**New Sculpture Discoveries and Research**

HOLLY: Good morning everyone. Welcome to the second day of the Art UK conference. My name is Holly Trusted. I'm on the Art UK Sculpture Steering Group. I'm also Honorary Senior Research Fellow at the V&A and it's a great pleasure to be chairing this session this morning, which is on New Sculpture Discoveries and Research. Before we begin I'm going to give you a few housekeeping tips. Questions for the speakers should be left via the Q&A button at the bottom. The chat function is not enabled. Questions will be asked of the speakers at the end of each session, so in this case at the end of the three papers we're going to hear. Closed captions are available thanks to live captioning by Stagetext, and a transcript will be available after the conference on request. Participants should click on the closed caption button at the bottom of their screen to access the captions. And finally, the session is being recorded and the video will be made available on Art UK's YouTube channel in due course. So on to the business of the first part of the morning. We have a great session ahead of us and I wanted to add my thanks to Andy Ellis's from yesterday and Katey Goodwin for doing such a good job for organising this conference, which we are all enjoying.

Our first speaker is Marion Richards who intriguingly says that her first degree in south-east Asian religion belief and thought has renewed relevance for her in the context of Art UK's Sculpture project. Marion is the Art Detective Manager for Art UK and this is a wonderful facility as you probably all know, where we can find out more about the images that we can see in the database and she's been doing great work on that. So I will now hand you over to Marion and leave the screen to her. Thank you very much.

MARION: Thank you. I am just sharing my screen, can you see my shared screen? Good. Hello, I'm Marion Richards, the Art Detective Manager at Art UK, as Holly said. I'm delighted to be starting today's session, I would like to give a short introduction to art detective, before describing some of our sculpture discoveries. Art Detective was launched in 2014, with the aim of improving knowledge about art in the public collection, national collection. At the time we just had oil paintings on the website and sculpture was added to Art UK in February 2019 with the first sculpture enquires reaching Art Detective the same month. We're a subject specialist network which brings together expertise from a wide range of contributors such as dealers, curators and members of the public, to support public art collections. We also have links to other subject specialist networks which are listed here. The British art network, understanding British portraits, the maritime curator’s group, European paintings pre-1900 and the costume society. You will notice that we are not linked to a sculpture network, so please make any suggestions you might have in the Q&A session. Our discussion forum is open to everyone and the discussions are linked to topic or regional groups. The group leaders are experts in their fields, often with an art history background, or specific local or technical knowledge. Our sculpture group leader is Catherine Eustace who is a fellow of the society of antiquities and former editor of the sculpture journal. Today I will be speaking about skull secure discussions open to all and on the public part of our website, but Art Detective also sends hundreds

of updates directly to public art collections every year. These are things like small but important details such as amending a digit in a date, to new artist attributions supported by clear evidence. We typically handle 70 to 100 new enquires every week, around 30 of which are sculptures. One of the best ways to see some of these outcomes is to look at Diane Bilbe's art detective sculpture discovery, the art project funded Diane for several months last year to help us and Diane was a visiting scholar as the V&A and was responsible for writing over 700 entries for its British sculpture catalogue. So what kind of discoveries have we made through our public discussions? I would like to start with three bronzes. The identification of this eight by six bronze medallion at the Gordon Highlanders museum is a nice example of how we could help by amending an erroneous record. The collection's online record stated plaque depicting French officer Petit Georges. Art UK inherited the title Petit Georges, and the article was recorded as JL which is stamped bottom left. Dublin based curator Kieran Owens suggested Georges Petit inscribed bottom right was probably the artist's name instead and David noted it looked like the work of a Belgian sculptor by that name and queried whether it could be a Belgian rather than a French army uniform. Kieran quickly found a link on the art medal website showing that the medal was issued in honour of Albert I king of the Belgians in his uniform and Kepi, which identified the artist as Georges Petit. Petit fashioned a second medallion with the king as its subject in 1918. Petit's signature and date and the same JL Monday gram can be seen on the face. Kieran found that the JL monograms is for the foundry of Joseph Lissoir of Belgium holds several examples of medallion. Kieran was able to provide another good example. Artistic partnership between Lissoir and Petit in the form of coins made in the honour of mothers of soldiers injured in the First World War. This is a screen shot of the updated Art UK page we were able to conclude that the sculptor was Georges Petit, the initials refer to Lissoir and the sitter was confirmed as Albert I of Belgium. Both sculptor and foundry are new additions to the list of items on Art UK. A different type of bronze next, an anything known as an African group, artist unknown. Despite being listed as artist unknown, this piece was signed on the back from the version on the site the inscription looked something like A Puyt Brussels. It was suggested it could be a Belgian sculpture probably 20th century and asked for ideas. It was Andrea Coleman who found us the answer. She discovered a very similar signature on a piece displayed on the live auctioneers

