Sculpting Beyond Borders:

Local Identity and Transnational Mobility in the Age of Rodin

by

Clarisse Fava-Piz

Bachelor of Arts in Art History, Université Sorbonne-Paris IV, 2009

Master of Arts in Art History, Université Paris Ouest Nanterre- La Défense, 2012

Master of Arts in Art History, University of Pittsburgh, 2016

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the

Dietrich School of Arts and Sciences in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Pittsburgh

2021

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

DIETRICH SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

This dissertation was presented

by

Clarisse Fava-Piz

It was defended on

June 23, 2021

and approved by

Martina Droth, Deputy Director and Chief Curator, Yale Center for British Art

Jennifer Josten, Associate Professor, History of Art and Architecture

Barbara McCloskey, Professor, History of Art and Architecture

Alex J. Taylor, Assistant Professor, History of Art and Architecture

Dissertation Advisor: Kirk Savage, William S. Dietrich II Professor, History of Art and Architecture

Copyright © by Clarisse Fava-Piz

2021

Sculpting Beyond Borders:

Local Identity and Transnational Mobility in the Age of Rodin

Clarisse Fava-Piz, PhD

University of Pittsburgh, 2021

The beginning of the twentieth century marked a high point in the production of public sculpture as Parisian-trained sculptors erected hundreds of monuments across cities in the Americas. Rejecting the prototypical commemorative statue of the valiant man on a pedestal, complex multi-figural groups with highly expressive gestures and ambiguous poses transformed the urban landscape not only in the United States, but also in Latin America. My dissertation examines the internationalization of modern sculpture in the Age of Rodin, and how some of the most ambitious sculptural projects in Argentina and the United States were created in a unique transnational space of artistic exchanges – the Paris Salons – amidst an environment of intense nationalist expectations and pressures. At the core of my argument, I redefine the Paris Salons, still considered today by scholars like a stuffy repository of academic art, as a vibrant transnational ecosystem in which ideas, themes, and sculptural motifs circulated with multidirectional channels of exchange. To this end, I argue that modern sculpture was borne not out of the mind of one man, Rodin, but grew out of the artistic creations of many in the Salons.

My study investigates the histories of sculptures made by the American George Grey Barnard, the Irish American Andrew O'Connor, and the Argentinian Rogelio Yrurtia, who chose France as their artistic home base at a time when national patronage systems remained crucial for financial stability. Although they designed monuments for the jury and critics of the Paris Salons, they needed to appeal to their domestic patrons, trying to meet, but also shape, the expectations of

their commissioners across the Atlantic. Active in the Paris Salons, they participated in the creation of a modern language of sculpture that rejected neoclassical didacticism, and offered a new, more accessible experience of public sculpture. Through close examination of objects as mobile and transformative agents across borders, my research bridges the historiographical divide between monuments and gallery-sized sculptures, and reveals the process of transformation that modern sculptures underwent while moving from the gallery space of the Paris Salons to the public square abroad.

Table of Contents

Preface ... xi

1.0 Introduction ... 1

1.1 Beyond Rodin and "Rodinism" ... 5

1.2 Modernism in the Paris Salons ... 14

1.3 Modern Public Sculpture ... 17

1.4 Methods ... 21

1.5 Research Itinerary ... 26

1.6 Sculpture & Photography ... 29

1.7 Three Foreigners in Paris ... 32

1.7.1 George Grey Barnard ... 34

1.7.2 Rogelio Yrurtia ... 36

1.7.3 Andrew O'Connor ... 38

1.8 From the Paris Salons to the Public Square ... 42

2.0 Modern Sculpture in the Age of the Paris Salons ... 48

2.1 Competing at the Paris Salons ... 52

2.2 The Internationalization of the Paris Salons ... 62

2.3 Crowding the Salons Floors ... 69

2.4 Making Modern Sculpture at the Paris Salons: Appropriation, Mutation, and Migration of Sculptural Forms ... 78

2.4.1 Quoting Rodin/Rodin Quoting ... 81

2.4.2 Modernism and Repetition: The Case of the Kneeling Figure ... 87

2.4.3 Redefining the Heroic Ideal..........94

2.5 Conclusion.......... 102

3.0 Sculptures in Transit: Materiality and Display across the Atlantic.......... 105

3.1 On the Move: Barnard's *Two Natures* between France and the United States 109

3.2 The Transatlantic Risks of Rogelio Yrurtia's *The Sinners*.......... 120

3.2.1 To Saint Louis…By Way of Buenos Aires..........125

3.2.2 *The Sinners* in Saint Louis..........126

3.2.3 Back to Paris…By Way of Buenos Aires..........129

3.3 *Life of Humanity*: Boston (1908)-Paris (1910)-Harrisburg (1911).......... 134

3.3.1 *Life of Humanity*: A Patchwork of Salons Models..........138

3.3.2 Transatlantic Crossing: The Harrisburg's Statuary in Boston..........142

3.3.3 *Life of Humanity* at the 1910 Salon des artistes français..........148

3.3.4 *The Prodigal Son* at the Armory Show..........154

3.4 Conclusion.......... 159

4.0 Monumental Failures: Nationalism and Patronage in the Transatlantic World.......... 163

4.1 Celebrating the Centennial of Argentina's Independence: Rogelio Yrurtia's *To My Homeland*.......... 167

4.2 Sculpting the Irish Exile: O'Connor's *Monument to Commodore John Barry* 182

4.3 Andrew O'Connor's Cosmopolitanism.......... 192

4.4 Repurposing *The Republic of America* into *Justice* 199

4.5 Conclusion.......... 209

5.0 The Labor of Monumentality: Transnationalism in the Paris Studios.......... 213

5.1 The Transnational Labor Industry System: Sculpting the Pennsylvania Capitol Statuary ... 220
5.1.1 An American in Moret ... 224
5.1.2 "While the heads on many of the figures are American, the models were French or Italian" ... 232
5.1.3 From Moret to Pietrasanta ... 237
5.1.4 "Bon voyage to them" ... 239
5.2 Sculpting Labor: Rogelio Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor* ... 242
5.2.1 "It is not a Triumph-to-Labor but rather A March of Suffering" ... 244
5.2.2 In the Tradition of Monuments to Labor ... 251
5.2.3 Yrurtia's Monumental Polyphony ... 256
5.3 Fragmenting, Disassembling, Reassembling Sculpture in Andrew O'Connor's Oeuvre ... 263
5.3.1 From Monument to Autonomous Sculpture ... 266
5.3.2 Sculptural Labor and the Trauma of War ... 273
5.4 Conclusion ... 275
6.0 Monuments *in Situ*: From Paris to the Public Square Abroad ... 278
6.1 "*Monuments must live*": *Hymn to Labor* and the Monumental Landscape of Buenos Aires ... 284
6.1.1 "The pedagogy of statues" ... 286
6.1.2 The Controversy of Rodin's *Sarmiento* ... 289
6.1.3 *Hymn to Labor*: "A Living Architecture" ... 296
6.2 Barnard's *Life of Humanity*: "The Portal of the People" ... 307

6.2.1 *Life of Humanity* and The Scandal of Nudity 311

6.2.2 American Modernism and the Construction of Whiteness 317

6.2.3 The Inauguration in Harrisburg......321

6.3 "Sculpture is monumental and out of doors" – Andrew O'Connor 323

6.3.1 [Dis]figuring War : *Le débarquement* (1918-1931, cast 1938) 325

6.3.2 From the Paris Salon to Dun Laoghaire: A Memorial to World War I Becomes a Statue to Christ The King 333

6.4 Conclusion 341

7.0 Conclusion 344

7.1 'Taking Down' Rodin 344

7.2 The Sculptors' Legacies 351

7.2.1 Rogelio Yrurtia......352

7.2.2 Andrew O'Connor 356

7.2.3 George Grey Barnard......361

7.3 Challenging Monumentality Today 364

Appendix A List of Referenced Figures...... 374

Bibliography 397

List of Tables

Table 1 Itinerary of Barnard's *Two Natures in Man* 119

Table 2 Itinerary of Yrurtia's *The Sinners* 119

Table 3 Execution and Itinerary of the Harrisburg Statuary Commission 223

Preface

Far beyond the present manuscript, this dissertation has been an itinerant adventure and a rewarding personal journey. It could not have come into being without the generous support of the scholars, curators, archivists, librarians, conservators, art dealers, descendants of artists, friends, and family members who have encouraged me along the way. Above all, my deepest gratitude goes to my advisor, Kirk Savage, for his intellectual generosity and infallible support throughout the past seven years. The members of my dissertation committee deserve my warmest appreciation for their extensive guidance and encouragements: Martina Droth, Jennifer Josten, Barbara McCloskey, and Alex J. Taylor. I would also like to thank Drew Armstrong, Josh Ellenbogen, Shirin Fozi, Alison Langmead, Chris Nygren, and Terry Smith with whom I have had the opportunity to take seminars during my PhD coursework, as well as Linda Hicks and Karoline Swiontek in the Department of History of Art and Architecture at the University of Pittsburgh.

Several organizations have invested in this research, allowing me the time and resources to bring it to fruition, and I am grateful to the Department of History of Art and Architecture and the Dietrich School of Arts & Sciences at the University of Pittsburgh, the Friends of the Frick Fine Arts, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the Terra Foundation for American Art, and the Smithsonian American Art Museum (SAAM). From September 2018 until March 2020, when the pandemic hit, the research and scholars center at SAAM provided me with an office space and welcomed me within its community of scholars. I would like to whole-heartedly thank Amelia Goerlitz, Stacy Weiland, and my mentoring curators Karen Lemmey and Eleanor Harvey, as well as the pre- and postdoctoral fellows with whom I have had the pleasure to share and discuss drafts of my dissertation chapters.

As I embarked on my dissertation, I had not anticipated meeting with the grandson of the sculptor Andrew O'Connor, and I would like to thank Joel Rosenkranz for pointing me in the direction of the artist's family. Andrew O'Connor and Kathryn Day Carrigan generously opened their homes to me, and provided invaluable assistance and documentation for my research. My stays in Peralta and Dublin remain some of my fondest memories of this adventure. In Ireland, Leah Benson at the National Gallery of Ireland; Margarita Cappock, Jessica O'Donnell and Logan Sisley at The Hugh Lane; and Keyes Marian at the DR Lexicon library in Dun Laoghaire, were instrumental in allowing me access to material on Andrew O'Connor. My research on this artist also led me to London, where I would like to thank Philip Ward-Jackson and Caroline Corbeau-Parsons, and to the Peace Palace in The Hague, where Jacobine Wieringa organized my viewing of O'Connor's statue of *Justice*.

In France, I owe deep gratitude to Claire Barbillon, my former MA advisor, Director of the Ecole du Louvre, and Catherine Chevillot, the former head of the Musée Rodin, for their longtime support and our yearly dinners in Paris. My special thanks go to Nathalie Cournarie, who helped me pursue my dreams of art history since my early years in the Classes Préparatoires in Toulouse, and to Micaela Blay, granddaughter of the sculptor Miguel Blay y Fábregas, for her friendship and our afternoon tea times. I would also like to thank Sandra Boujot and Hélène Pinet at the Musée Rodin; Nadège Horner and Ophélie Ferlier at the Musée d'Orsay; Amélie Simier, Claire Boisserolles and Stéphane Ferrand, at the Musée Bourdelle; Claire Martin at the Petit Palais; and France Desbuissons for providing access to her collection of Salons postcards.

My research on the sculptor Rogelio Yrurtia led me to Argentina for the first time, and I am grateful to my friends Clara Desalvo and Fer Viola for welcoming me to their hometown. Michelle Greet and Santiago Villanueva were instrumental in helping find institutional support in

Buenos Aires, and I owe many thanks to Marisa Baldasarre, Patricia Corsani, Georgina Gluzman, Erika Loiacono, Laura Malosetti Costa, Teresa Espantoso Rodriguez, and Carolina Vanegas for their guidance with my research. My thanks also go to Nora Altrudi at the Fundación TAREA-Universidad de San Martín for providing access to the Yrurtia archives; Andrea Elías, Constanza Varela, Florencia Vallarino at the Museo-Casa Yrurtia; Cecilia García, Paula Casajús, Carolina Moreno at the Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes; Maria Vivardo at the Instituto Payró, Mónica at the Museo de Arte Moderno, Ivana Sicolo at the Museo Sivori, and the staff at the Archivo General de la Nación, and at the Academia Nacional de Bellas Artes.

I have also travelled to many archives and museums in the United States, and to start with my home base in Washington, D.C., I would like to thank the staff at the National Archives, the National Gallery of Art's library, the Archives of American Art, and at the Smithsonian American Art and Portrait Gallery library. Alison Luchs played a critical role in organizing the viewing of O'Connor's sculptures at the National Gallery of Art, and I would also like to thank Daphne Barbour for welcoming me in the conservation studio to look at the *Commodore Barry* statuettes. At SAAM, I have learnt a lot about the materiality of sculpture from my visits to the conservation lab thanks to the generosity of conservators Ariel O'Connor and Greg Bailey. At the Walters Art Museum in Baltimore, Jo Briggs organized a viewing of more of O'Connor sculptures in storage, and at the Philadelphia Museum of Art, I had the chance to see O'Connor's *Slave* thanks to Cindy Veloric. I would also like to thank Jennifer Thompson, Matthew Affron, Susan Anderson and Miriam Cady at the Philadelphia Museum of Art.

At the Centre Country Historical Society State College, PA, my thanks go to Mary Sorensen for facilitating access to Georges Grey Barnard's papers, and for driving me to Bellefonte. I also owe thanks to Jason L. Wilson at the Pennsylvania Capitol Preservation

Committee, and Amy Hammond at The State Museum of Pennsylvania in Harrisburg. In Pittsburgh, I accessed artists and objects files at the Carnegie Museum of Art thanks to Akemi May and Elizabeth Tuft-Brown. During the pandemic, Corey Piper at the Chrysler Museum of Art kindly scanned object files for me. I am also grateful to Thayer Tolles at the Metropolitan Museum of Art for giving me access to departmental files on Barnard, and to Margarita Karasoulas at the Brooklyn Museum of Art for installing O'Connor's *Tristan and Isolde* in their Luce Center for American Art. I would also like to thank Tara Hart, Majida Mugharbel and Lawrence Hernandez at the Whitney Museum for organizing a viewing of Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney's sculptures in storage.

During these many research years, I was fortunate to receive the support of Michelle Greet, June Hargrove, Renée Ater, Sarah Betzer and Sheila Crane, from whose conversations I benefitted enormously. I would also like to thank Marjan Sterckx for helping me publish my first scholarly article on O'Connor, and Roberto Ferrari and Thomas Macsotay for inviting me to their CAA panel in New York City in 2019, where I had the pleasure to meet Brian Hack and Caterina Pierre. In these final months leading towards the submission of this dissertation, Lory Frankel, Jackie Duke, and Virginia Flavin have been of incredible help editing my manuscript. Over the past years, friends have opened their doors for me in Buenos Aires, Madrid, New York, London, Paris and The Hague. I would like to particularly thank Gala Amagat, Alison Boyd, Charlotte Foucher Zarmanian, Perrine Fuchs, Valentina Hristova, Paulina Pardo, Anne Théry, and Jill Vaum Rothschild. They made this research journey all the more joyful and fulfilling.

