition. It was much to the benefit of the main sculpture workshops to be caught up in these political disputes. In the third chapter we shall be looking at the problem of how Rysbrack's professional reputation and the characteristics of his works were promoted in the politically partisan London press. I shall explore the degree to which a sculptor's style could be defined by his presentation in the press and how his works could take on shades of political meaning by the continual mixing up of party propaganda with the description of monumental sculpture.

In the introduction we looked at some of the difficulties in establishing who was in control of the appearance and function of individual monuments such as those made to commemorate Philip De Saumarez and Elizabeth Isham. It was suggested that few categorical answers could be provided even to the problems of evaluating individual monuments. The issues of how, and to what degree, the metropolitan workshops controlled the London trade are even more thorny; these issues are, nevertheless, crucial to the comprehension of the imagery of any particular monument. It is apparent that, amongst many other contributory factors, the matter of the sculptors' commercial survival within a competitive market had a strong effect upon the form and imagery of monuments. Many of the characteristic styles and approaches to the design seen in monumental sculpture - such as Rysbrack's elevated classicism, or Roubiliac's theatricality - have some of their roots in the attempts of workshop masters to monopolise

---

For example:

The London Evening Post January 16th 1736. Inscription to Lord Barrington (An outright attack on Walpole's administration which impeached the deceased).

Grub Street Journal (Tory) January 29th 1731. Inscription for Rysbrack's monument to Sir Edward Seymour (A depiction of the deceased as a hero of Queen Anne Toryism).

London Evening Post December 21st 1731. Inscription to Scheemaker's Monument to Montague Garrard Drake (A depiction of the deceased as the upholder of "Old English Hospitality", which is Tory nostalgic jargon).
certain sectors of the London market.
Chapter II.

INHERITANCE, DONATION AND TRIBUTE.

In a recent paper concerning the competition for the commission of the Shelburne monument (Scheemakers, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, c.1753) Malcolm Baker has demonstrated that all three of the competing sculptors knew certain details of the family history; from simple facts such as the age of family members at their deaths to the complex issues such as establishing the relative importance of family members to the genesis of a noteworthy dynasty.1 Malcolm Baker has plausibly suggested, on the evidence of all three sculptors having included the same basic group and order of figures, that the patrons had provided a common brief of family history to the competitors before they embarked upon their designs. The sculptors, Roubiliac, Taylor and Scheemakers, were to be appraised on the way they handled this brief.

While the Shelburne monument, an exceptionally large and complex work, required a more comprehensive brief than most, it involved the three sculptors in a process of consultation with which they were familiar. A part of the profession of the master of a monumental sculptor’s yard was to provide a composition suitable for the circumstances of the particular family and one which expressed the relationship of the patron or donor to the deceased. A nephew seeking a monument to a beneficent uncle who had left him an estate did not require the same type of monument as a bereaved husband.

In this sense the monumental sculpture profession was similar to others in the funerary trade which were required to provide symbols suitable for particular circumstances. The herald painter, as Julian Litten has shown, was required to know a number of basic details about the deceased and his family circumstances before he started work upon an achievement.2 Set groups of colours and designs were established in order to differentiate the bachelor from the spinster or to distinguish whether the deceased was, for instance, a married man survived by his wife or had died a widower. Whilst the language of symbols required of a monumental sculptor was far more complex and subject to a greater variation of cost, the form and pathos

---

of a family monument was similarly dictated by ambient cultural preconceptions of what was appropriate for the particular circumstances of a commission.

The vocabulary and syntax of language of tribute developed and established in the 1720s and 30s.

Many monuments functioned as formal and permanent symbols of tribute. The making of a monumental tribute was largely dependant upon the use of a set of visual conventions which allowed the donor's respect for his deceased relative to be communicated in a manner which was comprehensible to his peers. The metropolitan workshops developed a formal "language" with a vocabulary of conventional poses and types of composition which were used to express equally formal social courtesies. Important variations from this formalised "language", such as the narrative compositions of Cheere's monument to the nineteenth Earl of Kildare (Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin, 1743-6) (ill. 35) or Roubiliac's Nightingale monument (Westminster Abbey, 1757-1761) (ill. 38), can be seen as attempts to break away from the formality and hierarchism inherent in its means of expression.

As this section largely concerns the means by which the figurative sculpture of monuments could be read, or compositions and poses decoded as symbols, I shall commence with some basic analysis of the types of visual language exploited by sculptors. An initiation into this difficult but essential issue may be best achieved by a comparative case study using monuments of the same date, and certain common areas of meaning, which divest their meaning to the viewer in very different ways. I have chosen the monuments of Lord Robert Raymond (Henry Cheere, Abbots Langley, Hertfordshire, 1733-5) (ill. 39) and the first Earl Foley (Michael Rysbrack, Great Witley, Worcestershire, c. 1733-9) (ill. 10) both of which used an element of narrative to communicate the idea of a family's rise to the peerage. By the term "narrative" I mean the construction of a fiction which showed a specific moment in time in which figures interact in a way which established their mutual involvement in a particular occurrence. In both cases there were also elements of what I shall term "semi-narrative"; a form of visual language in which certain poses and compositions with meanings established by precedent were used to communicate the underlying narrative of the set of family circumstances which had originally led to the monument being donated.

The Foley monument presents a number of the typical problems which arise when attempting to establish which family member was the controlling interest in the production of a
monument. It was certainly made under the patronage of the second Earl who claimed responsibility for the erection of the monument in a recorded conversation with William Shenstone. Pococke, writing in 1756, suggested that the monument was "erected by the dowager" who died in January 1736. However this may have been just a cursory impression. It is certainly a less reliable source than the record of an actual conversation in Shenstone's letters. A note concerning the construction of one of the figures in the *London Evening Post* of November 18th 1738 shows that the monument was in construction nearly three years after Lady Foley's death. Although it is difficult to measure the second Earl's degree of involvement in the monument's construction, it is certain that its imagery reflected the issues of inheritance which had caused him to come into the peerage.

The second Earl was the last of the surviving male heirs to the title and estate; he inherited by default upon the premature decease of his elder brothers. Upon his inheritance he was a bachelor and, for reasons unknown, he remained so after taking the title. Thus he presided over the end of the direct male line which stemmed from the prosperous iron merchant, Thomas Foley. With no close male heir to grant a special remainder, the peerage gained by his father was doomed to pass into extinction. The monument recorded the rise of the family to the Peerage, through the promotion of the central figure, the first Earl Foley. It was, however, paid for by an inheritor who made no attempt to perpetuate the title and probably anticipated at the time of its erection that he would end the direct male line.

The composition may be described as having originated as a gesture of respect for the system of primogeniture. A rejected preparatory drawing (ill. 40) shows a central narrative of the youngest heir, Richard, formally offering his brother, Strode Talbot, the heraldic crown. The

---

3 This conversation is recorded in a letter from William Shenstone to Robert Dodsley of November 20th 1762 is quoted on p. 205


Lady Foley's will (PCC 1736, 191) makes no mention of the monument.

5 *London Evening Post* November 18th 1738. "Mr Rysbrack has nigh finished a figure of the right Hon. the Earl Foley's brother, a youth who died aged 13, which is to be erected at the burial place of the family at Witney in Yorkshire. It is esteemed by all judges a masterpiece of the kind."


7 first Earl Foley, PCC 1733, 89. second Earl Foley, PCC 1766, 13.
boy heir looks down upon the image of his father for approval. A second drawing (ill. 41) showed the image of Strode Talbot, whose death led directly to the inheritance of the second Earl, reclining at the centre of the composition. This accorded central importance to the figure of the individual whose death led directly to the inheritance of the second Earl. Strode’s father and mother are ranged above and his image and his brother once more appeals upon his behalf. Both rejected drawings made the dead male heirs, to whom the second Earl owed his title, the focus of the composition.

It was, as we shall see, customary in this period that upon the inheritance of a title or estate a gesture of respect and gratitude should be made for, or on behalf of, the fortunate inheritor. A particular obligation was felt by those who, like the second Earl Foley, inherited by default at a stage of their life, or circumstances, in which they could not anticipate perpetuating their dynasty. As we shall see, Charles Earl Maynard, who erected a similarly massive family monument at Little Easton (erected 1746) (ill. 11), was another notable example of this type of bachelor inheritor; a Peer with vast estates who inherited after the premature deaths of his brothers and terminated his family. The Maynard monument which was erected immediately after Charles inherited his brother’s estate was intended, in the words of the inscription, to express the donor’s "gratitude" to his relatives.

The design eventually chosen for the Foley monument had far fewer passages of narrative than the proposed compositions seen in the drawings. The central composition of husband and wife, she with a young child dying in her arms and he responding to this calamity, remained the only narrative element in the composition. The executed monument placed the figures in a simple hierarchical order; each family member was accredited importance in accordance with their age at the time of death. The first Earl occupied the centre of the composition in a reclining position with his spouse attendant upon the same sarcophagus; the son who lived to the eldest age was presented to the right with his sister to the left and above them are the two boys who died young. The youngest boy was even differentiated as such by bearing the toga of a juvenile whilst the boys who died at an older age wear the toga virilis. The first Earl was placed upon a sarcophagus in a reclining posture in order to symbolise his ultimate seniority. The reclining pose was used by the London sculptors as a visual symbol for the principal character or main object of a monument. In every composition of the period which had a reclining figure within a sculptural group (with the exception of Cheere’s Thomas monument

---

8 The order of inheritance of the Earls Maynard is discussed in GEC, Peerages, vol. VIII, pp. 559-602. The monument is discussed on pp. 127-131.

9 This narrative episode is discussed on pp. 203-204.
at Hampton c.1733) an account of the life of the reclining figure was the first element of the inscription upon the central tablet.° The sense of hierarchal order within the Foley monument permeates both inscription and image. The central inscription tablet did little more than list the titles and offices of the first Earl whose image was above with the names of the children laid out in inscription tablets to left and right. The donor’s generosity could be evaluated by a factor no more complex than that each deceased character was accorded a life-size image. Figures were placed in such a way as to accord each figure due respect. The system of presentation reflected the strict codes of mourning in the period which have been described by Randolph Trumbach; rules of mourning in which each deceased family member was granted a proscribed period of mourning which varied in accordance with his or her relationship to the mourner. 11

The use of a group of life-size statues was the most expensive type of monument which could be used in such circumstances. Other contemporary monuments which recorded the decease of whole family lines resorted to selecting a representative member of the family and listing others in the inscription. The Maynard monument, erected in similar circumstances, is a slightly less lavish equivalent. It included a mixture of busts and relief busts and a chosen life-size statue of the figure who was considered most important to family history. The Foley monument made sure that each coffin in the vault had some sort of memorial; an earlier monument already erected in the Great Witley chapel recorded the names of all the first generations of Foleys in the vault below. 12 The second Earl, and possibly his mother, simply created a life-size image equivalent to every remaining coffin. From the afore mentioned letter of William Shenstone we know that the second Earl was inclined to boast that the monument

10 Monuments with groups of figures and a reclining figure at the centre which mention the name of the reclining figure first in the inscription:

The Foley family, 1733-8, Rysbrack, Great Witley (Worcestershire).
The Raymond family, 1733-35, Cheere, Abbots Langley (Hertfordshire).
The Duke of Buckingham and family, 1720-23, Scheemakers and others, Westminster Abbey.
Roger Owen, 1744, Cheere, Condover (Shropshire).
Lord Newhaven, 1732-35, Cheere, Drayton Beauchamp (Buckinghamshire).
Robert Jennens, 1725, anon, Acton (Hertfordshire).
Christopher Powell, 1742, Scheemakers, Boughton Monchelsea (Buckinghamshire).
Elizabeth Hastings, 1755, Scheemakers, Ledsham (Yorkshire).
Jane Pusey, 1743-53, Scheemakers, Pusey Berkshire.
Lord Shelburne and family, 1753, Scheemakers, High Wycombe (Buckinghamshire).


had cost over two thousand pounds; an indication that the patron wished his tribute to impress by its scale and munificence.

The narrative concerning the passage of the peerage crown which was present in a number of preparatory drawings for the Foley monument, had, as Malcolm Baker points out, disappeared behind a more abstract and disjointed design. A composition, based upon a highly schematised inter-play of figures, had been replaced by a system of tribute. The inter-relation of the figures was fractured in order that each component could symbolise the proprietary gesture of respect due to them from the donor. Such a formal tribute made certain rudimentary facts plain such as the age and relative seniority of the deceased and their blood relationship to one another. Unlike the two preparatory drawings, it did not use narrative devices within the hierarchical ordering of the figures in an attempt to explain the circumstances in which the monument had initially been erected. The interpretation of the basic facts supplied in the final inscription and the decoding of the imagery was dependent upon the spectator’s awareness that he is observing a certain type of tribute. Cultural assumptions concerning the donor’s motivations in the making of a tribute - in this case at a crucial juncture in family history the donor wished to show his formal respect to his deceased family and heirs - enabled the monument’s imagery to be decoded.

The Raymond monument, which was completed by Cheere in October 1735 at a cost of a thousand pounds, communicated its meaning in much the same way as the preparatory drawings for the Foley monument. It was a heavily schematised composition with a central narrative theme concerning the handing on of a peerage crown. As in the rejected drawings for the Foley monument, attempts had been made to link the actions of the main characters. The inter-relation of figures was rendered similarly disjointed by the presentation of its characters in certain formulaic postures from which they gesture in a rhetorical manner. An explanation of the composition is best accomplished by recording the way in which documents concerning the composition have been compiled.

In early November 1757, Beversham Filmer, the executor of the second Earl Raymond, signed a contract with Peter Scheemakers for a monument (ill. 42) requested in the will of the Earl who had died a year earlier. The composition he commissioned was to stand in the chancel of St Lawrence, Abbots Langley opposite to that erected in memory of the first Earl some

---

13 The erection and total cost of the monument was announced in the *London Evening Post* of October 25th 1735.

14 Second Earl Raymond PCC 1756, 280.
twenty two years before. It would appear from the instructions in the will of the second Earl, which we shall explore in chapter five, that a monument was required to symbolise the end of the dynasty begun by his father. The second Earl was married but childless and ended the male line which had flourished auspiciously in the elevation of his father to the peerage. The monument was to stand opposite his father's, an allegory upon the rise of the family to the peerage, in order to signal formally the end of the family line which had begun with such promise.

To create the appropriate type of composition Scheemakers needed to understand the allegorical meaning of the earlier monument. Despite being a close relative of the Raymonds, the patron, Beversham Filmer, may not have understood the allegory of a monument; this may be explained by the fact that it had been made some twenty years before without Beversham's involvement. Scheemakers, therefore, attached a large measured sketch of the earlier monument with long explanation of the latter's meaning written in his own hand to his bill and contractual drawing of the second Earl's monument. Whence the sculptor obtained his information is, unfortunately, not known. Scheemakers explained that the monument had been made:

......in the manner of an historical picture to tell their story. The point of time calculated of my Lords accepting the peerage...The great charta (ie Magna Carta) is open to intimate the Determination in the execution of that office. After having duly considered the right of the crown represented in the law books which last regard seems to have been the deliberation as to the rights of the people, represented by the Magna Charta open in his hand. And as a reward for his integrity the cherub at his left hand presents to him the Baron's crown upon which offer he is supposed to deliberate and turning his head to the right, where my lady presents to him in the profile of the youth's face on the medal upon her lap, a representation of their offspring. He then, taken into consideration of the whole, determines to accept the honour only for the sake

15 The original position of the monuments (which are now at the back of the church) is recorded in R. Wilkinson, An Octoceanary Guide to the Church of St Lawrence the Martyr Abbots Langley, London, 1952, p. 7.

16 See p. 271


18 Maidstone Record Office, Filmer Papers, U120 F. 19.
of transmitting it to his posterity. The resolution being formed he is beginning
to turn to the cherub to declare it.

The first line of this description is of particular interest. By describing the monument as
designed "in the manner of an historical painting to tell their story", Scheemakers was
acknowledging that the monument was essentially communicating in the manner of another
narrative genre; a painted genre separate from that which he was accustomed as a sculptor.
Indeed, The monument had not been designed by a sculptor but by an architect, the controller
of the Board of Works at the time, Westby Gill.\(^9\) This type of narrative composition was not
on any occasion employed by Scheemakers in a monument of his own design. Thus it struck
him as different from the usual production of his trade. The success, or otherwise, of using
this type of narrative as a means of communicating complex ideas can be measured by the fact
that even a family member required some explanation of what the composition meant. The
difficulties with interpreting this monument may explain why the more complex narrative
elements concerning the handing on of titles in the Foley monument were not used.
Furthermore it may explain why the narrative form was used in so few monuments concerning
dynastic matters and was reserved for use in military scenes such as the Wolfe monument
(Wilton, Westminster Abbey, designed 1760) and domestic dramas such as Roubiliac's
monument to Joseph and Elizabeth Nightingale (Westminster Abbey, 1757-61) (ill. 38).

The Raymond monument was a fanciful narrative. In this sense it resembled the composition
seen in the drawings for the Foley monument where a deceased heir intercedes to hand the
title to his brother. In this circumstance, however, a complete fiction has been constructed
which created a totally inaccurate idea of family history in order to communicate the abstract
idea of the deceased's virtuous lack of ambition. Unlike the Foley monument, that of the
Raymond family could not be used as a source of accurate genealogical information about the
family such as the age and relationship of those deposited in the vault. The narrative itself was
contrived to flatter Robert Raymond's route to social elevation as a lawyer which, as I shall
explain in chapter five, was tarnished by association with Robert Walpole's corrupt patronage
system.\(^20\) In order to create this vindicatory narrative Raymond's executor Edward Northey,
the deceased's brother-in-law who had also risen in the Walpolian legal system, created a total
fiction of family history. Northey's sister, who is shown appealing on behalf of her teenage
son, actually died in 1722. She never saw her husband receive his Peerage nor did she ever
know her son, for she died shortly after his birth. The second Earl, in fact, refers to her in his


\(^20\) See pp. 263.
will as his "father's wife". This deviation from the true history of the family, from such basic facts as the order and age of deaths was wholly untypical of monuments of the period.

The Raymond monument was an adaptation of that erected in memory of the Duke of Buckingham in Westminster Abbey, a design which Scheemakers in conjunction with Plumier and Delveaux had been responsible for inventing. This composition was popular in the Cheere workshop of the early thirties; two re-workings of the design, the monument to Viscount Newhaven (began March 1732, erected 1735) and that to Susannah Thomas (c.1733) (ill. 43), were in production at the time. The basic composition of the Buckingham monument, a reclining husband with a seated spouse, had been altered, and elements such as the cherub and relief portrait of the heir added, in order to create the impression of a specific moment. This composition was noted, as we shall see shortly, for its ability to communicate clearly the desirable order in a family; an order which defined the seated female figure as secondary to the male. The Raymond monument combined narrative with "semi-narrative" means of communication. It constructed a narrative around a formulaic set of postures which focused attention upon the reclining Earl and his moment of choosing to accept the title. His wife, a seated figure placed away from the centre of the composition, assumed the role of secondary figure. This was consistent with her being depicted as a soft-hearted woman whose plea on behalf of her son effects but does not dictate the decision of her husband which was intended to be the focus of the composition.

Like the Foley monument, where the central narrative concerned the mother emotionally covering her baby and her husband making a gesture of stoic acceptance, the hierarchical language of the monument reinforced certain rigid ideas of the man's and woman's role within the family. The seated figure of Lady Raymond gestures to her heart and represented the influence of emotions upon a decision made by her husband. Her husband, dressed in his legal regalia, placed his supporting arm on constitutional documents and made the decision of a public figure of integrity. The clear ordering of the figures within the composition reinforced the expression of desirable order in marital relations which were recommended in such

---

21 The monument to Viscount Newhaven is signed by William Woodman and has been described by Esdaile as "one of the most remarkable works produced by any Englishmen at any time" (K.A. Esdaile, Records of Buckinghamshire, vol. XV, Centenary Number 1947, p. 36) It is described as being made in Henry Cheere's studio in the London Evening Post of March 7th, 1732. A faculty for the erection of the monument was drawn out by Gertrude Tolhurst on the 12th of July 1736 (Buckinghamshire Record Office 9/61) four years after the death of W. Woodman the elder who is supposed to have made the monument. I would suggest that the monument was made by Cheere and erected by William Woodman the Younger who was, perhaps, subcontracted to him at this date. This attribution along with that of the magnificent Thomas monument at Hampton, the authorship of which is discussed below, gives a new perspective upon the importance of Cheere's work in the early 30s.

22 See an explanation of this device on p. 204.
contemporary sources as Daniel Defoe's *The Complete English Gentleman* (written 1728) and the Earl of Warrington's *Considerations upon the Institution of Marriage* (published 1737). These works argued that the woman should care for the children and represent the family's private life, whilst the man should represent the family's public business and make the rational decisions which determined its prosperity. The development of a formal hierarchical "language" in monumental sculpture and the clear expression of what was perceived as correct order in family life were indissolubly linked. It is, as we shall see in chapter six, not coincidental that the first main breaks with the "semi-narrative" language of sculpture in the 1740s and 50s, such as the narrative Kildare monument, are also breaks with these formal ideas concerning the kinds of behaviour considered appropriate for the sexes.

The central problem with the Raymond and Foley monuments was that the ideas concerning the passage of titles which they strove to communicate were exceedingly complex. It was probably the complexity of ideas demanded by the patron which caused Westby Gill to use, and Rysbrack to contemplate using, a narrative form of composition. In simpler situations such as a widow's commission for a monument to her husband - commissions which was the stock trade of most major metropolitan yards - certain visual conventions could begin to establish consistent meaning. A good example of the evolution of meaning in a visual convention was that of signifying the living donor of a monument by placing their figure above, or looking down upon, the deceased relative who was the object of the monument. This device, as Nigel Llewellyn points out in his analysis of the Teynham monument, can be seen in monuments of a century before; it developed in a most rationally consecutive way into the early eighteenth century, becoming by degrees more strongly articulated.

British sculptors of the seventeenth century used a variety of devices to express which of two life-size figures seen in a composition was the living donor of the monument. In certain cases this was well articulated by showing a widow, as in the case of Evesham, in prayer above the image of her dead husband. In other monuments this was less obviously symbolised by the living figure lying beside the spouse. In the monument to Moyle Finch (N. Stone?, Eastwell, 1740s and 50s, such as the narrative Kildare monument, are also breaks with these formal ideas concerning the kinds of behaviour considered appropriate for the sexes.24

The central problem with the Raymond and Foley monuments was that the ideas concerning the passage of titles which they strove to communicate were exceedingly complex. It was probably the complexity of ideas demanded by the patron which caused Westby Gill to use, and Rysbrack to contemplate using, a narrative form of composition. In simpler situations such as a widow's commission for a monument to her husband - commissions which was the stock trade of most major metropolitan yards - certain visual conventions could begin to establish consistent meaning. A good example of the evolution of meaning in a visual convention was that of signifying the living donor of a monument by placing their figure above, or looking down upon, the deceased relative who was the object of the monument. This device, as Nigel Llewellyn points out in his analysis of the Teynham monument, can be seen in monuments of a century before; it developed in a most rationally consecutive way into the early eighteenth century, becoming by degrees more strongly articulated.25

British sculptors of the seventeenth century used a variety of devices to express which of two life-size figures seen in a composition was the living donor of the monument. In certain cases this was well articulated by showing a widow, as in the case of Evesham, in prayer above the image of her dead husband. In other monuments this was less obviously symbolised by the living figure lying beside the spouse. In the monument to Moyle Finch (N. Stone?, Eastwell,

---


24 See pp. 280-286.

25 Llewellyn's comments upon this monument are discussed on p. 38.
In 1722 the syndicate of sculptors, Scheemakers, Delveau and Plumier, engendered much critical approval by adopting a solution, already popular in France and the Lowlands, of seating a mourning figure of the Duchess of Buckingham at the feet of her reclining deceased husband. A commentary upon the monuments of Westminster Abbey published in the *Weekly Register* of 1734 argued that the Sheffield monument was a remarkable development in the history of monumental art because it defined one figure from another with a new clarity.\(^2\) The sense of disorder in the "gothique" monuments of the previous two centuries was exposed to particular criticism. He derided a type of "gothique" composition:3

... which spreads over a vast extent of space, contains a prodigious quantity of marble, is adorned with a variety of decorations, dazzles your eyes with gilding, is animated by an abundance of inscriptions and yet upon the whole appears a magnificent heap without form, or order, beauty, or understanding.

The monument to the Duke of Buckingham was cited as the best example of a type of composition in which carefully chosen component parts were clearly articulated; a characteristic of recent works which was considered to have constituted progress in the art form. This sense of progress was noted in the monuments of the Chapel of Henry VII.\(^3\)
.. but these seem again reformed in the reign of the son, as appears in the monuments to the Dukes of Richmond and Buckingham. In these there are several fine figures, in brass and some like meaning and design; tho' even they had not learned to distinguish the principal characters and place them in such postures as should command the spectator's first and last attention, and regard.

Both these are avoided by Rysbrack in the monument to the late Duke of Buckingham. The Duke is the principal figure in the group and tho' he is in a recumbent posture and his lady in a most beautiful manner sitting at his feet yet her figure is charactered in such a manner as only to be a guide to his; the trophy at his head; the figure of time above with the medals of his children fill up the spaces with great propriety...

The monument was seen to combine two types of "propriety". It was praised for the manner in which its clear, judicious design expressed the appropriate moral order of marital relations. Clearly defining the roles of the husband and wife - establishing that the husband was of primary importance and that his wife is "a guide" to point out his worth - was associated with filling "up the spaces" in an ordered way. Like the Foley monument it combined order of design with the expression of appropriate order in family relations.

The composition of the Buckingham monument was of immediate influence to the entire sculptural profession. Only in two cases in the early 1730s, the monuments to Francis Page (Henry Cheere and Henry Scheemakers, Steeple Aston, Oxfordshire, 1730-33) (ill. 45) and Speaker Conolly (Thomas Carter, Celbridge, Co. Kildare, 1736), was the composition type used by Nost for the Queensberry monument ever employed again. The device of the seated donor was, as we shall see, only used in our period to symbolise female donors who were either alive when the monument was commissioned, or, in a minority of cases, left money in their wills for the monument to be erected. The London workshops uniform application of the device meant that an educated viewer was able to interpret from this type of composition the unambiguous idea that the monument was a tribute from a widow to her husband. The reclining statue was clearly "the principal figure", or the object of commemoration, and the seated statue was clearly the commemorator and thus the secondary figure.

---

31 This attribution to Rysbrack is, of course, an error.

32 The erection of the monument to Speaker Conolly by Thomas Carter was announced in the Dublin Gazette, 17th-19th August, 1736.

The meaning of this visual tradition was kept intact by the fact that other conventional ways of depicting a woman with her husband indicated clearly that the woman was not the donor. The imagery of placing a small relief portrait of a wife at the feet of her husband, as a sort of pendant, was only used in cases where the woman was not the donor. On all occasions the wife whose relief portrait was shown held up by a putto had died before her husband. This was so in the case of the monuments to Bishop Hough (L.F. Roubiliac, erected 1747) (ill. 46) and Peregrine, second Duke of Ancaster (Henry Cheere, Edenham, erected 1748) (ill. 47). In a minority of monuments the woman presented in this way died after her spouse; as is the case in the monument to Godfrey Kneller where the male object of the monument is presented as a centrally placed bust. This monument was, notoriously, commissioned and designed by Godfrey Kneller himself (Michael Rysbrack, Westminster Abbey, erected May 1730) (ill. 48). The implication of this form is that the woman was being remembered with her husband but that the monument had been commissioned primarily for his memory. Monuments erected by order of the testamentary instructions of a husband for a monument to himself and his wife upon equal terms tended, as we shall see shortly, to accord a similar status to husband and wife by presenting them in the same way upon a level plinth. The use of the level plinth ensured that the composition could not be confused with one of the, now outdated, "Queensberry" type showing a husband as a living donor raised on a plinth above his wife.

Only in cases where a woman was dead, and the central object of the monument, was she placed in a reclining position on her own upon a plinth. The workshops of Cheere and Peter

---

36 The erection of the Hough monument is announced the Gentleman's Magazine 1747, p. 199. Bishop Hough (PCC 1743 184) died without living issue in 1743 and his wife in 1722. His monument is described in the inscription (transcribed in Green, Worcester, 1818, pp. 157-160) as donated by his heir and cousin, John Byrche.

The monument to Peregrine, second Duke of Ancaster, (PCC 1742, 141) was announced as erected by Cheere in the Old England of August 6th 1748. The order of deaths in the Bertie family is shown in GEC. Peerages, vol. 1, pp. 127-9.

35 A discussion of the conditions of inheritance of Godfrey Kneller's (PCC 1723, 261) estate and his design of his own monument can be seen in Vertue, Notebooks, Vol. III, pp. 43, 51. Public criticism of Kneller for designing his own monument is recorded in the Grub Street Journal of May 23rd 1730 the monument was erected on this day. It is not, as M.J.H. Liversidge has argued, (Two Portrait Medallions by Michael Rysbrack, Burlington Magazine, December, 1990, p. 872) typical of Rysbrack's style in the "early 1720s".

36 A comprehensive list of monuments with reclining female figures:
E. Hastings, 1755, Scheemakers, Ledsham, Yorkshire.
S. Hare, 1741, Scheemakers, Stowe Bardolph.
A. Guise, 1733, anon, Strensham Worcestershire.
Lady Clancarade, 1733, anon, Westminster Abbey.
S. Thomas, 1733, Cheere, Hampton, Middlesex.
Scheemakers habitually depicted the deceased as a reclining figure reading a book, an image which Whitaker interpreted as a woman "reading a book of devotionals". This indicated in all cases a monument dedicated to the memory of a woman deceased at the time of commission and not its living donor. The head of all these figures was symbolically dressed in a "cypress veil". This was the convention within painted funerary portraits of deceased women in which it was customary to dress the subject in mourning garb to show that she was dead.

Scheemakers' monument to Jane Pusey (Pusey Parish Church, Berkshire, d. 1742) (ill. 49), which was commissioned by her husband John Allen in the mid-forties, is a good example of this use of the reclining pose. The monument was, as we shall see in chapter six, the product of a social circle who all protested the most ardent veneration for their wives and womankind in general. John Allen Pusey (d. 1753) rebuilt the church of Pusey and placed the monument in his family pew as a tribute to his wife. Her image was placed reclining at the centre of the monument and her husband, as the donor, was represented by a presentation bust placed on a plinth protruding from the pyramid above her. Jane's name and a description of her feminine virtue were placed above the account of the donor and forms the main element of the inscription. The monument conformed to the tradition in which the tribute maker ceded importance to the object of the monument by the symbolic gesture of appearing above his or her image. Its composition was an adaptation of the convention used in the Queensberry monument with the husband's image reduced from a life-size image to a bust.

The sculptor sought a different solution when a monument was commissioned at the behest of a husband's will who requested a monument to commemorate his wife and himself, both individuals being the object of the tribute. This was the case in the monument of George Strode of Beaminster in Dorset (d. 1753) (ill. 50), a widower who bequeathed money to his brother for:

All of these individuals were dead at the time of the erection of the monument.


38 This is how John Buswell describes the monument to Lady Walpole in Westminster Abbey, BM. Add. mss. 33,378.

39 Llewellyn, 1991, p. 96, fig. 74.

40 See pp. 292-295.

41 G. Strode PCC 1753, 259.
"...a monument to be erected in memory of me and my dear wife not to exceed 600l and not less than 500l".

The monument, which was made by Scheemakers, showed both husband and wife on a flat plinth reclining at equal levels. As the monument was designed to commemorate a couple the images of both the husband and his spouse were shown as the reclining objects of the composition. George Strode as the man, and in the orthodox hierarchy the more important, was the first mentioned in the inscription and the figure at the front of the plinth.

A good indication of discrepancies in the conventions used to convey the same type of tribute can be taken from the comparison of Scheemakers’ Strode monument with that of Rysbrack to William Powlett (West Grinstead, Sussex, 1746) (ill. 51) and his wife which was erected contemporaneously. The basic circumstances of the commission were very similar to the Strode monument. Powlett left instructions to his brother for:\footnote{W. Powlett PCC 1746, 331.}

"Five hundred pounds to be laid out on a monument for me and my dear wife".

Rysbrack produced a composition which showed both husband and wife standing on a level plinth, both figures being the equal object of the viewer’s attention. This was achieved without the use of reclining figures. In the last three decades of his career Rysbrack rejected the reclining figure as a device for the communication of tribute. The Powlett monument was, nonetheless, visually definable as a composition which had been designed as a tribute to the pair rather than at the behest of one as a tribute to the other. When, three years after the Powlett monument, Rysbrack was commissioned by William Young (Chartham, Kent, 1751) (ill. 52) to erect a monument in memory of his teenage wife, the sculptor chose a composition with poses of various heights. William Young was shown standing over his wife who appeared in the seated pose beside him. The composition of the Young monument conforms to the tradition of signalling the mourning figure by placing it above the level of the object of the memorial who appears first in the inscription. Once more the reclining pose is consciously avoided. Both figures are one stage less at ease than in the “Buckingham type”; she is not reclining but seated, he is not seated but standing. At approximately this time Scheemakers, in his monument to Charles and Alethea Savile (erected Methley, Yorkshire, 1743-59) (ill. 28), was still defining his donor figures through the reclining and seated composition he had used with Delveau and Plumier twenty five years before. Both workshops worked with basically
the same set of visual conventions although Rysbrack's had opted to define himself from his competitor by abandoning the reclining figure and adopting a more vertical axis.

The shift of some of the major workshops away from using the device of the reclining figure as a means of drawing attention to the central object of a composition provides a good indication of how and why such conventions operated. Like the fashionable postures recommended by authors such as L.P. Boitard, the author of The Rudiments of Genteel Behaviour (published, London, 1737), the poses used by sculptors were proprietary "courtesies". Boitard's illustrations indicate that ladies and gentlemen were able to demonstrate their respect for the status of and familiarity with the person they encountered by the way they held their bodies and placed their eyes and hands. If we are to believe such conduct manuals gentility was to be defined by the ability to judge how to move from one type of formulaic posture to another. Ultimately such systems were viable only as long as the particular poses held a consensus that they had a gravity capable of communicating respect for the deceased.

In the mid thirties there was a crisis of confidence in the reclining figure. From being the standard element in most major compositions the device became seldom used. Rysbrack used the male reclining figure in eleven major monuments commissioned in the first ten years of his English career (between 1723 and 1733) but only once in the subsequent thirty five years of his career. The four major monuments commissioned from the Cheere workshop in its first five years (1728-33) all used reclining figures. Despite the dramatic growth and great output of the workshop, the reclining pose was only ever used three times again. It appears

---

43 Rysbrack's reclining figures:
Earl Stanhope, 1733, Westminster Abbey.
Daniel Pulteney, 1733, Westminster Abbey.
Dean Drelincourt, mid-twenties, Armagh
Isaac Newton, 1731, Westminster Abbey.
Chief Baron Ward, 1726, Stoke Doyle.
Edward Colston, 1724, All Saints Bristol.
Sir Edward Seymour, 1731, Maiden Bradley.
Earl Harborough, 1733, Stapleford.
The Duke of Kent, 1730, Flitton.
Earl Foley, 1733-8, Great Witley.

Lady Bessborough, erected 1761, Derby Cathedral.

44 Reclining figures in Cheere's monuments:
Lord Newhaven, 1732-5, Drayton Beauchamp.
Robert Raymond, 1733-5, Abbots Langley.
Francis Page, 1730-32, Steeple Aston.
Susannah Thomas, 1732, Hampton.
that there was a particular confidence in the reclining figure in the years 1730 to 34, when between them these workshops made eleven monuments including such figures, but that this confidence ended abruptly.

This may be explained by the public success of a series articles upon the buildings of London, and monuments of Westminster Abbey, which appeared in the *Weekly Register* of 1734. The articles, which have been attributed to James Ralph, were entitled *A New Critical Review of the Monuments of London and Westminster*. The articles set about a vigorous attack upon the reclining figures in the Abbey and reciprocally praised heartily the "manly vigour" of standing poses such as that used in the Craggs monument. This attack upon the worthiness of the reclining pose to be used as a symbol of authority and manhood was an elaboration upon Addison’s frequently quoted criticism of the monument to Cloudsley Shovel which associated the pose with the lounging of a luxurious beau.

The *New Critical Review*..... was an exceedingly influential work; it was still being quoted by critics of the Abbey two decades later. It is, however, difficult to tell whether the opinions of the *New Critical Review*..... were merely a reflection of educated views upon the subject of the reclining pose or were the origin of the collapse of confidence in it. A number of contemporary comic prints survive which indicate that the reclining pose had become a symbol of corrupt pomp and the object of general ridicule. A notable example of these is entitled *To the Mortal Memory of Madam Geneva who Died Sept 29th 1736* (ill. 53). Here the corpulent lounging figure of "Geneva wine", symbolic of imported luxury goods, was placed at the centre of a funerary composition very similar to the recently erected monument to General Stanhope (Rysbrack, erected December 1732, Westminster Abbey) a composition which had been censured in the *Weekly Register* for being "expensively Gothique". The

---

General Sabine, 1739. Tewin.
Admiral Hardy, 1740. Westminster Abbey.
Roger Owen, 1744, Candomber.

---


46 Addison’s criticisms (The *Spectator* XXXVII, March 30th 1711) of the monument are quoted in the *Weekly Register* article. (*London Magazine* 1734, p. 29)

47 The author of a number of articles on Westminster Abbey in the *Martins Magazine* of 1759 (pp. 260-320) acknowledges his debt to the 1734 review.

48 British Museum, Satirical Prints, 2279.

49 Reprinted in *London Magazine* 1734, p. 28.
print was a criticism both of the corrupting trade in foreign goods and overblown luxurious funeral monuments.

Despite the declining confidence in the pose in the Cheere and Rysbrack workshops, Scheemakers' continued to use the reclining figure throughout the 1740s and 50s; employing the device in virtually all major commissions. Scheemakers' tendency to repeat over a forty year period the basic elements of design used in the first fifteen years of its production was, as we shall see, the defining characteristic of his workshop. His later works, with the exception of those designed by architects such as Kent and Athenian Stuart, were mostly formed of the basic elements of a monumental "language" which he had used in 1735. Scheemakers was, perhaps, simply more inclined than his contemporaries to remain with an established set of designs and saw no commercial disadvantage in doing so; his very conservatism and predictability being a distinguishing characteristic which appealed to his clients. Whilst it should be acknowledged that Vertue's comments upon Scheemakers were biased by enmity, it is possible to interpret some of the recherché characteristics of his production in the light of the antiquarian's allegations that he appealed to a less discerning clientele than that of his competitor, Rysbrack.51

The end of male lines: a case study of a prominent type of commission.

In order to analyse further the use of formal types of tribute I shall devote the rest of this chapter to the discussion of monuments commissioned in one broad set of social circumstances; that of the end of direct male lines. These social conditions were an exceedingly important factor in the funerary sculpture of our period. Approximately two thirds of the major monuments were a product of such circumstances. (see Appendix 1) These monuments have particular pertinence to the study of the formal "language" of monumental

50 Reclining figures in Scheemakers' monuments:
The Duke of Buckingham, 1720-23, Westminster Abbey.
Montague Garrard Drake, 1730, Amersham, Buckinghamshire.
Hugo Chamberlayne, 1731, Westminster Abbey.
Susanna Hare, 1741, Stowe Bardolph, Norfolk.
Christopher Powell, 1743, Boughton Monchelsea, Kent.
John Piggot, 1751, Grendon Underwood, Buckinghamshire.
Charles Savile, 1743-59, Methley, Yorkshire.
Elizabeth Hastings 1755, Ledsham, Yorkshire.
Lord Shelburne, 1753, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire.
Jane Pusey, 1743-53, Pusey, Berkshire.

tribute. Their commission was associated with two types of donor both of which acted out of social obligation: the inheriting individual who came into estates through the breakdown in a male line and the unmarried or childless individual who felt a social obligation to conclude his family with a formal gesture. It is not altogether a coincidence that these types of monuments have also been observed to have dominated the funerary culture of Imperial Roman society; a society upon whose visual and literary tradition a proportion, at least, of these formal obligations were modelled.

The importance and sheer quantity of monuments created at the end of dynasties was partly a result of the build up of excess capital which could not be handed to a direct male heir. A cluster of the largest and most lavish dynastic monuments constructed at the time - the Shelburne, Foley, Harborough, Maynard and Montagu monuments - were all erected by great peerage families who had failed to produce a direct male heir or were destined to do so by the childlessness of the inheritor. The wills of the last of family lines, male and female, frequently placed the instructions for an expensive monument amongst a whole group of large capital bequests to friends and charities. The main text of the will of the second Earl Raymond, who died childless and was unable to maintain his peerage line, made plans to wind up family affairs. As death approached he became more certain that he would not produce an heir and added codicils to the will which increased the amount of money left to his wife and dedicated large sums to several charities. Within these codicils two hundred pounds were left toward a monument and an inscription was dictated which was intended to contrast with that upon his father’s monument that had celebrated the beginning of the dynasty at Abbots Langley.

In those cases in which the inheritor of the accumulated properties of a failed line saw to the erection of the monument, the very size of the tribute could be used to indicate the magnitude of the legacy. Vertue interpreted Bird’s monument to the Duke of Newcastle in Westminster Abbey (c.1723) in this way. In the knowledge that Newcastle had been childless and cultivated Edward Harley, Earl of Oxford, as his principal heir, Vertue commented that:

\[\ldots\]’twas this nobleman (the Earl of Oxford) who erected the great and noble marble monument to the Duke of Newcastle in Westminster Abbey - such a

---

52 Second Earl Raymond PCC 1756, 280.


pile of nobleness as the imagination of men and Art could invent. This monument was designed by this noble peer to perpetuate the memory of a noble ancestor by whose fortune he was enabled to countenance and encourage emulation and Arts.

Massive and expensive funerals were frequently chosen by those childless individuals who left accumulated properties to relatives who already had substantial independent wealth and did not require money to be saved on their behalf. Admiral Molloy, whose monument was erected by Henry Cheere at Shadoxhurst in 1760, was a childless individual who left his property to his godson, John Cooke.\textsuperscript{55} Cooke was already a wealthy landowner with substantial estates at Cranbrook and the expected heir to a wealthy legal family. Molloy attached a plan of the monument to his will and left instructions for its erection including an entire draft inscription explaining his childlessness and the passage of his estates to his godson.\textsuperscript{56} This "plan" of the monument with its draft inscription formed only a part of an unusually elaborate set of directions for his interment and funeral. Payment for the monument was drawn out of a five hundred pound bequest toward the carriage of his corpse, heralds and undertaker's bills.

Such massive funerals were, of course, not unknown amongst those who handed property directly to a male heir. It is, however, reasonable to suggest it was more incumbent upon those who could not hand on properties by simple entail arrangements to plan in detail for their deaths or the division of property. Monuments planned and erected at such junctures cannot be dissociated from the range of other responsibilities for tying up family affairs which were expected of an individual without direct male heirs. Rysbrack's monuments to the Dukes of Marlborough (Blenheim Chapel, 1730-36) (ill. 54), Kent (Flitton, c.1730) and Harborough, (Stapleford, 1730-2) and Cheere's to Justice Page (Steeple Aston, 1730-32) and Thomas Archer (Hale, 1738) (ill. 55) are amongst those which were already designed and erected within the lifetimes of the last representative of the direct family line.\textsuperscript{57} Sarah Duchess of Marlborough, whose sons both died in adolescence, was one of many who erected a large

\textsuperscript{55} C. Molloy, PCC 1760, 434.

\textsuperscript{56} The inscription is transcribed in P. Parsons, The Monuments and Painted Glass of Upwards of One Hundred Churches Chiefly in the Eastern Part of Kent, London, 1794, p. 424.

\textsuperscript{57} Duke of Marlborough, PCC 1722, 42.
Duchess of Marlborough, PCC 1744, 261. (monument discussed in detail on pp. 116-117)
Duke of Kent, PCC 1740, 174. (discussed on pp. 202-203)
Earl Harborough, PCC 1732, 265. (discussed on p. 193)
F. Page, PCC 1742, 25. (discussed on p. 211)
A report upon Cheere's design completion of the monument to Thomas Archer (PCC 1745, 146) during the latter's own lifetime occurs in the London Evening Post of July 13th 1738.
family monument in the last years of their lives when preparing for the close of their direct
family line. Her widowhood was, as we shall see in detail in the next chapter, largely devoted
to finding appropriate ways of perpetuating the family and distributing its assets and
heirlooms.58 At the same time she was veritably obsessed with her responsibility to provide
ways of concluding the family line with dignity and defending its historical reputation. The
commissioning of such monuments was part of the process by which those closing their family
line symbolised their philosophical preparation to accept this fate. Rysbrack's great monument
to the childless first Earl Wyndham in the West end of Salisbury Cathedral (d.1745), which
is reviewed below, was designed in accordance with Wyndham's written testimony of his life's
achievement drawn up at a time when a surgeon had given him notice that his bowel condition
was inoperable.

A monument marking the end of a notable dynasty was a ceremonial gesture to mark an event
of great social consequence. The death of the young Edmund Sheffield (d. 1735), the only
direct heir of the first Duke of Buckingham, was celebrated with a magnificent funeral which
marked not only the death of a noted individual but the formal end of a chapter of dynastic
history. A coffin with an inscription on its plate lamenting the end of a great line was
conveyed to Westminster Abbey on a carriage which was resplendent with eight heraldic
banners and escorted to its destination by the heralds of Chester, York, Richmond, Windsor
and Lancaster. As the coffin was lowered into the vault before an assembled group of the
country's titled nobility there was a solemn recital of the "stile and titles of the deceased".59
Newspaper obituaries to the final members of ancient dynasties, such as that in the London
Evening Post in memory of John Dutton of Sherborne in Gloucestershire, frequently include
an official tribute to the whole line.60 These tributes demonstrate that literate society expected
conclusive gestures at such a time. Roubiliac's figure of Fame upon the Argyll monument
(Westminster Abbey, erected 1749) depicted half way through inscribing the titles of Argyll
and Greenwich in order to symbolise the end of the Duke's male line, indicated an expectancy
that the crowds at Westminster Abbey should react with particular sympathy to such events.61
The amount of monumental and funerary pomp which was devoted to the public celebration
of the end of great dynasties is evidence that there was a profound and enduring respect for
grand aristocratic hierarchy and formal dynasticism throughout the period.

58 See pp. 166-177.
59 An account of the funeral appears in the Gentlemans Magazine. 1736, p. 54.
60 The extinction of the Dutton family is reported in the London Evening Post of February 10th 1743.
61 Duke of Argyle, PCC 1743, 302.
Part one: the inheriting male relative as patron.

Most childless landlords who bequeathed the rights to property and arms to nephews or family friends had not planned or erected monuments before their death. The design of the monument was, therefore, left to the discretion of the inheritor. The monuments set up in honour of such benefactors by those who owed them "gratitude" tended to be rather cool, even emotionally sterile, statements which gave public notice of a legal transfer of property or change of name. A good example of this type of sculpture is the monument to John Dutton which was placed in the parish church adjoining the great manor house at Sherbourne which the deceased had begun to rebuild. Sir John Dutton died in 1743 (ill. 56) leaving only a sister surviving of his direct line. He left handsome bequests to his brothers-in-law, Thomas and George Reade. Thomas's young son, John Reade, was to inherit the property at Sherborne upon coming of age and take the name and arms of Dutton. He left instructions that:

"Three hundred pounds is to be laid out upon a monument within the space afore said which belongs to myself and my two wives. The form of which monument I leave in the hands of my brother-in-law Thomas Reade."

It took six years for the inheritors to erect the monument which has the date of 1749 inscribed upon it. The monument showed Rysbrack at his most cool and classical; Dutton's impersonal, togate image is full of grace and ease but totally devoid of emotion. Above the statue two escutcheons merge, which originally bore a great assortment of family arms. An informative comparison can be made with Rysbrack's contemporary monument to William Young (Chartham, 1751) (ill 52), which was erected to the memory of Young and his teenage wife as a token of the former's bereavement. Not only were the expressions upon the faces of the figures more animated and gestures more emotional but the very cutting of the marble was more dynamic. It would seem that Rysbrack was fully aware that such different commissions required separate, or even contrasting, attitudes to form, construction and composition.

---

62 J. Dutton, PCC 1743, 227.

63 A description of the monument and family genealogy can be see in S. Rudder, A New History of Gloucestershire, Cirencester, 1779, pp. 651-2.
The Dutton monument is by no means the most emotionally sterile to be erected at this type of juncture of family history. Henry Cheere’s monument at Hodnet in Shropshire which was erected as a gesture of gratitude for the passage of the estate and arms property from the Vernon to Heber family is little other than an elaborate framing of a legal notification of these changes. The monument took the form of an elaborate plaque marking the end of the line through the death of Sir Thomas Vernon and the inheritance of his only daughter Henrietta. It formally notified the viewer of the chain of circumstances which had led to the rest of the line bearing the surname Heber Vernon. The inscription ends with the matter of fact statement that:

The above mentioned Henrietta Vernon died on the 25th of June 1752 aged 69. The manor and advowson of HODNET with other estates in the same parish she bequeathed to her Cousin Elizabeth Heber niece to the above mentioned Sir Thomas Vernon and wife to Thomas Heber esq of Marton in Yorkshire by whose son this monument is erected.

Such monuments were generally set up in the chancel or above the deceased’s family pew in which public notice could be taken of a legitimate transfer of property, rights and privileges. In unusual circumstances when the heir’s rights within the community were doubted it became worth taking legal measures to assert the right to set up a monument notifying the inheritance of the manor in such a prestigious place. In chapter four I shall review an extraordinary and protracted legal case surrounding the rights of Thomas Warden, nephew and heir of Charles Sergison (d.1732) (ill. 58), to erect a monument to his benefactor in the chancel of Cuckfield parish church in Sussex (Thomas Ayde, erected c.1734).64 Warden had, according to the London Evening Post, inherited 150,000l and the political interest of his uncle.65 The case revolved around the refusal of the vicar and other local landlords to accept that Warden had inherited the "greater tithe" which justified him being regarded as Lord of the Manor and entitled him to erect a monument in the position usually reserved for the landlord with the gift of the Living.66

64 C. Sergison, PCC 1732, 296.

65 The immense inheritance of Thomas Warden is reported in the London Evening Post of November 28th 1732.

66 These documents are discussed on pp. 223-224.
It would, however, be erroneous to suggest that a sculptor's reaction to such a commission was necessarily to provide an inert image which might act as the frame for the communication of a prosaic legal statement. Some of the most original and poetic compositions of the period were erected by tangential relatives upon the inheritance of large estates. Roubiliac's Fleming and Hargrave monuments (Westminster Abbey, erected 1756) and Rysbrack's great figure of Eire on the monument of Lord Wyndham (Salisbury Cathedral, d.1745) (ill. 57) are examples of sculpture commissioned in such social circumstances. There were, however, no instances when the ingenuity of the sculptor was directed at producing overtly emotive family narratives to commemorate such an inheritance. The most emotive family compositions, such as Rysbrack's Young monument (Chartham, 1751) or Roubiliac's Nightingale monument (Westminster Abbey, 1757-1761), were created for family circumstances, such as the death of a young wife, which had no obvious bearing upon the passage of titles, arms or family money.

In order to understand the form and function of monuments constructed in honour of childless benefactors we need to negotiate some of the concepts used to describe the type of social behaviour expected at such times. The most important conceptual term used in formulation of what was expected to be demonstrated by a person inheriting an estate was "gratitude". This word appears in the sentence of an inscription referring to the act of donation in monuments, such as that of John Marshe at Womenswold in Kent (Robert Taylor, c.1753) or John Comyns at Writtle in Essex (Henry Cheere, erected 1759) (ill. 59) where substantial estates had been inherited at the failure of a male line. The conception of "gratitude" or, in Latin, "gratia" has been little discussed by contemporary historians of eighteenth century culture and etiquette but was of vital importance. The word "gratitude" had a more rigid meaning and the social idea of "gratitude" a far greater importance than it has assumed in twentieth century society. The demonstration of gratitude was a vital rule of conduct within any relationship of patronage. To be accused of "ingratitude" within political life for deserting a former patron was an ultimate slur upon one's integrity as a statesman. The term drew inflections of meaning from the Latin word "gratia", a word which defined formal an individual's duty or "obligatio" to acknowledge and respect a benefactor. The use of the term "pietatis gratia" in

---


The Comyns monument at Writtle is discussed on p. 110.


69 There is a discussion of the virtue of gratitude in political discourse and political monuments on pp. 168-169.
the erection of Roman tombstones concerning the legal obligation of relatives has been recently discussed by J.W Tellegen in *The Roman Law of Succession in the letters of Pliny the Younger*.\(^7\)

Along with terms of domestic obligation such as "filial piety" or "ancestral piety", which were also direct translations from the vocabulary of Roman ancestral religion, the term "gratitude" seems to come into fashion with epitaph writers of the early years of our period.\(^7\) The social emphasis upon gestures of respect, "tribute" and "gratitude" certainly contributed to the elimination of religious symbolism from family monuments. The sole purpose of a monument could become the primary gesture of respect; the form of the monument limited to the expression of a secular contract. The secular language of classical sculpture such as a simple tributary bust placed upon a sarcophagus with a note below of the donor's obligation was capable of expressing all that was required of a monument.

A recent article by Elizabeth Meyer in the *Journal of Roman Studies* on the "epigraphic habit in the Roman Empire" has pointed out the dependence of Roman tomb art upon the notions of inheritance and the "obligation" of inheritors.\(^7\) The conditions in which monuments were erected in the period of Imperial Roman civilisation so clearly foreshadow those of mid-eighteenth century monumental art as to suggest that large sections of the patronage based their ideas upon the commission of monumental sculpture on an understanding of classical precedent. Meyer began her article with a discussion of the "obligation to commemorate" in the Roman world. She notes that the main difference between Roman and Athenian Tomb epitaphs was the inclusion of a statement concerning the "commemorator" and proceeds to note the major importance of the patronage of obliged inheritors seeking to commemorate their benefactors.\(^7\) She referred explicitly to a type of inscription which became common in our period; this typically included some account of the deceased's titles and social position and concluded the inscription with a sentence concerning donation. Meyer explained, with quotes

---


\(^7\) I do not know of any Seventeenth Century inscriptions which use the word.


\(^7\) ibid., pp. 74-75.
from Cicero’s *de Legibus*, how the sacred obligations (sacra) of the heirs to their benefactors lay behind much of the production of monuments in Roman Imperial society:74

When a monument was specified, its erection - like burial - was a moral obligation laid on a specific person, the heir (unless another was designated), and ultimately dependant upon his or her sense of responsibility.... Because the obligation was moral within the legal relationship, and because the details of a monument could vary according to taste, personal wishes were sometimes spelled out in a Roman will; because it was a moral duty which the heir or person responsible for the burial wished to indicate had been discharged, references to the nature of the obligation and the fact of its completion appear frequently in inscriptions - hence the allusions to heirs and, in particular, the phrase "ex testamento" in epitaphs.75 The fulfilment of such an obligation was, therefore, a private and public matter. A Roman tombstone thus fulfilled two functions: it commemorated the dead by simply recording his name, sometimes with his or her achievements, and it also stated in writing the commemorator’s discharge of his duty.

Meyer argued that the role of the expression of the contract of inheritance in Roman monuments was more important than formerly appreciated. Her article was a critique upon of Sailer and Shaw’s work on Roman tomb forms which asserted that, "burial and commemoration were....closely associated with heirship, as well as a sense of family duty and affection".76 Meyer went further by suggesting that the primary reason for the erection of funerary monuments in the Roman world was the desire to demonstrate publicly that one was acting in accordance with the legal and social obligations of "heirship", an observation which could be applied with equal accuracy to the monumental art of mid-eighteenth century England.

It is clear that, when compiling funerary inscriptions and commissioning monuments, patrons such as Thomas Reade (patron of the Dutton monument) were acting upon an understanding

74 ibid., pp. 77-78.

75 A reproduction of this type of inscription with a statement of "ex testamento" donation can be seen in the Dutton monument which was, as we have seen, a thoroughly classical notification of inheritance.

of classical precedents. Increased awareness of Roman types was related to the growth of the
antiquarian movement amongst the cultivated English elite in the early eighteenth century. One
only need look at Johnson's essay upon inscriptions, epitaphs and monuments in the
*Gentleman's Magazine* of 1740 to see that educated contemporaries frequently had a
sophisticated knowledge of Roman epigraphic traditions and funerary customs. It would
appear from the types of inscriptions used in the period that many patrons were aware of the
importance attached to notions of gratitude and obligation in Roman funerary art. Through
reading Latin epitaphs and sources such as Cicero's *De Legibus* those with classical education
would have understood that there was a distinguished tradition of monuments being the
product of the social obligations of heirs. It is not, therefore, excessively cynical to look
through formalised expressions of grief, as I will in the case of the "weeping widow" motif,
to the sub-text of the mourner's obligation at the point of inheritance. Acknowledging this
classical sub-text in compositions such as the Buckingham monument is as important as noting
the classical precedent in the triumphal symbolism of its architectural frame or in the Roman
form of its reclining figure.

The erection of a monument in the circumstances of the inheritance of the male tangential
relation could coincide with the time of the donor's inheritance. Cheere's monument to Lord
Chief Justice Comyns was commissioned by a nephew and inheritor of his property, John
Comyns. It was not erected at the former's death in 1739 but upon the transfer of property
in 1759. This was probably a result of Comyns having protected his widow by arranging
that his nephew should inherit his estates only after her death. The executed monument
was little other than a formal gesture of tribute in reciprocation for the estate which
surrounded the church. Its inscription, which was a formal tribute to the deceased's public
career, concluded with a statement that:

>This monument (out of duty and gratitude) was erected by his nephew

Although a "gratitude" monument could function as a blatant or baldly stated symbol of a
social and economic contract, decorum had to be observed in the way this was done. The
patron demonstrating his respect to a benefactor had to be cautious that he did not draw a disrespectful proportion of the attention to his own role as donor. When in 1763 Francis Vernon, nephew and heir of Admiral Edward Vernon, erected a monument to his uncle in Westminster Abbey (ill. 60) he received a sharp rebuke in the London Magazine of September 1st 1763 (p. 492) for drawing too much attention to himself. The criticism centred upon Francis Vernon’s placement of his new title of Lord Orwell, accentuated with block capitals, in the centre of the inscription. This raised the question in the author’s mind of whether Rysbrack’s great drama of Fame crowning the Admiral’s bust had not actually been intended to celebrate his nephew’s social promotion:

It is a pity that the inscription on the former, which does as much for the language as justice to the character of the brave deceased, had not been placed as conspicuously on the upper part of the tomb, which one is apt to believe, from this circumstance, was meant to record the new acquired title of the nephew rather than the rigid virtues of the Uncle.

The phrase "from this circumstance" probably referred to social gossip which concerned the fact that Francis Vernon, a nonentity before inheriting his uncle’s fortune, had exploited the money and reputation of his deceased uncle to gain a peerage and a place in ministerial politics. The hail of criticism levelled at the self-interest of those who erected monuments to military and naval figures with private capital probably explains the composition which Roubiliac used for his monument to Admiral Peter Warren (ill. 61). Warren also died without a male heir (but with three daughters) and passed much of his capital to Captain James

---

82 A fine for the erection of the Vernon monument was paid to the Dean and Chapter in 1759 (Westminster Abbey Muniments, Treasurer’s accounts 49331) The erection of the monument was announced in the London Evening Post of April 14th 1763. For the inheritance of E. Vernon’s property see his will PCC 1757, 343.

83 E. Vernon, PCC 1757, 343.

84 Lord Orwell, GEC, Peerages, vol. XI p. 681. The criticism of the monument may refer to contemporary politics. Francis Vernon received his title of Viscount Orwell directly at the recommendation of Bute who was at this date exceedingly unpopular in London. His uncle was the hero of the Opposition and accordingly Francis had formerly flirted with Tory politics. His social ambitions caused him to align himself with the Ministry after his uncle’s death and he served as Clerk to the Privy Council from 1757 to 62.

85 It is interesting to note that one of the surviving drawings (V&A no E. 433-1946 illustrated in Physick, 1969, fig. 73) appears to show the figure of Fame removing a Flag which had been obscuring the bust of the deceased. The idea of the British flag obscuring Vernon may well refer to the dismissal of the Admiral which made him a martyr of the patriot opposition - a possible interpretation in light of the fact it was the opposition papers (see below) which called for the erection of the monument. The fact that the final composition presents no overt challenge to Whig authority may well reflect the donor’s desire to be promoted within the Pelhamite patronage system.
According to the *London Magazine* of 1757 the monument represented a scene in which:

Fortitude in the character of Hercules is shown carefully placing the bust of Sir Peter; Britannia on the opposite side is in a reclining posture with a countenance so amazingly expressive of sorrow...

The composition, therefore, was contrived to make the monument seem as if it had been donated not by self-interested parties but the spirit of heroism and patriotism itself. The form of the inscription is interesting. It is divided into two halves, the first concerning the "public" life the second the "private". This division of inscriptions into public and private eulogy was, as we shall see in more detail in chapter three, commonly used in the period.  

It probably reflects inscription writers' knowledge of the classical epigraphic convention in which, as Meyer shows, the obligation to commemorate was considered "a private and public matter".