Website described as Arthur Puyt Belgium early 20th century. A large, seated bronze sculpture of a blacksmith signed A Puyt resting on a naturalistic bronze base. On a Belgian antiques website Andrea found another example of this work, this crouching antique bronze panther. She was able to add that the sculptor's dates were given as 1873-1955 on several auction websites. Barbara Bryant was following this discussion found an article which looked relevant given the African context in volume 32 of L'Art modern 1912 there was a mention of piece called Katagna. She found that he trained at the academy, established himself in a municipality in the Brussels capital region of Belgium. And he worked on small sculptures memorials and graves as well as world war I memorials. He also produced medallions in collaboration with other artists. A number of examples can be seen in the collection of the former royal library of Belgium. We were able to attribute the piece give it a title and find out that the sculpture is a cast of a small figure group called foundry from Katanga cast in 1912 and purchased in that year by the royal museum for Central Africa. It's not certain whether this Aberdeen sculpture was a unique cast or one of an addition. It was obtained by Sir Robert Williams

largely responsible for discovered the copper deposits in Katanga. He bequeathed it to the collection where it was formally accessioned in 1946. It is the only item by Arthur Puyt in a UK public collection. This is a wonderfully rich account to offer the collection from having known next to nothing. I would like to focus on some work we have' done for the Royal Academy of Music next. One bronze and one marble. Before this bust came our art detective it was listed as bust of an unidentified female by an unknown artist and before that the artist was identified as an Ada Lewis. Ada Lewis appears to have been a recording error as Osmond bullet noted there was an Ada Bullet who was a generous benefactor at the Royal Academy of Music but died in 1906 it was suggested the sitter had a strong connection to the Royal Academy of Music perhaps as a pioneering composer musician or teacher. Albert Toft was suggested as the sculptor with Martin Hopkinson asking whether there was any certainty that the artist was British. A composite of images showing Tuft's Monday know gram was attached to the discussion and you can see why people would have thought it was that artist. Clara Schumann and Gertrude Steyn were discounted as possible sitters. It is clear they were suggested, there's a similarity in the faces. However it was James Trollop who provided the breakthrough we needed suggesting Elena Gerhardt. Added that she must have had a relationship with the Royal Academy. He attached composite images from the library of Congress. In the selection circa 1920 to 25 she had started sweeping her hair back into a bun. The sculpture very relevant because in 1928 Gerhard was based in Germany, she was then aged 45. There are further examples here from Osmond. Kieran Owens added helpful biographical information on Gerhard including that although she was based in Germany in 1928 she appeared in London several times that year for a series of four SCHUBERT centenary concerts. She moved to London after the Nazis came to power in 1934 and took up a teaching position at the Guildhall School of Music becoming a British citizen after the end of the war. She died at her home in Hampstead aged 77 in January 1961. Andrew shore, whose degree in music has come in very, very useful over the years, has been wonderfully helpful and me proposed Leistner. You can see the mono on the image provided by Kieran in a bust of actor Luthe Kerner. Coleman discovered a plaster cast of the bust in a museum in Leipzig. Acknowledging all the main contributors, group leader Catherine Eustace, this became an open and shut case. Sitter or subject Gerhardt, sculptor Albert Leistner and dated 1928. This was a very satisfactory conclusion. And most importantly, two figures from the diaspora suffered in the mid 20th century a diaspora which gave so much to this country regained their place in history. Thanks to the Art Detective they should not easily lose their identities again. 125 comments started about a marble bust in the same collection, of Carlo Alfredo Piatti, composer and teacher signed G Manzoni and the question was, is this by Giacomo 1909 or earlier. Could we find birth, death dates and signature.

The sculptor was confirmed of Bergamo, dates found and the bust was dated circa, this is the only work by Bergamo but we were sent photographs of another version at the Teatro Donizetti. The Royal Academy of Music's curator responded: "It's wonderful to have such a depth of information about this object in our collection. I will suggest that a concert be arranged once we're all free of this dreadful pandemic." In a happy coincidence, the year of birth coincides with the bicentenary of the Royal Academy of Music and this would be a fitting attribute for the institution as well as honouring the time and effort that has gone into this research. I would like to thank Peter Van De Vemer for gathering all the information into a biography for Art UK and an Italian heart historian Victor for his research in the archives in Italy and for sending us this photograph of the version in the Donizetti Theatre. My final object is another marble bust, a question again posed, this discussion attracted 133 comments, even more. The collection centre photograph of the inscription showing that the date had been misread, it was not 1897 but 1891. The realisation that the first initial was G, led rapidly to him identifying the sculptor, who died as widow in 1907. Course of the discussion we learnt about her background including she was married to David William Mitchell. Four months later he committed suicide by shooting himself near Paris. Five years after this tragedy, Gertrude remarried, a successful property developer who became one of the directors of the Westminster land company formed to build Westminster Cathedral. Although they had a home in south as cot they appear to spent much of their time in later years in the Riveira, with a property in Nice. Social reports and French newspapers of the period suggest they were part of a wealthy circle who entertained lavishly. Kieran discovered that the 23 February 1891 edition of the New York her articulated printed in Paris singled Gertrude out for special mention amongst sculptors shown at the ladies salary on. There's a crowned monogram on the circle, the principal letter being N and the work had the received title of the count he is suggesting the sitter may be of aristocratic connection. The misalignment were pointed out by both Katherine and Osmond. You can read more about this in a new discussion that we have about this sculpture which was just started this week, but, in brief, during cleaning, the bust had been replaced in the wrong position. And so it may in fact be original to the piece itself.