Finally, I could not have accomplished this PhD without the moral support of my parents, Isabelle and Jean-Michel Fava-Piz, who have always encouraged me to pursue my passion. Ma *belle famille*, Claudia, Richard, and Luke Robinson, has welcomed me with open arms, and played

a decisive role in my pursuit of a PhD in the United States. Lastly, there would be no dissertation if it were not for this one chance encounter that took place eleven years ago at La Complutense in Madrid, and which changed the path of my life. I owe my biggest thanks to Matthew Robinson, my husband, who has tirelessly read and edited every bit of writing of this dissertation, and who has showed infinite support, love, and humor, throughout this PhD adventure.

Merci à tous!

1.0 Introduction

Let us imagine the year is 1894. We are in Paris, in early April. Sculptors are getting ready to submit their works to the annual Salons, which will be opening at the beginning of May. Among them, the 31-year-old American George Grey Barnard (1863-1938) awaits a visit from the French sculptor Auguste Rodin (1840-1917), president of the sculpture section of the Société Nationale des Beaux-Arts, one of the major Paris Salons. Here is the (likely apocryphal) story as it has been told until now:

> Rodin came to Barnard's studio. His vast beard spread over his chest like a peacock. […] Rodin looked all over the studio.
> 'We want something for the Salon, Barnard,' […]
> 'I am the President!' Rodin said gruffly. 'I want all of these!'
> Trucks were brought. They loaded on the 'Two Natures', 'Brotherly Love', the 'Norwegian Stove,' and some busts.
> As the pieces were brought into the Salon, Rodin said to the committee: 'Here's the American that's done this wonderful thing. I'm going to give him his just place.'
> He called to the blue-uniformed porters.
> 'Move all of these marbles of mine out of here,' he ordered. 'Put all of Monsieur Barnard's in their place.'
> They hesitated. […] The twenty or so of them began heaving the statues and putting the young American's work in Rodin's place.[1]

This anecdote epitomizes the domination of Rodin over his contemporaries, both French and foreign, and over the institution of the Paris Salons. However, Rodin is here portrayed as a benevolent master who would give up his own spot at the Salon for the benefit of a hitherto unknown, but talented, young American sculptor.

[1] Daniel M. Williams manuscript draft, pages 372-373. "Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

Emblematic of the influential role that Rodin continues to play today in the modernist narrative of sculpture, this anecdote was recently mentioned in the opening line of the essay "American Sculpture and Rodin" co-authored by Roberta K. Tarbell and Ilene Susan Fort in the 2011 exhibition catalogue *Rodin and America*.[2] The origins of this story, though, date back from 1937, when it was first recounted by Daniel M. Williams in an article published in the journal *North American Review*.[3] The following year, it was copied and translated into French in a Belgian newspaper, in an article entitled "George Grey Barnard, le Rodin Américain."[4]

Published two decades after Rodin's death, this story, which showcases a remarkable display of generosity by Rodin towards a potential rival, runs counter to nearly everything we know from archival material about Rodin's career and his competitive nature. On March 31, 1894, Barnard went to Rodin's studio, bringing an introduction from the French sculptor Alfred Boucher (1850-1934). As he did not find Rodin, he left him a letter, asking for a favor: to place his sculptural

---

[2] Bernard Barryte and Roberta K. Tarbell, eds., *Rodin and America: Influence and Adaptation, 1876-1936* (Stanford, CA: Milano, Italy: Iris & B. Gerald Cantor Center for Visual Arts, Stanford University; Silvana Editoriale, 2011) 87.

[3] Daniel M. Williams, "George Grey Barnard," *North American Review* 243, no. 2 (Summer 1937): 281."Up to then, he [Barnard] was unknown as an artist. The time for the Salon exhibition, the great annual field day for artists in France, approached. Competition for places was hard. Rodin, the greatest sculptor of the period, had heard of Barnard. He visited his studio, was amazed by the gargantuan *Two Natures* and by five other figures. Barnard said he had only the *Two Natures* but added that the committee would not come to see it. 'I am the Committee!' exclaimed Rodin. 'I want all of these.' Six figures were carted to the Salon where Rodin ordered the attendants to move his own exhibit and put the American's in its place. The work brought this unknown sculptor acclaim round the world."

[4] Alice M. Nelson, "George Grey Barnard, Le Rodin Américain," *La Flandre Libérale*, April 18, 1938. This same story was recounted again in the journal *La Gazette*, Brussels, August 16, 1938. Archives and Documentation Center, Musée Rodin.

group in a more prominent location at the Salon.[5] This was a common request among ambitious young sculptors seeking to receive the attention of the press at the annual Salons. Barnard, who had already been living in Paris for ten years, never met Rodin and was relying on Boucher's connection to help improve his chances at the Salon.[6] Could it be that the account of Rodin's visit to Barnard's studio was entirely fictional?

In the spring of 2019, during a research trip to Philadelphia, I discovered the manuscript from which the aforementioned quote was extracted. Daniel M. Williams, an American journalist who had befriended Barnard in the 1930s, had worked on a book recounting the life of the sculptor. The manuscript, annotated in Barnard's hand, clearly shows question marks in the left margin, and a few pages later the sculptor commented, "All this story of Rodin involved is not keeping to the truth"[7] **(figures 1-2)**. Just one example in the construction of the narrative of Rodin's hegemony over his fellow sculptors, perpetuating the idea of his dominance in the development of modern sculpture, this illustration of myth-making epitomizes the goals and method of my research: through close analysis of objects and archival material, I want to change the way we have understood American sculptors as provincial imitators of French sculpture, overshadowed by Rodin, and tell a more collective and transnational history of modern sculpture.

---

[5] Barnard to Rodin, March 31, 1894 accompanied by an introduction card from Alfred Boucher. "George Grey Barnard Vertical File" (Paris, France, n.d.), Archives and Documentation Center, Musée Rodin.

[6] *Ibidem*. Alfred Boucher annotated his *carte de visite,* introducing Barnard as "a young American who has just made a large marble, which is very good and very special. He wants to put it in the Champ de Mars exhibition." Translated from : « un jeune Américain qui vient de faire un grand groupe en marbre qui est très bien et très particulier. Il désire le mettre à l'exposition du Champ de Mars. » Archives and Documentation Center, Musée Rodin.

[7] Daniel M. Williams manuscript draft, pages 372-373. "Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard."

Breaking with the pervasive model of individual statues of heroic men erected on pedestals, complex multi-figural groups transformed the urban landscape in the Americas at the beginning of the twentieth century. The ambitious proportions of these sculptural ensembles, the ambiguity of their poses, and their often-unexpected settings have rendered these once celebrated monuments difficult to decipher for contemporary spectators. Designed for an international context and audience, they were created in a unique transnational space of artistic exchanges – the Paris Salons – in an environment of intense nationalist expectations and pressures. Some of them, considered at the time too ambitious or too contentious to be fully executed, have remained fragmentary, while others never came to fruition. In this study, I propose to reevaluate the history of modern sculpture by redefining the affinities between public and gallery-sized sculptures, as well as by decentering Rodin, even now thought of as the father of modern sculpture. I argue instead that it was a shared Salons culture that led to the emergence of a modern allegorical language that helped fuel the international demand for large-scale, intellectually bold monumental programs.

Broadening the narrative of Euro-American art by including Latin America, this study is undergirded by the stories of three sculptors: the American George Grey Barnard; the Irish-American Andrew O'Connor (1874-1941); and the Argentinian Rogelio Yrurtia (1879-1950). Considered today "followers" of Rodin, they were all active participants in the Paris Salons. Yet, although they designed monuments for the jury and critics of the Paris Salons, they also needed to appeal to their domestic patrons, simultaneously attempting to meet, but also shape the expectations of their commissioners across the Atlantic. Their oeuvre offers a lens through which to consider various sets of issues, ranging from the use of appropriation, fragmentation, and repurposing from museum pieces to large-scale public sculptures; the conflict between a

transnational practice and nationalist expectations; to the shifting identity and cosmopolitanism of fin-de-siècle sculptors.

At a time of heightened public awareness surrounding monuments throughout the United States, Latin America, and western Europe, and at a moment when museums are attempting to challenge the traditional modernist narrative, this study seeks to reestablish the links between the shared history of public and modern sculpture and highlight the fluidity of artistic exchanges across Europe and the Americas. I reevaluate the Salons as a multinational ecosystem that encouraged collaborative artistic practices and fostered the creation and internationalization of modern sculpture. Rodin himself was an active participant and jury member in the Paris Salons, though he would come to be seen as being independent of it. This research rejects the modernist genealogy of individual figures and reconsiders the dichotomies between center and periphery, national and foreign, and academic and modern.

1.1 Beyond Rodin and "Rodinism"

The 2017 wave of commemorative exhibitions celebrating the centenary of Rodin's death across Argentina, France, and the United States demonstrated the enduring international presence of Rodin.[8] In Paris, the exhibition *Rodin: L'exposition du Centenaire* at the Grand Palais was accompanied by an international symposium, "Rodin, l'onde de choc," an academic reinforcement

---

[8] See the mapping project of Rodin's sculptures in museums all over the world created for the occasion of the centenary of the death of the sculptor in 2017: "Collections Rodin dans le monde," Google My Maps, accessed December 2, 2020, https://www.google.com/maps/d/viewer?mid=1ZxjuljoocvXSQjCJJDt8fJNw018.

of the premise that the French master dominated the development of twentieth-century modern sculpture.[9] Its intellectual agenda accorded with "*Rodin: Centenario en Bellas Artes"* in Buenos Aires, which emphasized Rodin's prevalent influence in the construction of Argentina as a modern nation.[10] In the United States, museums used this anniversary as an opportunity to showcase their holdings of Rodin's sculptures, for instance, at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City ("Rodin at The Met"), and the Legion of Honor Museum in San Francisco ("Auguste Rodin: The Centenary Installation"), to name a few.[11] Rodin is still considered *the* genius who forever changed the course of sculpture, and his name is inscribed alongside those of Henri Matisse (1869-1954) and Pablo Picasso (1881-1973) within the predominantly male and white western art historical canon of the twentieth century.

Whether perceived as the last nineteenth-century sculptor, having exhausted the expressive potential of sculpture, or as the founding father of modern sculpture, Rodin is cast as the leading man in both narratives.[12] Famous during his lifetime for his commercial works in bronze and marble, Rodin was dismissed for decades after his death until Leo Steinberg's 1963 essay for the exhibition catalogue *Rodin: Sculptures and Drawings* re-established him as a dominant figure in

---

[9] Auguste Rodin et al., *Rodin: le livre du Centenaire* (Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux, 2017).

[10] Andrés Duprat et al., *Rodin. Centenario en Bellas Artes*, Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes (Argentina, 2018).

[11] *Rodin at The Met*, The Metropolitan Museum, New York, Sept 5, 2017-Jan 15, 2018. *Auguste Rodin: The Centenary Installation*, Legion of Honor, San Francisco, Jan 28- Dec 31, 2017. Here is a comprehensive list of the events organized around the celebration of Rodin at 100, which took place in 2017: http://rodin100.org/en

[12] Penelope Curtis, *Sculpture 1900-1945: After Rodin*, Oxford History of Art (Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).

the genealogy of modernist sculptors.[13] Published again in 1972 in *Other Criteria*, Steinberg's essay on Rodin describes the French sculptor as the two-faced god Janus: "within the Western anatomic-figure tradition, Rodin is indeed the last sculptor. Yet he is also the first of a new wave, for his tragic sense of man victimized is expressed through a formal intuition of energies other than anatomical."[14] Inspired by the poet Rainer Maria Rilke's essay on Rodin, Steinberg proposed a new theoretical lens through which to consider the French sculptor's work, in particular, his experimentation with plasters, developing the concepts of "multiplication," "fragmentation," and "assemblage" to describe Rodin's innovative sculptural language. This analysis nourished Rosalind Krauss's ideas on modern sculpture in her groundbreaking publication *Passages of Modern Sculpture* from 1977, and prevails today, with Alex Potts's 2000 book, *The Sculptural Imagination. Figurative, Modernist, Minimalist*.[15]

Despite important studies on such figures as Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux (1827-1875) and Augustus Saint-Gaudens (1848-1907), the history of nineteenth-century sculpture is defined largely by two canonical artists at either end of the period: Antonio Canova (1757-1822) and Rodin. In 2009, the exhibition *Oublier Rodin? La sculpture à Paris, 1905-1914* attempted to

[13] Leo Steinberg's essay on "Rodin," was first published as an introduction to *Rodin: Sculptures and Drawings*, exhibition catalogue, Charles E. Slatkin Galleries, New York, May 1963. It was published again as part of the collection of essays in Leo Steinberg, *Other Criteria: Confrontations with Twentieth-Century Art* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972).

[14] *Ibid*., 323 and 325.

[15] Rosalind E. Krauss, *Passages in Modern Sculpture* (New York: Viking Press, 1977); Alex Potts, *The Sculptural Imagination: Figurative, Modernist, Minimalist* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000).

rehabilitate an entire generation of sculptors active in Paris before World War I.[16] For any sculptor of this generation, "the problem was Rodin."[17] Art critics used the French sculptor as a barometer of success, systematically comparing any sculptural work of interest to Rodin. Sculptors were either fascinated or repulsed by him. Either way, these artists could not escape the shadow of the French master. In her book *La sculpture à Paris 1905-1914. Le moment de tous les possible*, Catherine Chevillot considers Paris as a melting pot for European sculptors in search of a modern sculptural language. Rodin remains the symbol of modernity, but the author argues against the unifying modernist model asserting that modern sculpture gave up the representation of the human figure and broke away from traditional techniques and materials in order to introduce a conceptual dimension. Instead, Chevillot views the period from 1905 to 1914 as marked by a multiplicity of visions, perceptions, and sensibilities of sculptors in their search for autonomy vis-à-vis painting.[18]

Most studies on the origins of modern sculpture have been reduced to focusing on Rodin's oeuvre, arguing that sculptors had to relate not only to Rodin and his aesthetics, but even sometimes with the image that the artist projected and diffused in the press. Marisa Baldasarre, for instance, compares a photographic portrait of Rogelio Yrurtia, as a bearded man looking straight at the camera, with a portrait of Rodin holding a similar pose, arguing that the Argentinian sculptor

---

[16] Catherine Chevillot, Musée d'Orsay, and Fundación Mapfre, *Oublier Rodin?: la sculpture à Paris, 1905-1914* (Paris: Hazan, 2009).

[17] This expression comes from Albert E. Elsen, *Origins of Modern Sculpture: Pioneers and Premises* (New York: G. Braziller, 1974) 71: "In 1900, Rodin was sixty years of age, and he continued to exhibit and make sculpture almost until his death in 1917. For many young artists seeking to grow and establish their own identity, Rodin was the problem." Chevillot uses it as the title of her introductory essay in, Chevillot, Musée d'Orsay, and Fundación Mapfre, *Oublier Rodin?*, 17-23.

