The mid-nineteenth century saw sculpture spectacularly brought out of the closet by an educated and cosmopolitan elite for the public’s improvement – and, incidentally, also of course for its entertainment. From the 1850s it began to be hard for private collectors to keep up with the displays available at international exhibitions. This was something that came about partly through the agency of Prince Albert, and after the closure of the Great Exhibition by far the largest collection of sculpture ever seen in this country was assembled at Sydenham by the Crystal Palace Company, admittedly consisting mostly of plaster casts.¹ The burning down of the Sydenham Crystal Palace in 1936 and the dispersal of several important early Victorian sculpture collections have left Victoria and Albert’s collection of contemporary sculpture to enjoy unchallenged pre-eminence. Benedict Read in his book Victorian Sculpture paid due tribute to it for its unsurpassed range and variety, though his claim that the royal couple were an important source of patronage may have to be qualified in the light of what Jonathan Marsden has told us of their parsimony.² Whilst this may not be equally applicable to all aspects of the collection, what the present paper hopes to add to Read’s assessment is a perception of how far it reflects the enlargement of sculpture’s potential audience.

Comparing Victoria and Albert’s collection with the one formed by the Crystal Palace Company is clearly not comparing like with like. The directors of the company set out with great deliberation and with lightening speed to acquire examples of work by contemporary sculptors from all the European nations. It was an astonishingly representative panorama of modern tendencies in the art, though some of the wilder French romantics were excluded, and some pieces by the Swiss exponent of sculptural verismo, Vincenzo Vela, were acquired but not shown, possibly on grounds of decency.³ Victoria and Albert’s collection achieved something of the same internationalism and range of styles. This mix, in part an unintended consequence of gradual acquisition over twenty years, also reflects the variety of motives leading to the acquisition of different groups of works within the collection. In some instances it may be relevant to highlight significant omissions, but since Victoria and Albert chose their works from a standpoint of personal preference rather than in order to create a comprehensive record of contemporary practice, I have found that the best
way to achieve focus is to isolate the various functions their sculptures performed in their professional and domestic lives, and to consider a certain number of works within each group, in the hope of adding something worthwhile to the formidable and well-documented account provided by Jonathan Marsden in the Art and Love exhibition catalogue.

The first topic on which I have chosen to concentrate is the purchase of modern sculptures of a predominantly classical type for the niches of the new interiors at Buckingham Palace and to form a sculpture gallery at Osborne. Secondly, I look briefly at the indulgence of personal sentiment in portraiture, especially portraits of the royal children, and consider alongside this the loyalty of the royal couple to one particular family of sculptors. Third in the frame is the interest of Albert in the industrial arts, though I would suggest that from a purely personal point of view new reproductive techniques appealed to the Queen as well, as a means of diffusing amongst her friends and family images belonging to the previous category, much as she and we, following her example, give or show around photographs of our nearest and dearest. This, to me the most interesting aspect of the collection, brought with it a change in the focus of collectors from the markets of Italy and Germany to those of France. Finally, some objects in the collection recall Prince Albert’s promotion of a particular type of public art at a time when ‘statuemania’ was beginning to take off in the streets and squares of British cities.

To start with the classicising aspect, it should be pointed out that the royal collectors were shopping in a market in which there were no longer clearly recognised star performers as there had been in the time of George IV. Canova had died in 1822, Thorvaldsen returned to Copenhagen from Rome in 1838, dying there in 1844. In the letters from Italy in the 1840s of the 6th Duke of Devonshire, a passionate collector, the impression is conveyed of a man adrift and not knowing quite which way to turn. The older generation of Italian artists were dead. Pietro Tenerani, left in charge of Thorvaldsen’s studio, was, in the Duke’s words, ‘very successful’, occasionally ‘quite sublime’; but other Italian sculptors, such as Lorenzo Bartolini, were overpricing their works, and one thing that the catalogue of the Art and Love exhibition makes quite clear is that, when it came to sculpture, the royal couple were not big spenders.4

