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In early 1913 sculptress Kathleen Bruce (1878–1947) set out on an impressive voyage to meet her husband, polar explorer Robert Falcon Scott (1968–1912) in New Zealand on his and his crew’s return from their third expedition to the South Pole. After she had sold off some sculptures from her stock in order to finance the undertaking, she started on the nearly two-month trip by train and ship, from England via North America to New Zealand. She wrote her husband countless letters about her adventures on the way. On February 12, 1913, however, the ship that was to pick up the expedition team in Antarctica brought the tragic news that all team members had died in March 1912 already, in a snow storm after reaching the South Pole, as described in Scott’s diary. This message reached the sculptress more than a week later by telegram, between Tahiti and Rarotonga on a boat to Wellington, the place of the planned festivities.1 Two years later, Kathleen Scott’s monumental bronze statue of her late husband was inaugurated in Waterloo Place in London.2

Probable her renown as the wife and later as the widow of polar explorer Scott provided Kathleen Bruce some other public commissions too. In any case, her late husband was explicitly referred to in the order for the busts of Adam Lindsay Gordon for Westminster Abbey and of King George V for the London headquarters of insurance company Hearts of Oak.3 For other women, though, such as Patience Wright (1725–1786; USA), Anne Seymour Damer (1748–1828; Britain) or Clémence-Sophie de Sermezy-Daudignac (1767–1850; France), the death of their husbands actually meant the start of their careers as sculptresses, as along with their husbands, also the opposition against their sculpting aspirations disappeared. Moreover, the sale of their own works of art was seen as a “respectable” option for middle-class women (temporarily) pressed for money, because they were, for instance, orphaned
or widowed, especially if it meant they could support their family. This was, for example, the reason for Clare Consuelo Sheridan (1885–1970) to start sculpting professionally, after her husband’s death during the First World War, one week after the birth of their third child.

Apart from the circumstances of having to work as a sculptor, circumstances that were sometimes influenced by the death of relatives, women were remarkably active in the domain of sculpture and modeling for the dead from early on. This chapter considers the effigies, in wax, bronze and stone, for funeral collections and cemeteries, and the war memorials made by women for the deceased, between the late eighteenth century and the 1920s, making use mainly of examples from the public domain, particularly in Paris, London, and Brussels.

**Lifelike but Lifeless Wax Effigies and Animals**

Wax, which had been used since antiquity, was employed early on for preservation and the lifelike reproduction of facial features via masks from life and death masks, occasionally as an intermediate step towards a sculpted portrait in more permanent materials. Women had built a specialist tradition in working in wax at least since the Middle Ages. In women’s convents they produced wax flowers and votive objects, such as madonnas, babies Jesus and cribs, saints’ figures and candles. Since the Renaissance, because of its verisimilitude, wax was also frequently used for illusionist anatomical models, used in medical teaching and research, as an alternative for the illegal dissection of dead bodies, as well as in art education. Such wax models, resembling living or just dead flesh, and often staged as living sculptures, are on the borderline between internal and external, hard and soft, alive and dead. In the eighteenth century, Anna Morandi-Manzolini (1716–1774) from Bologna excelled in it to such an extent that Pope Benedict XIV ordered an entire museum collection from her, providing her with a lifelong income.

Before the invention of photography around 1839, wax portraits were the most lifelike representations of individuals, also after death, and as three-dimensional reproductions are concerned, this remains true to this day. Female artists used to make small portrait medallions in (colored) wax, often decorated with textile, precious stones and pearls, and probably often cherished in remembrance of a deceased loved one or family member. Apart from that, several enterprising women made full-length wax effigies of historic figures and of prominent contemporaries—alive, dying, or dead (Figure 10.1), as exhibited especially during the eighteenth century in France and Britain in popular public attractions, such as Mrs. Salmon’s Royal Wax-Works, managed by Mrs. Mary Salmon (1650–1740). More specifically, the heads and hands of these “mannequins” were modeled hyper-realistically in
wax; their “bodies” were made from wood and other media, and dressed with “real”, often silk, clothes, which were probably also mostly made by women.