The first half of the inscription is a strictly factual account of Warren's military career ending in the bold print words "GREAT BRITAIN". When placed upon a monument to a military man this bald factual type of inscription implied, as we shall see in the case of the Blenheim Column, that the plain historical facts of the deceased's military triumphs could, without partisan embellishment, justify the attention of unbiased Fame. Strict prose accounts were associated with the expression of facts which stood independent of what the Duchess of Marlborough refers to as "the partiality of relations". The second half of the inscription, which was the donors' personal tribute to Warren's private virtue, begins with the words:

On this tablet affection with truth must say.....

The implication is that the private tribute of his relations was allowed to demonstrate partiality but that Fame itself was guaranteed by more than this.

---

86 Warren, PCC 1752, 266. The inheritance of his property is discussed in DNB, Vol. LIX, p. 419-420.

87 The *London Magazine* 1757, pp. 552 and 560.

88 See pp. 199-200.

89 *Meyer, The Epigraphic Habü*, p. 78.

90 See pp. 166-177.
The design of the Warren monument, therefore, showed an awareness that inheriting relatives might be expected to "puff" their relatives for ulterior motives. Although, as we shall see, female beneficiaries of the end of male lines, in particular widows, were able to incorporate their own images as donors within monuments, no male inheritors in these circumstances did so. These codes of propriety were governed by the possibility that a male inheritor would make blatant use of the reputation and assets of his benefactor.

There were codes of propriety which dictated how "puffing" one's family could become acceptable. The existence of these social codes have already touched upon in our analysis of Philip Dumaresqu's correspondence concerning the De Saumarez monument. Although the members of this extended family expected that the monument was to promote the professional interests of the family, a debate arose as to how obviously this "puff" was to be made. The members of the De Saumarez family were probably not alone in their desire to find a monumental image which would ensure that they prospered from drawing public attention to their illustrious relatives. Roubiliac's monument to General James Fleming in Westminster Abbey (ill. 62) gives further indication of the subterranean issues behind sponsoring a large professional allegory having inherited a considerable estate. The monument was erected along with that to General William Hargrave by John Fleming who was James Fleming's nephew.

John Fleming was amongst the period's most fortunate inheritors. He was an unremarkable officer in Hargrave's Regiment who within the space of a year inherited the entire estates of his childless uncle James Fleming and his uncle's unmarried friend and military colleague, General Hargrave.91 Both Generals were very wealthy, Hargrave in particular had abused his position as Governor of Gibraltar to appropriate a massive fortune. John Fleming was suddenly rich enough to command the attentions of the highest ranks of London society. He purchased a fine house in Grosvenor Street and soon married the cousin of the Earl of Somerset, the highest ranking aristocrat in the Foot Regiments.92

The allegory of the Fleming monument, which concerned the values of prudent command in the field, seems to have been designed to appeal to the high ranking circles of the Foot Regiments in which the family moved. The sculptor chosen had recently completed a

---

91 James Fleming, PCC 1751, 80.
William Hargrave, PCC 1751, 143.


113
monument to General Wade who, like Fleming and Hargrave, had commanded troops in Cumberland’s suppression of the ’45. The monuments were to be placed on a second storey level of the South isle of the Abbey to be seen in continuity with General Wade’s monument (Roubiliac, 1750) (ill. 63) which was the first of the sculptor’s allegories to be placed upon this level.93 At the monument’s opening in June 1755 the London Magazine commented:94

The monument to General Fleming represents Prudence and Valour combining their symbols in a trophy. Valour is represented as Hercules, whose symbol is a club, the female figure is characterised by the mirror and the serpent, which appear in her right hand, and with her left points to the bust above. The honour of having merited such a trophy is expressed by the laurel on one side of the monument and there in perpetuity by the cypress on the other. As Prudence and Valour combine every military excellence this emblematical encomium is conceived and expressed with great force and propriety.....

The composition was not only on the same level as the Wade monument, it was an obviously similar composition; two allegorical figures balanced around a column with bust attached in an allegory of military glory. The choice of Roubiliac to make the monument was not coincidental; the sculptor was already a favourite amongst the high ranking officers of the Foot Regiments who had served in the ’45 campaign. James Fleming bequeathed a silver medal of the Cumberland Society; an organisation of those who had served in Scotland which met annually to commemorate the Victory.95 Various members of the Fleming and Hargrave family are recorded as members of the Society. Field Marshal Ligonier, who commissioned Roubiliac to make a bust of himself (c.1760) and erected a monument to his relative Colonel Francis Ligonier who had been killed at Falkirk in 1745 in the cloisters of Westminster Abbey, was a principal member of the Society.96 Ligonier, as Rex Whitworth has argued,

93 The erection of General Wade’s monument was announced in the Gentleman's Magazine 1750, p. 379. An article on the monument in the Tory Remembrancer (reprinted in the Gentleman's Magazine 1750, p. 514) indicates that the imagery of the monument was intended to vindicate George Wade and the Foot Regiments of charges of brutality and incompetence in the putting down of the ’45 Rebellion.

94 The London Magazine 1755 p. 324.

95 The surviving medals of the Cumberland Society and the lists of its members are recorded in G. Dalyrmple-White,”The Cumberland Society”, The Journal of Army Historical Research, 6, 1927, pp. 164-174.

promoted the military career of Lord George Sackville, the brother of one of the periods most enthusiastic supporters of the militia, Lord Middlesex. The latter was partially responsible for erecting Roubiliac's monument to Lord Shannon (Walton-upon-Thames 1756-9) which also vaunted the values of the Foot Regiments. Both John Fleming's choice of sculptor and choice of image were probably intended to promote his family amongst the London circles in which he moved.

Like Francis Vernon, who also had little to commend him to public service, Fleming received a title purely on the strength of his wealth and the reputation of his forbear. In 1763, a year before his death, he was created a Baronet with the patronage of the Duke of Newcastle. A letter, dated September 26th 1761, from John Fleming to the Duke of Newcastle records the former's request to receive an Irish peerage or Baronetcy upon the strength of the public reputations of his Uncle and General Hargrave, and patronage favours owed by the Pelham family for his benefactors past services. He promised that, through the agency of Sir Cecil Bishopp, the Pelhamite political broker for Sussex, the capital from his dual inheritances could be employed in the cause of the current administration.

Neither of the monuments which John Fleming erected were requested in the wills of the deceased and, whilst we should not doubt his affection for his benefactors, we should look at the monuments in the context of the patron's social ambitions. The monuments when erected actually brought a hail of criticism from the opposition "patriot" press. The most notable of these in the London Evening Post of November 5th 1757 claimed that the monuments of wealthy nonentities puffed for private interest had become more in evidence in the Abbey than genuine public heroes. The Tory paper called for a monument to Admiral Vernon, hero of the "patriot" opposition, to remedy the situation; this was rendered somewhat ironical by the way in which Francis Vernon answered the plea.

---

97 R. Whitworth, Field Marshall Ligonier, London. 1958, pp. 192, 238. See Appendix 2 for details of Middlesex's involvement in the monument to Earl Shannon. Ligonier was also a good friend of Wade and took over his seat as M.P. for Bath at his death in 1748. Documentary evidence of Lord Middlesex's involvement with the monument to Lord Shannon is discussed in appendix 2, p 318.

98 A good idea of the John Fleming's military acquaintances can be obtained from the bequests to officers in the wills of James Fleming (PCC 1751, 80), John Fleming (PCC 1763, 507),

99 British Museum, Pelham Correspondence add. mss. 32, 938, f. 371.

100 The political career of Cecil Bishopp is discussed in Romney Sedgwick, vol. 1, p. 463.

101 See, also, a letter to the Dean and Chapter of Westminster Abbey in the London Chronicle May 1758, p. 446.
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Analysis of the allegory of the Fleming monument also suggests some form of family "puff" was intended. James and John Fleming were relatives of Michael Fleming of Rydal, a Major of the Foot at the "Revolution", and part of an extended family which contributed many high ranking officers to the Foot Regiments. The heraldic arms taken by Michael Fleming were a serpent "nowed", or knotted, with the symbols of "Pax, Copia, Sapientia" and an olive Garland in its mouth. Whilst this is obviously not exactly the same motif as the allegory of heroism used in the monument it is sufficiently similar to merit notice. It can be no coincidence that the family symbol was a serpent tied up and the monument shows a serpent being tied to Hercules's club. Similarly the adoption of a military family's motif on the subject of the merits of judgement and peace broadly resembles the act of bonding together the symbols of prudence and warlike aggression.

The composition was probably a witty re-working of family heraldry which would have been obvious to family and friends but less so to society in general. The subtlety of the use of heraldry is reminiscent of the efforts of the Saumarez family to disguise the degree of blatant family "puff" seen in monuments to military figures in the Abbey. This adaptation of family heraldry in a stimulating intellectual manner signals the patron's awareness that an unsophisticated use of heraldic motifs to "puff" the family reputation might fail to impress polite spectators and be considered a sign of a want of social refinement.

Professional allegory monuments were used exclusively in circumstances when properties were left by a childless benefactor to a male inheritor. All the major professional allegories erected by the metropolitan workshops of the day were all patronised in these social conditions: Roubiliac's Wade, Warren, and Fleming monuments, Rysbrack's monuments to Lord Wyndham and Admiral Vernon, Taylor's monument to Sir Henry Penrice (Offley, Hertfordshire, 1753) (ill. 64) and Cheere's to John Scrope (Lewknor, Oxfordshire, c.1752) were all commissioned in memory of men who died without male heirs.

103 Heraldic and Genealogical accounts of the Fleming family appear in the British Museum manuscript collection, add mss 24,120 ff. 329, 332-51. 34, 265, ff. 265-7, 38, 133 ff. 55, 106.
104 There is a full discussion of heraldic puffing on pp. 252-253.
105 G. Wade, PCC 1748, 104.
P. Warren, PCC 1752, 266.
J. Scrope, PCC 1752, 108.
The Penrice and Wyndham monuments are discussed below pp. 117-119.
References to the profession of the deceased were also made in monuments commissioned by, for instance, widows commemorating their husbands. Four examples of the "weeping widow" type of composition included a mourning widow celebrating the military attributes of her husband. There are two cases, Cheere's monuments to George Cooke (originally erected Belhamonds estate, near Harefield, 1744-49) and Justice Raymond, when an element of professional allegory was used in a monument to a deceased individual who left a male heir.\textsuperscript{106} In these compositions elements of professional allegory were a mere component of a scheme of imagery relating to the elevation of the family or issues of inheritance.\textsuperscript{107} These compositions are distinct from the type of monument which centred explicitly upon an allegory of the deceased's professional attributes. Although many spinsters or daughters who inherited estates erected monuments, these female patrons commissioned no professional allegories.\textsuperscript{108} It would seem that the professional allegory was considered to be a type of formal tribute which was expected of male inheritors as a gesture of respect to their benefactor's public life. This concentration upon the public career of the deceased was consistent with the general tendency of male patrons to make formal public statements rather than express their private sentiments. A tribute to a benefactor's public career was probably considered to be one of the formal "obligatio" of the male inheritor.

The professional allegory can be seen as the most expensive version of its type. We can see this best by isolating monuments to one profession: the law. In the modest monument to John Comyns at Writtle a bust in full legal regalia was placed above an inscription listing the deceased's offices and professional attributes. A monument one stage more expensive was erected by Dr Richard Mead and Richard Topham for their benefactor, the childless lawyer Sir Thomas Reeves\textsuperscript{2} (Windsor, 1739) (ill. 65).\textsuperscript{109} The monument, which was designed by Mead himself and executed by Scheemakers, shows bust images of Reeve and his wife with a putto standing beside the male bust holding an small relief symbol of Justice.\textsuperscript{110}

Still more expensive was Robert Taylor's monument to Sir Henry Penrice, the chief admiralty lawyer of his day, at Offley in Hertfordshire (1753). Above the allegory of Penrice's combined

\textsuperscript{106} G. Cooke, PCC 1768, 272. First Lord Raymond, PCC 1733, 130.

\textsuperscript{107} See the review of the Cooke monument, pp. 242-244.

\textsuperscript{108} See Appendix 1, categories 1 & 2 and the review of some of these monuments on pp. 134-154.

\textsuperscript{109} T. Reeves, PCC 1737, 13.

\textsuperscript{110} The erection of the monument, which is inscribed R. Mead Arch., is recorded in the \textit{London Evening Post} of August 9th 1739.
professions of the Law and the Navy are set the coupled busts of Sir Henry Penrice and wife. Much of the inscription was devoted to lamenting the death of their only son and heir apparent, Spencer.\(^{111}\) The death of both father and son led to the patron of the monument, Thomas Salusbury, who was a neighbour and legal colleague of Sir Henry, inheriting the estate. However the basic form was elaborated upon to produce a monument of a size and expense suitable for the wealth and prestige of Sir Henry Penrice and his heir, Thomas Salusbury. A faculty which was passed by the Archdeaconry of Hertfordshire in October 1753 reveals that the entire chancel of the church was rebuilt and a dome built above the site of the monument to give the sculpture top lighting.\(^{112}\) Top lighting must originally have given the professional allegory a certain sense of drama. This architectural setting, no doubt designed by Taylor himself, was probably intended to make the most of the allegorical image of a profession which Henry Penrice and the patron of the monument, Thomas Salusbury shared.\(^{113}\)

A monument one stage more expensive was erected by the male heirs of the great lawyer of the Irish establishment Lord Baron Thomas Wyndham (Salisbury Cathedral, c.1745). On this occasion the commemorated had died childless leaving fifty eight thousand pounds to male heirs of the Wyndham family of Salisbury and Dorset.\(^{114}\) The instructions of Wyndham’s will were that no less than three hundred pounds should be set out upon a monument to himself. These instructions appear after the most extraordinary introduction to the will which took the form of a mini biography of Wyndham’s major accomplishments in the legal profession. He was probably concerned to give a final account of himself because he had been given a virtual death sentence by his surgeon. His preserved diaries for the last year of his life show that, after suffering from poor digestion for many years, he was informed seven months before his death that his case was hopeless.\(^{115}\) Having no children he began a notebook recording the ways in which he was disposing of the assets of his very lucrative career. Those who benefited most from these bequests set up the monument in his memory.

---

\(^{111}\) Faculty Papers concerning the monument are preserved at the Hertfordshire Record Office. Loose faculties AHH 19/2. Archdeaconry Hitchin and Huntingdon division, faculty book, ref 64394. These papers explain the conditions of inheritance. There is no PCC will for Sir Henry Penrice.

\(^{112}\) According to faculty papers of 1776 (AHH 19/2) relating to Lady Salusbury’s erection of Nollekeg’s great monument to her husband, the Penrice monument was moved to accommodate the later work in its splendid setting.

\(^{113}\) For an account of Thomas Salusbury’s career see his obituary in the *Gentleman’s Magazine* 1773, p. 581.

\(^{114}\) Lord Wyndham, PCC 1745, 340.

\(^{115}\) Maidstone Record Office, Wyndham papers, U 951 F 31/2.
The tributary inscription quoted almost verbatim the text of the deceased's little autobiography which appeared in the will. Having been left instructions for a major monument they simply transferred the professional characteristics vaunted in the inscription into the form of an allegorical figure. Rysbrack's beautiful figure of Eire holding the staff of Liberty expressed the professional achievements of a man who wished to be remembered chiefly for his stalwart conduct in the trial of Lord Barry of Santry; a case in which he was perceived to have employed his legal training to defend the very security of the Irish realm and the constitutional liberties of the Irish citizen. A monument of this type which contained not only a written but a life-size sculptural tribute was the very pinnacle of what metropolitan sculptors could have been expected to produce in such circumstances.

**Part 2: A magnificent gesture at the end of the dynasty.**

A clear indication that a magnificent social gesture was expected at the end of a direct male line can be gained from the will of Sir Basil Dixwell, the final direct heir of an ancient Kentish family. Dixwell died in 1750 but completed the will in 1731 after the death of his first wife. Despite marrying again he produced no male heir and thought it was incumbent upon him to make contingency plans for the failure of his line. He thus prepared to hand on his estates to a nephew of the Oxendon family and left instructions for a monument which was erected at Barham by his heir:116

..... to be buried amongst my ancestors in my vault under the chancel of Barham church.....since through God's pleasure I am as yet the last of my family, I desire a handsome square, round or oval monument may be erected by my executors after my death a little distance from the chancel window with a proper English inscription on the several parts thereof of all the members of my family deposited in the vault under it and their inheritances.

A large, well carved, freestanding structure with elaborate family arms was accordingly constructed by one of the best London workshops.117 The wording of this bequest, in particular the phrase, "since through God's pleasure I am as yet the last of the line", indicates

---

116 B. Dixwell PCC 1750, 145.

the existence of a cultural expectation that a gesture of respect or tribute should be made to
the forbears by the last representative of a dynasty. It is interesting to note that Dixwell did
not die for a further twenty years. This is an important issue in the comprehension of
monumental imagery erected at such junctures. On account of the vagaries of mortality in the
period, those who reached middle age without a male heir, such as Basil Dixwell or Earl
Foley, had to regard it as likely that they would terminate their dynasties. There was a stage
in life, frequently a long time before their own decease, when these childless individuals
began, as did Earl Chesterfield, to look in earnest for alternative ways of handing on property
and maintaining the assets and reputation of the line.\footnote{118}

The monument to Basil Dixwell was to function as a form of vault marker signalling its
formal closure. It was common in our period to use monuments as tributary vault markers at
the end of great dynasties; as a final symbol of respect for the extinct family from its last
member. At the termination of a wealthy gentry family such as the Swaynes of London and
Salisbury, for instance, a monument was erected to the value of three hundred pounds to mark
the end of the local family.\footnote{119} Benet Swayne, a London merchant of an ancient gentry family
of Salisbury, died a bachelor within a year of his childless brother Thomas, a South Sea
Company director. He left his family estate to a Salisbury neighbour with the instructions that
he should:\footnote{120}

\begin{quote}
...be interred in St Martins Church, Sarum and I would have a monument
erected against the wall of the value of three hundred pounds and thereon
inscribed the names of my Grandfather, Grandmother, father and the rest that
are buried there.
\end{quote}

His executor, John Martin, who employed Cheere to construct a monument (St Martins,
Salisbury) (ill. 66), chose to represent the family with images of two of its members, Benet
and his wife, who were represented as connected relief busts above an inscription listing the
contents of the vault at the time of closure.

\footnote{118} Earl Chesterfield first groomed his illegitimate son to succeed him and, on his son's death, his distant
kinsman and Godson, Philip Stanhope. The letters advising the latter on courtly behaviour and conduct are reprinted

\footnote{119} The fate of the family is recorded in Colt Hoare, \textit{The History of Modern Wiltshire}, vol. 4, p. 594.

\footnote{120} B. Swayne, PCC 1748, 253.
Thomas Swayne died intestate in February 1748.
The most notable common denominator of monuments of this type in the period was their extraordinary functional directness. Many patrons simply placed an image of a representative member of a family above a list of the deceased members of the family in the vault at the time of closure. A good example of this directness of approach can be seen in Scheemakers' monument erected at All Hallows London in memory of Anne Colleton (d.1741) (ill. 67), who, as last of the lines of Colleton and Richardson, died a substantial heiress and commissioned a monument over the old family vault at her death. The monument was of a very simple form, consisting of the bust of the donor placed above a sarcophagus near the closure stone of the vault. The simple form was matched by a plain prosaic inscription stating that.\textsuperscript{121}

\begin{quote}
In a vault near this place belonging to the family of the Richardson's and now closed up is interred the body of Anne Colleton of Stratford Langthome in Essex......
\end{quote}

The monuments to the families of the Earls Shelbume and Maynard, which were also commissioned at the end of direct male lines, have very similar simple inscriptions listing only the titles and date of death of the deceased family members. The reduction of monuments to the singular, and purely secular, function of marking the grave in this period was a symptom of the general increase in society's awareness of classical types. The "grave marker" form bears an obvious similarity to the idea of the stele which was used as a marker of graves in Greek and Roman culture. The writing of inscriptions which listed the name, rank and age of deceased belonged to a tradition of Roman form which was admired in the eighteenth century for containing no polemic but fact.\textsuperscript{122}

That the Shelbume or Maynard monuments were, in a sense, only larger versions of a vault marker type used in the period indicates that there were correlations between the social status of a family and the number of figures displayed. Whereas a prosperous London businessman such as Benet Swayne closed his family with two relief busts of the value of three hundred pounds, a wealthy peer such as Earl Maynard concluded his direct dynasty with a massive monument showing life-size images. The largest monuments of this type are all of peerage families such as the Shelburnes, Foleys, Maynards and Harboroughs. Wealthy individuals of the "peerage" class appear to have been expected to commemorate every member of the family

\textsuperscript{121} The monument is now destroyed but a photograph and transcription of the inscription has been provided by John Physick, 1969, pp. 114-5, figs 79-80.

\textsuperscript{122} The Roman tradition of simple inscriptions is discussed on pp. 197-198.
in the family vault with a sculptured image above. Equally wealthy individuals of Knighthood status and below did not feel the obligation to make such extravagant gestures.

These huge compositions were an extension of the patronage habits of some of the major peerage families when marking the initial rise of the family to the highest of social echelons. Between the death of the first Duke of Ancaster in 1728 and the death of the second of the line in 1748, the Berties placed a full size or bust image of every adult buried in their family vault at Edenham. According to the antiquarian notes of David Powell, the chancel windows were blocked in so as to make way for three massive monuments by Cheere displaying a total of nine busts and two life-size figures. At the termination of such aristocratic families it was a prestigious gesture, consistent with the social status of the family, to erect a single monument which did all this at one time. It is a characteristic of compositions made at such conclusive times that they gave the impression of being massive encyclopedic visions of the dynasty.

The existence of an established hierarchy within those compositions which were considered appropriate for marking the end of a dynasty can be seen in the directions of Mary Reade, last of the families of Reade and Brockett of Hatfield in Hertfordshire (ill. 68). Mary bequeathed five hundred pounds toward a monument, erected by Rysbrack in 1760, which was intended to close off the families’ ancestral vaults in the church. She left her executor James Dashwood the following instructions:

I desire you will employ the most noted artists to perform the said monument to Sir James and Sir Joseph Reade Bart in the most elegant manner and the sum left will admit not for effigies, unless a bust only of their persons, and so small a one. But rather (erect an?) obelisk decorated with emblematic figure of the social virtues and liberal arts and sciences with a fine piece of marble against the wall or on an obelisk for the inscription. You must purchase a proper place and erect the same near the Brocketts monument in Hatfield, Hertfordshire.

---

123 A full list of busts and figures placed in the chancel at Edenham at this time is supplied in chapter five, pp. 000.


125 M. Reade, PCC 1754, 237.
Mary enclosed a transcript of a long inscription which was intended to be placed on the monument. This simply listed all the members of the family in the vault which her interment closed and made it plain that she and her sisters had been the last of the line. Her reluctance to adopt the bust format as the obvious second class alternative to the full statue memorial is a good indication of the existence of the hierarchy of images used in the closure of a vault. It would appear that a family allegory ranked in prestige somewhere between a multiple bust monument and a portrait statue. The type of allegory she was thinking of bears some resemblance to that used by Scheemakers in his monuments to the second Earl Raymond (Abbots Langley, 1757) and Sir Michael Warton (Beverly Minster, 1728) both of which mark the end of dynasties. The doubts she had concerning whether she could get a grand enough monument for the money she left seem well founded. Her executor, James Dashwood, seems to have been keen to follow her instructions, for in March 1758 he applied for a faculty to erect the monument "in the Pansbourne Isle or the chancel which belongs to William Strode". He does not, however, appear to have been able to get Rysbrack to make the monument suggested for the sum bequeathed. On the contrary, he commissioned a bust monument of the cheaper type she specifically asked to avoid. However he followed her instructions to a degree by selecting the busts of Sir James and Sir Joseph Reade to place above the vault to symbolise the conclusion of the family.

The behaviour of the first Duke of Kent when faced with the prospect of failing to produce a male heir for his estates was typical of the exceptional munificence of a peerage patron at such important junctures in the history of his dynasty. Confident that his own generation of the family would represent a new turning point in the social prestige of the family the Duke set about rebuilding the residences of the family at Wrest Park and London. On the 27th of August 1704, shortly after inheriting from his father, he applied to the Diocese of Lincoln for a faculty to erect a large new "dormitory" and monumental chapel adjacent to the great network of vaults erected for the family in the seventeenth century. From a plan of the vaulting and coffins drawn up by the rector of Flitton in about 1740 it would appear that there was room in the existing vault but that the first Duke wished to symbolise the new generation by establishing a separate burial place.

---

126 Hertfordshire Record Office, Archdeaconry faculty book Hitchin and Huntingdon division ref. 64394 and AHH 19/2.
127 Lincoln Record Office, Diocese of Lincoln loose faculty papers, Fac/9/22.
128 Bedfordshire Record Office, P/2/1/3.
Unfortunately both of the Duke’s sons died in their youth. When the second died in 1726 his father was past his own expectations of many more years of life and the family in its direct male line appeared doomed to extinction. The Duke erected life-size reclining figures in memory of both boys. The monument to Anthony De Grey, (Dowyer, 1726) the second of the boys to die, bore an inscription indicative of his father’s resignation to the loss of his family.129 The death of the boy was described as:

..... a most unspeakable loss to his noble and ancient family of which he was the brightest ornament and the only hopes.

In June 1730 the Duke made a first draft of his will which commenced with instructions that he wished to be:130

....very privately buried in the vault built by me in the East chapel of the chancel at Flitton in the County of Bedford and direct that the monument designed to be erected by me in the said chancel for me and my two wives should be finished.

The Duke, therefore, commissioned the monument before his own death in 1740 (when the monument is traditionally dated). It was erected shortly after his marriage to his second wife and commemorated his first wife whose life-size image reclines to the left of her husband’s (ill. 69). The sculptor was very likely to have been Rysbrack who made a bust of the Duke which was recorded by Vertue in 1732.131 The monument was commissioned at exactly the same juncture chosen by Sir Basil Dixwell. Like Dixwell’s will of 1730, the Duke’s last testament reflected little confidence that the second marriage would produce an heir and showed a psychological acceptance that his situation was unlikely to improve. The Duke’s concern to hand on the property to a suitable male heir was exhibited by the fact that he arranged the marriage of his granddaughter and heiress Anne Sophia to Philip Yorke, when he was on his deathbed so that he could personally witness the suitable handing on of the property.132 He commissioned a grand monument suitable for the social standing of his

---

129 The erection of the monument by a certain "Dowyer" is discussed by Gunnis, 1953, p. 132.


131 Vertue, Notebooks, III, pp. 56-57.

family with two life-size statues, that of himself holding the peerage crown he failed to hand on. At his death, therefore, the Duke had commissioned life-size images equivalent to every corpse deposited in the new vault up to the time of his own demise.

The termination of families who could be considered to have a tradition of particular patriotic service, or to have produced patriotic worthies in the political crises of the previous century, was of particular public concern. Politically sympathetic newspapers noted the death of the last of heroic lines, such as James Jonson, as calamitous events in national history. Edward Atkyns, a bachelor with antiquarian interests and the last of the great line of rigorously Tory lawyers, left remarkable instructions for the erection of monuments which would close his family line (Henry Cheere, Westminster Abbey and Ketteringham in Norfolk, c. 1752) (ill. 70). His pious respect for his dynasty was demonstrated by the voluminous list of legal measures which were designed to ensure that his nephew and heir would erect a decent and lasting memorial:

I desire that between two and three hundred pounds should be expended upon setting up a monument to myself and my ancestors in Westminster Abbey in the niche which I purchased from the Dean and Chapter on the 29th of May next to the one intended for the Duke of Argyll's monument. I desire that there be an inscription on such a monument setting forth the honourable stations my ancestors (particularly Sir Edward Atkyns my Grandfather, Sir Robert Atkyns Knight of the Bath and Lord Chief Justice of the Exchequer, my Uncle and Sir Edward Atkyns Lord Chief Justice of the Exchequer, my Father) have held in the law and my descent from them and to describe me as Lord of the Manor of Ketteringham in Norfolk. For their guidance they may refer to Camden's Britannicus or my late Cousin Sir Robert Atkyns History of Gloucestershire. And I direct that my executors hereafter named (as soon as conveniently be after my decease unless I shall do it in my lifetime) shall lay out a sum of money not less than two hundred pounds or more than three hundred on erecting or setting up a monument in the chancel of the

---

133 The family history of James Johnson (builder of the Twickenham Pavilion), who was the last of the line of the Lords Winton, is lamented in the London Evening Post of May 7th 1737.

134 E. Atkyns PCC 1751, 68.

135 The will was drawn up on June 9 1746, ten days after he purchased the area in Westminster Abbey upon which the monument was to be set up. This suggests that the erection of the monument was of great importance to the donor.
parish church of Ketteringham both in model, size, and inscription as near as conveniently may be (to the monument in Westminster Abbey) and I desire that notice may be given on the monument in Westminster Abbey that another one is set up in Ketteringham church as aforesaid and that another is set up in Westminster Abbey. And to take notice on both that they were erected by me out of the veneration and regard I had for the memory of my said ancestors. And if the said monument should at any time want repairing or any letters upon it shall be defaced or become difficult to read then so often as shall happen it is my mind and will that the person who shall be in possession of my real estate at the time being shall (at his own expense) cause the said monument or monuments to be repaired and the letters there (which shall happen to be defaced) to be made legible and easy to read and from time to time to maintain and preserve the same in such repair and good condition. But if he refuses or neglects so to do I hereby charge my real estates with the payment of one pound per annum to the Dean and Chapter of Westminster Abbey and One Pound per annum to the vicar of the Parish church of Ketteringham aforesaid for the time being for the purposes aforesaid."

The monuments were duly erected and the requested family worthies were commemorated with short biographies which portrayed them as stalwart voices of dissent against historical developments unfavourable to the Stuart cause. Atkyns' remarkable concern to preserve this last tribute to his family from the ravages of time and the indifference of those who inherited his property displays his firm intention that, although gone, his dynasty should not be forgotten. Like Sir Basil Dixwell, Atkyns erected a monument out of a sense of moral duty as the heir who had failed to sustain the direct line of the family. The patron's particular concern that the monument be regarded as a symbol of his particular "veneration and regard for his ancestors" was reflected in the form of the monument. The composition, a relief "altar monument" mounted upon elaborate legs, was associated with a gesture of "tribute". A more modest version of the monument, also by Henry Cheere, was set up by Bourchier Wrey in memory of his wife, Lady Mary Wrey at Tawstock in Devon (erected 1754). This was described in the inscription as a "tributary stone".

The tenor of the inscription and composition used by the sculptor was intended to be illustrative of the formal obligations of respect which a gentleman of distinguished family owed to his ancestry. The ordering of the family in terms of those who had achieved most in public life implies that family was bonded by a sense of strict, formal hierarchy rather than spontaneous affection.
Atkyns' description of the monument as a gesture of his "veneration" gave a sense of quasi-religious respect reminiscent of the "ancestral piety" practised in Roman ancestral cults. The commentary of twentieth century scholars on the meaning and significance of these terms is limited to Peter Martin's comments upon Pope's use of the term "filial piety". Pope used the term in various ways: to express the tender emotions of respect he had for his own parents after their decease and describe the ancestral veneration of Robert Digby when he erected an obelisk at Sherborne Castle in memory of his ancestors who had distinguished themselves in the Civil War. The implications of the use of the term in contemporary newspaper articles and obituaries was that the person who demonstrated family "piety" was to be admired for observing the moral imperative of living in accordance with the standards of conduct or political principle exhibited by his forbears.

The Tory London Evening Post gave an account of "the piety to his ancestors" of Robert Davis of Mold in Flint (May 23rd 1728), a Tory High Sheriff of Flintshire from a stolid Royalist line whose monument was erected by Cheere. It can be noticed that the families who showed most enthusiasm for these large compositions which communicated their respect for passing dynasties were mainly of Tory or "country party" political persuasion. As Martin has suggested, Alexander Pope's veneration of family piety as a social virtue connected the ideals of dynastic loyalty, which were perceived as old-fashioned virtues, with the values of nostalgic politics. In the fifth chapter I will demonstrate that many of the most conspicuously expensive monuments erected as tributes to dynasties are associated with the ideology of political opposition to City government.

The monument erected by Lord Charles, Maynard (ill. 11) upon his accession to the title and Essex estates of his family, also related to the formal obligations of the last of a distinguished line. Charles Maynard had much in common with Edward Atkyns; he inherited his estates as a bachelor and remained so until his death, thus terminating the direct male line of his

---

136 Martin, 1984, pp. 116-117.


138 Martin, op. cit., p. 117.

139 See pp. 256-291.

140 C. Lord Maynard, PCC 1775, 316.
family and was a country Tory with a family history of loyalty to the Stuart cause. A keen antiquarian he had a particular interest in local topography and British medals. Between his accession in 1745 and 1747 Maynard undertook a large scale project to rebuild and repair the monumental chapel to the south of the chancel of Little Easton church. According to the investigations of Julian Litten, it was at this time that he reconstructed and refurbished the vault beneath the chapel containing the coffins of his ancestors, from the time of William, first Lord Maynard. Knowing that his own coffin would be the last of this direct line he had a huge monument, with an image for every member of the family deposited beneath, placed adjacent to the vault entrance. The monument bore a simple inscription clearly indicating that its intended function was to act as a conclusive gesture for the direct line of the family:

Within this vault lie the bodies of his worthy Ancestors, Parents, brothers and sisters by whose care and through whose hands the houses and estates of family, after splendid, hospitable and charitable use of them have been transmitted to him, the Right Hon Charles Lord Maynard in testimony of piety, love and gratitude.

A relief image of a selection of female personifications of Christian virtues, standing in the fields of Lord Maynard’s estate with the church spire of Little Easton in the distance, was placed above this inscription. This was intended to illustrate and commemorate the passing dynasty's moral qualities which were recounted in the inscription immediately below.

Lord Maynard’s use of the three words "piety, love and gratitude" to describe his motives for the erection of the monument is of particular interest. The terms "piety" and "gratitude" infer the formal obligations of respect expected of a gentleman toward his forbears; suitable words for a man who had, owing to the premature death of his elder brothers who had died

---

141 A manuscript pedigree of the family is available in the British Museum Manuscript collection. British Museum, add. mss. 5520. f. 24.

142 Philip Morant discusses the collection of medals with Maynard in their surviving correspondence. British Museum, add. mss. 37220 ff. 118-174 and add. mss. 34, 610 ff. 107-112. Maynard was also a correspondent of Conyers Middleton (BM. add.mss. 32, 557 ff. 163, 166.) and employed (P. Toynbee, The Correspondence of Thomas Gray, Oxford, 1955, vol. 2, p. 790) the notable antiquarian Pulter Forrester as his Chaplain and had his brother Richard, also an antiquarian, staying at Little Easton with him.


unmarried and childless, just inherited the title and estate. These two words are combined with the ultimate affective term "love", suggesting spontaneous, informal affection for those commemorated. This mixture of terms is reflected in the design of the monument. Emphasis is given to the portraits of the first and second Earls which are at the centre of the composition.

The second Earl was credited with a full life-size portrait which was the most dominant element of the composition. His father, the first Earl was placed in a medallion which is fixed by a ring to the apex of the pyramid indicating symbolically his place as the pater familias or founder of the family. The image of the first Earl most clearly mimics a medal of the type created in the seventeenth century by a notable medallist such as Thomas Simon (1623-65).

It is significant that Lord Charles Maynard was a well known collector of such historical medals. He left a special bequest to the London coin dealer, John White of Newgate Street, who had helped him acquire his cabinet of medals. The form of a period medal was probably used as a means of impressing an idea upon the spectator that the founder of the family was a military "worthy" of the Civil war period. As Philip Morant reports in his *History and Antiquities of Essex* of 1768, Lord Maynard, the antiquarian's most generous benefactor, held at Little Easton a letter from Charles II to the second Lord Maynard thanking him for his major part in the restoration of the monarchy.

The central emphasis upon the second Earl's image was, therefore, consistent with the patron's hierarchical vision of family history in which the second Earl could be demonstrated to be the most significant character. Lord Charles Maynard was acting very similarly to Edward Atkyns whose "veneration" for the historical achievement of his dynasty caused him to leave instructions to single out certain key family members when concluding his family line. The basic hierarchical vision of the family is symptomatic of his primary desire to demonstrate his "piety." Whilst he eliminated the images of female relatives of the first generation of his family in favour of exhibiting the important achievements of the male line, the patron included the busts of those female relatives who lived in his own lifetime.

145 John White, of whom little is known, was a dealer and antiquarian of some importance. A catalogue of his effects has survived. J. White, *A Catalogue of the Entire Collection of Coins, Medals, Books, Shells, etc.*, being the property of John White, London, 1788.

A similar mix of formal ideas of respect to dynasty and affection can be seen in the composition from the monument which was erected with a bequest left by the first Earl Shelburne who left no direct male heir. This huge monument was also an effective vault closure. In June 1752 William Monck and Slingsby Bethel, executors to the childless first Earl, applied for a faculty from the Diocese of Lincoln to permit the erection of the monument. This demonstrates that the monument was intended to be erected as near as possible to the opening of the family vault. Only half of the family members shown were actually buried there; the remainder, including William Petty, are interred in St Mary’s, Dublin. However, the inheritor of the title, John Fitzmaurice had no intentions of being buried in the vault; before his own death in 1759 he was planning a new vault at Bowood. The vault, therefore, was being symbolically closed on the direct family line at the erection of the monument.

Scheemakers’ composition presents the family in a rigid hierarchical order. The central sarcophagus holds the two reclining figures of the central objects of the monument, the first Earl Shelburne and his spouse. At the centre of the composition is the medallion portrait of William Petty, the economist and family "worthy" who was considered to have been the "pater familias". This is similar to the imagery of the Maynard monument where a medallion portrait of the "pater familias", William, first Lord Maynard, was hung resting from the fabric of the monument. The image of William Petty is probably based upon a period portrait in the possession of William Monck, the executor who erected the monument. The idea of "family worthy" is enhanced by making the image one stage nearer two dimensionality than any other in the family group and so to appear as a family icon or relic in some ancestral gallery. This gives the composition the aura of what Lord Charles Maynard described as "piety". Another similarity to the Maynard monument is the way in which the whole composition radiates from the central period image of the "pater familias". This firm hierarchical structure of the monument was exploited to bring in elements of family tenderness. Upon the left of the composition the sisters of the young heir, Charles Petty, were

---

147 Lord Shelburne, PCC 1751, 125.
148 Lincolnshire Record Office, Diocesan Faculty book 1.
149 GEC. Peerages, vol. 11, pp. 669-671. Lists the place of burial of members of the Petty family.
150 An account of Lord Shelburne’s intentions concerning the mausoleum at Bowood can be seen in the London Chronicle January-June, 1761, p. 471 and the Lloyd’s Evening Post December 1763-June 1764, p. 321.
151 The DNB (vol. XLV, p. 118) biography of William Petty mentions “a portrait in the possession of Mr Charles Monck of Coley Park, Reading”. This had, presumably, been inherited from William Monck.
shown standing by him ready to instruct him from the books in their hands.\footnote{152} To the right of the composition are the first Earl’s deceased son and daughter-in-law in a family group with their child who died in infancy.

This formulaic mixture of themes of "love", "piety" and "veneration" or "gratitude" can be seen in the imagery of many of the largest monuments erected in tribute to whole dynasties. Those erecting formal tributes in the period made a distinction between elements of formal "public" tribute and those of more intimate "private" tribute. Meyer and many other recent commentators upon the classical epigraphic tradition have noted the formal mixing of private terms of affection with those of obligation. As Meyer commented, the classical tradition required that the tribute to a family or benefactor was both "a private and a public matter". The formal distinction between the "private" and "public" gestures was a vital part of the classicism of sculptors such as Rysbrack and Scheemakers.\footnote{153} The division of tribute into these two distinct spheres which were so vital to the Roman legacy seems particularly appropriate to compositions such as the Shelburne, Foley and Maynard monuments which were otherwise so rigorously classical in their presentation of the family.

Malcolm Baker has suggested that the "affective" elements in the composition were intended to give an amiable image of the family to the locality in line with the contemporary benefactions to the church and town by the inheritor of the title.\footnote{154} I would suggest a far more simple solution: that the executors who, according to the several faculty papers had the monument made, understood that certain conventions of respect to the institution of the family were expected. The demonstration of "love" was, as we shall see in the case of the convention of the "weeping widow", part of the formal code of behaviour in funerary ritual. This presents yet further problems in applying Stone’s notion of the "affective" family to funerary culture. The affective emotions, which in Stone’s thesis are necessarily more spontaneous and informal than the values of the hierarchical family, can also be perceived to be a part of a set of formal social obligations.

The free association of terms of familial affection and the most rigid and formal obligations to dynasty suggest that there are problems with the theoretical position adopted by Stone and

\footnote{152} It is probable that this group was dependant upon an engraving of a Roman monument or sarcophagus in which such small groups of adults and children are common. A similar composition is to be seen in a well-known tomb of the 2nd or 3rd Century AD which is now at the Trier Landesmuseum. (illustrated in P. Veyne ed., A History of Private Life, From Pagan Rome to Byzantium, p. 238.)

\footnote{153} See p. 199 and pp. 232-239.

his followers such as Clare Gittings; theories which have been based upon the assumption that there was a progressive development toward more relaxed and "affective" bonds of family.\textsuperscript{155} These affective values are deemed to have been incompatible with the formal and hierarchical notions of kinship and dynasty and to have gradually displaced them. This is a rather cumbersome and inaccurate model of social dynamics. The Maynard monument, like that of the Foley family, combined demonstrations of tenderness and "love" with a rigorously hierarchical vision of family. Although in the latter the composition was concerned with the transmission of the Peerage crown, it exhibited prominently the images of two daughters whose existence was insignificant to the passage of titles. In fact the central narrative showing Lady Foley with a child dying in her arms and her Lord grieving with her, concerns the loss of an infant daughter, Anne.

The most perplexing problem to arise from those monuments which were erected by bachelors such as Edward Atkyns and the Lords Foley and Maynard is that these massive tributes to the institution of the family should have been erected by those who, by their refusal to marry, actively doomed their direct lines. According to the statistics produced by T.H. Hollingsworth, and subsequently reviewed by John Cannon, over 80% of the peerage was married in this period and there was a clear onus upon the male heirs of such families to ensure the continuation of the family.\textsuperscript{156} The failure to produce an heir was a matter of the greatest tragedy to men such as Thomas, Lord Leicester of Holkham whose monument was erected at Tattershall in Norfolk (Atkinson and Roubiliac, d.1759).\textsuperscript{157} In all the cases discussed the bachelors had inherited in mid-life due to the expected heir's death and it may simply be that marriage had passed them by.

Further investigation of Lord Maynard's work upon the vault at Little Easton reveals that he must have had hopes for the perpetuation of his family. Although Maynard effectively capped the top of the vault with a monument, he intended that there should be further family burials upon the site. At the same time as completing and reorganising the vault chamber of his ancestors in 1747, he had another large vault room built adjacent to the older structure with

\textsuperscript{155} Gittings, 1984.


\textsuperscript{157} Lord Leicester, PCC 1759, 208. Thomas Coke found it particularly terrible to build a huge Mansion at Holkham for his future family only for his heir to die, and scaled down the building at his son's death. (Country Life, vol. CLXVII, 1980, p. 299)
an entrance connecting them. The chamber was designed to hold a further thirty-eight coffins. This was not the act of a man who saw no future for his family. The Earl had, indeed, made detailed legal plans for the smooth passage of his lands and titles to William Maynard of Walthamstowe who was his nearest male relative.

The Maynard monument does not represent the end of the dynasty in the broadest sense, but only of the direct blood line. It only marks the conclusion of a chapter in family history. By tracing the family back three generations Charles Maynard included, in the person of the first Earl, the root of his chosen heirs' blood connection to his family. The imagery of the monument facilitated and clarified the validity of the passage of property which would follow the patron's death. It was not the only one of the large family monuments to function in this way. Malcolm Baker has recently suggested that the imagery of the Shelburne monument which traced the family back to William Petty also served the purposes of a tangential relative who inherited the property and titles. In this case, the heir John Fitzmaurice based his right to inherit upon his common ancestral connection to the economist William Petty.

There was, as Malcolm Baker demonstrates, no affection between the second Lord Shelburne and his heir. This situation was not, however, the most common relationship between childless benefactors and their chosen heirs. With high infant mortality, and the onslaught of sudden epidemics often eliminating all direct heirs within a few weeks, such relationships were a fairly common and expected part of domestic life. Richard Trumbach has demonstrated that the grooming of a relative to inherit one's lands, name and family arms could be accepted with positive enthusiasm. The will of the first Lord Harborough, who had lost his only male heir in infancy, demonstrated how the head of a notable family could embrace the claim of a tangential relative to his lands and titles. As the pairing of dead mother and child in Rysbrack's monument (Stapleford, Leicestershire, 1730-32) (ill. 72) indicates, his wife had died in childbed (30th May 1702) and his only son shortly after (born April 1702 and died August 1702). He appears not to have had the inclination to try to produce again as when in 1719 he was created Lord Harborough he arranged that his uncle's son, Philip Sherard of

---

160 ibid., p. 841.
161 Trumbach, 1978, Chapters 1 and 2.
162 A complete survey of Lord Harborough's family circumstances is given in GEC Peerage, vol. VI, pp. 274-296.
Wissendine, should be nominated to the titles by specific remainder. Not only did he carefully and generously prepare for the succession of his cousin within his own will, but he made special note of bequeathing him a symbol of the common ancestry which justified his heir's inheritance. He mentioned that he would like his Peers robes to be presented to his heir and that:

The role of parchment containing the pedigree of my family shall be enjoyed by such person who shall enjoy the title Earl of Harborough.

According to his will Harborough had, like the Duke of Kent, already erected his monument in Stapleford parish church before his death. Rysbrack's splendid monument symbolised two generations of Harborough's family; the first Earl and his consort holding their only child at the age of his death are shown in life-size figures beneath relief busts of the first Earl's parents Benet Sherard, 2nd Baron of Sherard of Leitrim, and Elizabeth Sherard. Tracing the family back a generation helped to facilitate the inheritance of his heir who based his claim upon having the closest relationship to Harborough's father.

Part 3: Monuments erected by female inheritors.

The donation of monuments was very much a matter of the expression of certain formulaic virtues such as piety, gratitude, love or veneration. There were, as we saw in the case of the Vernon monument, certain codes of propriety relating to the making of a tribute. The female donor figure, commonly used in monumental sculpture of our period, provides a particularly interesting example of how sculptors found generic solutions to some of these problems of decorum. The comparison between the treatment of male and female donation in monumental imagery tells us much about the differing codes of propriety operating between the sexes at times when large bequests were inherited.

A female donor, unlike her male equivalent who risked competing with the reputation of the gentleman whom he sought to honour, could, even when living, have herself represented as a life-size statue upon the same plinth as the central subject of the monument. The great

---

163 Lord Harborough, PCC 1732, 265.

164 There is a description of the monument together with a detailed genealogy of the family in Nichols, Leicester, 1804, vol. 2, pp. 340-343.
majority of figures of female donors represented widows in mourning over their deceased husbands. Despite the fact that a woman could not be considered to be in direct competition with her husband, it was still necessary to ensure that the female donor's image made a secondary impression to that of her spouse. Delveau and Scheemakers' Buckingham monument, one of the most emulated compositions of the period, owed much of its success to having solved some of these problems of decorum. The author of the aforementioned article upon the monuments of Westminster Abbey in the *Weekly Register* of 1734 admired the monument for having distributed attention so carefully between the female mourning figure and the reclining male. The figures demonstrated a harmonic balance which left no ambiguity about the Duke of Buckingham being the appropriate centre of attention. The attraction of the composition was the decorum of conventional sexual roles which it expressed:

The Duke himself is the principal figure in the group ... and his lady, in the most beautiful manner sitting at his feet, her figure is characterised in such a manner, as only to be a guide to his and both reflect back beauty on each other.

The formula of placing the donor figure above the reclining central character was, as we have seen, symbolic of the tributary acceptance of the upper figure's secondary importance. For two decades after the erection of the Buckingham monument the self-depreciatory imagery of the donor figure looking with adoration down at her spouse remained popular. It continued to be a formal demonstration of the donating widow's humility who allowed her image to assume the status of a pendant to that of her husband. A version of the Buckingham composition was designed for these purposes by Cheere for the monument to Roger Owen and his wife Catherine completed for Candover Parish church in Shropshire in accordance with a contract drawn up in October 1744.\(^{165}\) The executors of Catherine Owen, her son-in-law Trafford Barnston and his brother the Rev. Roger Barnston, were instructed to erect a monument to "my late husband and late daughter".\(^{166}\) The monument was to be designed at the executor's discretion but instructions were given that attention was to be taken not to draw too much attention to the donor of the composition:

"I desire," she wrote "that no other mention be made of me in such an inscription other than that I was the wife of the said Mr Owen and the mother

---

\(^{165}\) Shrewsbury Public Library, Deeds 13408.

\(^{166}\) Will proved locally. Shrewsbury Public Library, Deeds 9973.
of the said Catherine Owen and that the monument was erected at my expense."

Her executors obeyed these requests precisely when composing the inscription which made
the merest mention of the donor. An image was designed to correspond with the inscription
which showed Catherine as the donor figure paying a humble respect to the memory of her
husband in the visual tradition of the Buckingham monument.

Like the "gratitude" monuments erected by tangential male relatives, the "weeping widow"
type was largely the product of the failure of direct male lines. The imagery was also
associated with the appropriate expression of tribute upon the passage of money. An abstract
which details the conditions of inheritance underlying the donation of all "weeping widow"
monuments erected in the period (appendix 2) shows this clearly. In all but two cases the
widow shown in the monument had been left with a degree of executive power over the entire
estates of her husband. In the great majority of cases the widow or female heir represented in
the composition was the living heir at the time of the commission.

From this there were two exceptions, the monuments of Roger Owen and Earl Shannon, where
a daughter or her representatives arranged the monument at the specific behest of her mother.
Both these monuments were erected from donations provided by mothers who had only female
children surviving them and were left substantial heiresses at the breakdown of their husband's
male line. In all but four occasions where the "weeping widow" device was used, the estate
had broken down through the failure of the depicted widow's marriage to produce a male heir.
In only one case was a male heir surviving of an age to inherit directly. In the circumstances
where no male heir survived it was elected that, rather than leaving the estate in the care of
male friends or tangential relatives, the lands and properties were to devolve to the widow. In
the great majority of cases the widow, with or without male heir, was not only left executive
power but with riches much beyond her original jointure.

The majority of widows erecting such monuments could, therefore, have considered
themselves to have been fortunate and trusted by their husbands.167 Recent work upon the
legal and social status of widows and spinsters in eighteenth century England has emphasised

167 The legal and economic position of widows in the period is discussed by Trumbach, 1978, pp. 50-55, 81-87.
that widows were often at the mercy of their husband's generosity. Although, as Lloyd Bonfield shows, widows were protected by a common law "right of Dower" they were (particularly when their husband died without a heir and they could not expect the generosity of an adult child) reliant upon special clauses in their husbands' wills to assure that they maintained the prosperity to which they were accustomed.

A series of articles published in the Gentleman's Magazine in the 1760s and 70s campaigned for the legal measures to ensure the welfare of genteel widows not properly provided for.

The idea that loving images of grieving widows indicated their gratitude for a splendid bequest from their husband was taken for granted in the period. The Connoisseur Magazine of 1755 (no.73) advised its readers to view widows' posthumous tributes to their husbands with suspicion:

The veracity of posthumous encomiums may, indeed, be fairly suspected as we are generally told that the disconsolate widow, or weeping son, erected the monument in testimony of their affection for the loss of the kindest of parents or most affectionate father. But what Dowager, who gets a comfortable jointure by her good man's decease, would refuse to set her hand to his tombstone that he was the best of husband's; tho' perhaps they had parted beds? or what heir would be so base and ungrateful, as not to give a few good words to a crabbed parent after his death, in return for an estate.

Not all marriages in which the marital pair had "parted beds" left the widow well provided for. Lord Bingley, who left a number of illegitimate children, did not even grant his wife any trusteeship over her small children. His splendid monument (Henry Cheere?, Bramham estate chapel, erected c.1732) exhibits only his image and was erected by his trustees. The terminology used in the wills of those husbands shown in "weeping widow" compositions suggests that both parties knew that exceptional trust was being put into the hands of the widow; the power of executorship granted as a special tribute in return for mutual affection.

---


170 The Gentleman's Magazine, 1762, p. 84, 1766, p. 58, 1775, pp. 79, 125, 175, 230, 314.

171 Lord Bingley, PCC 1731, 86.
This was often the case when the broking of a large estate which had failed through a lack of male heirs was entrusted solely to the widow.

A good example of this is the short codicil of Sir Christopher Powell of Boughton Monchelsea (d. 1742) (ill. 73) whose widow, Frances, erected a monument showing herself as donor to the left of her husband.\(^{172}\) Having died childless Sir Christopher made no arrangements to hand on his property but simply entrusted everything to his "dear wife" with a refreshing lack of legal prerequisites or conditions.\(^{173}\) In those few cases where male heirs had survived, an affectionate faith was put in the ability of the wife to take care of the future of the family such as in the case of Alethea Savile who erected a large "weeping widow" monument to her husband, Charles Savile of Methley (Yorkshire). Despite leaving a son and heir, Charles addressed the whole will to "my dear wife whom I make my sole executrix".\(^{174}\) His exceptional generosity toward his wife was probably influenced by the fact that he had been socially embarrassed by his previous wife whom he divorced in the mid-thirties on account of her adulterous behaviour.\(^{175}\) His simple instructions were that:

\begin{quote}
...all my goods, chattels, rights, credits and personal estate whatsoever I devise and bequeath to my dearly beloved wife her heirs and executors forever.
\end{quote}

Matters relating to the inheritance of property also lay behind the design and original commission of the Duke of Buckingham’s monument. The problems of inheritance following the Duke’s death were well-known in London society and the contemporary audience may well have been expected to interpret the image with reference to them. The will of the Duke of Buckingham, which was published by the Duchess in 1729, recorded his special concern to provide for his widow. He states that:\(^{176}\)

\begin{quote}
...all my goods, chattels, rights, credits and personal estate whatsoever I devise and bequeath to my dearly beloved wife her heirs and executors forever.
\end{quote}

\[^{172}\] The extinction of the family is recorded in Hasted, *Kent*, 1778, vol. 2, p. 399.

\[^{173}\] C. Powell PCC 1742, 229.

\[^{174}\] C. Savile PCC 1743, 133.


I cannot take too much care in securing the happiness of a wife whom I esteem and value so much... knowing this to be an age or country unlikely to value such uncommon virtue.

The Duke’s comments implied that he was leaving her such complete authority over his estates in order that she could be protected against the evils of contemporary society. The Duke and Duchess were known to have harboured Jacobite sympathies and to have been discontented with Hanoverian society. As we shall see in the next chapter, the feeling that female virtue and family values were threatened by social and political corruption was a major factor in the presentation of ideal family groups in the monumental art of the Walpole period.

Beyond this the Duchess could feel grateful that her husband had left her in such a favourable position when he had a number of illegitimate children (the result of philandering in his previous marriage) who were claimants to part of his fortune. The Duke left the Duchess in charge of the welfare of his illegitimate son and daughters. Samuel Richardson records in his *Familiar Letters*... (1741) that, because Buckingham owned his illegitimate children in his will, the Duchess had severe problems suppressing their claims for a share in the Duke’s estate. Despite considerable legal efforts she eventually lost the family estate to the Duke’s “natural” heir, Charles Herbert, on the death of her own son. In her own will she left a large sum to Sophia Cox for being the only one of the natural children not to have disputed with her.

It is clear that the Duke of Buckingham’s memorial had originally been planned as a smaller affair which, according to the specific instructions of his will, was not to exceed the value of five hundred pounds. A monument of this approximate worth was designed by Gibbs showing a single reclining figure of the Duke. Nevertheless the formidable widow decided to expand the monument into a family monument including the adoring image of herself and the image of the deceased children of her marriage alone. Like the printed will of 1729, which was published with a panegyric account of their marriage and the death of her children, the

---

177 The liaisons of the Duke and Duchess and their heir with the Pretender’s Court are discussed in Historical Manuscript Commission, Egmont Diary, vol. 1, pp. 206, 209-10.

178 See pp. 183-195.


180 Duchess of Buckingham PCC 1743, 66.

181 This design was engraved in Gibbs, 1739, p. 116.
monument was to some degree an argument for her and her children’s right to be seen as the most immediate family of the deceased. Her demonstration of affection was consistent with her desire to be thought of as the grateful recipient of her husband’s bequests of property and title.

Lady Isabella Drake, who erected a monument at Amersham in Buckinghamshire (Peter Scheemakers, 1730-31) with her own figure mourning over her husband, Montague Garrard Drake, was also left empowered by her spouse’s will although she was not left in such complete control over husband’s affairs. Beneath the life-size sculptured pair was placed a figure of Abundance which was intended to communicate Montague’s kindness toward his wife and regret for the premature ending of their marriage. According to a draft preparation of the inscription in the Drake papers the sculptor was to place above the inscription:

An open heart --- put in the middle as an affectionate husband. He conveyed to begin as... but he was... (sentence lost).

Unlike in the case of Alethea Savile, the care of the family’s male heirs was left in the hands of trustees with Lady Drake as the controlling figure. She was left with an exceptionally generous capital bequest from her husband (which left her a woman of substantial private fortune) and considerable responsibility in the management of the family and children during her son’s minority. According to surviving contractual documents, Lady Drake personally dealt with Peter Scheemakers concerning the erection of the monument. The monument was presumably paid for out of the capital left her in her husband’s will.

The term "gratitude", used by male recipients of substantial bequests appeared in several monuments erected by women inheriting sole power over the estates of their husbands. The word was used in the inscriptions of the monuments erected by the widows of Brigadier Stuart at Bath Abbey (Thomas Carter ?, d.1736), Sigismond Trafford at Tydd St Mary in Lincolnshire (Michael Rysbrack, 1741) (ill. 74) and John Piggot at Grendon Underwood in Buckinghamshire (Peter Scheemakers, d.1751) (ill. 75). All of these widows had been left as
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182 M. G. Drake PCC 1728, 144. The erection of the monument is announced and inscription printed in the London Evening Post of December 21st 1731.

183 Buckinghamshire Record Office, Drake Papers, D/DR/10/24.

184 Buckinghamshire Record Office, Drake Papers, D/DR/10/11 7 11A.
the executrix of a husband who died without a male heir. The term appears in the will of Lady Frances Powell of Boughton Monchelsea which was proved in 1762 after her death but made on the 3rd of July 1743 shortly after the decease of her husband. The will was drawn up at this time as a security in case of her unexpected death because she had been left to distribute the estate. It also allowed her to make sure that, even if she died, a tribute to her husband would be erected to her plan. The monument was to be erected by the Rector of Boughton Monchelsea in the "most convenient place in the chancel" at a cost of five hundred pounds. The composition was to be:

......to the memory of my dear husband with such an inscription as my executors think proper making some mention that it was directed to be put up out of gratitude and respect by his loving, tender, faithful wife in remembrance of her most indulgent, kind, affectionate husband. I desire that Sir Christopher's mother may be mentioned as the best of wives, mother and friend as she truly was, and the time of my death and my age shall be mentioned upon the monument that my age may not give trouble to anyone's memory.

She went on to state that the monument was intended to be erected in her lifetime and that these instructions had been provided in case of her death. It would seem most likely that she was successful in erecting this monument and had done so shortly after the will was made in 1743.

Frances Powell's instructions provide as interesting a mixture of terms of formal obligation and affection as the inscription of the Maynard monument. The words "gratitude and respect" are freely mixed with "loving, tender, faithful". The chosen composition reflects this

---

185 J. Stuart PCC 1736, 28.
S. Trafford, PCC 1741, 53.
J. Piggot, PCC 1751, 316.
The Piggot monument, for instance, mentions specifically the generous bequests of the donor's husband. The donor declared that she had erected the monument out of "gratitude" as:

".....an ample testimony of the great Regard and affection which he honoured her with whilst living and by the generous regard he made for her at his death."

186 F. Powell, PCC 1762 536.

187 Two dates are possible. The first is between the making of Frances' will in 1743 and her being declared insane and incapable of running her own affairs in December 1746. The second is that it is a late work of the sculptor erected after Frances' death in 1762.
intertwining of formality and spontaneous affection. The basic form of the Powell monument was that used by Scheemakers in other monuments where the widow had inherited the controlling interest over the estate. The husband reclined as the impassive object of his widow’s tears while she looked down upon him in the conventional way. She was depicted as a standing figure to make a visually pleasing balance to the image of her mother-in-law who could not have been shown as the traditional seated mourner beside her son on account of having died before him. The statue of Frances, which depicted her as an anguished woman grasping at her husband’s feet, reflects the touching strength and sincerity of the feelings expressed in the will.