The outcome was very sag, we closed the discussion with Walsh identified as Gertrude Walsh, the title was updated from female bust to the original French title, and read date was amended from 1897 to 1891. Peter produced a biographical summary from the discussion, the only such account of this artist known to date. When to close a discussion is a really difficult discussion, there's always more to be said and found. Given the constraints caused by the pandemic we felt we had got as far as we could. Before I closed it I mentioned our search for a line version of the category to Linda White Housely, researcher in the University of Oxford where she has taught since 1995. She promised to keep an eye out for it and the discussion was closed. Soon afterwards, Linda's friend and colleague director of the French sculpture census kindly sent a photograph of a reproduction of the relevant page from the 1891 catalogue from Pierre Sanchez's dictionary of the union of woman painters and sculptors. A conference like this, is a huge pool of knowledge and interest, so please do read our new discussion and help to use her if you can. As Mantice, our group leader says Art Detective comes with a warning, it's pretty addictive. Thank you.

HOLLY: Thank you so much, Marion. That was a great start to today's conference, the second day of the conference. Your paper also very nicely leads into Malcolm's paper because you ended up mentioning the socle. There are many questions I'm sure that we want to ask you and as you say, it's an addictive process this getting engaged with sculpture. So thank you, again, we'll come back when we have a the questions. So, now, it's a great pleasure to introduce our next speaker, Malcolm Baker, distinguished Professor in California. Malcolm is known so many of us and especially for his knowledge and expertise in 18th century British sculpture but his range is more wide than that. He is a marvelous teacher, he has had a lot of teaching experience. So his talk this morning is on busts, socles and settings, Roubiliac's bust for Lord Ligonier.

MALCOLM: Thanks very much, Holly. Thank you. Prominent among the works of sculpture that are now happily will to be seen on Art UK's website, a very many portrait busts and Marion has already shown us some of these. So the portrait bust and sculptural portrait that, unlike a statue, shows only the head and shoulders the sitter represented. Bust like that are Virginia Woolf here. Very often busts don't just consist of the head and shoulders but also of the bases and socles that represent them. One very welcome aspect of the images reproduced by Art UK is the inclusion of those features so often missing from museum categories and websites. The socles and the backs. So, here's one such example from Noel, from the Art UK website, of the duchess of Dorset by Thomas Kirk. And here's a bust of Francoise Viette in the Bose Museum showing the back. So difficult to find, if you are looking for these images.

What do I mean by a socle? These term as their use can be rather fluid. The common generic term is base. But following Nicholas Penny's analysis I'm drawing a destination between different types of base -- different types of pedestal, plinth and socle. So, on the far left, you'll see an image not on the Art UK website which stands on a tall pedestal. Then to the right the bottom you have a plinth, that's Nolekin's monument to Elizabeth Howard, a horizontal plinth. And then, on the far right, the one we've just seen, Kirk's duchess of Dorset on the socle and on the right, from Colchester museum, which has a bust on a socle placed on a pedestal. So pedestals, plinths and socles are significant because of the ways in which they moderate our viewing of a sculpture. Such bases form a significant component of freestanding sculptures and play an important role in what we might term the staging of sculpture, to use a phrase. This has been increasingly recognised by those who write about the history of sculpture. Just as historians and paintings started looking some time ago more closely at the frames around pictures. Though often overlooked now, bases of various sorts have engaged the attention of major artists. Most famously, there is Michael Anglo's plinth for the antique equestrian statue on the hill. And this was a much imitated type so you see it imitated on the bottom right on the Howard monument but, then, in small scale as the base of a small bronze. Pedestals and plinths below statues were significant not least because they provided a field for the descriptive and complementary text as we see on the Nolekin's monument but also on a more contentious statue, Christopher Codderington at All Souls, Oxford. The inscription, which is a quotation from ad son's Latin poems, details his achievements as a soldier and as a scholar as well as at the behest of his library. Today we're especially conscious of what such texts omit. Especially in the case of figures involved in the slave trade, not least Codderington, I was thinking of this yet last night when I was listening to Mary Beard and Jeremy Dellar. What about busts and their souls? We can follow their development of certain distinctive types from the 17th century onward. So on the left, you'll see an engraving of a lost bust of Charles I either by Benini or someone else with a distinctive socle with a bowed front and on the right, the bust of the painter Quapelle where the socle is not only physically integral with the bust itself, but, also, conceived as part of one composition. The sculptor is negotiating with the convention of the truncation, that's the cutting off, of the upper part of the figure. Cutting off of the lower part of the figure. And the viewer's expectations about this convention. More often, however, bust and socle were separately carved. Sculptors and their workshops often used distinctive types so that in 18th century Britain there are some clear patterns we can recognise. On the left a bust by someone with a high waisted circular socle and, on the right, a bust by Joseph Willton with a characteristic low oval socle with coat of arms. Sometimes they were used to connect busts belonging together as a group in a specific setting. Here are two busts by different sculptor with similar arrangements of coats of arms on the socle. Lord Cobhan and the Earl of West Midlands. Within the temporary of friendship attestor.