Most famous, up until now, are the waxworks of Marie Grosholz (1761–1850), later known as Mme. Tussaud. Starting in 1802, she toured Britain for around 30 years with her Grand European Cabinet of Figures, with celebrities of the time, “taken from life”—as Tussaud punned—and illusionistic “tableaux” of contemporary events, before permanently housing The Bazaar in London. Her original, eighteenth-century collection was based on the Salon de cire and its infamous counterpart, the Caverne de Voleurs, of her “uncle” Philippe Curtius in Paris. Together they compiled, during the French Revolution, a macabre, relic-like collection of wax heads of the guillotined victims (e.g. Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette, but also De Robespierre), making themselves eyewitnesses and their craft testimonial. Mme. Tussaud noted in her memoirs that these wax heads were made against the clock from the bleeding heads on her knees.\(^\text{10}\)

Shows like Mme. Tussaud’s, notably her “Chamber of Horrors”, frequently contain scary figures of infamous criminals, gruesome historical scenes, such as the staging of Marat in agony—just murdered and dying in his bath (Figure 10.1), or sinister details, such as the “authentic” bloodstained shirt of Henry IV. These encouraged a somewhat perverse curiosity, sensationalism, and a kind of “morbides plaisances”.\(^\text{11}\) As such, they managed to draw large crowds from all layers of society in eighteenth-century Paris and London. The sometimes grotesque wax figures could also arouse fear, and as such may be related to Sigmund Freud’s later notion of the “uncanny” (“das Unheimliche”).\(^\text{12}\) In his 1919 essay of the same name, Freud refers to the findings of Ernst Jentsch (1906), who explicitly labeled wax figures, just like sophisticated puppets and robots, as “unheimlich”.\(^\text{13}\) The fear for those is supposed to originate from the uncertainty whether an object is alive or not. Both the idea of a lifeless body (once more) coming to life (cf. Pygmalion, Lazarus), and of a supposedly living body that proves to be lifeless, could (and can) arouse great fear. Even in the eighteenth century there were already instances of visitors who assumed wax figures were alive—which incidentally was the purpose of many waxworks displays—and who were shocked when this did not prove to be so.

Women were also commissioned to sculpt at least six of the originally fourteen (ten still in existence) wax effigies in the more prestigious and enduring funeral collection of Westminster Abbey. This has a respected tradition as national mausoleum for kings and war heroes, with still the most important collection of early English funeral waxworks (1686–1806), carried in funeral processions until 1743.\(^\text{14}\) This confirms women’s expertise in this field, all the more as the author of only eight of the effigies in the Abbey is known. Catherine Andras’ (1775–1860) Lord Horatio Nelson (1805) attracted a record number of visitors to the medieval abbey.\(^\text{15}\)
That was indeed the aim of the commission, after it had been decided in 1805 to erect the tomb of the recently deceased naval hero in St. Paul’s Cathedral, the last resting place of British heroes since 1795. With a life-size and realistic wax effigy, allegedly wearing a few original pieces of clothing that Nelson had worn during the fatal naval Battle of Trafalgar, and thus making the figure authentic, Westminster Abbey hoped to share in the bounty of the flood of visitors to St. Paul’s.\textsuperscript{16}

Meanwhile in Paris, sculptor Julie Charpentier (1770–1845) represented dead animals in a lifelike way, as if still living, with little or no idealization. Taxidermy has these features in common with waxworks, together with its somewhat lugubrious character and its low esteem. Charpentier took a badly paid job as a taxidermist in the Paris Muséum National d’Histoire naturelle, famous for its large collection of mounted animals, especially birds, in order to make a living, and supplement the sculpture commissions she received.