A cynical observer might suggest that the use of such terms as "loving, tender, faithful" and the emotional posture of Frances was merely a visual convention to allow the formal statement of gratitude for property to seem more convincing. This, in fact, seems unlikely for we know that shortly after erecting the monument Frances was declared insane due to her bereavement. The property she inherited passed into the hands of legal guardians.188

A widow’s expression of "gratitude" did not imply that the monument was not a symbol of genuine sentiment. Rysbrack’s monument to Sigismond Trafford further exhibits the use of a monument to communicate the combined obligations of "gratitude" and the sentiments of a widow’s love. The monument was erected in July 1741 by Trafford’s widow who, being childless, was left by her husband with the entire control of his Lincolnshire estates.189 She applied for a faculty from the Diocese of Lincoln to build a vault for the burial of herself, her husband and those of her own family line who would inherit from her the estates of her husband.190 The monument, a rather formal relief bust described in one of the faculty papers as "decent", stood as a symbol of her gratitude for her inheritance. The inscription stated:

He was tender and affectionate to his wife
Kind and indulgent to his relatives
In testimony of which truths and under a grateful sense of their real force his widow caused this monument to be erected.
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188 Maidstone Record Office: Frances Powell/Insanity. Estate administration papers, U515 E.1.
189 S. Trafford, PCC 1741, 53.
190 Lincolnshire Record Office, Diocese of Lincoln faculty book 1.
In November she applied again to the Diocese for approval of the monument she had erected without mentioning it in the first faculty. She pleaded that she had erected the monument in haste because of a desire to demonstrate:\(^{191}\)

.....the great regard and affection she had for her said deceased husband.

According to the faculty the monument had been erected "over the family pew belonging to the said Elizabeth Trafford". Her living image appeared with the monument much in the same way as symbolised in the "weeping widow" imagery. Again the monument combined the functions of being a genuinely affectionate gesture of mourning and formal symbol of the passage of property. Like the larger "weeping widow" monument to Frances and Christopher Powell, it was both a "decent" gesture appropriate at such a time of inheritance and a symbol of affection.

The "weeping widow" figure raises many of the difficult questions associated with defining the expression of feeling from the proprietary gesture of emotion. Much as the sculptors' imagery was formulaic, so was the behaviour depicted. A widow's grief in our period was so much governed by codes of public propriety as to make it difficult to assess the private, "affective" relations of marriages from visual symbols of it. Profuse public exhibitions of grief during the period of mourning were, as Nicholas Penny has shown, part of the social obligations of a widow.\(^{192}\) As an article in the *Gentleman's Magazine* of 1735 on widowhood shows, it was anticipated that the widow should grieve out of "love or gratitude"; implying that there was a cultural expectation that if the widow could not feel the former it was quite acceptable for her to observe the latter.\(^{193}\) The widow who was obliged to feign tears for reasons of social propriety was somewhat of a literary topos of the period. It was commonly assumed that the tears of widowhood could be used as a formal face whilst the widow privately considered the quality of her settlement.\(^{194}\) Affection and grief were as much a part of the formulaic social obligations of marriage as the "gratitude" felt upon the inheritance of a large estate. The figures of weeping widows, therefore, were as much a part

\(^{191}\) ibid.


\(^{193}\) The *Gentleman's Magazine* 1735, p. 14. Quoted from the *Prompter* no. XI.

\(^{194}\) E. Jones, *Luxury, Pride and Vanity, the Bane of the British Nation*, London, 1736, pp. 52-55.

A typical parody of the widow who feigns grieving because she has received a large bequest can be seen in: R. Graves, *The Spiritual Quixote*, reprinted Oxford, 1967, p. 387.
of propriety of domestic life as a hierarchical ordering of figures which can be seen in the monument to the Maynard family.

Like the large professional allegories commissioned by grateful male inheritors, the "weeping widow" imagery was the most expensive version of a commercial type. The inclusion of a life-size "weeping widow" was a sculptor's symbol for a donor which in a less expensive monument would be reduced to a line of tribute and sentiment in the inscription. The "weeping widow" image was, in one sense, a generic formula applied by sculptors to the problem of creating an image of tribute on behalf of a widow who had a considerable amount of money to dedicate to the project. A product range, or hierarchy of composition types, with the "weeping widow" at its summit can best be seen in the workshop production of Peter Scheemakers which illustrates the extraordinary rationale behind his production of "semi-narrative" tributes.

Peter Scheemakers was one of the trio who produced the Buckingham monument which was the most influential monument in the formation of "weeping widow" imagery. Having satisfied public critics with this image at the beginning of his career, Scheemakers re-used this basic form of composition when subsequently approached by rich widows. At least twenty years after the erection of the Sheffield monument he applied a less elaborate version of the same composition to the monument commissioned by Alethea Savile at Methley. The composition of this monument was very similar to that which Scheemakers had designed for Lady Drake in 1730 but as the pair had lost no male child, the pendant putti (one of which held an image of the Drakes' dead son) were not necessary.

For a little less money a widow could receive an image of her reclining husband with a written declaration of love and gratitude in the inscription replacing her own figure. At approximately the same time as he received the commission for the Methley monument Scheemakers' workshop produced the monument to John Piggot which was commissioned in very similar circumstances to the former but with specific cost limitations. Having lost his only son shortly before, John Piggot left his property in the custody of his wife and executrix, Christobella who was to hand the estate to a tangential relative at her own death. She was left a capital gift of one thousand pounds and five hundred pounds for a monument to be erected at her own discretion. The composition she chose was a reclining image of her husband with an inscription beneath recording her "gratitude". Above them the image of their
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195 The Piggot monument is described in Lipscombe, Buckingham, 1847, vol. 1, p. 260.
196 J. Piggot PCC 1751, 316.
only son is transported into the heavens. This was a less ambitious version of the image of Time carrying off Lady Buckingham’s children set above Scheemakers’ original weeping widow composition in Westminster Abbey. In essence the Piggot monument is a reduced version of Rysbrack’s monument to Edward Eliot of 1723 which, in turn, was directly inspired by the Buckingham monument; the main difference between the compositions was the elimination of the donor figure.

A diminutive type of the same composition, and presumably very much less costly than the Piggot monument, had been used by Scheemakers in 1739 for the monument to Richard Brodrepp at Mapperton in Dorset (ill. 76).197 In this case the deceased had left all his estates in the trust of his widow until such point as his son came of age. Unfortunately his only son and heir George Brodrepp died, aged 24, shortly after his father, leaving his mother a heiress in her own right.198 She concluded her family with a simple relief image of her husband accompanied by a smaller bust of her dead son. In effect this was a truncated version of the Piggot monument; the life-size image of the husband had been reduced to a handsome bust image and the bust of his son and heir simply deprived of the narrative addition of a flying cupid. Despite its size, the composition manages to give an idea of the hierarchical order of the family. The bust of Richard Brodrepp is noticeably larger in scale than that of his son. As in the Piggot monument the donation of the monument by the bereaved widow and mother was recorded in the inscription rather than symbolised in the sculpture itself. There was no simple relationship between the amount of money left and the size of the monument. At her remarriage Richard Brodrepp’s widow was a very wealthy heiress said to have a fortune of £20,000.199 She was certainly capable of affording one of the larger types of monument. It was not, however, coincidental that many of the largest monuments of the genre, such as those of Roger Owen, Earl Shannon and the Earl Montagu, were erected in circumstances where massive capital assets devolved on female heirs who were left with vast sums of spare capital.

Monuments of "weeping widows" erected at the end of male lines can be seen in terms of the elaborate arrangements for mourning that became possible when there was a build up of excess capital. Like the childless Admiral Molloy, whose chosen heir was already wealthy in his own right, many childless female inheritors seemed ready to spend a great deal of money on funerals and expensive mourning rituals. Tessa Murdoch has pointed out that Roubiliac’s
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197 R. Brodrepp PCC 1738, 3.

198 The genealogy of the family is discussed in Hutchins, Dorset, 1868, vol. II, p. 159.

199 The marriage of Hester Brodrepp ("a widow of virtue and of a fortune of 20,000 l") to Thomas Strode was announced very shortly after the death of her first husband in the Weekly Miscellany of March 3rd 1738.
monuments to the Duke and Duchess of Montagu, the first of which exhibits an image of the mourning Duchess, was probably erected with two thousand pounds left by the Duke for his widow's "mourning". This unusually large sum can be explained by the context of the rest of the will which saw the childless Duke distributing his estates and arms to his nearest male relatives. The elaborate expenditure on mourning and charities by Anne Lynn, who appears as the donating mourning figure in Roubiliac's monument to her husband George Lynn of Southwick, are somewhat typical of the wills of female heiresses. She can be seen as a woman with enough economic power to exercise sophisticated tastes and make her own death and that of her husband truly ceremonial events.

Anne's husband died in 1758 leaving no male heir to inherit the substantial wealth of his Northamptonshire estates. He decided to:

.....devise unto my Dear and Beloved wife during the term of her natural life all the singular manors, messages and lands, etc.

Instructions were given to Anne Lynn to supervise the running of the estate. Anne Lynn was not, however, simply left as a figure of economic power, but one with the capital to indulge her own educated tastes. It would appear from the surviving contract that she handled the commission of the monument personally. The choice of such an important sculptor at the peak of his career may well have been her own. In the years of her widowhood she was a woman not only of great wealth, but of learned associations. Much of her largesse was left to members of the Johnson family of Spalding, who were the founding and controlling family of the Gentleman's Society of Spalding. Both the Lynn family and Anne's family, the Ballamys of Walthamstowe were related to the Johnsons. George Lynn had been a friend of the founder of the Society, the antiquarian and art collector. Counsellor Maurice

201 A. Lynn, PCC 1767, 311.
202 G. Lynn PCC 1758, 192.
204 There may well be a link between the choice of Roubiliac for this monument and the sculptor's association with the nearby Montagu/Folkes/Stukeley set. That both Lynn and the Johnsons were in regular contact with Stukeley and Montagu can be seen in The Family Memoirs of the Rev. William Stukeley, The Publications of the Surtees Society, Vol. 80, London, 1887, pp. 39, 41, 321.
205 The Lynn family pedigree has been compiled by E. Green, The Genealogist, vol. I, 1877, pp. 345-354.
Johnson. Anne was responsible for distributing bequests from her husband’s will to the founder’s son, Colonel Maurice Johnson, then President of the Society. It may well have been that the inscription for Lynn’s monument, which praises the learned pursuits he engaged in as part of the Society, was provided by a member of the Johnson family itself.

Although not requested by her husband’s will to erect a monument, Anne Lynn did so as part of a project to restore the church at Southwick. Using the capital which she inherited at the end of the family she was able to supervise the rebuilding of parts of the church and left a further two hundred pounds to complete the project after her death. As was typical of female heiresses who ended their family lines she was able to distribute considerable benefactions to friends and relations at her death. Substantial bequests were made for "mourning" amongst her social group at Southwick and Spalding. The surplus capital from the estate also made it possible for her to pay the entire congregation of Southwick to observe mourning on her behalf. The imagery of the monument itself can be seen as a part of this lavish ritual of official mourning which she was able to enforce on the locality by her substantial economic power.

Spinsters who inherited estates through the failure of male heirs could not, of course, signal the end of the family with a mourning tribute to their husband. This type of female heiress was an important class of patron for funerary sculptors of the period. Many of such female patrons acted in much the same way as their childless male counterparts, requesting a dynastic image to conclude the family line and close the vault. Anne Payler of Bugthorpe in Yorkshire (Cheere, d.1751), a spinster who was sister and heir of the last of the male line, tied up the affairs of the family in exactly the manner observed by bachelors in her situation. She selected a male relative and instructed him and his heirs:

"....to receive the name Payler and on all occasions use and bear the coat, escutcheon, and achievement and arms of the Paylers."

Like the childless Admiral Molloy, she left a great deal of money for a funeral involving the whole community. She requested that:

---

206 George Lynn’s contribution to a meeting of the Society is recorded in Owen & Woodward, pp. XIV, 25.

207 M. Payler PCC 1751, 22.
"Eight hundred pounds in lawful money should be laid out upon my funeral and erecting a monument over me or as near as may be the place where I am buried. Near the place of Williamson Payler (her brother)."

Preparations for her funeral were so elaborate that a special bequest was even made for the "plumber, my friend Wales of Picadilly" who was to make her coffin. A monument by Henry Cheere, another friend of her family, included a fine relief bust of her as the last representative of her direct line, was placed above the old family vault in the chancel.208

Monuments erected by daughters as the female heiresses and last representative of direct lines were frequently very similar to those of male inheritors. The same social duties of "filial" respect or piety and gratitude appear to have governed their erection of monuments to commemorate the last of the line. The monument in Westminster Abbey (Henry Cheere, c.1745) (ill. 77) marking the effective closure of the Prideaux vault is representative of this type.209 It was erected by Anne Prideaux to commemorate her parents and was thus dedicated in the inscription:210

They had issue one son named Peter, who died in infancy; and one daughter Anne, married to John Pendarves Basset of Tehiddy in the County of Cornwall: who surviving her father and mother erected this monument out of a due filial and affectionate regard to the memory of them both.

The monument showed the conjoined relief busts of the pair with incense burning beneath them from an antique lamp; a visual symbol of "filial" piety as practised by Roman society in burning incense to revered ancestors.

The best illustration of this type of dynastic concern can be seen in the directions of Mary Reade, last of the families of Reade and Brockett of Hatfield in Hertfordshire. She left a considerable sum of money for the erection of a monument marking the end of the dynasties

---

208 Mary Payler was on friendly terms with a number of Cheere's regular clientele. Thomas Grimston, who commissioned two monuments, is mentioned in her will. She was related and on affectionate terms with Cheere's most consistent patrons of the Tufnell and Jolliffe family who possessed property at nearby Nun Monkton. (F.W. Steer, Samuel Tufnell of Langley, Manuscript Copy, Institute of Historical Research, pp. 54, 70-83). She left money to Matthew Duane who was also a beneficiary of Cheere's will.


210 The inscription upon the monument which gives detailed genealogical information is transcribed in Physick, 1969, pp. 124-5.
of Brockett and Reade of which she was the last member. The text of her will was written in language remarkably free of legal terms which revealed a strong independent character.\textsuperscript{211} The very detailed instructions which she left for her monument are just part of the statement of a woman who obviously enjoyed much power in the community due to her inheritances. She spoke with continual pity of her "dear but unhappy" younger sister, Anne Myddleton, who had not been "sufficiently settled as to be able to act for herself". Able to act with authority, she addressed herself to the subject of the monument, with a force of purpose seldom rivalled by males in her position. Her desire to be the last of her line buried in this vault led her to take extraordinary measures to have the vault reopened. On account of the last burial in the vault being many years before, another local family had appropriated the right to it. Mary’s anxiety to lie with her ancestors and fulfil her dynastic duties to honour them exceeds that of many male patrons. Her wishes were that:

\begin{quote}
... this mortal part of my body may (in a decent and private manner) be deposited with the Reades and Brocketts at Hatfield there to lie in constant hope of a joyful resurrection with those dear friends to the mansions of the blessed.....I beg the favour of my cousin Sir Thomas Styles and Sir James Dashwood to send an express to the Rector of Hatfield Parish to ask leave of the Pansbourne family and William Strode Esq that I may be buried in their vault formerly belonging to the Brocketts and Reades, but now in their possession.....if that vault be full with the family or if they refuse then purchase me a place near it and defer my funeral till it is fit for use.
\end{quote}

Mary Reade was acting in a similar manner to that expected of a male patron closing his family vault. She was even aware, as we have seen above, of the type of bargaining and compromises in cost which a patron would have to engage in order to commission such a dynastic composition. The compositions she envisaged were very similar to those used by male patrons to symbolise the end of a dynasty. Her view that the dynasty had failed through the death of its male heirs was preserved in her request to have the monument primarily dedicated to the last male heirs. Her father and brother Sir James and Sir Thomas, the most recently deceased of whom had died forty years before her, were to be accorded a greater significance than her sisters some of whom had died more recently.

\textsuperscript{211} M. Reade, PCC 1754, 237.
It is worth noting that three of her sisters had married and a fourth died young and Mary Reade did not apparently live with them. This may have had some affect upon the design of her envisaged monument. In a case, such as the Newman sisters of Old Palace Yard, who all lived in the same family house until their deaths, the imagery of the monument (Henry Cheere, Fifehead Magdalene, Dorset, after 1747) (ill. 37) which closed their family vault was more orientated to the relationship of the sisters. The Newman sisters were the only heirs of their brother, the wealthy Middle Temple lawyer, Sir Samuel Newman. Two of them were unmarried, another was married briefly but remained childless, and so they presided over the end of the dynasty that had become country landowners in Dorset in the generation of their grandparents. The monument, which was erected by the sisters, displayed the busts of their brother and parents with their own portraits set in a triangular group below. It seems likely that the fact of their living together in the family house next to that of Henry Cheere in Old Palace Yard cemented their relationship in a way that made them anxious to be represented together as the last generation of the family.

The Newman family are representative of an important social type in the patronage of monuments; the affectionate group of women who chose, due to one of their number being an heiress, to remain unmarried. These social groups held together, often living in close proximity, presumably because they had the independent wealth did not need to succumb to the economic refuge of marriage. Wealthy women who ended family lines were inclined to erect monuments with subsidiary money, but they regarded the prime relationship in their lives as that with their female companions. The monuments of this social type often tended to concentrate on female group. This was probably because the patrons were wealthy enough to indulge their own sincere sentiments, and overlook the importance of male members of the family. Lady Susannah Thomas, who lived with her mother at Hampton in Middlesex, left two hundred pounds for the erection of a monument to herself and her mother at Hampton church. The monument was designed by her executor, the architect Thomas Archer, and made by
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212 This information can be gleaned from the inscription which is printed in Physick, 1969, p. 105.

213 It seems most likely that the monument was erected in 1763 because it is evident that Barbara Newman’s date of death (27th January 1763) is carved by the same hand as the lettering on the rest of the monument whilst those of the other two sisters are a later addition.

214 The death and inheritance of Samuel Newman’s property is discussed in the London Evening Post June 6th, 1747.


The family genealogy is recorded in Hutchins, Dorset, 1861, vol. IV, p. 57. Elizabeth Newman married a local apothecary, a certain Mr Kitchen who predeceased her and she returned to her maiden name.
Henry Cheere (erected Hampton Parish Church, c.1733) (ill. 43). It was an adaptation of the "weeping widow" composition of the Buckingham monument which showed a mourning daughter seated tearfully beside her reclining mother. As with the more frequently occurring monuments showing a male object of the mourning, Lady Susannah's mother was her benefactor who had left all the family estates to her daughter as the only heir. Sir Dalby Thomas who died many years before leaving Susannah (in the words of the inscription) "sole daughter and heiress" was relegated to a mention in the inscription.

The most notable monument of this type is that to the Hastings sisters at Ledsham parish church. Contrary to all previous assumptions concerning the work it was not erected in 1739 at the death of the famous female philanthropist Elizabeth Hastings. Elizabeth, in fact, left instructions, that "no monument be left" to her memory. It was constructed at the bequest of Anne Hastings (d.1755), the last surviving of the three sisters who died sixteen years after Elizabeth. She left instructions for a monument to her sister Elizabeth to the value of four hundred pounds. Her instructions were for Granville Wheler of Ledsham:

```
.... to erect a monument in the Parish church of Ledsham in the County of York to the memory of my sister Lady Elizabeth Hastings with the advice and approbation of my sister (meaning sister-in-law) the Countess of Huntingdon.
```

The monument erected by her executors was Scheemakers' adaptation of the composition used by Lady Frances Powell. It was, like the monument to Susannah Thomas, a feminisation of a composition invented chiefly to commemorate a man. The image of Anne, the donor, stood to the right of the composition, as had Frances Powell. The second sister Frances Hastings (d.1751), stood to the left in the position of Sir Christopher Powell's mother. Elizabeth Hastings, the desired focus of the monument reclined at the centre, in the established position for deceased women who were the declared object of a monument. The monument was, like that of Sir Christopher Powell, that in memory of the end of a line. In an indenture attached to her will in the papers of the Hastings Charity, Lady Elizabeth describes herself as:

216 The monument is signed by William Powell of Hampton who was a pupil of Cheere's (R. Gunnis, Dictionary..., p. 310) Daniel Lyson states directly that the monument was by Henry Cheere. (An Historical Dictionary of the Parishes in the County of Middlesex Which are Not Described in the Environs, London, 1800, p. 81.) Archer's design of the monument as Susannah's executor is discussed in, M. Wiffen, Thomas Archer, Architect of the English Baroque, California, 1973, p. 41.

217 Documents relating to the affairs of the Hastings estate after Elizabeth's decease are preserved in the papers of the Hastings Charity, Borthwick Institute, York, LE/A-L.

218 A. Hastings, PCC 1755, 92.
Sister in whole blood and heir of the right Hon. George Earl Of Huntingdon
and daughter and heir of Elizabeth Countess of Huntingdon - one of the two
daughters and co-heirs of Sir John Lewis of Ledsham.

Elizabeth bequeathed her estate to her sisters only "if unmarried"; a clause she repeated many
times. Although all three sisters' choice not to marry may have been, at least partially, a result
of their exceptional piety, they probably remained spinsters in order to maintain their financial
independence. The form of the monument was, therefore, both reflective of the close
relationship which developed between spinsters in such circumstances and similar in type and
function to a "gratitude" monument. In this case it was a female benefactor who distributed
the largesse of a failed male line to her sisters.

It would not be unduly cynical to suggest that the great reputation for charitable works left
by Elizabeth Hastings was largely due to her having been an heiress with the fruits of an
entire estate to distribute. The great reserves of capital she left for the Hastings Charity school
were similar to those bequests left by the last of male lines. Her sister Anne’s very ability to
leave such a large sum of money for a monument was due to her position as the very last of
this line. The tale of the Hastings monument is somewhat typical of female patronage in the
period. Women were a very important sector of the patronage of monumental art, but their
patronage was largely limited to those who had been granted substantial independent finances.
The great majority of monuments erected by women in this period were erected by heiresses
who were the last of their family lines. Some were erected by female inheritors who were
more fortunate than women in their circumstances could expect to be. A good example of the
later type of patron is Eleanor Curzon, the youngest daughter of Nathaniel Curzon, who was
left sixteen thousand pounds by her father (d.1719) and executrix to her mother (d.1727).
She acknowledged this ten years after her mother’s death by commissioning Rysbrack to erect
one of the finest, though least known, monuments of the period which has the magnificent
images of her parents seated around an urn.

Whilst female heirs were bound by the same obligations of "piety" and "gratitude" as male
inheritors, there are no compositions which are purely devoted to professional allegory
associated with female patronage. This is related to the subject of private and public tribute
which was of such importance in monuments commissioned by inheritors; purely public
tributes do not seem to have been appropriate for a female donation. The portrayal of women
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219 See Appendix 1, categories 1 & 2.

220 N. Curzon PCC 1719, 44. A reference to his wife’s will of which Eleanor was executrix is made in the
margin of the final page. The size of Eleanor’s own fortune is revealed in her will PCC 1754, 322.

221 Rupert Gunnis (Gunnis, 1953) attributed the monument to Scheemakers. It was, however, announced as
completed in the studio of "Mr Rysbrack of Oxford Row" in the Weekly Miscellany of July 29th 1737.
such as the Duchess of Buckingham or Lady Raymond was intended to exhibit the female figure as the appropriate "private" foil for the "public" image of her husband. Similarly monuments erected by women had associations with the idea of the "private" tribute.

Where a profession was celebrated in the "weeping widow" type, it is frequently the profession of arms. The monuments to the Dukes of Marlborough, Montagu and Buckingham, and Earl Shannon all deal with the idea of the symbols of military Fame and Triumph as perceived by a mourning female donor. As we shall see in the next chapter in the case of the monuments to the Duke of Marlborough, the idea of Fame as perceived by the widow, or seen through the eyes of private affection, was an attractive idea in a society where the public tributes of interested male parties were viewed with suspicion. In the same way Cheere's monument at Abbots Langley justified Robert Raymond's decision to accept his title by having his judgement swayed by his wife; his acceptance of the trappings of Fame could be sanitised by the fact that the "private" interests of the family were seen not in terms of corrupt personal ambition but the natural partiality of a sentimental wife and mother.

Whilst women formed a significant proportion of those involved in the patronage and donation of monuments it is difficult to talk of the female "taste" in family imagery. Several of the "weeping widow" images - that of John Smith, Roger Owen and possibly Earl Shannon - were compositions chosen by men from money donated by women. There were probably other "weeping widow" monuments which were symbolic of female donation though actually contracted by men. It is more accurate to say that the images such as the "weeping widow" type were not the product of the impact of female tastes upon the market but of the contemporary attraction of the idea of female donation as an abstract virtue. The high level of family sentiment seen in the images of crying or fainting female donors was not a sign that a feminine sensibility was evolving in monumental art, but that an emotionally distraught donor was a good metaphor for the virtuous private tribute.

Family monuments erected at the end of family lines in our period, both with male and female patronage, were dominated by a series of visual conventions concerned with expressing the donor's tribute. It is important to note that many of the values of "semi-narrative" tributes were coming under threat towards the end of our period. Cheere's monument to the family of the nineteenth Earl of Kildare (Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin, 1743-6) shows a direct break away from all the conventions of the "semi-narrative". The family is shown grieving around the prostrate corpse as if a moment in the laying out ceremonies at the family home had been

---

222 See pp. 172-173.

223 See Appendix 2 for the patronage conditions of these monuments.
captured for posterity. Unlike the "history painting" narrative of Cheere's earlier monument to Robert Raymond all the formal posturing and hierarchical conventions of the "semi-narrative" form have been swept aside.

It is significant that the monument to the Earl of Kildare was not erected for any obvious dynastic reason; the nineteenth Earl had died with a direct male successor at a good age to inherit the title. It was commissioned neither to commemorate the beginning nor the end of a great dynasty and was thus concerned purely with the expression of grief at the decease of an individual. Roubiliac's other great funerary narrative of the moment of death, the Nightingale monument (Westminster Abbey, erected 1761), was also erected to commemorate the death of a wife which was of emotional rather than dynastic importance. It was in monuments erected for reasons other than "tribute" at the end of dynasties that the most fundamental breaks with the conventions of "semi-narrative" composition types occurred.

Roubiliac was cognisant of the type of formal gesture required of a "gratitude" type of monument. His professional allegories and "weeping widow" monuments are consistent with the sort of tribute which could be expected of his clients in their circumstances of inheritance. A good example of this gratitude type is the monument to Jane and Cecilia Kerridge (Framlingham, Norfolk, 1747), the last of a family line who bequeathed all their estates to William Folkes (the brother of Martin Folkes who was one of Roubiliac's most notable patrons). Two sober urns bearing the arms of the family which had become extinct emerge from behind a cloth drapery with a factual inscription below explaining the transfer of property. He was, however, the first monumental designer of his period to begin to play with and actively flout the conventions of the "semi-narrative" tribute. The postures of his monumental figures did not rely upon the established forms used by his competitors. His compositions such as the Montagu, Shannon and Lynn monuments show an awareness of the "weeping widow" type used by his competitors but vary from them in such a contrived manner as to suggest that he was demonstrating his "invention" in the witty transformation of these prototypes. In the last fifteen years of our period Roubiliac, Cheere, and to some degree Rysbrack, began to explore the emotions of panic and horror and uncontrollable grief in the face of bereavement. It was the response of some of the metropolitan masters to the need for monuments which went beyond the expression of what was considered an appropriate tribute which posed the greatest threat to the language of sculpture developed in the first two decades of our period.


225 J. Kerridge, PCC 1744, 217
C. Kerridge, PCC 1748, 383.
Chapter III.

RYSBRACK'S MAJOR FAMILY GROUPS: AN INVESTIGATION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF SCULPTURAL STYLE AND COMPOSITION WITH THE ASPIRATIONS OF THE COUNTRY ARISTOCRACY.

In the previous chapter we looked at large groups of material in the quest for certain broad perspectives on the generic types of composition produced by the whole metropolitan sculpture profession. This approach will now be complemented by a more detailed investigation of a small group of works from one of the workshops, that of Michael Rysbrack. At the core of this study are the sculptor’s five largest family compositions all of which were made for families of Peerage rank: the monuments to the Dukes of Marlborough, Beaufort and Kent and Earls Harborough, and Foley. These monuments share a common association with the politics of the "country" aristocracy. Four of the five were constructed in the period 1729-39, the time of the growth of the organised "country" opposition to Walpole.

I have not set out to demonstrate the existence of some grand design in which a sculptor’s work was exploited for the definition of the political identity of a closely linked group. This would not only have promulgated misunderstandings of how the sculptor gained his patronage, but would have misrepresented the extent to which such things as style, pose, and composition could be used as political ideology. It would also have suggested that it is possible to isolate certain broad-based political groups and associate them with neatly definable ideological positions; a dangerous assumption to make when much of the fiercest historical debate concerning this period has centred upon the issue of whether it is possible to define political parties and party ideologies. My aim is to point out links between Rysbrack’s style and an area of moral and political discourse which historians such as John Sekora have called the "luxury debate". As monumental sculpture could be perceived to be the ultimate vainglorious luxury the study of the "luxury debate" has a relevance to the study of all the major sculptors’ work. It has, nevertheless, particular application to the comprehension of Rysbrack’s understated classical style, and the purchase of monumental sculpture by those who wished to distance themselves from what were perceived to be the more sordid associations of the moneyed economy and political intrigue.

---

Rysbrack's "sublime" style, its patronage
and the ambient political debate.

We have seen in the first chapter that Rysbrack, unlike Cheere or Taylor, seems to have had no interest in using the financial profits of his profession to enter the political arena. His regular clients were, however, chiefly from those families who had definite associations with the aristocratic vanguard of "country" opposition and, more specifically, those with Tory sympathies. To mention those families who regularly sponsored Rysbrack's workshop is to catalogue the most stalwart forces in opposition to the administrations of Walpole and Henry Pelham: the Duchess of Marlborough, the Marquis of Queensberry, the Harley and Foley families, Pope, Bolingbroke and the "Craftsman" circle, Lord Burlington, Lord Strafford, the Duke of Beaufort and the Curzon, Bouverie, Hoare, Finch, Friend, Williams Wynn, and Tynte families.

Rysbrack did not, of course, only undertake work for a clientele of this political persuasion. In fact he worked extensively for Walpole at Houghton, and made monuments for an array of his followers such as his Lord Chief Justice, Peter King, and the Whig champion of the city, Gilbert Heathcote. Ironically we can only begin to get some idea of why such City and Administration clients were in the minority by looking at an article written to praise and promote the sculptor which was published in a major pro-Walpole periodical, the Free Briton of August 16th 1733. The article claimed that Rysbrack neither was nor needed to be the creature of one party or another:

Having said so much of statuary, as worthy of the protection of a great, a free, a wise people, I will add, that, in the countenance we give men of genius (ie. Rysbrack), we ought wholly to consider genius. We should never take PARTY into the affair, nor prefer a bad or indifferent hand on the score of politics. I know not whether Mr Rysbrack be a Whig or a Tory. I know him to be a good statuary and believe him to be an honest man. I have also a great opinion of honesty and neutrality in these times of faction and division. If he hath made a busto of Sir Robert Walpole he hath made a monument to the late Daniel Pulteney, esq. Formerly, indeed, parties were not so charitable, and Symonds (ie.the medallist and wax modeller, Thomas Simon), the most excellent sculptor amongst the moderns, was on trial in King Charles II's time, wherein he showed his infinite superiority over all his competitors yet
was rejected by the judges, and removed from office only for having the misfortune of having been employed as an engraver under Oliver Cromwell.

As this statement emanated from the hand of the most vitriolic government propagandist of the period, William Amall, or Walsingham, it was not to be regarded as a politically inert or conciliatory. Walsingham argued that, owing to the support of patrons of all political persuasions for sculptors, there had been a renaissance in the elevated art. However it was the Administrational Whigs whom he deemed to have been responsible for the basic political freedoms which allowed this to be so; good and tolerant government guaranteed that a "great", "free" and "wise" people enjoyed the liberty to employ or be employed by whomsoever they wished. Walsingham went as far as to compare Walpole's England with the epochs of Greek civilisation when "sublime" sculpture was considered to have blossomed under enlightened government.

The article was an extended commentary on a visit to the sculptor's workshop at the time of the completion of the equestrian statue of William III (ill. 78). It was, in fact, part of a major controversy that had raged between the government and opposition press since November 1731. On November 4th 1731 the Free Briton had launched a rigorous attack upon the decision of the Aldermen of the City of London, led by the anti-Walpole independent, Alderman Barnard, to block the motion to erect a statue to William III. The opposition periodicals the Fog and Grub Street Journals retorted with strongly worded defences of the decision. By December of that year the government press were publishing the declarations of the Whig cities of Bristol, Hull and Dublin that they would sponsor monuments of the highest quality to compensate for the insult meted out by the Aldermen of London. Walsingham commenced by directly addressing this issue:

I have lately the pleasure of seeing the statue of our great and brave King William at Mr Rysbrack's. If human vanity could in any instance claim indulgence, the author of the Free Briton might be allowed to remember the pleasing share which he had in reviving the sense of gratitude in his countrymen, at a time when a faction in the City of London had treated that virtuous and beneficent Prince with disgrace. When they influenced the city legislature to such an amazing degree, that even so grave an assembly as the
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2 Articles relating to this controversy appear in the Daily Courant of December 21st 1731; Read's Journal of November 13th 1731 and December 4th 1731; Fog's Journal of March 25th 1732; Grub Street Journal of November 11th 1731 and August 22nd 1734.
common council would not hear a proposition of erecting his statue but denied the petition to be read.

The response of city groups to the insult by the City of London caused the *Free Briton* and other government papers to argue that the revival of sculpture was caused by a groundswell of what was termed as the "vox populi"; a social force which it claimed to represent.\(^3\)

The article was part of a wider debate upon the political use of Rysbrack’s works. A protracted passage discussed Rysbrack’s recent work at Blenheim on the monument to the Duke of Marlborough and identified the "sublime" military genius of the Duke with the administration. As we shall see, the monuments at Blenheim had recently been used by the *Craftsman Magazine* in an orchestrated attack upon Walpole’s treatment of the Duke and the notion that Walpole could be considered an elevated character.\(^4\) Walsingham’s comments can be seen as an attempt to restore the reputation of the Government party; a vindication of Walpole and his colleagues from charges of having betrayed the achievement of Marlborough:

\[\ldots\text{ the two greatest men, whom modern times have known or the English armies were ever led by, William III and the Duke of Marlborough, have lately had Rysbrack to give them life and likeness in brass and marble.} \ldots\]

Had any sculptor but Rysbrack attempted King William, I should have been in pain, from the apprehension that they were labouring to deserve a severe indignation. No hand can give an expression to a hero or any figure unless it is blest with true genius to conceive the reality of heroism. There must be the true sublime in the artists imagination, otherwise he will never be able to describe the sublime or elevated character.

The *Free Briton* was at pains to associate itself and the Administration with the appreciation and sponsorship of the "sublime"; both in terms of military and political conduct and artistic achievement. Walsingham claimed to have seen "the spirit of Antiquity sublimely expressed in every stroke" of Rysbrack’s works and claimed that the sculptor worked for nobler ends than his predecessors and competitors. There was even the suggestion that Rysbrack was providing a quality of work at a price which showed that he was not aiming to make a profit upon his commissions. The sculptor’s workshop was portrayed as an elevated environment

\(^3\) This aspect of the debate is best seen in the *Gentleman's Magazine* 1734, pp. 317, 378.

\(^4\) See pp. 166–177.
producing, by its lack of concern for profit, works with a ambience superior to more mercenary competitors and precursors:

The misfortune of many of the moderns in general hath been to have made no distinction between artists and mechanics, but have rewarded science as if paying for mere dull drudgery... It is a melancholy circumstance when men of sublime capacities have not scope for ingenious industry, have not the desire, liberty or recompense for such labour as might carry art to the highest excellency. Too many, instead of being inspired with emulation and incited by encouragement to seek after such an attainment, have been doomed to the unworthy fortune of working for their mere livelihood.

Rysbrack probably had an active role in promoting the notion that he was a sublime and altruistic genius. George Vertue, who was a friend of the sculptor, saw him as a noble figure who was undercut by the sharp business practices of the impertinent and money-grubbing Scheemakers. It seems reasonable to postulate that these views were formed during his conversations with the sculptor who wished to promulgate this view of his practice. Rysbrack’s hypocrisy in attempting to profit from a reputation for genteel altruism did not escape the attention of the Grub Street Journal. An article of September 6th 1733 (no.193) which was published in direct response to that in the Free Briton was clearly written with information that Rysbrack had sought to profit from Walsingham’s publicity. It attacked the sculptor for intending to profit from a Government "puff" and began by criticising the sculptor for choosing an uncultivated hack with no claim to be a connoisseur to promote his work.

"De pictore, sculptore, sictore
nisi artifex, judicare, ----- non potest.

To be a complete judge of painting, sculpture and statuary, it is necessary to have had a proper education in some famous Academy; to have studied for several years the Graces of the most celebrated works, ancient and modern, in the originals, or, at least, in the best copies; and to have conversed with the most celebrated artists of the Age, to enable him to discern the nice strokes and touches of Art, which distinguish the hands of artists, and are
imperceptible to all but such -- But has Mr W this Discernment; and how did he attain it?"

Later in the article Walsingham's inability to recognise the hands of the different sculptors is parodied:

".... in order to do justice to Mr Rysbrack, he has attributed to him the bustos, those monuments of genius, which her majesty has chosen to Grace her GROTTO; which unfortunately happen to be the work of another, and some as think, a much inferior hand. (Guelfi) Upon which account, they say, that if Mr Rysbrack, out of Gratitude for this affectionate zeal without knowledge, should think it fit to exert the great profusion of his Art upon Mr Walsingham's own bust, as the properest present to him; in order to render it more antique, it ought to have the Ears of Midas."

The author of the article claimed to see beneath this show of taste the lowest financial and political motives. Walsingham's expertise was seen as the result of "enthusiasm" and "suitable encouragement"; clearly innuendo for political enthusiasm and material greed. The Journal threatened the sculptor that if he continued these undiscerning business practices he would damage his career. To castigate the sculptor the Journal gave its own "puff" to the competing workshop of Peter Scheemakers:

Had he (Walsingham) viewed the monuments in Westminster Abbey, he might have seen the works of one who has expressed the spirit of antiquity; tho' in a different manner, and who may succeed Mr Rysbrack, with as little damage to his reputation as the D. of Marlborough succeeded K. William.

The debate concerning which party had the right to make claims to taste in sculpture had already been taken to the government in an article in the Fog's Weekly Journal of December 4th 1731. This claimed to be written in praise of Lorenzo Foggio, a fictional sculptor of the classical type who worked in Rome and was related to the editor of the opposition paper. The paper launched a spirited defence of the status of the sculptor as a man who like the poet was gifted with special insight into the human character; who, in particular, was able to read from the face and posture of a man the quality of his inner moral nature. The piece ended with the sculptor's reply to a request to make a monument to Robert Walpole; who, unlike the sculptor, was depicted as a "low mechanick genius". Lorenzo replied that from the description of the
personality he had been given he would be unable to make anything other than a low realistic statue of a corpulent figure:

".....busy stuffing his pockets with Gold looking slyly about him all the while as if he is apprehended by somebody who saw him".

Rather than being made of marble he states that it would have been cast in brass; referring to Walpole's reputation as the "man of brass", a coarse, thick-skinned politician capable of withstanding corruption charges.

As the universally acknowledged leader of the profession in the 1730s Rysbrack, whose cool classical style was most associated with the "sublime", became symbolic of a type of sculptor who could not really represent the spirit of the government. A verse was published in the Grub Street Journal of September 20th 1736 upon a bust of "Fanny" or Lord Hervey - then principal government agent in the Lords and propagandist for the administration - which satirized the claim that Rysbrack's elevated style could be used for a government hack. The bust in question was described as having been seen by "a fox" in Rysbrack's workshop; a reference to Stephen Fox a friend, and supposedly homosexual lover, of Hervey's and a major political ally in the defence of the Walpole Administration. The joke was two pronged: firstly aimed at the idea that Fox could be described as a grand connoisseur of the arts and secondly at the idea that Hervey - notorious for his use of white make-up and for conducting his political career in the manner of a petulant effeminate beau - could be accredited with one of Rysbrack's noble busts.

A strolling Fox once chanced to drop
Grand connoisseur! in Rysbrack's shop.
A noble bust he there beheld
Whose beauty all the rest excelled
Much he admired the curious craft
The sculptor praised - and praising laughed
A pretty figure I profess
It is Lord Fanny's head I guess
How happy Rysbrack are thy pains
The life G-d L-d it has no brains.

---

When the opposition periodical *Common Sense* of January 6th 1739, a magazine sponsored and edited by Lytton and Chesterfield, published a blue-print for the foundation of "A New Society for Monuments and Inscriptions" it proposed that:?

Mr Rysbrack be invited to join himself to us as an assistant in Chief, and that he be retain'd by a permanent salary.

The purpose of the Society, which was always simply intended as a joke, was to prevent the use of elevated inscriptions and images for those whose character did not suit. Its main duty was to enquire into any such use of a monument to the "Prime minister" and then, by degree, his cronies. These jibes must be seen in the context of the general debate upon the administration's sponsorship of the Fine Arts, discussed at length in the work of Bertrand Goldgar.8 The opposition, led by dilettante figures such as Lyttleton and Bolingbroke, claimed that the elevated arts were generally sponsored by the pillars of the country nobility. Conversely when these products of the fine arts were commissioned by the Walpole Administration they were parodied as mere ostentatious baubles disguising the absence of any intrinsic dignity.

These ideas were reiterated three years later in an article in *The Craftsman* on the subject of "Political sculpture" which was probably written by the periodical's editors, William Pulteney and Lord Bolingbroke.9 It was one of many issues of the Magazine which suggested that the "nouveaux homini" of the administration lacked the inherent cultivation to appreciate the fine arts.10 In a notable passage the author puts himself in the position of a government agent planning a monument to Horatio Walpole:

I had some thoughts of showing him in the attitude of Cicero speaking but was obliged to lay aside that design, because it would look too much like purloining from his brother (ie Robert Walpole), who is already set up at his country palace enveloped in flowing robes, which entirely hide his goodly port and shew nothing of the orator but the easiness of the garment.

---

9 The article is reprinted in the *London Magazine* 1737, p. 263.
10 This debate can be seen in editions 170 and 456 of the *Craftsman*. 162
The use of the specific character of Cicero as the character of antiquity envisaged by those creating such noble togate philosopher figures is notable and significant. This had great bearing upon a controversy involving the Craftsman in which the character of the Pulteney family had been strongly associated with that of the orator who suffered and died fighting tyranny. This controversy had led directly to the commission of Rysbrack's monument to Daniel Pulteney (d.7th September 1731) in the guise of a togated Roman philosopher which was erected by the Craftsman's editorial team in Westminster Abbey in July 1733.11

The monument was designed as a reply to a posthumous attack upon the character of Daniel Pulteney, who along with his nephew, William, had founded the Craftsman.12 The libel, which was initially perpetrated by the Free Briton, was the culmination of a long running saga of allegations concerning the Pulteney family's involvement in political corruption whilst holding office under Queen Anne. It insinuated that the Craftsman's editorial were supreme hypocrites; that the money which supported the Craftsman, a magazine intended to expose the crafty exploitation of Government Offices, was itself gained from statecraft.13 In order to counter these allegations William Pulteney adopted the personal image of being the second Cicero; the statesman, philosopher and orator who was made scapegoat for the evils of the state. Defences of the Pulteney family were frequently begun or ended with quotations from Cicero in prison. At about the time of the erection of the monument to Daniel, his nephew William Pulteney commissioned Charles Jervas to paint his portrait in the guise of a scholar sitting in his study deliberating over a bust of Cicero with a copy of the philosopher's works on the table beside him.14 An anonymous correspondent to the Fog's Weekly Journal of December 30th 1732 uses a sculptural image to reinforce this analogy:

Praise is a tribute due to merit as a calumny is a tax upon it and virtue wants no advocate. Your public spirit and services like Phidias's beauteous figures instantly discover truth and speak their own worth ...(When the author thinks of Pulteney.) The image of Cicero naturally comes to mind and I cannot

---

11 An announcement of the erection of the monument was made in the Gentleman's Magazine 1733, p. 376.
12 For an abstract of Daniel Pulteney's political career see Romney Sedgwick. II, pp. 272-4.
13 Arguments concerning the public reputation of the Pulteney family appear in the Craftsman of July 3rd 1731 and October 16th 1731; London Courant July 1st and July 6th 1731; The Free Briton July 29th, August 5th, September 30th, October 21st 1731.
14 There is a discussion of this portrait and others of Pulteney with the works of Cicero in, J. Kerslake, Early Georgian Portraits, London, 1973, vol.1, pp. 16-17, vol. 2, fig. 55.
express my fear, without horror, that the fate of this great man was designed for you.

The Journal was here using the argument employed in its article upon Lorenzo Foggio; that virtue would appear in the posture and bearing of a man when his image was sculpted by a man of genius.

The Pulteney monument bore an inscription which was commonly known to have been written by Bolingbroke. Littered with rather suave references to the Administration, this inscription became famous as the archetypal example of rhetorical grace. It suggested that Pulteney had remained aloof from its corrupt standards:

He exercised virtues in this Age
Sufficient to have distinguished himself in the best.

Not only was the inscription’s suave ironical tone thoroughly Ciceronian but the image of the togate figure immersed in a book was exactly the type of "Cicero" figure which the Craftsman had deemed unsuitable for portraits of ministerial officials. It was the image of the stoic philosopher bearing the afflictions of life with grace and a noble posture; an image was typical of Rysbrack’s togate figures in his major family monuments. Care had been taken to provide a composition of the most rigorous and pure classicism. The whole design was made by the Venetian architect, Leoni. As author of a text book upon the designs of Palladio (The Architecture of A. Palladio Revis’d, Design’d and Publish’d by Giacomo Leoni, London, 1720), Leoni was noted for his strict academic knowledge of the classical canons.

The architectural style of the monument is quite remarkable for its date. Unlike many of the most prestigious contemporary pieces, such as Scheemakers’ monument to Montague Garrard

---

15 Walter Harrison (A New Universal History, Description and Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster, London, 1775, p. 171.) repeats the typical guide-book commentaries upon the inscription when he praises it for: "...purity of diction, and the propriety and elegance of the composition (which) exceeds every other in the church and cloister".

A commentary upon Bolingbroke’s inscription for the Huntingdon monument (quoted below) in the London Magazine of 1749 (p. 420) provides firm evidence that Bolingbroke was the author of the inscription to the Pulteney monument.

16 Dr M. Siani (lecturer in Latin at Birkbeck College and a Cicero specialist) informs me that the oratorical devices of this inscription are typically Ciceronian in tone.
Drake (Amersham 1730-31), it did not employ an expensive assortment of decorative marbles. Neither were there any architectural elaborations such as pilasters or swaths of carved decoration. The monument was, indeed, reduced to the bare essentials of plains of unembellished marble. It should be recalled that Rysbrack’s friend, Vertue, accused Scheemakers of undercutting him by the use of "polish and finishing of works", which, the antiquarian implied, appealed to a less sophisticated type of client. Rysbrack appears to have enjoyed the reputation amongst his supporters for a quality of work which needed no embellishment to make it attractive in the tawdry market place.

The stark, unembellished forms of the Pulteney monument have interesting parallels with those of the architectural decoration chosen by Bolingbroke when building his "farm" at Dawley. Here also visual simplicity was used as an emblem of honest political practice. A poem, which was published in June 1732 with the note that it was "by an admirer of Lord Bolingbroke", described the contrasts between plain surfaces in the architecture of Bolingbroke’s country estate which were to be seen as a symbol of the owner’s moral nature.

See! emblem of himself, his villa stand
Politey finished, regularly grand!
Frugal of ornament, but of that the best,
and all with curious negligence expressed.
No gaudy colours stain the rural hall;
Blank light and shade discriminate the wall.

This reserved aesthetic is contrasted with that employed by the *nouveau riche* minister; a caricature intended to parody Walpole himself.

Contraste of scenes! Behold the worthless tool
A dubbed plebian, fortunes favourite tool,
Laden with public plunder, loll in state
'Midst dazzling gems, and piles of massy plate.

---

17 Scheemakers’ contractual drawing for the monument at Amersham (Buckinghamshire Record Office, Drake papers, D/DR/10/11 711b) is marked with notes concerning the different decorative marbles which would be used.


19 Published in the Gentleman’s Magazine 1732, p. 262
The verse is reviewed by P. Martin (Martin, 1984, pp. 127, 135-6, 138.) as a work of Alexander Pope.
'Midst arms, and Kings, and Gods and all such Quaff
His wit all ended in an idiot laugh.

The poem demonstrated that a reserved, simple but elevated style was seen as an appropriate metaphor for the stately but retired grace of the "country" politician. The use of such aesthetics in an exactly contemporary work of the *Craftsman* Circle indicates that the chaste simplicity of the Pulteney monument was no accident. Daniel Pulteney, the co-founder of the Craftsman accused of statecraft by his adversaries, was to be remembered by a work which employed craft not as luxurious artifice but as the emblem of his simple virtue.

The monuments at Blenheim.

The debate concerning the parallels between moral simplicity and simplicity of design had important effects on the monumental sculpture commissioned from Rysbrack by Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough. In the late twenties or early thirties, when the Duchess first began to employ Rysbrack, she was moving in the same cultural milieu as that which produced the Pulteney monument. The help of the *Craftsman* team was solicited in order to devise and publicise the imagery and inscriptions of the monuments which she erected in these years. In order to appreciate fully the application of these aesthetics to Rysbrack's great family monument constructed for the chapel at Blenheim we must begin by looking at the contemporary "Column of Victory" at the centre of Blenheim park. This Column, despite having no proven connections with Rysbrack himself, gives us a well-documented account of how certain elements of composition and style used in Rysbrack's work at Blenheim acted as political emblems.

The work of David Green has shown that from being the germ of an idea in the mind of Sarah Churchill in 1728 and its completion in 1731, the "Column of Victory" went through many stages of design, was given several different names, and a variety of inscriptions.\(^\text{20}\) Amongst the titles which Sarah chose was "The Monument to Ingratitude"; a title which would have made clear reference to the perceived ingratitude of those who were involved in dismissing Marlborough on charges of military corruption upon his application to become Commander General of the Forces for life in 1712.

At the time when Sarah Churchill first began to plan the Column she was becoming increasingly embittered with the Walpole administration. She found reason to think that Robert

\(^{20}\) Green, 1961, pp. 170, 173-4, 177, 269, 277, 278.
Walpole had betrayed her husband. In an extraordinary feat of this twisted reasoning she employed the principal figure of the opposition, Lord Bolingbroke, to write the inscription - which was to refer obliquely to the Country’s "ingratitude" to Marlborough, his widow and family. As Marlborough had himself appreciated, Bolingbroke was actually one of those in the Tory administration who had orchestrated Marlborough’s original downfall. In a series of overlooked letters (1728-9) to Thomas Pengelly, a lawyer dismissed from power by Walpole, Sarah discusses the underlying purpose of the Column:

Upon what you so obligingly say, as a native of England, it is impossible not to reflect upon those, who for their own ends and love of power and greed and Private gain, made these successes of little use; the ill consequences of which we are as yet unable to see the end of....... And this has been brought about by wretched men who had more fortune than they deserved and still desired more, at the hazard of the whole..... But yet when all is done, if I should expose the ingratitude of what followed, even of those that reaped the advantages of the successes, and the ministers who had no ground to stand on but that the Duke of Marlborough had given them, and to whom he had been a useful friend, the whole park and garden would have not been sufficient to contain the infamy of that relation.

Whose "ingratitude" she was referring to is apparent in the way she exploited Bolingbroke’s inscription at the erection of the monument. Bolingbroke was given permission to publish the entire inscription in the Craftsman with an interpretation of the architecture, sculpture and language totally damning of Walpole. His comments upon the monument which were printed in the Craftsman of May 1st 1731 repeat the familiar jibe that monuments made in a grand but simple style were not fitting for the administration. He gave his reasons for publishing the inscription as:

.....the late endeavour of certain hirelings to draw an awkward parallel between his Grace the Duke of Marlborough and another gentleman who hath discovered a manifest affection to vie with him in titles and exceed him in acquisitions without the least similitude of character and abilities.

---

21 Walpole is attacked in Sarah’s draft memoirs, British Museum, add. mss. 9122, p. 182.

22 BM. add mss 38, 506 f. 21
This sentiment was echoed in the style of the inscription and sculpture. The simple prose style of the inscription, which did little more than list Marlborough’s victories, was intended to give the impression of a man who needed no panegyric to sing his praises. The *Craftsman* described the inscription as written in a:

...plain, elegant, masculine style which is the only panegyric they (*his deeds*) require. It is founded upon facts.

This had an obvious contrast with the other "great man", as Walpole was known, who was perceived by the opposition to be puffed on the panegyric of hack Grub Street poets or what Bolingbroke describes as "hirelings". In another letter to Thomas Pengelly, Sarah explained why she had chosen this simple list of Marlborough’s achievements:23

The other three faces of the inscription hold all the material in the four acts of Parliament, which is solemn and fine, and that my own fancy. For they are as voucher to the inscription which is a true history and I like anything of that sort better than anything poetical, which might be done of the partiality of relations.

The idea that a reminder of the bare essentials of historical fact was all that a truly great and honest man needed to establish Fame has obvious parallels with the Bolingbroke’s use of a plain style as an emblem of moral purity in the design of the Pulteney monument and Dawley Farm. The pillar upon which the inscription was cut was of the Doric order, an order associated with simple masculine virtue, indicating once more the parallels between aesthetic simplicity and self-evident moral virtue.24

Like Bolingbroke’s inscription for Daniel Pulteney, that of the Blenheim Column made its partisan political point by the use of rhetorical irony. Its final lines declared the Column to have been erected as a signal of:

...Marlborough’s Glory
and of BRITAIN’S GRATITUDE.

---

23 BM, Add. mss. 38, 506 f. 20

24 The use of the Doric Order was approved by the Read’s Weekly Journal of April 24th 1731.
This was, of course, an ironical reference to the original purpose of the Column as a "monument to ingratitude". This phrase was seized upon by the government press who took it to be a poorly disguised attempt to vindicate Bolingbroke from the charge of having been instrumental in the initial downfall of Marlborough. The Free Briton of May 6th 1731 retorted that as:

"....no monumental marbles or inscriptions could add to Marlborough's Glory; so no recitals of those inscriptions can take away from B-L-N-G-R-K-E'S INGRATITUDE."

Bolingbroke's motivation for calling the monument a tribute to a nation's "gratitude" was not only to vindicate himself but to show that the very erection of the monument was a symbolic triumph over adversity. With a statuette of Britannia in its raised hand, the massive image of Marlborough at the top of the column towered over the words "Britain's Gratitude", a phrase intended to bring to mind its inverse. Sarah erected the column with the intention of evoking a classical triumph. She wrote of the inscription to Thomas Pengelly:

"I am prodigiously fond of it, though it is a melancholy sort of entertainment. I am told that something of the same nature was put on Augustus's Pillar."

Classically educated readers would have understood that after a triumph the Romans considered it a patriotic duty to erect monuments out of "gratitude". Conversely the Roman ingratitude in the later years of the Empire, which was witnessed in their failure to recognise heros or rip down the statues of yesterday's men, was seen as a sign of social instability and decay which led to the downfall of the Civilisation. Bolingbroke's statement of "gratitude" made it appear as though it was his faction who had at last acknowledged Marlborough and vindicated him from the slurs of the administration. Bolingbroke and the editors of the Craftsman portrayed the "country party" as the representatives of the true "Britain" which showed its duty of "gratitude" in the formal tradition of great Roman society at its apogee.

The monument erected in the chapel at Blenheim was designed to communicate much the same message of ultimate triumph over perfidy. In this case, however, the triumph was that of the family as a whole. The initial contract for the monument was completed in June 1730;

---

25 BM, add. mss. 38,506 f. 20.
26 Reference to this classical tradition is made in the Old England Magazine, April 5th 1746 and the Daily Courant of December 21st 1731, an article which relates to Rysbrack's Equestrian statue of William III at Bristol.
it was to be designed by Kent and carved by Rysbrack.\textsuperscript{27} It was a vast project which was not announced "entirely finished" until April 1736.\textsuperscript{28} The composition agreed upon in 1730 was an arrangement of the figures of the direct family of the Duke of Marlborough; the Duke, his widow and deceased male heirs are shown in a triangular grouping over a sarcophagus. Under the sarcophagus writhes an ugly beast symbolic of Envy which hisses as if squashed under the weight of the triumphal group above. Amongst the preserved draft inscriptions considered by Sarah Churchill is the simple statement that the deceased had:\textsuperscript{29}

"Triumphed over his last enemy, Envy."

Kent and Rysbrack's imagery of a great man stepping over an insidious beast symbolic of his envious adversaries had a long tradition within public monumental sculpture. The symbol of the trampling down of Envy was used by Cibber in the relief on the base of the Monument to signal the triumph of Charles II over the Envy, no doubt of a subversive Catholic variety. Later the same imagery was employed in the Mansion House relief by Robert Taylor (finished 1752).\textsuperscript{30} It seems very likely, however, that the precise way this device was used was borrowed from the monument to Pope Gregory XIII which was erected in St Peter's by Camillo Rusconi in the period 1715-23.\textsuperscript{31} Kent may well have seen and drawn this monument on his travels to Rome. The imagery was, therefore, definitively "public" in its associations which was eminently suitable for its function. Despite being situated on a private estate, the monument was seen by thousands of visitors and very much a public statement of vindication.

Rysbrack's statue of Marlborough appears to rise in apotheosis over his hissing foe; upon his head the laurel crown of the victor with the helm of his vanquished enemy under his raised foot. As in the Column, the truly great man is distinguished from lesser beings by the material evidence of his acts alone. The image of Sarah, seated as a living donor below her husband, points down to the wall on the left where a great series of relief medals, sculptured in stone.

\textsuperscript{27} The signing of the contract is reported in the \textit{Grub Street Journal} of June 9th 1730.

\textsuperscript{28} \textit{London Evening Post}, April 17th 1736.

\textsuperscript{29} Green, 1961, p. 274. The draft inscriptions are, according to Green, in papers kept at Blenheim rather than sent to the British Library.

\textsuperscript{30} A detailed description of the iconography of the Pediment appears in the \textit{Old England Magazine} of November 4th 1752.

are hung. Sarah’s depiction of herself bearing witness to these symbols of lasting Fame is reminiscent of her belief that the inscription of the Column did not need to be an apology or panegyric but a record of the historical fact of his victories.

It may well be that the hanging display of marble medals was intended to remind the viewer of the famous parallel between medals and monuments used in Pope’s *Dialogue with Addison Upon the Medals*. The poet was, of course, an acquaintance of Lady Marlborough and the circle of Kent and is known to have been involved with the design of the Column. The *Dialogue...* concludes with the idea that the virtue of a medal was in its material strength. After marble monuments had been broken up they stood as true witness to the hero’s actions. The image of the Duke’s widow pointing to medals as ultimate evidence of his triumphs referred the viewer to a rhetorical convention used in a number of contemporary military monuments (discussed below) which depicted the deeds of the truly great man as more durable than the fabric of monument itself.

The medals to which Sarah points probably represented the real treasures of her widowhood. In a draft will of 1729 which was sent to Pengelly she gave instructions concerning just such a series of medals:

To my Lady Burlington I give my bag of medals.

Kent, the designer of the monument, was one of Lady Burlington’s personal friends and may well have known of the intended bequest. The device of placing combat medals upon the monument of a military leader may well have been Kent’s idea, for it was also used by the architect in his design for Rysbrack’s monument to General Stanhope in Westminster Abbey. According to Vertue these monuments were completed at “about the same time”.

---


33 Green, 1961, p. 170.

34 See, pp. 198.

35 BM. add mss 38,056 fol. 24

36 An announcement of the monument’s erection appears in the *London Evening Post*, December 12th and 21st 1732. It was erected at the behest of his widow (PCC 1723, 61) who left £1000 to Charles Viscount Fane, Lady Mary Fane, Thomas Pitt, and Thomas Lord Londonderry to erect the monument. Stanhope died in fervent opposition to Walpole after the latter’s sabotage of the Peerage Bill and his executors were all aligned with the Whig opposition by 1732. Lady Fane was a friend of Sarah Churchill (BM add. mss. 33, 939, f. 113).

37 Vertue, Notebooks III, p. 65.
It may well be that this erudite reference to the tradition of medals was a purposeful attempt upon the part of designer and sculptor to show their erudition in matters of antiquarian knowledge.

Rysbrack’s drawing for the Stanhope monument has a payment both to Kent and a ”Mr Knight” for their part in designing the monument. It is significant that the monument and its inscription were discussed by the Spalding Society on the 1st of February 1733. In the Chair was the then President of the Society, Samuel Knight who may well be the ”Mr Knight” who was paid for his help in designing the monument. Rysbrack and Kent were elected full members of the Society shortly afterward. The Society had a number of meetings explicitly devoted to the discussion of antique medals and it is probable that the use of the device owed much to their erudite discussions. It seems, therefore, that there is a direct relationship between Rysbrack’s considered classical style and his claims to be amongst the virtuosi of London’s classically educated artists.

Sarah’s fascination with the idea that the self-evident facts of history would endure over Envy and detraction was reflected in the way she points to her husband’s medals making the deeds speak for themselves rather than arguing innocence. When she eventually chose an inscription it comprised little other than a statement of a few facts of Marlborough’s main victories and the dates of his birth and decease; all argument was implicit in the imagery of the sculpture. This echoes her choice of an inscription for the Column which made the facts of her husband’s career speak for themselves. She wrote to Pengelly:

I believe that you will observe that the person who wrote this has taken care not to obviate the relation of the sole objections that ever were made to the Duke of Marlborough’s management of the war, without arguing, which would have been absurd in a thing of this kind.

There are many interesting parallels between this idea of self-evident or implicit virtue and those of the contemporary Fog’s Weekly Journal (December 4th, 1731) upon the ability of the great sculptor to expose the physical signs of greatness with his imagery alone.