One of the Duke of Devonshire’s nieces was Harriet, Duchess of Sutherland, who, as Mistress of the Queen’s Robes, exercised a particularly strong influence on the Queen in artistic matters. Her husband, the 2nd Duke, had once been a patron of Thorvaldsen. Youthful travels in Prussia had made him a convert to the Nordic version of neoclassicism before he had had the opportunity to travel in Italy.5 He and his wife would turn their attention to the Parisian art market in the 1830s, but before doing so they bought some work from the lesser and cheaper artists working in Rome, such as Rinaldo Rinaldi, who had taken charge of Canova’s Roman studio, and the Spaniard Antonio Sola. These purchases were respectable but not spectacular.
In fact Victoria and Albert, no doubt learning from the experiences of other collectors, bought only one modern Italian sculpture, though at £408 it was the single most expensive item of sculpture the royal couple was ever to acquire. This was the *Flora* of Pietro Tenerani (fig. 1). Like so many of these things, the work was a replica and hardly fresh. The figure in the Royal Collection, purchased in 1849, is dated 1848, and was therefore produced eight years after the first version, which had been bought by Nicholas I of Russia. The purchase was almost certainly made in deference to the opinion of John Gibson, the chief British neoclassical sculptor working in Rome at the time. Gibson believed Tenerani to be ‘the first sculptor now in Europe … his style most pure and beautiful.’ The operative word here is likely to have been pure, since Tenerani belonged to the group of Italian artists known as the ‘Purists’, artists who had come under the influence of the Nazarenes. In this sense the *Flora* was more than the exception that proved the rule of Victoria and Albert’s abstention from Italian sculpture, since her sculptor, through his work with Thorvaldsen and being surrounded by the so-called ‘Deutsch-Romer’, had been thoroughly infiltrated by the Northern spirit. The *Flora* is a pagan work, evidently, but significantly Gibson did not perceive paganism as Tenerani’s strongest point, believing that ‘the works which will consign his name to posterity are chiefly of a religious character.’ The Duke of Devonshire concurred in this opinion, finding Tenerani most successful in Christian subjects, a relief of *Martyrs Going to be Devoured by Lions in the Amphitheatre*, in his opinion ‘quite sublime’ and his portraits of Pius IX ‘most skilful’.

It would be wrong to make too much of this argument, since there is a wealth of elegantly treated mythology in the collection, particularly by R.J. Wyatt (fig. 2), William Theed and Lawrence Macdonald, but the preference for a version of the
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**Fig. 1** (far left)
Pietro Tenerani (1789–1869), *Flora*, 1840
Marble, height 157.5cm
Royal Collection, Buckingham Palace, RCIN 2050

**Fig. 2**
Richard James Wyatt (1795–1850), completed by John Gibson (1790–1866), *Nymph of Diana*, 1835
Marble, height 155.5cm
Royal Collection, RCIN 2130
classical tradition filtered through Northern sensibilities may be owing to something more than the effectiveness of the German and English cultural networks, of which the exhibition catalogue tells us so much. Queen Victoria may not have been quite the prude that folklore liked at one time to paint her; but the family atmosphere would have militated against the indulgence of unbridled sensuality in her sculpture collection. She attributed to Albert the request for the lengthening of the kilt and the sandalling of the feet in the second version of Emil Wolff’s statue of him in classical armour, but he may have insisted on this in order not to disturb the Queen’s calm when in the more formal surroundings of Buckingham Palace. The earlier, more naked version was placed at Osborne. The fact remains that the royal couple did not follow Italian sculptors in their move towards verismo, purchase work by Pompeo Marchesi or Bartolini, or imitate the Duke of Devonshire in commissioning work from the brilliant Italian immigrant Raffaele Monti. Nor is there anything in their collection quite as steamy as Canova’s Mars and Venus, commissioned by the Prince Regent in 1815.

My second subject is the indulgence of family sentiment. Queen Victoria seems to have been in general exceptionally loyal to people to whom she had once taken a liking, though she could occasionally be severe in her judgement of the works of favourite artists, as was the case with the sculptor Susan Durant or the disapproval she expressed for Marochetti’s Crimean Peace Trophy of 1857. The Queen’s attachment also continued from one generation to the next. The Wyatt family, for instance, had since the time of George III enjoyed royal patronage, so it was hardly surprising that the Queen should feel concern when she heard from John Gibson in Rome that the elderly sculptor Richard James Wyatt, already distressed by being evicted from his studio, had suffered minor injuries from an exploding grenade during the French bombardment of Rome. She decided to comfort him by commissioning two new mythological statues from him, to add to the two she already had. Her touching words, as passed on to Gibson by Marianne Skerrett, the Queen’s ‘dresser’, are recorded in Gibson’s reminiscences: ‘Poor Mr Wyatt, I am so sorry for poor Wyatt, he shall make me a statue. Write to Mr Gibson directly and desire him to inform Mr Wyatt of my wish. – Yes, he shall make two statues for me, some graceful subjects – say that he must send me sketches soon in a letter.’ Wyatt only lived to complete one of these statues. The second had to be finished under Gibson’s superintendence.