[18] Catherine Chevillot, *La sculpture à Paris: 1905-1914, le moment de tous les possibles* (Vanves: Hazan, 2017).

strategically appropriated Rodin's props to represent himself like the French master.[19] This comparison is characteristic of contemporary art critics who consistently related any sculptor active at the turn of the century with Rodin. However, early twentieth-century sculptors demonstrated contradictory behaviors towards Rodin: although aware of Rodin's work and the artist's preeminent position, they also contested their forced filiation to the French sculptor. This ambivalence is well illustrated by Barnard, who, in asking Rodin for a favor, praised him as "the master who had the most influence on me." [20] Yet when commenting on the fact that "His work has been compared to Rodin's," journalists reported that "Barnard himself denies any admiration for or sympathy with Rodin's methods."[21]

This dissonance between the influential role attributed to Rodin on his contemporaries and the opinions of the sculptors themselves is highlighted in Yrurtia's response to the French art historian Louis Hourticq, who, in a lecture on South American art, asserted the lineage of Yrurtia's sculptures with Rodin. Yrurtia expressed his disagreement in a letter addressed to *La Nación*, the Argentinian newspaper that reported Hourticq's observations:

> This matter of my kinship with Rodin, which is far from honoring me in any way, has not surprised me. He was already a cliché of generality, when he deigned to distinguish me among the French contemporary sculptors – at the time that I lived among them – and that M. Rodin himself applied to disclose it to the critics every time that we exhibited in the same place, claiming his authorship over me, which I have never accepted nor understood

[19] Baldasarre, "El nombre de Rodin", in Duprat et al., *Rodin,* 71.

[20] Barnard to Rodin, March 31, 1894. "George Grey Barnard Vertical File." « Je ne me permettrais pas de venir vous déranger ainsi si l'endroit où l'on a placé mon groupe n'était pas si défavorable que j'ai peu d'espoir que le jury puisse même le voir, oserais-je espérer que vous voudrez bien faire quelque chose pour moi ; et me pardonner si, ne connaissant personne ici, je m'adresse au maître dont j'ai le plus senti l'influence. »

[21] Olive Sanxay, "'Parentage of Genius. The Story of George Gray [Sic] Barnard's Life and Work,'" *The Indianapolis News*, October 4, 1898, 5.

> […] Time, I hope, will establish the truth. Until then I will suffer in silence what fate has so unjustly reserved for me.[22]

Yrurtia's remarks are illustrative of Rodin's use of French critics to establish control over his fellow sculptors. Here, the Argentinian sculptor disapproved of Rodin's paternalistic behavior, but at the time, he was not in a position to contradict the French sculptor's claims. The sculptor's archival correspondence shows other instances in which Yrurtia denounced the dominant role of Rodin: his friend, the Argentinian painter Martín Malharro (1865-1911) warned Yrurtia early in his Paris sojourn not to express his truthful feelings about Rodin in public because they could be used against him.[23] Yet scholars have generally questioned the veracity of these artists' testimonies, ascribing to them petty defensiveness in their strategic denial of Rodin's influence on their art.

Contrary to the widespread idea of Rodin's broad influence over his fellow sculptors, only a small number of sculptors were actually his *students*. The Institut Rodin, also referred to as the Académie Rodin, that was founded in 1900 by Antoine Bourdelle (1861-1929), Jules Desbois (1851-1935), and Rodin did not last long. Bourdelle, a former student of Rodin, quickly took it

---

[22] "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Casa de Yrurtia. Draft of letter written by Yrurtia, undated, in response to the article, "*M. Hourticq disertó sobre arte sudamericano*" published in *La Nación* on April 5, 1924. "Este asunto de mi parentesco con Rodin que está bien lejos de honorarme en ningún sentido, no me ha sorprendido. Él era ya el cliché de la generalidad, cuando se dignaba distinguirme por entre los estatuarios contemporáneos franceses - en el momento que yo vivía por entre ellos - y que M. Rodin se aplicaba *lui même* a divulgarlo a la crítica cada vez que nos encontramos expositores en algún paraje reclamándose mi paternidad que yo nunca he aceptado ni comprendido […]"

[23] "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

over and transformed it into what became the Académie de la Grande Chaumière.[24] In Paris, sculptors mostly trained with, or worked in the studios of French sculptors in the *Académies libres,* or at the prestigious École nationale des beaux-arts. During his first stay in the French capital, Barnard had enrolled at the École nationale and took classes with Jules Cavelier (1814-1894) at the Académie Colarossi. After his arrival in Paris in 1900, Yrurtia attended modeling classes during the day at the Académie Julian with Raoul Verlet (1857-1923), and at night went to drawing classes at the Académie Colarossi with Jules Coutan (1848-1939), for whom he worked as a studio assistant. Although contemporary critics referred to them as the "American Rodin" and the "Argentinian Rodin" respectively, the two sculptors never studied under Rodin.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Rodin's studio in Meudon became a site of pilgrimage for visitors who were living in or passing through Paris.[25] Scholars have often emphasized the importance of these studio visits, even though, in the case of Andrew O'Connor and Rogelio Yrurtia, there is no proof in the archives that the sculptors ever visited. In her study of Latin American artists, collectors, and intellectuals in Paris, Baldasarre defined this established practice of visiting Rodin's studio as "modernist pilgrimages," arguing that Rodin's oeuvre was a source of fascination for sophisticated Argentinians. Referring to Yrurtia, she maintained, "Rodin functioned as an artist model for the young South American, but his figure, his teaching, in turn

[24] In 1900, three sculpture masters, Rodin, Desbois and Bourdelle founded a school of sculpture, at 132 boulevard Montparnasse, to compete with the official curriculum of the École Nationale des Beaux-Arts. Within the first month, it counted 30 students, men and women, among which a large group of foreigners. See Amélie Simier, Claire Boisseroles, and Stéphane Ferrand, *Transmission / Transgression : Maîtres et Élèves Dans l'atelier : Rodin, Bourdelle, Giacometti, Richier...*, Musée Bourdelle (Paris: Paris musées, 2018).

[25] Starting in 1893, Rodin rented a studio in Meudon that he bought in 1895. The sculptor would establish his residence at the Hôtel Biron in Paris in 1908.

was fed by all those sculptors who, coming from the most distant cities, swelled his brood of followers."[26] While Rodin embodied a model for many, the French sculptor also took advantage of his influence over foreign artists, and he would most directly exert his artistic domination over his contemporaries through his leading role in the Salons system.

Admittedly, sculptors could not ignore Rodin's influential role in the Parisian artistic milieu. Well before his 1900 retrospective at the Pavillon de l'Alma that brought him international recognition, Rodin had participated in exhibitions abroad.[27] Rodin's growing success following the important commission of *The Gates of Hell* in 1890 encouraged foreign critics to compare the works of their local artists to those of the French master as a signifier of prestige. Today, art historians continue to use derivative terms, such as "*rodinesque*" or "*rodiniste,*" to define a sculpture "in the manner of" Rodin. Both in the academic literature and on museum walls and object labels, the work of the French sculptor is systematically used as an analytic prism to consider sculpture of his time, serving as the major, and often unique, point of reference for early twentieth-century sculptures.

The expression "in the Age of Rodin" in my dissertation title is emblematic of the role played by the French sculptor in the popular imagination. Seeing early-twentieth century sculpture through the lens of what is known of Rodin is pervasive because of his dominance in all the studies

---

[26] María Isabel Baldasarre, "Peregrinaciones al santuario del arte moderno. Obras, artistas e intelectuales de América Latina en el taller de Auguste Rodin," *Nuevo mundo mundos nuevos*, 2017, 27, https://doi.org/10.4000/nuevomundo.70720.

[27] See the list of exhibitions in which Rodin participated outside France at the Archives and Documentation Center, Musée Rodin, Paris. As early as 1876, Rodin had sent his works to the Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia. See also Auguste Rodin, *Rodin en 1900: l'exposition de l'Alma* (Paris: Musée Luxembourg : Musée Rodin : Réunion des musées nationaux, 2001).

of sculpture, as well as his penetration into popular culture. I believe that Rodin's oeuvre needs to be reconsidered within the context of the Paris Salons system. Rather than arguing for its dismissal, I propose that we reevaluate his works *alongside* the sculptures of his contemporaries in the context of the Paris Salons. In short, we need to *decenter* Rodin – knock him off his pedestal, so that he may stand with the rest of the modern sculptors of his time. Although Rodin is still referred to as a "genius," this term has seen its use wane. In the early 1900s, for instance, the Argentinian artist and politician Eduardo Schiaffino (1858-1935), applied the term "genius" in his correspondence to the painters Pierre Puvis de Chavannes (1824-1898) and Jean-Francois Millet (1814-1875), whom he greatly admired.[28] I seek to reevaluate a modernist narrative of great individuals—"geniuses"—that set Rodin apart to make him the one and only, and emphasize instead the *collectivity* of the Salons, in which artists, both French and foreigners, shaped the language of modern sculpture.

In a way, Rodin offers a *shortcut* to describe the sculpture of his time. He is emblematic of a style, of modernism, but also of an epoch. Without Rodin, scholars lack the visual tools to describe early twentieth-century sculpture. This study aims to bring back a broader range of visual material and archival documentation from that time in order to recontextualize Rodin's oeuvre in the collaborative system of the Paris Salons and, at the same time, to offer a more complex understanding of the modern system of production of transatlantic monuments.

[28] "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

1.2 Modernism in the Paris Salons

At the turn of the twentieth century, the Paris Salons constituted a major cosmopolitan nexus in the international network of exhibitions. In Europe, Paris played a leading role among the several cultural capitals that included London, with its annual exhibitions at the Royal Academy, Madrid, with its national exhibitions organized by the Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando, and Brussels, with its Salon Triennal and the Groupe des XX, among others. But the French capital affirmed its dominance at a global scale by organizing four Expositions Universelles between 1855 and 1900, becoming an important node in the transatlantic circuit of world's fairs with other booming metropolises such as Philadelphia (1876), Chicago (1893), Buffalo (1901), Saint Louis (1904), and San Francisco (1915), to name a few. While many studies have focused on the role of the world's fairs in the construction of national identities, this study explores the culture of the Paris Salons and its role in the internationalization of modern sculpture in the age of Rodin.[29]

The Paris Salons suffer from their perception as a stuffy repository of French academic art. Most of the visual material documenting the Salons is composed of photographic albums, known as the *Albums Michelez,* commissioned by the French government to highlight the works that received a jury prize and were bought by the State, and these tended to be predominantly French

---

[29] Patricia Mainardi, *Art and Politics of the Second Empire: Universal Expositions of 1855 and 1867* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990); Robert W. Rydell, *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984); Robert W Rydell et al., eds., *Revisiting the White City: American Art at the 1893 World's Fair* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1993); Astrid Böger, *Envisioning the Nation the Early American World's Fairs and the Formation of Culture* (Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag, 2010).

pieces.[30] The illustrated Salons catalogues also mostly featured French sculptures. It is therefore difficult to paint an accurate portrait of the diversity of sculptures at the Salons. However, the Salons catalogues offered a complete dataset of all the sculptors' names and works on display in these exhibitions, making them the most efficient tool to recover the international dimension of the Paris Salons, alongside popular magazines, such as *Art et Décoration*, *L'Illustration*, or *Le Figaro-Salon*, which published illustrated reviews of the annual Salons.

Although the institutional history of the Paris Salons has recently benefited from renewed interest by scholars and even sociologists, who have studied them as a social structure in which artists gained public recognition, the role of the Salons in the development of modernism needs to be reassessed.[31] Scholars have not yet moved on from the historiographical paradigm that considered nineteenth-century sculpture as a binary between Rodin and modernism on one side and the so-called "academism" of the monolithic Salon on the other. This study, however, rejects

---

[30] Some scholars have nonetheless pointed out the presence of foreign contemporary acquisitions by the French government at the turn of the twentieth century. Véronique Wiesinger published a list of the American paintings and sculptures that entered the French national collections between 1870 and 1940. See Véronique Wiesinger, "La politique d'acquisition de l'Etat français sous la Troisième République en matière d'art étranger contemporain : l'exemple américain (1870-1940)," *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art Français*, 1993, 263–99.

[31] Dominique Lobstein, *Les salons au XIXe Siècle: Paris, capitale des arts* (Paris: Martinière, 2006); Patricia Mainardi, *The End of the Salon: Art and the State in the Early Third Republic* (Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Pierre Vaisse, *La Troisième République et les peintres*, Série Art, Histoire, Société (Paris: Flammarion, 1995); James Kearns and Pierre Vaisse, eds., *"Ce Salon à quoi tout se ramène": Le salon de peinture et de sculpture, 1791-1890*, French Studies of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries 26 (Bern, Switzerland ; New York: Peter Lang, 2010); Fae Brauer, *Rivals and Conspirators: The Paris Salons and the Modern Art Centre* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014); Nathalie Heinich, *Etre artiste: les transformations du statut des peintres et des sculpteurs* (Paris: Klincksieck, 2012).

the idea of rupture in the artistic development at the time, which would have widened the gap between a supposed "academic" and "modernist" art stemming from the development of a new gallery system.[32] Even with new galleries emerging in the cultural landscape in the late nineteenth century, the Salons maintained their relevance, not simply as a space for artistic recognition but, more important, as privileged exhibition platforms, especially for nineteenth-century sculptors, who had few opportunities to display sculptures in private galleries.

By 1900, the Paris Salons were the most prestigious sculpture exhibitions in the western world, with sculptors from twenty-two countries represented in this annual two-month event. They formed a major artistic hub for foreign sculptors seeking critical validation of their work; the artists were acutely aware of the impact this legitimation could have on their domestic and international success. Although scholars still consider the Paris Salons as a center dominating over its peripheries, I argue that they operated as a vibrant transnational ecosystem in which ideas and sculptural motifs circulated with multidirectional channels of exchange. The Salons encompassed a repertory of forms in which sculptors appropriated, emulated, and repurposed sculptural motifs for their own works, participating in the creation of a modern language that rejected neoclassical didacticism and offered a new, more accessible experience of public sculpture. There is no clear break between the avant-garde and the so-called tradition of nineteenth-century sculpture.

Modernism did not arise against the establishment and the so-called "academism" of the Salons but rather found its origins within this collaborative Salons culture. While the American critic Leo Steinberg singled out Rodin's oeuvre as pioneering in his use of "multiplication,"

[32] Harrison C. White and Cynthia A. White, *Canvases and Careers: Institutional Change in the French Painting World* (New York: Wiley, 1965); Béatrice Joyeux-Prunel, *Les avant-gardes artistiques 1848-1918: une histoire transnationale*, Folio Histoire (Paris: Gallimard, 2015).

"fragmentation," and "assemblage,"[33] I show that these modernist practices were already common in the system of the Paris Salons, in which Rodin was actively engaged, and each of the sculptures discussed in this study is linked to the institutional system of the Paris Salons. Moving away from an art history tracking a genealogy of individual geniuses, I suggest instead that the Paris Salons functioned as a collective system that shaped the development of a modern language of sculpture. Looking past the bibliographical gap between modernist sculpture and monument, I show how Rodin and his contemporaries created a modern language for public sculpture that transformed plazas in France and abroad.

1.3 Modern Public Sculpture

In the early decades of the twentieth century, complex multi-figural groups with exaggerated gestures and contorted poses broke from the pervasive model of statues of heroic men on horses erected on a pedestal. Erased from the predominant modernist narrative that proclaimed the "death of the monument," these ambitious monuments have fallen through the cracks of art history.[34] Instead, modern sculpture has become associated with smaller, gallery-sized works with condensed forms leaning towards greater abstraction, even though nineteenth-century sculptors worked on different scales at the same time, both for artistic and commercial aims. This presumed

[33] Steinberg, *Other Criteria*.