>> Sometimes matching socles were used to collect busts belonging together as a group in a specific setting. Here are two busts by different sculptors with similar arrangements of coats of arms on the socle, lord Cobham and these were designed to stand on regularly placed matching pedestals within the temple of Friendship at Stowe. Various distinctive types of socle were also used by Louis-Francois Roubiliac, the main rival. Most common was the square socle, square waisted socle as in these example of John Wray at Trinity College Cambridge and sometimes these had added medallions and here you have the bust of Andrew Fantaine of Wilton which reproduced the reverse of a slightly earlier medal. Sometimes all this becomes more nuanced - here is - sorry there is a second type used by Roubiliac later, with Charles I and Princess Amelia. Sometimes this becomes more nuanced, so on the left you have Chesterfield, on this familiar square waisted plinth but with an elaborate shaped cartouche with this coat of arms and then there is used on Roubiliac's bust of Hogarth where instead of a coat of arms, you have a painter's pallet used as a false coat of arms. Here we see an individual sculptor using a range of different types of socle, sculptors used socles that were mainly specific to their own workshops but sometimes as in these examples by Roubiliac, model modified according to the individual sitter. All this forms a background to an unusually specific and complicated case involving questions about a bust setting. Concerned here with the bust of George II and Lord Ligonier, in the royal collection. These are among Roubiliac's finest and most ambitious portrait busts, which are still rather baroque swagger is combined with subtly nuanced textures and highly finished carved surfaces. Though not much taller than most of Roubiliac's busts, they have an unusual grandeur, not least through their Drapery effects and their breadth. Probably executed about 1760 and perhaps connected with Lord Ligonier's elevation to the peerage. These were almost certainly commissioned by Lord Ligonier himself. Payment of £153, an unusually large sum for two busts was recorded in the general's regimental accounts on the 12th February 1763. Actually after Roubiliac's death, Lord Ligonier was a late payer obviously. Then in 1817, the two busts were presented to George V by Lord Ligonier's descender Thomas Lloyd. By the late 1820 both busts were displayed at Windsor where all the busts were placed on new circular socles, so as to form a harmonised display. But these 19th Century circular socles were different from any type used by Roubiliac. A plaster version of the Lord Ligonier bust dawn by Nollekens in 1962, the drawing on the left and this comes from the Art UK's website, the plaster version was apparently set on a familiar square socle with a medallion at the front. Like the type used earlier for the bust of Andrew Fantaine. Roubiliac was employing a standard element in his workshop repertoire of designs. But this familiar type was not the form that was in fact used for the marbles of Lord Ligonier on the king. The original socles had in fact been much grander has can be glimpsed in the staircase landing at Carlton house. You can see on the far left and far-right much the socles visible here were unusually

large and sat awkwardly on the supporting pedestals. Although the socle for Lord Ligonier's own bust does not survive, that for George I. Has happily been brought to light in the course of Jonathan Marsden's work on his catalogue of sculpturing in the royal collection. So here on the right is the bust of George I. On its original socle and you can see the contrast with the bust on its 19th century socle demonstrates clearly how the original socle played a role in how the bust was viewed. The socle is of an exceptional scale with a breadth matching and echoing that of the bust itself but its form is puzzling and atypical. The size certainly explains the large size of the busts but what are to make of the design. One prominent feature is the massive spreading veloutés match the ones on the Shannon monument, but other details diverge from Roubiliac's familiar formats. The arms for example are contained within a linear frame, quite at odds with the asymmetrical cartouche the sculptor usually employed. Why? The answer I think lies in the setting. Exceptionally we can identify with some confidence the interior in which these two busts were placed. While Lord Ligonier's country house has been auctioned, his town house in Mayfair survives with its interiors intact. At the rear was an impressive gallery described as perhaps the most beautiful early Georgian roof surviving in London. This was probably designed between 1728 and 1730 by Sir Edward Lovett Pearce, best known for the Irish Houses of Parliament in Dublin. At each end they are just the right size to accommodate the unique busts and their unique socles rather than the knishes being designed with the bust in mind it was the other way round. You have the bust and the gallery. So the busts were executed about 1760 to fit within the interior design some 30 years earlier. This may have prompted the effect of grandeur that makes these two busts exceptional. Did Lord Ligonier ask for busts with the panache and presence appropriate to this grand room? More than that, however, Roubiliac was evidently taking account not only of the scale of the knishes but also of the other decorative features of the interior. Here I suggest lies the explanation for that unusually shaped cartouche. It may be atypical for Roubiliac but corresponds exactly with the shape employed in the centre of the room's chimney piece, perhaps the veloutés that we see on the chimney piece. Be that as it may, what we can say is that as far as the socles are concerned, this is a highly unusual case of a sculptor taking account of the intended setting and responding to an imitating earlier format. Only rarely can we connect busts with specific settings. Even more rarely do we find socles being given such a role or such prominence. Exceptional though this case may be, it alerts us to the significance of socles and the ways in which they might shape our viewing of a bust. Socles matter and perhaps we should pay more attention to them as the Art UK Sculpture programme has indeed done. Thank you.

HOLLY: Thank you so much Malcolm, that was fascinating, and very much related to Art UK but also looking further afield and again we have questions which we are saving up for the end of the whole session. And so we will return to that. Thank you again, great paper. So our final speaker is Rebecca Wade. Rebecca is an art historian and curator. She completed her PhD at the University of Leeds in 2012 and her research interests sit between 19th Century museum and exhibitionary cultures, art and design education and the production, circulation and display of sculpture and its reproduction. Her latest book I can warmly recommend, was published in 2019. Her talk this morning is about wonderful sculpture at Leeds, which I must say has always intrigued me personally. It's The Veiled Venus by Kuhne Beveridge and Ella Von Wrede, apologies if I mispronounced those names. But I'm sure we're going to find out more about the people and the sculpture from Rebecca. Over to you.