But it was from a member of the Francis/Thornycroft dynasty that Victoria and Albert succeeded in getting the most continuous supply of birthday and Christmas gift sculptures. The founder of the dynasty was John Francis, a sculptor from Lincolnshire farming stock who, after training with Francis Chantrey, acquired a reputation as a portraitist for a Whig and Masonic clientele. Francis had been doing busts of royalty and members of the royal family since 1823, and in 1844 became sculpture tutor to Prince Albert. Francis’s daughter, Mary, also trained under her father and married
one of his pupils, Thomas Thornycroft, who, like his father-in-law came from a farming background, in his case from Cheshire. The royal connection with Thomas will be highlighted later in connection with public statuary, but here the relevant figure is Mary, with her series of full-length fancy-dress portraits of the royal children, which she began in 1845. At that point Mary was herself the mother of two children. According to the story first told by Mary’s obituarist F.G. Stephens, it was through the recommendation of Gibson that she was given this series of commissions. When Queen Victoria proposed to Gibson that he should sculpt her children, he, having recently met Mary in Rome, assured the Queen that she would make a better job of it. It is perfectly probable that a woman sculptor would have stood in need of such an endorsement, but recently the art-historian Fiona Darling-Glinski has found evidence that it was Mary’s father who initially undertook his daughter’s promotion with the royal couple, taking along to Windsor her first exhibited piece, an Orphan Flower Girl, for their inspection.13 The use by old Francis of this sentimental image, intended no doubt to appeal to the Queen's maternal instinct, forms an appropriate prelude to the sculptural series that Mary went on to produce. This represents a movement away from the classical ideal towards a more private world of familial sentiment. The royal children are represented by Mary Thornycroft as Seasons or in various allegorical and genre guises (fig. 3), in simple and historically unspecific costume. They are shown in rural and predominantly pacific occupations, the only exception being the statue of Prince Arthur represented as a hunter. The boy steps forward with a horn in his raised right hand and a staff in his left, the dagger at his waist the only hint at the violent side of hunting.

Though in a more august and old-fashioned mode, reminiscent of Bronzino’s portrait of Andrea Doria as Neptune, Marochetti’s statue of Prince Arthur appealed clearly to the same vein of parental sentiment. It shows the Prince as little more than a baby and is proof, if proof were needed, that in those days at least women were from Venus and men from Mars. The ability of Marochetti to muscle in, as it were, on Mary Thornycroft’s territory, when her series was well under way, may prompt one to ask whether there was some dissatisfaction with the softer approach of the woman sculptor. The prince is shown naked but for a discreet swatch of loincloth, in as heroic a pose as the infant anatomy permits, leaning on a sword almost as high as himself. We are indebted to Jonathan Marsden for pointing out that this sword represents the martial mantle, passed down to the prince from his godfather and namesake, the Duke of Wellington.14 Marochetti followed this up with a more factual group, Prince Alfred with a Highland Pony (fig. 4), perhaps suggested by the portraits of their children in Highland costume which the Duke and Duchess of Sutherland had commissioned from French sculptors.15 Depicting the prince wearing a kilt, with his arm resting on the shaggy mane of his pony, this once again evokes a more bracing, and ‘masculine’ activities, rather than the world of the nursery and childish fancy-dress evoked by Mary Thornycroft. From a letter which he wrote to the Keeper of the Privy Purse, it appears that Marochetti had hoped that this group would be used as
a birthday gift from the Queen to the Prince on 26 August 1854. It was not, and he himself expressed some dissatisfaction with it, but this did not prevent two versions, one in bronze and one in Mintons’ Parian ware (fig. 5), entering the Royal Collection. For the bronze Marochetti was paid £125, the sum which he had requested, justifying the amount by stating that it was not ‘a published work’.16

Marochetti’s insistence on the exclusivity of his bronze brings us to the next topic: Prince Albert’s interest in the industrial arts. Because even if the bronze of the Prince Alfred group was not ‘a published work’, after its acquisition for the Royal Collection the model was to be reproduced in Parian ware by the firm of Mintons. By great good fortune, letters survive in the Royal Archive from Mintons requesting permission to reproduce this and other royal portraits by Marochetti.