[34] Lewis Mumford, "The Death of the Monument," in *Circle; International Survey of Constructive Art*, ed. Leslie Martin, Ben Nicholson, and Naum Gabo (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971), 263–70. "The very notion of a modern monument is a contradiction in terms: if it is a monument, it cannot be modern, and if it is modern, it cannot be a monument." (264)

shift from monument to gallery-sized sculpture also reduced modern sculpture to individual artists, ignoring, for instance, that if Constantin Brancusi (1876-1957) and Isamu Noguchi (1904-1988) carved their own sculptures directly, they also worked collaboratively on monumental ensembles.[35] Furthermore, scholars have isolated these sculptors as modernists and dismissed their ties to the generation of sculptors from which Rodin, Barnard, O'Connor, and Yrurtia belonged, yet Brancusi was a former student and assistant of Rodin, while Noguchi worked under Gutzon Borglum (1867-1941) early in his career and wrote to Barnard asking for letters of recommendation.[36]

This study bridges the bibliographical divide between monuments and gallery-sized sculptures. I analyze how sculptures were designed to work both as monumental assemblages and as fragments "extracted" from the ensemble, and how they served as prototypes, or sources of appropriation, to be transformed incrementally by other sculptors until the original source of the motif could scarcely be identified. The movement of these fragments across continents and spaces of display, and the processes of transformation they underwent while moving from the gallery space to the public square, affected both the commissioning process and the reception of artworks in the contemporary press. Both small-scale sculptures and monumental projects were exhibited at the Paris Salons. The category "monument" was even added to the Salons catalogues in the nineteenth century, even though most sculptural projects, even preliminary sketches of monumental works, continued to be listed under the section on "sculpture." There was no true

---

[35] Noguchi attempted to gain commissions for the WPA projects but only faced rejections because instead of designing monuments that dignified the war, he proposed antiwar monuments.

[36] "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

distinction between gallery-sized sculptures and monuments, which were all exhibited together at the Paris Salons.

Recently, scholars have offered new ways to interpret this phenomenon of monumentality at the turn of the century. In France, Chevillot argues that the French painter Puvis de Chavannes's (1824-1898) large figurative compositions impacted the domain of sculpture toward a greater monumentality. For instance, Albert Bartholomé's (1848-1928) *Monument to the Dead*, presented in its plaster version at the 1897 Salon des artistes français and inaugurated at the Père Lachaise cemetery in 1899, constitutes a perfect example of the application of Puvis de Chavannes's principles in sculpture.[37] In the United States, Darcy Grimaldo Grigsby uses the concept of the "colossal" to connect the engineering achievements of Frédéric Auguste Bartholdi's (1834-1904) *Statue of Liberty*, Gustave Eiffel's (1832-1923) eponymous tower, and the construction of the Panama Canal.[38] However, limited to specific case studies, the scholarship on early twentieth-century sculpture does not address the role played by monumental sculpture in the modernist narrative.

In this study, I call "modern public sculpture" these ambitious, multifigured compositions that turned away from the traditional model of the hero standing on a pedestal or riding a horse and instead developed complex narratives for a broader audience. Early twentieth-century sculptors rejected the decorative function of sculpture and pushed against the established categories of sculpture and architecture by creating monuments that were architecturally

---

[37] Chevillot, *La sculpture à Paris*, 37–38.

[38] Darcy Grimaldo Grigsby, *Colossal: Engineering the Suez Canal, Statue of Liberty, Eiffel Tower, and Panama Canal: Transcontinental Ambition in France and the United States During the Long Nineteenth Century*, 1st ed. (Pittsburgh [PA] New York: Periscope Pub; Distributed by Prestel, 2012).

ambitious. Not interested in “doing statues,” as Barnard put it, they designed monuments that did not function like the prototypical model of heroic statues, flanked with props and attributes, as commonly featured in neoclassical sculpture. Rejecting established binaries, such as the victor and victim, modern sculptors abandoned codified gestures that relied on the spectator’s knowledge of Cesare Ripa’s emblem book *L’iconologia.* Instead, their monuments explored more universal issues, such as the traumas of war or exile, in Andrew O’Connor’s works, or the progress of humanity, in Barnard and Yrurtia’s sculptures.

Pushed by their belief in the ability of sculpture to shape society, modern sculptors developed a sculptural language that explored the human condition. Some have labeled Rodin’s sculptures “symbolist,” to describe the sculptor’s ability to express in marble the emotional strains of humanity.[39] Yet the stylistic category of “symbolism” does not account for the profound transformation of the sculptural language that Rodin and his contemporaries tackled. By discarding attributes and allegorical gestures, they popularized the sculptural language, so that every spectator could relate to it. Nonetheless, the complexity of their figurative compositions, often paired with the ambiguity of the postures and body language, did not always allow for a clear interpretation. Although these same characteristics differentiate these sculptural groups from fascist and populist sculptural propaganda, the opacity of their meaning may have also contributed to their erasure from art historical narratives.

[39] Le Normand-Romain opens her essay on symbolism wondering if we can talk about “symbolist sculpture” according to Aurier’s definition of symbolism from 1891, and claims that “we have always answered this question with a name: Rodin”; or in French, « *on a toujours répondu à cette question par un nom : Rodin* ». Antoinette Le Normand-Romain, “Le symbolisme,” in *La sculpture française du XIXe siècle* (Paris: Editions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, 1982), 380.

Adding to their obscurity, many of these ambitious sculptural projects ended up monumental failures. Some were spurned by patrons who had different expectations of what a monument meant; others were aborted due to financial stress and the sculptors' running out of time. For instance, most projects of monuments to labor that emerged in western Europe at the turn of the twentieth century, from those of Jules Dalou (1838-1902) to Constantin Meunier (1831-1905), were left incomplete, and eventually were dismissed from the modernist narrative. Even Rodin's project for a *Tower of Labor* was omitted from Steinberg's reevaluation of the French master's oeuvre. John M. Hunisak, after describing it as "the single most ambitious project of Rodin's long career," continued, "it has been almost totally forgotten since his death."[40] This lack of interest for the monumental creations of modern sculptors highlights the marginal place that monuments hold in the history of art, where they have been pigeonholed either as political public propaganda or as decorative park pieces.

1.4 Methods

At the crossroads of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century American, European, and Latin American art, this project borrows methods from all three fields. Americanists have traditionally analyzed nineteenth-century sculpture through the successive generations of American sculptors who traveled to Italy, Rome and Florence, in particular, before changing

[40] John M Hunisak, "Rodin, Dalou, and the Monument to Labor," in *Art the Ape of Nature*, ed. Moshe Barasch and Lucy Freeman Sandler, Harry N. Abrams (New York, 1981), 689–705.

course to Paris later in the century.[41] Following the accounts of sculptors who went to Europe for training, or sometimes to set up their studios, these studies have accentuated the center-periphery dynamic, identifying American sculptors as followers of European masters, Rodin in particular.[42] In this study, though, I reevaluate this predominant narrative by centering my analysis around the histories of the sculptures themselves, and how they functioned as mobile agents across borders. Inspired by Jennifer Roberts's work on materiality in early American art, I analyze how transatlantic distances deeply affected the creation of modern sculptures, which were made within a network of artists, patrons, and critics and circulated between various spaces of studios, galleries, exhibitions, and public squares, in different countries.[43]

In her groundbreaking scholarship on the arts and visual culture in nineteenth-century Argentina, Laura Malosetti Costa demonstrates that the concepts of "national" and "modern" attributed to works of art have different meanings in diverse national contexts.[44] Although Ernesto de la Cárcova's (1866-1927) painting *Sin pan y sin trabajo* (*Without Bread and Without Work*) was considered outdated in Paris, where it was made and showcased, the painting became an icon

---

[41] Wayne Craven, *Sculpture in America: From the Colonial Period to the Present* (New York: Crowell, 1968); Melissa Dabakis, *A Sisterhood of Sculptors: American Artists in Nineteenth-Century Rome* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2014).

[42] Ilene Susan Fort and Mary L. Lenihan, *The Figure in American Sculpture: A Question of Modernity* (Los Angeles, Calif: Los Angeles County Museum of Art in association with University of Washington Press, 1995); Barryte and Tarbell, *Rodin and America*.

[43] Jennifer L. Roberts, *Transporting Visions: The Movement of Images in Early America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014).

[44] Laura Malosetti Costa, *Primeros modernos: arte y sociedad en Buenos Aires a fines del siglo XIX* (Buenos Aires: Fondo de cultura económica, 2001).

of modernity in Argentina. There, to this day, it is held as an image of the collective memory and has been appropriated by contemporary artists whose works denounce social injustices.[45] The legacy of Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor* corresponds with that of the painting of his contemporary de la Cárcova. Created in Paris at the beginning of the century, *Hymn to Labor* was shipped to Buenos Aires decades later, where it was regarded as a great example of Argentinian sculpture. Although it was moved to various sites throughout the city over the years, the monument still appears to resonate today for Argentinians, and its image was reproduced on a commemorative postage stamp alongside a quote by Eva Perón in 2010.

This study is situated in the lineage of scholarship on sculpture that has reevaluated the modernist canon of art history, such as that of Anne Wagner, who, in her monograph on Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux (1827-1875), reconsidered the dynamics between the capital and the local context: Paris versus Valenciennes, the sculptor's hometown.[46] By inscribing Carpeaux in the cultural environment of his time and investigating in detail three of his sculptures (*Ugolino*, *The Prince Imperial*, and *The Dance*), the author demonstrates how Carpeaux positioned himself as a precursor to the changing status of sculpture in the middle of the nineteenth century, well before Rodin's time. Inspired by Wagner's method, my dissertation investigates in depth specific examples of sculptures that were created within the transnational ecosystem of the Paris Salons, both as monumental works and autonomous pieces "extracted" from them, and that were destined for a different context, which completely changed their perceived meaning.

[45] *Ernesto de la Cárcova*, Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes (Buenos Aires, 2016).

[46] Anne Middleton Wagner, *Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux: Sculptor of the Second Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986).

My work is also indebted to Alex Potts's concept of "sculptural imagination," which considers the viewer's physical encounter with the sculpture as a basic element of the sculpture itself.[47] Potts argues that starting in the eighteenth century, a shift occurred in what constitutes a sculpture: no longer only based upon its form, the structuring of a work was also defined by its staging and viewing experience. Potts reassesses the traditional dichotomy in the study of sculpture between "classic" and "modern," reevaluating Canova's works as modern. In the *Three Graces*, for example, the figures do not form a coherent unity—as Rosalind Krauss had argued in *Passages in Modern Sculpture*—but rather are brought together in the viewer's gaze. Although Potts's analysis is confined to the study of gallery sculpture, my dissertation seeks to understand the transformation of the viewer's experience of public sculpture in the early twentieth century, when these ambitious, multifigured groups transitioned from the Parisian gallery to the plaza. Modern sculptors rated the issues of the spectator's engagement and site-specificity fundamental to their monuments, issues that scholars have for too long restricted to the work of the minimalists from the 1960s on.

In the museum world, curators Martina Droth and Karen Lemmey have moved away from the artist's agency toward a focus on the sculptural object itself in its materiality. Their respective exhibitions, *Sculpture Victorious: Art in the Age of Invention, 1837-1901* and *Measured Perfection: Hiram Powers' Greek Slave*, have demonstrated that considering multifaceted aspects of the sculptural object, such as its technique, its industry, and its business, helps unravel new threads of understanding about a sculpture and its history.[48] In this lineage, my dissertation

---

[47] Potts, *The Sculptural Imagination*.

[48] T. J. Barringer et al., *Sculpture Victorious: Art in an Age of Invention, 1837-1901* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014); Karen Lemmey, "From Skeleton to Skin: The Making of the Greek Slave(s)," *Nineteenth-Century Art*

examines sculptures as active objects whose meanings are shaped through the work of a chain of collaborators, and through the distance they traveled across the Atlantic. Issues of materiality and labor are more specifically explored in chapters 3 and 5, where I disentangle the histories of various sculptures that originated from a single prototype and circulated overseas, and reinscribe the making of objects within the collaborative labor system of the Paris Salons.

This study leads the reader to cities as diverse as Buenos Aires, Dublin, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, and Washington, D.C., to explore the modern enthusiasm for complex monumental compositions, which has been erased from the genealogy of art historical movements in "- isms." The names of Paris-based sculptors who participated in the creation of a modern sculptural language have largely been forgotten by posterity. Among them, one finds the American George Grey Barnard, the Argentinian Rogelio Yrurtia, and the Irish American Andrew O'Connor, whose sculptural projects, born out of the Paris Salons, are explored in depth in this study. While some scholars have placed foreign sculptors in national boxes, others have tried to identify what was "rodinist" about them. These conflicting ideas, though, are two sides of the same coin: they reduce sculptors to followers, either of Rodin or of their nation. I argue, instead, that these sculptors were products of, and participants in, historically specific collectivities—the Paris Salons—that were created and sustained by actual systems rather than by individual geniuses or national essences. Rodin was as much a product and participant in this collectivity as were Barnard, Yrurtia, and O'Connor, although he became extremely powerful within that system.

Worldwide 15, no. 2 (2016), http://www.19thc-artworldwide.org/summer16/lemmey-on-from-skeleton-to-skin-the-making-of-the-greek-slave.

1.5 Research Itinerary

Most art histories are created out of secondary source documents. This study, though, relies almost exclusively on primary source material from Argentina, England, France, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, and the United States. Over the past six years, my doctoral research has led me to sculptures in museums' storage areas and many dives into boxes of historical records in public archives and private collections on both sides of the Atlantic. I uncovered original materials – archival documents, photographs, and objects – separated geographically, and incorporated them into a holistic and international context. Equipped with my camera and a notepad, I also documented and photographed monuments in public squares that were hiding in plain sight. The ability to navigate between English, French, and Spanish helped me to reconstruct the transatlantic histories of these sculptures and the relationships between artists, patrons, workers, and critics involved in different countries. Letters, contracts, employees' books, insurance certificates, customs forms, press cuttings, photographs, artists' diaries, sketches, and postcards, among other historical documents, helped shape this study across borders, to develop a new transnational discourse about the history of modern sculpture.

This study unveils a history of sculpture that is hidden. The dominant modernist narrative that elevated abstract sculpture over figurative works relegated the latter to museums' basements and attics. Moreover, the scholarship on nineteenth-century sculpture is further challenged by past misconceptions of the value of plaster works, as well as their loss or destruction.[49] Despite the

[49] *La sculpture du XIXe siècle, une mémoire retrouvée : les fonds de sculpture*, Rencontres de l'Ecole du Louvre (Paris: Documentation française, 1986). For decades, nineteenth-century sculpture was denied a place of choice in museums. In France, it was only with the opening of the Musée d'Orsay in the former Orsay train station in Paris

dispersal of archives and the plethora of works in storage that constitute barriers to access, Rodin's archives and works – including his plaster casts – have survived, thanks to the sculptor's self-promotion and subsequent canonization. All of Rodin's works, collection, and archives were donated by the artist to the French government at his death in 1917, transforming his former residence and studio in Meudon into an incredible repository of the artist's oeuvre. At the same time, substantial materials on Barnard, O'Connor, and Yrurtia also survive, owing to their own or their families' promotion of them. These sculptors benefited from some of the same structures that supported Rodin's reputation: Yrurtia created his own house museum in Buenos Aires, O'Connor profited from the patronage of The Hugh Lane gallery in Dublin, and Barnard's self-promotion resulted in various repositories as well.