\textbf{Portraits and Pleurants for Cemeteries and Churches}

There was no lack of commissions for funeral sculpture for women sculptors, as these usually did not come through official channels, but through family and social networks. The patrons—usually members of the family—did not necessarily look for an established name for this genre, even though almost all sculptors of renown made funeral sculptures, and quality and status were anything but unimportant. Indeed, the funeral monument was, for well-to-do citizens, not only a place of commemoration, but also a means of showing the prestige of the family to the outside world. The large nineteenth-century cemeteries are, as such, not merely necropolises but also monumental open-air sculpture collections, displaying a multitude of styles and forms. They express standing and splendor on the one hand, and modesty and sadness on the other. In order to express the sorrow of the bereaved, the choice was sometimes for serenity, sometimes for pathos.\textsuperscript{17}

In Paris and Brussels particularly, women’s funeral sculptures are quite numerous, compared with the total number of open-air sculptures made by women, and to the total number of funeral sculptures in those cities.\textsuperscript{18} It was there that, in the late eighteenth century, the authorities (resp. Napoleon I and Joseph II) prohibited any further burials within the city walls, and built new, park-like cemeteries outside the city center (at the time), evoking the Elysian fields. A Napoleonic decree in 1804 gave rise, in Paris, to cemeteries in the four points of the compass, clockwise and beginning from the north: Montmartre, Père-Lachaise, Montparnasse, and the Cimetière de Passy.
From then on, one could acquire an individual concession, whether or not in perpetuity (“concession à perpetuité”: c.a.p.), and erect funeral monuments and sculptures. Yet this was no immediate success, as only the aristocracy and clerics already had such a tradition. In Brussels, sculptures began to appear in cemeteries, especially from 1870 onwards, when local authorities took over their management from church fabric committees, and began to create new, neutral cemeteries in an atmosphere of increasing laicization. Apart from religious sculpture, a veritable cult of the dead found expression in sculpting. During the same period, the 1870s and 1880s, which also saw a considerable increase in the numbers of women sculptors, Paris saw the erection of most funeral sculptures by women.

In London, there are significantly fewer of those. If the wall memorial for Sir Coutts Trotter, signed by Hippolyte de Fauveau, Felicie’s brother, in the Church of St. Mary Hendon in Greater London, and the decoration of the funeral monument of the Charles Lindsay family (c. 1840) at the graveyard of this church, with the Christian resurrection symbol of the pelican and its young, an angel head with an “E” above it (presumably for “Edith, the beloved little daughter of the Hon. Charles and Mme. Lindsay”), and originally two gisants, may be (largely) attributed to the French-Italian sculptor Félicie de Fauveau (1801–1886), on historical and stylistic grounds, this would constitute one of the earliest funeral contributions by a woman in London.

Elsewhere in the United Kingdom, especially in churches, many splendid funeral sculptures made by women have been preserved, though, such as the touching marble monuments by Mary Thornycroft, born Francis (1809–1895), for Sarah, Baroness Bray (c. 1862) (Figure 10.2), who is holding snowdrops in her hand, while a dog is lying at her feet—a symbol of loyalty—in St. Nicholas Church, Stanford, and another for the infant John Hamilton Martin (+1850) in St. Michael and All Angels’ Church in Ledbury, Herefordshire, made together with her husband Thomas. The baby is represented as sleeping, under a thin cover, with both hands on his breast. The artist couple, parents of seven, were said to have sought here the effect of Francis Chantrey’s Sleeping Children (Monument to Ellen-Jane and Marianne Robinson) (1817) at Lichfield Cathedral. Susan Durant (1820s–1873) was the author of the wall memorial (1867) in Parish Church in Esher, to Leopold I, first King of the Belgians, with a lion next to him—symbol of strength, referring to the Leo Belgicus. Most numerous within funeral plastics by women sculptors are portraits, in marble, stone or bronze, and in the form of a bust, head or portrait medallion. In general, women sculptors made remarkably many portraits, as the naked body did not have to be studied for this genre,
the size was usually moderate, and the sitter could come to the sculptress’s studio, or was not even needed at all. If the subject had already died at the time of the commission, sculptors usually relied on wax or plaster death masks and/or photographs of the deceased, taken while still alive or on their death bed. Death masks themselves hardly ever feature on tombs, because a “living” memory is preferred. Sometimes “real” material objects of the deceased were used too, in order to obtain liveliness and likeness. For that reason, for example, Yvonne Serruys (1873–1953) asked the widow of luminist painter Emile Claus not only for photographs of her former teacher, but also for a used pair of his shoes, when working on his monument for the Citadelpark in Ghent, in 1924, shortly after his death:

With the documents that I owe you, I can and must be able to make a true and living image of the dear, disappeared Master [...]. I have forgotten but one thing, namely to ask you a pair of shoes, which is very important for the proportion of the foot. If you still have some, any pair of used shoes would be helpful to me [...].
Not all portraits in cemeteries were specifically designed for that purpose. The portrait repeatedly already existed during the lifetime of the deceased, and the bereaved then posthumously placed it on the grave. Often, portraits by women sculptors at cemeteries represent their family members, teachers, colleagues, or acquaintances. Marie-Anne Collard-Bigé (?–1871), for example, signed the portrait medallion (c. 1857) of Louis Bigé, tax inspector and probably her father, on the impressive family monument at the Montparnasse cemetery, in which she herself is buried as “painter” (“peintre”). 25 In 1893, Jeanne Itasse-Broquet (1867–1941) not only realized the bronze portrait, but also a putto with tied-on wings and sculptor’s attributes for the tomb of her father, who was also her sculpting teacher, at Père-Lachaise. The ribbon on a wreath has the dedicated inscription: “Revered father, regretted master” (“Vénéré père, regrette maître”). In contrast, Noémie Cadiot’s stone medallion for her mother is rather poor compared with the eye-catching bust which the sculptor reserved for herself on one of the wide avenues at the same cemetery. Charlotte Besnard-Dubray (1854–1931) designed an original and innovative portrait for the tomb of Georges Rodenbach at Père-Lachaise (Figure 10.3). Holding a flowering rose in his hand, the Belgian poet in bronze seems to collapse into—or raise from—his rocky stone tomb. At the 1902 Paris Salon a fragment of this work received praise:

It is only a fragment that has been presented [...] but we love this fragment for its harmonious melancholy, for the supple and almost feminine grace of the figure and of the gesture of the dying young poet, whose bare arm languishingly holds up a flower that his dull eyes can no longer contemplate. 26

Besides portraits, women sculptors also produced other subtypes within funeral sculpture. Grieving angels and putti, or mourning figures (mostly women because the most extreme registers of feelings were reserved for them) do not frequently feature in their oeuvres, but the pleurants and putti that women did design for the gravestones of their beloved ones belong to the most moving pieces of funeral sculpture. Since the eighteenth century, family ties had considerably narrowed, with the role of the nuclear family steadily growing in importance. Women who made funeral sculptures for their own child or parent, clearly made a special effort, and possibly the work was a way of managing their grief. According to legend, Clémence-Sophie de Sermézy-Daudignac, a pupil of Joseph Chinard, discovered her sculpting talent when she tried to model the features of her departed daughter’s face, although earlier work by her hand is known. 27 For the tomb of her daughter, who died in 1809 aged 19, she designed a sad young woman (La Douleur) in long garments and bare feet, supporting herself on one knee, the hands folded in prayer and the head imploringly tilted towards the grave. 28
10.3 Charlotte Besnard, *Funerary monument to Georges Rodenbach*, bronze and French stone, 1902.
Père-Lachaise Cemetery, Paris, France.
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One hundred years later, Mme. Cl. Didsbury modeled a *Douleur* for the grave of her son Robert Didsbury, who died at the age of 20 in 1910, for Montmartre cemetery²⁹ (Figure 10.4). Here, too, we see a young woman, consumed by grief, in long garments, seated this time, her right arm extended towards the grave, the head tilted sideways and backwards, the mouth slightly open. For this pose, the sculptress might have been inspired by Gianlorenzo Bernini’s *The Ecstasy of Saint Theresa* (1646–52) or his Blessed Ludovica Albertoni (1671–74). At the time of Didsbury’s sculpture, such “ecstatic” pose was explicitly used in the melodramatic film genre in order to express grief and despair. In the late nineteenth century this pose was sometimes medicalized as a clinical picture, especially after the photographic recording of an attack of hysteria in women (c. 1880), by Albert Londe at the Paris Hospital La Salpêtrière (where sculptor Julie Charpentier had died).³⁰