---


39 A note of the payments on the verso of the drawing (BM. no. 1859-7-9-99) made in Physick, 1969, p.83.

40 BM. add. mss. 38,506 f. 20.
The theme of the monument has something in common with Roubiliac's monument to Admiral Warren (Westminster Abbey, erected 1756). Here, as we discussed in the previous chapter, the heroism of the deceased is depicted as already established by the unbiased forces of eternal fame and the family's tribute is considered to be an affectionate and "private" affirmation of this. In the monument at Blenheim Chapel the widow's role is simply to point to the material evidence of the tributes poured upon her husband. The same idea of incurring the virtue of humility upon a widow's tribute to Fame, by suggesting rhetorically that it was superfluous to need, was employed some thirty years later in the inscription of Rysbrack's monument to Admiral Boscawen. The inscription, which was written by Lady Boscawen herself, declared that it would be the grand forces of "History", rather than her monument, which would ensure the reputation of her husband. Lady Boscawen's role as the loyal widow of a great military man was merely to augment the processes of history.

The composition of the Marlborough monument also recalls that of Roubiliac's monument to Earl Shannon (Walton-upon-Thames, 1756-59) in which the widow is also seen below the image of her husband. In the monument to Earl Shannon the hero was depicted in a triumphant pose at the apex of the composition with his widow looking up at him with adoration; rising out of the gun smoke like an apparition conjured up from his widow's fond remembrances. In a society which distrusted male relatives' tendency to exploit military monuments to promote their own reputation, the presentation of military greatness as a vision of the righteous widow was an attractive one. The tribute of a widow's love was, in the ideal, more obviously altruistic than that of a male relative and, therefore, a more persuasive medium for the communication of military greatness. The idea that the husband's "fame" or virtue could be perceived as being witnessed by his widow's veneration was somewhat of a convention of monumental sculpture in the period. Rysbrack also used the device in his monument to Nicholas Rowe which, according to the London Evening Post, was erected in 1743. Here a seated statue, which is described by contemporaries as an image of "his lady in deepest affliction", holds a volume of her husband's work and leans tearfully upon his bust which is set up upon a plinth and decked with laurels. Like the Duke of Marlborough's...
monument it is an image of apotheosis witnessed by the venerating widow. The monument to Rowe was also a product of Tory circles; it bore an inscription by Pope referring to the superiority of the poet's genius over political machination. The combination of the image of the mourning widow and the imagery of Roman triumph is a common feature of the weeping widow monuments of our period; the Buckingham, Marlborough, Shannon and (with the addition of some wit) Montagu monuments all concern a widow grieving over a military husband shown with cannons or other spoils of war around him. It is probable that the role of the grieving widow as a pious guardian of her husband's fame was based upon ideals from the Roman world. J. P Balsdon points to the tradition of the virtuous "univarea", widows whose role was perceived as the humble and loyal representative of her husband after his decease.

The position which the figure of Sarah adopts as the donor of the monument - seated below the standing image of her husband and looking up at him with adoration - demonstrated her humility. The imagery differed noticeably from that made popular by that of the Duchess of Buckingham - a reclining hero and weeping widow seated looking down upon him. Sarah knew the Duchess of Buckingham; she had, in fact, refused Lady Buckingham the use of the Marlborough's funeral car upon the grounds that her husband was not great enough to assume the same trappings as the Duke of Marlborough. The two formidable Duchesses, both of whom set up a small industry of vindicatory literature around their husbands' and their own posthumous reputations, seem to have been in competition regarding who was to be seen publicly as the most virtuous widow.

It was unlikely, therefore, that Sarah should have desired a monument which was in any way a derivative of the Buckingham composition. On the contrary, by placing herself humbly looking up at the image of her husband in apotheosis she out-did the Buckingham composition which was, as we have seen, admired for its decorous placement of the female donor who was seen as a "reflection" of her husband's glory. The Duke of Marlborough's monument was

---


48 The Duchess of Buckingham commissioned a vast array of works of art which depicted her as a good mother. A wax model of her son Edmund (d. 1736) was placed in the proximity of the Henry V chapel in Westminster Abbey. Wax images of herself and her young son, the Marquis of Normandy (d. 1714), were placed in a wainscot press by the monument in Westminster Abbey. She and Edmund erected a monument to her man mid-wife Hugo Chamberlayne (erected 1731) in the Abbey. A large allegory of herself and the Duke was painted by Antonio Belluchi on the ceiling of the main room in Buckingham House (completed July 1722) at the time of the erection of her husband's monument (Vertue, Notebooks, vol. III, pp. 6, 97).
more than an image of the grieving of the virtuous widow; it was an image of the humble worship of a husband's memory who was depicted crowned by laurels in god-like apotheosis. Its composition made clear visual allusions to the notion, discussed in the previous chapter, of the donation of a family monument as a formal act of family "piety". As a gesture of a donating widow's "sacra" (to use Cicero's afore mentioned term), or appropriate quasi-religious respect, it was one stage more forthright than the Buckingham composition.

By erecting an image of herself in the process of giving defiant witness to her husband's deeds and crushing the image of Envy, Sarah included her own and her sons' reputations in the triumph. At the time of commissioning the monument Sarah was writing a draft of her memoirs which was to be published after her death. These were intended to vindicate her reputation from accusations that she had been involved in scheming and power machinations in the court of Queen Anne. Sarah and her apologists retorted in her defence that she was a woman of feeling rather than calculation, a retired country mother rather than court magnate. In her draft memoirs she defines herself as a woman of genteel feeling whose amiable femininity contrasted with her arch-rival at Court "the stinking ugly chambermaid", Abigail Hill. She describes Hill as, "by nature very hard and not apt to cry" and in so doing vindicated herself from the charge of being a calculating, feelingless woman. As one vindicatory article recalled in 1745, her very femininity was her best defence. The words of Bishop Burnet were reprinted as evidence of the purity of her motivations:

She was thought proud and insolent on her (Queen Anne's) favour though she used none of the common arts of court to maintain it; for she did not beset the Princess or flatter her, she stayed much at home and looked very carefully after the education of her children.

This type of comparison between the court and the country woman was, as we shall see below, borrowed from a popular topos upon the corruption of high society women by court behaviour; a topos which advocated the woman of virtue as the quiet domestic who preferred country retreat and the duties of the education of infants.

Sarah's portrayal of herself as the retired country wife reflected her contempt for standards of femininity in the Hanovarian court. This contempt was most clearly reflected in the monument

---

49 See particularly BM. add. mss. 9122, pp. 171, 199.
50 BM. add. mss. 9121, p. 58.
51 Anon. The Life of Sarah Late Duchess of Marlborough, London, 1745, p.50.
to Queen Anne which was completed by Rysbrack in 1738. In her manuscript memoirs she states that the main objective of this monument was to vindicate herself from charges that she had connived against the Queen and also to lament the decline of standards in what she perceived to be the luxurious Court of Walpole’s patroness, Queen Caroline. A print of the monument (ill. 79) was circulated widely with an inscription claiming the inscription was, like that of the Blenheim column, a "True History". Below the engraving was printed a long account of the Queen’s life and virtues included a full inventory of the Queen’s expenditure upon clothes and jewels. By Sarah’s own admission, this was intended to bring shame upon the over-spending on such luxuries by Walpole’s patroness, Queen Caroline. The Tory *London Evening Post* of November 21st 1739 suggested that the inscription might also apply to the character of the Princess of Wales, who by then was at the head of the rival court. Rysbrack’s statue, set up on a plain marble base with an image of the Queen in the simplest attire in which a monarch could be expected to be seen publicly, was used as a metaphor for moral purity.

Similarly his statue of Sarah upon the Blenheim monument reiterated the notion that she also was free from the corruptions of the vain and luxurious modern court. Sarah depicted herself as the paragon of retired femininity; a mother with her child in her arms dressed, not in court lace, but in a simple garment. The irony of the monument was that this ideal pair - the man of action and masculine example, and the woman of retired domestic virtue - had lost their children and heirs. The couple’s failure to produce a direct heir was famous and can be expected to have been in the mind of contemporaries who came to see the monument; Samuel Richardson writing in 1741, for instance, referred to the Churchill family as his generation’s most spectacular loss of a direct male line. The monument was a lament of the end of a dynasty, combining triumph with irreversible loss. There was a tragic irony in the central image which, according to Philip Yorke, was that recording a moment when "the Duchess presents his son, The Marquis of Blandford, to him." Sarah saw that the remains of her

---

52 An announcement of its completion appears in the *London Magazine*, 1738, pp. 343-4.


"the character of the Queen’s is so much the reverse of Queen Caroline that I think it (the statue) will not be liked at Court. And though I make no observations upon it, nobody can read it without reflecting upon the difference in the proceedings in Queen Anne’s reign and the present."


eldest son were removed from his College at Cambridge for burial beneath the monument before her death. His image, the clay model of which she cherished as a private memento, added sentiment to the public pomp of the composition.

The imagery of the Marlborough monument showed the whole noble, unfortunately blighted, family in triumph over Envy. In order to understand the duality of this imagery we must look at the contemporary perception of "Envy". Like "Gratitude", the meaning of the concept of "Envy" in the period reflected its Latin origins. The Latin term "Invidia" had greater inflections of meaning than that of covetous behaviour; it was used to describe the jealousy of social inferiors which could threaten the whole fabric of genteel society. Eighteenth century conduct manuals place "envy" as an ultimate crime against polite society. Lawrence Klien has demonstrated that polite society in the early eighteenth century was built upon a loose code of values enshrined in a vocabulary of terms such as "open, fresh, and clean". These terms reflected the gentleman's ease and his acknowledgment of his position within the social hierarchy. "Envy" was the very inverse of many of these polite values which deprived men of the gentleman's affable poise and spread a discontent which undermined the whole structure of society.

In showing herself and her family as an affectionate group the Duchess was demonstrating their innocence and amiability. Noble sentiments and polite, loving gentility made the family superior to the sordid machinations of their detractors. The bestial and thoroughly ignoble image of Envy which crawls out from below was symbolic of the general social level from which such undermining forces tended to lurk. The imagery symbolised the general social pique which so frequently motivated the Duchess; it is apparent in the statements of her letters and private papers concerning those who thwarted her - be it Vanbrugh, Abigail Hill or Robert Walpole - that she considered herself a member of a noble line beset by the ambitions of her social inferiors.

56 British Museum, Cole manuscripts, add. mss. 5836. 45.
The use of the tradition of triumphal imagery and the notion of the dynasty conquering adversity: Rysbrack's imagery and its context in the political use of funerary images of the family in the period.

The triumph of the Duke of Marlborough and his family was symbolised by the use of dual metaphors of the sublime or elevated mind: the figures are carved in an elevated classical style and they are placed in an elevated position above the representations of their menial detractors. A similar use of the aesthetics of the sublime, or elevated, were used in the vindication of Thomas, third Lord Strafford in his monument by Rysbrack (d.1739) (ill. 80) which was erected by his son in the sham ruin of Stainborough Castle. Like the Duke and Duchess of Marlborough, Earl Strafford considered himself the victim of an administrational conspiracy of the later years of Queen Anne. After being impeached for his role as a negotiator of the Peace of Utrecht in the trials managed by the Whig Administration, Strafford became a bastion of the Tory opposition, received a Jacobite Peerage and probably became an active Jacobite. He lived a retired existence upon his estates in Bedfordshire and Yorkshire where he laboured under the notion that his dynasty had been blighted by wrongful impeachments engineered by a corrupt state. In 1739, shortly before his death, he had documents from the family archive published in order to vindicate his ancestor the first Earl Strafford from the charges which led to his downfall.60

The third Earl's will contained detailed requests for a coffin plate inscription and monument in which he attempted to absolve himself and his future dynasty from any defamation. He wished to be interred:61

......with a brass upon my coffin, with my coat of arms deeply engraved upon it or embossed and under it the titles I bore at the death of Queen Anne; that I was impeached in the First Parliament of King George the First for serving the great and good Queen Anne and the nation at the Peace of Utrecht. Putting my answer article by article and that the impeachment was dropped since which time I have lived a Private life - keeping up the dignity of my family and constantly attending the service of my Country in the Parliament and doing in opposition with the same resolution during the time of my impeachment was pending as afterward


61 Lord Strafford, PCC 1739, 271.
Instructions were left for a monument that was to be placed in a designated position within Stainborough Castle:

.... with an inscription to the same effect as that desired to be upon my coffin.

The unusual decision to have his monument placed in this sham Castle on a hill-top above his estates needs some explanation. According to Joseph Wilkinson the Castle of Stainborough, which has now collapsed, bore an inscription that it had been "rebuilt" by Strafford upon the site where an ancient British hillfort was thought to have stood. Rysbrack’s image was erected within the enclosure of the Castle, on or near the spot where excavations apparently revealed a tomb of an ancient warrior dressed in his full armour.

Such ancient hillforts were, as William Hay’s (published 1730) famous poem entitled Mount Caburn emphasised, associated with the heroic resistance of an ancient indigenous warrior class to threats to their natural liberty. Hay was a cousin of the Duke of Newcastle and, thus, a loyal supporter of the Walpole Administration which demonstrates that such nostalgia was not an exclusive characteristic of the "Country Party’s" ideology but the province of a larger debate upon political liberty.

Why graves so eminent did warriors chose?
Was it with useful precepts to infuse?
Would they their sons with martial glory fire?
Or by their death more peaceful thoughts inspire?
The curious antiquaries will sumize
View their odd armour and gigantic size
And us their modern pygmy race despise.

If it were in Strafford’s mind to place his monument upon a hill-top to "inspire" his "sons" with the spirit of resistance he may well have been following the example of his fellow Yorkshire peer, Lord Carlisle of Castle Howard. Letters in the Wentworth Papers show that

---


63 The monument is described shortly after its erection in Cartwright ed., *The Travels Through England of Dr Richard Pococke*, vol. 1, p. 64. This gives some impression of the original splendour of the monument which had a "canopy of four Corinthian Columns of Free Stone."

64 A political biography of Hay is available in Romney Sedgwick, vol. 2, pp. 119-120.
the third Earl knew Lord Carlisle and Castle Howard. There is even a surviving correspondence with Lord Bathurst in 1733 concerning the similarity of the lie of the land at Castle Howard and Wentworth Castle in which Bathurst suggests that both estates were suited to grand statements.65

In the year that Strafford compiled his will Lord Carlisle published a verse entitled *The late Earl of Carlisle's Advice to his son, the present Earl of Carlisle, written a few hours before his death*, which was published in the *London Magazine* of 1739.66 This urged his son to use the image of his father's monument upon a country hill top to keep him in constant mind of his duty to remain hardy and aloof from the corruption of court circles. Once again the political background to this contemplative dynastic image was "country" ideology. The second Earl who commissioned the mausoleum, and his son who completed it were, like Strafford, involved with the Yorkshire opposition to Walpole.67 The monument was, as Lord Carlisle's verse explained, placed upon a hill-top to remind Carlisle's son and all future heirs of the moral principles to which the "pater familias" had kept in his rural life and to act as a conspicuous reminder of the value of country retirement. The poem ends with the following pronouncement:

```
The times will come, nought can prevent
From these green shades thou will be sent,
To darker far below
On yon green hill a dome does stand,
Erected by thy fathers hand,
Where thou and I must go.
To thee what comfort then 'twill be!
The like also will be to me
When our last breath we yeald;
That some good deeds we here have done,
A fruitless course we have not run,
When thus we quit the field.
```


In previous lines Carlisle had recommended the classic country political philosophy of retired estate life as the key to this virtuous life:

He recommends the life he chose
Where health and peace abound;
He did from long experience find
That true content and quiet of mind,
Seldom in courts are found
Fly then from thence, the city leave
Thy very friends will thee deceive
Virtue does there offend:
In this retreat safe shalt thou be,
From all uncertain mischief free
That do in courts attend.
Nor think this lonely shade
For ease and quiet are made
Inactive thou must be;
Occasions often will present,
Whereby vile deeds thou must prevent,
Justice will call on thee.
The bold oppressor thou will awe,
the violator of the law.
Shall feel thy heavy hand.
To the distressed and needy poor,
Thy ready charitable door
Shall ever open stand.

Recent commentators have not observed this element of triumphal imagery in the placement of the Castle Howard mausoleum upon a hill-top. It argues majestically that dynastic tradition transcended in country retirement the shifting and corrupt world of public life and power politics.68

The initial rebuilding of Stainborough Castle (1715-33) was a gesture of political defiance, but it was also intended to signal a triumph over domestic adversity. M.J. Charlesworth has argued that the Castle was built upon this highest position in Strafford's land to signify his triumph

over his Whig cousin, Lord Malton, whose lands and magnificent classical seat of Wentworth Woodhouse occupied the valleys below.69 Strafford had been disinherited by the second Earl of Strafford who, despite the fact that Thomas was the expected heir, left all of his wealth to a nephew who later bore the title Lord Malton.70 When, through his successful public career, the third Earl managed to regain some of the wealth he expected to inherit, he bought the land above Malton’s estates.71 The gesture of "rebuilding" Stainborough Castle in a Gothic style on land over-looking Lord Malton’s grand classical mansion of Wentworth Woodhouse was intended to make his cousin’s family appear the *nouveaux riche* pretenders. The erection of the monument upon his own estates also signalled his objections to being commemorated in the traditional depository of his ancestors in the East End of York Minster. Here stood Nost’s monument to the second Earl Strafford which was erected in 1696 by the nephew who had supplanted him. Its inscription explained Malton’s inheritance of his uncle’s property. A large monument by Guelfi of Lord Malton (d.1723) and his wife was placed directly beside it as a homage to his benefactor.72

Rysbrack depicted Strafford as a titanic Roman warrior, dressed in his great cloak and gesturing as if to speak. The statue gave the strong impression of a commander in the midst of the field of action; an image of command which reinforced the idea of sublime triumph over adversity which is indicated by its placement upon a promontory looking down upon the world. As in the Column and monument at Blenheim, the metaphor of placing the monumental image of a warrior figure in an elevated position was used to communicate the idea of a man’s ultimate triumph over adversity.

Like Rysbrack’s monument at Blenheim that of Earl Strafford set out to defend the institution of the family. Strafford’s instructed that the monument should commemorate the idea that he had:

.... lived a private life keeping up the dignity of my family.

---


70 GEC, Peerages, XII, pp. 328-331.


72 These monuments have been moved but an account of their original positions appears in a ground plan of the Minster bound between pages 518 & 519 of F. Drake, *Eboracum or the History and Antiquities of the City of York*, London, 1736.
In the classical tradition of "otium" virtuous retirement in a time of corrupt city administration was the duty of the upright statesman. Here he could devote himself to the microcosm of life around his estate; an environment where he had complete moral control. The retired landlord was to turn his attention not only to his tenants and the sound management of his estates but the judicious maintenance of the institution of the family. Having invested in sound domestic values, such a man could base his hopes for the future upon the health and morality of his progeny; reassured that the time would come when his heirs would come to power in a more just society. It is important to note that the major text of the country opposition upon the theory of historical change, Bolingbroke's *Letters on the Study and Use of History* (written 1731), contended that posterity, and the unbiased majesty of "history", would expose the evil and vindicate the just when periods of tyranny or corruption were concluded. Rysbrack's "sublime" style and his use of timeless traditions of antiquity made his sculpture an appropriate medium for the communication of such ideas.

These ideas were particularly relevant to those in Strafford's immediate social orbit. He was a close friend of Lord Bathurst to whom Pope had written his famous *Epistle.... on the Use and Abuse of Riches* which was, perhaps, the definitive statement of the values of virtuous retirement. Bathurst may well have inspired the later's use of monumental sculpture as a medium for political complaint. J. Dodd's manuscript diary of his tours of 1733-5 records seeing "a statue of a slave in chains" on the lawn before Bathurst's House at Cirencester Park which was erected so that:

.....the Noble Lord may at least see the prospect of what he was made a peer for on the famous 11th December 1713.

The ideas about which Pope's *Epistle to Bathurst* revolved were, as Peter Martin and Maynard Mack have shown, very much the ideological basis of the Tory aristocracy's reaction to Walpole's Administration. The Tory *London Evening Post* was prone to writing laudatory obituaries to the representatives of old country families whose achievements were in retirement. One, published on July 5th 1735, praised the Heneage family for having at least

---


74 British Museum, Cole manuscripts, Dodd Travel Diary, add. mss. 5942, 244, 270.

been able to maintain the existence of the dynasty through difficult times. George Heneage and his wife were praised for being:

A singular example for most husbands and wives at these times, who are more solicitous to indulge their passions and vanities than provide for their children and improve their estates.

Peter Martin has shown in his work upon Pope at Sherborne Castle that the notion of family "piety" to one's ancestors was politicized by the poet and his circle. Stolid domestic values and rigorous family loyalties were made to seem the ideological prerogative of the "country" opposition. This extension of political ideology to domestic spheres led to the Country Party of the Walpole period taking a great interest in large ancestral images and heraldic paraphernalia.

The imagery of the Marlborough and Strafford monuments was concerned with more than a retreat to family values; it suggested that the very fabric of the family had been threatened by political adversity. The Duchess of Marlborough's desire to vindicate herself and her family from any slander which might occur after her death was not an individual paranoia but a response to a fear of posthumous libel which was widespread at the time of her writing. A wave of posthumous libels in the early thirties stimulated a lively press debate on the subject of how the posthumous slander threatened the dignity and privacy of families. The most controversial case of posthumous libel began when several Government periodicals launched a posthumous attack upon the reputation of Daniel Pulteney. During the "Excise Crisis" of 1733 Opposition periodicals had their revenge by attacking the Government placeman, Sir Charles Gounter Nicoll (d.1733), who died shortly after receiving a knighthood in return for voting for the excise.

The Dormer monument (ill. 81), which was erected at Quainton in 1731, was connected to one of the most important cases of political character assassination engineered in the Walpole period. Though very different in design, the composition of the monument was based upon an idea of family vindication which has strong parallels with that seen at Blenheim. The

---

76 Martin, 1984, pp.116-117.
77 See chapter five pp. OOO.
78 The main attacks on Sir Gounter Nicoll appeared in the London Evening Post for November 27th and December 15th 1733. There is an excellent monument to Gounter Nicoll at Racton (H. Cheere?). Its inscription contains a number of quotations from the libel and defence of his reputation in the Free Briton of December 13th 1733. .
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monument was commissioned by Sir Robert Dormer's widow who appears as a life-size weeping donor on the right of the composition. According to the inscription she died before the erection of the monument which was eventually set up by her sons-in-law, John Parkhurst and Lord Fortescue Aland.

This is one of the finest monuments of the eighteenth century. It was never finished, and appears to have been the result of a contract which went wrong in some way. Largely because of this, its authorship remains a problematic issue. Both Roubiliac and Carter have been linked erroneously with the work. It is possible that the architecture of the monument may have been designed by Leoni whose name appears on a monument to the Pigott family (attrib. Rysbrack, c.1735) which originally stood beside that of the Dormer family. The two monuments share an unusual carved group of putti emerging from beams of light at the summit of centrally placed pyramids. Leoni signed the Pulteney monument which was begun in the year of the Dormer monument's completion and worked with Rysbrack at this time upon Clandon House. There are several elements of the monument which suggest that Rysbrack was the author: the face and torso of the weeping widow figure closely resembles that of Anne Rowe at Westminster Abbey (erected 1743) and the figure of Justice Dormer strongly recalls the contemporary figure of Edward Seymour (erected Maiden Bradley, 1731) (ill. 82 & 83).

Mary Dormer, like Sarah Churchill, was left a widow in a family that had failed to produce a male heir. She also supervised the building of a family vault in which to place the remains

---

79 The main inscription is scrapped on to the marble by an amateur or poor local mason, and the figures themselves are just roughed out on the backs. In places the figures are hewn in a crude manner which indicates that they were polished before the final stage of carving was complete. There was a notable legal dispute over the Dormer property (J. Dormer vs J. Parkhurst and others... the demise of J. D. esq plaintiff in error... the case of the defendanis in error, London, 1738) after the death of Lady Dormer in which the sons-in-law’s rights to inheritance were questioned and it may be that payments to the sculptor were delayed or curtailed because of this.

80 Esdaile (Roubiliac, 1928, Chapter 1) argued that the monument was Roubiliac’s earliest work. However the evidence of a faculty of 1727, which is reviewed below, shows that the monument was planned long before the sculptor arrived in England. The monument is currently labelled as a work of Carter in the Conway Library. There is, however, no evidence to substantiate this attribution and I have never seen a work in Carter’s oeuvre which approaches the quality of carving to be seen in this monument.

81 A description of the monument in its original position is provided in Lipscombe, 1847, Vol 1, p. 431. A photograph of the monument appears in the Conway collection with an attribution to Rysbrack by R. Gunnis.

82 An account of Leoni and Rysbrack’s cooperation appears in Clandon Park, Surrey, National Trust publications, 1979, pp. 13-28.
of the family's last generation. On the 1st of February 1727 she applied to the archdeaconry of Buckingham for permission to build the vault and:

....to fix up a monument to the said Robert Dormer and Fleetwood Dormer Esq in the chancel of the said church near the seat of the said Robert Dormer.

The monument took an unusual narrative form showing the corpse of Fleetwood Dormer lying between his mourning father and mother. The inscription left the viewer in no doubt of the extreme grief felt by Sir Robert at the death of the only hope of his family. It explains that the judge had died of a broken heart:

.... unable to support himself under so great a grief of mind.

What was omitted was that this son had died embroiled in a political scandal. Pursuing a legal career like his father, he was charged with utilizing the sale of legal positions as a broker for Lord Chancellor Macclesfield. The Lord Chancellor was commonly assumed to have been made a scapegoat for the corruption of the Walpole administration. Walpole engineered the public impeachment of Macclesfield and actually read the final statement of guilt at the trial. Fleetwood Dormer went into hiding in Holland and was charged and fined heavily (£24,046) in his absence. He died shortly afterwards and, in the circumstances, suicide seems likely. Part of Fleetwood Dormer's defence was mounted by Lord Fortescue Aland and John Parkhurst, his brothers-in-law, who saw to the final erection of the monument. Summing up the charges against him, Lord Chief Justice King used the terminology of monumental sculpture in a manner which may well have inspired the monument:

National Acquittals are eternal monuments of renown. They are more glorious and lasting than pillars of marble or triumphal arches, but, my Lord, as there are monuments of praise there are columns of infamy. There are national condemnations as well as national acquittals. It is evidence of a man's crime that he flies for it."

---

83 Buckinghamshire Record Office, Deanery Faculties, 9/32.

84 The Country Party viewpoint on the innocence of Lord Macclesfield is best seen in his obituary in the Tory London Evening Post of April 29th 1732.


86 ibid., p. 810.
In response to this Fleetwood's mother erected above his prostrate image a marble pyramid inscribed with an inscription from Luke (18. 17) referring to his discovery of virtue in boyhood:

"Quicumque non accepit regnum Die sicut puer, non intrabit in illud".

("Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a boy shall not enter therein.")

The symbolism of setting this inscription upon a pyramid, the symbol of eternity, seems appropriate to an image vindicating the family in the eyes of posterity. The character of the unfortunate Fleetwood (ill. 84) is vindicated in the inscription where he is described as:

"...a young gentleman of great merit and yet greater expectation. Of an excellent disposition of mind and perfectly well accomplished"

The composition of the monument revolves around a popular literary convention of the period which depicted the death-bed scene as a moment of moral truth. This dictated that the virtue of the deceased could be seen in the grief-stricken reaction of his family to his death. In a society which regarded the dissection or desecration of the corpse of a criminal as the worst indignity to be inflicted upon him - which joked that the bodies of its corrupt dead politicians such as Henry Pelham (ill. 85) should be sent to the anatomists where they would immediately decompose from internal rot - the tender grouping of the family around a dignified corpse could act as a potent symbol of moral purity. The imagery of the monument is reminiscent of a passage in the Free Briton of December 13th 1733 which referred to the death and posthumous libel of the government placeman Sir Charles Gounter Nicoll and the manner in which the family of a victim of political defamation was afflicted with an increased pain of mourning. The attack upon the posthumous reputation of the politician was deemed to have made:

---

87 The monument is described and inscription transcribed in Lipscombe, Buckinghamshire, 1847, vol 1, p. 428.

88 This convention is discussed in greater detail in chapter six, pp. OOO.

89 A print in the British Library Collection (BL. 3271) published in May 1754, shows the rotten and puny corpse of Henry Pelham, (who died in this month) undergoing a dissection. His organs give away the truth of his moral condition. One surgeon comments:

"The Vena Cava of the Thorax makes a noise and sounds as if one should say - thy Country be damned and his intestines have got, I think it is Bribery written upon them - Not a good drop of blood in his heart."
...the scene of the horror more perfect. by adding murder of fame to the loss of his dear life; to aggravate the sorrows of his afflicted friends and unfortunate relations by mangling the character and butchering the memory of one whom they deservedly held dear, whilst his corpse is lying breathless before them.

The Dormer monument's inscription, like that on the contemporary column to the Duke of Marlborough, did not argue innocence but merely suggested a nobility superior to low imputation. It shared the same basic means of vindicating a family; the postures of the sculptured figures were themselves used as eloquent indicators of their innocence. Sarah Churchill was a good friend of Macclesfield and corresponded regularly with him after his impeachment, sharing a feeling of mutual affliction. She also knew Mary Dormer and corresponded with her on political matters. The imagery of the monument plays upon the ideas, which were later reiterated in the Marlborough composition, that family grief, mourning and the loss of heirs were made even more poignant by the circumstances of political slander. Like Rysbrack's monument to the Marlborough family, the genteel tenderness of family feeling was employed to argue the superiority of the family over low detraction. The family appeared as a sentimental union threatened by, and triumphing over, insidious exterior forces.

The image of the family in virtuous retirement.

The conception of the family as a private institution under threat from corrupt public society was of great importance in the period. To claim that the traditional values of moral patriarchy and submissive motherhood were being eroded by corrupt, fashionable society became a standard topos in the literary debate concerning the decline of manners in the period. These complaints were made by moralists of the court as well as country. Daniel Defoe, who was a regular apologist of the Whig administration, devoted a whole section of his The Complete English Gentleman (1728) to the subject of the decline of sound family government. Defoe's particular concern was the erosion of the values of caring motherhood and the decline of breast-feeding which was considered the prime symptom of this social decay. Grumblings of this type were a common feature of periodical literature from Addison to the end of our

---

60 British Museum, add. mss. 750 f. 435.
61 British Museum, add. mss. 12114, f. 5
62 Defoe, English Gentleman, pp. 71-86.
period and beyond. They were most frequently directed against the fashionable mother who was drawn to high society or Court in London and invested more in expensive clothes than in her children. John Sekora has shown that the perceived decadence of the modern woman was made a common theme of the "luxury debate" in the period.

Rysbrack's monument at Blenheim was just a conspicuous example of how the design, meaning and function of monumental imagery could be affected by the debate upon the corruption of the family. Addison, writing in the *Spectator* of June 3rd 1711, stated that a passage from the inscription of the monument to William Cavendish (d.1676) in Westminster Abbey - an inscription which contrasted ideals in male and female behaviour - should be used as an example to a society which he considered to be threatened by the failure of men and women to act in a manner traditionally considered suitable for their genders. The idea of the woman who managed to be virtuous despite, rather than because of, her society was somewhat of a convention of monumental art. In the last chapter we saw that the imagery of the family of the Duke of Buckingham in Henry VII's Chapel was created for a Tory widow who was considered to be an example of traditional femininity in an "age" and "country" which was thought too corrupt "to value such uncommon virtue". Dame Sarah Bramston (d.1765) of Eton left instructions in her will that she wished to be commemorated with a monumental inscription stating that she had:

......dared to be just in the reigns of George II and III.

The ideals of good motherhood became soundly embroiled in the court/country debate. The *Universal Spectator*, a paper which boasted a country viewpoint, devoted a whole issue to the views of Mrs Plainly, a country wife who was.

...unfashionable enough to show she is a mother.

---


95 Anon, *A Short Character of John Sheffield, Duke of Buckinghamshire*, pp. 36-38.

96 S. Bramston PCC 1765, 43.

The idea that the country marriage was more successful and fruitful than that of the town was a commonplace; perhaps the definitive image reinforcing this ideal is Rowlandson's comparative prints of the *Four o'clock in the Town* and *Four o'clock in the Country* (etched 1788). The argument that marriages conducted in country retirement were more successful led by association to the notion that the mourning of a spouse in such a marriage would be all the more severe. The death of the virtuous country spouse merited particular grief. This idea manifested itself most clearly in monument to the Earl of Huntingdon (d. 1747) at Ashby-de-la-Zouche (ill. 86); a work of Rysbrack under the patronage of the circle of Bolingbroke which was completed in 1749.

The monument took the form of a storied urn, upon which was carved the grieving image of the famous evangelical Selina, Dowager Lady Huntingdon. Whilst the visual imagery of the monument had no apparent political content, the inscription, which according to Nichols was written by Bolingbroke, politicized the grief of the widow who was shown above. Bolingbroke, who was a friend of the deceased Tory Earl and acted as guardian and political mentor to his son and heir after his death, had the inscription published in many popular periodicals. The reader of the *London Magazine* was prepared for the polemical content of the inscription by an explanation that it had been:

..... written by an excellent critic, who assisted in the composing of the elegant inscription to Daniel Pulteney.

The reader was then advised to return to the earlier inscription to compare them.

The employment of Rysbrack made it even clearer that the monument was a product of the same milieu which had commissioned that to Daniel Pulteney. This reinforced the idea that it shared some of its precursor's political meanings. Like the Pulteney monument, Lord Huntingdon's memorial portrayed the deceased as a wronged public figure who had responded to his fate with the stoic forbearance of a retired philosopher:

He looked down from the higher ground

---

98 A good example of this debate appears in the *London Magazine* 1753, p. 321.


on the low level of a futile and corrupt generation
Despairing to do national good
He mingled as little as his rank permitted in National affairs.
Home is the refuge of the wise man's life;
Home was the refuge of his.
By his marriage to Lady Selina Huntingdon
Second daughter and one of the co-heirs of Washington Earl Ferrers
He secured himself happy in retreat
A scene of happiness he could not find in the world.

Bolingbroke proceeded to explain that the exceptional feelings of loss which had caused the Dowager to erect the monument were the result of the premature ending of their virtuous rural union.

Similar sentiments were expressed in Roubiliac's contemporary monument to Lucy, wife of the opposition politician and "country" pamphleteer George Lyttleton (Roubiliac, Hagley, 1747-51) (ill. 87). Lyttleton built a veritable sentimental cult around the loss of Lucy, his first wife. He idealised Lucy by depicting her as a rural antitype of the fashionable wife who preferred court circles. To accompany Roubiliac's image of Lucy's beautiful reclining form Lyttleton composed an inscription which depicted her as a woman of country virtue:

Polite as all her life in courts have been
Yet good as she the world had never seen
The noble fire of an exalted mind,
The gentlest female tenderness combined
Her speech was the melodious voice of love
Her song the warbling of a vernal grove.

As Woodbridge has shown, Lyttleton complemented the erection of his monument to Lucy in the church with the building of melancholic glades in the gardens. These extended around the church so that the visitor could see the memento of this rural love in the "vernal

---

102 Lyttleton's publicisation of his mourning is mentioned in detail on p. 279.
103 The inscription was published in many periodicals including the Gentleman's Magazine 1747, p. 338.
grove" itself. Earlier Lyttleton had expressed his veneration for "out of Court" womanhood in an inscription upon a monument to Henrietta Howard, Lady Suffolk. This was "designed to be set up in a wood at Stowe" in 1734, the year of the Lady's retirement in disgrace from the Hanoverian Court:

"Her wit and beauty for a court were made
But truth and goodness fit her for a shade."

Within a literate culture which so frequently showed family values as threatened by corrupt civic society, the image of a happy traditional family group carried the implications of a moral statement. The implications of an image of a mother and child were often nostalgic and moralistic. An account of the gardens at Vauxhall reported that amongst the moralistic paintings in the covered central supper boxes there were large comparative scenes of the "Good and Bad Family" (Francis Hayman, 1741-2). A riotous scene of domestic discord was compared to that of "a husband reading" with his "wife with an infant in her arms." This imagery reflected the social stereotypes of the ideal gentry family which were promoted by Defoe and other writers upon genteel conduct. The London Chronicle of 1761, for instance, saw the decline of womanhood in the hard-hearted, fashionable London ladies who went to laugh at the inmates of Bedlam. The author may well have been referring to the fashionable voyeuristic ladies seen in the Bedlam image of Hogarth's "Rake's Progress". He recommended as an alternative a visit to Mr Pine's shop where an image of a mother nursing her baby demonstrated the virtues of the sex. As the very encapsulation of moral values the image of an ideal family group could inspire extraordinary emotion. A letter, published in the London Magazine in 1749 and written in 1708, described how its author broke down in tears before a large painting of a family showing a mother and father and little boy in the arms of his sister.

---

105 The planting of melancholic glades around the church is described in R.S. Sulivan, A Tour Through Several Parts of England, Scotland and Wales, London, 1778, p. 20.

106 The inscription is recorded in an edition of his complete works published in A. Chalmers ed., The Works of the English Poets, London, 1810, Vol. XIV, p. 187. The monument is not at Stowe today and I do not know whether this is because it was never erected or because it has been lost. Henrietta Howard, Lady Suffolk was the mistress of George II. She fell out of favour and "retired" from court in November 1734 and became, like the Duchess of Queensbury, a notable female member of the opposition. For further details see, L. Melville, Lady Suffolk and her Circle, London, 1924.

107 Anon, A Description of Vauxhall Gardens (BL. 578 a. 29), London, 1762, p. 35.


The association of mother and family groups with conservative moral values and country ideals provides some explanation of their popularity amongst Rysbrack's "country" clientele. It is probable that the "madonna" image (as Malcolm Baker describes it) which was used in a number of Rysbrack's major family monuments of the early thirties was not invented by the sculptor himself. It was first invented by Kent for the Marlborough monument; a design of 1730 which probably predates any other use of the "madonna" device in Rysbrack's oeuvre. William Kent was the architect most readily associated with the "country" opposition to Walpole and thus probably knew of the political uses of the device.

The "madonna" image was subsequently applied by Rysbrack to two other monuments for peers of a "country" persuasion; Lords Foley and Harborough. The second Earl Foley, for whom Rysbrack's family group at Great Witley (c.1733-9) was made, was amongst the most resolute of the group of peers in opposition to Walpole. He voted against the Administration in every recorded division. Lord Harborough's politics were less explicit. He was a Whig by family tradition but supported the interests of the Tory aristocracy in Leicestershire. He was reported to have snubbed Walpole by declining a substantial pension from the Administration in the period when he commissioned the monument from Rysbrack. His desire to be remembered as a worthy "country" aristocrat can be discerned from the instructions of his will for a memorial plaque to his land steward. He requested that his land steward was to be buried in the family vault near that of his master and a tablet in his memory placed on the floor directly in front of Rysbrack's monument. As a reading of the standard rhetoric produced on behalf of groups of anti-Walpole peers to accompany their protest votes demonstrates, their political identity was formed around the idea that they were

---


111 The composition of a reclining male figure with mother and child at the end of his couch is seen on a number of Roman Sarcophagi. A typical example, now in the Avignon Calvet Museum, can be seen illustrated in P. Veyne, A History of Private Life, from Pagan Rome to Byzantium, p. 180.

112 Foley's voting habits are described in GEC, Peerage, vol 5, pp 525-6 (footnotes) and A.S. Turberville, The House of Lords in the Eighteenth Century, Oxford, 1927, p. 118.

113 Romney Sedgwick, vol. 1, p. 275. Harborough was a Whig related to some of the greatest of local Tory magnates such as Lord Gainsborough (his executor) and Sir Thomas Cave.

114 Reported in the Grub Street Journal of June 4th 1730.

115 Lord Harborough, PCC 1732, 265.
resolutely defending the constitutional and moral traditions of society.\textsuperscript{116} They were motivated by\textsuperscript{117} Isaac Kramnick terms "nostalgic" political sentiments. The family imagery which they commissioned seems to justify the use of the same epithet.

Nostalgic family sentiments led on occasion to the belief that the marriages of a former generation of the family were superior, by virtue of the women having been less susceptible to corruption. These sentiments lay behind the second Lord Warrington's monument to his father and mother at Bowden Parish church (ill. 88).\textsuperscript{118} The monument, which was made by Andries Carpentière, was erected in 1732 over thirty years after the death of his father.\textsuperscript{119} At approximately the time of the monument's erection Lord Warrington was engaged in writing a book entitled Considerations upon the Institution of Marriage (published 1737); a defence of divorce as a means of concluding unsuitable marriages, and a statement of the values essential to sustain a happy married union. The book was prompted by the Earl's notoriously unhappy marriage to a rich merchant's daughter which had been made out of financial necessity.\textsuperscript{120} In the book he made clear distinctions between what was expected of a husband and what was expected of his wife. The husband was to be the intellect of the family; in ultimate control its private life and its representative in public business. His spouse was to be a submissive counter-part to her husband who in private supported his public career and saw to the care and education of children.\textsuperscript{121} True to this clear demarkation of marital roles, the inscription upon the monument showed the career and manly virtues of his father upon the right and the praises of his mother upon the left. A strong vertical line was cut in the marble between the two inscriptions. The ideal of womanhood promulgated in his book had much in common with the inscription to his own mother.

The central objective of the monument was to promote the first Earl as a political worthy. He had, as the inscription tells us, sacrificed all for the Whig cause at the time of the Monmouth

\textsuperscript{116} A Complete Collection of all the Protests made in the House of Lords from 1641 to the Dissolution of the Last Parliament, June 1747, London, 1747.

\textsuperscript{117} I. Kramnick, Bolingbroke and his Circle, The Politics of the Nostalgia in the Age of Walpole, Harvard, 1968, chapters 1,2, 3, and 8.

\textsuperscript{118} Genealogical details of the family are available in GEC, Peerages, vol XII, part 2, pp. 353-356.

\textsuperscript{119} A bill from this year recording the payment of £390 to Carpentiere is mentioned in G. Jackson-Stops, "Dunham Massey", Country Life, vol. CLXIX, June 4th, 1981, pp. 1862-81.


\textsuperscript{121} Booth, Considerations Upon the Institution of Marriage, pp. 7-9.
Rebellion and had been imprisoned and threatened with execution. J. V. Beckett and Clyve Jones have shown in a short biography of the Second Earl that his father had been promised a pension in compensation for his loyal services which was never fully honoured in his own or his son’s lifetime. Shortly before the erection of the monument Walpole had abolished the small pension Warrington had been receiving in order to punish him for voting independently. When the monument was erected Warrington was fully embroiled in the opposition to Walpole in the House of Lords; he joined the local Tories in a "country" alliance as a "real whig" motivated by upholding the true principles of the Revolution for which his father had sacrificed himself.\(^{122}\) Warrington’s nostalgic political convictions and his disappointment with his own marriage combined in the view that his parents were to be seen as a domestic ideal from a hardier, more principled generation.

This mode of thinking also influenced the design of Rysbrack’s massive monument to the Dukes of Beaufort (Badminton, c.1746-66), which also touched upon the subject of divorce as necessitated by the perceived liberality of modern femininity. The monument was commissioned by Charles Noel, the fourth Duke of Beaufort, upon his inheritance of the title from his childless brother Henry.\(^{123}\) As Rysbrack’s drawings in the Badminton Papers suggest, a single monument was originally planned.\(^{124}\) This was to show three generations of the family: to the extreme right was to stand the image of the fourth Duke as donor with his consort in the same position upon the left; in the centre was a conversation piece which depicts a dialogue between the donor’s deceased elder brother (the third Duke, d.1746) and father (the second Duke, d.1714). The reclining image of the third Duke proffers an image of his mother (Rachel Noel, d.1709) for his father’s inspection. Rysbrack’s bills for the packing and setting up of the monument which were paid by the Dowager Duchess in 1766 show that its execution was much delayed.\(^{125}\) The composition was eventually split up with the image of the Dowager Duchess omitted and the fourth Duke (d.1756) made into a separate monument (ill. 89).

\(^{122}\) op. cit., pp. 1-11, 32-33.

\(^{123}\) The inheritance of the successive Duke’s of Beaufort is recorded in GEC, Peerages, vol. II, pp. 53-55.

\(^{124}\) Changes in the design of this monument are discussed in K. Eustace, Michael Rysbrack, Sculptor 1694-1770, London, 1982, pp. 154-159.

\(^{125}\) The text of a letter from Rysbrack to the Duchess of April 14th, 1766 appears in Physick, 1969, p. 100. Papers relating to the monuments are lodged at Gloucester Record Office, Badminton Papers, FMJ 3/13, FM K1/6. FMK 4/18. Drawings, D. 2700. 7. 54-57.
Rysbrack's primary drawing and final image omits the third Earl's wife; she is not mentioned in the inscription. This is to be explained by the divorce of the couple which scandalised society some years before the monument was planned. Their marriage was terminated on account of her adulterous affair with William, Lord Talbot and there was further scandal when it was alleged that her husband was impotent; a failing which he was obliged to disprove with a legally witnessed visit to a prostitute. Horace Walpole gave a dramatic description of this incident based upon an original account of Dr Mead who was one of the chosen witnesses. Rysbrack showed the third Duke holding the image of his mother for the inspection of his aggrieved father who holds his hand to his heart. (ill. 90) The implications of the image were clear; that his mother was being held up as an image of female virtue from the past by her disappointed son.

The social position of the Dukes of Beaufort as the leading peerage family in the Tory/Jacobite alliance made the shame upon the family exceptionally severe. Since the accession of George I the successive Dukes of Beaufort had taken an Olympian public stance against the perceived corruption of Hanoverian court circles. Those in the social milieu of the Duke and his brother developed reputations for exemplary marital relations in a corrupt age. The Tory periodical *Mitre and Crown* wrote in their obituary of Watkin Williams Wynn - the most notable friend and strongest political ally of the third and fourth Dukes - that he had proved himself a "true patriot" in his private life by being:

...a noble example of conjugal fidelity, a virtue very rare in this improved age of lewdness and gallantry".

Dr William King, the leading intellectual figure of the third and fourth Dukes social milieu, appears to have had similar ideas on the desirability of retired femininity. At the opening speech for the Radcliffe Library (1749), where Rysbrack had worked for the third and forth Dukes of Beaufort who were trustees of the Library, he took special pains to praise the simple dress and demure deportment of the women present. The speech was delivered to a group of Oxford Tories and their wives and King's speech was widely interpreted as a potentially

---

126 Walpole, vol. 18, pp. 185, 199.


128 The *Mitre and Crown*, October 1749, p. 44.

subversive piece of Jacobite rhetoric aimed at exposing the corruption of modern Whiggery and the injustice of Hanoverian rule.\textsuperscript{130} Set within a Tory political polemic, it seems probable that these comments were calculated to flatter those women present by suggesting that they represented a nostalgic counter-ideal of Tory womanhood.\textsuperscript{131}

The third Duke of Beaufort's divorce and the failure of his sexual relationship with his wife was a threat to the continuity of the dynasty. It had meant that the third Duke died without an heir, leaving his title to his brother who was able to perpetuate the family. The will of the fourth Duke, who was the original patron of the monument, demonstrated his personal obsession with the continuity of the title and estates. Its text ran to seventy-seven folio sheets much of which were devoted to legal measures that were designed to ensure the permanency of the family and estate.\textsuperscript{132} It was one of the longest and most thorough testament produced in the whole period. This obsession with continuity led him to choose a defiant motto as a heraldic device which signified the family's unchanging moral stance across the generations. Putti above the heads of the statues hold up an image of the Ducal coronet which had passed from father to son; a cloth wrapped around them bears the words, "Mutare Vel Timere Sperno" ("I scorn to change with the times"). Like Rysbrack's monument to the Earl of Strafford, or Lord Carlisle's mausoleum, the monuments at Badminton were intended to affirm the permanence of dynastic tradition and enshrine the hopes of the family at a time when they were forced to retire from a corrupt society.

Although the design of the Beaufort monuments suggested a complex meaning, the inscription did not contain a complex panegyric or political invective. Like that upon Rysbrack's monument to the Duke of Marlborough, it provided little more than a list of titles and offices. The classical reserve of Rysbrack's sculptural style was combined with the idea that a monument should divest itself of its meaning in an equally reserved and erudite manner. The Harborough and Foley monuments were also graced with concise and factual inscriptions. That of the Harborough monument in particular is cut in Roman capitals with the letters spaced in careful imitation of a Roman inscription tablet.

---


\textsuperscript{131} The fourth Duke of Beaufort was a trustee of the Radcliffe Library Building project from 1737 onward. The accounts of the trustees show that it was in this project that he first began to employ Rysbrack. (Badminton Papers FMJ/4/1.)

\textsuperscript{132} Duke of Beaufort, PCC 1756, 320.
The simple prose inscription which presented little other than a list of achievements and titles was a well-known Roman type. Samuel Johnson in his essay of 1740 upon the history of epitaphs and monuments referred to this type as the most dignified form used in the Roman world.\textsuperscript{133}

This is indeed a commendation which it takes no genius to bestow, but which can never become vulgar or contemptible if bestowed with judgement; because no single Age produces many men of merit superior to panegyric.....Next in dignity to the bare name is the short character, simple and unadorned without exaggeration, superlatives or rhetoric.

The function of such inscriptions was, therefore, similar to that which we have noted in the figure of the Duchess of Marlborough pointing to her husband's medals; virtue made manifest by the prosaic recounting of facts. Johnson, in fact, chose the inscription of Rysbrack's Newton monument (Westminster Abbey, erected 1731) as an example of noble simplicity in which the achievements of the great were implied rather than copiously explained.\textsuperscript{134} The deeds of the truly great man were sure to be remembered by history and no monumental eulogy could enhance them. Cheere's monument to his relation, the explorer Sir John Chardin, (Westminster Abbey, erected 1746) which had the simplest of Latin inscriptions which attempted little more than the naming of the deceased, was praised in the periodicals, for "resembling the Ancient inscriptions". The monument implicitly left the recounting of Chardin's deeds and virtues to historians.\textsuperscript{135}

Rysbrack's simple, understated, classical style was so frequently combined with this type of inscription that it may be considered to have been the style of inscription thought fitting for his work. The afore mentioned Common Sense of 1739 even thought of "Mr Rysbrack" when considering a sculptor suitable for a Society monitoring the use of eulogy in funerary art. The employment of these prose inscriptions was also related to the "luxury debate" for rhetorical ebullience and dramatic eulogy could be considered symbols of cultural decline or moral laxity. The Craftsman of November 10th 1739, for example, quoted from Livy upon the detrimental effect that the uncontrolled use of funeral panegyric had upon the moral fibre of classical civilisation. Dr William King, who wrote the Latin inscription for Rysbrack's monument to Watkin Williams Wynn and signed the verso of Rysbrack's contractual drawing

\textsuperscript{133} Johnson, vol. II, pp. 272-273.
\textsuperscript{134} Ibid., p. 273.
\textsuperscript{135} A review of the monument appears in the London Magazine 1746, p. 98.
along with the Duke of Beaufort, saw the enthusiasm of his contemporaries for fulsome and flowery inscription writing as a symptom of a more general moral malaise. In his memoirs he recommended the terse Latin type that had flourished at the height of Roman civilisation.\footnote{136}{The drawing (V&A no E 426-1946) signed by the Duke of Beaufort and Dr King is reviewed by Physick, 1969, fig. 61, p. 95. Dr King is accredited with the inscription by Thomas Pennant \textit{(A Tour in Wales}, London, 1773, vol. 1, pp. 286-287).}

I could wish we had not departed from the simplicity of the Old Roman type of inscription, for our modern epitaphs consist generally of a string of fulsome praises bestowed equally on the worst and the best that they are generally disregarded.

Dr King placed these comments within a lament concerning the blurring of moral values in his own times. The inability to distinguish eulogy from fact had become an emblem of a corrupt society. Rysbrack’s presentation of King’s inscription for the monument to Watkin Williams Wynn (1749-52) demonstrates how the sculptor’s clear designs and knowledge of the Antique could be used to communicate a sophisticated political statement (ill. 91).\footnote{138}{After the sudden death of Watkin Williams Wynn in a riding accident he was made a martyr of the Tory Opposition. Highly political obituaries appeared in: the \textit{Craftsman} of October 7th 1749; the \textit{London Evening Post} of October 3rd and November 11th 1749; and the \textit{Universal Magazine} 1749, p. 223.}

Below the statue was a declaration of Wynn’s political principle which was written in large capitals resembling an inscription upon a classical pediment or public building.\footnote{139}{An association between the term “assertor of public liberty” and the Opposition’s nostalgic respect for the great “forefathers” who established political principles is made in the \textit{Craftsman} vol. 442.}

\begin{center}
\textbf{ADSERTORI LIBERTATIS PUBLICAE.}
\end{center}

\textit{(To the asserter of Public Liberty)}

Directly beneath this is a second inscription with factual details of the life, ancestry and career of the deceased. The frame is of an unusual type which, as J.D. Stewart has argued, was based upon Rysbrack’s antiquarian knowledge of the framing of classical inscriptions.\footnote{140}{J.D. Stewart, \textit{New Light on Michael Rysbrack, Augustan England’s Classical Baroque Sculptor}, Burlington Magazine, CXX, 1978, pp. 214-222.} Below this is a rhetorical defence of Wynn’s character and political career, the phraseology of which
is redolent of King’s detailed knowledge of the Roman rhetorical tradition. The final paragraph of this inscription clearly stated that it was invented as a personal tribute from the writer to the deceased:

Talis tantique viri immaturo interitu quam grave damnum fecit Britannia: quem cuncti qui ejus virtutes cognoverint (cognovit penitus qui heac moerens scripsit) eo er, miserorum omnium perfugium, bonorum omnium delicias, doctorum omnium preasidium, Walliae suae decus et ornamentum, et clarissimum reipublicae lumen ereptum et extinctum esse fataentur.”

What a grave loss has Britain suffered by the untimely death of a man of such qualities and greatness. When all who knew his virtues - and the man who in his grief wrote these words recognised them better than anyone - confess that with his loss there has been taken from us the refuge of all wretches ....etc

In the manner of the Column to the Duke of Marlborough a clear distinction was made between the "partiality of relations" or friends and the simple statement of fact. Private eulogy and the statement of public principle have been physically divided in order to make it clear that the two types of tribute had not been confused. The rhetorical device adds credence to the statements of praise which are based upon a declared partiality. As in the case of Rousbiliac’s Warren monument (Westminster Abbey, 1757), these ideas were readily incorporated into compositions by sculptors with a profound knowledge of antiquity. Rysbrack’s simple classical style had, once more, been used to articulate clearly the difference between plain fact and polemical opinion. The very clarity of the sculptor’s design enabled Dr King to demonstrate a knowledge of the formal disciplines of the classical epitaph writer.

The relationship between the simple classical figure and the idea of shunning unnecessary eulogy, panegyric or hyperbole was explained by William Dodd, Chaplain Ordinary to his Majesty, in his Reflections upon Death which was published as an anthology of moral essays in 1763. Dodd compared the style of Rysbrack (though he does not mention the sculptor’s name) with Rousbiliac’s "fantastic monuments" which had been recently erected in the Abbey. He regarded Rousbiliac’s ”darkest shades of allegoric poem” as funerary eulogy superfluous for the virtuous man, the visual equivalent of the over-blown epitaph.141

---

"While I turn away in disgust from these fine but misapplied efforts of art, the elegant simple monument strikes and delights me. It is the statue of the late Duke of ------ It is finished with the highest taste; it affords exact resemblance to the person, the posture is natural and easy, proper for the place, serious and contemplative: it is raised on a plain and beautiful pedestal, there are no fantastic decorations. The inscription contains nothing more than the name of the worthy nobleman, the date of his birth and death, and the detail of his illustrious issue. There needs no more; his virtues live in the faithful memory of his friends and country; and time itself cannot obliterate the impression his benefice had upon the hearts of mankind. Methinks, as I stand contemplating the animated statue, I can fancy the noble original before me, as I often had seen him, and hear him thus addressing me:

‘See the end of human grandeur, and learn to think nothing great in mortality! Nothing can be truly great that is uncertain, nothing truly good that must shortly end. Ere while I flourished in all the verdure which human existence can boast, high in birth, rank and Royal favour; abounding in wealth and of consequence courted by the universal voice of mankind; I remembered that I was a man, that I was to give account to a superior tribunal... When, therefore, the solemn summons came, when I heard the alarming voice "Thou must Die!" I was not confounded .... Then might this melancholy statue well stand as a representative of my afflicted soul; revolving with sorrow at past enjoyments, and looking with a wishful eye to that mansion, that lovely park which I once ranged with such pleasure then forever denied to my hapless feet. Mine was the better choice; the remembrance of death taught me wisdom; for they who remember death will assuredly be wise’.

Dodd’s description bore a strong resemblance to Rysbrack’s image of the fourth Duke of Beaufort. Indeed, Rysbrack’s monument acted as a memento mori in much the same way as Dodd described. The togate figure looks at the spectator and points past a cupid holding his Ducal coronet, to the floor beneath. The device of a male figure pointing to the floor was used in a number of Rysbrack’s major family monuments. The first to be designed was the monument to the Duke of Kent (erected at Flitton before 1730) which shows the Duke holding his coronet in one hand and looking out at the spectator whilst gesticulating toward the
ground. On his visit to Flitton the antiquarian David Powell noticed that the figure of the Duke was:

..... pointing to that spot of his interment below.

It would seem that the Duke, who had constructed the vault and interred his heirs within it, was demonstrating his philosophical acceptance of fate. The ducal coronet in his resting hand can be taken to symbolise the earthly grandeur which ultimately passes. There was a tradition, which was established in English monumental sculpture of the late seventeenth century, of using the Ducal coronet as a symbolic device within allegories alluding to the futility of human grandeur.

In both the Flitton and Badminton monuments the figure with the coronet was the donor of the monument who looked out at the spectator and appeared to enter into a dialogue upon fate. It is as if magnificent images of the dynasty had been set up for the admiration of the viewer, only for the patron of all this splendour to warn of the ultimate transience of life. The effect is similar to that of Dodd's imagined statue who enters into a dialogue with him concerning "that mansion, that lovely park"; the symbols of the grandeur of palatial life which one was reminded of by looking from the monument to the estates beyond. Both Wrest Park, the mansion built by the Duke of Kent, and Badminton, the residence of the Dukes of Beaufort, were just such grand palatial environments. The inscription tablet of the Duke of Kent's monument urged the spectator to witness his temporal grandeur by going to look at his splendid building works:

His taste and magnificence are still conspicuous in the elegant house he erected for the town residence of his family and the beautiful and spacious gardens which he laid out at his favourite seat in the neighbourhood.

---


143 For further discussion of this iconographical tradition see chapter five, p. 264.

The inscription also referred to the amount of care which the Duke had devoted to the proper upbringing of his family; a reference which was rendered all the more tragic by the nearby monuments which were witness to the deaths of his sons. The viewer was told that his:

....private and domestic character appeared in his politeness and hospitality, the regular government of his family and the excellent education of his children.

The image of the Duke pointing to the family vault whilst holding the peerage crown which he was unable to leave to a son probably depicts the moment of stoical resignation when the Duke realises the failure of his dynastic ambitions.

The Duke's gesture toward the family vault suggests that he had the philosophical wisdom to accept common mortality and a nobility of spirit which transcended the mere trappings of finery and temporal ambition. It was somewhat of a convention in the period to regard the process of being alerted to a family vault as an experience of moral awakening. William Dodd, for example, recounted a visit to a nobleman's house from whence he was taken to view the family vault:

By the side of the church, where first I was led in to these reflections, such a vault is found. Let me descend into the solemn and sacred recess! How awful as I tread slowly the stone steps which lead into it and a melancholy murmur seems to echo through this silent mansion..... Their coffins are decorated with velvet and silver; but all the occupants are only vulgar dust.

Dodd's references to the velvet and silver upon the coffins of the great indicate that the use of the device of pointing out the family vault related directly to the "luxury" debate. It can be no coincidence that in all three cases in which the device of the figure pointing to the family vault was used - the monuments to the Duke of Kent, Dukes of Beaufort, and the Foley family - it was within a composition commissioned by a pillar of the "country" aristocracy. A

---

145 Dodd, Reflections upon Death, pp.130-131.

fact which suggests that Rysbrack had a sophisticated awareness of the social attitudes of his clients to the "luxury debate".

The Foley monument, which celebrated the rise of the family to the Peerage, made a particularly appropriate use of the device. The monument had at its centre a narrative concerning the stoical acceptance of fate. An image of the first Earl lies recumbent upon a sarcophagus at the feet of his spouse, who is depicted at the moment of losing her child. As the child's arm drops to her side her mother pathetically raises a cloth to cover her (ill. 93). She looks down to her husband who is raised upon one elbow with his index finger above his ear in the traditional symbol of melancholy (ill. 93). He points laconically downward in exactly the pose used in the earlier monument to the Duke of Kent. Since the monument was designed to stand above the family vault it would appear that he was depicted at the moment that another corpse was accepted into the dark space beneath. The Earl's facial expression is melancholic but not tearful; he was depicted as an exemplar of a very popular virtue in Georgian funerary culture, resignation.