The research on each sculptor's oeuvre has necessitated different methods in light of the diverse nature of their archives and the locations of their sculptures. In the case of Yrurtia, I made three research trips to Buenos Aires, Argentina, where most of Yrurtia's material is located. The artist's papers are divided between the Fundación TAREA-Universidad de San Martín and the Museo Casa Yrurtia. Correspondence from the artist was also found in the papers of his protector Eduardo Schiaffino at the Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes and at the Archivo General de la Nación. This government archive contained in addition documentation on the competition for the monument for the centennial exhibition of the independence of Argentina, as well as a photographic archive, in which material on Yrurtia's proposed projects, photographs of sculptures,

---

repurposed into a museum in 1986, and under the influential role of scholar Anne Pingeot, that the terraces of sculptures were designed to give visibility to nineteenth-century sculptures. See Christian Germanaz, ed., *La sculpture française Au XIXe Siècle* (Paris: Ministère de la culture et de la communication, Editions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, 1986).

and public monuments can be found. The sculptor's links to the Academia Nacional de Bellas Artes led me to consult archival boxes of Ernesto de la Cárcova at this institution. Moreover, I looked at curatorial files in various museums that hold Yrurtia's works, among them the Museo Nacional de Arte Moderno and the Museo Sivorí, also in Buenos Aires.

Like Yrurtia, George Grey Barnard was successful in gaining recognition in his homeland, and the sculptor's papers are today divided between three major archival repositories in the United States: The Archives of American Art of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., the Archives of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, and the Centre County Historical Society in State College, Pennsylvania. Furthermore, vertical files of the sculptor can be consulted in museums throughout the United States that hold works by the sculptor. In contrast, my research on O'Connor's oeuvre led me to various locales outside the United States, including France, Italy, the Netherlands, Ireland, and England. His archives are dispersed among many institutions on both sides of the Atlantic, as well as within private hands. The Center for Irish Studies at the National Gallery of Ireland and The Hugh Lane in Dublin constitute the two major repositories of his archives and sculptures, respectively. O'Connor's *Christ the King* sculpture is located in Dun Laoghaire, a town situated on the coast south of Dublin, where the papers of the commission for the statue are also conserved. The scattered nature of his archives and works, long relegated to museum storage spaces, helps explain how sculptors, like O'Connor, whose careers were not bound to one nation, at least in a traditional sense, were left behind by scholarship and museums. At the same time, the breadth of locations that contain historical records of the artist are a testament to his cosmopolitanism.

1.6 Sculpture & Photography

In this study, photographs are used as analytic tools to deepen our understanding of what modern sculpture is. Extracted from various archives, they offer new visual material regarding the making of sculptures and their modes of display at the Paris Salons, international exhibitions, and in public squares over time. Most of these archival photographs, undated and unsigned, were created with no artistic intention, even though today one might consider their aesthetic value. The history of sculpture has become "the history of that which can be photographed," as articulated by André Malraux in his 1947 book *Le musée imaginaire*.[50] Indeed, the historian of sculpture relies on the photographic medium primarily for its capacity to document sculptures and ensure the survival of objects to our present time. However, it is necessary to recognize the limitations of the medium in documenting reality and acknowledge its power of invention. Art historians have recently explored "how photographs shape sculptural knowledge and visualize changing methods for seeing, conceptualizing, and disseminating the objects they record."[51] The sculptural object, perceived through a specific vantage point, setting, lighting, and proximity, is transformed by the medium. Photography shapes the viewer's relationship to a given object, by telling them where to stand, what to see, and how to perceive it.

Photographs and sculptures can be described as being on both ends of the artistic spectrum. One is light, transportable, easy to manipulate, circulate, and display, while the other is bulky,

---

[50] Malraux, quoted in Roxana Marcoci, Geoffrey Batchen, and Tobia Bezzola, *The Original Copy: Photography of Sculpture, 1839 to Today* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2010) 13.

[51] Megan R. Luke and Sarah Hamill, eds., *Photography and Sculpture: The Art Object in Reproduction*, Issues & Debates (Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute, 2017) 4.

heavy, difficult to transport and set up. In a photograph, the three dimensions of a sculpture are transformed, thereby rendering it portable and flexible. Photographic images of sculptures are not perfect testimonies of the object, though they often act as surrogates, to make up for the distance that separates sculptors from their patrons, families, friends, or admirers. Sculptors often used photographs as a means of communication and as embodiments of the distances that they bridged. For instance, asked by their patrons to submit evidence of their progress on a commissioning project, Paris-based sculptors sent photographs of their works in process in the studio, in exchange for financial payments. In some cases, they used photographs to market their sculptures to potential collectors. For instance, a number of photographs of O'Connor sculptures, signed by the artist, were addressed to museum directors, probably as marketing devices, across the United States. In other cases, sculptors shared their work with families and friends back home through photographs, like Barnard's annotated photographs of himself posing with *Life of Humanity* in his French studio. Moreover, photography could become an artistic tool in the hands of sculptors. Barnard, for example, experimented with the photographic medium while working on *Life of Humanity*.

In the chapters that follow, I gather a wide range of photographic material, from panoramic views of the Salons and studio photographs to postcards, all of which were conceived for different uses and intended for various audiences. Although I mostly chose these historic photographs for their documentary value and the subject they depict, I am also aware of their aesthetic qualities, as well as their limitations in recovering the life of a sculptural object, a sculptural display, or the industry of sculpture in the artist's studio. My argument of the Paris Salons as a greenhouse for modern sculpture is based on an analysis of Salons photographs (chapter 2). The government albums, known as the Albums Michelez, were composed of panoramic views of the hall of sculptures at the Salons over the years, and also featured photographs of individual objects prized

by the jury, showing sculptures tagged with a Salon number on their base. These photographs have become, in some cases, the only records of these Salons sculptures.

Displayed at exhibitions, photographs of sculptures functioned as substitutes for the physical objects. However, the case of Yrurtia's *The Sinners*, which was shipped from Paris to Buenos Aires before being sent to the Louisiana Purchase Exposition in 1904, demonstrates the limits of photography. Indeed, Schiaffino insisted that the original group in plaster – rather than a photographic record – travel to Buenos Aires in order to secure support for Yrurtia from his Argentinian patrons and the public (chapter 3). As a result of this risky decision, *The Sinners* eventually ended up being destroyed. The absence of the object forces art historians to rely exclusively on photographic material to develop their analysis of the sculpture, and this brings its own challenges. Despite the multiple photographs of *The Sinners* I assembled, it remains unclear to me if the group was composed of five or six female figures, much less the nature of the spatial relations between them. Most photographs of *The Sinners* were taken from the same vantage point, which perhaps resulted from a conscious decision by the sculptor to have the viewer look at his group from a specific angle. Unfortunately, this unique camera angle restricts the viewer's understanding of the object in its entirety.

Photographs direct the ways we experience sculpture, as well as how we tell its history. They can provide a lasting record of sculptural projects that were proposed for competition and rejected by their commissioners. Left unrealized, these sculptural models, like O'Connor's *Commodore Barry Monument* and Yrurtia's monument to Argentinian Independence, would not have become part of the history of sculpture without their photographic record. Moreover, some photographs capture the various stages of creation of a monumental project or the variations on a given model, providing invaluable insights into the artistic process of sculptural appropriation and

repurposing. For instance, by means of photographs of the various sculptural models of O'Connor's *Commodore Barry Monument,* I was able to reconstruct the genealogy of the allegorical figure of *The Republic*, later repurposed into his *Justice* statue for The Hague Peace Palace (chapter 4). Photographs of the sculptor's studio offer a glimpse into the labor industry of sculpture, featuring works in progress and at times the sculptors posing with their collaborators (chapter 5). Finally, photographs can offer a testimony of the installation of sculptures in public squares, capturing the passerby or the crowd of people at its unveiling, and record the transformation of the monumental landscape over time (chapter 6).

1.7 Three Foreigners in Paris

Looking across Europe, the United States, and Latin America, I have deliberately chosen three sculptors whose oeuvres bring to light different aspects of the internationalization of modern sculpture at the beginning of the twentieth century. At first sight, the American George Grey Barnard, the Argentinian Rogelio Yrurtia, and the Irish American Andrew O'Connor have little in common. Although Barnard and O'Connor were both American citizens, O'Connor, who was of Irish ethnicity, lived most of his life outside the United States, moving between France, England, and Ireland. Furthermore, the three of them do not seem to have known each other, although they were likely to have seen each other's works in Paris. In fact, Barnard, Yrurtia, and O'Connor all established their studios in and around Paris at the turn of the century, exhibited often at the Paris Salons, and were contemporaries of Rodin.

It is not my intent to tell the stories of forgotten sculptors simply to pull them out of obscurity. Barnard, Yrurtia, and O'Connor, alongside Rodin, are emblematic of the change of

status of the modern sculptor who embraced architecturally ambitious sculpture to move away from the prototypical heroic statue. While these sculptors' oeuvres have hitherto been read through the prism of their national schools, the analysis of the mobility of their sculptures across spaces and national borders, and their critical reception in these various contexts, add complexity to this history. This study is not a compilation of monographs, nor a social analysis of the networks of foreign artists in Paris, but it nonetheless explores the particular histories of sculptures to broaden the understanding of modern sculpture as a global phenomenon. Relying on extensive archival research focused around three sculptors and their oeuvres, I propose a new methodological model that casts aside the framework of national artistic schools, the genealogical model of biographies, and the history of artistic styles. This object-based study helps illuminate important aspects of modern sculpture that had been left ignored in the archives, sculpture that did not fit the univocal modernist narrative.

The literature on foreign artists in Paris has homogenized the various circumstances that led sculptors to study or establish their studios in the French capital.[52] A variety of reasons led young foreigners to the French capital: some, like the American George Grey Barnard, went to Paris seeking to improve their sculptural technique; others wished to complete their artistic training in Paris in the context of a government-funded program, such as the Argentinian Rogelio Yrurtia;

---

[52] André Kaspi and Antoine Marès, eds., *Le Paris des étrangers depuis un siècle*, Notre Siècle (Paris: Impr. nationale, 1989); Steven Huebner and Federico Lazzaro, eds., *Artistic Migration and Identity in Paris, 1870-1940: Migration artistique et identité à Paris, 1870-1940* (Artistic Migration and Identity: Paris, 1870-1940 (Conference), New York: Peter Lang, 2020); Ihor Junyk, *Foreign Modernism: Cosmopolitanism, Identity, and Style in Paris* (Toronto ; Buffalo ; London: University of Toronto Press, 2013); Karen L. Carter, Susan Waller, and Norma Broude, eds., *Foreign Artists and Communities in Modern Paris, 1870-1914: Strangers in Paradise* (Farnham Surrey, England ; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2015).

while others, already on the path to becoming famous in their own country, chose Paris as a destination for self-exile, like the Irish American Andrew O'Connor. All three sculptors had different career profiles: while O'Connor was already a well-trained sculptor when he left New York for Paris around 1900, the young Yrurtia arrived that same year with a scholarship to study with French sculptors. From 1883 to 1887, Barnard studied in the French capital, where he remained until his first showing of sculptures at the Société Nationale des Beaux-Arts (SNBA) in 1894.

1.7.1 George Grey Barnard

In 1884, the twenty-one-year-old George Grey Barnard, a native of Pennsylvania who studied sculpture at the Art Institute of Chicago, settled in Paris **(figure 3)**.[53] At first sight, Barnard's trajectory resembles those of many nineteenth-century American sculptors, such as Saint-Gaudens and Frederick MacMonnies (1863-1937), who traveled to Paris for training but later established their careers in the United States. Indeed, Barnard's plan was to study in the French capital for three years before heading to Italy, but he ended up staying in Paris until his first success at the Salon a decade later. Soon after his arrival in France, Barnard passed the

[53] For biographical information on Barnard, see: Harold Edward Dickson, "Barnard and Norway," *Art Bulletin* 44, no. 1 (March 1962): 55–59; Harold Edward Dickson, "Barnard's Sculptures for the Pennsylvania Capitol," *Art Quarterly* 22, no. 3 (Summer 1959): 126–47; Harold Edward Dickson, "Log of a Masterpiece: Barnard's 'The Struggle of the Two Natures of Man,'" *Art Journal* 20, no. 3 (Spring 1961): 139–43; Frederick C. Moffatt, *Errant Bronzes: George Grey Barnard's Statues of Abraham Lincoln* (Newark : London: University of Delaware Press ; Associated University Presses, 1998); Brian Hack, "American Acropolis: George Grey Barnard's 'Monument to Democracy', 1918-1938" (New York, City University of New York, 2008).

entrance exams for the École Nationale des Beaux-Arts and became the apprentice of Jules Cavelier, until the French master encouraged him to start working in his own studio.

Barnard did not participate in the Salons until 1894, when his works garnered a triumphant reception at the SNBA. French critics pointed out Barnard's national identity as a factor in his new artistic vision. Thiébault-Sisson, for instance, noted that Barnard "belongs to that young and virile America,"[54] while others emphasized, "It is a foreigner, Mr. Barnard, who is represented [at the Salon] with the most éclat."[55] Scholar Emily Burns argued that "the innocent eye," which she described as the forgetting of artistic knowledge in favor of a theory of American newness, had a role in shaping sculptural practices in Paris in the 1890s. She commented that "critics linked their [Barnard and MacMonnies's] sculptures to stereotypes of American character as youthful and innocent, a claim that dodged French artistic influence."[56] Although Barnard returned to the United States after his showing at the 1894 Société nationale des beaux-arts, he would settle in France again ten years later to work on his ambitious commission destined for the Pennsylvania State Capitol in Harrisburg.

[54] Thiébault-Sisson, in *Le Temps*, May 7, 1894.

[55] Ponley, *La Patrie*, April 24, 1894.

[56] Emily C. Burns, "'A Baby's Unconsciousness' in Sculpture: Modernism, Nationalism, Frederick MacMonnies and George Grey Barnard in Fin-De-Siècle Paris," *The Sculpture Journal* 27, no. 1 (2018): 89–103; Emily Burns, "'With Eyes Half Shut': George Grey Barnard, the Innocent Eye, and American Nationalism in Paris," in *Prestige in Modern and Contemporary Sculpture: Modern Sculpture and the Question of Status*, ed. Cristina Rodríguez Samaniego and Irene Gras Valero (Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona, 2018).

1.7.2 Rogelio Yrurtia

In 1899, the twenty-year-old Yrurtia left for France as part of the first generation of grantees selected by the Argentinian government to train in Europe **(figure 4)**. These artists, among them the painters Cesáreo Bernaldo de Quirós (1879-1968), Carlos Pablo Ripamonti (1879-1968), and the sculptor Arturo Dresco (1875-1961), were the winners of the first national competition of fine arts held that year in Buenos Aires with the objective of sending Argentinian artists for two or three years to complete their artistic training in Europe.[57] Artists were given the freedom to choose where they wanted to settle, and while Dresco had already established himself in Florence, Yrurtia, after visiting many cities in Europe, chose Paris.[58] Before his departure, Yrurtia had been a student of the sculptor Lucio Correa Morales (1852-1923) in Buenos Aires. The themes of his early works, namely "*Inválido argentino*" ("A disabled Argentinian"), shown at the national

[57] Eduardo Schiaffino to Juan R. Fernandez, minister of public instruction, June 29, 1902. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes. Until 1897, and the appointment of a National Commission of Fine Arts, Argentinian artists who went on a scholarship to Europe were chosen by personal recommendations sent to the Congress, such as in the case of the Argentinian sculptor Lola Mora.