The kneeling angel, with eyes and hands raised towards heaven, on the funeral monument of crown prince Ferdinand d’Orléans (1810–1841), in a specially constructed funeral chapel at the precise location of his fateful accident, in Neuilly-sur-Seine, on the outskirts of Paris, is the work of his younger sister, the princess Marie-Christine d’Orléans (1813–1839) (Figure 10.5). The angel, who according to some has her own facial features, seems to commend her brother to God; yet the princess-sculptor did not design the statue with this purpose, as she herself had already died young too when the stone angel (1837), perhaps her last sculpture, was posthumously integrated, at the request of her mother, in the funeral monument (1842–43) designed by Ary Scheffer and executed by Henri de Triqueti.³¹ Then again, on the typanum of the funeral chapel of Ary Scheffer and his mother, his own daughter Cornelia (1830–1899) sculpted a somewhat clumsy but nonetheless touching crying angel on a tomb (c. 1858–60)—an almost exact translation into marble of a painting by her father—with the caption “Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted” (“Heureux ceux qui pleurent, ils seront consolés”)³² (Figure 10.6).

Marguerite Syamour’s (1857–1945) *Douleur* or Méditation (c. 1903–04), a veiled, seated female figure in a thinking pose, holding an oil lamp, on the tomb of Charles Blech (1826–1903), treasurer of the Société Théosophique, and his family, at the Montparnasse cemetery, on the other hand, is an example of a mourning tomb sculpture linked to freethought³³ (Figure 10.7). Then again, a variant version of this sculpture, exhibited in plaster and marble at the Paris Salon, with a skull and an open book in her hand—both classical symbols of vanity—is a clear example of a *memento mori*. 
10.5 Henry de Triqueti, Marie d’Orléans and Ary Scheffer, 
*Monument to Ferdinand d’Orléans* (Angel by Marie d’Orléans, 1837), marble, 1842–43. 
Chapelle Saint-Ferdinand (Notre-Dame de la Compassion), 
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10.6  Cornelia Marjolin-Scheffer, *Angel crying on a tomb*, marble, *circa* 1858.  
Ary Scheffer family chapel, Montmartre Cemetery, Paris, France.  
Photo: author
War Memorials with Mourning Women

A sculpted group that is a cross between a funeral sculpture and a war memorial, and as such atypical, is Kláth Kollwitz’s poignant stone Das Trauerende Elternpaar (Mourning parents, 1932) at the German military cemetery near Vladso, Diksmuide (Belgium), where her youngest son Peter, who died in World War I, shortly after joining the army as a volunteer in the autumn of 1914, is buried. The group does not only express the deep sorrow of the sculptress and her husband on the death of their son, but is at the same time a universal symbol of grief and suffering, and a manifest of pacifism.34

Mourning figures similar to those on gravestones appear on war memorials, even if usually more static and “respectable.” Women sculptors quite frequently made war memorials, too, especially for World War I.35 Private feelings of inconsolable grief are transcended here by the public character of the monument. Mourning and sorrow for the fallen who are remembered, are combined with hero worship, a certain triumphalism and patriotism; this double symbolism is characteristic for monuments erected after World War I.36 Because such monuments for the commemoration of a substantial section of the population have to appeal to a large audience, they usually contain a clearly recognizable and repeated typology, iconography and symbolism, which was often explicitly asked for by the commissioning committee, leaving the sculptor little artistic freedom. Men and women are mostly represented in traditional roles: whilst robust and militant men, in active poses, wearing military uniform, radiate strength and patriotism, the mourning women, in passive poses, embody the inconsolable sorrow and suffering of the bereaved.37 Many of the generation of women sculptors of the early twentieth century who designed a war memorial, depict a woman.38 It remains to be studied whether this was, in the first place, the artist’s choice, or that of the commissioning committees—for women sculptors especially, one often liked an accordance between the artist’s sex and her subject. According to Helen Beale it is precisely the merit of women sculptors, in the 1920s, that they revived and reinvented the allegory in public monuments by the incorporation of real, representative, yet allegorical women dressed in contemporary, everyday clothes and with a contemporary identity.39