This image was particularly appropriate to a composition which illustrated the story of the rise of the Foley family to the Peerage. The family's reputation balanced precariously between _nouveau riche_ and bastion of the Tory aristocracy. The family was famous throughout the country as an example of the quick transition which could be made from trade to gentility. A pun circulated, recorded by Daniel Defoe, which explained how wealth created by Thomas Foley's iron foundry had propelled the family into the aristocracy:

\[\text{He may be called the founder of the family but his posterity are gentlemen:} \]
\[\text{as may be said of the Foleys now illustrious.} \]
\[\text{He was the workman, alluding} \]
\[\text{to his trade, that built the house.} \]

The rise of the Foley dynasty pays testimony to the Namierite theory of political interest groups. Inter-marriage with the Harley family, which came to power in the latter years of Queen Anne resulted in the family's immediate elevation to the peerage class. Robert Harley was impeached by the Whig administration in April 1715 and the Foleys were soon isolated

\[147 \text{Defoe, English Gentleman, p. 267.} \]
Within two generations the family were elevated from the iron trade to being the most aloof of the country aristocracy. There was a certain unmistakable irony in the second Earl’s tendency to posture as the very bastion of "Country" opposition to the "upstart" administration of Robert Walpole.

Behind the central narrative of the Earl accepting the common lot of mortality, was draped a huge swathe of embroidered cloth. Whilst this may be just a piece of decoration it seems more likely that it represented the palatial environment and wealth of the family. A similar cloth was draped beneath the central composition in the Beaufort monument. The combination of the two images implies that even in an environment of conspicuous grandeur the owner must be prepared to accept the hand of all-leveling fate.

This interpretation is supported by a great number of documentary accounts which described the lost interior of Great Witley as exceptionally opulent. William Shenstone, a friend and neighbour of the second Earl Foley, reports in letters written at Great Witley that his host prided himself upon having one of the most luxurious houses in the country. His table which groaned with expensive fare for his guests was, according to Shenstone, only to be matched by the quite exceptionally extravagant chapel. Shenstone wrote to Robert Dodsley on November 20th 1762 of his immediate impression of the chapel and monument at Great Witley:

"The chapel is so very superb and elegant that Mrs Gataker has nothing to do but send you and me thither to say our prayers in it. In reality it is perfect luxury; as I truly thought it last Sunday St'enight. His pew is a room with a handsome fireplace. The cieling coved and painted in compartments and the remainder enriched with gilt stucco ornaments; the walls enriched in the same manner; the best painted windows I ever saw. The monument to his father and mother and brothers cost, he said, 2000l and the middle aysle rendered comfortable by iron stoves in ye shape of urns; the organ perfectly neat and

---


149 References to the grandeur and hospitality offered at Great Witley can be seen in Shenstone, pp. 374, 376, 554, 496, 528, 634.

good in proportion to its size; and to this chapel you are led throu a gallery of paintings seventy feet long - what you more? You'll say a good sermon - I really think his parson can preach one."

Shenstone was not the only visitor to by overwhelmed the palatial interiors at Great Witley. Travel writers for the next hundred years commented upon the gaudy excesses of gilding in the house. Descriptions of the interior do not differ greatly from the caricature of the nouveau riche palace used in attacks upon Walpole and his administration. There were clear social benefits in the display of an image which demonstrated that the family were capable of transcending the palatial wealth of their surroundings. The memento mori imagery inside the chapel was extended outside. As the traveller Sir Thomas Savile tells us, the Earls Foley allowed the parishioners’ churchyard to extend out onto the lawn in front of the house. Visitors were warned by the staff who showed them around the house that if they did not like the sight of common mortality they would have to close the shutters.

Rysbrack’s compositions are by no means devoid of strong emotion. The rendition of subjects such as the death of Lord Foley’s baby daughter was intended to be touching. Whilst his depiction of women was frequently of passionate grief his treatment of male emotion in his major family compositions is consistently redolent of the restraint of emotions engendered by the application of stoic philosophy. Rysbrack’s preoccupation with themes of stoic resignation are connected to the way in which his work relates to the luxury debate. John Sekora has pointed to the currency of a traditional distrust of passion in male behaviour in the eighteenth century emanating from Cato’s association of male emotion with social decay and luxury. Strong emotion was, as Pocock has argued in *The Machiavellian Moment*, frequently considered to be the root of social decay, corruption and disorder in mid-Georgian political discourse.

---
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The controversy between the *Grub Street Journal* and the *Free Briton* concerning Rysbrack's style and business methods clearly indicates that Rysbrack was capable of promoting his own work as a "sublime" style which was superior to that of his competitors. Observation of his oeuvre as a whole suggests he was consciously using designs which were simple or understated. Whilst his main competitors Cheere and Scheemakers regularly used swathes of decoration and a wide variety of coloured marbles, Rysbrack remained self-consciously restrained. The only decoration upon many of his monuments is a low relief acanthus moulding upon the base. There can be little doubt that Rysbrack's attitude to design was as sophisticated an attempt to secure a position in the London market as any conceived by Sir Henry Cheere. Although he was capable of using Walsingham, the Walpole Government's most notorious hack, to "puff" his workshop, he patently understood how his style could be used by the "country" aristocracy as a political metaphor. It is difficult to comprehend such designs as the Watkin Williams Wynn monument, with its complex relationship of design and political meaning, without an acceptance that Rysbrack was fully aware of how his style could be used. Part of Rysbrack's skill as a workshop master was his ability to design luxury products in a manner which suggested a critical appreciation of the luxury debate.
Chapter IV.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PLACEMENT TO THE MEANING OF FAMILY IMAGERY IN THE COUNTRY ESTATE ENVIRONMENT.

The extent to which large works of art constructed in London were designed to fit into particular settings at locations outside the capital is one of the most important issues in the debate upon "metropolitanism" in the arts. J. T. Smith, writing from his experience as a sculptor in Nolleken's workshop, argued that the London sculpture trade of his and earlier generations had made and transported monuments without concern for their eventual setting in the countryside:¹

Nollekens seldom knew, nor indeed did any of the sculptors in former days care, in what part of a country church their monuments were to be placed; they received the measurements from a carpenter, who was not at all times very correct, without any notice of the aspect, or stating whether that space was over or under a window, or against a pier, or near the altar, receiving a vertical light, or a diagonal one: and upon this carelessly measured order, the sculptor proceeded, never dreaming that his work was to be placed close to the vestry door in a dark corner. Then, too, when it was up, the plaster was to adorn it with a neat jet black border of a foot in width! so that it would match ostentatiously with a monument on the opposite side, in an equally forlorn position, belonging to a family with whom the relatives of the last deceased had been for ages at variance; whilst to crown the whole of the unhappy injury to Art, the putting up was generally entrusted to a mason, who on his return to London, was rarely questioned as to where it was erected, or as to how it looked.

Smith was exaggerating to make a point; he was keen to show that his former master, Nollekens, who had left him a mean bequest in his will, was trained in and practised a trade of naked profiteering. In this chapter I will test the validity of Smith's view and assess the significance which was originally accorded to the placement of monuments. Unlike Smith, who dismissed patrons' choices of situation with a certain humorous aplomb, I will look in

detail at the patron’s role in choosing a suitable setting. My focus will, of course, be upon how placement affected the meaning and function of family imagery.

Much of the evidence discussed in this chapter is taken from diocesan and archdeaconry faculty papers, or legal documents relating to disputes over the setting up of monuments in parish churches; documentary sources which have been largely ignored by those studying monumental sculpture. This type of documentary material invariably reveals the original placement of monuments and includes a brief description of interiors of buildings in which they were erected; invaluable information in circumstances where the great majority of works have been removed from their original settings or set up in considerably altered interiors.

The central objective of using these sources, however, is to establish the metaphorical associations of erecting a monument in a certain position; such as within the chancel, at the back of the family pew, or within a family mortuary chapel. Following naturally from this is the exploration of the question of whether there was any relationship between the imagery chosen for a family monument and the position in which it was intended by to be seen. The problem is once more that of discriminating the meaning and social significance of certain generic types. In the same way as monumental imagery developed generic meanings, the settings in which they were placed carried their own set of generic meanings. The inevitable question is whether correlations existed between the use of generic images - such as the standing male in the posture made popular by Craggs and Shakespeare monuments - and the metaphorical associations of the settings which were chosen for them.

It is important to avoid the a priori assumption that patrons or sculptors thought in depth about where a monument was to be placed, let alone the meaning of that placement. On the contrary it is certain that on some occasions the actual erection of a monument in a church was of little concern to those who had initially commissioned it. A good example of this is the antiquary William Cole’s manuscript notes upon a visit to Fowlmere in Cambridgeshire to see a newly erected monument to his relation William Mitchell (Thomas Ayde. d.1745). He had great admiration for the sentiment of the composition which showed "a lady sitting in a melancholy and weeping posture on a sarcophagus of black marble supporting a large medallion of her husband". Despite this, he reacted with horror to the fact that a fine medieval monument had been destroyed to make way for it:²

² British Museum, Cole manuscripts, add. mss. 5842. 105, 5837. 73, 5808. 33.
I was far from pleased when I got time and saw in my notes that the oldest monument in the church had been taken away and destroyed to make room for the more modern and costly one. In all probability neither Mrs Mitchell or any of the family or my late brother Apthorp, who was left guardian jointly with Mrs Mitchell and the late Duke of Manchester, had known nothing of the destruction, as none of the family ever saw the place, they living altogether at Carshalton in Surrey or in London and my brother was never at the church but for the funeral of Mr and Mrs Mitchell.

Cole goes on to state that the family, who never entered the building, had left it to the rector to supervise the erection of the monument in the church. Although the monument centred upon a tender image of conjugal affection, the widow herself appears to have had little interest in it after visiting the sculptor in London to have it made. It seems reasonable to posit that many monuments, especially those erected at the end of male lines by tangential relations who had other estates or lived in London, were of little interest to their patrons beyond their initial commission. One of the attractions of the metropolitan workshops was that a monument could be ordered from the comfort and convenience of a London house and transported to a country environment without the patron being any further inconvenienced by it.

A clear distinction should be made between the function of a family monument as a tribute, as discussed in chapter two, and the idea that a monument actually had a continuing social function in the environment in which it was set up. Although it was in Thomas Ayle's commercial interests to design a monument which reflected the fact that, symbolically at least, it was a token of the bereaved widow's grief, it could not be presumed that even the widow represented actually used the monument as a focus for her mourning. The anonymous author of a topographical guide for a tour through Britain published in 1762 noticed that family monuments set up in country churches were frequently left to moulder, ignored by the very people who commissioned them. He noted with regret that carefully maintained monuments would "bring many visitors to churches" but revealed that many tourists were regularly disappointed by the scene of filth and neglect which greeted them:

> With great seeming piety, and at large expense, the next heir or the most obliged, rears a monument to the deceased; and it is dedicated, too professedly, to posterity. In very little while the monument is covered in dust and cobwebs and the inscription is often effaced. Common decency succeeds

---

not to this piety and it becomes a monument of the ingratitude or neglect of the survivors rather than of the honour of the deceased.

It would appear that those childless individuals who left estates in the care of tangential relatives were most concerned with the fear that their monuments would be erected in some gloomy corner of the parish church and left to decay. Edward Atkyns, who left his property to his nephew was, as we can see from the excerpt of his will quoted in chapter two, concerned to see that the family monument which he had requested would be erected in the place of his choice and well maintained in perpetuity. Trust funds for the maintenance of monuments were set up by Mary Marshe of Chelmsford (Chelmsford, Essex, c.1757), William Brotherton of Pusey (Pusey House, Bedfordshire, c.1759-60), Thomas Chilcot of Tawstock in Cornwall (Prince Hoare, c.1757) Justice Page of Steeple Aston in Oxfordshire (H. Scheemakers and H. Cheere, erected 1730-32) Arthur Winsley of Colchester in Essex (Colchester, c.1728) all of whom died without male heirs. I know of only one trust fund, that for Cheere’s massive monument to General Sabine (Tewin, Hertfordshire, c.1739), which was set up by an individual who died leaving direct family heirs. Such funds can be compared to the precise instructions left in the wills of childless individuals such as John Dutton (Rysbrack, Sherborne, Gloucestershire, erected 1749) and Robert Tothill (Scheemakers, Urchfont, Wiltshire, d.1753) that the building and gardening projects started in their lifetime be maintained or that those

---

4 Mary Marshe (PCC 1757, 333), a substantial heiress without direct male heirs, left her executor, John Olmius, instructions to erect her own monument and maintain those monuments of members of her family which had become extinct at her death.

William Brotherton (PCC 1759, 386) died without children leaving a trust fund for the maintenance of John Allen Pusey’s monument and instructions that those of the Bouverie family who were his heirs should see to the maintenance of the monument.

The will of the childless Sir Francis Page (PCC 1742, 25) legally requires his inheritor, John Bourne, to repair the vault and monument at regular intervals.

The desire of Edward Atkyns to have his monument repaired by his inheritor can be seen in the sections of his will quoted in chapter two.

Thomas Chilcott (PCC 1767, 38), who died without a direct heir, left a trust fund to the parish for the maintenance of the monument to himself and his wife (discussed in chapter 6).

Arthur Winsley (PCC 1727, 154) left instructions that a house in Colchester High street be rented out in perpetuity with the revenue contributing to the maintenance of his monument.

5 The monument and vault in Tewin churchyard was erected by the deceased’s widow, Margareta Sabine (PCC 1751, 93). A trust fund for its maintenance was used by their heir to pay Henry Cheere to move the monument into the church in 1759.
who inherited their properties be obliged to live in them for at least part of the year. It must be remembered that the place in which the family vault was located by tradition may have been upon one of many estates owned by the family of the patron of the monument. The estate itself may well have been run by a land agent and the church by a rural pastor who rarely saw the landlord.

Before any detailed analysis of the metaphorical meaning of particular settings it should be pointed out that practical matters such as the strength of walls, obstruction of light and space available could be of prime importance in the choice of a situation. Small country churches were frequently unable to support the demands for space made by local families over several generations. This was true not only of wall space above but of potential vault space below. A good example of this can be seen in the Lincolnshire Diocesan faculty for a new vault and monument in Amersham Church in Buckinghamshire drawn out by "petitioners" representing, and including, the widow and son of Montague Garrard Drake (Scheemakers, 1730-31). An old vestry building to the north of the church near to the proposed family vault was to be converted into a family vault to house the new monument. All this new building was necessitated because the petitioners found that when they came to deposit Montague’s corpse and plan his monument it was found that the chancel and vault was:

so filled and taken up with the corpses of your petitioners ancestors and monuments for them that there was no room left for the commodious interment of his father’s corpse nor for ye erecting of a monument to his memory.

The monument to Elizabeth Drake (Cheere, 1757), which showed a family at prayer within a secluded ecclesiastical setting, was the first monument placed in the chapel after the initial building project. It was, as we shall see in chapter six, intended to function within this secluded setting, an environment which had a particular meaning to a family which prided itself upon domestic traditions of intense private piety. However it was prosaic matters of practical necessity, the need for a "decent" burial and further wall space for commemoration, which had the fundamental influence on how the monument was displayed.

---

6 Sir John Dutton (PCC 1743, 227) left instructions that garden designs drawn up by Bridgeman for Sherbourne should be completed after his death and the property maintained as it had been in his life. Instructions for the maintenance of property and completion of building work were left by Robert Tothill (PCC 1753, 64). It is interesting that George Bowes (PCC 1761, 382), who died without a male heir leaving instructions for a massive mausoleum at Gibside, also left directions for the maintenance of building and gardening projects.

7 Lincolnshire Record Office, Diocesan faculty papers, Fac/9/23.
Large monuments were often of a height which could obscure windows and cut out the light needed for clergy-men and parishioners to follow their service books. Similarly monuments designed with wide bases set upon the floor were a potential obstruction to parishioners attempting to use the church for worship. Many faculties suggest that patrons were mindful not to disturb the worship of even the most humble parishioner by erecting a family monument. As the faculties for the erection of the monument to Samuel Ongley (Old Warden, 1728) and the relocation of the monument to General Sabine show, any disturbance of the poor families pews at the back of a church in order to fit in a monument was only justified by the proper reconstruction of the pews in acceptable locations.

Much of the attraction of small monuments which could be secured to walls without support from below was that they could not in any way impede worship in the church. Some of these were erected at the back of large family pews where they had little chance of impeding either the comfort of the family or the worship of parishioners. A faculty dated 18th November 1742 from the Diocese of Lincoln was taken out by Elizabeth Trafford, widow of Sigismond Trafford, in order to confirm the legality of erecting Rysbrack's monument to her husband. It claimed that:

"...the said monument is not, nor can be, incommodious to any of the parishioners being erected over the family pew belonging to the said Elizabeth Trafford."

The design of the monument, which Elizabeth had chosen to commission from Rysbrack's workshop, was of the small wall mounted type. Similar monuments, one at least constructed by Rysbrack in memory of Lady Diana Fielding (erected June 1733), appeared in Gibbs' Book of Architecture, with a caption recommending that they were suitable for country estate churches. The advantage of wall mounted designs was that the metropolitan workshop master did not need to send his assistants to visit the site in order to measure a space before designing the monument. Cost conscious patrons would not have to undergo the extra expense

---


9 Hertfordshire Record Office, AHH 4/2. Loose Archdeaconry faculty papers of 1759 concerning Henry Cheere's removal of the monument to General Sabine into the church using the trust fund of Margareta Sabine.

Lincolnshire Record Office. Faculty Book 1.

10 Gibbs, 1739, p. 128, plate CXXV. The completion of Diana Fielding's monument (formerly unattributed) by Rysbrack is recorded in the London Evening Post of June 16th, 1733.
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of relocating pews, strengthening floors or knocking out new windows. It is significant that a very high proportion of Georgian monuments exported to the Channel Islands, America and the Colonies, where no sophisticated preparation of a space was possible, were of the wall mounted type.\(^\text{11}\)

In the later part of his career, when he was refining his business techniques, Henry Cheere designed a far greater proportion of his monuments to be erected upon walls. Whilst at least half of Cheere’s compositions of the period 1728 to 45, are floor-mounted a very small proportion of the commissions of the last fifteen years of his workshop were not wall-mounted. Many of Cheere’s later monuments, such as those to Magdalene De Carteret (Jersey, St Helier, erected 1751), Admiral Molloy (Shadoxhurst, Kent, 1760) or Lady Jane Bridges Rodney (Old Alresford, Hampshire, d.1757), can be construed as essays in the art of applying more complex compositions to the wall-mounted format.\(^\text{12}\) The commission of a wall monument cut the inconvenience and cost incurred by a patron whilst it probably increased the margin of profit to the workshop. Cheere’s exploitation of the wall monument type in the later part of his career is one of the best indications of his movement towards more efficient methods of large scale production.

A comparison of faculty records from the various dioceses and archdeaconries throughout England demonstrates the variety of power relationships existing between landlord and local ecclesiastical authority and landlord and parishioner. In the Northamptonshire Diocese of Peterborough, for instance, no faculties for monuments were taken out between 1720 and 60. By contrast the archdeaconry of Hertford and Huntingdon were rather punctilious in such matters.\(^\text{13}\) When in 1762 William Cole visited Roubiliac’s monuments to the Duke and Duchess of Montagu at Boughton, which were erected without a faculty in the Diocese of

\(^{11}\) I have visited, and photographed in, the majority of Channel Island Churches and have access to the photographic record of American and West Indian monuments now being made by Joan Coutu.

\(^{12}\) A good indication of the high efficiency of Cheere’s transport system can be had from letters concerning the erection of a monument and fireplaces for the Grimstone family which were published by E. Ingram in 1948-9 (Country Life, CIV, p. 534, and CVI, pp. 48-50) This includes a letter from Cheere’s workman, John Smith, who appears to have travelled to the area with a cart loaded with three monuments and other sculptural items which had been shipped to Bradford. Smith had a well worked out schedule for setting up sculpture en masse.

\(^{13}\) The Diocese of Peterborough faculty book 1726-75 (no number, Northamptonshire Record Office)

Hertfordshire Record Office, Archdeaconry of Hitchen and Huntingdon, faculty papers AHH 19/1, 1607-1748 & AHH 19/2, 1752-1845 and faculty books ref. 64394.
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Peterborough, he commented upon the extraordinary freedom given to country landowners in certain areas: 14

It was thought something singular that so much pagan divinity should be introduced into a Christian church. Here if the family thought fit to have the whole pantheon it would not be gainsaid.

When Cole was writing, the Diocese of Oxford were threatening even the august Earl Harcourt with legal action for knocking a door in the church wall of Stanton Harcourt. 15 As a number of legal cases show, a vicar or humble churchwarden was able, on occasion, to temporarily block, or change, the plans of a great landlord for the erection of a monument. Two parishioners of the parish church of Walton-upon-Thames, Benjamin Cobbett and William Cole, took Lord and Lady Middlesex to the Court of Arches over their attempts to erect Roubiliac's monument to Earl Shannon. 16 The immense monument would have blocked two windows which provided light for church worship.

The legal proceedings forced the patrons to have other windows designed "with large squares of crown glass" especially to accommodate the monument. The church wardens fought against the monument from July 1756 to February 1760. Only after two dozen appearances of their legal representatives at one type of ecclesiastical court or another was the monument erected. As with many disputed faculty cases concerning monuments, the dispute seems based upon more fundamental conflicts in the power structure of the parish. The litigious behaviour of the church wardens seems to exceed what was necessary in the circumstances. The final document in the faculty case (19th February 1760) was a congratulation to the family of the Earl of Middlesex from the Vicar of the Parish and the most substantial landlords: 17

We think the same to be a great ornament to the said church and know verily that so far from obstructing any light that there is much more than before the monument was erected.

14 British Museum, Cole manuscripts, add. mss. 5834. 48.
17 Greater London Record Office, Mic. Box X/7/2.
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It would seem that the dispute was a focus for an underlying power struggle between the prerogative of the principle landlords of the parish and those more humble individuals who had executive power in the running of church affairs.

Legal inconveniences of this type encouraged many patrons to opt for the least potentially contentious situation in which to place a monument. By far the most popular request in wills and faculties is that monuments should be erected immediately above vaults which had already been excavated for the family. In order to avoid any complications it was often stated that the square of church floor above the vault, which contained the vault stone, was also the property of the family. In many cases the simplest solution was to place the family pew and monument directly over, or as near as possible to, the vault so that two separate areas within a single church need not be defined as the property of the family. In the case of Rysbrack's afore mentioned monument to Sigismond Trafford a particularly neat and compact solution was found: not only was the monument erected above the pew but, according to a faculty of 16th July 1741, the family vault was dug directly beneath.¹⁸

Large monuments were more difficult to accommodate within a pew. In circumstances such as the erection of the huge monument to Fleetwood Dormer and his grieving parents potential problems were avoided by placing the monument adjacent to the family pew at the west end of the chancel.¹⁹ At the same time as the monument was planned a vault was dug, of seventeen feet in length and ten feet in breadth, which was to go partly under the pew and extend a few feet westward. An unbroken rectangular section of the church floor was, therefore, consigned to the direct jurisdiction of the family. This ensured that the future ownership and maintenance of the family's possessions was as simple a matter as possible; a drain was even dug beneath this section of the church to make sure that the area was as dry and maintenance free as possible, so that section of the church should be no further concern or "inconvenience" to the rest of the parishioners.

Placing monuments in such direct proximity to the family pew not only had practical purposes but symbolic ones. The visual effects of this practice was to place the symbol of a deceased generation of the family in direct alignment with the living family at Sunday worship. This might give the impression that the living generation of the family was mindful of the monument; sitting with the image of a deceased relative, or relatives, inferred that one had the respect or love to be seen regularly in their presence. Evidence of this can best be seen in Jane

¹⁸ Lincolnshire Record Office, Faculty book 1.

¹⁹ Buckinghamshire Record Office, faculties for Deanery 9/32, 1st Feb 1727, Quainton.
Austin’s Northanger Abbey (published 1818). Although the novel concerns a period fifty eight years after ours, it remains a valid literary source for the historical assessment of how the placement of a monument on, or within, a pew could be interpreted by spectators. In a scene of Sunday worship at the parish church Catherine fantasises that she is experiencing a gothic horror stimulated by the sight of General Tilney seated beside the monument to his wife. Her horror stems from her belief that Tilney had murdered his wife and by sitting before her image as if he treasured her memory was committing the ultimate act of sinister hypocrisy.20

The day was unmarked therefore by anything to interest her imagination beyond the sight of a very elegant monument to Mrs Tilney, which immediately fronted the family pew. By that her eye was instantly caught and long retained: and the perusal of the highly strained epitaph, in which every virtue was ascribed to her inconsolable husband, who must have been in some way her destroyer, affected her even to tears.

That the General, having erected such a monument, should be able to face it, was perhaps not very strange, and yet he could sit so boldly collected before its view, maintain so elevated an air, look so fearlessly around, nay, even that he should even enter the church seemed wonderful to Catherine.

The idea that placing a monument within, or directly adjacent to, the family pew was to pay the deceased particular reverence, and to observe their memory formally, was not new to the England of 1818. The faculty case between Lady Middlesex and members of the congregation of Walton-upon-Thames, for example, shows that one of the main reasons for placing Roubiliac’s monument in a situation which controversially blocked up two windows was that it might be directly opposite her Ladyship’s pew. A clause in the faculty requested specifically for the removal of a "screen" directly in front of Lady Middlesex’s pew that she might have a clear view of the monument. This demonstrates her desire to observe, and be publicly seen to observe, the images of her father and mother at Sunday worship.

Documents concerning the erection of family monuments by Rysbrack above the Duppa pew at Hollingbourne (1737) in Kent give some indication of the manner in which a special tribute could be offered to a deceased family member by a relative electing to sit beneath his monument at worship. Baldwin Duppa’s will (d.1764) gives detailed instructions concerning the monuments he had placed above the new family pew and vault which he had built twenty

---

20 This passage occurs at the beginning of chapter IX.
five years before. A faculty from the Diocese of Canterbury shows clearly that the monuments had been erected at the same time as the building of a family pew above the new family vault excavated in September 1737. Baldwin Duppa desired to be:

Buried but not ten days after my decease at the Parish Church of Hollingbourne aforesaid close to the body of my Dear father in the vault made by me under my pew and the pews adjoining to it. My body being first into a wooden and then into a leaden coffin with the inscription herein inclosed (the blanks left therein being properly filled up) engraved on a silver plate gilt and fixed to the lid of the latter. I desire my executor....to raise the memorial of me herein also inclosed the blanks therein for my age and the time of my death properly filled up to be put up and described on the blank marble table set up on the monument by me set up over my own pew in the said church near the monument by me erected of my dear and honoured parents.

Baldwin's description shows that he had sat for over twenty years beneath his own monument with the inscription omitted. Like his body in the vault beneath the pew, the monument was placed in affectionate proximity to the image of his parents. The inscription which was added after Baldwin's death stated that he had:

"caelibe vitam egi  
Moriens Relquias suas  
luxta charissimi Patris ossa poni jussit".

(.....lived a celibate life and dying ordered his remains to be placed next to the bones of his dearest father.)

As a "celibate" man Baldwin was childless and the monuments marked the end of his dynasty. The language of the inscription which he requested, particularly in the phrase "cherished bones", suggested the erection of the monument to be an act of family "piety" which involved contemplating the remains of his parents beneath as religious relics. It also tells us that, like the monuments above the vault, the coffins below were to be placed in tender relationship to each other. As we have seen in the case of Brownlow Sherard of Lobthorpe in Lincolnshire,

\[21\] B. Duppa, PCC 1764, 678.

\[22\] Canterbury Cathedral Archive and Library DCD/EF/Hollingbourne.
the placement of similar monuments next to each other was a form of exceptional tribute. A similar case can be seen on the South wall of St Margaret’s, Westminster; here Margaret Graham showed her exceptional fondness for John Le Keuk by erecting, in her own lifetime, an image of herself (Cheere, erected 1765) directly beside his memorial (Cheere, erected 1755). Like Baldwin Duppa, Margaret Graham followed up the monumental tribute by requesting to have this symbolism repeated in death by having her coffin placed in the vault below the monuments directly beside that of her loved one.

For twenty years Baldwin Duppa sat beneath the two memorials as a symbol of his constant fidelity to the close relationship he had with the parents who lay in their coffins beneath him; a fidelity anticipating the eventual placement of his own coffin with theirs. The existence of certain sentimental associations between sitting above one’s relatives at church, and anticipating a reunion with their remains, explains a few of the cases in which monuments and pews were erected directly above vaults. Clare Gittings quotes the case of the well-known agricultural expert Arthur Young, who:

...in 1797, on the death of his dearly beloved 14-year-old daughter, had her buried beneath the family pew ‘fixing the coffin so that when I kneel it will be between her head and her dear heart’.

A less sentimental, though probably more common, reason for the building of a new pew and family vault within a country church was the arrival of a family in an area in which they had not previously lived. A substantial family, or an individual who purchased land in an area, and intended to establish some sort of permanent family presence there, would obviously require a good new pew and vault. A popular choice was for the individual who purchased local land to prepare for his own death by applying for a faculty and erecting a vault after he had bought enough property to establish himself. Frequently permission would be sought to erect a monument and pew at the same time. The most common procedure was for the heirs to erect a monument immediately after the decease of the builder of the vault. A good example of this can be seen in the monument of John Borrett (Cheere, d.1740) and his wife at Shoreham Parish church in Kent (ill. 94).

---

[23] Cheere’s payments for erecting these monuments are mentioned in the Church Warden’s accounts of St Margarets for 1755 and 1765, Westminster Public Library E135 and E136.


John Borrett was an important Inner Temple lawyer who having made a considerable fortune in London invested in a mansion house near Shoreham in Kent. He had, as can be discerned from a faculty drawn out by another member of the congregation in 1726, already converted an area which is now a slightly elevated vestry area, for use as a family pew. Below the marble floor of this room there was placed the family vault which John Borrett must have had built in anticipation that his family would become established as the principal family of the area in perpetuity.

After his death in 1740 John Borrett’s eldest son and heir, Thomas, had Cheere make a monument to his father and mother which was to be placed at the back of this area. The pew was of substantial enough proportions that the monument, which was mounted upon a wide marble base seated upon the floor, could be conveniently placed within it. This appeared directly behind the living family and acted as a form of reminder of the “pater familias” who had originally established the family. The long Latin inscription explained how John Borrett established the family amongst the ranks of the blood aristocracy by marriage to the daughter of the Trevor family who were one of the best established landed families within the London legal profession of the day. Special significance was given to this monument amongst others erected to members of the family. Three other family monuments were erected by Cheere to members of the Borrett family during the lifetime of Thomas. None of these had bases resting on the floor and were set up upon church walls outside the pew; probably within the chancel which was erected by Thomas Borrett in 1741-2 and later obliterated by “restorers”.

The special respect reserved for the founder of the family was connected to the formal expression of the idea of “ancestral piety”. This phenomenon has been discussed in chapter two in the analysis of the imagery of the monument to the Lords Maynard where the founder of the family is credited with the central and most prestigious image amongst a group of his progeny and relations. The association between placing a monument in the family pew and virtuous observation of family piety is also vital to the understanding of Rysbrack’s monuments to the Duppa family.


27 Lambeth Palace, Archdeaconry (peculiar) of Shoreham faculty book VH/88/2, page 1, 1726 pew for Robert Anston.

28 Lambeth Palace, loose faculty papers, VH 89/19. A plan of the new chancel dated August 1742.
The Lethieullier chapel at Little Ilford in Essex (sculptor and architect unknown, c. 1737) (ill. 95) provides an important example of the significance which the placement of monuments had within a family pew or chapel. The Lethieullier family were established amongst the country gentry of Essex by John Lethieullier (d.1737), a Huguenot financier who much improved the family fortune and built their Manor at Aldersbrook. According to John’s will, the chapel was "proposed to be built" in his lifetime over a vault which he had previously excavated for the interment of his wife. The original use of the chapel can be best understood from the description of the antiquarian Peter Muilman who visited it some thirty years after its erection:

At the north west corner of the church, the Lethieullier family has erected a very neat room about fifteen feet square..... It has a fireplace and every necessary convenience to accommodate the family at divine service. The pavement is of free stone and beneath is the family vault. Along the North side of the room is a capital supported by columns. It is ascended by two steps, and between the two columns is a very neat altar tomb in black and white marble, supporting a beautiful marble urn... The monument is in memory of John Lethieullier and his wife... The most elegant simplicity runs through this place, which is calculated to inspire serious contemplation; and upon the whole it is the prettiest of the kind we remember having seen.

The iconography of the chapel seems to confuse consciously the idea of religious worship with that of respect for the deceased head of the family. The monument to John Lethieullier, which Muilman describes as an "altar tomb", is raised upon stairs and approached in the manner of an altar within a typical medieval raised chancel. The tomb itself was framed with a sort of doric tabernacle structure. The choice of the doric order, which was associated with masculine plainness, seems purposeful. Along with the very restrained tone of the architectural elements within the tabernacle this justifies Muilmans’s assertion that the room was designed for "serious contemplation". A respect for the virtues of reserved contemplation can be expected of a staunchly protestant nouveau riche Huguenot family with no desire to flaunt their wealth. In fact Smart Lethieullier, who was instructed by his father’s will to erect the chapel, and whose monument was designed to be to the right of his father’s, was commemorated in the inscription as having made a pledge to "walk humbly with his God".

---

29 The establishment of the family is recorded by Morant, Essex, 1768, pp. 4, 27.
30 J. Lethieullier, PCC 1737, 33.
The family monuments themselves produced this atmosphere of "serious contemplation". The "altar tomb" which commemorated the founder of the family lay at the heart of this contemplative design with the plaques and marble urns of other members of the family arranged around it in modest subservience. The Lethieullier family's attendance at church was designed to be an occasion to remember one's ancestors and one's God; religious experience was itself founded upon the hallowed traditions of past family members. Like many contemporary landowning families the Lethieulliers used the pew structure to encase themselves symbolically in the memories of their deceased relatives who lay in the vault below their feet and whose monuments surrounded them. Inevitably the role of monuments in these circumstances was to blend, in the minds of the family and spectators alike, the values of ritualistic religious observance with those of family loyalty.

The very process of building a family chapel in which to place the monuments of "ancestors" could be considered an act of virtue. This can be seen in the language of a faculty granted by the Diocese of Lincoln to George Viscount Torrington on the 27th of July 1733 for a family vault at Southill with:

.... a room over it of the dimensions aforesaid with a door or passage from the said church or chancel into the said room.

Permission was given to erect the structure and place monuments within it on the grounds that the Diocese considered that:

....justice and piety, and the practice of the best ages have for the encouragement of virtue, commended unto us interment of worthies with such honourable distinctions and such monuments of their noble acts as may preserve them in everlasting remembrance.

It would appear from this statement that the very act of entering such a chapel and being surrounded by the monuments of "worthy" ancestors could be considered an act of "piety" and a traditional means of acknowledging the moral authority of ancestral example.

The position of pews and vaults was, of course, an important factor in the demonstration of power and authority in a church. Different church designs meant that a whole range of areas might be considered to be the best position to which the principal inhabitant would be...

32 Lincolnshire Record Office, Bishop's Register, no. 38.
expected to stake a claim. A number of protracted cases which passed through the court of arches in our period demonstrate the lengths to which families would go to acquire a prestigious position for a vault and pew. A good example is a case conducted in 1719 between Sir John Thornicroft and the Freeman family concerning the rights to a pew position in an annex area to the south east of the upper part of the aisle of Bloxham church. After a protracted legal battle, Thomicroft won the rights to the pew and proceeded in November of that year to apply to the Diocese of Oxford for the right to place a vault beneath it. A splendid vault in which his ancestors were to be more salubriously interred. Permission was also obtained for:

......leave and licence to erect a monument in memory of John Thornicroft and Dorothy his wife, father and mother of Sir John Thornicroft over said vault.

Shortly afterward a substantial monument was erected to the couple and a number of Sir John’s other relatives (here attt. Andries Carpentière). When Sir John died two years later he disinherited his son whose improvidence he considered a risk to the continuity of the family. He left the property to his more reliable son-in-law (Brigadier Roger Handysyd) who, in all probability, commissioned Andries Carpentière to make a major life-size image of Sir John himself. The erection of this series of monuments and the provision of a more splendid vault and pew may well have been precipitated by the elevation of Sir John to the Knighthood which the inscription of his own monument celebrated. New family status may well have caused Sir John to vie for the most prestigious pew area in the church, to upgrade the quality of his ancestors interment, and surround himself with the images and heraldry of his forbears.

Whilst side chapels of the type preferred by Thomicroft were in some cases the most prestigious sites for monuments it was the chancel walls which were most frequently associated with the power prerogative of the landlord who held the advowson. The best illustration of the importance of the chancel walls is preserved in a group of faculty papers of the Diocese of Chichester concerning the objections of the Reverend Daniel Walter, Rector of Cuckfield, to the erection in the chancel of the monument to Charles Sergison (Thomas Ad... 1734). The case, conducted between February and June 1734, demonstrates in detail the

---

33 Lambeth Palace Library 1719 Aa 26/202218, 27/32, E. 24-42.
34 Oxford Record Office, Oxford Diocese faculty papers C. 104. 21
35 Sir J. Thomicroft PCC 1726, 81.
symbolic importance of controlling the chancel area to gentleman with a disputed claim to be Lord of the Manor.37

The dispute originated in the claim of Thomas Warden later Sergison, a nephew of the wealthy naval administrator, Charles Sergison, who had inherited his lands and local tithes, to the right to erect a monument to his Uncle against the north wall of the chancel. Thomas Warden/Sergison consulted the vestry and eighty of the inhabitants of the parish for their approval of his plan but was blocked by the Rector. The dispute centred upon Thomas Warden/Sergison’s claim to the rights of the chancel as "principal inhabitant of the said parish", possessor of "a greater estate in the parish than any other parishioner of the said parish", and the landlord with the support of the "impropriators or tenants of the great tithes as appears by the vestry book". The Reverend Daniel Walter named a list of other substantial landowners as supporters of his case. These he deemed to be "the true inhabitants of the parish", stating that he considered his own lesser parishioners to have no rights in the matter.

When Thomas Warden/Sergison inherited his Uncle’s land he also inherited his political interest. As the inscription of the monument stated at some length, Charles Sergison had been the representative of the "patriot" opposition in the locality. The monument itself was erected in the wake of a hard fought election campaign in which Warden had lost narrowly despite winning the support of "country" voters.38 Election records demonstrate that all voting members of the Cuckfield congregation voted for the Tory interest; only Daniel Walter, the Rector of the parish, voted against.39 The dispute over the erection of the family monument in the chancel area was, therefore, somewhat of a symbolic skirmish in the broader conflict for regional power.

Thomas Warden/Sergison won the case and proceeded to erect a splendid floor mounted monument, the size of which signals that few compromises were made for the sake of the defeated rector’s pride. Thomas Adye’s design showed the relief bust of the deceased in the arms of the female figure of Truth, an allegory of the qualities of a public figure and local politician as extolled in the inscription. As a new figure in the politics of the area, the patron relied upon the maintenance of the authority and regional reputation built by his uncle. The

37 West Sussex Record Office, Episcopal archives Ep. II/27/5. Seven documents.


trial of force over the placement of the monument signals Thomas Warden/Sergison's determination not to abandon even the symbols of an established family power base.

The case of the Sergison monument, where the reputation and status of a nephew was dependent upon that of his uncle, indicates that the function of a monument could be to promote the reputation of a wide kinship group. A dispute commenced in 1736 over the rights to erect monuments in the chancel of Dunstable church demonstrates the point at which extended family interests could breakdown. The vitriolic legal dispute which surrounded the erection of an excellent metropolitan wall monument to Jane Carte (Thomas Carter?, erected 1732) reflected the way in which relatives living in a single parish could become such different factions as to be considered in competition for local supremacy.

The case was brought by Blandida Marshe and Marshe Dickenson, the wealthier part of a local dynasty to which the deceased Jane Carte and her executors were also members. As the faculty documents explain. Jane Carte and her executors were related to the Marshes by the marriage of Elizabeth, sister of Blandida Marshe, to a Thomas Chew. Elizabeth and Thomas Chew were parents of Jane Carte and, therefore, Jane Carte was the niece of Blandida Marshe. Blandida claimed that before erection of the monument to Jane Carte a monument to her relative John Marshe, erected in 1700, had been moved from the most prestigious position adjacent to the chancel at the end of the Marshe pew in the north aisle. From the description given, the monument to John Marshe was a grand heraldic structure erected over a newly built burial vault:

...the arms coat or ensigns of arms and crest of the said John Marshe were depicted on an achievement or hatchment and placed in a large frame and were, together with his sword, helm, streams and other ensigns of honour fixed in honour of the said deceased John Marshe upon the peer in the said inclosed aisle over the grave...

As representatives of the Marshe family in its broadest sense, the executors had moved this symbol of family power and prestige in order that a "Table of benefaction" might be installed; above this table was placed the monument to Jane Carte who had donated it in her will. Blandida Marshe, against the will of the majority of the congregation, insisted that all of this was moved and the authority of her direct line of the family reinstated. The fact that the case was taken to the Court of Arches in November 1737, and prosecuted with a certain bitter

40 Bedfordshire Record Office ABF 3/77.
punctiliousness by the direct line of the Marshe family, shows the importance of the positioning of a monument in defining the hierarchy in large family groups.41

Although cases of this type were rare they alert us to the idea that, even in small country churches, several parts of a family who had by the processes of inheritance divided local land amongst themselves might live separate or competing lives. The distribution of family monuments around churches may in many cases be due to the fact that they represent the deceased of different parts of the family who attended divine service in separate pews or were buried in separate vaults. An example of this can be seen at Otford church in Kent where two brothers, David and Charles Polhill, shared control of the living. Separate monuments to the two brothers can be seen today on either side of the church; these were made at the same time by Cheere at the direction of Charles Polhill, junior, son of David.

Immediately noticeable is the difference in size; Charles Polhill the younger brother of David, who became a Syrian merchant in order to provide for himself, had a monument at least four times the size of his brother’s. This was in direct contrast to their actual status in life for David was the heir to the majority of the family property, long standing Member of Parliament for the region, and had become a local political hero for his assistance in ensuring the safe arrival of William III in Kent. Faculties drawn out separately for the two monuments reveal that the two brothers sat in separate pews in the church. In 1740 Charles Polhill, junior, a representative of David’s side of the family, applied for permission from Lambeth Palace to excavate a new vault beneath, and erect a monument above, the family pew in the South aisle.42 In 1754 Charles Polhill, senior, applied for permission to build another vault for his own side of the family in the opposing North aisle and erect a monument over it "in memory of himself and his family."43 Whether Charles Polhill, senior, set out to stress family divisions in the commission of his monument remains an open question. What is certain is that he did not trust his nephew, Charles, to erect a monument in the church after his death. In his will he warned his nephew that if he did not:44

41 Lambeth Palace Library. November 1737. A29; A30; B16/46; D1359; E 33/1444; G 133/17 4551/60, 68, 70; J 115/ 62, 63, 70.
It is significant that Blandida Marshe employed Robert Taylor to erect a family monument in the contested area in the late 1740s.

42 Lambeth Palace, Archdeaconry of Shoreham, faculty book VH/88/2, p. 68.

43 ibid., p. 125.

44 C. Polhill, PCC 1755, 267.
lay out the said six hundred pounds on the monument in the space of two years then I give the sum of one thousand pounds to the Dean and Chapter of Rochester out of which they are to lay the said sum of six hundred pounds to build the afore-mentioned monument.

Power prerogatives and private mourning: ambiguities and contrasts in "private" and "public" imagery.

The expression of wealth and power within a community was one of the prime factors which dictated the placement of monuments. As a glance through the Act Books of any Diocese of the period demonstrates, most parishes drew a proportion of their revenue from a carefully stratified set of burial fees; charges were scaled from the churchyard burial of a humble child of the parish to interior vault burials with monuments for the wealthy. Contemporary commentators noted, whilst debating such subjects as the dangers to public health of interior vault burial, that the health of congregations was often a secondary consideration to the desire of local families to jostle for the right to use a parish church's most prestigious burial sites. The precise power structure of a community could be gauged by observing the relative position of vaults and commemorative stones. In certain parishes on the busy fringes of eighteenth century London it is still possible to read monuments in this way. At Hillingdon, for instance, Cheere's reclining image of the Earl of Uxbridge (d.1743) in full Roman military garb occupies the north of the chancel whilst an array of lesser inhabitants, such as the theatrical manager John Rich, received more modest tablets above pews or vaults in the main body of the church.

Faculty papers frequently precede an application to erect a vault and monument in some prestigious position of a church with a declaration of status and property. The preamble to an application for a monument to Anthony Tournay and his wife Jane in St Mary Abchurch listed at length the evidence of their social standing. A short account of the deceased’s status as a Deputy Alderman of the City was reinforced by the assurance that he was:

---

45 The relation of the desire to erect interior monuments and vault burials to the health of parishioners is discussed in the London Magazine 1736, p. 560.

46 A description of the church before Victorian changes can be seen in D. Lyson, An Historical Account of the Parishes in the County of Middlesex Which are not Described in the Environ, London, 1800, pp. 166-74.
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....a considerable trader and of a very good fortune, credit and reputation, and that the said Jane was a daughter of Sir John Biddulph of the City of London descended from the ancient family of Biddulph in the County of Hertfordshire.

Monuments could, of course, be used as symbols of legitimation which reinforced the power prerogatives of a family with images of wealth and dynastic status. A good example of this may still be seen in the well-preserved interior of Gayshurst Parish church in Buckinghamshire (ill. 96). According to a Lincoln Diocesan faculty the church was rebuilt after 1725 in accordance with the will of George Wright. Wright also left money for a family monument in the chapel above a vault for the interment of the future Wright dynasty. The church was rebuilt as a virtual estate chapel within a hundred yards of the front entrance of the family house which had been purchased by George with a fortune built up through the legal career of his father, Sir Nathan Wright.

The design of the church has certain peculiarities. The parishioners sat in a row of modest pews along the north wall of the main body of the church whilst the Wright family occupied a single pew which extended much of the length of the south wall. The chancel and east end were only visible to the congregation through a central arch; if the congregation should look directly eastward they would gaze directly at a blank wall and the landlord should look in the same direction he would see the huge family monument mounted against the front of his pew. It was ultimately much easier for the congregation to see the Wright family, and the family to see the congregation, than to observe any part of the liturgy which might take place in the eastern part of the church.

The achievements and heraldic emblems of family burials were placed immediately above the closure stone of the Wright family burial vault which lay beneath the pew. The corpse of Nathan Wright, the pater familias, had been removed from the family's former estates in Lincolnshire for reburial in the vault. The congregation saw the Wrights mounted above

48 This faculty is reprinted in Lipscombe, Buckingham, 1847, vol. 2, p. 160.
49 G. Wright PCC 1725, 103.
51 The size of the family vault is mentioned in the London Evening Post of January 30th, 1737.
52 Lipscombe, Buckingham, 1847, vol. II, pp. 142-161.) records a dispute between the Rector and the family concerning the reinterment of Nathan Wright.
the remains of their ancestors, surrounded by heraldic symbols, with a huge image of the family's founders on the wall behind them. The excellent, but unknown sculptor had constructed an image of the utmost opulence with every detail of expensive wigs and embroidered coats carefully reproduced. The rendition of the deceaseds' mountainous periwigs created an impression of vanity and pomp which attracted the censure of many of the monument's critics. The monument is an ostentatious symbol of family wealth and power and it is clear that the ostentation was largely intended to create an impression with the tenantry and those in service with the family.

The imagery of the Wright monument was somewhat out of date at the period in which it was made. It has the design and general timbre of the most splendid works of the type produced by the Stanton family and metropolitan workshops of the late seventeenth century. The use of the outmoded convention of twin standing figures, and the general impression of sheer opulence of surface detail, makes it very likely that the sculptor was one of the group of metropolitan masters of the previous generation who were at the tail-end of their careers in the late twenties. The problem of whether the way in which the image was positioned and used was also becoming out of date is more complex.

In his work upon "Life in the English Country House" Mark Girouard has argued that such use of church furnishings was already becoming out of date in the late seventeenth century. He shows an image of the massive gallery pew of the Duke of Somerset at Petworth (1689-92) as an example in a wider argument that the values of the "formal house" were in recession. This is seen as a product of the declining belief in the social values of rigid and formal hierarchy which blurred the distinctions between private and public life in elite society. Girouard traces the waning of such values to the failure of Charles I's attempts at an absolute monarchy. He says of the court party of the later Stuarts that they:

......maintained the sixteenth century belief that a hierarchy under a single head was the only right order for society, because it was ordained by God and followed the model of the universe. But it placed much greater emphasis upon the power of the King, and on the central authority of the state, which derived from the king. This authority was absolute, because it came from God and not man. Outside his own households the member of the aristocracy had authority only because the king gave it to them. Because they were his chief servants

---


and filled the top rank of the hierarchy below him they had to be treated with honour and respect. They still received visitors, or ate in state, under a canopy. They sat in chapels framed in a flamboyant set of curtains, coats of arms and coronets. Their wives walked with a train and page even within their own gardens. But they were not what they had been.

Throughout this work Girouard was much influenced by the Stonian vision of the progression of society towards a domestic life which was less formal, more private and more dependant upon "affective" relationships. The movement of his text from the description of the Formal house 1630-1720 to the Social house 1720-70 and on to The arrival of informality shows this influence most clearly. Girouard contends, as does Stone, that the design of houses were dictated by the emerging need for "privacy". Thus the formal rituals of parading heraldry and other symbols of dynastic pomp before the family and before servants and social inferiors, became increasingly irrelevant.

Theories of a gradual social movement away from a "formal" life-style, surrounded by entourage and kinship group, have been connected with the growing fashion for small "private" burials and nocturnal funerals. Clare Gittings has argued that there was a decline in the great formal heraldic burials with great groups of relations and servants in favour of more discrete domestic affairs. We can posit that, if such theories are valid, funeral sculpture also would become less and less for pompous show in the community and more for the "private" mourning rituals of the "affective" family. There is plenty of evidence, particularly from the last two decades of our period, which would support this general hypothesis. Most significant was the developing fashion of abandoning the church setting altogether in favour of placing monuments in "private" gardens or even, as in the case of Ralph Willet's monument to his uncle (Rysbrack, c.1752-66) which was erected in the hallway of Merly House, in the interior of houses. This practice did, of course, limit the audience of the monument to the direct family and invited guests to the property. The fashion for these settings, as we shall see shortly, developed exclusively in the period after 1740, and had much to do with the developing taste for "expression" and "meaning" of the later part of our period.

The notion of "privacy" in eighteenth century funerary and mourning practice should be approached with a certain caution. The request for a "private" funeral was without doubt the

---

55 Gittings, 1984, p. 188.

most popular instruction to appear in wills throughout our period. Most frequently the term "private" was combined with the phrases "and decent" or "but decent". The term "decent", however, may have encompassed whatever levels of pomp which were considered suitable for the status of the deceased. The instructions for "private" and "decent" funeral might be immediately followed by requests which indicate the funeral was not a small family occasion. For Jacob Bouverie, Viscount Follstone (died 1761) a "private" funeral meant limiting the number of carriages in the official funeral cortege. The first Earl Ancaster requested that his "private" funeral should not cost more than three hundred pounds; a sum which, from contemporary funerary bills, may be seen to have purchased an exceedingly grand occasion.

It is difficult to discern whether the term "private" meant the exclusion of servants and dependants from the funeral service and subsequent official mourning. According to the will of Earl Poulett (d.1743) there was by the early forties a "Modern rule of mourning" where servants were to be excluded from funerary ritual. There are, however, numerous examples from this period of large, often heraldic burials, in which the whole local community was asked to be involved and mourning garb was bequeathed to servants or villagers. Whether or not the term "private" actually meant a small domestic affair, there can be little doubt that the whole concept of privacy in mourning and funeral practice was fashionable at the time. As the private funeral became increasingly fashionable so it was inevitable that the show of privacy would become, rather ironically, a far from private statement. An example of this is the nocturnal funeral of Peregrine, second son of Earl Poulett (d. 1752), which was described in the *Ladies' Magazine*. Not only were servants banished but the service was conducted by torch light with a temporary pontoon bridge built and hedging demolished to allow the coffin to be carried to its resting place without going through the local village. The story as reported in the magazine has a certain essential irony which seems typical of the feigned privacy of aristocratic death and burial in the period. Despite the extraordinary lengths taken to keep the burial private the journalist recorded its every last detail and reported it to the public at large. It seems that part of the reason for excluding the village was to impress the world with the depth and drama of the private sentiment. Torch-lit nocturnal funerals of this

---

57 J. Bouverie, PCC 1761, 92.

58 First Duke of Ancaster, PCC 1724, 81.

59 Earl Poulett, PCC 1743, 342.

60 A typical example is the will of Charles Molloy of Shadoxhurst (PCC 1760, 435) who invited a host of local tenants to his funeral and arranged for some of them to receive the heraldry from his funeral carriage as gifts.

type whilst intended to be the antitype of great public funerals became just as expensive and ostentatious. In fact the number of candles used at such occasions became a status symbol; as the vestry books of St Margaret's Westminster for the year 1748 show, fees had to be imposed upon every hundredweight of candles used at such occasions for the number of people attending could become a serious fire risk to a church.62

Despite some inconclusive evidence of the gradual limitation of mourning to the "nuclear" family one should be cautious of talking of genuinely private grief in the period. As Trumbach has demonstrated, mourning in early eighteenth century England was a very formalised, public and rule-based activity.63 There were regulation periods of wearing mourning which were strictly graded according to the nearness of the blood relationship to the deceased. Despite having its critics, this formality did not, according to Trumbach, seem to be relinquished over the period. The tensions caused by the continuation of formal public mourning against the background of a broad movement towards family privacy had major repercussions for funerary sculpture. An important example of a design crucially affected by these pressures is the mausoleum and monument to Marwood Turner at Kirkleatham in Yorkshire (James Gibbs and Scheemakers, 1739-42).

Although Terry Friedman has done much work on the documents and drawings for the mausoleum, the essential function and originality of the structure seems to have been missed.64 Cholmley Turner commissioned a structure in which he could mourn, in absolute privacy, for his only son, who had died on the Grand Tour in 1739.65 In order to enter the building a visitor had to negotiate two layers of doors separating it from the main body of the church. When these doors were closed, the visitor entered a dimly lit vaulted interior which resembled a subterranean coffin vault. The effect of Scheemakers statue of the young man, who is tragically posed with his head on his hand, is profoundly enhanced by the melancholy lighting and enclosed space in which it was designed to be seen (ill. 97). It is a tribute to Gibbs' skill that visiting the interior still feels like an intrusion of privacy.

Gibbs used the unusual and metaphysical associations of circular buildings to inspire a sense of scholastic contemplation. There was a visual tradition associating buildings of this type with

62 Westminster Public Library E. 2420.
65 The tragedy of his death is emphasised in an obituary in the Weekly Miscellany of November 3rd 1739.
contemplation upon the mysteries of time. Zachariah Heyn's *Emblemata*, for instance, illustrates the concept of "tempe" with a circular building set in a rural landscape. The pose envisaged for the statue of the young scholar, who had died upon the grand tour, was also part of a tradition of presenting a rural scholar musing upon the mysteries of time in his mystical grotto (ill. 98). A clear comparison can be made between Gibbs' original drawing of the interior and the famous sketch of Pope in his grotto (Lady Burlington or William Kent, c.1730) (ill. 99). The seated pose with one arm propping up the head is, as John Dixon Hunt shows, synonymous with the idea of the melancholic scholar's private contemplations. These original drawings suggest that there were thoughts of adding to this sense of scholastic meditation by inserting statues of Virtues associated with the acquisition of scholastic wisdom in the adjacent arches (ill. 100). Balanced against this imagery of privacy and quiet contemplation there was placed on the exterior an inscription in grand Roman capitals declaring the father's tribute to his son to the world outside.

The contradictions between public and private grief, which were inherent in the design of the mausoleum itself, got Turner into a deal of trouble with his image amongst local freeholders. As a public gesture of his private grief Turner withdrew from local politics. Shortly after the mausoleum had been constructed in November 1741 he returned to the political fray under the pressure of government party managers. The opposition *York Courant* automatically suggested that his display of private grief was a hypocritical publicity stunt. Turner's own election managers replied to "this barbarous insult to the distress of a parent" by claiming that the *Courant's* attack had been directed at:

...a pretended piece of inconsistency in Mr Turner whose conduct in that very point has been just what has been expected from a tender affectionate father.

For his allies and opponents alike his public display of grief seemed only the expected social protocol for a man who had lost his only son. The conspicuously private visits of Charles Turner to the mausoleum were a part of an expected public display.

---

66 For the significance of circular buildings in the rural landscape see J. Dixon Hunt, *The Figure in the Landscape*, Baltimore and London, 1976, pp. 58-9. The association between circular buildings in rural landscapes and Newtonian reflections upon time has been discussed by Saumarez-Smith, *The Building of Castle Howard*, p. 168.

67 A preparatory drawing showing these Virtues can be seen in T. Friedman, "Cheemakers' Monument to the Best of Sons", *Burlington Magazine*, vol. CXXII, 1980, pp. 61-65, figs. 90-95. The drawings remain in the possession of the Parochial Church Council of St Cuthbert's, Kirkleatham.

68 *Leeds Mercury*, November 10th 1741, a reply to the attack in the *York Courant*, October 10th 1741.
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Turner was not the only patron of a sentimental family monument who was compromised by being held to the statement of sincere affection made in a monument. When in 1733 Anne Knight was rendered a widow by the death of her husband, John Knight of Gosfield in Essex, she commissioned Rysbrack to create an image of herself and her husband in loving embrace (ill. 101). A notice of the erection of the monument appeared in the *London Evening Post* of July 17th 1736: this confirms that it must have been designed to fit into a specially built extension at the North side of church which was built in 1735-6. The extension was half memorial chapel and half box pew. Originally this chamber presented the widow to the rest of the congregation where she could be seen directly in front of the image of herself and her husband. The placement of the image directly behind the widow at church was somewhat of a commitment to a permanent mourning; an image of her love that would remain an unavoidable part of her life until her own death.

This type of commitment to the rituals of widowhood appears to have been a family tradition. Her sister was Elizabeth Eliot, wife of Edward Eliot the patron of Rysbrack's first "weeping widow" monument at St Germains. The widow’s pledge in the inscription of this monument (which will be analysed in chapter six) that she would await with yearning the reunification of their ashes in death was in this case upheld. Under the influence of her friend and mentor Alexander Pope, Elizabeth Eliot embraced Catholicism and followed the continental custom of observing a life of prayerful reflection until her death. This monument was placed in a retired private chapel constructed from a medieval side chapel. Here also the widow herself could presumably be seen to enter for private meditation upon her loss.

By placing this tender image of and her husband behind herself at worship, Anne Knight made a strong public affirmation of the sincerity and permanence of her private grief. It was little wonder that, as Vertue noted, she was forced to surround the image in crates on her remarriage to Robert Nugent. The patroness’s actions could be justified by the knowledge that she would have expected her new husband to sit with her in the pew directly in front of his sculptured predecessor, as a sort of reverse mirror image. This public presentation was

---


70 See p. 295.


73 Vertue, Notebooks, vol.V, p. 117
especially embarrassing as Nugent had effectively inherited the entire estate of his childless predecessor. Even in the 1770s, as Peter Muilman reports, Rysbrack’s monument was “inclosed in a large wainscot case that opens by two folding doors”. These doors could be opened during the majority of the week and shut at service times for the sake of the finer feelings of Nugent and the family he had by the former Mrs Knight. Like Cholmley Turner’s mausoleum, the Gosfield pew box fostered the expectation that the ritual of mourning would not only be sincere, but permanently observed before the locality. Both patrons ran the risk of pledging through strong visual images a type of dramatic public mourning which could not be upheld in the cold light of day.

Rysbrack’s monuments for the two sisters, Elizabeth Eliot and Anne Knight, were designed with some obvious attention to obtaining a degree of harmony between the image chosen and the surroundings in which the monuments were eventually placed. The sculptor appears to have understood that tender images of conjugal affection were particularly suitable for a retired or private area off the main body of the church. Rysbrack probably had a hand in designing the space into which the Knight monument went. The way in which he centralised the composition so that it formed the neat symmetrical focal point of the pew suggests that Rysbrack was well aware of the final setting. Rysbrack’s use of the novel composition of two seated figures suggests he appreciated the idea that it would be seen behind the seated donor echoing her own position. In order to achieve this type of harmony between design and setting it seems that Rysbrack would have actually visited the church. If the sculptor had simply reused the type of imagery seen in the monument to the Duke of Buckingham, the reclining male figure with seated female mourner, it would have been difficult to see beneath the front face of the pew. A reclining figure seen at the floor level of the church, which is at least five feet below the top of the wooden front of the raised pew box, would have presented a very distorted image. The monument was, in fact, erected upon a sort of marble plinth which allowed the whole of the seated figures to be seen. The main inscription tablet was placed, uniquely in the sculptor’s oeuvre, directly above rather than below the figures so that it would not be obscured from view by the front of the raised pew.

It is interesting to note that Rysbrack employed the device of seating the widow donor figure around an urn in a complementary and symmetrical position to her husband in the King mausoleum at Ockham in Surrey (ill. 102). Here also the design was even more carefully chosen to be appreciated within the architectural space. As a faculty drawn out in June 1735

---

by Lady King demonstrates, the chapel was built to accommodate Rysbrack's monument.75 According to a press report in the *London Evening Post* the monument was erected by Rysbrack in the chapel on November 9th 1738. It can also be discerned from the faculty that the chapel was built in an area "adjoining the seat of the said Lord King". We can assume, therefore, that, in the original interior, entrance to the chapel was through the front of a family pew. An arch was knocked in the back of the pew making the monument appear in a darkened withdrawn space directly behind the family.