REBECCA: Thank you so much. Thank you very much to Art UK and for organising this conference, it's a privilege to speak this morning. This short paper considers one object and three subjects. Two makers and one model. It's been motivated by my work with the Leeds sculpture collection and more specifically a body of research on the development of the collection from its inception in 1888 to the turn of the century. The sculpture in question, The Veiled Venus by Kuhne Beveridge and Ella Von Wrede, occupies the very end of this chronology, having completed in 1900 and presented to the collection in 1901. The striking sculpture has been almost continuously displayed at Leeds Art Gallery for as long as I can remember. For a provocative object that has had such a long public life by a family who were hardly ever out of the newspapers in their own lifetime, it's generated surprisingly little scholarship. For this reason I would like to take the opportunity this morning to begin to sketch a contest for both the object and the people who brought it into being. The family in question are a mother, daughter and sister. The mother and daughter were recorded as the sculptors and the sister as the sitter. Ella Von Wrede born to a German mother. A dramatist, musician and dressmaker at various times, the extent of her work on The Veiled Venus is difficult to determine as it was her daughter who trained and practised as a sculptor. During Beveridge's early career in the decade before The Veiled Venus, the press accused her mother of stage managing her daughter's career. In 1892 the Wave reported that "Beveridge is quite incapable of taking the steps that secured the degree of notoriety she's already achieved, the push and energy is all supplied by her mother." This narrative persisted and ten years later a reporter for a town talk wrote of Ella Von Wrede "she understands the art of advertisement so thoroughly that even Sarah Bernhard's press agent might learn from her."

Kuhne Beveridge was born at the executive mansion in Illinois where her paternal grandfather was state governor at the time. (Loss of sound) Beveridge had an itinerant childhood and studied in New York and Paris. During her time between 1825 and 1829 she attended a polytechnical college where she studied with a Bavarian sculptor. There's possible there's some relationship between the sculptor, and The Veiled Venus or maybe all they share is a superficial stylistic similarity and title. Beveridge first attracted public attention in 1891 at the age of around 17 when she was noted as a society beauty with aspiration of a stage career. The weekly periodical the Wave published a brief account of her life in San Francisco. It was this year Beveridge began to exhibit sculpture in public showing a bust of a politician Adolph Sutro and an ideal head at the 1891 San Francisco mechanics industrial. Emergence as a society figure in her own right seemed to have granted her early access to public figures. Favourable portraits with whom have long formed a means of advancing a career in sculpture. Despite being awarded a diploma, Beveridge's public profile immediately resulted in a backlash. The Wave magazine's coverage became increasingly hostile. They reported "Adolph Sutro was one of victim of her talent for sculpture and the result of her efforts was so excellent Rupert Schmitt her teacher forgot to be silent in his share of the achievement." Even if it were true it seems churlish to admonish a teenager for still being under the tutelage of an artist. She was moved to New York where she was at work a life-sized model of a male athlete titled Sprinter. Intended to be cast in bronze for the Chicago's world fare, the magazine of art recorded (loss of sound) to the young artists lack of experience never reached the jury. It is doubtful it would ever have passed since on the one hand it belonged with a California exhibit and on the other it had technical defects which

the jury would have found insuperable. It was an extraordinary achievement for a young girl who “shows a too precocious facility for her age." In the same year 1893 Beveridge was profiled by the author Gertrude Atherton who had herself sat for a portrait bust by the sculptor. She described her as the most talked of woman sculptor of the day and praised this latest work Sprinter as having been in her words “modelled with anatomical exactness, instinct with life at the very clay seems to longer a fit synonym for death.... its power and the gravity which following some eccentric deflection has found its way not dreamy brain and delicate fingers of a girl”. The accompanying illustration here does not appear to fulfil a promise of these words though they noted the difficult circumstances of its execution. “In a cold room with no north light, no turning table, no-one even to help her mix the clay, when it was finished she went to bed dangerously ill, and the figure was half ruined in the casting". Later that year, aged 19, she married for the first of three times. Her new husband was the actor Charles Coghlan then aged 52. The marriage was over within a year after Coghlan returned to the woman he had assumed to be his wife. The effect of the scandal which had been the subject of much feverish speculation over what some presented to have been a case of bigamy, was the discovery Beveridge’s theatrical ambitions in favour of a recommitment to sculpture. In the immediate aftermath she made two as yet untraced sculptures titled The Devil's Victim and the Devil's Wife which seems to demand biographical interpretation. Beveridge remained a regular fixture in the north American press. With reports over her youth, or critical of her grasping for attention through disastrous marriage and expensive dresses. One article criticised her pursuit of publicity in the following terms. "She aims at the striking in the decadent or any other realm where she can obtain notice. She seems to know the tree where the wealthy art lovers grow and never has any trouble in shaking one down whenever she wants to sell a statue." More cutting was the assertion that "Kuhne Beveridge would have made a good sculptor if she had not been so enamoured with the stage".

She succeeded in doing one thing, keeping in the public eye. So like Sarah Bernhardt before her, Beveridge also modelled a bust when she was just 17. Her association with the stage presence in the press and status as a woman were used to construct a public persona cast her practice between affectation and unnatural endowment of otherwise masculine ingenious. According to an emergent in passport application in - loss of sound - in England and France. One source recorded that it was Sarah Bernhardt who offered to take her to Paris in preparation for a stage career. Beveridge was in Paris in 1896 at the time of the summer exhibition in London at which she presented two terracotta busts. Most accounts mentioned she studied drama during this time. A collection of letters from Beveridge which show their correspondence began in 1897 and lasted around a decade.