[58] Eduardo Schiaffino, April 3, 1900. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino."The grantees had forty days upon their arrival in Europe to tell the National Commission of Fine Arts where they would reside during their first two years of study, and provide an address as well as the name of a professor with whom they would work. The choice of cities where they could settle was: Germany (Berlin, Munich), France (Paris), and Italy (Rome, Florence, Milan, and Naples). See Comisión Nacional de Bellas Artes, *Reglamento de los concursos de Pintura, escultura y música para optar a las subvenciones para estudios en Europa, aprobado por decreto de fecha 10 de julio de 1899* (Buenos Aires: Ministerio de instrucción pública de la nación argentina, 1899) 25.

exhibition of 1898-1899 in Buenos Aires, and "*Meditación*" ("Meditation"), representing a male figure, demonstrated his early interest in figurative sculpture.[59]

Newly arrived in Paris in the spring of 1900, Yrurtia attended modeling classes during the day at the Académie Julian with Raoul Verlet and drawing classes at night at the Académie Colarossi with Jules Coutan. The latter was well known in Buenos Aires, where he had completed public commissions. Yrurtia admired his work greatly and would eventually become his studio assistant. In addition, Yrurtia registered as a "free student" at the École Nationale des Beaux-Arts, but only for a limited time.[60] Soon after his arrival in the French capital, Yrurtia struggled financially and had difficulties integrating himself into the Parisian artistic milieu. In his letters to Eduardo Schiaffino, then president of the National Commission of Fine Arts in Buenos Aires, Yrurtia described French teachers as "a species of monster," and, lamenting that they were unreachable, recounted what someone had told him: "How could you think that Rodin, Coutan, and others would incline their heads to even glance at you?"[61]

To fulfill the requirements of his scholarship, Yrurtia sent his academic drawings and photographs of his sculptures in progress to Schiaffino. His interest in figurative sculpture resurfaced in his request to submit a sculpture of a life-size, nude female figure instead of the

---

[59] "El Concurso de Pensionados," *Caras y Caretas,* Buenos Aires, November 25, 1899.

[60] Rogelio Yrurtia to Eduardo Schiaffino, June 4, 1900. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes.

[61] Rogelio Yrurtia to Eduardo Schiaffino, June 5, 1900. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes. "¿Como quiere usted que Rodin, Coutan y otros inclinen sus cabezas para dirigirnos una mirada?"

ornamental sculpture required by the scholarship program.[62] Unlike Barnard, he felt ready to display his work at the prestigious Paris Salons after only two years. At that point, he was working in his own studio. Yrurtia sent a photograph to Schiaffino of a model of a sculpture two meters tall that represented "Felicity," which, he explained, was based on "labor and home."[63] There is no trace of the picture, or any description of what this work looked like, but it may have been the basis for his *Hymn to Labor*, Yrurtia's lifelong sculptural project, which I will analyze in more detail in the following chapters.[64]

1.7.3 Andrew O'Connor

In the early 1900s, the Irish American sculptor Andrew O'Connor relocated to Paris **(figure 5)**. Having left behind his wife and child in New York, O'Connor began a new life in France with his model Jessie Phoebe Brown, with whom he would have four sons.[65] The reasons for O'Connor's self-exile to Paris are not explicitly known, but the artist might have wanted to work among what he believed were the best sculptors in the world. Born in Worcester, Massachusetts,

---

[62] Rogelio Yrurtia to Eduardo Schiaffino, December 21, 1900. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes.

[63] Rogelio Yrurtia to Eduardo Schiaffino, June 10, 1901. Letter in the archive but no picture. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes.

[64] Moreover, on November 30, 1901, Yrurtia sent pictures to Schiaffino of a new group he said had started two months before, entitled: "love and labor." Rogelio Yrurtia to Eduardo Schiaffino, November 30, 1901. Letter in the archive but no picture. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes.

[65] Homan Potterton, *Andrew O'Connor 1874-1941: A Complementary Catalogue to the Exhibition Marking the Centenary of the Sculptor's Birth* (Trinity College, Dublin: Gifford & Craven, 1974) 18.

and introduced to sculpture by his father, the young artist had left home to work at the 1893 Chicago World's Columbian Exposition, where he would meet his future mentor, Daniel Chester French (1850-1931), and collaborator Louis Sullivan (1856-1924).[66] At an early age, O'Connor rapidly developed a US-centered network and reputation. Hired by French, who at that time was working on the doors for the Boston Public Library and needed an assistant in New York City, O'Connor would then become John Singer Sargent (1856-1925)'s assistant in London for two years. There, he helped Sargent construct relief sculptures for his mural "The Triumph of Religion," also destined for the Boston Public Library.

Back in the United States in 1898, O'Connor gained recognition among his peers for his work alongside French and Stanford White (1853-1906), the chief collaborators of the design of the sculpted doors, tympanum, and friezes for the memorial commissioned by Mrs. Vanderbilt for her deceased husband Cornelius Vanderbilt at Saint Bartholomew's Church in New York.[67] According to the renowned New York art critic Royal Cortissoz, "when Saint-Gaudens saw O'Connor's work, he hunted up his junior's name and address, and straightway called upon him with words of the warmest appreciation."[68] The critic emphasized the precocious talent of the artist: "Rarely does an artist emerge from his pupilage with so clearly defined style and one so free from borrowed influences."[69]

Although O'Connor was on the path to becoming a famous American sculptor, well acquainted with the most established sculptors of his time and already described as having

---

[66] Potterton, 15.

[67] Potterton, 18.

[68] Royal Cortissoz, "The Work of Andrew O'Connor," *Art and Progress* 1, no. 12 (October 1910): 344.

[69] Cortissoz, 347.

developed his own style, he decided to leave to establish his studio in Paris. O'Connor would spend the next forty years of his life mostly in Europe. In a 1933 letter, he confessed to his friend the Baltimore poet Warren Wilmer Brown: "Witness my own adventures. For over forty years I've lived in Europe with only one short stop in America during the war. France, Italy, Spain, and the British Isles, I know them intimately."[70] In Paris, the sculptor participated annually in the Salons, where he quickly won renown.[71] O'Connor is one of the rare foreign sculptors whose works at the Salons were acquired by the French government and entered the national collection.

Surprisingly, the name of Andrew O'Connor is only cited once, alongside the name of his contemporary George Grey Barnard, in the 722-page volume of Wayne Craven's comprehensive survey of nineteenth-century American sculpture, published in 1968.[72] However, publications by Lorado Taft from 1921 and 1924 on American and modern sculpture named O'Connor a sculptor

---

[70] Andrew O'Connor to Warren Wilmer Brown, October 3, 1933, London. "Andrew O'Connor Vertical File" (Baltimore, n.d.), The Walters Art Museum. While based mainly in France through the early 1930s, O'Connor worked in Spain on the Columbus memorial commissioned to Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney and also traveled to Carrara, Italy, to choose marble blocks for his own work.

[71] Andrew O'Connor exhibited at the *Société nationale des beaux-arts* in 1905, and at the *Salon des artistes français* in 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910, 1912, 1913, 1926 and 1928; that last year he won the gold medal for his group *Tristan and Isolde*.

[72] Craven, *Sculpture in America: From the Colonial Period to the Present,* 402. O'Connor does not appear in the index, but his name is cited on p. 402 in a discussion of Daniel Chester French's statue of Lincoln: "He [Daniel Chester French] also aimed at a natural dignity in the rugged, unpolished personality and appearance of the man, instead of concentrating on his gangling, self-conscious awkwardness as George Grey Barnard and Andrew O'Connor were to do a few years later."

of talent.[73] In 1927, the artist was the subject of a memoir written in French by Hélène Desmaroux, who documented and photographed his work while living with the O'Connor family after World War I.[74] Mostly forgotten since then, O'Connor's oeuvre featured in an exhibition at Trinity College in Dublin in 1974 organized by the Irish scholar Homan Potterton to celebrate the centenary of the artist's birth.[75] This scholarly initiative highlights the adoption of O'Connor by Ireland, reinforced by an entry dedicated to the artist, written by the British scholar Philip Ward-Jackson, in the recently published encyclopedia of Irish sculptors from 1600 to 2000.[76]

Expatriates in Paris for many years, all three sculptors negotiated their national identity in different ways. Barnard claimed that his Americanness pushed him to return to the United States after a decade spent in France, while O'Connor developed a cosmopolitan identity, returning briefly to his homeland only to escape World War I, but then reestablishing himself successively

---

[73] Lorado Taft, *Modern Tendencies in Sculpture*, The Scammon Lectures for 1917 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1921) 132-135; Lorado Taft, *The History of American Sculpture*, New ed., rev [1903] (New York: The Macmillan company, 1924) 447-448.

[74] Hélène Desmaroux, *L'œuvre du sculpteur O'Connor* (Paris: Librairie de France, 1927).

[75] Potterton, *Andrew O'Connor 1874-1941*. Potterton's research archives and correspondence, today held at the Center for the Study of Irish Art at the National Gallery of Ireland in Dublin, demonstrate the scope of the research led by the Irish scholar to identify and locate O'Connor's works in Europe and the United States with the help of the artist's family.

[76] Philip Ward-Jackson, "O'Connor Andrew," in *Sculpture 1600-2000: Art and Architecture of Ireland*, ed. Paula Murphy (Dublin : London: Royal Irish Academy ; The Paul Mellon Centre, 2014) 265-267. In 1995, Doris Flodin Soderman, owner of the former O'Connor property in Paxton, Massachusetts, published a monography on the sculptor's oeuvre. Soderman, *The Sculptors O'Connor*. The author provides great details about O'Connor's personal life and social environment, especially during his time in Paris. However, this publication lacks complete footnotes and bibliography, which prevents the reader from tracing her sources.

in Paris, London, and Dublin, where he eventually passed away. As for Yrurtia, he spent more than two decades in France, but remained loyal to his country of origin. After completing his *Hymn to Labor,* the Argentinian sculptor moved back permanently to Buenos Aires in 1920. O'Connor and Yrurtia were both sons of immigrants in their respective countries, and their ethnic origins were used against them in critiques of two sculptural projects that they created in Paris for their homelands. Chapter 4 analyzes how O'Connor's *Commodore Barry* and Yrurtia's *Monument to the May Revolution* were both rejected in their respective countries, in part owing to attacks against the sculptors' national identities.

1.8 From the Paris Salons to the Public Square

This journey begins in the crowded sculpture galleries of the Paris Salons and concludes in the plazas of Buenos Aires, Harrisburg, and Dublin. Instead of using the traditional format of the artist's biography, which would have reinforced national frameworks, this study employs a methodological shift from a monographic model to a thematic structure framed around the histories of objects. As I moved through my research, major themes, such as materiality and display (chapter 3), patronage (chapter 4), and labor (chapter 5), came to the forefront of my dissertation chapters, casting a new light on the mobility of objects between the transnational ecosystem of the Paris Salons (chapter 2), and the public squares overseas (chapter 6). While the works of Barnard, O'Connor, and Yrurtia serve as entry points to broaden our current understanding of the field of sculpture around 1900, one could also use this methodological framework to include the works of other international sculptors active in Paris at the turn of the century, such as the Brazilian-Italian

Victor Brecheret (1894-1955), the Danish Rudolph Tegner (1873-1950), the Norwegian Gustav Vigeland (1869-1943), or the Swedish Carl Milles (1875-1955), among others.[77]

In chapter 2, I analyze how the nineteenth-century Paris Salons operated as a cosmopolitan ecosystem of multidirectional exchanges, from which emerged a modern language of sculpture. Instead of considering the sculptures of Barnard, O'Connor, and Yrurtia as a direct response to Rodin, or under the spell of a "*rodiniste*" influence, I interpret them as the products of the Paris Salons culture. Rather than situating Rodin at the origin of the modernist artistic processes of fragmentation and repurposing, I examine how sculptors active in the Salons extracted sculptural motifs for their aesthetic potential as opposed to their significance and appropriated them in order to create new meanings for their works. I employ the metaphor of the greenhouse to describe the physical and conceptual transformation of the Salons at the turn of the century and argue that the internationalization of the Paris Salons led to the development of a global language of modern sculpture. Rejecting the conventionalized gestures of the neoclassical model, modern sculptors used sculptural motifs for their artistic and emotional possibilities, deploying them in various narratives. In decentering Rodin, this chapter does away with the dichotomies between "academic" and "modern" and "national" and "foreign," instead exploring how the Paris Salons operated internally as an aesthetic petri dish for sculptors.

Chapter 3 examines how modern sculptures created in the system of the Paris Salons circulated across borders and participated in the construction of national identities. The study of

[77] This study could also be expanded to the works of other American sculptors like Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney (1875-1942), Gutzon Borglum (1867-1941), Lorado Taft (1860-1936), and Frederick MacMonnies (1863-1937) whose works appear at times in this study. On Whitney, see Erica Ando, J. Rachel Gustafson, and Ellen E. Roberts, *Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney: Sculpture*, First edition (West Palm Beach: Norton Museum of Art, 2018).

the materiality and mobility of these sculptures forces a reconsideration of how the appropriation of sculptural motifs from the Paris Salons played out in several contexts. When sculptures left the cosmopolitan environment of the Paris Salons and moved across the Atlantic, they were increasingly placed into national frames. For instance, at the 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition, Yrurtia's *The Sinners* was installed among a group of sculptures made by Argentinian sculptors in the large Hall of Sculptures, and Schiaffino celebrated it first and foremost as an embodiment of the success of the Argentinian artistic school. I analyze how foreign sculptors in Paris managed the tension between the multinational environment of the Paris Salons and the nationalist demands of exhibition in world's fairs and in their home countries.

This study bridges the divide between monuments, on the one hand, and gallery sculptures, on the other: there simply is no such thing as a separate history of modernist sculpture and a history of monuments. The artificial division made by the historiography on sculpture will be addressed in chapter 3, where I show the interconnections between the sculptural practices of monumental works and gallery-size sculptures. For instance, before becoming a public sculpture, Rodin's *The Thinker* originally belonged to the ensemble of *The Gates of Hell*, from which Rodin extracted it and made it autonomous. This practice originated at the beginning of the nineteenth century and was widespread among turn-of-the-century sculptors, who worked at different scales at the same time. These "extracted" sculptures fulfilled a need different from that of their monumental ensemble. Barnard's *Prodigal Son* and the various groups that originated from his monument *Life of Humanity* were displayed at his 1908 Boston retrospective and at the Armory Show in New York, where Barnard exploited them to finance his large sculptural project.

Chapter 4 investigates the mechanisms of sculptural patronage across the Atlantic in the context of rising nationalisms at the turn of the century. The gap between the artistic environment

of the Paris Salons and the political realm of the public space intensified the different expectations between the sculptors and their commissioners. In some cases, this led to the rejection of sculptures produced in the Salons system, as illustrated with Yrurtia's *Monument to the May Revolution*, destined for Buenos Aires, and O'Connor's *Barry Monument* for Washington, DC. In embodying issues of human progress and exile, respectively, these monuments pushed back against the tradition of the commemorative statue and reimagined the idea of collectivity. Even though they were never realized, these sculptural projects are exemplary of what could have constituted an alternative monumental landscape. Despite the failure of his *Barry Monument*, O'Connor would go on to extract and repurpose a figure from this rejected project into a modern allegory of *Justice* for the International Court of Justice in The Hague.

In chapter 5, I explore the tension between the carefully crafted ideal of the individual labor of the sculptor shown to the public and the collaborative reality of the industry of sculpture in the development of modern sculpture. Indeed, the labor of sculpture was the product of a collective effort, shared between the sculptor and the many assistants and workers in their studio. Expatriate sculptors in Paris contributed to a modernist labor system composed of models, *praticiens*, carvers, suppliers, and transporters, among others, all part of the machinery of the Salons. This chapter challenges preconceived notions of labor as an individual endeavor by modern sculptors and brings to light the names of the many actors who played important roles in the making of early twentieth-century sculptures. I study labor both as a mode of production and a subject matter. Each of the three sculptors illustrate a different aspect of labor: the physical labor and the subject of labor (Yrurtia); the collaborative endeavor of the studio industry (Barnard); and the sculptural techniques of fragmentation, recombination, and repurposing (O'Connor).