The first letter was addressed to Marianne Skerrett on 25 November 1855:

When Mr Campbell of our firm was in town recently, he called at Baron Marochetti’s studio, and was exceedingly pleased at having the opportunity of inspecting a magnificent Bust of her Majesty, and a statue of Prince Alfred standing by a pony. We should feel highly gratified and honoured if permission could be obtained from her Majesty for us to copy these beautiful works in our Parian material, and, especially so, as we recently produced the statue of Prince Arthur, and sent a copy to H.R.H. the Prince Consort. If you see no impropriety in bringing this subject to Her Majesty’s attention we should feel most gratefully obliged if you would kindly do so. The Baron Marochetti was not at home when Mr Campbell saw the works above named; but we have no doubt that if Her Majesty’s sanction can be obtained to their reproduction in Parian, no obstacle will be interposed by the Baron.17

The firm’s representative admitted in a subsequent letter to having forgotten to ask if they might also reproduce Marochetti’s bust of the Prince Consort. The firm trusted that ‘that also may be included in the gracious concession they have been favoured with’. The second letter concluded with the assurance that ‘M & Co. will carefully attend to the names being properly inscribed on each of these beautiful works’.18 Evidently permission was forthcoming for all three, since they, as well as the Prince Arthur statue, were produced in Parian.19 The letters seem to indicate that the initiative here came from Marochetti, who before the Great Exhibition had already designed a jardinière, an urn and a ewer for Mintons. A role can of course be assigned to Prince Albert, with his well-known advocacy of the industrial arts, but once again the influence of the Sutherlands may be detected. The close relationship with the Staffordshire potteries that their frequent residences in their country house, Trentham Hall, close to the potteries district, enabled them to maintain, meant that a manufacturer like Herbert Minton could benefit from their cosmopolitan artistic contacts – and he was not the only one. Marochetti, despite his Italian birth and name, had been resident since early childhood in France, and he was just one of the
Parisian artists employed or patronised by both these aristocratic patrons and by British manufacturers. The economic crisis which precipitated the downfall of the July Monarchy in France in 1848, together with the ensuing political unrest, encouraged a sort of creative brain-drain in the years leading up to the Great Exhibition, which would greatly enhance the look of many British products.20

The two Highlander candelabra in the Art and Love exhibition (fig. 6), a pair from a set of twelve made in 1854 from two models for the drawing room at Balmoral, testify to this importation of foreign talent by Mintons. Here the figurative element was in Parian ware and the metalwork contributed by another firm, R.W. Winfield & Co.21 The execution of the figures bears all the stylistic marks of Mintons’ chief modeller, the Frenchman Albert-Ernest Carrier-Belleuse, later to become the leading decorative sculptor of the Second Empire. Edwin Landseer played some part in the design of the groups, but when making recommendations as to the breed of dog that should be represented, the painter wrote to Herbert Minton, saying ‘when the right time comes for the execution of the model I can lend you a print or two … that would be of use to your artist’.22 In this case the phrase ‘your artist’ must refer to Carrier-Belleuse, at this time an employee of the firm. Unlike the ceramic statues of the royal children, the candelabra were bespoke items, unavailable on the open market, although they, too, through exposure in an international exhibition, did eventually reach a wider public. The only other copies produced were a couple presented by Queen Victoria to Napoléon III, which were shown at the Paris International Exhibition of 1855.23 It was in this year that Carrier-Belleuse returned to his native country, and the Queen’s gift would have represented a significant royal endorsement for future patrons in his native country, including the Emperor himself, of the sculptor’s abilities in this sort of commission.

In 1829 George IV had made an exceptional purchase of a large French bronze group, the Hercules and Achelous by François-Joseph Bosio, but it was only after the Great Exhibition that Victoria and Albert began to follow his example, purchasing ethnic busts by Charles Cordier and two large bronzes by James Pradier, whose marble Phryne had attracted so much attention as part of the French display. The mid-1850s would bring even closer diplomatic relations between France and Britain than had existed in the days of the July Monarchy, despite the warm feelings for the exiled Louis Philippe and his family entertained by Queen Victoria. The accession of a nephew of Napoleon Bonaparte initially appeared auspicious, but the two nations were soon bound in a military alliance against Russia over the balance of power in the Balkans and the Near East. When Queen Victoria visited the International exhibition in Paris in 1855, Sebastopol was under siege by the allied armies of France and Britain. Previously she and Albert had only crossed to the Northern French coast, to visit the French royal family at Eu. Now they saw with their own eyes things that they must have heard described by the Duchess of Sutherland or by Louis Philippe himself.