Beveridge, The Wave Magazine's coverage became increasingly hostile. They reported, I quote:

"Someone was a victim of her talent for sculpture and the result of her efforts so excellent, her teacher forgot to be silent in regard to his share of the achievement." While Schmida's role is difficult to substantiate it's churlish to admonish a teenager for being the taught religion. The following year Beveridge moved to a studio in New York working on a portrait entitled Sprinter. Intended to be cast in bronze for the fayre in 1983.

"Oh to the young artists lack of experience in she never reached the jury for admission for it was to being cast by a cheap but clumsy workman. It's doubtful if it would have ever passed since off the one hand it was formed by a California exhibits and on the other it had technical defects which the jury would have found insuperable but the statue was an achievement for a young girl who ..."

In the same year, 1893 Beveridge was also profiled by the author Gertrude. She described her as the most talked of women sculptor of the day and praised this latest work Sprinter as having been modeled with anatomical exactness, so instinct with life that the clay seems not a fit synonym for death but ... power and the gravity which following some eccentric deflection has found its way into the dreamy brain and delicate fingers of a girl. The accompanying illustration you can see here doesn't appear to fulfill the promise of these words although think the author noted the difficult circumstances of its execution. In a cold room with no north light, no turning table, no one even to help her mix the clay. When it was finished she went to bed dangerously eluate figure was half ruined in the casting."

Later that can year, aged 19, she married for the first of three times. Her new husband was an actor Charles Coughlan. The marriage was over after a year after he returned to the woman many assumed to be his wife many the effect of this scandal, was to discourage Beveridge's -- in the immediate aftermath she made two sculptures entitled the Devils Victim and the Devil's Wire. Regular fixture in the north American press. Youth, beauty, breeding, artistic ability and European training. Or on the other hand critical of her grasping for attention through disasterous managers and expensive dresses. One article criticised her pursuit of publicity and patronage in the following terms:

"She aim as at the striking and the deck dent or any other realm where she can achieve notice. And she never has any trouble in shaking one down whenever she wants to sell a statue."

More cutting still was the assertion that, "She would have made a good sculptor if she had not been so enamored of the stage. Her idea was to become an actress. She never studied conscientiously the details of either art."

She decided in doing one thing, keeping in the public eye.

Like Sarah Bernhard before her, her association with the stage, presence in the press and status as a woman were used to construct a public persona that cast her sculptural practice between an affect an unnatural of other masculine genius.

According to an emergency passport application in 19 ... the decade between 1896 and 1906 in England and France one source recorded it was Sarah Bernhard who offered to take her to par in preparation for stage career. She was there at which she presented two terracotta busts. Most accounts mentioned she studied under Rodin during this time. A collection of letters from Beveridge to Rodin are held in the museum which show their correspondence began in 1897 and lasted around a decade. Aside from advice about securing institutional support and opportunities to exhibit, it's very difficult to substantiate the extent of any formal training she received from Rodin. Neither is it clear where and when Beveridge began working on The Veiled Venus. Briefly she returned on the occasion of her short lived second marriage. She spent the second half of 1889 in London, dominated by sculptors of and for figures embedded in the colonialisation of ...

Reported she had made a great deal of money from these millionaire magazine nominates and built a strong reputation in the country before the Boer War. This collection consolidated through her third marriage, with him she was expected to retire to South Africa but returning to Parises The Veiled Venus had been selected for displays are the part of the United States exhibition. The work did not receive one of the main prizes but was awarded an honourable mention, a relatively small, horizonal bronze in a forest of vertiginous marble. The aim of the United States section had been to demonstrate a firm distinction between their mode of artistic and the French although they were not thought to have succeeded in moving away from European precedents.

Indeed a French source took great pride in noting that The Veiled Venus was by an American sculptor and presented in the United States, by the leading foundry responsible for the production of many of Rodin's works in bronze. It's possible her use of this foundry was a tangible result from the correspondence between Beveridge and Rodin.

The sculpture attracted some notice in London including the following piece in Illustrated Sporting and Dramatic News and you will not be able to read the text underneath the portrait so I'll read it here. It says the artistic abilities of Miss Beveridge, one of the best known American lady sculptors are widely recognised in Paris and London. Although she is quite young she has done many exhibited at the royal academy and other continental art centres. Perhaps her most popular success was the exhibit in the Paris exposition last year subtitled The Veiled Venus. This very beautiful life size figure was done in collaboration with her mother. And brought great credit to both of these talented ladies. The work was purchased by a Yorkshire gentleman and will be presented by him to the Leeds museum."

The term collaboration is not worthy here. It emerges more than once in contemporary commentaries although the nature of the collaboration between mother and daughter was never articulated. While the mother appears to have taken an active career in both her daughters, The Veiled Venus seemings to have been the only work of sculpture to which her name was attached. An ungenerous way the relationship was interpreted suggested it was a strategy to extend the profile after whole family, by associating with Beveridge's reputation as a sculptor. A Yorkshire gentleman did present The Veiled Venus to Leeds Art Gallery anonymously in 1901. Although the published records preserve the anonymity of the donor the original accession registers shows it was given by Henry, then the head of John Smith's Brewery in nearby Tadcastoe. This was the only work listed in the first two catalogues of the permanent collection that did not reveal the identity of the benefit factor, described in an obituary notice as one of the commercial men in Yorkshire tempting to speculate he may have been tempted to maintain anonymity through the potential for lured interpretations of the sculpture. By contrast the second and third generation industrialists that formed his peer group appeared to have been only too keen to have their donations made part of the public record. The model for The Veiled Venus was Kühne Beveridge's younger sister. Known as the American Venus. The sisters returned to this when it was planned that Kühne Beveridge was planning ... likely work announced consign with the opening of the play, the American Venus Up-to-date where Ray played a role of a wife and model. Variety published the following review: quite a crowd gathered, everyone thought they would be pulled off a disrobe scene and just between us that's what brought the crowd. But nothing came off, not even the drapery from Miss Beveridge. Ray wouldn't uncover. It's tough on respectable married men, catching a glimpse of venus. If you want a real. Between us it doesn't matter whether you are a Venus or not."