Chapter 6 analyzes how modern sculptures, born in the ecosystem of the Paris Salons, saw their meanings change in the context of the public square. Most of the literature on site specificity and environment is bound to the Minimalists in the 1960s, even though for modern sculptors, issues of site and the spectator's engagement mattered almost as much as the sculpture itself. This chapter examines how the transnationality and collaborative nature of Barnard, Yrurtia, and O'Connor's "international" monuments translated overseas, and how they fit into an already established commemorative landscape. The shift from the artistic environment of the Paris Salons to the political realm of the public space marked a mutation of the sculpture, which went from being an object considered primarily for its aesthetic qualities to the embodiment of an ideology or the group identity that it championed. Public squares are not neutral spaces, and monuments contribute to the political ideologies in their context of display. The meaning of sculptures modifies over time, evolving with the transformation of their urban environment. As politics change, public spaces evolve alongside, though often with a time lag, and the stereotypical permanence of monuments is shown to be illusory, as demonstrated by Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor*, which was moved all over the city of Buenos Aires.

Through a geographic and conceptual itinerary that leads the reader from the Paris Salons to the public square, this study reconstructs the histories of ambitious sculptures that transformed the meaning of public monuments in the early twentieth century: instead of expecting the passerby to recognize an individual hero, modern sculptors encouraged their viewer to reflect upon the human condition. This study expands the definition of what is traditionally conceived as modern sculpture (i.e., abstract works) to encompass figurative sculptures, both gallery-sized groups and monumental ensembles. Furthermore, it also extends the category of modern sculpture to new geographies beyond the Northern Hemisphere to include Latin America. Broadening the scope of

this project to Argentina unveils new connections between France and Argentina and exposes the triangular network of exchanges between Argentina, France, and the United States. Although early twentieth-century sculptures have been read through nationalistic lenses, or attributed to Rodin's style as "*rodiniste*," they are better described as the product of appropriation practices by sculptors at the Paris Salons, which itself was a modernist, cosmopolitan ecosystem. The meaning of these works, after leaving the Salons, evolved in various contexts, and once they reached their final destination in plazas overseas, they were both individualized and nationalized.

2.0 Modern Sculpture in the Age of the Paris Salons

Most museum visitors today would have a difficult time imagining what it must have felt like to be in a Salon gallery in the early 1900s. The white cube had yet to be invented: there were no sterile spaces with a small number of thoughtfully selected objects carefully displayed in an airy gallery.[78] Instead, they would have found themselves in the middle of "an indefinable crowd of pieces of all dimensions, monuments, statues, statuettes, bas-reliefs, busts, masks, where Christs neighbor military generals, […] dizzy in front of so many plasters, granites, marbles, terracottas, sandstones, bronzes […], so many known attitudes, declamatory gestures, so many useless effigies."[79] In their reviews, Salons critics vividly described the jumble of objects representing all scales, forms, subjects, materials, and poses. But rather than being amazed by the variety of sculptures, they were overwhelmed by their heterogeneity and critical of the chaotic display. Critics, who aimed to highlight in their Salons reviews the best artistic contributions of the year,

---

[78] Early "white cube" stagings were developed in the 1920s and 1930s in Germany. Maximilian Sternberg, "Modern Stagings of the Medieval at the Schnütgen-Museum in Cologne (1910–1939)," *The Art Bulletin* 102, no. 1 (January 2, 2020): 79–105, https://doi.org/10.1080/00043079.2019.1638676.

[79] Albert Thomas, "La sculpture aux salons," *L'art décoratif*, July - December 1903, 34. The art critic is describing the 1903 Salon des artistes français. "Dans le hall immense où s'entasse la sculpture des "Artistes français », la flânerie est moins aimable que dans le jardin et la rotonde de la « Société nationale » Moins aimable et moins fructueuse ! […] C'est bien au contraire une cohue indescriptible d'envois de toutes dimensions, de monuments, de statues, de statuettes, de bas-reliefs, de bustes, et de masques, ou les Christs voisinent avec les généraux, […] Le vertige vous prend devant tant de plâtres, tant de granits, tant de marbres, tant de terre cuites, tant de grès, tant de cires, tant de bronzes plus ou moins patinés, devant tant d'attitudes connues, tant de gestes déclamatoires, tant d'inutiles effigies. »

found the task hard. Sculptures on view at the Paris Salons were showcased not as individual works of art but as part of an ensemble of many such works, effecting an environmental display.

By the end of the nineteenth century, at a time when the Salons multiplied, sculptors found strategies to distinguish themselves from their peers by submitting larger, ever more complex compositions to the annual exhibitions.[80] The crowding of the Salons floors developed at the same time as the increased complexity of the sculptures themselves: multi-figural groups joined the more traditional nudes, allegorical figures, and military heroes on pedestals. These large formats attested to a growing competition between sculptors on the congested floors. A shift occurred in the display, but also the type, iconography, and scale of the sculptures submitted at the annual competitions. The Salons became a saturated environment where artworks were competing, but also, at the same time, in constant dialogue with each other. This chapter reconsiders the Paris Salons as a cosmopolitan ecosystem of multidirectional exchanges in which the language of sculpture was continuously redefined, a breeding ground in which modern sculpture evolved.

The annual Salons offered young artists, both French and foreign, the chance to exhibit their works on an international platform with the potential for excellent exposure and possible commissions by the State or private collectors.[81] Recognition at the Paris Salons, whether in the form of formal prizes or critical acclaim, which was perhaps even more important, also brought

---

[80] Although commonly thought to be one entity, it would be more accurate to refer to the Salons, since beginning in the second half of the nineteenth century several Salons were founded: Salon des refusés (1863), Salon des artistes français (1882), Salon des Indépendants (1884), Société nationale des beaux-arts (1890), and the Salon d'Automne (1903), among others.

[81] The term "international" is used here to refer to nations from the western world represented at the Paris Salons. While sculptors from the European and North and South American continents were participants in the Salons, no artist from Africa, Asia, nor Oceania was represented there.

artists hoping to be chosen as representatives of their country at the world's fairs within the radar of their national commissions. By the end of the nineteenth century, art journalism was well established in the French capital, and it proved instrumental in advancing artists' careers.[82] In their press coverage, French critics commented on both the Salon des artistes français and the Société nationale des beaux-arts, even though the section dedicated to sculptures was often relegated to the end of the article and routinely took the form of an enumeration, and sculptures from the Société nationale were discussed last. Salons reviews highlighting the work of international exhibitors were translated and disseminated in the press abroad, participating in the shaping of careers both in and outside of France. However, the nationalistic agendas of critics at the time have long concealed the transnational and collaborative nature of the Salons system.

Rather than focusing only on the personalities and career strategies of sculptors, this chapter sheds light on the role of sculptures and how they performed in the diverse environment of the Salons. It asks the question: What were the rules of the game? I regard the Salons as a fertile ecosystem, a breeding ground in which sculptures multiplied and grew in size. The spaces of the Salons both functioned as and resembled greenhouses, a space where new specimens developed, styles could take root, and careers could flower. The study of this dynamic environment, which displayed thousands of objects every year, is essential if we are to understand the transformational process of the language of sculpture at a time when technological achievements allowed artists to expand their works in the direction of a new monumentality. Sculptures were active agents of transformation in the environment of the Paris Salons. Not all sculptures followed Rodin's work as the sole model; instead, sculptors borrowed, appropriated, and emulated sculptural motifs from

[82] This phenomenon began in the mid-eighteenth century with Denis Diderot. See Denis Diderot, *Salons*, ed. Michel Delon, Gallimard (Paris, 2013).

a wide variety of Salons models. By "decentering" Rodin from his unique influential stature, I aim to place him back within the broader context of the collective Salons.

Too long regarded as a conservative warehouse of academic sculptures, the Salons actually offered a transnational space of artistic exchanges: a complex system that functioned collaboratively, although hierarchically, with many different actors pursuing personal agendas. Internally, the Salons constituted an exclusive environment regulated by a selection jury and a system of honorific prizes. Within this environment stretched a web of sculptural motifs with which sculptors engaged and fed each other's compositions, modernizing the representation of the human figure. To illustrate this phenomenon, I trace the genealogy of a number of sculptural motifs that operated as agents of transformation of the sculptural language at the turn of the century. Reassessing the gap between "academic" and "modernist" sculpture, I analyze instead the continuity and alteration of sculptural motifs in the transnational milieu of the Paris Salons. Externally, the Salons system functioned as a commercial network in which local and foreign patrons, collectors, and critics engaged actively with the artists' works, determining their aesthetic and commercial values. At the same time that sculptors participated in the Salons system, they negotiated with, and sometimes even shaped, the expectations of collectors and patrons abroad.

This chapter examines the Salons as a ground for competition between artists before turning to the analysis of the sculptures themselves as active motifs of transformation in the transnational ecosystem of the Paris Salons. I map out the increasing participation of international artists at the annual exhibitions in order to analyze how the Salons became a cosmopolitan environment. I then consider the crowding of the Salons floors as an incubator for new artistic strategies by sculptors, which led to the display of works of growing size and complexity. Finally, I analyze the migration of sculptural forms, motifs, and themes from one sculpture to another, and

the development of a modern language that emerged from these practices of artistic appropriation. I argue that the Salons played a decisive role in shifting from the neoclassical mode of emblems and props in sculpture to the representation of large groups of (often nude) figures that conveyed meaning through extreme physical poses, such as strenuous bodily contortions and group interactions. By rejecting the conventionalized gestures and predetermined meaning of neoclassical sculptures, modern sculptors chose sculptural motifs for their artistic and emotional possibilities and deployed them in multiple narratives.

2.1 Competing at the Paris Salons

The period between 1890 and 1914 marked the apogee of artistic cosmopolitanism in Paris. The city's training opportunities, exhibitions venues, dynamic art market, as well as its labor infrastructure and technological advances encouraged international artists to head to the City of Lights.[83] Notably in the domain of sculpture, the well-trained French labor force and experienced foundries, with their specialized labor of carvers, pointers, *praticiens*, and unique mastery of bronze metallurgy, were in high demand.[84] As a venue to display their works, the Paris Salons

---

[83] In regard to training opportunities, the 1863 reform of the École des beaux-arts encouraged more international students to attend the school. In parallel, new training opportunities were offered in the Académies libres created at the end of the century, such as the Académie Julian, where half of its students were foreigners. Alain Bonnet, *L'enseignement des arts au XIXe siècle: la réforme de l'Ecole des Beaux-Arts de 1863 à la fin du modèle académique* (Rennes: Presses Universitaire de Rennes, 2006); Catherine Fehrer, *The Julian Academy, Paris: 1868-1939*, Shepherd Gallery (New York, 1989); Anne Martin-Fugier, *La vie d'artiste au XIXe siècle* (Paris: L. Audibert, 2007).

[84] Elisabeth Lebon, *Dictionnaire des fondeurs de bronze d'art: France, 1890-1950* (Perth: Marjon, 2003).

provided the most prestigious exhibition platform in the western world and attracted hundreds of foreign artists each year. Getting their foot in the door of the Salons was not an easy task for young artists, especially if they were not French or at least based in Paris—as were the majority of the participating artists. Most made use of whatever institutional affiliation they may have had, such as the prestigious École des beaux-arts, and since many were also students at one of the many artist-run ateliers of the city, such as the Académie Julian and the Académie de la Grande Chaumière, among others, they put forward the names of their French teachers to bolster their chances when they submitted their works to the Salons jury.[85]Although these sculptors who participated in the Salons belonged to a unique collective system, critics would distinguish them based on what they called their "individuality," which they often analyzed through nationalistic lenses.

Rodin perhaps embodies the most successful case of career making at the Paris Salons. It was only in 1877, at the age of thirty-seven, and in the wake of the scandal provoked by *The Age of Bronze*, that Rodin began to make a name for himself as a sculptor. Until then, Rodin continued to be looked on as a *praticien*. Very soon, he embodied the figure of the antiacademic artist par excellence, one who never competed for the Prix de Rome nor studied at the École des beaux-arts.[86] The sculptor would feed his own myth as a genius opposed to the artistic system status quo, yet it would be misleading to think that Rodin did not do everything he could to penetrate the artistic system in place. As the noted scholar Ruth Butler so aptly put it, "Rodin loved the

[85] This constituted a major difference with exhibitors at the world's fairs, who often sent their works from abroad as part of a national representation.

[86] Rodin tried three times to gain admission to the École des beaux-arts and failed every time. Ruth Butler, "Rodin and the Paris Salon," in *Rodin Rediscovered* (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1981), 19.

system."[87] Rodin's first Salon piece dated from 1863, but that year, and for the next two years, his work was rejected by the jury. Rodin's first experience in showing his work at a Salon and executing public commissions did not take place in Paris or, for that matter, in France, but in Brussels.[88] Not until ten years later did Rodin finally make his way into the Paris Salon, in 1875. That year, the sculptor had anticipated the expectations of the jury, as Butler demonstrated, and his first entries in the Paris Salon could be described as "reticent, conventional,"[89] two adjectives that seem at odds with the widely held idea of Rodin's works today.

Although Rodin's oeuvre has been analyzed as rupturing with the Salon system, the artist accepted civic commissions throughout his career. He won some of the most desirable contracts to be had by a sculptor, with his monuments to Victor Hugo, Claude Lorrain, the Burghers of Calais, Balzac, and, most important, his work *The Gates of Hell*. Even during his lifetime, French art critics participated in the mythmaking of Rodin, touting him as a national genius. They compared him to Michelangelo, denying any influence from contemporary artists: "Rodin did not have any precursor in our century: he proceeds from Michelangelo.'"[90] They did not bother to mention anything about his artistic training, nor his apprenticeship with French sculptor Ernest Carrier-Belleuse (1824-1887) while he worked in Brussels, or his time at the Manufacture de Sèvres, the famous porcelain factory. Instead of highlighting the fact that Rodin's works were at

[87] Butler, 46.

[88] Butler, 20–21. Rodin showed his works in the Salons of Ghent, Antwerp, and Brussels, and also at the International Exhibitions of London and Vienna.

[89] Rodin was attentive to his choice of subjects in his desire to meet the expectations of the juries. He sought to inscribe himself in the lineage of Carpeaux and his handling of portraiture. Butler, 22.