More often than in big cities, the war memorials by women sculptors are to be found in towns or villages, and repeatedly their home towns.40 Even though she had long been living in Paris, Yvonne Serruys (1873–1953), for example, designed the war memorial for her native village Menen, in West-Flanders (Belgium), without charging any fee, as was more often the case.
Her War Memorial (1921), containing two female figures, which may be interpreted in different ways, is an example of the combination of remembrance and patriotism, and of an allegory with a common symbolism, yet with some individual and contemporary accents (Figure 10.8). The figure on the left, in military regalia, including a helmet, symbolizing strength and invulnerability, is adorned with wings enveloping the composition and offering a protective shield for the woman next to her. The left figure is holding a palm and a laurel wreath, symbols of glory and immortality, but sometimes also of mourning.\(^{41}\) A winged figure with those attributes is, in this context, usually read as a personification of Victory, even though contemporary commentators also saw her as a personification of the nation.\(^{42}\)

She puts a consoling hand on the shoulder of a crouched and crying young woman, who not only refers to “real” grieving mothers, wives and fiancées of the fallen, but can also be read as a personification of the motherland (or nation) bemoaning her children (a female figure like the Latin “Patria” or the French “Patrie”), and/or a personification of Pain (\textit{la Douleur}), referring to the “\textit{mater dolorosa}.” The fact that this figure is naked is not unusual for an allegory, nor within Serruys’ \textit{œuvre}, yet it is fairly uncommon for a war memorial.\(^{43}\)
Conclusion

From the moment that women sculptors emerged, they have been creating sculptures for the dead, in multiple forms. Many of them specialized in the art of portraying, which was in high demand for wax figures, statues and funeral monuments. The fact that those, along with war memorials, often played on the area of emotions—which was traditionally viewed as “female”—apparently made the choice for a woman sculptor even more acceptable. The commissions for funeral monuments and war memorials more often came through unofficial rather than official channels, creating better opportunities for female artists. Just as for male artists—within the mythical stories of vocation—the perfect end of life as a woman sculptor was to die at work, holding a hammer and a chisel, as a contemporary described the last moments of the sculptor Marcello, the pseudonym for Adèle d’Affry (1836–1879): “Marcello died in 1879, in Castellammare, chisel in hand, standing upright until the last moment…”
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34 Marjan Sterckx, “‘Dans la Sculpture, moins de jupons que dans la Peinture’. Parcours de femmes sculpteurs liées à la Belgique (ca. 1550–1950),” Art&Fact 24: Femmes et créations, no. Alexia


This is more so for European women sculptors than for their American colleagues. Wingate only shows one such World War I Memorial; Bashka Paef’s Sacrifices of War, in Kittery, Maine, 1926. Wingate, “Monumental Visions: Women Sculptors and World War I,” 316.


Mostly, palm and/or laurel wreath are offered in worship at war memorials to an idealized soldier. (Prost, “Les Monuments aux morts: Culte républicain? Culte civique? Culte patriotique?,” 198, 203; Martinet, “Le monument public de 1850 à 1914,” 36.) In this case, though, they seem to be offered to the grieving woman. Laurel wreath and palm are mostly interpreted by the different authors either as a kind of “crown” of Glory and Hope, or as a sign of Glory and Immortality to be granted to the victims because of their sacrifice for the country; this allows the woman to live in hope. (P.V. 1921: 3; Edouard 1921: 397; Harlor, “Les Arts: chez Yvonne Serruys,” La Vie, 15/8/1935.)


44 “Marcello mourut, en 1879, à Castellamare, le ciseau dans les mains, debout jusqu’au dernier instant …” Frédéric Loliée, Les femmes du second empire (papiers intimes) (Paris: F. Juven, 1906), 347.