This shocking assessment of the production based on the absence of nudity and revealing comments on what exactly constitutes a nude body in public space. At one time Ray Beveridge stipulated in her contracts that she would not appear to stage with more than half of her body uncovered yet The Veiled Venus fronts her almost entirely so albeit with a greater degree of ... it is both in is and not her body. Several quiet years followed The Veiled Venus and Beveridge's third and final marriage but she returned to public attention in 1910 with an exhibition of new work. Alongside a series of allegorical busts and figures Beveridge presented a work that the New York Times described as the most daring work her chisel has ever attempted at absolutely limit in artistic boldness. Her life size sculpture the vampire caused a sensation particularly in the North American press. The sculpture made later in her career is important for us to consider because it provided an opportunity for Beveridge to write and speak about her own work. Her own words rarely emerge in the public discourse. The thoughts about gender and sexuality, although they may have involved in the decades since they made The Veiled Venus perhaps provide a framework for thinking about her earlier work. In the catalogue to the exhibition Beveridge wrote of the Vampiric relationship between men and women showing that man takes all, always, and woman gives everything. An illustration of gender politics may have been the most literal interpretation but Beveridge was also keen to emphasize the vampirism of the age, alongside the ideas that humans were capable of intellectual, emotional and moral vampirism, too. It went on to be displayed in Munich but the American art news published the following deannouncement. "We should hardly think this possible for as no newspaper would dare under our lawyers publish the reproduction of the photograph. It is hardly likely that the police not to speak of Anthony, frankly speaking it is not an artwork but an indecent production". Anthony was founder of the New York society for the suppression of vice and he exerted a powerful and censorious over public life. As with the vast majority of her work the vampire remains untraced. Beveridge showed what appears to have been a final tranche of sculpture to an art critic from the Washington Post at her Munich studio in 1916. She reflected on the opposition equally applied to The Veiled Venus. She wrote:

"I endeavour to show that sexuality is the cause of all action and of all the wonders of nature and in life. I do not need to shock or offence by the words sexuality. I do not thereby need sin or stupidity both of which invariably bring regret. What I do mean is the wonderful mystery of the devine unrest of nature. I should like to tear the veil of hypocrasy away." And changed to a man in the yoke, entitled marriage about to be murdered in the mystic hands and crushed by the weight of motherhood in maternity. I hope you have a sense of how relevant and interesting her work remains and that such a prolific artist recognised in her own lifetime appears to have been largely lost to art history. Beveridge died after stroke 1944 while living with her sister Ray in the Spa town in German, now part of Poland. The sisters activity during the two waters were beyond the scope of this paper, the politics and fascist bleaches likely to have contributed to the absence of scholarship and difficulty locating exant works. Further research may yet uncover, only work by Beveridge in a public collection certainly in the UK.

So to conclude briefly, it's surprising that the weight of publicity in north America appears not to have translated into any particular notice of the arrival of The Veiled Venus in Leeds in 1901. Railly Smith's anonymity as the donor was preserved and the received second largest bronze. Seemingly with little comment. What appears to many today as a troubling subversion of an image more readily associated with concealment and modesty, The Veiled Venus is not so different in the sense that the both sculptors the cover of mythological figure to present works that could occupy the territory of the just convincingly enough to assuage concerns over the nude female form. If we're to follow the argument that Beveridge generate publicity, we have only to see that the extent of her self promotion was as nothing compared to her tutor.(10.30)

Rodin chose the Paris exhibition for its work elevating the output of pun man as equal to the status of the nation state. Neither was it unusual for a sculptor to bolster their reputation through busts of contemporary figures. Thank you very much.

HOLLY. Thank you so much, that was great. Very suitable for the week of international Women's Day as well. Looking at a really fascinating woman artist. I wonder if all three speakers could return, and we can look at the many questions that have come in. I had some questions, but I think in fact we've got a lot of questions from the audience which I want to just ask before we have the luxury of Chair's questions. There is a question for Marion from Layla Bloom. I don't know if you have answered it already Marion. Layla asks if there was more interest as far as you were concerned in the detective work for sculpture than paintings? Is that possible to answer? It's one of those open questions?

MARION: I did actually answer direct to Layla, but I will just say sculpture is a new area for me. I came to Art UK to look after paintings discussions, so I would say it's been hugely educational for me. I try to add a really wide range of topics to art detective rather than focussing on either painting or sculpture. So we just have a good mix really.

HOLLY: A couple of questions for Malcolm. Again it may have been in chat, a comment saying that in his training, or her training at City & Guilds socles work was considered very, settled into very much part of the training so what you say absolutely corresponds with what is taught today.

MALCOLM: It may be curators have lagged behind. Artists knew it all the time.

HOLLY: There's an anonymous comment asking you what the difference is between a pedestal and a plinth.