Fig. 6
Herbert Minton & Co. and R.W. Winfield & Co, after designs by Sir Edwin Landseer (1803–73), Highlander candelabra, 1854 Parian ware, copper alloy, plated with silver and gold and partly patinated, 94 x 38 x 38cm Royal Collection, Balmoral Castle, RCIN 12143
At the Great Exhibition they had purchased an ivory *Sappho and Cupid* by Henry de Triqueti. In 1855, visiting the mausoleum of Ferdinand, Duke of Orléans, and glimpsing a double portrait of the daughters of the British ambassador in Paris, Lord Cowley, they also became aware of his marble work and were then persuaded by Lady Cowley in 1858 to buy his statue of *Edward VI Reading Holy Scripture* (fig. 7).

The change of direction in their patronage can most clearly be seen on the garden terraces at Osborne House. Having up to 1855 purchased their garden statuary, mainly reproductions after the Antique, from the Berlin firm of Geiss, the royal couple then smartly switched their allegiance to the French firm of Miroy frères, and even bought two daringly modern-looking allegories of the Seasons from models by Mathurin Moreau for the upper terrace at Osborne (fig. 8 A, B, C, D). There they look somewhat exotic and anomalous in this predominantly Italianate environment. Like the Geiss statuary, these Miroy pieces were cast in zinc, but these French manufactured pieces had the edge over their German rivals in using electroplating, what the French call *galvanoplastie,* to give them a bronze finish. The garden at Osborne is a veritable showcase of the ornamental sculpture of three nations. As well as the pieces from Geiss and Miroy, there is the *Andromeda Fountain* cast by the Coalbrookdale Company, exhibited at the Great Exhibition and bought by the Queen following the exhibition. The figure of Andromeda and the elaborate pedestal were modelled by John Bell, but the *Cupids Riding on Marine Monsters* disporting themselves round the basin were later additions of 1860 by William Theed, cast by the Birmingham firm of Elkington’s.

New industrial processes were one way of bringing sculpture to a wider public. Another was the placing of statuary in the streets and in parks and squares. Certain small-scale works in the Royal Collection, such as the bronze statuettes of Richard Coeur de Lion and the Black Prince by Carlo Marochetti, are reminders of the involvement of Victoria and Albert in the raising of public statues in London.
Very few such statues were funded by government, the usual system being limited or public subscription. Royal influence where it was applied had to be discreet, the most transparent and blameless exercise of it being a generous – but not too generous – contribution to a public fund. Perhaps the most visible intervention of the Queen was her letter to Lord John Russell insisting, with regret, that Matthew Cotes Wyatt’s colossal equestrian statue of the Duke of Wellington should remain on the Constitution Hill Arch, since to have it removed might be seen as an insult to the aged Duke. On this occasion sentiments of personal loyalty to the subject of the statue prevailed over any aesthetic judgement.

However, more indicative of the royal couple’s taste were the occasions when public sculpture projects received their active support and encouragement. The Richard I, Coeur de Lion (fig. 9) was one of these. The reason it was produced in the first place, in plaster, to stand outside the western entrance to Crystal Palace, was, I believe, to
upstage the colossal Godefroy de Bouillon by Eugène Simonis, which all would have been aware was coming to the Palace from Belgium. This statue, inspired by Marochetti’s own Emanuele Filiberto in Turin, was to have been cast by Marochetti’s Parisian founder, Soyer, until Soyer was sent to prison for fraud.\textsuperscript{29} When the Crystal Palace closed its doors in Hyde Park, a movement was set afoot to erect Marochetti’s statue in bronze as a permanent memorial to the exhibition. This, however, met with vociferous objections. The \textit{Art Journal} thought that ‘a foreign sculptor alone’ ought not to be permitted to commemorate the Great Exhibition, and that ‘the effigy of a valiant crusader’ was not a fitting symbol of what it described as the ‘the great Peace congress of 1851’.\textsuperscript{30} The Lord Mayor of London echoed these sentiments in a speech which no doubt reached a much wider audience.\textsuperscript{31} The advocates for the statue’s permanent erection then sought a site for it elsewhere in London, the vicinity of parliament soon becoming the preferred site, and the committee was eventually to be successful in getting it placed there, despite strong objections from Sir Charles Barry (fig. 10). Prince Albert was one of the chief supporters of this project. He personally contributed £100 to the fund, though the Queen gave £200.\textsuperscript{32}