Thus, unless one entered the family space, a view of the monument could only be gained from standing within the church and looking through the archway to the monument. If one stands in this position it is possible to see that the figures were designed to be neatly framed by the arch.76 Once more the sculptured family appeared seated directly behind a space designed for the living family to sit in. The King and Knight monuments were planned and erected at more or less the same time; from the style of the plaster work and general design of the vaulting it appears very probable that the same team were involved on both projects.77 The design of the monuments within their environment suggests that the sculptor had a clear understanding of the emotional impact of viewing an intimate scene of family grief by gazing from outside into the family's private inner sanctum.

The monument to Lord King struck a fascinating compromise between an intimate and public statement. From outside the chapel one could not only see the melancholic pair seated beneath torches but, in the boldest Latin capitals, the statement that Lord Chief Justice King had been:

**A TRUE FRIEND OF LIBERTY AND PROPERTY**

The words are printed in such large capitals that they are amongst the first things one sees when looking into the chapel. It seems probable that this political statement was to act as the motto of the family. King was the nephew, executor and close friend of John Locke, the man most associated with the foundation of this political ideology.78 Locke's papers were actually

75 Greater London Record Office, Mic. Box X7/2.

76 A less symmetrical design appears to have been rejected. J. Physick has identified a preparatory drawing showing Lord King in a reclining position as a study for the monument. (Physick, 1969, pp. 88-90, fig. 57.)

77 The King Chapel has been attributed to Hawksmoor who produced designs for the mansion at Ockham. (K. Downs, *English Baroque Architecture*, London, 1966.) There is no documentary basis for this assumption and little stylistic justification.

78 E.S. De Beer ed., *The Correspondence of John Locke*, Oxford, 1989, vols. 7 & 8. There are so many surviving letters between King and Locke it seems superfluous to list them.
kept at Ockham at the time of the erection of the monument and published by one of King’s
descendants.79 Like the mausoleum chapels at Southill and Little Ilford there are links
between the idea of entering a family chapel and the “piety” of immersing oneself in the moral
heritage of one’s ancestors. The effect of the inscription being placed in this context was to
make a public statement of family principle seem to be associated with an intimate private
experience. As we shall see shortly in the case of the monument to George Cooke (Cheere,
Belhamonds, Middlesex, 1744-9), an intimate environment for a family monument could be
used to make its political statements seem like matters for the private conscience of future
family members.

The distinction between the use of private and public inscription forms in family mausoleums
was a matter of some significance in Roman funerary culture. Recent research by W. Eck has
highlighted the existence of a firm definition in Roman funerary culture between “Public”
epigraphic statements upon the exterior of mausolea and “private” epitaphs upon the
interior.80 The degree to which this tradition was known by men such as Gibbs and Rysbrack
is difficult to discern. Gibbs’ use of a large Roman capital inscription upon the exterior of the
Kirkleatham mausoleum, and his plans for a figure of a retired scholar within, suggest that he
was aware of a tradition of this type.

Rysbrack, who as we have seen in the case of the Wynn monument, clearly understood the
existence of the Roman debate upon “private” and “public” statements, may well have also
incorporated these ideas in his design of images for the King and Knight chapels. The idea
of viewing a private space from without suggests that privacy was being thought of in the
Roman tradition; not so much as an image from which the outsider was excluded but a symbol
of a sphere of life. To look from the exterior of the King chapel into a darkened private space
and see a large print Roman capital political motto, of the type used upon the Watkin
Williams Wynn monument, was a witty and erudite use of the contrast in the formal spheres
of life. The epigraphic tradition of public and private tribute is integrated carefully into the
design in the manner of Roubiliac’s Warren monument (Westminster Abbey, 1757).

Only in one mausoleum, that of the Streatfeild family at Chiddingstone in Kent, was the
outsider genuinely not intended to see the monument. According to faculty papers which are
preserved at Lambeth Palace, the mausoleum was planned and built by Henry Streatfeild in

79 GEC, Peerages, vol. 7, pp. 275-277. Peter King (seventh Baron). The Life of John Locke, with Extracts from
His Correspondence, Journals, etc., London, 1829.

80 W. Eck, “Romische Grabinschriften. Aussageabsicht und Aussagefähigkeit im funeraren Kontext”, in H.
the period 1731-5. It takes the form of a closed copula with a staircase inside leading directly to the vault. There was no space provided to walk around the interior and no window looking in. Above the staircase is a magnificent terracotta bust of Henry Streatfield which is inscribed on the socle with the date 1738 (Cheere, or Roubiliac). An inscription on a brass plate beneath states that the "passions" of the deceased builder of the mausoleum had "always been followed by repentance."

How Henry's "passions" manifested themselves is, unfortunately, not recorded and there is not enough evidence in family papers to make an educated guess at them. All that can be said is that the inscription was intended to make his descendants doubt his absolute virtue. However enigmatic, this was the only piece of candour used in a major funerary monument of the period. Here genuine privacy meant that the family could indulge in a bit of frank realism when contemplating its ancestors. Grand conceptions of piety towards one’s ancestors and commitment to rigorous traditions of moral or political principal were here eclipsed by the desire to remember a relative with all his foibles. A comparison between the idea of the private family inscription of the Streatfield mausoleum and the King mausoleum, suggests that there were two contemporaneous understandings of privacy; the former a state of complete exclusion from those outside the intimate group and the latter a sphere of life emblematically distinct from the public. Whether the term "private" which we see in so many Georgian requests for funerals and mourning tributes refers to the former or latter interpretation of the word remains a problematical and unexplored issue.

Although there was a long tradition of erecting monumental chapels which were closed to all but the immediate family and privileged visitors, it was in our period that these spaces seem to have developed concrete associations with the communication of the family’s intimate feelings. Monuments which celebrated intimate family feelings in withdrawn areas of a church anticipated those removed altogether from church settings and placed in private gardens or houses. The erection of funerary monuments in garden settings, which became increasingly fashionable in the 1740s and 50s, is an important indication of major changes in attitude to monumental sculpture.

---

81 Sevenoaks Record Office, Streatfield Papers Q13/1-5. Lawyer Thomas Tyllot and Henry Streatfield, faculty papers. Q13/1 indicates that the mausoleum had been designed by 14th September 1735. Faculty Record relating to different stages of the mausoleum’s production are preserved in the Lambeth Palace Archive VH/89/6 & VH/88/2, p. 46.

82 The drapery of the bust is very close to that upon the terracotta bust of Tyers frequently attributed to Roubiliac which is reproduced in R. Strong ed., *Rococo, Art and Design in Hogarth’s England*, London, 1984, p. 82, fig. F1.
The discussion of such sculpture brings the historian into the debate upon natural environment, rural solitude, retirement and contemplation; an area of scholarship well-trodden by such scholars as John Dixon Hunt, Kenneth Woodbridge and Maynard Mack. The genre of the garden monument was a distinctly literary and academic response to the erection of monumental sculpture. The patrons who sponsored garden funerary monuments were generally of literary eminence or familiar with literary circles: Alexander Pope, John Rich, Jonathan Tyers, Richard Gough, William Shenstone and Thomas Anson. The setting of monumental sculpture in retired groves and the use of intimate inscriptions or self-consciously understated designs was largely inspired by the literary debate upon the futility of pompous monumental display.

A common theme of garden monuments was that of the superiority of the learned man over the trappings of earthly pomp and public glory; a literary formula most notably expressed in the engraving showing Pope in meditation amongst the ruins of monuments which appeared in the poet’s Essay on Man (1734) (ill. 103). Many early examples of the genre of garden monuments were learned parodies of the sombre clichés of contemporary inscriptions and pompous public funerary sculpture. Cobham’s monument to Congreve at Stowe (inscribed as designed by William Kent in 1736) commemorated his comedic talents by placing the image of an ape on top of a cinerary urn. John Rich’s lost “Monument to Care” (c. 1750, here attri. Roubiliac) set up in his gardens at Cowley, which took the form of a cinerary urn surrounding by dancing putti, was a parody of the type of monument expected for a "tyrant" or great public hero.

The tradition of setting up funerary monuments in a rural environment had many of its roots in Roman monumental art. Scholars such as Thomas Browne and Samuel Johnson were well aware that the Romans had set up the majority of their funerary sculpture on road-sides or the perimeters of private land. Roman epigraphy was largely geared to the rural setting in which inscriptions were seen; epitaphs frequently included a formal address to passing travellers or aimed to catch the attention of a casual passer-by with some thought provoking

---

83 An account of the monument appears in Lipscombe, Buckingham, 1847, vol. 3, p. 98.

84 The Monument to Care and its inscription are recorded in: Thompson, The Life and Miscellaneous Compositions of Paul Whitehead, p. 176. The description of the monument conforms closely with that of the putti dancing with wreaths around an urn seen upon Roubiliac’s monument to the Duchess of Montagu (Warkton, 1752). Roubiliac is known to have visited Rich at Cowley, an estate which he purchased in 1744, and I suggest the monument was by him.

statement or witticism. Congreve's light-hearted monument at Stowe which was seen by tourists from far and wide related directly to this tradition.

Contemporary awareness of this tradition of the classical tomb which alerted the passer-by to some moral subject is best seen in James Stuart and Peter Scheemakers' "Shepherd's monument" at Shugborough (1759); a monument set up in a rural grove, upon the design of a grotto, which was intended to commemorate a mystery lover of Thomas Anson (ill. 104). The central relief was, as Pennant tells us, a scene of two lovers alerted to their mortality by a passing rustic who introduces them to a tomb hidden in the undergrowth. According to Shenstone, (writing in 1759) it was drawn directly from an engraving of Poussin's famous "Et in Arcadia Ego" (1630).

The experience of viewing classical rural tombs had a traditional association with the realisation of common humanity; it was this, of course, which lay behind the monument at Shugborough being called the Shepherd's monument and its imagery being that of a common man introducing travellers to their human fate. This tradition led to a number of formal distinctions being made between private and public epigraphy and monumental imagery. Obelisks, triumphal arches, and images of conspicuous human achievement such as the statue of Hercules with a club representing his labours, could, when broken by time, act as witness to human vanity.

There was, indeed, a great tradition of landscape painting, of which Poussin's "Et in Arcadia Ego" is only a notable example, in which such broken public imagery is explained to scholastic travellers by rustics. Within this tradition a monument which initially set out to offer the example of private virtue was to be considered superior on account of the fact that it did not pretend to be a symbol of human grandeur in the first place. Such a monument could more be aimed at imparting common wisdom rather than doing so unintentionally as a result of its inevitable decay. Samuel Johnson, in a discourse touching upon the Roman conventions of placing monuments on road-sides, comments that:

---

86 A mid-Georgian collection of such inscriptions were published in T. Warton (attrib.), *Inscriptionum Romanorum Metricarum Delectus Accedunt Notulæ*, London, 1758

87 The erection of the monument and derivation from designs for rural groves is discussed by Watkin, *Athenian Stuart*, pp. 25-6, figs. 13, 14 and 15.


89 Shenstone, pp. 524-5. Shenstone to Graves, October 3rd 1759, *On Fables, Mottos, Urns and Inscriptions*.

90 Johnson, vol 2, p. 278.
..... the best subject for epitaphs is private virtue: virtue exerted in the same circumstances which the bulk of mankind are placed and in which, therefore, may admit many imitators.

He then quotes a number of two line classical inscriptions, one in memory of a virtuous woman, drawn from such rural monuments. This type of modest Latin inscription to private virtue had an obvious influence on a number of patrons setting up garden monuments. Among the best examples were Shenstone’s brief Latin eulogy to Miss Maria Dolman which was placed upon a funerary urn (erected 1759) at Leasowes, and Pope’s inscription for the monument to his mother on her obelisk at Twickenham (erected 1735-8).

The setting of a monument in a country estate - where, discovered amongst the undergrowth or in a grove, the sculpture lost all sense of pompous public display - was a useful metaphor for the communication of the idea of private virtue. By removing a funeral monument from a church environment its imagery was being aimed at the genteel guest to a private estate rather than the parishioner; the sensation of observing such monuments was linked to the whole experience of being privileged to share the most intimate and "private" emotions of the family who owned the property. At a time when it was becoming fashionable to omit servants and parishioners from contemporary "private" funerals, the garden monument embraced a notion of the "private" which manifested itself as an exclusion of the hoi polloi. Oliver Goldsmith, for instance, wrote an essay upon fictional circumstances in which a certain brash, ill-educated City entrepreneur, "Mr Truepenny", purchases William Shenstone’s garden at Leasowes and cuts down all the melancholic glades replacing them with monuments which lent the place a "more peopled air". It is an essential irony of the genre that it grew out of a desire to express a patron’s acknowledgement of common mortality or to provide a universal example of private virtue, and yet was at the same time part of a movement towards making monumental art more socially exclusive. These ironies were a natural consequence of the literary origins of the genre; in particular the prevalent literary notion that a finely attuned

---

91 ibid., p. 279. Epitaph for Zozima.

92 Shenstone, op. cit., pp. 524-5. The letter On Fables, Urns and Mottos contains a brief discussion of the formulation of such short inscriptions.

93 The monument and inscription to Pope’s mother are discussed in Martin, 1984, pp. 56-70.

94 P. Martin records (Martin, 1984, pp. 56-60) that Pope placed upon a gate near the monument to his mother which was used by guests entering his garden the inscription "Mihi & Amicis".

sense of one’s common mortality was a sign that a man had a far from common education and
cultivation.

The monument to George Cooke of Belhambons (d. November 1740) near Harefield (Cheere,
erected 1744-49) was intended to be just such an intimate experience for the visitor to the
estate (ill. 105). The monument was commissioned by George Cooke’s eldest son and heir the
notable M.P. for Middlesex, George Cooke (jnr). It was erected some time after his inheritance
of the property. William Vernon, who owned Belhamonds in the mid-nineteenth century,
ruled that this monumental statue originally stood in a grove "close by the house at the South
end of the terrace". The statue invited the viewer into an area symbolically close to the
bosom of the family in order that he might participate in private family grief. Its inscription,
which suggested that the viewer has come across a ritualistically revered symbol of private
mourning, made it clear that this was an image designed for the appreciation of an audience
wider than the family who lived in the adjacent house:

Hence ever honoured amidst this grove; the loved remembrance and the form
revered of a kind father and a faithful friend.

The statue shared the posture of the recently completed monument to Shakespeare in
Westminster Abbey (erected 1741). Paulson and others have demonstrated that this cross-
legged pose belonged to English tradition, going back to the Elizabethan period, which
depicted meditative scholars in woodland. In this case the pose is cleverly combined with
a parallel continental tradition of rural scholar imagery. On the base of the monument there
was, indeed, a relief carving of the interior of George Cooke’s library within the house (ill.
106). Even the bovine skulls on the pedestal upon which Cooke leans recall the foreground
of Salvator Rosa’s Democritus in Meditation (engraving published 1662) (ill. 107). The latter
image was, according to John Dixon Hunt, central to the development of the iconography of
retired melancholia which became so important to the ideology of landscape design at the
beginning of the eighteenth century.

---


97 The meaning of the cross legged pose in a rural environment is discussed in: R. Paulson, "The Aesthetics

98 J. Dixon Hunt, The Figure in the Landscape, pp. 58-59.
The monument was cleverly designed to draw the spectator into the same sense of retired melancholy as indicated by the posture of the statue. The scholastic meditations of the figure are centred upon an open book; at the base of the structure upon which he leans was engraved a quotation from Horace's Odes (book II, 14):

Liquenda tellus et domus et placens uxor, neque harum, quas colis, arborum te praeter invisas cupressos ulla brevem dominum sequetur."

("Your land, your house, your lovely bride must leave you; of your cherished trees none but these sad cypresses will cleave to their fleeting master's side.")

The monument's imagery probably referred to the contemporary topos on the character of the collector and scholar for George Cooke bequeathed a substantial collection of classical statuary and antiquities to his sons.99 This convention, which is most notably seen in Nichols' biographical notes on Richard Gough, portrayed the antiquarian collector, or the scholar with interests in monuments and sculptural antiquities, as a man prone to melancholic reflection upon the transience of human life.100

The scene of Cooke's private study, which was carved on the pedestal, featured an exhibition of the classical busts purchased for the family collection from the Earl Halifax.101 The inscription was carved upon a short column with a freeze of ram's skulls which is plainly a reproduction of a Roman or Greek funerary altar, designed after the classic "Rhodian" type.102 Such small Roman monuments were relatively cheaply acquired by English collectors and an example may well have been in Cooke's own collection. The monument has, therefore, overt connections with the idea of the classical rural or road-side stele or funeral altar devoted to private virtue and containing the customary thought provoking address to the passing spectator. The inscription from Horace reminded the reader of his own mortality on his pleasurable walk through a scene of rural contentment.

99 G. Cooke PCC 1768, 272.


101 The purchase of parts of the sculpture collection from the Earl of Halifax is recorded in George Cooke's (jnr) will.

102 For similar funerary altars see: P.M. Fraser, Rhodian Funerary Monuments, Oxford, 1977, figs. 64-83.
The reason for this particular choice of imagery was very likely to have been political, its aim being to create an image of private virtue in the tradition of the retired classical statesman in order to highlight the honesty of the Cooke family in public affairs. The monument was connected to a well-documented political episode: the Middlesex election of 1749. Nick Rogers has shown that Cooke relied upon the political image of being a country gentleman which was intended to contrast him with his Whig opponent Frazer Honeywood, a "very active zealous Whig" and an unashamed self-made tycoon of the City. According to Rogers, Cooke's support came from the country gentry of Middlesex rather than the city suburbs. Thus the country environment in which the monument was set had a direct bearing upon the attachment of the patron, his friends and supporters to the values of "country politics".

Henry Cheere received two payments from George Cooke in 1744 and 1749. On the second date the sculptor, in his capacity as a Justice of the Peace for Middlesex, was also acting as a political broker for George Cooke who was the prospective "country" M.P. in his campaign for a Middlesex seat. Cheere's association with Cooke must have been forged through the sculptor's powerful position in the City of Westminster where the politician had been a leading member of "The Free and Independent electors of Westminster". It is an indication of the complexity of politics in the period that the sculptor was agent for the Government party which opposed Cooke and his associates. The last words of the inscription echo precisely the terminology of Westminster and London opposition politics:

He maintained his integrity through the various circumstances of fortune. And dying in an age of general corruption had the satisfaction to leave his family free and independent.

The "various circumstances of fortune" referred to are very likely to be the loss of Cooke's parliamentary seat to Government jobbers in 1722. References to "an age of general corruption"...
corruption" can mean little else than the fact that Cooke died in opposition to the Walpole administration. The monumental inscription was infused with the values of the country opposition. The central part of the inscription was, as no viewer could be expected to miss, drawn directly from the most famous statement of the "country" party's landed ethics. Pope's Epistle to Bathurst, On the Use and Abuse of Riches (published January 1732, lines 219-222):

The goods of fortune not meanly or ambitiously pursued. Blessed with the sense to value. With the art to enjoy and with the virtue to impart.

George Cooke was attempting to portray his father as the model of retired forbearance who, when denied political power, returned to the land and the bosom of his family. The monument was placed in the heart of the estate with the land initially purchased by the deceased for the benefit of his future family stretching out all around. Whilst we can place the Cooke monument in the context of the broad cultural reaction against public sculpture of the 1740s, its combination of Tory politics and arcanian reflection upon monumental vanity had its roots in the earlier part of our period. Landscape painting with broken public monuments had appealed to those forced into contemplative political retirement since the late 1720s. Arline Meyer has shown that John Wootton painted many such subjects for Pope and other notable Tories.108

The rich and complex imagery of the Cooke monument is a good focus for the debate which David Bindman has initiated upon the intellectual roots and social causes of the reaction against public sculpture and grand dynasticism in monumental art in the fourth and fifth decades of the century.109 The remaining two chapters of this thesis will be devoted to charting the social causes and extent of this movement toward images of personal loss and private virtue. If indeed there was a "reaction" in the 1740s and 50s, it was constituted from an array of pre-existing topoi; traditional debates, often with roots in classical literature, on subjects such as the nature of true nobility and the precedence of private over public virtue. Like any social reaction or change borne out of the jumbling together of certain traditional debates, it leaves the historian with the problems of whether to accentuate elements of continuity or whether to accentuate elements of change.


For further discussion of Tory Patrons' enthusiasm for melancholia and ruined monuments in landscape art see, D. Solkin, Richard Wilson, The Landscape of Reaction, London, 1982, chapters 3, 4, and 5.

Monuments as objects of contemplation within an arcadian setting commonly appear in the imagery of "graveyard" poetry; a literary genre that had its epoch in the late 1740s and 50s and was, at least partially, responsible for stimulating the reaction against public sculpture in this period. Jean Hagstrum has shown that Gray's *Elegy in a Country Churchyard* - a poem in which the contemplative traveller comes to an understanding of his common mortality through his contemplations upon monuments set in a rustic English landscape - was a reworking, using English Gothic imagery, of the traditional iconography of an encounter with a classical memento mori in the arcadian landscape of which Poussin's "Et in Arcadia Ego" was the most notable example.\(^{10}\)

Even the central works of the "evangelical revival" such as Hervey's *Meditations in a Flower Garden* (*Meditations and Contemplations*, first published 1746) - a poem in which a young girl is reminded of her mortality by a journey through an arcadian landscape with pyramids and other monumental relics - were Christian reinterpretations of literary traditions which had been previously used to encourage a pagan stoic outlook. It is somewhat of an irony that attempts to make monumental sculpture the focus of a Christian reflection - such as Jonathan Tyer's famous melancholic garden at Denbies which centred upon Roubiliac's stucco monument showing the Catholic Robert, Earl Petre (d. 1742) rising from the grave with a copy of *Night Thoughts* chained to a reading desk before it - were themselves founded upon these pagan formulae.\(^{11}\)

Like Gray's *Elegy*, the Cooke monument does not convey any new reactions to monumental pomp but merely brings many strands of a traditional debate together with a new sophistication. Cheere's monument, like the *Elegy*, seems to fuse elements of tradition into a cocktail of potently emotive images which seem to conform to the rise of a culture of "sensibility" - a culture which has been defined by modern critics in terms of an enthusiasm for hyperbolic combinations of emotive images.\(^{12}\) Monuments set in secluded groves with classicising inscriptions upon rural private virtue were regarded by some contemporaries as the most hackneyed images of fashionable sentimentality. In the early fifties, for instance, Richard Gough set up a monumental grove in which his visitors were to be treated to a display


of mock melancholy monuments in memory of animals which parodied the current enthusiasm for privacy in mourning ritual. The inscription to his domestic cat was an obvious spoof on the earnest language of a monument such as at the grove at Belhamonds:113

Once more, ye venerable elms, once more
Beneath your sacred shade receive a corpse,
Whose virtue you must rescue from oblivion.
Your leafy honours once again shall deck
Sweet friendship's mem'ry, while this humble plate
Repeats in verse his fame whose tomb it shows
Poor Puss is dead, and hath not left his peer.

There are strong parallels between the way the Cooke monument combined a complex cocktail of visual formulae and literary topoi and the tendency of literature in the 1740s to force "pots of meaning" into a single work which has been noted by Gerald Newman.114 The design of the Cooke monument, therefore, had links with the movement to put new energy of "meaning" in the pre-existing formulae and classical conventions of monumental sculpture. It had much in common with Roubiliac's monument to Lord Shannon which did not seek to abandon emotionally sterile classical conventions but to intensify their "meaning" and pathos by approaching them with a new sophistication.

J.T. Smith's contention that the sculptors of his youth had simply transported metropolitan sculpture to the countryside with no thought to individual situations was at best a truism. Finding an appropriate composition for the proposed setting of a monument was, like finding the proprietary form for a particular family circumstance, one of the considerations in the design of a major family monument. Compositions such as the Cooke, Knight and King monuments are so clearly suited to their environment and function as to suggest that there were detailed consultations between sculptor and client upon these matters. It was part of the trade of a leading London sculptor such as Rysbrack to provide the appropriate imagery for a particular setting; a commission such as the monument to Earl Strafford (Stainborough Castle, c.1739-41), erected on a hill top with an inscription referring to his public career, required the triumphal imagery of a Roman general in a posture of command, whilst postures

113 Nichols, 1872, vol. 6, p. 314.

114 Newman, 1987, pp. 87-127. It is interesting to note that Janet Todd has described Sterne's definition of the term "sentimental" as a "richness of moral reflection". (Todd, Sensibility, 1986, p. 9.).
of melancholic contemplation were more appropriate to withdrawn family chapels such as that at Ockham.

The period saw designers such as Cheere producing a great number of wall monuments to be set up in country churches with the minimum of consideration for their particular environment. The designers of monuments regularly considered matters of lighting and atmosphere or the aesthetic impact of viewing a work from a particular angle or vista. It is probable that an educated knowledge of such matters as the formal distinctions between a private and public space, or a contemplative posture and that of public triumph, was an expected attribute of an erudite, classically educated workshop master. The financial independence which initially fostered the growing erudition of sculptors in such matters was based upon their improving efficiency in the transportation and production of the smaller monuments which formed the bed-rock of the trade. These were the inevitable characteristics of an age in which the production of sculpture was developing in two potentially paradoxical directions: at once becoming increasingly efficient and rising to the status of a polite art.
Chapter V.

THE DECLINE OF HERALDRY AND DYNASTIC POMP?

The idea that the use of heraldry was in decline in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries has become a typical assumption of work published in sympathy with Stone’s theory of the development of the family. Stone’s thesis is much dependent upon the argument that the values of "kinship", "lineage" and "clientage", which he sees as an important part of sixteenth century society, were gradually rejected in favour of the "nuclear" and "affective family". The values of large, formal family groups are seen as so diametrically opposed to those of the small affective family that the development of the latter is considered a reaction against the former. As we have seen in Mark Girouard’s comments upon the pew box at Petworth, Stone’s followers have been quick to associate heraldry with the starched formality of a declining old aristocratic order. Stone himself pointed to the decline of the great, formal funeral as a symptom of this perceived social change.1 Clare Gittings, whose Death, Burial and the Individual in Early Modern England (1984) is much influenced by Stone, has taken his comments further and argued that the use of heraldry in death ritual was in decline - forced out by the culture of "individualism" and "rationalism".

In this chapter we will explore the value of such hypotheses to the assessment of the changing attitudes to the design and function of funerary sculpture. These social theories provide a useful though unsophisticated social model against which we can evaluate some broad changes in the way sculpture was designed. Although one can detect broad shifts in attitude towards heraldry and the grandeur of dynasty they can be explained better as a complex metamorphosis rather than a decline. The contemporary debate concerning the use of heraldry and value of blood nobility - a debate which dictated or reflected the types of dynastic display considered socially acceptable - was complex and full of subtle nuance. Analysis of this debate suggests that the broad picture was not of outright rejection, but of the formulation of genteel codes of conduct in which, if abused, heraldry and dynastic display might become unacceptable.

The author of an article in the Connoisseur of 1756 (January 8th, no. CII) was in little doubt that "the study of heraldry is of little repute amongst us" and that the period had seen a

---

1 Stone, 1977, p. 95.
decline in those prepared to give any serious attention to the subject. There is ample evidence that by this date the more pompous aspects of heraldic ritual had become the object of general ridicule. A letter of October 1744 from Francis, Lord Hastings in Westminster to his wife Selina at Ashby-de-la-Zouche is a good indication of the extent of the reaction against heraldic pomp. He described going to witness the rituals of the Knights of the Order of Bath in the Henry VII chapel where the "trophies" of the dead knights were to be ceremonially buried. Two old Knights of the Order, Lords Tyrconnel and Montagu (Grand Master) doddered with pompous senility through the rituals which they had only agreed to perform because others of the Order were afraid to look ridiculous. He comments that Lord Chesterfield had:

.....said that he knew of six old Knights of the Order then in town who were ashamed to walk (in the ceremony).

Even in the first two decades of our period it was common to ask that no escutcheons or other heraldic paraphernalia should be used at a burial. Sir Thomas Reeves (d.1737), whose monument was erected by Scheemakers (Windsor, 1739) according to the designs of his executor, Dr Richard Mead, requested that there should be no escutcheons at his funeral because he had observed that the "only use of which has made disorder at a funeral". The evidence of such wills does not, however, suggest that the writer, his family or executors were necessarily against the use of heraldry in other circumstances. The second Earl of Warrington's use of heraldry provides a useful example of this. As a man of austere Low-Church opinions he requested to be buried in the most simple, plain manner possible with no heraldry, and yet in his life he was exceedingly interested in heraldry. As the authors of the most thorough study of his patronage at Dunham Massy have shown, the Earl had virtually every item commissioned in his lifetime emblazoned with heraldic devices. The funeral monuments which he had designed by Andries Carpentière - one in memory of his father, another, in memory of his brothers (Bowden, erected 1732) - further demonstrate this fascination with

---

2 Another article from the *Connoisseur* (reprinted in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1755, p. 153) mocked the erection of heraldic monuments by inventing pompous inscriptions for the monuments of thoroughbred sporting dogs and race horses.


4 T. Reeves, PCC 1737, 13.

5 Lord Warrington, PCC 1758, 253.

heraldry; the latter exhibits a central shield with at least fifty heraldic devices which trace his brothers' ancestry with impressive thoroughness.

Although it is possible to point to many wills where the services of a Herald were actively rejected, it is possible to complement this with as many examples of individuals requesting full heraldic funerals or some heraldic paraphernalia. It is, indeed, very difficult to quantify the proportion of funerals which did use some type of heraldic display. Requests for "private" funerals cannot be taken to mean funerals without heraldic pomp. Robert Tothill, whose monument was constructed by Scheemakers (Urchfont, d.1753), requested that his monument should be placed below an Achievement which was to be carried before his coffin and hung ceremoniously in the chancel as a part of his "private" burial.7

Julian Litten and Clare Gittings have pointed out that the number of funerals employing the services of the College of Arms was declining rapidly in the seventeenth century and virtually extinct by the beginning of the eighteenth.8 However this may only indicate that it was becoming inexpedient to employ the College and is not firm evidence of the decline of the use of heraldry in funerary culture. Herald painters, such as "Mr Holland" whose bust was made by Rysbrack before 1732, continued to thrive, and heraldic devices were made in profusion without the consultation of the official body.9 Bills for the workmanship of Herald painters are a regular feature amongst surviving groups of funeral and mortuary bills in family collections. An article printed in the Gentleman's Magazine of 1754 complained that, far from dying out, the enthusiasm for heraldic funeral devices was spreading to classes with no legal entitlement to bear arms.10 Had the use of heraldry really been in decline it would not have been necessary to re-found the Courts of Honour in 1732; a decision taken by a group of Oxford Tories largely in order to prosecute those who used unauthorised arms at funerals.11

Caution must be shown in the interpretation of the many contemporary jokes at the expense of heraldic pomp and those who postured before images of dynastic splendour. In the first

7 R. Tothill PCC 1753, 64.

8 Gittings, 1984, p. 188.

9 The bust of Mr Holland, a herald painter, is recorded by Vertue (Notebooks III, pp. 56-7).


11 A report on the re-foundation of the Courts of Honour appears in the Gentleman's Magazine of March 30th, 1732.
chapter we saw how the Durell, De Saumarez and Dumeresqu families were embarrassed when their monument to Admiral Hardy became lampooned as a family "puff". Whilst this demonstrates that fashionable London society might laugh at a funeral monument which traced a relatively humble provincial family back to medieval times, it does not indicate that other less patently contrived references to ancient ancestry were unacceptable. The Gentleman Instructed of 1732, a conduct manual published with a dedication to Lord Combury which was much in favour of the values of blood nobility, advised its readers that it was "both fulsome and ungentle" to:

...fling out the registers of your genealogy on the table before all company.

Roubiliac's subtle adaptation of the Fleming family arms in the monument to James Fleming (erected Westminster Abbey June 1755) is a good example of the way in which heraldry could be presented in an oblique manner and thus appear to be more intellectually sophisticated. It is significant that Roubiliac's monument was planned at the same time as Philip Dumesqu wrote his letter (1754) of caution concerning the use of unsophisticated family "puff" in the Abbey.

The heaviest censure of heraldry and dynastic posturing was in cases where its use was associated with gauche, ill-educated or uncultivated behaviour. A close reading of Defoe's The Complete English Gentleman, for instance, shows that the author had a great deal of admiration for the values of cultivated, well-educated blood nobility. His objections were to the sort of blue-blooded buffoon who had little to commend him but his ancestry. He took an opportunity to make a joke at the expense of vacuous English booby squires:

"They're born, they live, they laugh, they not know why
They sleep, eat, drink, get heirs and die."

Hogarth some years later poked fun at the vacuous blood nobility in his Marriage-a-la-mode (1743-5). Here the gouty indolent gentleman of breeding postures vainly before his family tree while on the verge of offering up his son for a disastrous marriage on account of having nothing to commend him but his bloodstock.

---

13 Defoe, English Gentleman, pp. 1-35.
14 ibid., p. 33.
The gentleman who postured vainly before a funeral monument was likely to encounter the same sort of stricture. A popular conduct manual *The Gentleman's Library* published in several editions throughout the 1730s advised its readers that:15

> It is a sign that a man is very poor, when he has nothing of his own to appear in but is forced to patch up his figure with the relics of the dead and raise tombstones and monuments for reputation.

The author went on to assert that "the man who trades on borrowed glory" is also likely to be "starched and supercilious, to swagger at footmen and brow-beat inferiors." A concern for genealogy was a symptom of unfashionable "pride" and as such was inseparable from an over-preoccupation with social status. This haughtiness was incompatible with the kind of relaxed, erudite and amiable behaviour recommended for the country gentry in the rest of the book.

Whilst the gauche or ill-educated person's preoccupation with heraldry and dynasty was generally abhorred, the erudite pursuit of genealogical studies was far from in decline. As a branch of antiquarian studies, which were becoming an increasingly fashionable pursuit for the gentry, heraldry and genealogy became a recognised intellectual exercise. Travelling antiquarians such as William Cole assiduously copied monumental inscriptions and took notes of monumental heraldry in order to compile local histories.16

As Ian Ousby has argued, travel to country estates was increasing in the early part of the eighteenth century.17 Topographical travels within Britain were assumed to contain some element of interest in the genealogy and dynastic achievements of the families whose estates were on the itinerary of visitors. A new terminology was invented for this type of travel. In the introduction to Thomas Cox's *Magna Britannia* (1738) he described the principal types of topographical pursuit that his book wished to promote. Amongst these was "hero-ology"; the patriotic investigation of family history which attempted to explain the development of the political constitution through the country families who had participated in it. He defined it thus:18

---

15 Anon. *The Gentleman's Library*, p. 382. The quote arises in a commentary upon the vice of pride.
16 British Museum, Cole manuscripts, add. mss. 5812. 150, 5819 1-71, 5802. 112, 5832. 93-119, 6402. 129.
Inevitably funeral monuments to "worthy" members of families were designed to provide for this type of audience. A feature of such monuments was a direct address to the spectator in the inscription which diverted attention from the monument to the political reputation of the family who dominated the local countryside. A good early example is Scheemakers and Delvaux's superb monument at Rockingham Castle to the first Earl Rockingham (erected Rockingham parish church, 1725) (ill. 108). The monument was lavishly constructed of statuary and polychrome marble. It was designed to commemorate the initial rise of the family to the peerage and, as such, emanated the pomp of power and the wealth of palaces. Inscriptions on several tablets reeled off a list of titles and offices gained by the deceased Earl and his wife. The central inscription sought to explain to a visitor that these titles were a reward to the family for its services to the formation of constitutional liberties:

Know reader that the titles here recounted were not conferred to cover want of merit. But are the memorials of uncommon merit raised in a zeal for the House of Hanover.

The "reader" is then diverted to look at the castle on the hill above the church for the evidence of the family's past privations in the altruistic support of political principle:

The house of which the lord was first styled Baron still bears the scars of prosperous rebellion and unsuccessful loyalty.

It would appear from this that, even in those early days of the fashion for hero-ology, the castle had been left proudly as a war torn ruin in order to give witness to the political virtues

---

19 Payments for the monument are preserved in the Lincolnshire Record office, 28b/1411. The monument and vault is discussed in the obituary of its patron, Lady Monson, in the London Evening Post of September 2nd 1735.


21 The genealogy and titles of the Watsons of Rockingham are discussed in GEC, Peerages, vol. XI, pp. 58-59. The inscription beneath Rockingham's wife, Catherine, is simply a list of titles. She was sole heiress to the title Viscount Sondes, which was conferred as the second title of those inheriting the title of Earl Rockingham. The juxtaposition of the two figures thus referred to the assumption of the family to its two new titles.
of the family. The "reader" was asked to reflect upon the antiquarian experience of visiting the medieval fortress in order to justify the opulence and classical grandeur of the monument.

A similarly direct address to the reader can be seen in a monument erected at Lullingstone to the non-juror Sir Percival Hart (d.1739) and his ancestors (ill. 109). The monument was designed as a gesture of gratitude by Thomas Dyke upon inheriting the estate by virtue of his marriage to Anne Hart, the last representative of the family. It was modelled in stucco upon the west wall of the family's recently restored monumental chapel. The monument not only celebrated the life of Percival Hart, but also all the other dead commemorated in the chapel over the years. It took the form of an inscription surrounded by a great display of painted stucco heraldic devices representing the whole history of the family to this date. The commission of the monument broadly coincided with the building of a perimeter wall incorporating a castellated entrance around both church and manor house and the decision to rename the house "Lullingstone Castle". The monument, which was probably the first Gothic Revival funeral monument, was designed to give the impression of being part of an historic "Castle". A direct address to the visitor was placed at the foot of the inscription which requested him to act as a witness to the continuation of the family's moral traditions by observing the manner in which the estate around him was being maintained:

The curious inspector of these monuments
Will see a short account of an ancient family,
   For more than Four centuries
   Content with moderate estate
       Not wasted by Luxury
   Nor increased by avarice.

22 There is an account of the eighteenth century restoration of the Castle in Wise, op.cit., p. 66.

23 Eveline Cruikshanks has kindly given me access to the notes for Percival Hart's biography from the forthcoming edition of the History of Parliament.

24 Thomas Dyke's radical Tory politics and his career as a parliamentary candidate for Westminster are described in Romney Sedgwick, Vol 1, pp. 285-6. Political prints concerning Dyke's Jacobite tendencies are preserved in the British Museum collection (BM prints 2856, 2859, 2860, 2888).

25 The inscription refers to the "curious inspector of these monuments" which reminds us that Thomas Dyke commissioned the monument when restoring all the family memorials at the church.

26 The family archive was destroyed in the Second World War but notes on the family and history of the property appear in S. Robertson, "The Church of St Botolph, Lullingstone", Archaeologia Cantiana, 1886, XVI, pp. 99-115, and Hasted, Kent, 1778, vol. 1, part 2, pp. 311-314. A review of the development of the "Castle" has been written by G.W. Meates in a pamphlet guide.
One only needs to look at the rest of the inscription to see that these words were intended to be seen as part of a Jacobite invective against the corruption of the Hanoverian State. The main Hall of the house was turned into a "sub-rosa" meeting place for those of Jacobite sympathies and a shrine of pro-Stuart memorabilia. The phenomenon of the "hero-ology" monument which grew up in the 1720s and 30s was largely a product of the opposition to Walpole. Owing to the Old Whig politics of his family Lord Rockingham's heir, Edward Watson, also entered the opposition. The erection of monuments of this type was particularly popular amongst those with family traditions of radical Tory or Whig politics which brought them into ideological conflict with Administrational Whiggery.

The early thirties saw the rapid growth of interest in a type of funeral monument which commemorated long dead family worthies of the seventeenth century. A list of the major monuments of this type erected at this time placed against a brief summary of the political stance of the patronage shows that the genre was formed under the patronage of the "country" opposition. (See appendix 3). The erection of such monuments frequently coincided, as at Lullingstone, with building projects in which traditional Gothic or Tudor styles were revived for patriotic reasons. At Dunham Massey, for instance, a new Tudor wing was built (erected 1732) by the second Earl Warrington at the time of the erection of a monument to his father who had died some forty years before as a hero of Whig politics at the "Glorious Revolution".

Building in this style emphasised, as did the monuments, the claim of the family to be regarded as the ancient aristocracy of the country estates; the stalwart blood nobility with traditions of political principle which were perceived in "country party" ideology to form the backbone of the nation in a period dominated by the "corrupt" transitory interests of the City administration. Warrington was a member of the "Liberty Club" (founded 1732) which met in a Gothic Hall in Westminster designed by Batty Langley. This was an association of peers of ancient Parliamentarian or Scottish Covenanter families who met to discuss their

27 A discussion of this room appears in H.T Stevenson, "Some Jacobite Clubs", The Circle of Glass Collections. Paper no. 59, February 1945, note 118. The room has an excellent rococo stucco portrait of Queen Anne over the fireplace which may well date from the same time as the erection of the monument.

28 For a political biography of Edward Watson, Viscount Sondes, see Romney Sedgwick, vol 1, pp. 523-4.


30 The Temple is described in the London Evening Post of September 13th 1735 and mentioned in H. Colvin's biography of Langley (Colvin, 1978, p. 563).
fundamentalist Whig opposition to Walpole.31 Another member of the Club was Lord Cobham who commissioned James Gibbs to erect in his gardens at Stowe the famous Gothic Temple to Liberty, which displayed a massive mosaic of family arms on its vaulted roof and was originally known as the "Temple of Ancestral Liberty".32 Here again a massive display of heraldry, on this occasion tracing the family back to Saxon times, was associated with nostalgic ideas of political Liberty inspired by the politics of the "Country" opposition.33 In the Walpole period the "hero-ology" tour, for which such monuments were, at least in part, designed, became heavily associated with the tastes and patriotic convictions of the country party. A well known article of December 15th 1739 published in the "Country party" periodical *Common Sense* actively urged its readership to distrust visits to new Classical edifices and to admire the traditional Gothic grandeur of baronial halls with a "Constitutional sort" of reverence.

Monuments of the "hero-ology" type were also designed to defend long deceased members of a family from the detraction of history writers. Those erected to a long dead "pater familias" whose achievements first brought the family to the peerage had much to do with the exhibition of the social virtue of ancestral "piety". The erection of an historical monument such as that to the first Lord Maynard and his descendants by the Tory peer and antiquarian Lord Charles Maynard (Little Easton, Essex, 1746) (ill. 11) was regarded as a gesture of "piety" to a worthy family. The defence of such family "worthies" from the detraction of politically partisan biographers or historians was, as Philip Hicks has shown, felt to be the obligation of loyal ancestors.34

The erection of a monument was a good way of a family mounting a defence of its ancestors in a period in which antiquarians copied and disseminated monumental inscriptions and used them as a major source of historical information. Indeed certain families were successful in using funeral monuments to effect history's perception of them. This was true of the long historical defence of the career of General Thomas Tollemache (d.1694) inscribed below a splendid bust on his monument which, according to the *London Evening Post*, was erected at

---


32 The discovery of a stone from above the door of the Temple which described it as the "Temple of Ancestral Liberty" is recorded by C. Hussey in, "Stowe, III", *Country Life*, 1947, CII, pp. 626-9.
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Helmingham in Suffolk in August 1730 by Lady Tollemache. This was forty years after the General’s tragic death which had been brought about, as the inscription intimated, by the jealousy and ambition of the Duke of Marlborough who is reputed to have sent his talented rival into a hopeless attack. The inscription still forms the basis of the Dictionary of National Biography’s account of his life. It was, even at the time, accurately integrated into a Magazine account of the General’s life.

Rysbrack’s monument to the first Earl of Shaftesbury (Wimborne St Giles, erected 1732) was designed to be placed in the impressive newly built chancel of Wimborne St Giles above a new family vault (ill. 110). The Earl was a friend and correspondent of the Earl of Warrington and used monumental sculpture in a similar way. The monument was crowned by the bust of the first Earl (1621-1695) in the dress of his own period; a portrait which, according to Vertue, was designed from a miniature preserved in the family house at Wimborne in Dorset. The rebuilding of the church and the commission of the monument coincided with the coming of age of the fourth Earl in 1732. This Earl eventually entered political life as a radical Whig opponent to Walpole. The monument was, like the Maynard family memorial, designed to celebrate the inheritance of the family title; a gesture of family “piety” upon accession to the title. Its Latin inscription indicated that the monument was intended to vindicate the Earl from the detraction of historical writers:

"Vitae publicis commodis impensae memoriae et laudes stante Libertate nunquam avolebit Tempus edax, nec edacior Invidia"
(While there is Liberty neither greedy Time nor even greedier Envy will ever
destroy the praise of a life spent promoting the Public Good.)

This statement was intended for the perusal of the educated reader who may have developed
certain preconceptions about the founder of the family from his general historical reading. The
"invidia" referred to was likely to have been that of Clarendon and Bishop Burnet who
condemned the conduct of the Whig statesman. At approximately the same period as he
commissioned Rysbrack, the fourth Earl of Shaftesbury had hired Benjamin Martyn to write
a vindicatory history of the life of his ancestor. Although this biography was finished in 1736
it never came to press and has remained in the family archive.43

As Isaac Kramnick has pointed out with particular reference to the "nostalgia" of
Bolingbroke’s political literature, the "country" ideology of the Walpole period was
characterised by attempts to polarize the interests of the "upstart" City administration and the
traditional landed families.44 The erection of monuments which stressed the depth and
distinction of a family’s roots can be seen as a manifestation of a type of exaggerated
awareness of traditional landed dynastic values amongst the "country" aristocracy. The
aesthetic characteristics of the genre of historical monuments - gothic revival architecture,
massive displays of heraldry, the bust dressed in studied period garb - suggests that they
conformed to the tastes of patrons who found consolation in looking back with nostalgia upon
their family’s past political achievements.

A perspective upon the patterns of patronage in major dynastic monuments reveals that there
was a general awakening to issues of dynastic status in the Walpole period. In the period of
the height of the "Robinocracy", 1723-43, a total of sixteen monuments were erected to first
peers which were intended, in part at least, to commemorate the families’ rise to a new social
status (appendix 4). In the next twenty years, the period 1743-63, only four monuments of this
type were erected. The majority of the families erecting such monuments were affiliated to the
"country party". Far from there being an easy and gradual dying-out of interests in titles, grand
dynasties and heraldry, as Clare Gittings suggests, these interests reached a peak in the 1720s
and 30s. Titles and dynastic splendour became the preoccupation of those grand families

---

43 Public Record Office 30/24/28/42. Other versions of the biography revised by Gregory Sharpe and Dr Kippis
also survive (30/24/10/7-9). An anonymous contemporary manuscript (30/24/10/18) in the collection has a more
explicitly vindicatory purpose. It is entitled A Vindication of the Character and Actions of the Late Earl of
Shaftesbury from the detractions and misrepresentations of Gilbert, Bishop, of Sarum, in his History of His Own
Time.

44 Kramnick, Bolingbroke and his Circle, chapters 1, 2, & 3.
forced into long periods of country "retirement" and deprived of the executive power which was commensurate with their status by the longevity of Walpole's Administration. Those rendered impotent at national level found particular comfort in the status and splendour of their dynasties which had been conferred upon them by previous administrations. Grand shows of dynastic splendour, and exhibitions of domestic refinement, appealed, as we saw in the case of Rysbrack's major family monuments, to those obliged to posture in a splendid manner from enforced country obscurity.

There were perennial supporters of ministerial policies amongst those who commissioned great series of dynastic images. The massive display of dynastic sculpture set up in the chancel of Edenham church from 1728-48, including life-size images of the first (erected 1728) and second Dukes of Ancaster (erected 1748), was commissioned by representatives of a family who invariably supported the ministerial party in Lincolnshire. The tone of this series, which consisted of classical images above recitals of titles and offices, may be put down to factors no less complex than the family's particular regard for their own position in society. There was a tradition of the family surrounding themselves with pompous dynastic imagery established before the erection of the monument to the first Duke. In the great hall at Grimsthorpe, which was designed by Vanburgh, a heraldic crown was carved above the fireplace in order to commemorate the family's rise to the peerage. Above this was a great circle of wall paintings of the various kings in history to whom the family had rendered the loyal services which were considered to have justified this elevation. Members of the family seem simply to have been preoccupied with their standing in society. Peregrine, second Duke of Ancaster, whose monument was erected by Cheere in August 1748 and in whose lifetime most of the images were erected, began his own will with a long preface in which he recited his list of titles and offices.

Although the Ancasters were supporters of the ministerial Whig party in Lincolnshire it is significant that they were never to the fore in public politics. A list of the greatest series of dynastic imagery in the monumental sculpture of the period - the Foley, Maynard, Shelburne,

---

45 A huge monument by Cheere (c.1748) was erected near the monuments to the first and second Dukes which displays the busts of the third Earl Lindsey, Lady Lindsey, Philip Béré, Arbemarle Bertie, Norry Bertie, Peregrine Bertie and Lady Arabella Rivers.

The Lincolnshire political interests of the Dukes of Ancaster is discussed in Romney Sedgwick, vol. 1, p. 276.


47 Announced as erected by Henry Cheere in the Old England of August 6th 1748.
Ancaster, Beaufort, Kent, and Harborough monuments - was not only dominated by those who did not generally support ministerial politics, but contains none of the families who dominated government policy-making at Westminster. The patronage of grand dynastic monuments was associated with the sectors of the aristocracy who concerned themselves more with land management, local Lieutenancies and private pursuits than the burdens of public life.

The increased interest in heraldry or the depth and splendour of dynasty cannot be explained as a mere by-product of conflicts between "court" and "country", or monied and landed interest. Whilst it is possible to note the strong correlations between this type of exaggerated dynasticism and nostalgic "country" politics, the issues appear to transcend pure political diagnosis. An illustration of this point may be taken from analysis of the imagery of Scheemakers’ remarkable monument to Justinian Isham (Lamport, erected c. 1737) (ill. 111). Scheemakers’ bust of Justinian was surrounded by a show of heraldry; a group of seven splendidly painted and gilded escutcheons unmatched in any bust memorial of the period. This taste for heraldic display can be explained by the fact that Isham’s executor, Dr Edmund Isham, was the principal figure in the re-founding of the "Court of Chivalry".

The Court was re-founded under the patronage of the catholic Duke of Norfolk and many of its officials had Jacobite sympathies. Dr Isham, who shared his colleague’s political sympathies, was employed to prosecute nouveaux riche families who used unauthorised heraldry at funerals. When erecting the monument to his brother he obviously enjoyed the demonstration of his legitimate privilege to bear Arms. The Latin inscription for the monument at Lamport was suffused by highly nostalgic Tory propaganda referring to the deceased as "an example of the Ancient English Character".

---


40 The contemporary understanding that Isham was the leading figure in the re-foundation can be seen in the Gentleman’s Magazine 1732, p. 828.

50 The surviving documents concerning the Court of Chivalry are discussed in A. Wagner, Heraldo Memoriale, or Memoirs of the College of Arms from 1727-1744, London, 1981. Reference to Isham’s role in the society is made on pp. 35, 37, 38, 40, 46, 48 & 106. Wagner reveals that many of the Court’s officials were Jacobites. Isham’s fellow prosecutor was John Anstis, a well-known Jacobite. The York Herald appointed by the Court was Sir Charles Townley, a Catholic who supported the ’45 Rebellion. The Lancaster Herald was Charles Green who was accused of harbouring Jacobites after the ’45.

51 Justinian and Edmund Isham’s political careers are reviewed in Romney Sedgwick, vol. 2, pp. 168-9.

52 The politics of the inscription are mentioned in E.G. Forrester, Northampshire County Elections and Electioneering, 1695-1832, Oxford, 1941, pp. 48-50.
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connected to underlying political concerns with the perceived threat to the old landed classes by the Whig administration. This enthusiasm for the age and distinction of his family cannot be put down to his nostalgic Tory politics alone. The social issues surrounding the re-foundation of the Court of Chivalry were not strictly concerned with the satisfaction of Tory interests.

Isham and his friends' re-foundation of the Court received much support from the *Universal Spectator* which on October 28th 1732 published a whole article on the moral benefits of looking at heraldry and ancestral busts in connection with the re-founding of a Court of Chivalry. The paper declared in its first issue (October 12th 1728) that it wished to serve cultivated country readers of all political persuasions. Like Defoe's *The Complete English Gentleman*, which was the work of a Government Whig, the paper was interested in making the blood gentry of all political persuasions more refined. Similarly the Isham monument showed Justinian dressed in his morning cap, a convention thought suitable for the busts of scholars, above a declaration of his building of library in the house, his love of antiquarian books, and general scholastic nature. The imagery of the monument enshrined the ideals of the established, genealogically concerned gentry who combined their blood nobility with refinement, thoughtfulness and learning. Isham was presented as the antithesis of the empty-headed booby squire; a type of character which was mocked by the whole of polite society independent of political affiliation. As with much of the dynastic bombast employed by opposition families in the Walpole period, we are left with the knowledge that nostalgic political sentiments of the patron only partially explain their design and function. Such monuments were the product of a complex series of social tensions, which the political debate between court and country, or Whig and Tory merely used and accentuated.

Whilst accepting that caution should be shown before too readily accounting for the grand dynastic display of the Isham monument, there is benefit in contrasting it with the roughly contemporary monument to Sir Gilbert Heathcote (Rysbrack, Normanton, c.1733) (ill. 112). Heathcote was a notable City Whig and an important figure in the formation of the Bank of England, who established himself on a country estate at Normanton in Rutlandshire. Here he built a mansion and a new family vault to which were transported many of the coffins of his immediate family. Heathcote was, as Romney Sedgwick points out, a man of

---

53 For a discussion of artists use of these caps see the *Universal Magazine*, October 1752, pp. 160-2.

54 The transport of eight coffins from Long Layton in Essex is recorded in the *London Evening Post* of July 29th 1735.
entrepreneurial values who became known as a scoffer at pedigrees. The patron of the monument was his executor, another notable City banker, the amateur architect, Theodore Jacobsen. It cannot be coincidental that Rysbrack's monument included only the tiniest of heraldic devices - an escutcheon so small as to be considered perfunctory. A comparison of this composition with the vast array of heraldic paraphernalia on monuments to Tory country gentlemen such as Percival Hart and Justinian Isham indicates that the presentation of heraldry in funerary sculpture was, at least partly, a reflection of the ideological position of the patron or deceased.

That it was not the prerogative of the Country party to be concerned with using heraldic symbols in a refined manner can be seen in the monument to Sir Robert Raymond, a well-known agent of the Walpole Administration. The composition showed, as the papers of Peter Scheemakers already quoted in chapter two explained, a narrative justifying the first Lord Raymond's decision to accept an elevation to the peerage. Sir Robert was shown politely accepting a heraldic crown, a marble replica of the heraldic symbol of the peerage traditionally carried upon a velvet cushion at the burial of a peer and placed upon the coffin within the vault.

The patron of the monument was Robert Raymond's executor and brother-in-law, Edward Northey, a colleague of the deceased who was also promoted for his support of the government party. The patron's desire to depict the deceased's titles as the fruits of political principle may well be related to the way in which these titles were initially gained. Lord Chief Justice Raymond was the most notable career lawyer of his period; an ambitious Tory turncoat who had been alienated from many of his former Tory friends by his decision to take office within the Walpole administration. The monument may well, therefore, reflect a rather forced concern to establish the idea that the family had not been elevated by machination at

55 Romney Sedgwick, (vol. 2, p. 123) records a contemporary anecdote that:

"He was not curious to enquire into his ancestors believing it more a man's business to look forward and retrieve, than look back and repine".

Gilbert Heathcote's personality is discussed in E.D. Heathcote, An Account of Some of the Families Bearing the Name Heathcote Which Have Descended Out of the County of Derby, Winchester, 1899, pp. 79-90.

56 G. Heathcote PCC 1733, 45. The inscription states that Jacobsen was the donor.

57 See p. 96.

58 See pp. 89-93.

59 Robert Raymond's political career is reviewed in Romney Sedgwick, vol 2, pp. 379-80.
Court or petty personal ambition. The design of the monument reflected the fact that it was erected in memory of a government placeman in the twilight of the "Excise Crisis"; a period in which there was considerable conflict between "country" and "court" concerning the diminishing value of honours awarded by a government perceived to be handing them out like confetti to its cronies. Raymond's political master had recently earned the nickname "Sir Blue String" for having recreated the Order of the Garter to honour himself and his political dependants.

At the same time the composition transcended political issues and reflected the values of the "polite" and educated aristocratic legal elite of which Edward Northey and Robert Raymond were glittering examples. In this composition, as in the Isham monument, dynastic pomp was made acceptable by the intimation that the individual commemorated had the cultivation to carry it off. Raymond is shown carefully considering whether to accept a title; the composition demonstrated the noble superiority of the deceased to the sort of ambitious or vainglorious buffoon whose lack of dignity and virtue would have caused him to grasp hungrily at the trinkets of power and family honour. He was seen to be relaxed and easy in his deliberations, the opposite of the ambitious man. His erudition was witnessed not only by the tomes upon which he leant but the studied Latin of the composition. These contrasted him clearly with the type of empty headed aristocrat who would have been satisfied with titles and pomp. The whole composition radiates the values which Lawrence Klein has identified as essential to the modern "polite" standards of behaviour coming into vogue in the early eighteenth century: "amiability", "composure", "erudition" and an "obliging" nature.

The heraldic crown already had a long tradition in English monumental sculpture of being used as a device around which to centre a narrative composition. Grinling Gibbons, in particular, frequently made use of such devices. In the monument to the fourth Earl Coventry (Croome d'Abitot, commissioned 1690), for instance, the deceased Earl was presented in a reclining position in the process of exchanging his peerage crown for that of heavenly glory (ill. 113). Rysbrack's figures of the Dukes of Kent and Beaufort pointing from their heraldic crowns to the vault below represented a subtle adaptation of this earlier theme. Rysbrack used the heraldic crown as Cheere had done in the Raymond monument: to suggest a certain educated aloofness from the symbols of office. The crown was exhibited only to be

---

60 A discussion of titles in the context of the Excise Crisis appears in the Tory Fog's Journal of July 15th 1732.


treated with some rhetorical show of suspicion in order to indicate that a man's nobility was
more fundamental than the mere trappings of grandeur. The imagery seems to relate to the oft-
repeated topos of true nobility being founded in virtue and cultivation rather than the baubles
of office. 63 The debate upon true nobility can be seen repeated in Magazine articles of the
period and it had a role in the political propaganda of the Walpole and Pelham period. 64
Walpole's defenders, for instance, made political capital of his tactical refusal to take the
honour of a peerage and opposition figures delighted in maintaining their noble integrity whilst
receiving none of the honours and titles awarded to placemen. 65 A good example of this
topos being employed in funerary culture was the much publicised tomb epitaph of the staunch
Tory, Sir John Hinde Cotton: 66

Without any views to venal reward
Above the desire of ill-got power
Untainted by the itch of tinsel titles.
He lived, and died, a Patriot.

This debate refers directly to the arguments of Defoe's The Complete English Gentleman and
other Gentleman's Conduct manuals of the period which contended that status or "blood"
obility became credible only when matched with virtuous or refined behaviour.

An important example of this intellectually aloof attitude to the crass expression of the pomp
dynasty and display of heraldry was, according to William Cole's manuscript notes, to be
seen by the visitor to the house and church at Boughton, the residence of the Dukes of
Montagu. The second Duke of Montagu was noted socially as the grand master of the Order
of Bath, a position which, as we saw earlier in the quote from Lord Huntingdon's letters,
involved him in a lot of potentially ridiculous ceremonious use of heraldic symbols. He was
famous in his later years for being loaded with honourary positions which, although they
sounded grand and paid well, involved little responsibility. He was, for instance, Master of the

---

64 A highly politicised debate upon the nature of true nobility in the Tory Common Sense, no. 272, May 1st, 1742, entitled "Of Nobility". This is reprinted in the Gentleman's Magazine, pp. 247-248.
65 A typical use of Walpole's decision to remain in the Commons, to prefers "fame" to "titles", can be seen in Francis Hayman's political print "The Patriot-Statesman". (Reproduced in B. Allen, Francis Hayman, London, 1987, pp. 145-146)
66 The inscription is discussed in the London Magazine 1752, p. 93.
Ordnance, a title which gave him military prestige without ever entering the field of combat. As a character of some learning and sophistication - a Fellow of the Royal Society, a friend of the antiquarians Folkes and Stukeley and somewhat of a philanthropist - Montagu appears to have wished to be seen as intellectually superior to this type of pompous display.  

Cole noted on his visit to the interior of the manor house at Boughton that:  

In several rooms I observed pedigrees. I think over three chimney pieces, elegantly carved and gilt, and others about the house around the upper part of the wainscot of some room. And one thing of the same suit, very singular, was on the staircase on every step at the end fixed with a small shield of the Montagus, Churchills and co which Mr Walpole thought was the fancy of the late Duke to ridicule the vanity of pedigrees and that it was meant according to the Duke's pleasant manner as a sort of pun..... The noble hall was filled with full length pictures of imaginary ancestors in the supposed dress of the time.