MALCOLM: Here, for years, I have been using these terms rather promiscuously and vaguely. But what I found very helpful was a great analysis by Nicholas Penny in the collecting sculpture in early modern Europe and it's a very overview of all these different terms and the development of different bases of various sorts. So I followed his terminology, or I'm going to do so from now onwards. So the pedestal has more of a vertical emphasis and a plinth is more horizontal. Then a socle is something small that relates to something larger above. So as in the case of a bust. I think there's still a fair amount of slippage, but that seems to be really helpful definitions.

HOLLY: Then I think this is primarily for you Malcolm, Kerry Thomas asks to what extent can class sizing forms of the elevating socle be related to contemporary neoclassical architecture and its manifestations of class and power?

MALCOLM: Yes, I am sure that is so, not least because we use the socle to, or the pedestal or the plinth, to put on an inscription or a coat of arms to denote status. In the particular case I was talking about, I think if the bust had been done for a setting say of around 1760, the forms might have been more strictly neoclassical. Here I think what Roubiliac is doing is reverting to an earlier less strictly neoclassical more Palladian baroque language, so of course the forms are basically classical but there's a richness and monumentality and almost excess that I think is the sculptor responding to this earlier setting.

HOLLY: I should have said the question goes to you Rebecca, and says does the low plinth of the Venus, that's a counter point to the sort of messages that the socles are being given, did you want to comment on the low plinth you've got for the Venus.

REBECCA: Sure, it is frustrating not being able to find an image of the veiled Venus as it was displayed in Paris. The plinth on which it has been displayed at Leeds for as long as I know has been fairly low and quite plain. And that has resulted in quite a lot of interaction with the public. I was tasked with helping to clean the bronze in 2017 just ahead of Leeds art gallery reopening after a period of closure and it was fascinating to spend so much time with the object up close and personal and one thing we found was and please forgive me for the directness of this answer, we found that the public had been tremendously engaged with both the toes and the nipples of the sculpture. They had become rubbed completely free of their pattern of the bronze and we would often find people sitting on the sculpture and having their pictures taken. So I think it definitely did invite interaction and participation in ways that we didn't necessarily enjoy.    
HOLLY: It reminds me, years and years ago there were two bronze, and their noses were always getting rubbed beyond the staircase. People can't resist. Pauline Rose had a question, which is for you Rebecca. She says given that both were society figures how do you think the press in the US was so hostile to Kuhne, whereas in the UK it was largely admiring, does that tell us something about the popular press at the time in each country?    
REBECCA: It's a really interesting question. I think there are lots of different factors. The early press whilst she was still in her teens tended to be relatively positive tended to position her as a precocious talent and unusual talent. But somewhere between aspiration for a career on the stage, the public nature of her mother and sister and the whole family having quite an unusual trajectory in society having effectively fallen from grace when her mother divorced her first husband and remarried, they were just a problematic family in some ways. Very difficult to pin down and once Kuhne started to produce sculptures that were openly critical of the gender balance between men and women, started to express sexuality, eroticism, they became quite difficult for the north American press to tolerate I think, specifically I mention the Anthony come stock in New York and very censorious atmosphere around the turn of the century. She just wasn't making polite objects is one of the answers and as she became more engaged in her German side and start today affiliate herself more with Europe and especially with Germany, particularly during the First World War, I think quite understandably the north American press became intensely suspicious of her allegiance.

HOLLY: I should have said, I am trying to keep up with all the questions coming in, that the question, somebody called Laurie has said pedestals and socles are elevate today protect the work, so war memorials, so that's another comment Kerry has said that they are reminded of Merdardo, and that's simply a comment. I wondered if, I don't know do any of you have questions for each other? Because obviously your papers interact very interestingly. I don't know if you wanted to ask or make any comments yourselves

MALCOLM: I had a question for Rebecca, was there an awareness of those earlier, perhaps you mentioned this, and I was busy replying to a question on the question and answer on the chat is there a relationship but your figure and those earlier veiled figures by Monty, it was a wonderful talk by the way thank you.

REBECCA: That's a really interesting question. Something I was close to bringing up, I was running out of time. Lots of things outside this, I was very much thinking of Monty. It's a perfect contrast really, the idea of a Monty upstanding marble bust that completely, the detail, the fastidiousness of the marble carving is entirely opposite to the horizontal bronze where the veil is being actively pulled into the face. It's quite a distressing image from some angles. So that contrast between concealment, modesty and something that some people have interpreted almost as a sado-masochistic gesture, but it could be, I would really like to explore that more and I'm not sure I can give awe good answer.

MALCOLM: It was just an idea that came up. HOLLY: Same thing occurred to me, I wonder if this is far less interesting really, is it also a way of expressing her virtuoso abilities, doing a veiled figure, it's quite an interesting play and quite a thing I would imagine to do. There maybe I am unable to do this, I'm clever enough to do this. The other thing that struck me about Beveridge was whether it was just the nature of the photographs, reminded me of silent movies, the sort of melodrama and the fact she did want to be an actress, there was something very theatrical and dramatic about her work. Which seems to be in tune with the times in many ways. We have headed towards the end of the session. So I would like to thank you all once again. You have really made us all think much more clearly about all sorts of aspects of sculpture and very much illustrating the achievements of Art UK and especially Marion, I was so interested by the discoveries you and your team have made and no doubt will continue making. Thank you again and I think we now close down and if I remember rightly, we return for the next session at 11.00. People can sign on again for the second session of today. Thank you again.  