Feeling against Marochetti was already running high by the time the statue was finally put up in Old Palace Yard, outside the House of Lords, in 1860, because of his success in cornering government money for other projects, and it is extremely unlikely that without the Prince’s support this could have been achieved. Indeed, a project of Marochetti’s to create a pendent figure of the Black Prince to face his Richard I fizzled out following the Prince Consort’s death, as did a number of his other schemes.\textsuperscript{33}

Another historical public monument by Marochetti, and one for which Queen Victoria personally covered the cost, was the somewhat theatrical retrospective tomb for St Thomas’s church in Newport on the Isle of Wight of Princess Elizabeth (fig. 11), the daughter of Charles I who had died a captive of the Commonwealth forces in Carysfort Castle. So many of the works of art in the Houses of Parliament,
ordered by the Royal Commissioners for the Fine Arts under the chairmanship of Prince Albert, were about restrictions on royal power imposed by the barons or by parliament. Marochetti’s historical works show a complete indifference to the idea of a parliamentary constitution. Richard I Cœur de Lion shows royal power untramelled, in a way which failed to impress a number of practically minded and historically well-informed Victorian critics, whilst the Princess Elizabeth exploits that same vein of rather mindless pity for the fate of royal ‘martyrs’, which had been worked on so successfully by Paul Delaroche in his illustrations of scenes from English history.34 Judging by the number of stereoscopic views of it, the Newport tomb was a popular success, and the Richard I has retained its status as a national symbol, though few members of the public will remember the name of its sculptor.

Regrettably we do not have access to Albert’s innermost thoughts on such matters. Nevertheless, it can be established that his occasionally unpatriotic support for foreign artists was held in check by a sense of how far it was appropriate for him to go in backing Marochetti’s more arrogant self-promotions. Another public sculpture project, which was not completed during the Prince’s lifetime but to which he gave his support, may suggest that his advocacy of Marochetti was intended to raise the national game. Like Marochetti, Thomas Thornycroft was a royal favourite, though he held a very low opinion of his rival’s talent as a sculptor. What was to be his magnum opus, the group of Boadicea and her Daughters (fig. 12), was first sketched out in 1856 and Thornycroft gave it his full attention so long as Prince Albert lived.
Later his interest in the project waned, and it was left to his son Hamo to complete. It was not finally erected until 1902, on the corner of Westminster Bridge, not far from Marochetti's Richard I. It was a project in which the Prince took a close interest, perhaps in part because it was a homage to the Queen — Boudicca meaning in Proto-Celtic 'victory' or 'Victoria'. He lent the sculptor horses from the Royal Mews as models; tried, but failed, to persuade him that the chariot should be pulled by three rather than two horses; and insisted that the subject should be treated in a poetic rather than a purely realistic or archaeological way. The Prince and the sculptor disagreed on an appropriate site for the group, the Prince proposing the top of the Marble Arch, the sculptor preferring a 'rocky eminence' within Hyde Park.35

When the Boadica group was finally erected, it had begun to show its age. One journalist complained that it was 'at once feeble and violent in conception', the modelling being 'that of a weak follower of the bad traditions which were in vogue in England 40 years ago, when a sculptor's business was thought to be the imitation not of nature but of Gibson'.36 Neither Victoria nor Albert would have held it against Thornycroft's work that it resembled that of 'dear Mr Gibson', and certainly by the standards of the time it was an ambitious composition, going some way to fulfil the promise held out by the Westminster Hall exhibitions of the 1840s of a sculpture which gave something like a plastic equivalent of multi-figure history painting. So often ambitious allegorical and mythological work was proposed by Victorian architects for public places, yet never realised. The Boadica realises this ideal, as, appropriately, do some of the groups on the Albert Memorial. It makes one wonder how Victorian sculpture might have developed had the Prince lived a fuller span.
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