It would seem that the house created by Montagu at Boughton was intended to be a sophisticated parody of the type of grandiose aristocratic interiors built by the Bertie family at Grimsthorpe. The design of the interior reflected the Duke's desire to be seen as an enlightened character. Such an elaborate joke at the expense of those who took the pomp of heraldry too seriously can be expected to have appealed to Horace Walpole. As Sally Battham has shown in a recent essay upon the rise of what she terms "Romantic antiquarianism" in the later part of our period, Walpole scoffed at the antiquarian practice of gathering inscriptions and heraldic material. He belonged to a school of thought which associated the minutiae of genealogical enquiries and the detailed analysis of heraldic symbols with scholastic pedantry. The collection of genealogical information was differentiated from the pursuit of

---

67 An obituary verse parodying him as the supreme Government pensioner was printed in the London Magazine 1749, p. 297.


71 There is a discussion of some of the contemporary views on collectors and antiquarians in I. Pears, The Discovery of Painting, The Growth of Interest in the Arts in England 1680-1768, London, 1988, pp. 157-206. He includes an interesting print (fig. 56) of a group of antiquarians inspecting an old chamber pot whilst a dog urinates.
the past as a genteel, enlightened and liberal intellectual exercise. Horace Walpole's views upon antiquarian studies developed from those seen in the conduct manuals of the 1730s which regarded an unsophisticated enthusiasm for heraldry as a sign of a lack of cultivation.

It seems no coincidence that Roubiliac's monument to the Duke was aimed at demonstrating just such an "enlightened" intellectual vision of the trappings of Fame and heraldic splendour (ill. 114). Roubiliac's design showed an image of the Duke being attached to the monument by a figure of Charity bearing her children. The figure of the Duchess looked up at this scene whilst holding in her hand several symbols of the Duke's dynastic status. These included, as Tessa Murdoch has shown, the representation of real objects owned by the Duke and bequeathed in his will; a Diamond studded badge of the Order of the Garter and a sword left by his wife's relation, the Duke of Marlborough. There was also a peerage crown which probably symbolised the idea that the Duke died as last of his direct line with his peerage becoming extinct. Like the Raymond monument, the figures appear to be using the heraldic crown in a composition which referred to the debate on true nobility. There was, indeed, an obituary verse circulating about Montagu, published in the London Magazine of 1749, which directly related to the topos of true nobility:

How sweet the mem'ry of his Grace is
Who died possessed of goodness and of places
His places he has left behind,
And Dukes enow to share them we shall find:
But for the goodness that was in his breast
And with his soul has gone to rest
No candidate for that has put up request.

The figure of the Duchess looked past these trappings of family and status towards a figure of Charity who demonstrated the Duke's right to be celebrated by monumental Fame.

---

72 Murdoch, Montagu, 1985, p. 41.

73 C. Wise (The Montagus of Boughton......, p. 89) records "a card which had for many years been placed beside the monument to help visitors to understand the designs" which suggests that the monument referred directly to the end of the male line. The cherub "with a torch in his hand inclining to go out (which) denotes the family to be extinct."

74 The London Magazine 1749, p. 333. The verse was printed with a commentary concerning the extent of Montagu's pensions and charitable works in the London Evening Post of July 22nd, 1749.
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symbols of power and family were presented as mere accessories to an inherent true nobility which had arisen naturally from a superior commitment to the pursuit of philanthropic virtue.

The Montagu monument belonged to a tradition of "weeping widow" monuments in memory of military figures; the tradition of the Buckingham, Marlborough and Shannon monuments in which the widow was seen contemplating a commander at a moment of military triumph. In this case, however, the symbols of Roman triumph in the form of trumpets, laurels and armaments are shown thrust into the arched openings on the left and right hand side of a sort of elaborate cupboard structure. Such objects, along with an heraldic crown, could be seen at the public heraldic funerals of great military men, like Marlborough's at Westminster Abbey. John Buswell’s manuscript account of Westminster Abbey provides a detailed description of Marlborough’s funeral including a list of similar heraldic devices which surrounded the ceremonial carriage that bore his corpse. Lady Montagu, who was related to Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough but never got on with her, may well have intended some parody of a monument such as that at Blenheim where medals and the pompous trappings of triumph are used as proof of greatness. Here the widow’s mementos were seen as the physical signs of her husband’s triumph over his enemies and his right to the trappings of worldly fame.

As if to confirm this idea of a composition formed of the remains of a grand heraldic funeral, the vase at the top of the composition was filled with feathers like the plumes which were attached to the horses who bore the funerary carriage at such solemn occasions. In particularly grand contemporary funerals the carriage bearing his coffin was filled with feathers. Roubiliac was the only sculptor of the period to use undertaker's feathers in a funerary monument, which indicates that he was seeking to make some particular commentary upon the trappings of an undertaker's grand funeral. This created the impression that heraldic paraphernalia have been packed away after such a grand funeral and that the widow muses amongst the mementos of such a ceremony.

Roubiliac wittily employed the clichéd symbols of the funerary trade: the formulaic relief bust monument, the piles of heraldic paraphernalia, and the undertaker’s feathers. By producing intelligent critiques upon the symbols which were used by the artisans of the funerary trade -

---

75 John Buswell's account of Westminster Abbey c.1755 (BM. add. mss. 33379, pp. 99-107)
76 Lady Montagu's well-known disagreements with the Duchess of Marlborough are mentioned in Green, 1961, p. 274.
77 The use of such feathers for a particularly grand funeral was specified by Thomas Chilcot, Organist of Bath, (PCC 1767, 38) in a will reviewed in the next chapter, pp. 291-292.
such as the herald painters, undertakers and monumental sculptors who could be perceived to produce unquestioning, fulsome tributes to their clients - he was placing himself above the level of the unquestioning "mechanick". The Montagu monument draws its dramatic power from its visual relationship with monuments such as those of the dukes of Marlborough and Buckingham; monuments in which the sculptor had accorded uncritical respect to the pomp of titles, and the trappings of Fame. Roubiliac, like the clients he worked for, could gain the prestige of appearing to have an educated mind by playing wittily with a subject for which only the brash and ill-educated were meant to have unquestioning respect. The sculptor's demonstration that his creative imagination was above being impressed by the cant of office and haughty nobility was part of his claim to be regarded as a man of intellectual sophistication.

The first half of the eighteenth century can be seen not so much as the period when grandiose symbols of family and heraldry declined but as one in which the educated became reticent and self-conscious about the way in which they were used. Stone and his followers have perhaps over simplified matters when formulating a social theory which starkly polarized the values of dynasty and heraldry and the "affective" aspects of family life. Gittings' argument that the forces of "rationalism" and "individualism" were gradually supplanting what she perceives to be the opposing values of dynasty and heraldry is particularly problematic. We can draw examples from throughout the period to show that patrons saw no such distinctions and were happy to combine the most sentimental images with the expression of unabashed enthusiasm for the pomp of heraldry and details of genealogy. A faculty of June 2nd 1727 from the Diocese of London for a monument in memory of Anthony Toumay and his wife at St Mary Abchurch argued that the monument should be placed in a prominent position because:78

> The deceased was a considerable trader of a very good fortune credit and reputation and that the said Jane was a daughter of Robert Biddulph of the city of London descended from the ancient family of Biddulph in the county of Hertfordshire.

The petitioner, who was the deceased's son, explained that the monument was also to be erected:

> ....to remain to future ages as a monument of the conjugal love of his said father and mother and in memory of their children deceased.

At Staunton Harold a set of library busts showing Washington, Earl Ferrers and his children—a fond family group which includes daughters—was commissioned to stand in a room entirely devoted to the legal and genealogical history of the family. According to Nichols the busts, which were made by Scheemakers (c.1743), looked down on a huge parchment which exhibited upon its thirty foot length a genealogy and extracts of wills substantiating the facts of family inheritance. The most splendid displays of heraldry and dynasty, when sanctioned by the reputation of their patrons with educated sophistication, could be readily combined with the most overtly sentimental of family images. George Lyttleton, a member of the Society of Antiquaries, placed Roubiliac’s sentimental monument to Lucy, his wife, (erected 1751) in a new Gothic church at Hagley totally devoted to the celebration of his historic dynasty. The scheme of heraldic shields within the church was designed by Charles Lyttleton, the President of the Society of Antiquaries. There is no record of either Charles or George or any visitor to the church seeing any contradiction between a display of dynastic pomp and family sentiment.

It is, however, significant that even amongst the closest acquaintances of the Lyttleton family there were voices of complaint concerning their great heraldic project. Shortly after the building of Lyttleton’s Gothic parish church or family mausoleum he was attacked by his friend William Shenstone for ignoring the religious functions of a church. In a letter to Lady Luxborough of April 1755 Shenstone wrote:

Their new chancel at Hagley is a mere Mausoleum and contains such a display of pedigree etc as one would think must prove invidious to the last degree.

Shenstone himself was buried in the churchyard at Hales Owen to demonstrate his dislike of the trappings of status associated with a church vault burial; an inscription by Richard Graves which was placed on a simple monument inside the church criticises all monumental


81 Shenstone, p. 446.

82 A discussion of Shenstone’s burial at the South Side of Hales Owen churchyard and his modest monument appears in Hutchins, Dorset, 1861, vol. 1, 530-534.
splendour. Graves' inscription belonged to a literary tradition seen in Pope's tribute to the "Man of Ross" which depicted the philanthropic rural gentleman as the natural opponent of monumental vanities.\textsuperscript{83} Shenstone's repulsion at the "display of pedigree" conforms fully with his admiration of the sentiment of works of graveyard poetry such as Gray's \textit{Elegy}. In one letter Shenstone declared that he liked the \textit{Elegy}, with its passage on "the boast of heraldry and the pomp of power", "too well".\textsuperscript{84}

The climate of educated opinion in the 1740s and 50s, at least in the wide circles which admired the works of Blair, Young, Gray, and Hervey cannot have boosted the popularity of bombastic dynastic sculpture. Although religious enthusiasm did not prevent such men as George Lyttleton from demonstrating their love of heraldry, the religious climate of the 1740s and 50s did not inspire sympathy for purely secular displays of family power such as the monuments of the Ancaster family at Edenham.

The contrast between the monuments erected in the chancel of Abbots Langley church in memory of the first and second Earl Raymond is most illustrative of the wide-ranging changes affecting monumental art. When the second Earl died in 1756 he knew that the dynasty started by his father would die out. He requested a monument (Scheemakers, 1757) to mark the end of the dynasty which was to stand directly opposite that of his father's in the chancel of Abbots Langley (Cheere, 1732-5). The monument was to be designed around a motto dictated in the will which was obviously intended to contrast with that of his father's monument: "Oblatos honores filii gratia accepit judex aequissimus" (\textit{The very fair Judge has accepted the honour offered for the sake of his son}).\textsuperscript{85} Raymond's own motto was to avoid all mention of dynasty and suggest that personal virtue and sincerity was the only matter of ultimate consequence: "Nec Fallere Vitam Ultima Laus est" (\textit{The ultimate praise is due to he that does not lead a false life}) The composition of the monument was designed by Scheemakers about this theme; exhibiting two Virtues in attendance at a sarcophagus which bears a splendid gilt coat of arms. Raymond was happy to close his dynasty without pomp and circumstance, but with a reputation for having been true to his own private convictions. Although we should be wary of extrapolating from one case, the contrast of monuments does seem to be some

\textsuperscript{83} Graves' verse entitled "On an Urn in Halesowen Church" is printed in W. Shenstone, \textit{Essays on Man and Manners}, London, 1800, part 2, p. 90. Pope's poetic description of the Man of Ross, the local philanthropist who required "no monument, no inscription stone" to promote his good name in the locality, appears in the \textit{Epistle to Bathurst} (lines 254-299).

\textsuperscript{84} Shenstone, p. 309.

\textsuperscript{85} 2nd Earl Raymond, PCC 1756, 280.
reflection on the changes in the general themes of the period; the movement away from images of dynastic status and towards those of individual conscience, sentiments and responsibilities.\textsuperscript{86}

It seems significant that the number of monuments commissioned in memory of first peers declined so rapidly in the period after 1743. As dynastic sculpture declined in relative importance monuments erected by bereaved husbands and other works created for sentimental rather than dynastic reasons became increasingly popular.\textsuperscript{87} Great family monuments erected in the mid-forties and early fifties, such as the Beaufort monument at Badminton (c.1746-66) or the Shelburne monument at High Wycombe (c.1753), belonged to a genre whose general significance was diminishing against the background of the Evangelical Revival and the advance of the literary culture of sentimentality. There was, indeed, a decline in the admiration of heraldry and dynasty. This cannot be explained as well by the use of massive sociological terms such as the rise of "individualism" and "rationalism" as it can by tracing the complex forces of religious and social change which altered the values of certain sectors of society in the later two decades of our period.

\textsuperscript{86} The cultural emphasis on personal conviction and sincerity in the 1740s and 50s is discussed in detail by Newman, 1987, pp. 96, 104, 128-129, 133-135, 139-142, 156, 196, 206, 213, 217-218, 230, 244.

\textsuperscript{87} See chapter six pp. 273-276.
Chapter VI.

THE MAN OF FEELING REINTRODUCED: THEMES OF LOSS, SEPARATION AND REUNIFICATION IN THE 1740S AND 50S.

An article appeared in the Gentleman's Magazine of 1754 on the subject of the new excesses in mourning behaviour which were to be seen in the streets of London. Its targets were those who, no doubt capitalising upon the current vogue for graveyard poetry, appeared to be enjoying, or profiting from, a new range of fashionable mourning accessories. A stationer who surrounded the borders of his notepaper with skulls and other fashionably morbid motifs was the butt of one joke. A well-known author who mourned his wife in the most melodramatic manner was also ridiculed:¹

"Upon the death of his wife (he) brought a collar of black satin ribbon for his lap-dog. This little favourite with the sable memorial of its mistress he used to carry about inside his arm and never failed, when he mentioned his loss to an acquaintance, to call their attention to Veny and relate the incident of his putting him in mourning."

In alerting its readers to a mourning husband who made a show of clinging to the mementos of his marriage the article was isolating one of the main characteristics of funerary culture in the late 1740s and 50s; the tendency of those of the male sex to make a public spectacle of their grief.

Some of the most ambitious monuments of the 1740s and 50s - Rysbrack's monument to the wife of William Young (Chartham, Kent, 1749) (ill. 52), Cheere's monument to Elizabeth Drake (Amersham, Buckinghamshire, d.1757) Scheemakers' monument to Jane Pusey (Pusey, Bedfordshire, after 1743), and Roubiliac's Nightingale monument (Westminster Abbey, 1757-1761) (ill. 38) - were erected in memory of a husband's bereavement. The growth in the number of husbands seeking monuments to their wives can be used as a measure of the change in funerary culture. During the second and third decade of the century no metropolitan monuments were erected purely to commemorate a husband's affections for his wife. A few major monuments, such as those in memory of Justice Page (Henry Cheere and Henry Scheemakers, Steeple Aston, Oxfordshire, 1730-32) or Alexander Denton (Henry Cheere,

¹ The Gentleman's Magazine 1754, p. 469.
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Hillersden, Buckinghamshire, 1735), were commissioned by the husband after his wife’s death in order to commemorate them both.

The second and third decades of the century were not only characterised by a preoccupation with the making of grand dynastic statements but were a period in which few monuments concerned any other subject than the rise and fall of dynasties and the passage of property. Those monuments which were commissioned were set up by grateful inheritors to female benefactors such as Arabella Oxendon (Rysbrack, Rockingham, Northamptonshire, 1735-40) and Anne Fielding (Rysbrack, Ashtead, Surrey, 1733). With a few isolated exceptions, such as the monuments to Edward Eliot (ill. 6) and John Knight (ill. 101), inscriptions composed in this period were devoid of emotive reference to personal loss or grief. Edward Stanton’s monument to Lady Isham of 1713 was, indeed, the last major work from a metropolitan workshop to contain an emotive statement of a husband’s grief. Even in this case the patron was keen not to be "fulsome" in his account of his bereavement.

The absence of any celebration of male mourning or male emotion in the first two decades of our period marks an interlude in the history of funerary sculpture. Men with their hands placed passionately upon their hearts, or mourning their cherished wives, had been a significant part of the imagery of monumental sculpture in the period of John Nost (fl. 1680-1729), John Bushnell (fl. 1670-1720) and Grinling Gibbons (1648-1720). Amongst Gibbons’ greatest monumental works are images of men overcome by emotion. His remarkable monument to the eighth Earl of Rutland who died in 1679 (Bottesford, Leicestershire), eight years after his wife, shows a husband standing beside his deceased wife grasping at his heart with uninhibited grief engrafted upon his features. Gibbons’ neighbouring monument to the seventh Earl centres upon a figure so tortured by emotion as to be described by Pevsner as "operatic". John Bushnell’s monument erected by William Ashburnham for his wife in 1675 (Ashburnham, Surrey) (ill. 115), which has a passionate inscription on the subject of lost love and a touching image of a husband in paroxysms of grief over his wife, is perhaps the best

2 A. Oxendon PCC 1735 12. According to her obituary in the Gentleman’s Magazine of 1735 (p. 51) Arabella Oxendon died without children leaving her considerable estates to Charles Leigh. The inscription records that the monument was erected by Leigh out of respect for his benefactress. Recent work by J. Lord ("J.M. Rysbrack, a Group of East Midland’s Commissions", Burlington Magazine, December 1990, pp. 866-870) has established that it is a work of Rysbrack.

A. Fielding PCC 1732 9. Anne Fielding, a wealthy heiress, bequeathed her property to Henry Bowes who erected the monument out of gratitude. The passage of property at her death is recorded in an obituary in the London Evening Post of January 18th 1732 and the monument (formerly unattributed) is announced as being completed in Rysbrack’s workshop in the London Evening Post of June 16th 1733.

example of a type of sculpture which went out of fashion in the first three decades of the eighteenth century.4

The growth of interest in male grief and emotion in the 1740s and 50s was only one aspect of a movement toward the funerary culture of the last four decades of the century; a culture in which personal loss began to be as important a theme for monumental sculpture as inheritance and dynasty.5 There was a corresponding growth in the number of major works which were commissioned solely to commemorate the death of young girls; a type of monument which, like that of the bereaved husband, can be associated with family grief rather than dynastic display. Roubiliac's monument to Elizabeth Smith and the monuments to Mary Southcote (anonymous metropolitan sculptor, Brixham, Devonshire, d.1752), Mary Roope (anonymous metropolitan sculptor, St Clements, Dartmouth, Devonshire, c.1740) and the Askham sisters (here attrib. Henry Cheere, Connington, Cambridgshire, c.1748) are amongst the best examples of this type. Although girls had occasionally been commemorated within a few large funerary compositions in the earlier part of our period (most notably the Buckingham and Foley monuments) not one metropolitan monument was commissioned solely for this purpose.6 The growth of the popularity of monuments to children or wives suggests, as does the emergence of a fashion for garden monuments, a significant movement away from, or reaction against, the funerary culture of the previous period.

The resurgence of enthusiasm for compositions concerned with emotional family loss also coincided with the revival of interest in eschatological subjects depicting death or resurrection. These subjects had also been popular in the late seventeenth century. The idea that the 1740s

4 The inscription declared that he had married her as a young soldier when she was "a young, beautiful, and rich widow". It declared that they had:

"lived together five and forty years most happily. She was a very great lover and (through God's mercy) a great blessing to his family, which it is hoped will ever remember it with honouring her memory."


It is also interesting to note that the subject of the death of mothers in childbirth was not popular throughout our period. Monuments of mother and baby groups in the Shelburne, Foley, Harborough, and Marlborough monuments, for instance, are to infants who died young rather than with their mother. This subject had, according to J.W. Hurtig, ("Death in Childbirth: Seventeenth Century English Tombs and their Place in Contemporary Thought", Art Bulletin, LXV, 1983, P.603) been popular in the seventeenth century but only returned to favour in the last two decades of the eighteenth century (Penny, "English Church Monuments of Women who died in Childbed.")
and 50s was a period of revival, or return to, themes current in era of Grinling Gibbons has been put forward by David Bindman. He argues that the prevailing latitudinarianism and deism of the 1720s and 30s provided little counsel or hope for the bereaved. By contrast the "evangelical revival" of the 1740's stressed a powerful and simple faith which would provide the consoling hope of reunion in paradise to those whose loss was unendurable.

Bindman's general assertion that the literature of the evangelical revival stimulated the movement towards a greater concentration upon loss in the period is supported by the broad chronology of the development of the genre of monuments erected by bereaved husbands. Most of the major examples date from the period after 1743, a trend which exactly mirrors the growth of the genre of graveyard literature, the central works of which were published in the mid-40s and early years of the 50s. A preoccupation with the loss of young love has, as Bindman demonstrates, some of its origins in the imagery of works such as Edward Young's Night Thoughts. He points to the passage in which Lysander and Aspasia die on the eve of their wedding; a tragedy so appalling that the only consolation can be in the hope of reunion in paradise.

7 Bindman, Consolation, 1986, pp. 32-34.
8 ibid., p. 31.
9 Charlotte Pochin, Barkby, Leicestershire. (Rysbrack, erected 1747)
Lady Feversham, Downton (Scheemakers, c.1755)
Elizabeth (Cheere? d.1741) and Susannah Serle, Ealing (Rysbrack, d.1752)
Dorothy Snell, St Mary Le Crypt (Scheemakers, d.1741)
Susannah Borrett, Shoreham, Kent. (Cheere, c.1752)
Mrs Charles Yorke, Wimpole, Cambridgeshire, (Scheemakers)
Dame Judith Williams, Clopton, Northamptonshire, (Cheere, d.1754)
Mrs Cox, Kilkenny Cathedral (Scheemakers, c.1746)
Mrs Brotherton, Pusey Gardens, Berkshire, (anon. c.1759)
Jane Pusey, Pusey, (Scheemakers, 1742-57)
Harriot Bouverie, Coleshill, Berkshire, (Rysbrack, c.1750)
Mrs Neville, Aubin Old Church, Lincolnshire, (Cheere?, c.1746)
Mrs Young, Chartham, Kent, (Rysbrack, c. 1749)
Jane Bridges Rodney, Old Arlesford, Hampshire, (Cheere, c. 1757)
Mrs Nightingale, Westminster Abbey (Roubiliac, erected 1761)
Elizabeth Drake, Amersham, Buckinghamshire (Cheere, 1757)
Ursula Fortyre, Northfleet (Scheemakers, d.1740)
Elizabeth Townshend, Thorpe, (Taylor, d.1754)
Mary Wrey, Tawstock, Devon, (Cheere, 1754)

10 J. Hervey, Meditations and Contemplations, first published 1746.
E. Young, Night Thoughts, first published 1743-1746.

This interpretation of the dynamics of change in funerary culture is supported by the tendency of those bereaved husbands erecting monuments to concentrate upon the beauty, youth and moral purity of the deceased. Physical beauty was a major part of the imagery of the monuments themselves (such as Cheere’s lascivious bust portrait at the centre of the monument in memory of the young wife of Admiral Bridges Rodney [d.1757] at Old Arlesford) and explicitly referred to in the inscriptions of a number of the most notable examples. It was characteristic of funerary culture in the late 1740s and 50s to isolate moments of seemingly unbearable tragedy which suggested that fate had a cruel dominion over human affairs, in order to argue that only a faith in a compassionate saviour could provide solace. Certain Letters on the Dying, which were published in the Lloyd’s Evening Post of 1764/5 as a posthumous tribute to James Hervey, take the reader into a "House of Death" where he sees scenes of absolute tragedy which can only be mitigated by his knowledge of the forthcoming resurrection:12

Here rests a mother near her once smiling babes, and there a virgin, spotless as the morning dew, moulders into dust.

Monuments marking the premature partition of marital couples were, therefore, just one of the scenes of horror to become attractive. A new type of epitaph came into fashion which commenced with a declaration of some appallingly unfortunate death and, having invited the reader towards a state of unmitigated gloom, ended with a few lines of religious condolence. A typical example appeared in the London Evening Post of August 11th 1748 transcribed from a monument in memory of a young lady at Kinsale in Ireland:

Beneath the horrors of the Grave
In promiscuous ruin lie
The noblest charms which virtue gave,
With all that nature could supply.
Then why, dread tyrant, was it given
for thee to sink such worth in dust
Why it was the great command of heaven,
To pluck the fairest flower first."

The deaths of young children also provided the opportunity for such religious reflection. This is seen best in the monument set up to the two children of William Robinson of the Inner

12 The Lloyd’s Evening Post and British Chronicle, Dec 1764 - June 1765, p. 152.
Temple in 1749-50, a description of which was printed in a number of contemporary magazines. The Ladies Magazine printed the inscription with the following introduction:\textsuperscript{13}

The following epitaph contains such natural, moral and pathetic sentiments expressing so strong a parental affection, and at the same time such a pious resignation to the will of heaven, under the most affecting of all human calamities, the loss of dear children, that we doubt not it will be acceptable to our readership.

The monument, which once stood in Willesden churchyard (sculptor unknown) but is now lost, showed the images of a girl and boy child "habited as angels with wings upon their backs" standing around a flaming urn. An inscription below informed the viewer that:

Their bodies sleep in this monument
United by mutual tenderness
Their sympathising souls impatient in separation and eager to rejoin the kindred angels,
With a smile took leave of their weeping parents and Ascended to their immortal sire above.

The stricken parents were said to have yielded with:

"...perfect resignation to divine will, insomuch that they congratulate the dear departed on their timely departure.

A monument with a similar inscription was erected at Connington (Henry Cheere?, c.1748) which exhibited a pair of exquisite relief busts of the young sisters of the Askham family, who, as if to provide a particularly poetic calamity for their parents, died upon the same day (1st September 1748). In this case the parents drew consolation from the idea that their beautiful and virtuous girls were not divided in death and that God had not chosen to deprive them of their other children.\textsuperscript{14}


\textsuperscript{14} The inscription is long, fervently pious and lachrymose. A few lines give an idea of its general tone:

"Since they were not only lovely in their lives
but in their deaths were not divided
Hoebeit we Sorrow without Hope !
The great literary success achieved by George Lyttleton with the *Monody* (published 1747) and inscription in memory of his beautiful young wife, Lucy, further attests to the popularity of scenes of appalling personal loss. The imagery used upon the monument cannot, however, be said to be overtly concerned with matters theological. The widely published inscription seemed designed to invoke the sympathies of the type of reader who found pleasure in sentimental images of youthful feminine virtue such as abound in Richardson’s *Clarissa*; a similar sense of latent sexuality both attracted and appalled the reader. It was no coincidence that Samuel Richardson and his female correspondents seem to have had an immediate understanding of the tension between moral reflection and erotic sensationalism within Lyttleton’s verses. In a letter of 30th September 1751 on the subject of the difference between lust and love Richardson told Hester Mulio that the *Monody* in memory of Lucy was open to being interpreted as romantic erotica:

Think you madame that a certain monodist (ie. Lyttleton) did not imagine himself possessed by his purer flame who, mourning over a dead wife of exalted qualities, could bring to the readers imagination, on the bridal eve, the hymenal torch being lighted up;

"Dearer to me, than when thy virgin charms were yielded up into my arms."

How many soft souls have been made to sigh over the images here conveyed, and to pity the sensual lover when they should have lamented with the widower or husband.

Roubiliac’s monument (designed by Charles Frederick, Hagley, 1751) echoed Lyttleton’s successful literary formula by stretching a beautiful relief of Lucy out upon a solemn funeral urn. According to Pococke, the grief-stricken cupid accompanying the urn was an image of Hymen, the god of marriage, which was intended to signify their blighted union. Lucy’s figure was shown in a reclining pose which immediately brings to mind the physical beauty eulogised in the inscription. The symbolism of placing so beautiful an image on a cinerary urn, a reference to the classical tradition of keeping the mortal remains within a vase, conjured up a disturbing image of the mortification of the flesh.

For they were glorious within as well as abundant in external graces.”

---

15 Lyttleton’s inscription was published in the *London Magazine*. 1747, p. 228.


The eroticisation of death in this period has been considered a symptom of a society in which "religion" was losing its vital power and faith in the spiritual had waned to a degree that made physical loss and partition frightening and unbearable. Roubiliac's Nightingale monument (1757-61), with its magnificent image of Joseph Gascoigne Nightingale fending off the dart of Death from the breast of his beautiful young wife, has been used as the definitive example of the eroticisation of death in the mid-eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{18} Clare Gittings observed that:\textsuperscript{19}

Previously, the skeleton acted as a memento mori, emphasising the natural inevitability of death; it actually represented the deceased after the decomposition of the flesh. By the later part of the eighteenth century, such reminders of physical decay were no longer accepted, or so acceptable. The Nightingale monument, with its personification of death, owed some of its power to the fact that skeletal imagery was not in such common use; it was designed to arouse shock rather than resignation in the face of death. In Roubiliac's work the lightly clad lady is fought over by her husband and death, emphasising the struggle and heartbreak involved in passing from this world to the next, rather than the natural ease of transition. The comfort of religion has little part in this eighteenth century conflict....The eroticising of death is further testimony to the failure of eighteenth century rationalism to tackle successfully the problem of death and render it truly a thing of indifference. As is apparent from the experience of the twentieth century, an essentially scientific, rational and materialistic outlook cannot fully compensate for the immensely threatening role of death in a highly individualistic society.

The problem with this interpretation of the emergence of "erotic" elements in funerary sculpture is that many of the best examples were sponsored by those associated with evangelical or "enthusiastic" religious opinions. George Lyttleton was, as we have seen, a man of decidedly fervent religious beliefs who cannot be associated with the supposed threat of "rationalism" to religious belief. The imagery of the Nightingale monument can be even more closely associated with the sentiments of the so called "evangelical revival" of the 1740s and

\textsuperscript{18} The monument was erected in 1761 but, I would suggest, a large floor mounted monument was planned by 1757 when a large "fine" of £80.00 was paid to the Abbey. (Westminster Abbey Muniments, Treasurers' Accounts 49311)

\textsuperscript{19} Gittings, 1984, pp. 212-3
50s. The "lightly clad lady" was, in fact, sister to Lady Selina, Countess of Huntingdon.20 The monument may well have been erected to the specification of the Countess herself. Along with two of her religious circle, "Catherine Shirley and Miss Crowley", she was designated executrix of the will of Joseph Gascoigne Nightingale in which the sum of five hundred pounds was left for the erection of a monument to "my late dear wife and myself".21 According to the Royal Magazine of 1763, the "design" of the monument was undertaken by "Mr Hervey"; by whom is meant James Hervey, the author of the influential Meditations and Contemplations (1746) and a friend of the Countess.22

David Bindman has suggested that Wesley's recorded admiration of the Nightingale monument is an indication of an implicit understanding that the image of tragic loss was intended to lead to theological reflection.23 Wesley referred to the monument as "truly Christian" and commented that its narrative represented "common sense",24 comments which infer that its imagery was to be interpreted as illustrative of the natural dilemma which faced the Christian mourner who, though he was comforted by belief in the reunion of souls at the resurrection, found physical partition unbearable. Although this interpretation was probably intended, it did not necessarily mean that the majority of spectators understood these levels of meaning or that the popularity of the monument was dependant upon it. Walter Harrison, who was repeating the popular guide-book's interpretation of the monument, saw in this "most superb monument" a drama in which a husband:25

.....suddenly struck by astonishment and despair, would willingly ward off the fatal stroke from the distressed object of his care.

We should not presume that the absence of any awareness of the composition's underlying theological meaning in these comments was just an omission of the obvious.

---

20 That this monument was well-known to be connected with the Hastings and Ferrers families can be seen in Nichols, Leicester, 1804, vol. 3, part 2, p. 716.

21 J.G. Nightingale, PCC 1752, 216.

22 The Royal Magazine 1763, vol. 9, p. 115, ill. 172.


25 Harrison, A New Universal History, p. 137. His comments on Roubiliac's monument are copied from an earlier source. The Companion to Entertainment in London, (London, 1767) gives precisely the same critique of the monument and its comments are probably copied from another source.
Moments of high emotional drama based upon the juxtaposition of youth, beauty and death enjoyed popularity with or without a reference to Christian consolation. There was, as the Gentleman's Magazine complaints concerning the fashionable mourner and his lap-dog indicate, a contemporary association between the vogue for making a sensation of personal grief and the theatrical triviality the self-indulgent beau. Whilst Lyttleton was a man of well-known piety he cannot be dissociated from this type of behaviour. It is probable that he was, like the beau author mentioned in the Gentleman's Magazine, primarily motivated by the desire to make a public spectacle of his profound sensibility as a man of literary temperament. The notion that the literary man was gifted with a physical constitution which led to exceptional emotional sensitivity was in itself a literary topos in the period; a topos which, as John Mullan has argued, was becoming increasingly attractive amongst the authors of sentimental fiction in the 1740s.

George Lyttleton and his literary circle seem to have relished the idea of the literary man as a figure of refined emotional susceptibilities, or exemplum of contemplative "private" virtue. His friend and neighbour, William Shenstone, puzzled long over short sentimental inscriptions for rural monuments such as that set up at Leasowes in memory of the beautiful Miss Dolman (Leasowes Gardens, 1759). Their mutual friend Thomas Anson of Shugborough, another retired gentleman with literary tastes, also used monumental sculpture to demonstrate that he was a man of pronounced sensibility. He employed James Stuart and Peter Scheemakers to set up the "Shepherds' monument" at Shugborough (completed 1759) which has as its centre a relief of two lovers alerted to their mortality by a passing rustic who introduces them to a tomb hidden in the undergrowth. Pennant commented that the Shepherd's monument had been:

.....placed here by the amiable owner as a memento of the certainty of the event and as a secret memorial of some loss of a tender nature; for he was wont to hang over it in affectionate and firm meditation.

Below this image is an inscription tablet with the identity of Anson's private love disguised in a code message at the top of it. As the historian Thomas Pennant tells us, Anson was

---


27 Pennant's extensive commentaries on Shugborough appear in Pennant, A Journey from Chester to London, pp. 70-72.

28 The dates and derivations of the designs for these two monuments are discussed in Watkin, Athenian Stuart, p. 25.
known to have found virtue by following "the still path of private life"; he regarded himself as the model of virtuous private life as the complementary counterpart of his brother, Admiral Anson. who, as a definitive man of public affairs, was commemorated by a triumphal arch (1761-69) on the hill above.

On occasion George Lyttleton himself romanticised the literary man's identification with the competing forces of love and death. The verse he composed for the monument to his young relative Captain Grenville (d.1747) for the monument to his memory at Stowe (Prince Hoare and John Pitt of Encombe?, erected in the "Grecian Vale", 1747-52) cast the young officer as a romantic hero in the tradition of Sir Philip Sydney; part a "private" man of literary sensibilities and part a "public" man of action. His death was regarded as the loss of a romantic lover to the young women of England as well as the loss of a naval hero to his country:

Like him (Sydney) possessed of every pleasing art
The secret wish of every female's heart:
Like him cut off in youthful, glory's pride
And unrepining for his country died

The propensity of certain sectors of polite society of the 1750s to respond enthusiastically to the romantic sub-plots behind notable military or naval deaths can be seen in the interest shown in General Wolfe's fiancée, Miss Lowther, in the period after the General's death. The Scots Magazine of 1759 reprinted an article from the London Courant which was supposed to constitute the advice of its readership to the sculptor who was to design the imagery of the Wolfe monument. The proposed monument was to constitute an elaborate pedestal upon which a statue of the hero would stand. On one face of the pedestal was to be carved a relief of Wolfe's funeral alluding to the intervention of death before his marriage:

---

28 The erection of the monument with a figure designed by John Pitt and Prince Hoare is discussed in a letter from William Pitt to George Grenville printed in W.J. Smith ed., The Grenville Papers, London, 1852, pp. 99-100. This would appear to be a discussion of the monument which George Grenville intended to erect to Thomas Grenville in Westminster Abbey. This monument was never erected but a fine of £31 was paid to the Abbey to erect the monument in 1761 (Westminster Abbey Muniments, Treasurers' Books 49311).
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".....with the grief of the happy matron who gave him birth; of the illustrious lady on the eve of her wedding this young hero ravished from her arms in the flower of his youth".

The use of terms such as "ravish" and "flower of his youth" in the description of the moment when a soldier is separated from his lover has more to do with erotic sensationalism than theological speculation.

It is difficult to chart precisely the complex pattern of social change which caused a society, that twenty years before had been extraordinarily reticent over making any "fulsome" statement upon bereavement, to relish such stark images of romantic tragedy. The occurrence of an "evangelical revival" in the 1740s may have precipitated a growth of interest in matters of personal loss in funerary sculpture, but it was only a contributory factor. Whether the literary "culture of feeling" of the 1740s and 50s is to be seen as the inspiration of the movement towards "enthusiastic" personal belief or whether the religious movement is seen to have inspired the cultural and literary one, is, of course, a matter of the historian’s emphasis. The works of Hervey and Young were part of a wider literate culture which, as John Mullan argues, was reacting against the Shaftesburyite admiration of rational order and distrust of emotion which prevailed in the first three decades of the century. The social movement towards a culture of "feeling" was manifested both in the atheistical philosophy of David Hume and in the religious enthusiasm of John Wesley. Similarly the movement toward profound pathos and the commemoration of personal loss can be seen in images as diverse as the pagan monument to Henry Pelham (d. 1754), which shows the deceased taking leave of his widow to go with the boatman across the Styx, and the "truly Christian" Nightingale monument.

Roubiliac’s Lyttleton monument encapsulates the problems of defining the fundamental causes of the movement towards topics of personal loss in monumental sculpture. It was the product of a bereavement in which George Lyttleton was counselled by the evangelical minister, Philip Doddridge. The patron’s friend Samuel Richardson considered it to be to be open to interpretation as a piece of erotic sentimentalism, and it bore an inscription which was a tribute

33 Mullan, Sentiment and Sociability, pp. 1-56.

34 The imagery of the Pelham monument is discussed below, p. 289.

35 Letters between Lyttleton and Dodderige concerning the death of Lucy are printed in G. Nuttal ed., (Hist. man comm.) Calender of the Correspondence of Philip Doddridge D.D. (1702-1751), London, 1979, letters 1247-8, 1269, 1286, 1321.
to a rural love which, like his friend Thomas Anson's Shepherd's Monument, drew inspiration from the pagan classical tradition of bucolic love poetry. Ultimately it is difficult to tell whether the imagery of its cinerary urn was a Christian memento mori or a product of the tradition of retired stoic fatalism which, like the imagery of Cheere's Cooke monument, had its origins in the tradition of Classical Arcadian poetry.

Without the explicit evidence of documents or inscriptions it cannot be assumed that images of family loss were erected with the implicit purpose of impressing upon the spectator the importance of religious consolation. The Earl of Kildare's monument (ill. 35), which shows the Earl's family in mourning around his corpse, has been used by David Bindman to illustrate his argument that a change in religious climate was of primary importance to the revival of themes of personal loss in funerary sculpture. Its imagery was, however, intended to inspire reflection upon the inevitability of death, and upon the significance of the death-bed moments of the virtuous man, rather than to provide a focus for the current theological debate on the need of the bereaved family for religious consolation. It is possible that the particular subject matter of the monument arose from a word play on the name of the deceased. A verse circulated at the time of the Earl's death suggests that this interpretation is possible:

Who killed Kildare? Who dared Kildare to kill?
Death killed Kildare, who dare kill who he will.

The long inscription of the monument made no mention of the necessity for theological consolation. It did, however, emphasise the well-known Christian virtue of the deceased and described the function of the monument as an image:

.....to recommend to his descendants, the imitation of his excellent example.

Emphasis upon the grief-stricken reaction of the family may well relate to an oft repeated adage of the period concerning the revelation of virtue in death. Christopher Fox, in a recent article on the imagery of the good death in English literature of the 1730s and 40s, has

---

35 Part of the inscription is quoted on p. 244.
36 Bindman, Consolation, 1986, pp. 33-34.
38 The nineteenth Earl was famous for his piety and moral rectitude. Anecdotes of this appear in the London Magazine 1761, p. 76 and C.W. Fitzgerald, The Earls of Kildare and their Ancestors from 1057 to 1773, Dublin, 1862, p. 371.
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referred to the popularity of the topos in Augustan literature and traced its origins to the writings of Suetonius, Tacitus and Plutarch; sources in which the qualities of a man were mirrored in the manner of his death and the expressions of those at his death-bed. In his Epistle to Cobham (published 1739) Pope compared the death predicted for Earl Cobham, supposedly an archetypal man of virtue whose family were expected to weep around his corpse, with that of the corrupt "Euclio" whose relations had gathered around his deathbed to coldly conspire to divide his property. Here the scene of the family at the death-bed was said to reveal the "ruling passion" of the deceased. A dramatic illustration of the continuing currency of the topos appeared in the Royal Magazine of 1761 which recounted the death of a certain "Benevolens" whose virtue was such that his family could not endure his passing and clung to his mortal remains. Benevolens' body was left:

.....pale and motionless...his wife almost deprived of sense, his children bathed in tears and spectators filled with horror and confusion.

Like the literary topos itself, the device of the death-bed scene in funerary sculpture as an illustration of the deceased's moral virtue was not invented in the later part of the period. The monument to the Dormer family of Quainton which was planned in 1727 has a similar design; a fact which makes it difficult to argue that the Kildare monument was necessarily a product of the prevalent theology of the 1740s.

One of the principal differences between the monuments at Quainton and Christ Church, Dublin is in the depiction of the male mourner. At Quainton there is an immediately noticeable contrast between the Judge's calm reaction to the death of his son and that of his widow who is brought to her knees by grief. Justice Robert Dormer looks out calmly at the spectator and gestures as if engaging him in a philosophical discourse upon mortality. The monument was repeating the formula seen in Rysbrack's Foley monument in which the male is defined as rational and philosophical whilst his spouse complements his role in the family by being caring and compassionate. The Kildare monument depicted James FitzGerald, the deceased's son and successor, in a state of horrified grief; sharing with his mother and sister an intense and uninhibited emotional response to a family death.

---


41 The Royal Magazine vol. 4, p. 188.
This image of the twentieth Earl - who, according to the *London Evening Post* of September 6th 1746, supervised the erection of the monument - can be explained by Earl’s particular tendency to cast himself as a man of feeling. Surviving correspondence between the twentieth Earl and his wife and family reveal a man who indulged his family with the most extravagant statements of affection. Letters to his wife, Emily Lenox, whom he married at the time of the erection of the monument, are habitually addressed to “My Dear Angel” and loaded with the most fulsome statements of affection. His sister, who appears upon the monument with him, is habitually referred to with the same sort of language. The Earl and his young wife shared a taste for the most sentimental tragedies appearing upon the stage. On one occasion the Earl wrote to his wife to advise her to not see the *Orphan of China* because her constitution would not bear the tragic sentiment. Nevertheless she obtained a copy, had it read out in a family group, and wrote to her husband to inform him that she had dared to do so. She informed him that the reading of the play had only reinforced her husband’s impression that if she saw it enacted it would “kill” her. In accordance with his enthusiasm for sentimental drama concerning children, the twentieth Earl ran his own family with regular reference to the most enlightened authors on the subject of child rearing. His wife, Emily was reported by the Irish diarist Mrs Delany to be so convinced of the merits of Rousseau’s writings upon the family that she considered employing him as a personal tutor to her children.

The monument in Dublin Cathedral can be seen as evidence of one of Ireland’s wealthiest aristocrat’s attempts to cast himself in the role of the fashionable and enlightened man of sensibility. He was well-known to have been attempting to become a leader of Dublin fashion. In the year of the erection of the monument he is recorded to have begun building a Town House (Leinster House) in an unfashionable part of the city protesting, when asked of his motives, that Dublin Society “will follow me wherever I go.” When completed this house was formally run upon a set of enlightened “rules” which were written down by the Earl and

---

42 The impression that the twentieth Earl supervised the erection of the monument is also given in a note in the *General Advertiser* of the 5th September 1746.


44 *ibid.*, vol. 1, pp. 69, 73 and 83.

45 *ibid.*, vol. 1, p. X.

46 *ibid.*, p. X.
remain preserved in the manuscript collection of the Earl of Northumberland. The monument reflects the rise of the ideal of the caring, compassionate and "enlightened" household more than it does the theology of the "evangelical revival". There is, indeed, little evidence of "enthusiastic" piety in the large collection of correspondence left by the Earl of Kildare and his family.

The inscriptions used in the emerging genre of monuments erected by male mourners also have few references to religious consolation; often the principal objective was simply to present a memento to blighted love. The monument, which was commissioned from Rysbrack (Chartham, 1751) (ill. 52) by William Young for himself and his teenage wife, is a good example of this. It shows the bereaved husband, a prosperous Barbados planter in the guise of a Roman citizen, stepping forward with one hand upon his heart and another stretching down to touch his seated wife. The beautiful young woman looks back at him with adoration as death intervenes before them in the form of a putti extinguishing the torch of life into a skull. As the inscription made plain, the couple had not been married for long at her death and she was in the very bloom of youthful beauty. The imagery was that of the reluctant separation of a couple in the flush of, what the inscription terms, "romantic" love.

Immediately below the figures is an inscription tablet with a short verse description of the deceased wife:

Most amiable she was of human kind
Of lovely form, of angelic mind
Though snatched from earth in beauty's early bloom
Her bright example survives the tomb
And warms the breast which once her merit knew
But feels too much to pay the tribute due.

---

47 The manuscripts of the Duke of Northumberland, Alnwick Castle, Historical, manuscript Commission, 3rd rep., p. 124.

48 William Young was an immensely wealthy patron of the arts. His interest in classical sculpture may explain his sponsorship of such an important work. He was reported by Mann in his letters with Horace Walpole to have been purchasing classical sculpture in Rome and posturing as a wealthy dilettante. (Walpole, vol. 20, pp. 327, 331) His second wife was the daughter of the antiquarian and authority on artistic perspective, Dr Brooke Taylor. Young himself was a member of the Society of Antiquaries by 1749 and an associate of Stuart and Revett. His son was an important amateur artist and authority on Grecian antiquities leaving a manuscript work upon Grecian architecture entitled, An Essay on the Ruins of Peastum, with Coloured Drawings of its Temples. 1773 (Ashburnham Mss., Historical Manuscripts Commission, 8th report, III, p. 41.)
The last two lines are of particular interest and are cryptic enough to require some interpretation. The clue to their comprehension is the prominent signing of the verse with the letters "EY". Engraved above this was a prose introduction to the verse which is signed "WY". The indication was that the patron, William Young wrote the prose introduction but "feels too much to pay the tribute due" of writing the epitaph. The task of writing "the tribute due" was consigned to the hand of the poet who signs himself "EY". The poet may well have been Edward Young who was possibly related to the patron.49 Although probably written by Edward Young, there is no mention in the verse of the religious consolation provided in his account of the death of Lysander and Aspasia in Night Thoughts. The emphasis of the epitaph is upon the sincerity of the mourner who is unable to "pay the tribute due" by penning the poetic rhetoric required of him. The contrived sense of feeling too intense to be discussed, or which would cause a breakdown in a person's ability to express themselves, was, as Janet Todd suggests, definitive of the literary style of "sensibility".50 William Young's own inscription was a prose declamation of his ability to find the words for such a "tribute":

In her beauty of person, the virtuous accomplishments of her sex and the loveliness of her disposition she was so truly excellent that HERE perhaps could be no room for flattery even should the affection of so fond a husband represent her in the most romantic of terms.

The very use of a personally signed declaration defines this inscription from the great majority of those commissioned in the 1720s and 30s when it was unusual to mention personal loss. Personally signed declarations of loss which give the impression that they are informal or spontaneous are a common feature within the inscriptions of the genre to which the Young monument belonged. The contemporary monument erected at Coleshill in Berkshire by William, Lord Folkestone, in memory of his wife (Rysbrack, d.1750) also featured a passionate declaration of personal grief which is engraved on the base of the monument directly beneath the inscription tablet as an intimate addition to the prosaic account of her life and genealogy which is seen above (ill. 116).

49 There appears to be no genealogical information on William Young. There was, however, a close association between William Young and his son and the Lee family of Hartwell, in particular Sir William Lee. This recorded by Lipscombe (Buckingham, 1847, vol 2, p. 326. The poet, Edward Young, married into the family of William Lee of Hartwell (ibid., vol 2, p. 405) and it may be that William Young was drawn into the family circle through some unknown relation to the poet.

Like the George Cooke monument and many other examples of the genre of the garden monument, that to William Young and his wife combined a reaction against the predictable formulae of monumental tribute with a contrived sense of intimacy. It is a definitive example of the "private" monument; at one time an "example" with which to perpetuate unblemished feminine virtue and an apparently spontaneous testimony of a mourner's innermost feelings. The studied tone of candid personal address used within the inscription suggests that there was a relationship between the rise to popularity of the monument of male mourning and the reaction against formal, public mourning. This reaction gained momentum in the 40s and 50s for reasons far more complex than the "evangelical revival" alone.

Despite remarrying, purchasing a large estate in Buckinghamshire, and living much of his life in the West Indies, William Young remembered the wife of his youth. At his death in 1788 he left instructions that his body should be returned from Barbados to be laid beside hers. Rysbrack's monument, which had been in the bell-tower of the Chartham church for four decades, was not erected above the vault until after his death. The genre of monuments erected by bereaved husbands was associated with the most elaborate rituals of "private" mourning and a preoccupation with the physical reunion of remains. These rituals were the product of a certain maudlin sensibility which in many cases was based upon an elaborate combination of superstition, Christian eschatology, and Roman pagan funerary traditions.

Peter Serle who erected two beautiful bust monuments at Ealing (Henry Cheere?, Elizabeth Serle, d.1741) (Michael Rysbrack, Susanna Serle, d.1753) - one to his first, another to his second wife - specified in his will that a special coffin was to be made in which the bodies of himself and his two wives could be deposited together. Many of the husbands who were depicted in monumental imagery as enduring a painful loss made arrangements for such sentimental funerary rituals. Joseph Gascoigne Nightingale's will, for instance, specifies that the family vault in Westminster Abbey should be altered and the coffins of himself and his wife placed in a compartment specially divided from the main family vault. This type of punctilious, and overtly morbid, attention to the details of corpse placement and other kinds of funerary ritual became a mark of the man of sensibility. Jean Hagstrum has shown that this

---

51 W. Brotherton PCC 1759, 368.
52 The monument was reported by Edward Hasted (Hasted, Kent, 1778, vol. 3, p. 152) to be stored in the bell tower. A faculty was drawn up by the Diocese of Canterbury in 1788 for the monument to be erected above the vault.
53 P. Serle, PCC 1782, 200.
54 J.G Nightingale PCC 1752, 216.
preoccupation with physical reunion in the vault became an aspect of the developing culture of "sensibility." He refers to Thomas Gray's enthusiasm for the idea of reunion with his mother in the vault at his death - a mother whom the poet had ritualistically mourned for over a decade - as a particular symptom of Gray's melancholic "sensibility".55

In the period after his bereavement Thomas Chilcot (d.1767), the immensely wealthy organist of Bath Abbey, employed Prince Hoare of Bath to construct a monument with his own bust and that of Anne, his deceased wife in overlapping relief (erected at the death of his wife in 1758). The monument was placed directly above a vault at Tawstock in Devon which had been made specifically to contain only the remains of himself and his wife.56 This desire for union in death was mirrored in his desire to have his own funeral conducted in exact imitation of that which he had arranged for his wife.

Chilcot's body was to be carried to Tawstock in a white hearse with its interior bedecked with feathers. The whole ceremony was to be conducted "in the same manner as my wife was". The body was to be rested overnight at the same places on the journey that his wife's had been. His corpse was to be:

"......buried at Tawstock in Devonshire in the vault made on purpose for me next to where the remains of my Dear wife are deposited and with whom I hope, through the tender mercy of an all glorious and good God, to rise in glorious resurrection."

The Incumbent of Tavistock was to be given "half a guinea forever in order to preach a sermon in memory of me and my wife, Anne Chilcot, and to pay the Clerk and Sexton for the time being five shillings each in order that they may keep the monument clean from dust and strew the gravestone with flowers".

Anne Chilcot was the daughter of the Rector of the Parish of Tawstock, the Reverend Christopher Wrey. Four years before her decease her relation, Bourchier Wrey, had employed Cheere to erect a monument to his wife with an exceedingly tender and touching inscription. Prince Hoare's monument was erected near to it. It would seem that when he chose to venerate his wife in this way Thomas Chilcot was behaving in accordance with a recently


56 T. Chilcot, PCC 1767, 38.
established family tradition. The most remarkable case of this type of family tradition of mourning ritual involving monuments to deceased wives took place in the social milieu of the Pusey family of Berkshire. The monuments erected by this group show how certain funerary rituals could become *de rigueur* amongst a small social set. The latest of these monuments was erected within a "Greek Temple" by William Brotherton (d.1759) which was set up in memory of his wife in the garden of Pusey House.

This monument proffers the best example of the sentimentalism of male mourning which came into fashion in the last decade of our period. Like Thomas Chilcot, William Brotherton had no children and thus was able to divert much of his large fortune to the funerals and monument of himself and his wife. He became the male representative of the ancient Pusey family when he married Elizabeth Pusey (d.1757) the sister of the childless John Allen Pusey (d.1753). The monument, which he erected after his wife’s death, was part of a sentimental mortuary cult similar in many ways to that of Thomas Chilcot. It also combined the desire for a union of physical remains with an enthusiasm to have an identical funeral. However Brotherton’s plans, as stated in his will, were far more thorough. His wish was to be buried:

...in the vault at Pusey, as near as possible to my Dearest Wife.... I mean that the coffins, contrary to the modern usage, may actually touch each other. It being my intent to be buried close to her and between my Dear Sister Jane Allen.... It is my further desire that my corpse should be conveyed thither and in the same manner and along the same path as the corpse of my dear wife.

There follows a long list of instructions which ensured that the process of the laying out of corpse and burial was conducted in the same manner as his wife’s had been. A trusted servant was employed to inspect the placement of coffins in the composition required. Brotherton requested that, like that of his wife, his corpse was to be laid out for a five day period; a detail which suggests that the funeral practice shown in the monument to the Earl of Kildare (1743-6), whose will requested that "my body be kept unburied for as long a period after its decease as it can be", was connected with a sentimental ritual. Strong men were chosen to carry the coffin and ensure:

---


58 A connection between the imagery of the Kildare monument and the request of the nineteenth Earl to have his body laid out for an unusually long period has been suggested by H. Potterton, *Irish Church Memorials 1570-1830*, Ulster, 1975, p. 40.
...that it might be rested at the statue (or where I intend the statue to be erected) to the memory of that best of women my dearest wife.

Further instructions for the monument were left in a specially prepared codicil preserved amongst the papers of the Pusey family:59

It is my earnest desire that the statue, bustos, terms and tempoli and everything relating there to be erected and placed by me in the ground at Pusey, or intended so to be to the memory of my dearest wife should be completed and finished as soon as possible according to the plan I have settled for that purpose and that the same intended inscription be inserted upon the pedestal and nothing more relating to myself...... And as I think it is become far too common a practice in putting up monuments and inscriptions in memory of deceased people and that it takes away or lessens, at least, the merit of others that are put up, it is, therefore, my desire that no obelisk, bust, statue or monument of any kind be at any time put up on my account or in memory of me either in the churchyard gardens or pleasure grounds at Pusey and I thereby will that any person putting up such or any inscription (except the inscription upon the pedestal aforesaid) shall be intituled to lose and forfeit all benefit they might otherwise have, or be entitled to, under my will.

This last clause shows how earnest Brotherton's veneration was. The very title "Temple" or "Greek Temple" set the tone of a veneration which came close to a classical religious cult.60 Seats were provided within the interior to enable long periods of contemplation in the midst of this imagery. Four busts were placed within the building representing the female Virtues of Modesty, Benevolence, Prudence and Truth which surrounded a life-size image of the deceased. It is a measure of the confusion between Christianity and the classical cult religion which characterised Brotherton's mourning rituals that it is difficult to ascertain whether these busts, which are carved in the purest of classical styles, were to be interpreted as Pagan or Christian Virtues.

---

59 Berkshire Records Office, Pusey Papers, D/EX 1056/1.

60 An inscription below the figure reinforces the impression of a religious icon, "Sacrum conjugi panter et amicae, amors longaevi, fidei inviolatae, constantiae insolitae, virtutisque quidquid est humanioris, monumentum hoc et exemplar posuit Gulielmus Brotherton, 1759."
The central statue within the "Temple", the sculptor of which is unknown, ranks as one of the finest works of the period. It shows a beautiful young woman, dressed in diaphanous robes, stepping forward with a funerary wreath in her hand. A small dog is curled up at her feet which symbolises the faithful union of husband and wife. This mourning dog is somewhat reminiscent of the one which was reported in the Gentleman's Magazine to accompany the fashionable young mourning gentleman in the streets of London. It seems possible that such dogs were playing a part in the fashion of sentimental mourning ritual of Continental as well as British society. A small dog of this type appears in Jean Jacques Caffieri's (1725-1792) exceedingly sentimental sculptured group entitled l'amitié qui pleure sur un Tombeau (Paris, Louvre, c.1770) which shows a beautiful young girl lying grief stricken upon her lover's tomb with the dog curled at her feet.

When erecting this monument William Brotherton knew that he was acting within a tradition which had been established by his brother-in-law John Allen Pusey (d.1753). John Allen had rebuilt the whole of Pusey church in 1744 to commemorate his wife, Jane. Within the family pew in the south aisle was set up a monument by Scheemakers to the memory of Jane (ill. 117). The statue of Jane Pusey is remarkably doll-like in expression and shares the overt sentimentalism of that later erected by Brotherton. Compare Scheemakers' rendition of her reclining figure to that of Susannah Hare (Stowe Bardolph, Norfolk, c.1741) (ill. 118), for instance, and it is possible to conclude that he was asked to produce a particularly soft and romantic vision of womanhood. William Brotherton may have had a hand in the erection of the earlier monument and certainly felt a responsibility for its upkeep. A regular stipend was left for paying a mason in perpetuity:

"...to clean and strengthen the monument to my dear friends Mr and Mrs Allen Pusey in the South isle.

The memory of both the ladies was celebrated in a veritable family cult of womanhood. Brotherton left money to the Reverend Phipps of Pusey so that:

"...a sermon may be preached on the merit of women not of any particular woman there deposited but of the virtues in general of that sex as there are several buried equally deserving both in character and example.

---

61 V. Howse, Pusey: a Parish Record, Faringdon, 1972, p. 35.

62 Susannah Hare (PCC 1741, 118) was a pious spinster whose monument was, according to the inscription, erected by her brother Thomas.
The idea that all the women of the family deserved to be accorded veneration is significant. Jane Pusey’s nephew, William Bouverie, Earl of Radnor, also erected a monument (Coleshill, Berkshire, d.1750) to his beautiful young wife. The monument, which was made by Rysbrack’s workshop which was favoured by the Bouverie family, took the form of a pair of overlapping relief busts with a heart bonded by chains with two crossed flaming torches. This cult of male mourning went beyond the direct family. Christopher Nevile, the executor to William Brotherton who was to oversee the completion of the Temple, had also erected a monument to his youthful, and apparently beautiful, wife. He erected (Aubin Old Church, Henry Cheere?, c.1746) a little known, but exquisite, monument which includes a remarkably delicate relief portrait of the young lady.

Although the elaborate mourning rituals concerning the mingling of physical remains became increasingly important in the 1740s and 50s, they had been part of funerary culture since at least the beginning of the century. Requests for burial next to, or touching, the coffin of a loved one were common in the first two decades of our period. There was only one major monument of the earlier two decades of our period whose inscription dealt with this theme overtly. Rysbrack’s monument to Edward Eliot (St Germians, 1723), which depicted the deceased’s widow mourning over his recumbent figure, had an inscription pledging the eternal love of the donor through her desire for reunion in the vault:

```
monumentum hoc Amoris numquam morituri,
Flens et Animi sui desiderium indies filetura,
Uxor, eheu quondam felicissima posuit
Hic et suos cineres Depositura.
```

---

63 William, Earl of Radnor’s desire to be buried next to his first wife can be seen in his will, PCC 1776, 92. He was brother of Edward Bouverie who was heir to the Pusey estates.

64 Rysbrack’s works for the Bouverie family include three busts of family members at Longford Castle (1730), a fireplace at the Castle (1744) and a statue of Britannia with a relief of Alfred (1761). The important monument to Bartholomew Clarke and his family at Hardingstone (c.1746), who left his property to Viscount Bouverie, was also a family commission.

65 It seems that this family cult of virtuous womanhood might explain the iconography of Joshua Reynolds’s painting of Mrs Edward Bouverie with Child (1770) and the melancholic painting of Mrs Crewe and Mrs Edward Bouverie inspecting a monument with “et in Arcadia Ego” written upon it (1769). Edward Bouverie was the younger brother of William, Earl Radnor.

66 C. Neville PCC 1772, 103.
(This is a monument to their undying love, the weeping, yearning and longing of spirit. A wife, alas, once so very happy placed this and will deposit her own ashes here.)

This reference to mixing of ashes was the only overt reference to an idea which was merely hinted at in a number of major funerary monuments of the 1720s and 30s. Rysbrack's beautiful images of marital couples in the monuments to Lord King (Ockham, erected 1738) (ill. 102) and Nathaniel Curzon (Kedleston, 1737), where both husband and wife lean melancholically upon a centrally placed urn, may have such inflections of meaning. The idea of a placing a cinerary urn in a central position as a focus for a couple's hopes of reunification was more graphically expressed in Rysbrack's monument to John Knight and his widow at Gosfield. Here the image of the widow leans forward and grasps the central funerary urn as her husband comforts her by placing a consoling hand upon her shoulder. Anne Knight was, as we have seen, Elizabeth Eliot's sister; a fact which suggests that, as in the Pusey/Bouverie family, certain rituals of loss became attractive within a kinship group.

The use of the term "cineres" or "ashes" seen in the Eliot inscription referred to the practice of cremation which was not used in England until the nineteenth century, yet was the most common form of Roman burial. Such references to the mixing of ashes were probably founded upon a knowledge of the mourning iconography of antiquity. They can be interpreted as further indication of the growing awareness of the classical monumental tradition which characterised monumental sculpture in the 1720s and 30s. Those with a good classical education may well have known that there was often a mixture of the ashes of a number of persons in the cinerary urns of antiquity. The seventeenth century Norwich antiquarian, Dr. Thomas Browne, wrote a review of the issue of "whether the bones of different persons were mingled in the same urn" in his *Hydrotaphia, Urn burial, or a Discourse on Sepulchral Urns* of 1658.67

It is possible that Pope, who wrote the inscription of the monument to John Knight, was also the author of the Latin inscription of the Eliot monument. The poet seems to have been attracted to the Classical imagery of the mixing of ashes. The final lines of his inscription for

---

67 The book and the subject of pagan eschatology is discussed by Samuel Johnson in his biography of Thomas Browne which was reprinted in *Johnson*, vol XII, p. 283.
Rysbrack’s monument to Nicholas Rowe (Westminster Abbey, erected 1743) used a similar image to describe the function of the monument:68

To these so mourned in death so lov’d in life
The childless parent and the widowed wife
With tears inscribes this monumental stone
That holds her ashes and expects her own.

Samuel Johnson, who reviewed a version of this inscription along with all of Pope’s epitaphs in the Abbey, recognised that it was derived from classical prototypes. He complained that the inscription demonstrated that epigraphy had been "infected" by "ancient worship" during Pope’s life-time.69

Caution should be shown before interpreting such references as evidence of the growth of what Stone describes as “the companionate marriage”.70 Reference to the mixture of ashes was, like the donor’s concluding statement of "gratitude" discussed in chapter two, a classicising device used in the dedication of monuments. The final lines of the inscription to Nicholas Rowe were written in accordance with the classical tradition of making an "ex voto" statement in which the dedicator performs a promise, the permanence of which is guaranteed by its being "inscribed" upon the monument for public witness. The formula used created the fiction that the donor had placed cherished remains within the "monumental stone" itself and that proceeded to use the monument as a focus for her own thoughts upon joining them in death. Despite re-marrying, Rowe’s widow specifically requested in her will (proved in 1748) to be buried in Westminster Abbey beside the bodies of her first husband and daughter.71

The incidence of the use of this type of dedication increased in the 1740s and 50s and new ways arose of integrating it into the imagery of monuments. A good example of the re-working of this idea can be seen in Rysbrack’s monument to Lord Huntingdon of 1749 at Ashby-de-la-Zouche (ill. 86). Here a relief image of the weeping widow is placed upon the cinerary urn itself. The device of setting an image of widow upon the vase itself gave the impression to the spectator of witnessing the "monumental stone" which was itself the physical

---


70 Stone, 1977, pp. 217-253

71 A. Rowe/Deanes, PCC 1748, 8.
focus of a widow’s loss and hopes of physical reunion. This type of device also appeared upon
the monument erected to the memory of Henry Pelham (d.1752, erected c.1755) by his
secretary, John Roberts, in the gardens of Esher, a description of which appeared in the
_Gentleman’s Magazine_ of 1818. A cinerary urn was mounted on a pedestal which was
carved with an image of the distraught Lady Pelham cleaving helplessly to a similar funerary
receptacle. Another relief panel showed the moment of partition in which Henry Pelham’s soul
is being prepared for the ride away from his loving wife across the waters of the Styx.

Roubiliac was particularly sympathetic to the idea of using an urn as a symbol of physical
reunion. In the monument to Lord Bolingbroke (Battersea, erected 1752) he used an unusual
design of urn, which has two bulging compartments and separate lids, to emphasis that it is
the receptacle of unified remains (ill. 119). His monuments to George Lynn (Southwick,
Northamptonshire, 1760) (ill. 14) and Earl Shannon (Walton-upon-Thames, 1756-9) (ill. 13),
which placed an image of the grieving widow grasping a cinerary urn on a platform in front
of the main part of the composition, exploited a sense of the vase itself being the object of a
widow’s pathetic clinging to some symbol of her husband. The placement of the urn in an off
centre position under the widow’s arm pointedly departs from the tradition of positioning the
cinerary urn in a central position between a marital couple which was to be seen in Rysbrack’s
Curzon and King monuments. This created a fiction which implied that the vase had been
taken down from the monument by the widow; a fiction which was designed to give the
spectator the impression that the widow was a living mourner rather than part of the
monumental composition. The final lines of the inscription on the Shannon monument, which
refer to the bereaved widow’s hopes that her "ashes" would finally be placed "together with
those of her beloved Lord", gave emphasis to this imagery.

Roubiliac’s composition was a translation into visual imagery of the epigraphic formula seen
in the Rowe and Eliot monuments. His depiction of Lady Shannon in the throes of an
imaginative reverie - a reverie in which she appears to conjure up the image of her husband
which appears above - is a graphic reinterpretation of the type of imagery seen in the
inscription to the Rowe monument. The monument itself appears to have been erected as the
"monumental stone" which was to act as a focus for a widow’s contemplations upon loss in
the period preceding the final reunion of her remains with those of her husband. Roubiliac’s

---

72 A detailed description of the monument appeared in Justice Hardinge’s description of a trip to Claremont
and Esher in the _Gentleman’s Magazine_ 1818, p. 494.

73 The erection of the Bolingbroke monument was announced in the _London Magazine_, 1752, p. 437.
tendency to show his widow figures in faints or reveries - the physical reaction to holding some relic of their husband - was broadly in tune with the preoccupation of contemporary sentimental fiction with such emotional states. We should, nevertheless, be cautious of regarding such figures as unambiguous evidence of Roubiliac’s particular affinity with the culture of "sensibility".\textsuperscript{74} The use of the fainting pose may just be further evidence of Roubiliac’s desire to articulate and re-interpret the essential "meaning" of the traditional conventions of classical funerary culture.

The sculptor’s witty reinterpretation of the topos in which the "monumental stone" was regarded as a fictive repository of remains and its erection as a votive gesture preceding her own death, is similar to his replacement of the convention of "unmeaning" Roman trophies with modern weapons of war.\textsuperscript{75} The changing attitude to the use of the cinerary urn can, therefore, be understood in terms of the intellectual reaction against "unmeaning" funerary conventions of the late 40s and 50s which was referred to in chapter one. In other contemporary monuments attempts were made to ensure that the use of a centrally placed sarcophagus carried the clear meaning of a fictive depository for the united remains of those whose images were placed around it. At the time of the second Earl Hardwicke’s erection of a monument (Wimpole Parish Church) to his parents in September 1764 the designer, "Athenian" Stuart, wrote to Thomas Anson, who was a relation of the family, explaining his use of the central sarcophagus. The monument, which was carved by Scheemakers, was supposed to represent the essential characteristics of male and female virtue.\textsuperscript{76}

.....on one side is Minerva, not the Warlike but the eloquent and therefore instead of a Lance, she holds a Caduceus, for this I have authority. On the other side is Pudicitia, the matronal Virtue, She is veiled and holds a stem of lilies. One Sarcophagus is supposed to hold them both, and the medallions on the sarcophagus are their portraits in profile.

The tone of Stuart’s description, with asides such as "for this I have authority", indicates that he had chosen to emphasise the idea of the couple being united in the sarcophagus as evidence of his classical learning. He was revealing his knowledge of the Roman custom of actually burying a corpse within the sarcophagus. His motives were not simply to create a sentimental image of mutual love but to articulate the proper meaning of what had become a tired motif of funerary sculpture. Like Roubiliac’s use of the cinerary urn in the Shannon monument, the increased stress upon family feeling in the image was coincident with the designer’s attempts

\textsuperscript{74} The place of faints and swoons in the literature of sensibility is discussed in Todd, Sensibility, 1986, p. 7.

\textsuperscript{75} See the London Magazine (December 1759) critique of the monument quoted in chapter one, pp. 57.

\textsuperscript{76} The document is transcribed in Waikin, Athenian Stuart, p. 55.
to make plain his erudition by demonstrating a sophisticated understanding of the meanings which lay behind the formal conventions of classical sculpture.

Although funerary art of the first two decades of our period occasionally hinted at the sentimental comforts of unification in death, no image or inscription celebrated the idea of joint resurrection. Belief in the idea that placing remains together would lead to reunion at the resurrection was common in the 1720s and 30s though never seen in funerary art. In his will of 1731 Sir Basil Dixwell requested to be buried in his vault at Barham in Kent:

......next to my dearly beloved wife some years deceased and laid in there who some thirty years before had been the companion, comfort, and happiness of my life and next to whom I have ordered room to be left for me that after death our bodies, being laid together, may to some measure resemble the very inseparable kindness we always had for one another...... And whereas God in his great mercy has since my former loss given me another very kind and good wife, who I hope will continue my partner and felicity for the rest of my life, room may be left on the other side of me, when laid down in the same vault, that after such a happy time as I can wish her in the world she may after death be laid by me against God's great call to judgement when the Lord have mercy upon us all.

That such ideas appeared in wills but never received "public" airing in the epigraphy of the 1720s and 30s may be the consequence of a fear of appearing to be superstitious or religiously "enthusiastic" in a culture of prevailing latitudinarianism.

During the 1740s references to the hope that placing remains together beneath a monument would lead to loved ones rising together became relatively popular amongst those composing monumental inscriptions. Eschatological reflections of this type can be seen in Henry Cheere's notable monument to the Gywnn sisters at Great Baddow. This was erected at the behest of Anne Hester Antrim (d.1752), a friend who lived with the sisters and wished to celebrate her desire to be buried with them. Miss Antrim left instructions that her body should be buried:

.....in the same grave either at the head, foot, or side of my two dear friends"

---

77 B. Dixwell, PCC 1750, 145.
78 A.H. Antrim, PCC 1752, 176.
A monument was to be erected:

.....as near our remains as possible mentioning the eighteen happy years we spent together likewise the time we survived each other.

The sculptor emphasised the sentiment of the friendship between the women by surrounding the delicate relief portraits of the two sisters with great garlands of flowers. The inscription, devised by their executor the Rev. George Itchener, stressed that the function of the monument was to commemorate hopes for the eventual reunification of the friends:

Numbered for their friendship
Their bodies are united in the dust
In a state of separation from their souls
But we hope in the almighty power
Of God and Christ our Saviour
They will be reunited to them on the last day
That both may be glorified together.

The funerary culture of later two decades of our period was characterised by an increased interest in matters eschatological. However these preoccupations were seldom unambiguously Christian in derivation and Christian and classical pagan eschatology were frequently indissolubly combined. This is exemplified by the monument commissioned from Scheemakers by Alethea Savile (Methley, d.1759) (ill. 28) to commemorate herself and her husband. The inscription repeated the familiar formula of the widow building the monument as a votive offering to act as formal witness of her promise to reunite her remains with those of her husband. It contains the widow’s personal statement that the monument was built above a specially constructed vault:

....prepared in the purpose and hopes that they might rise together. Desiring that when she departs this life her remains may be deposited by his.

Although there was mention of a Christian resurrection, the strict classicism of Scheemakers’ classical figures reflect that the very function of the monument was based upon the imagery of "ancient worship" to be seen in the Rowe monument. Conflation of these visual and epigraphic traditions continued to be a characteristic of monuments which communicated the hope of maintaining the marital state in the after-life. Nollekens’ monument to Sir Thomas and Lady Salusbury, which according to faculty papers was erected by Lady Salusbury in 1776,
is an extraordinary example of this (ill. 120). The monument shows the couple repledging their marriage in the after-life, above them in the branches of an oak is slung a funerary cowl. Their postures were unmistakably derived from a Roman sarcophagus which had been used by Rysbrack at Kensington Palace (1723) for his relief of a "Roman marriage"; even the cowl draped over the tree seems to be adapted from the cloth curtaining which was hung behind the figures in the prototypes of the design. (ill. 121-122) Ultimately the spectator is unsure of whether he is witnessing an image of reunion in a Classical elysium or Christian paradise.

The idea of corporeal resurrection was seen by some contemporaries as a pagan superstition rather than Christian belief. Dr. Johnson in his essay on epitaphs of 1740 remarked disapprovingly on the "heathenish superstition" implied by the use of a plea not to disturb remains which was to be seen on Cowley’s monument:To pray that the ashes of a friend might not be disturbed....is only rational in him who believes the soul interested in the repose of the body.

The monument erected by William Drake in memory of his wife Elizabeth, who died in February 1757, bore an inscription composed by the bereaved husband which began with just such a plea (ill. 123).

Peace to these dear Remains, the sacred dust
Where late fair virtue dwelt, and where again
Beauty shall dwell, when heaven revives the just.

The Drake monument exhibited the same sort of conflation of religious traditions as the Charles Savile and Thomas Salusbury monuments. Although its inscription began with a conscious imitation of a "heathenish" epigraphic form which was composed by the bereaved husband himself, the monument can be construed as a conscious rejection of the use of the classical tradition in funerary sculpture. Its imagery, that of a kneeling woman at her prayers in a private chapel with her children in a line behind her, was popular throughout the seventeenth century but had fallen completely from favour in the second and third decades of the eighteenth century. The depiction of Lady Drake at prayers in the flush of youthful beauty

79 T. Salusbury, PCC 1775, 447. Unexplored faculty papers (May 1776) relating to this important work are preserved in the Hertfordshire Record Office. Archdeaconry of Hitchin and Huntingdon, loose faculty papers AHH 19/2 and faculty book ref. 64394.


81 Drafts of the inscription in William Drake’s own hand are preserved in the Buckinghamshire Record Office, Drake papers, D/DR/10/24.
with a reference below to her restoration to youthful vigour is reminiscent of Grinling Gibbon's monument to Mary Beaufoy (1705) in the nave of Westminster Abbey which shows a beautiful young woman resurrected in the midst of her devotions (ill. 124).

That Henry Cheere, who must have known Gibbons’ monument, was deliberately attempting to revive an old form is indicated by the carving of the curtain looped over a rail which defines the fore of the composition. This iconographic detail had an important role in the imagery of seventeenth century monuments, but had no currency in eighteenth century funerary art. Similar images of a spouse in a private chapel behind a curtain could be seen upon the left and right hand columns of Grinling Gibbons’ masterpiece, the monument to the family of the third Viscount Campden at Exton (1683). This was the second family monument erected in the family chapel at Amersham which had been built as an extension of the former vestry building in 1728. Its imagery of a family at private prayers was particularly appropriate for a monument erected on a wall adjacent to the altar rail of a private family chapel. That an imagery redolent of a tradition of domestic piety was being used may well be explained by the Drakes’ particularly strong tradition of family religion. William Drake left instructions in his will that his sisters, Isabella and Elizabeth, should be left:

.....copies of The Great Importance of Religious Life (which I recommend as a moralist and not as a Methodist.)

He left a bequest to the Rev. Dr Townson, who had advised him at the time of bereavement in 1757, that the cleric might act as an example:

"to all my connections....of his genuine piety and moral merits."

To his own children he addressed:

"....their father’s last extortion to be as like their mother as possible in all excellence".

He instructed them to keep to a moral and religious life:

---

82 A typical use of this curtaining appears in Maximillian Colt’s monument to Alice, Countess of Derby (d.1636) at Harefield.

83 Documents relating to the Drake chapel are reviewed on, pp. 212.

84 W. Drake, PCC 1796, 408.

85 Letters in Buckinghamshire Record Office (D/DR/ 8/16-17) Dr Townson advised William upon the death of his wife and appears to have advised him upon the use of electric shock treatment to revive Elizabeth from a coma.
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"...that will bring to them, as it did to their parents, peace to the last.

Cheere’s revival of a seventeenth century composition for an exceptionally pious client may well reflect a considered reaction against the secularization of monumental art which had taken place in the first three decades of the eighteenth century. Thomas Wilson, the sculptor’s friend and Rector of his Parish, made a published attack on the tendency of the sculptors and patrons of the 1750s to ignore the forms of monument which had satisfied their "pious forefathers." It is interesting to note that, shortly after the publication of Dr Wilson’s book, the Vestry of St Margarets, with Cheere at its head, claimed parish expenses for an outing to see Lord and Lady Dacre’s monument at Chelsea (1594) which was a notable example of the type of "pious" imagery which the Rector had recommended.

Despite the return in popularity of references to the resurrection of families and couples in some monuments erected in the 1740s and 50s, their naive religious conviction did not meet with universal approval. The Ladies Magazine of August 1752 printed a copy of the will of Francis Bancroft of Mile End with the intention of depicting the deceased as an amusing eccentric. In order to facilitate a comfortable resurrection he commanded that his coffin was to be made to a specific design:

The top or lid thereof hung with strong hinges, neither nailed or locked down, or fastening any other way but to open freely and without trouble like the top of a trunk.

The later part of our period saw opinions upon the possibility of resurrection in the flesh become the subject of controversy; Johnson was not the only scholar to abhor this trend toward such naïve faith and specious eschatological superstition. A widely published passage from the will of a certain Dr Martin of Plymouth, concerning his own burial and monument, provides evidence that there was the growing belief in physical resurrection not only amongst the landed classes but amongst the poorer middle classes. In the perception of this "good catholic Christian" far too many of the middle classes were beginning to waste hard earned money on expensive funeral vaults to ensure that they would be with their families at the last day. Martin requested not to be buried in a vault but in the ground where his body would decay and mingle with the earth; leaving instructions for a monument with an inscription.

Wilson, 1761, pp. 95-6.

St Margaret’s Church Warden’s Account accounts for 1764, Book E. 136.

The Ladies Magazine 1752, vol 2, p. 309.
warning such families to avoid vault burial. William Cole comments in his manuscript notes that Martin’s monument was designed as a reproach to contemporary clerics for making a living out of encouraging such fears in order to profit from the charges levied for building of a vault. The inscription criticised the incitement amongst the ill-educated of a:

......ridiculous fear lest their Kinsfolk at the day of judgement should suffer because their corpses were wrongly situated or not where the worldly advantage of the spiritual guide called for them. (Dec. 1762)

It was, perhaps, because of continued opposition to the idea of the physical reunion of the family that, despite appearing in many inscriptions, the notion of joint resurrection was never the subject of a major monument between 1705 and 1766. The last monument of this type to be erected in the first half of the century was Edward Stanton’s beautiful image of Sir Francis Russell (Strensham, Worcestershire, c.1706) rising from a sleep at the last trump with his widow kneeling beside him pointing out the heavenly crown descending upon him (ill. 125). This imagery returned to funerary sculpture in 1766 with Joseph Wilton’s magnificent image at Chenies of Lord Bedford awakening in paradise with his bride; here the couple are reunited and restored to the bloom of youth as the image of the Trinity emerges from the celestial clouds.

The importance of the depiction of physical loss and the pains of bereavement in the funerary culture of 1740s and 50s can be overestimated. Only a small proportion of those monuments erected in the later decades of our period concerned the loss of wives and female children. There were only a dozen major commissions of the former type and half a dozen of the latter. The great majority of monuments erected in the later two decades of our period continued to be of types favoured in the first two: tributes of grateful inheritors and symbols marking the opening and closure of family lines. It would be misleading to use images such as the Kildare and Nightingale monument as normative exemplars of the monumental imagery of their times.

The ability to provide images which communicated the patron’s strong sense of personal loss was not a prerequisite for financial survival in the 1740s and 50s. Scheemakers continued to make a handsome trade in monuments which were, if anything, more emotionally sterile than his works of the 1730s. It is a clear indication that we should not over-emphasise the changes in funeral culture in our period that a sculptor who does not appear to have been aware of any change in that culture continued to run one of London’s most successful businesses. There is a glaring incongruity between many of his images of the 1740s and 50s and the intimate and emotive terminology of their inscriptions. The monument to the Piggot family (c.1751) at

---

A press cutting containing a draft of Martin’s will with Cole’s comments appears in, British Museum, Cole manuscripts, add. mss. 5841, f. 183.
Grendon Underwood combined one of the most passionate inscriptions of the period - concluding with a declaration of the donor’s desire to be reunited in death with her family - with one of the most formal and pompous images of the sculptor’s œuvre. Rysbrack may not have noticed any radical change in his clients’ attitudes to death and mourning in the 1740s and 50s for he was called upon to create only three images of dramatic personal loss: the Lord Huntingdon (1749), William Young (1751) and William Bouverie (c.1750) monuments. The movement towards the commissioning of monuments which expressed the pains of bereavement and stimulated the sympathies of spectators was, as David Bindman suggests, largely limited to the sculptors of the St Martin’s Lane group.

David Bindman has argued that Roubiliac’s production of powerful images of personal loss reflect the sculptor’s desire to emulate the aspirations of contemporary painters who sought to touch the emotions of their viewers. He suggests that the desire of sculptors of the St Martins Lane group to affect the emotions of spectators coincided with Hogarth’s declared aesthetic objectives in his painting of Sigismunda:

I had been flattered as to the expression my whole aim was to fetch (a) tear from the spectator, my figure was the actor that was to do it. Sigismunda grieve over her lover’s heart, this I will ever as there are many living ladies especially which shed involuntary tears I was convinced that peoples hearts were so easily touched as I have seen them at a tragedy.

Hogarth’s aims were not only to produce an image to excite the emotions but one which affected emotions like a drama on the contemporary stage. He may well have been influenced

---

90 The inscription is printed in Lipscombe, *Buckingham*, 1847, vol. 1 p. 260. The death of the couple’s only son is described as “an inexpressible loss and affliction to his parents”. It ends with the statement that:

“Christobella Piggot hath caused this monument to be erected to the memory of her ever honoured husband and dear son, who both lie buried together underneath this chancel, where she intends to be buried with them and hopes to rise with them in glory on the last day.”


92 Roubiliac’s conscious desire to mimic the dramatic effects of painting is reflected in the language of a “puff” of the Warren monument which appeared in the *London Magazine* 1757, p. 560.

“As works of this kind, like pictures, are to be seen in a proper light and at a proper distance; if we stand some paces from the monument, we view the whole to more advantage, we may afterwards approach nearer and examine the nicety and elegance of the workmanship.”

by the achievement of a mutual acquaintance of himself and Roubiliac, David Garrick. Garrick was certainly the principal figure in the movement towards making contemporary stage performances more immediate. Recent scholars such as Earl Wassermann, who has written on Garrick's pivotal role in developing "the sympathetic imagination in eighteenth century theories of acting", have stressed the actor's role in making theatre a more direct emotional experience for spectators.

David Garrick's innovations in stage design at Drury Lane may well have had a direct influence upon Roubiliac. Garrick pioneered the tripartite stage; a theatre design which complimented and enhanced a style of acting which brought the players into close and intimate contact with the spectators encouraging an empathic response to the action. A frontal stage came out into the audience surrounded on either side by theatre boxes and with an audience pit to the fore. Behind this was the proscenium and another level of stage containing the fiction of the painted stage set. Actors playing upon such a stage set were so much amongst the audience that occasionally they could touch them or be embarrassed by projectiles falling from the galleries onto the stage. This technique of stimulating a sharper response from spectators by placing the focus of the action in their midst whilst allowing the scene behind to appear as a fiction was very similar to the basic design of the monument to the Duke of Montagu (Warkton, completed 1753).

Roubiliac placed a sharply realistic mourning figure of the Duchess of Montagu on a shallow plinth within the same space as the viewer. The placement of this figure at the front of the monument was probably supposed to give the spectator an empathic sense of loss. The remarkable effect of this device was noted by William Cole when he saw the monument in June 1763. Significantly he suggested that its effect was to increase the "expression" of the monument, precisely the term used by Hogarth in his description of the intended dramatic appeal of his Sigismunda:

The monument on the North side is the most beautiful one I ever saw, being a pyramid against the North wall on which hangs a medallion of the late

---


97 BM. Cole mss., add. mss. 5834. 48-49.
worthy Duke of Montagu, supported or pointed to, by a full length figure of Charity, with her three children about her, standing on a sort of altar part of the monument, is a most elegant figure of the Duchess standing on the ground leaning upon the said altar part, and looking up to the figure of her husband with all the marks of expressive sorrow and despair, perhaps the expression may be too outré.

The sculptor employed the device on a number of occasions. In the monuments to Earl Shannon and George Lynn the female mourning figures were similarly placed upon a shallow plinth in front of the main part of the design. They were depicted as living figures mourning beside a monument rather than as parts of a marble composition. The device was also used in the Nightingale monument, which differs significantly from its Continental prototypes such as Pigalle’s Marechal De Saxe (Strasbourg, St Thomas, designed 1756) and Slodtz’s Languet de Gergy (Paris, Saint-Sulpice, 1750-57) by being mounted upon the floor; a very realistic image of Death emerged from the vaults directly into the space of the spectator. The sense of threat to domestic happiness was, thus, directly felt by the spectator as well as the couple at whom his dart is aimed.

David Bindman’s general assertion that, in aiming to touch and express the human emotions through dramatic images of bereavement, Cheere and Roubiliac were breaking new ground by attempting to emulate the aesthetic objectives of painters deserves further investigation. The introduction of words such as “expressive” and “expression” into the critique of monumental sculpture, chiefly that of Roubiliac, certainly mirrors that which was used in the discussion of painting. The term was defined by the portrait painter, Joseph Highmore, in his Essays Moral, Religious and Miscellaneous (published 1766). Here the term is used in the context of a larger debate on the common importance of depicting the human passions within painting and sculpture.

Again; all mankind are the judges of the passions and readily see what expression the painter intends; and cannot avoid being properly affected when these are well executed.

As a consequence of this the sculptor and painter were ultimately to be judged upon:

---

*The derivation of the Nightingale monument from Pigalle’s monument to the Maraschal De Saxe, the model of which was produced in 1756, is discussed by Malcolm Baker in R. Strong ed., Rococo, Art and Design in Hogarth’s England, p. 304.

* Reprinted in the Lloyd’s Evening Post 1766, p. 533.
Highmore was referring to an established convention of commentary upon the shared objective of sculpture and painting. His sentiments and vocabulary are little different from those to be seen in an essay upon painting, sculpture and the "moral truth" and "hypocrisy" which appeared in the Daily Courant on September 28th 1731: (My italics)

The motions of our limbs, the figure of our faces, and our gestures, are as really as expressive as words themselves of the disposition of the heart and the ideas of the mind. Our looks and behaviour, which are the silent rhetorick of the body, are interpreters of our thoughts and passions as well as the sounding organ in the mouth.

Thence the sculptor and the painter, who are eminent in their art, are able to express the countenance, eyes and postures of men's figures, shame and horror, fear and joy, admiration and love.

Although written in 1731 this statement provides a convincing explanation of the aesthetic theory behind Cheere's composition for the monument to the Earl of Kildare of 1746. Here the subject was the moral worth of the deceased; a rectitude proven by the distraught facial expressions and postures of his relatives. The family are depicted in different stages of despair: the only daughter, Margaretta, comforts her quietly melancholic mother whilst her horror struck brother grasps at his father's feet. The depiction of a series of emotional reactions has a similar effect to the prints of the various human passions which had appeared in Le Brun's Treatise on the Passions and Roger De Piles' The Triumph of Painting. The author of the article in the Daily Courant does, indeed, seem to have gleaned his views on the moral purpose of painting and sculpture from such sources. There was, therefore, little in Cheere's aesthetic ambitions as seen in the Kildare monument which was new to the 1740s. The depiction of differing attitudes to grief and loss which are seen in the Dormer monument, or in the central narrative of the Foley monument, can also be construed as the products of this debate.

100 The theatricality of this work may be a result of Cheere's interest in the Garrick's work. The Cheere family had a box at the Drury Lane theatre a lease for which survives in the Westminster Public Library (deeds 196/8).

The terms "expression" and "expressive" which can be seen in the commentaries of Roubiliac's work - in, for instance, the puff of his monument to the Duchess of Montagu in the Revived Spectator of December 1753 and Valentine Green's critique of the Hough (1764) monument - derive from a time honoured debate upon the relation of pose and countenance to the revelation of what the Daily Courant described as the "moral truth". The underlying purpose of concentrating upon the "expression" of the passions was not just to create sympathetic sensations within the audience but to assist in the revelation of the "moral truth" of the deceased. Roubiliac is accredited with precisely this social function in a widely published verse entitled An Ode to Sculpture (published 1756) which celebrated the erection of his statue to Newton at Trinity College, Cambridge. This speaks of the sculptor as a moralist revealing "the varying passions of the mind" in order to inspire posterity with life-like images of the virtuous.

Valentine Green's use of the term "expression" in his comments upon the image of Bishop Hough in Worcester Cathedral (erected 1747) was unmistakably similar to that of the Daily Courant of some thirty five years before:

He is represented sitting upon a block of black marble with gold veins beautifully dispersed upon its surface, his right elbow resting upon some books; his hands joined as if in the act of devotion, which is fully expressed when we view the position of his head, which is inclined to the left shoulder in and somewhat elevated. The countenance is highly expressive of quick sense, the religious hope; meek yet animated. The attitude is easy yet venerable.

It would be simplistic to characterise Roubiliac as a sculptor of feeling whose style and imagery contrasted with the impassive classicism of Rysbrack and Scheemakers. His interest in uninhibited poses, and figures which overtly expressed their own internal passions, do not necessarily indicate that his prime purpose was to bring a tear to the spectator's eye. The faints and reveries seen in the Montagu, Nightingale and Shannon monuments cannot be interpreted merely as evidence of Roubiliac's desire to touch his spectators. The "puff" of the Shannon monument in the London Magazine of November 1759 indicated how the sculptor's use of uninhibited postures was intended to be interpreted.

---

102 The Revived Spectator, vol. XVI, 25th December 1753. V. Green's comments on the Hough monument are cited fully below.


Below is placed an image of his Lady, a figure of consummate elegance and in an attitude of the most graceful that can be conceived. The character of the hero is dignity, and that of the Lady is sweetness; a composition in which one sets off the other.

This critique was similar to that of the *Weekly Register* of 1734 upon the Buckingham monument from which that to Earl Shannon was probably adapted. The *Weekly Register* praised the Buckingham monument for the manner in which the male and female figures complimented each other; the pose of the female figure was interpreted as a "guide to" that of the masculine military figure.¹⁰⁶ Roubiliac's uninhibited poses articulated in a fresh way the contrast between the ideals of active, public masculinity and retiring, contemplative femininity; the ideal characteristics of gender which formed the basis of what was considered to be a correct moral order. Whilst Roubiliac was seen by his contemporaries as the designer of new "inventions", his role as a sculptor was not a new one. It was founded upon a fresh and witty interpretation of the sculptor's and painter's role as established by theorists such as Le Brun. The postures adopted by his sculpted figures were seen to be moral emblems; their bodies articulated and communicated to posterity "the silent rhetorick" of worthy souls.

¹⁰⁶ Reprinted in the *London Magazine*, 1734 p. 76.
CONCLUSION.

In the opinion of a number of contemporary commentators with the knowledge to make informed comparisons with other countries of Europe a preoccupation with monumental sculpture was a prevailing characteristic of the English. Commenting upon the "Present state of the Arts in England" in 1755, Jean André Rouquet, a Frenchman who lived much of his life in English artistic circles, observed that sculpture in England was, and had a history of being, a funerary art. George Vertue, writing some twenty years before, recorded that the production of monumental sculpture was the most lucrative profession of all the arts and artisan trades in London. It was, he tells us, chiefly London's buoyant monumental sculpture market which encouraged sculptors in search of fortune to travel from their countries of origin in Continental Europe.

It is difficult, or perhaps impossible, to verify these comments with comparative statistics of the number of monuments produced in each of the countries, or geographical areas, of Europe. However it would seem that the demand for public monuments - for works commemorating notable clerics, great Princes or military heroes - was not exceptional. Indeed there were contemporary complaints that Britain was not as good as other European countries, in particular Holland, at recognising public heroes with funerary monuments. The exceptional strength of the English market in the period was founded upon the demand for family images which were erected upon country estates. The market for monuments grew and prospered because of a wide enthusiasm for making a splendid record of the fate of dynasties and the passage of land and property. In the first two decades of the period the entire production of the London workshops was dominated by the demands of three types of client: those who sought to mark their gratitude for the inheritance of property; the last representatives of

107 Rouquet, 1755, p. 64.
108 Vertue, Notebooks, vol. 3, p. 146. This reference is quoted in Chapter one, pp. OOO.
109 The idea that the Dutch in particular were better at erecting public monuments than the English seems to have prevailed throughout the period. An Article on the erection of monuments and inscriptions in the London Magazine of 1739 (p. 7) records that:

".....our neighbours the Dutch, tho' they are very often laughed at by us as a rude, impolite people have excelled us in this particular."

A discussion of Admiral Ruyter's monument in the New Church, Amsterdam, in the Royal Magazine, 1761, (vol 4, p. 66) comes to similar conclusions.
landowning dynasties or their executors who recorded the demise of family lines; and those families who had brought estates or been elevated by titles established themselves as landed dynasties. This pattern of patronage persisted to the end of our period despite a strong literary reaction against formal dynastic sculpture in the late 40s and 50s. Indeed, the literary reaction against pompous dynastic sculpture in the 1750s which was enshrined most famously in Gray’s *Elegy*, can be understood as a back-lash against a funerary culture which had to an unparalleled extent turned monumental sculpture into a medium for recording the passage of property and titles.

Monumental sculpture of the early and mid-eighteenth century can, therefore, be studied as an art form which charts the ebb and flow of new and old blood in the country estates. It seems irresistible to hypothesise that monumental sculpture appealed in particular to the English because of the strong sense of social flux which contemporaries saw as a characteristic of English society. The particular strength of the monumental sculpture market in England seems to have been linked to the particular vigour of social movement in English landed society in the area around London. The country churches within Daniel Defoe’s famous hundred mile ride from London - those parishes of Kent, Surrey, Essex, Buckinghamshire and Northamptonshire where Defoe talks of the dramatic interchange of families of old and new blood - abounded with newly erected monuments. By contrast the market for monuments in Yorkshire was largely limited to the patronage of a few great old families and the number of major metropolitan monuments erected in County Durham, Westmorland, Cumbria or Scotland could be counted on one hand. Similarly there were, despite the massive growth in the industry as a whole, fewer monuments commissioned for erection in Scotland in our period than there had been in the last forty years of the seventeenth Century.

The dearth of metropolitan sculpture in these regions cannot simply be explained by the fact that it was more difficult to transport monuments to obscure sites; a more likely explanation is that the competition for new estates was not as fierce in these areas. Thus the success of the London sculpture profession was connected to the broader impact of the growth of the city

---


12. Whereas there were many major monuments set up in Scotland in the late seventeenth Century (David Howarth, in F. Pearson ed., *Virtue and Vision, Sculpture in Scotland 1540-1900*, Edinburgh, 1991, pp. 27-38) only one, that of the Duchess of Gordon (Scheemakers, 1766, Elgin), was erected in the period 1720-70.
upon the stability of life in the country. Hundreds of monuments were erected to aspiring professionals many of whom bought land in the environs of London and married into, or made legal compacts with, the established land families of the locality. Newly rich families such as the Borretts of Shoreham or Cookes of Harefield used monumental sculpture to commemorate the deceased’s movement into the ranks of the landed gentry.

Many amongst the new professional rich who established their families near London were not entrepreneurs but socially aspirant provincial gentry: families such as the Kings of Ockham, a Welsh gentry family who were able, as a result of Peter King’s meteoric rise in the Whig legal establishment, to purchase prime land on the hills of Dorking with a view of the Capital. Monuments close to London also record the movement of premier aristocratic families, such as the Pagets of Warwickshire, onto small but convenient suburban estates. Cheere’s magnificent monument at Hillingdon to Henry Paget, first Earl Uxbridge (Hillingdon, d.1743), stood above a new family vault commemorating a man who established himself near to London leaving the running of the family’s ancient estates to a land agent. Mixed amongst these new families were ancient landed dynasties. Many of these, particularly those of Tory persuasion such as the Harts of Lullingstone (neighbours of the *nouveau riche* Borretts), the Earls Maynard (Little Easton, Essex) or the Ishams (Lamport, Northamptonshire), used monumental sculpture to make grand gestures of permanence and displays of heraldry. The inscriptions used upon their monuments gave the impression that these families saw their estates as islands of tradition and stability surrounded by a sea of change. In the outer-lying counties, where it was possible to own vast estates and sustain veritable family monarchies upon the land, families such as the Williams Wynn of north east Wales, the Dukes of Beaufort of Gloucestershire, and the Earls of Carlisle of north Yorkshire, glorified in bombastic images of dynastic continuity.

David Bindman has given emphasis to the role of sculptors in the stimulation of the reaction against the values which prevailed in the 1720s and 30s. He portrays Roubiliac and Cheere as representatives of the city bourgeoisie: socially aspirant individuals impatient with the role of reinforcing the ideology of the landed elite. The emphasis of many of their major works was certainly on themes of personal loss and common human predicament, rather than

---


the reinforcement of social status. This was combined with the tendency to use modern dress and sweep aside many of the stuffy conventions of a type of monumental art which was intended to reinforce the social status of both the patrons and the commemorated. The reaction against the orientation of the art form towards the expression of the prerogatives of landed power and material status was, however, sponsored not by patrons from the city bourgeoisie but men such as William Shenstone, Martin Folkes, William Drake and the twentieth Earl of Kildare, representatives of the ancient aristocracy or cultivated country gentry. As I have suggested in my analysis of the monuments to the Duke of Montagu and Earl of Kildare, such patrons were not attempting to abandon the idea of status but redefine nobility as a state of superior moral virtue and refined emotional sensibilities.

It would appear that this means of defining nobility or gentility grew to dominate monumental sculpture in the next fifty years. The emerging importance of themes of domestic moral sentiment - virtuous women dying in childbirth or resurrected into the welcoming clouds of paradise, bereaved husbands and the innocent babes of tender parents - had a greater role in the sculpture of Joseph Nollekens (1737-1823), and John Bacon (the elder) (1740-1799) than they had in that of any London sculptor of our generation. Such themes are, perhaps, even stronger in the oeuvre of John Flaxman (1755-1826) and Richard Westmacott (1775-1856) than any of their predecessors. It would seem that the preoccupation with loss, innocence and naïve religious consolation which began in the late forties had its apogee later in the century. If we look at the progress of monumental imagery from the late seventeenth century to the late eighteenth century through the most hazily focused of lenses we can observe a gradual movement towards images which stressed the affectionate bonds between the Stonian nuclear family.

However, the manifest slump in the popularity of themes of family pathos in the twenties and thirties and, to a lesser extent in the last two decades of our period, suggests that there are a number of problems with the theory that there was a steady progression toward the "affective" family. Either there was no clear increase in the currency of affective family values or the relationship between monumental imagery or funerary culture and other types of social activity is more complex than Stone and Gittings would have us believe. The general impression created by monumental sculpture in our period is of a complex series of reactions and counter-reactions. There is no clear and unambiguous movement toward the triumph of "affective individualism", nor, indeed, is there any clear sense that there was an "affective" as opposed

---

115 The importance of such themes in late eighteenth and early nineteenth century funerary sculpture is recorded by Penny, *Church monuments*, Chapter 4, ("Devotional attitudes and a feminine heaven") and, for monuments to small children, pp. 115-119 ("Marble Beds and Gothic monuments").
to a "linear" family. One suspects that in the forty years preceding and following those discussed in this thesis the perception of "the family" and its image in funerary sculpture was just as reflective of the complex interaction of a myriad of ideals and ideologies which conflicted and combined in no easily determinable order. Looked at with a more refined lens, therefore, the complex patterns of development within the design and function of monumental sculpture in the mid-eighteenth century, suggest that the clear vision of social change promoted by Stone, Gittings and Trumbach may be rather too clear to provide an accurate foundation for the history of private life in the period.
Appendix 1

MAJOR MONUMENTS ERECTED AT THE EXTINCTION OF FAMILIES IN CIRCUMSTANCES PRECIPITATED BY THE FAILURE TO PRODUCE MALE HEIRS.

The monuments are presented in three main categories:

(1) Those erected by daughters, sisters, or female heirs who represented the last of a direct line.
(2) Those erected by childless widows.
(3) Those erected by, or for, male inheritors of extinct family assets.

In brackets beside each entry is a direction to a place of further reference where information on the passage of property may be gained. Those monuments which have associated wills and genealogical information discussed in other parts of the thesis are marked with the word "text".

Category 1:

Busby, T., 1753, Rysbrack, Addington (inscription)

Clanricarde, Lady, 1733, anon, Westminster Abbey (text, appendix 2)

Clarke, B., c.1746, Rysbrack, Hardingstone (PCC 1746, 290)

Colleton, A., 1741, Scheemakers, All Hallows (text, chapter 2)

Coningsby, the Countess of, c. 1761, Rysbrack, Heydour (PCC 1761, 243)

Edwards, F., 1728, anon, Welham (inscription)

Guise, A., 1732, Thomas Carter, Strensham (inscription)

Hamilton, J., 1760, Scheemakers, Bangor, County Down (inscription)

Hastings, E., 1755, Scheemakers, Ledsham (text, chapter 2)

Kempthorne, T., 1757, Cheere, Great Hampden (inscription)
Nanny, A., 1729, anon, Llanfachreth (inscription)

Newman, S., after 1747, Cheere, Fifehead Magdelene (text, chapter 2)

Owen, R., 1744, Cheere, Candover (text, chapter 2)

Palmer, J., 1760, Rysbrack, Ecton (inscription)

Pigot, R., c. 1735, Rysbrack?, Quainton (inscription)

Prideaux, E., c.1741, Cheere, Westminster Abbey (text, chapter 2)

Pusey, J., 1753, Scheemakers, Pusey (text, chapter 4)

Reade, J., 1760, Rysbrack, Hatfield (text, chapter 2)

Rockingham, Lord, 1725, Scheemakers and Delveau, Rockingham (text, chapter 5)

Scott, C., 1762, Cheere, Winchester School (PCC 1762, 175)

Shannon, Lord, 1759, Roubiliac, Walton-on-Thames (text, chapter 2)

Smith, H., and Dacre Barret, D., Cheere?, South Weald. 1753 (inscription)

Smith, J., c. 1730, Rysbrack, Westminster Abbey (text, chapter 2)

Sommers, Lord, c.1735, Scheemakers, North Mimms (administration 1716, property to daughter)

St John, Holles, 1736, Rysbrack, Battersea (PCC 1738, 244)

Thomas, S., c.1732, Cheere, Hampton (text chapter 2)

Willoughby, T., 1753, Rysbrack, Birdsall (inscription)
Yate, J., Cheere, 1758, Arlington (PCC 1758, 206)

Category 2:

Broderipp, R., c. 1739, Scheemakers, Mapperton (text, chapter 2)

Colepeper, Lord, 1738, Rysbrack, Hollingbourne (PCC 1741, 83)

Dormer, R., Rysbrack?, 1726-31, Quainton (text, chapter 2 & 3)

Eliot, E., 1723, Rysbrack, St Germains (text, appendix 2)

Kendal, J., 1751, Rysbrack, Stratford-upon-Avon (PCC 1751, 311)

Knight, J., 1736, Rysbrack, Gosfield (text, appendix 2)

Lynn, G., 1760, Roubiliac, Southwick (text chapter 2)

Martin, M., 1765, Taylor, Nettlescombe (text, chapter 1)

Newhaven, Lord, 1732, Henry Cheere, Drayton Beauchamp (text, appendix 2)

Nicoll, G., 1733, Cheere?, Racton (text, chapter 3)

Piggot, J., 1751, Scheemakers, Gendon Underwood (text, chapter 2)

Powell, C., c. 1742, Scheemakers, Broughton Monchelsea (text, chapter 2)

Rowe, N., 1743, Rysbrack, Westminster Abbey (text, chapter 2)

Stuart, J., 1736, Carter ?, Bath Abbey (text, chapter 2)

Trafford, S., 1743, Rysbrack, Tydd St Mary (text chapter 2)
Category 3:

Adye, D. 1752, Taylor, Wooten-under-Edge, (PCC 1752, 115)

Archer, T., 1739, Cheere, Hale (text, chapter 2)

Atkyns, E., 1751, Cheere, Westminster Abbey (text, chapter 2)

Bamber, J., 1752, Roubiliac, Barking (text, conclusion)

Barlee, H., 1747, Cheere ?, Clavering (PCC 17

Bingley, Lord, 1732, Cheere?, Braham (text, chapter 2)

Booth L., 1732, Carpentièreme, Bowden (text, chapter 5)

Burlington, Lord, 1752, Roubiliac, Battersea (GEC, Peerages)

Chardin, J., 1746, Cheere, Westminster Abbey (text, chapter 1)

Chetwynd, M., Taylor, Grendon (PCC 1750, 143)

Cheyney, T., 1760, Cheere, Winchester Cathedral (inscription)

Comyns J., 1759, Cheere, Writtle (text, chapter 2)

Cooper, J., 1743, Cheere, Westham (PCC 1743, 356)

Denton, A, 1735, Cheere, Hillersden (PCC 1740, 291)

Dixwell, B, 1750, anon, Burwell (text, chapter 2)

Dobell, W., Cheere, Streat (PCC 1752, 246)
Dodson, D, 1741, Woodman, Cheshunt (will, Hertfordshire Record Office)

Duppa, B, 1738, Rysbrack, Hollingbourne (text, chapter 5)

Dutton, J., 1749, Rysbrack, Sherbourne (text, chapter 2)

Emmott, C., 1746, Taylor, Colne (PCC 1746, 45)

Fettiplace, G., 1743, Annis, Swinbrook (PCC 1743, 159)

Fielding, D., 1733, Rysbrack, Ashtead (text, chapter 6)

Fleming, J., 1756, Roubiliac, Westminster Abbey (text, chapter 2)

Foley, Lord, 1732-9, Rysbrack, Great Witley (text, chapter 2 & 3)

Foxall, Z., 1758, Annis, St Botolph’s Aldersgate (PCC 1758, 149)

Halsey, H. 1739, Rysbrack, Great Gaddesden (PCC 1739,

Hampden, J., 1754, Cheere, Great Hampden (PCC 1754, 44)

Harborough, Lord, 1732, Rysbrack, Stapleford (text, chapter 2)

Hardy, T., 1742, Cheere, Westminster Abbey (text, chapter 1)

Hargrave, W., 1756, Roubiliac, Westminster Abbey (text, chapter 2)

Harte, P., 1739, ?, Lullingstone Castle (text, chapter 4)

Hosier, C., 1751, Cheere, Wicken (PCC 1751, 12)

Hough, Bishop, 1747, Roubiliac, Worcester Cathedral (text, chapter 2)
Kent, Duke of, 1740, Rysbrack, Flitton (text, chapter 2)

Kerridge, C., 1747, Roubiliac, Ketteringham (text, chapter 2)

Kneller, G., 1730, Rysbrack, Westminster Abbey (text, chapter 2)

Lade, J., 1740, Cheere, Warbleton (PCC 1740, 337)

Lewis, T., 1747, Scheemakers, Soberton (inscription)

Lexington, Lord, 1723, Palmer, Kelham (GEC, Peerages)

Leicester, Lord, Roubiliac, Holkham (text, chapter 2)

Mansfield, T., 1741, Cheere?, West Leake (inscription)

Marlborough, Duke of, 1732, Rysbrack, Blenheim (text, chapter 2 & 3)

Marshe, J., 1753, Taylor, Womenswold (text, chapter 2)

Marshe, M., 1757, Cheere, Colchester (text, chapter 5)

Maynard, T., 1742, Stanley, Hoxne (PCC 1742, 278)

Maynard, Lord, 1747, Stanley, Easton (text, chapter 2)

Merrick, J., 1749, Cheere?, Northolt (PCC 1749, 151)

Miller, N., 1747, Cheere, Sandon (inscription)

Molloy, C., 1760, Cheere, Shadoxhurst (text, chapter 2)

Montagu, Duke and Duchess of, 1752, Roubiliac, Warkton (text, chapters 2 & 5)
Moore, A., 1734, Carter, Great Bookham (PCC 1734, 248)

Moore, W., 1746, Carter, Great Bookham (inscription)

Newton, M., 1743, Scheemakers, Heydour. (administration)

Oxendon, A., 1735-40, Rysbrack, Rockingham (text, chapter 6)

Page, F., 1732, Cheere and H. Scheemakers, Steeple Aston (text, chapter 5)

Payler, M., 1758, Cheere, Bugthorpe (text, chapter 2)

Penrice, T., 1753, Taylor, Offley (text, chapter 2)

Polhill, C., 1757, Cheere, Otford (text chapter 4)

Powlett, W., 1746, Rysbrack, West Grinstead (text, chapter 2)

Pye, R., 1734, Rysbrack, Rochester (PCC 1734, 141)

Raymond, Lord, 1756, Scheemaker, Abbots Langley (text, chapter 2)

Reeve, T., 1739, Scheemakers, Windsor (text, chapter 2)

Reresby, L., 1748, Cheere, Thryburgh (PCC 1748, 340)

Rockingham, Lord, 1725, Scheemakers, Rockingham (text, chapter 4)

Salwey, T., 1760, Taylor, Ludlow (PCC 1760, 214)

Scrope, J., 1752, Cheere, Lewknor (text, chapter 2)

Sergison, C., 1734, Adye, Cuckfield (text, chapter 5)
Shelburne, Lord., 1753, Rysbrack. High Wycombe (text, chapter 2)

Strode, G., 1751, Scheemakers. Beaminster (text, chapter 2)

Swayne, B., 1748, Cheere. Salisbury (text, chapter 2)

Thursby, C., 1733, Cox. Abingdon (inscription)

Tothill, R., 1753, Scheemakers. Urchfont (text, chapter 5)

Turner, C., 1761, Cheere, Kirleatham (PCC 1757, 260)

Tyrconnel, Lord. 1754, Cheere. Belton (GEC, Peerages)

Vernon, E., 1763, Rysbrack. Westminster Abbey (text, chapter 2)

Wager C., 1743, Scheemakers. Westminster Abbey (PCC 1743, 184)

Warren, P., 1757, Roubiliac. Westminster Abbey (text, chapter 2)

Warrington, Lord., 1732, Carpentiere. Bowden (text, chapter 5)

Warton, M., 1728, Scheemaker. Beverley (text, chapter 1)

Wentwoth, H., 174?, Cheere. Hodnet (text, chapter 2)

Widdrington, Lord., 1743, Rysbrack, Nunnington (GEC, Peerages)

Widdrington, P., 1748, Rysbrack. Nunnington (PCC 1748, 67)

Winsley, A., 1728, Rysbrack ?, Colchester (text, chapter 5)

Wither, W., 1733, Cheere?, Wooten St Lawrence (inscription)

Wyndham, Lord, 1745, Rysbrack. Salisbury (text, chapter 2)
Appendix 2

Metropolitan monuments including a figure of a mourning female erected or commissioned in the period 1720-60.

Rysbrack:

John Knight, Gosfield: erected 1736 J. Knight PCC 1734, 183.

The monument was erected in 1736 by Night’s widow who was left executrix. No male heir survived and all the property and estates devolved to the widow. There was no request for monument in John Knight’s will.

Nicholas Rowe, Westminster Abbey: erected 1743 A. Deanes/Rowe PCC 1748, 8.

The monument was commissioned by his widow c. 1739 and completed in 1743. The widow, Anne Deanes (d.1746), erected monument after death of her daughter, Charlotte (1739) who is also commemorated. No male heir survived. The widow, thus inherited the substantial properties of her daughter and husband and left bequests of 40,000l.


The monument was erected with money donated by John Smith’s eldest daughter and heir, Lady Clanricarde. It was finished by 1733, the year of her death. It is described in her will as "erected by Mr Gibbs and paid for by Mr De Gols." She, however, appears from the will to have been centrally involved, for she requested her own monument to be placed opposite that of her father. Mr Conrad De Gols was a South Sea agent of Dutch extraction who was executor to John Smith. Lady Clanricarde was sole heir of her fabulously wealthy father. There was no request for monument in John Smith’s will.


According to faculty papers (see chapter four) of the Diocese of Winchester the monument was erected in a mausoleum built by his widow in 1734. It was announced that the monument was erected in 1736. Peter King left a son and heir of inheriting age but instructed his wife should be executrix and left her very well provided for. There was no request in Peter King’s will for a monument.


The monument was erected by Marlborough’s widow between 1730 and 36. At this date both male heirs were dead. Sarah was left in control of estates and distributed the family properties in her own will.

According to the inscription the monument was erected by the widow in 1723. The property passed by administration widow appears from her own will to have had personal wealth. She was left with a male heir in minority.

Attrib. Rysbrack:

Dormer family, Quainton: 1727-31.

A faculty document, reviewed in chapter three, shows that the widow commissioned the monument in 1727. The couple’s male heir died in 1726 and, because Justice Dormer and his widow left no wills, the property was contested in court by their male relatives.

Cheere:


According to London Evening Post, (see chapter 2) Lady Newhaven commissioned the monument from Cheere in 1732. A faculty survives demonstrating that it was set up by Gertrude Tolhurst, executor of Lady Newhaven. Lord Newhaven died without male heir leaving his wife and executrix and all his property. She died handing much of the estate to her kinswoman, Gertrude Tolhurst. No monument was requested by Viscount Newhaven.

Susannah Thomas, Hampton: erected c.1732. Wills not found- inheritances explained in inscription.

The monument shows an image of Susannah Thomas grieving over that of her mother. It was erected at the behest of Susannah Thomas by her executor Thomas Archer (see chapter 2). The mother and daughter were successively heirs of the property of Sir Dalby Thomas who produced no male child.

Roger Owen, Candover. erected 1744, (see text.)

The monument was erected by Trafford Barnston in accordance with the will of Roger Owen’s widow. Barnston was the husband of Leatitia, daughter and sole heir of Roger Owen. All the massive family estates in Shropshire devolved though Leatitia as sole heir (L. Barnston/Mytton, PCC 1755, 306.)

Scheemakers.
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Sir Christopher Powell, Broughton Monchelsea: c. 1743, Christopher Powell PCC 1742, 229. Frances Powell PCC 1762, 536.

Erected by Frances Powell, the widow, c.1743. Christopher Powell died without male heir leaving his wife complete charge of the estates. There was no request from Christopher Powell for a monument.

Charles Savile, Methley: c.1743-59, PCC 1743, 133.

According to the inscription the monument was erected along with a new family vault by Althea Savile, widow. A male heir survived in minority but all property was left in the care of widow as sole executrix. There were no instructions for a monument in will of the Charles Savile.

See text for details.

Erected by widow who according to the published will of the Duke left her in especially good financial circumstances to protect her against an age which would not appreciate her feminine virtue. Instructions for monument left in the Dukes will. Widow’s legal right to all the property contested by children of the Duke born both in and out of wedlock.

Montagu Garrard Drake. Amersham, erected 1731. M.G. Drake, PCC 1728, 144.

Erected by Montagu’s widow in 1728. A male heir, William, survived but in minority. The property was left in the trust of a group of which Lady Drake was the principal member. According to her own will Lady Drake was left with considerable personal property.

Roubiliac.


The monument was commissioned by George Lynn’s widow. Lynn died without a male or female heir leaving substantial properties in the total trust of his widow. George Lynn left no instructions for a monument.


The monument was erected in 1759 by Lady Middlesex with capital bequeathed by her mother, Lady Shannon. Lord Shannon died without a male heir leaving all the family property to his widow who passed it to her daughter, Lady Middlesex. Faculty documents of Diocese of Winchester, which are reviewed in chapter four, demonstrate that Lord Middlesex was at least partially responsible for the monument.

The monument was erected by Lady Montagu with help of Martin Folkes her own executor. Lord Montagu died without a male heir leaving substantial bequests to widow including a large sum of 2000l for mourning. No monument was requested by Lord Montagu.

Robert Taylor:


The monument was designed for Mary Martin by Taylor before her death in 1763. It showed her in mourning over the busts of her relations, Thomas and John Crosse. She was a wealthy widow with no children.

Charles Adye

William Mitchell, Fowlmere: died 1745.

The monument was erected by a group which included the widow depicted. (see chapter 5) The property was managed by a group of trustees because Mitchell made no will

Anon.


The monument was erected in 1729-31 with two hundred pounds which Lord Dysart left to his widow for the purpose. The property and title passed to the his grandson due to the death of his heir. His widow was left as sole executrix to manage the minority.

Robert Jennens, Acton: erected c. 1726.

The inscription tablet recorded by Davy stated that the monument and family chapel was originally erected by his widow. A fraud was perpetrated in the passage of estates which led to a legal case so protracted as to be used as the model for Dickens Jarndice vs Jarndice. Nobody knows to this day whether the person who inherited from Lady Jennens was the legitimate male heir.
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Appendix 3:

List of monuments to long-dead British "worthies"

The first Earl of Warrington (d.1698), Carpentière, Bowden, 1732.
Promoted in the inscription as a Whig "worthy". The monument was erected by the second Earl, a anti-Walpole Whig. (text, Chapter 5)

Christopher and Downhall Thursby, Cox of Northampton. Abingdon, 1733.
Promoted in the inscription as Royalist "worthies". The monument was erected by Richard Thursby, a "country" Tory. (Romney Sedgwick, vol. II, p. 116)

Edward Seymour (d.1707), Maiden Bradley, Rysbrack. 1731.
Tory "worthy" in early Queen Anne ministries. The monument was erected by Francis and Edward Seymour, "country" Tory M.P.s. (Romney Sedgwick, vol. II, pp. 417-418)

The first Earl of Shaftsbury (d.1682), Rysbrack, Wimbourne St Giles, 1732.
Promoted and vindicated in the inscription as a Whig hero. The monument was erected by the forth Earl who was an anti-Walpole Whig. (text, Chapter 5)

Beville Granville (d.1643), anon, Landsdowne Hill, 1720.
The monument to a Royalist martyr erected at the site of his death by the George Granville, a Jacobite politician and literary figure. (DNB vol. XXII, pp. 415-416)

General Thomas Tollemache (d.1698), anon, Helmingham, 1731.
The monument, erected by Lady Dysart, has long inscription vindicating the reputation of the General. (text, Chapter 5)

Sir John Packington and family, Joseph Rose, Hampton Lovett, 1728.
A defence of the Tory and Royalist past of the family erected by John Packington. (Romney Sedgwick, vol. II, p. 321)

Admiral Monck, Scheemakers and Kent, Westminster Abbey, erected 1743.
A hero of the Restoration erected by an unknown descendant.

John Hampden (d.1643) and family, Cheere, Great Hampden, erected c.1754.
A relief image of the Parliamentary hero dying at Chalgrove Field.
The monument was erected by Robert Trevor-Hampden, a member of the Grenville faction, on inheriting the estates and lands of the Hampden family. (L. Namier and J. Brooke ed., The History of Parliament, The House of Commons 1754-1790, vol. II pp. 575-576.)
First (1628-1647) and second (1640-1699) Lords Maynard and family, Stanley, Little Easton, 1746.
Royalist heros commemorated by Charles, Lord Maynard, a "country" Tory.
(text, Chapter 2)

William Petty (1687), Lord Shelburne and family, Scheemakers, High Wycombe, 1753.
A monument centring on the late seventeenth century economist. Erected by, or on behalf of, John Fitzmaurice, a politically uncommitted gentleman.
Appendix 4:
MONUMENTS COMMISSIONED TO COMMEMORATE
THE CAREERS OF FIRST PEERS.

Period 1723-43:

First Lord Rockingham, Scheemakers, Rockingham, 1725
Heir is an old-Whig. (text, chapter 5)

First Lord Raymond, Cheere, Abbots Langley, 1733
Ministerial (text, chapter 5)

First Lord King, Rysbrack, Ockham, 1734

First Lord Bingley, Cheere ?, Bramham, 1731
Tory but converts to ministry before death. (GEC. Peerages, vol. II, pp. 177-178)

First Lord Uxbridge, Cheere, Hillingdon, 1743
Tory. Losses all places in 1716. (GEC. Peerages, vol. X, p. 286)

First Viscount Barrington, anon, Shrivenham, (lost), 1736. (text, Chapter 1)

First Lord Newhaven, Cheere, Drayton Beauchamp, 1732
Tory. (GEC. Peerages, vol. IX, pp. 539-540)

First Lord Carlisle, Castle Howard Pyramid. 173?
The patron was the commemorated’s son, an anti-Walpole Whig (text, chapter 3)

First Duke of Ancaster. Cheere, Edenham, 1728
Ministerial Whig (text, chapter 5)

First Lord Harborough Rysbrack, Stapleford, 1732
Whig/anti-Walpole (text, chapter 3)

First Lord Buckingham, Scheemakers, Westminster Abbey, 1723
Tory (text, chapter 2)
First Lord Trevor, Spanger, Bromham, 1730
Tory. (GEC. Peerages, XII, pt. 2, pp. 30-31, Voted for the administration at times and against at others)

First Lord Stanhope, Rysbrack, Westminster Abbey, 1733
Family anti-Walpole Whig. (text, chapter 3)

First Lord Warrington, Carpentière, Bowden, 1733.
The patron is the commemorated’s son who is an anti-Walpole Whig. (text, chapters 3 & 5)

First Lord Shaftsbury, Rysbrack, Wimbourne St Giles, 1733
The patron is the commemorated’s great-grandson who is an anti-Walpole Whig. (text, chapter 5)

First Lord Foley, Rysbrack, Great Witley, 1733-9.
Tory (text, chapter 3)

**Period 1743-60**

First Lord Wyndham, Rysbrack, Salisbury, 1745
(Irish Peer)

First Lord Maynard, Stanley, Little Easton, 1747
Tory (text, chapter 2)

First Lord Shelborne, Scheemakers, High Wycombe, 1753

First Lord Bolingbroke, Roubiliac, Battersea, 1753
Tory.
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