[90] M.G., "Les Monuments de Rodin," *L'art décoratif*, first semester (October 1898-March 1899): 205–6. « Rodin n'a pas eu de précurseur dans notre siècle ; c'est de Michel-Ange qu'il procède. »

first rejected many times by the Salons, critics described in military terms his combative endeavor against the Salon des artistes français: "Rodin, after many years of continuing combat, is close to complete victory" against "the last rampart of false principles, of unhealthy education, of tradition badly understood, and of moulage."[91]

Rodin was not exempted from having to submit his works annually to the Salons, like any other artist, until after the commission of *The Gates of Hell* in 1880.[92] Surprisingly, although he could have decided to ignore the Salons, Rodin became even more involved in their organization, taking on positions from which he exercised considerable influence over younger sculptors as they entered the world of public exhibitions. A founding member of the Société nationale des beaux-arts in 1890, Rodin was elected its vice president in December 1892 as well as president of the sculpture section, replacing Dalou. Rodin was also an exhibitor at the SNBA, where he displayed thirty-four sculptures between 1890 and 1906.[93] One might wonder if the presence of the renowned sculptor would have attracted other sculptors to display their works there. The SNBA was a recruiting ground for Rodin for his own studio, and he encouraged his practitioners to exhibit

---

[91] Yvanhoe Rambosson, "'La sculpture aux Salons,'" *L'art décoratif,* second semester (June 1899): 97-99. « le dernier rempart des faux principes, de l'éducation malsaine, de la tradition mal comprise et du moulage. » « Rodin, après de longues années de combat incessant, est près de la complète victoire. »

[92] Antoinette Le Normand-Romain, *Rodin: La porte de l'enfer* (Paris: Musée Rodin, 1999); Butler, "Rodin and the Paris Salon," 44. *The Gates of Hell* were originally destined for the entrance door of the future Museum of Decorative Arts.

[93] Rodin exhibited regularly at the SNBA - with the exception of 1891, 1894, and 1903.

there.[94] It became common for Rodin to receive letters from young sculptors asking for a better spot for their works at the Salons, like Barnard's demand to display his group *Two Natures* at a more visible place at the SNBA salon of 1894.[95] Furthermore, even though he was involved with the SNBA, Rodin continued to exhibit at the SAF, whose membership he never gave up, and was even regularly chosen a member of the jury of sculpture.[96] Rodin's authority over the Salon system was dominant; no young sculptor could escape his control.

Like many of his American contemporaries, the sculptor George Grey Barnard used the Paris Salons as a career springboard. Barnard first appeared at the Paris Salon not as a sculptor with accepted pieces but as the subject of a portrait painted by the Polish artist Anna Bilinska (1857-1893) and showcased at the 1890 SAF. Whereas Barnard confessed to his parents that it was "hard to give time to" posing for this painting, and he did not like the idea of exhibiting the painting publicly at the Salon, he was certainly conscious of the benefit it could bring him.[97] On a

---

[94] See Emmanuelle Héran, "La sculpture aux Salons de la Société nationale des beaux-arts," in Bruno Gaudichon, ed., *Des amitiés modernes: de Rodin à Matisse: Carolus-Duran et La Société nationale des beaux-arts, 1890-1905* (Paris : Roubaix: Somogy ; La Piscine, Musée d'art et d'industrie de Roubaix, 2003) 31-45.

[95] "George Grey Barnard Vertical File" (Paris, France, n.d.), Archives and Documentation Center, Musée Rodin.

[96] Archival material at the Musée Rodin shows that Rodin was a member of the sculpture at the SAF jury in 1889, 1897, 1899, 1902. "Société Nationale Des Beaux-Arts" (Paris, France, n.d.), Archives and Documentation Center, Musée Rodin.

[97] George Grey Barnard to his parents, February 24, [1890?], "I posed four days last week for that portrait which you may imagine is hard to give time to. But [I] have to do it. The group is far from being finished but is on the road and coming out of the dark like a Spring bud. The portrait is really a picture 6 feet by 11 -so build a house for it. Against my desires it goes to the Salon." "Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

canvas of very large dimensions, 6 feet by 11, the young man, depicted as muscular and athletic, is seen at work, sitting on the edge of his sculptural group, his sleeves rolled up above the elbows to display his powerful arms, a topos in the representation of the sculptor **(figure 6)**. With this romanticized portrayal of the artist, Barnard tried to fashion his own image as an individual genius. As described by the American sculptor and art critic Lorado Taft, "In these days Individuality is the watchword. […] He [Barnard] has learned what Paris had to teach him, and yet withal has preserved and strengthened amid those powerful influences the gift which was his own—his artistic character."[98]

Since his arrival in Paris, Barnard had visited the annual Salons, collected press releases, and commented on them in his correspondence, but he would not display his works at the Salons until a decade later.[99] In April 1884, a few months after settling in, he wrote to his parents, "Salon comes of next May 1, I will write you about it."[100] Years later, he would declare about the 1889 Salon: "Quite encouraging for Americans; large number of American works there. American Art is well represented."[101] However, in his early years in the capital, the young artist was neither willing to socialize with the local community of American artists nor interested in participating in the Salons. "I do not as yet work for prizes, but the prize of learning itself," he humbly bragged to

---

[98] Press cutting Lorado Taft, *Arts for America*, Chicago, September 1897. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

[99] See issues of "*Figaro* Salon 1893" and "Le Salon de 1880," among others in "George Grey Barnard Papers."

[100] George Grey Barnard to his parents, April 9, 1884."Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard."

[101] George Grey Barnard to his parents, May 13 [1889?]. "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers" (State College, PA, n.d.), Centre County Historical Society.

his mother, who was eager to see him make a name for himself in the French capital.[102] Not until March 1894 did Barnard submit his works to the SNBA for the first time, with the ambition "to partially make up for the long years of silence."[103] Among them was the group *Two Natures* featured in his portrait by Bilinska. A month before the Salon opened to the public, Barnard wrote his first letter to Rodin, then president of the sculpture section of the SNBA, asking him to use his influence to change the location of his group at the Salon so that it would be more likely to catch the eyes of critics.[104] While we do not know if Rodin complied with his request, Barnard's sculptures earned approval at the Salon that year, and the sculptor celebrated his breakthrough: "I was introduced amid music as the great success of the Salon. […] the papers have been splendid to me; artists say I have had the greatest début known for years."[105]

Other Paris-based sculptors would use their victories at the Salons to establish their artistic authority in their homeland. Such was the case of Argentinian Rogelio Yrurtia, who after only two years in Paris expressed his desire to display his works at the prestigious Salons.[106] In 1903, he

---

[102] George Grey Barnard to his parents, March 1, 1885 or 1886. In another letter to his parents dated April 9, 1884: "All I do is study […] I don't care for anything but my own work […] They are hundreds of Americans studying here, I have no desire or time to get acquainted with all of them." "Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard." (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archive.

[103] George Grey Barnard to his family, April 1, 1894. "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers."

[104] Barnard to Rodin, March 31, 1894 accompanied by an introduction card from Alfred Boucher. "George Grey Barnard Vertical File."

[105] George Grey Barnard to his parents, April 30, 1894. "Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard." (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archive.

[106] Rogelio Yrurtia to Eduardo Schiaffino, June 10, 1901. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

listed himself as "élève de M. Jules Coutan" in the SAF catalogue, entered the competition, and triumphed with his group *The Sinners*. It was the first of Yrurtia's sculptures publicly shown in the French capital, and it was received with critical acclaim by French critics. Camille Mauclair and Charles Morice published glorifying reviews in *La Revue Bleue* and *Le Mercure de France*, which were immediately translated and diffused in the Argentinian press. Although the sculpture would later be destroyed, a photograph of the artist wearing a loosely fitted robe and seated on a stepladder next to his group offers a glimpse into Yrurtia's Paris studio **(figure 7)**. The success of *The Sinners* at the Salon won for Yrurtia a one-year extension of his government-funded stay in Europe.[107] During that time, he traveled to Florence to see Michelangelo's works, but he judged this brief sojourn time ill spent. To Yrurtia, Paris was the only place to be to "pursue and crown [his] triumph." Unlike Buenos Aires, which he called "my hopeless soil" and "poor land," the Argentinian artist considered Paris his perfect battleground: "a fight is pleasant wherever there are people to understand it."[108]

Yrurtia remained in the French capital for another decade, during which time he worked on major commissions for his homeland. Although satisfied with his achievements in Paris, the sculptor was nonetheless highly critical of the Salon system and the awarding of medals. He wrote to Eduardo Schiaffino: "It is certainly true that I have triumphed in Paris as few others have: they called me the greatest artist of the era—very dangerous to French art. All this triumph —you would understand, is only intellectual—and it is the only one that I sought. […] those who <u>pretend to</u>

[107] Letter, November 16, 1903."Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes.

[108] Yrurtia to Schiaffino, July 12, 1903. "mi desgraciada tierra" "Una lucha es agradable en donde hay gente que la comprendan." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino," n.d.

make art to obtain medals and official honors, have disgusted me. Their medals are distributed even before the works were sent to the salon."[109] Perhaps due to his distrust of the SAF regarding the selection of medal recipients, the artist would choose to exhibit his works at the Salons of the Société nationale instead, where he was promoted to the status of associate of the SNBA.[110] Yrurtia would use his Parisian-made masterpiece, *The Sinners,* as a showpiece to establish his artistic identity in his homeland and as representative of the Argentinian school at the Saint Louis International Exposition in 1904.

In the early 1900s, the Irish-American sculptor Andrew O'Connor settled in Paris, where he participated annually in the Salons and quickly won renown.[111] In 1906, O'Connor was applauded in the press as the first foreigner to be awarded a second-place medal at the SAF, with his statue of General Lawton, a monument planned for Indianapolis, Indiana. Paul Leroi, a distinguished French critic, dedicated an entire page of his article on the 1906 Salon to the illustration of O'Connor's General Lawton in the monthly journal *L'Art*, and commented: "The

---

[109] Yrurtia to Schiaffino, July 12, 1903, sent from Florence. "Es bien cierto que en Paris he triunfado como pocos: me han llamado el primer artista de la época – muy peligroso al arte francés. Todo este triunfo -comprenderá, es solo intelectual- y solo es al que yo buscaba. Yo [¿], de todos los medios que se valen los que pretenden hacer arte para conseguir medallas y honores oficiales, que me ha repugnado. Sus medallas son distribuidas antes que las obras se envíen al salón. Con esto -perfectamente sé que no lo sorprenderé." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino."

[110] Yrurtia exhibited twice at the SNBA in 1906 and 1909. See Gaïte Dugnat, ed., *Les catalogues des Salons de La Société Nationale Des Beaux-Arts* (Paris: Echelle de Jacob, 2000).

[111] Andrew O'Connor exhibited at the *Société nationale des beaux-arts* in 1905, and at the *Salon des artistes français* in 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910, 1912, 1913, 1926 and 1928, that last year he won the gold medal for his group *Tristan and Isolde*.

jury could only have acted justly had it awarded Mr. O'Connor a first-place medal."[112] Leroi goes on to attribute this decision to artistic nationalism. O'Connor exhibited at the SAF every year between 1905 and 1913, with the exception of 1911. In 1909, he displayed a marble statue of General Lew Wallace, whose coat O'Connor wore as he posed for a photograph in which he presented himself as an embodiment of the sitter **(figures 8-9)**.[113]

O'Connor did not represent himself as an American artist, yet French critics analyzed his work through that lens. In his review of the 1909 monographic exhibition of O'Connor's work at the Galerie Hébrard, the prominent critic Louis Vauxcelles stated: "O'Connor has kept his personality intact and he strongly expresses the character of his race. His figures, their musculature, their overall arrangement, are clearly American."[114] Despite this label, O'Connor was the most cosmopolitan figure of the three sculptors whose oeuvre is studied here, and he even used his Irish ethnicity to participate in the 1906 competition for a statue of Commodore John Barry destined for Washington, D.C. In France, O'Connor's career reached its apex when he was awarded the Légion d'honneur for his group *Tristan and Isolde*, which received the gold medal at the 1928 Paris SAF.

---

[112] Paul Leroi, "'Salon de 1906,'" *L'art. Revue Mensuelle Illustrée* 66 (1906): 184. « Le jury n'eût agi que justement en décernant d'emblée a M. O'Connor une médaille de première classe. »

[113] The marble statue of Lew Wallace stands today in the National Statuary Hall in the Capitol in Washington D.C. A bronze version was made that was destined for Crawfordsville, Indiana.

[114] Louis Vauxcelles, *Le Gil Blas*, May 1909. « O'Connor a conservé intacte sa personnalité et exprime fortement le caractère de sa race. Le type de ses figures, leur musculature, leur construction d'ensemble, sont choses nettement américaines. »

2.2 The Internationalization of the Paris Salons

A showcase of contemporary artistic creations, the Paris Salons attracted sculptors who prepared all year long to submit their works to this annual competition that welcomed visitors during the months of May and June. However, the Salons are still misconceived today as a stuffy repository of French sculpture and wrongly associated with what some have called "academic art" or "official art," related sometimes even to the Prix de Rome or the Académie des Beaux-Arts. Often referred to as a singular institution, the Salon was in fact plural *Salons* at the turn of the century, a time when new artistic societies and exhibition venues were founded. Although recent scholarship has revised this mythic conception of the Salon and rediscovered the participation of foreign artists' communities in these events, the Paris Salons have yet to be reconceived as a transnational system of exchanges and a site for artistic experimentations that played a major role in the development of modernism.

The term "Salon" designates the French institution in charge of organizing artistic events that took place in Paris from the second half of the seventeenth century to the beginning of the twentieth century. The first references to a regular exhibition of paintings, sculptures, and engravings appeared in the founding texts of the Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture in 1648.[115] December 4, 1663, is considered the official date of birth of the Salon, when the institution's statutes and rules were established by the Académie royale de peinture et de

[115] Martin de Charmois, state adviser and art amateur, presented a petition for the foundation of an academy of painting and sculpture. It received royal approval and was published on January 20, 1648. Bonnet, *L'enseignement des arts au XIXe siècle*, 31; Claire Maingon and Daniel Bergez, *Le Salon et ses artistes: une histoire des expositions du Roi Soleil aux artistes français* (Paris: Hermann, 2009).

sculpture.[116] The term "Salon" itself surfaced in 1725, after the historical foundation of the event, and it was originally used to designate the Grand Salon, which is today the Salon Carré at the Louvre, in which the exhibition of paintings and sculptures took place that year. Starting in 1737, the Salon exhibition became a regular event, organized every year, or every other year, at the Louvre.[117]

First reserved exclusively for the members of the Academy, it was opened to all artists after the French Revolution in 1791. A jury was in charge of choosing the works accepted for display and of administering awards. This organizational system, which was modified, at times suppressed, and then restored, was subject to debates between artists and the institution throughout the nineteenth century, and more particularly in 1830, when the State put the function of jury in the hands of the Académie des beaux-arts. It was then that the prestigious term "Salon" took on a pejorative connotation, and the Salon started to be regarded as a rigid institution defending academic and official art in opposition to an innovative and more "modern" art. Past studies have reinterpreted the first Salon des Refusés in 1863, the Impressionist exhibition of 1874, and the creation of the Salon des Indépendants in 1884 as many manifestations that demonstrated the

---

[116] F. Humbert and T. Robert-Fleury, *Rapport fait par la commission d'étude pour le comité chargé de constituer définitivement la Société des artistes français* [1882], Archives Nationales F21 4417. The first part of the report is dedicated to the history of the Salon institution. Olivia Tolède, "Une Sécession Française : La Société Nationale Des Beaux-Arts (1889-1903)" (Nanterre, Université Paris X-Nanterre La Défense, 2008).

[117] The first official exhibition of the Salon took place at the Palais Brion (the site of the actual Palais Royal) in 1667. Subsequent exhibitions took place in 1669, 1671, 1673, 1675, 1681, and 1683. In 1699, the exhibition was held in the Grande Galerie at the Louvre. Dominique Lobstein, *Les Salons au XIXe siècle : Paris, Capitale des Arts* (Paris : Martinière, 2006), 9–10.

victory of modern artistic freedom over the rigidity of an academic art protecting archaic principles, even though this analysis did not reflect the historical reality of the Salons.[118]

Throughout the nineteenth century, the rules of the Salon were modified and differences among its members intensified, which led to the emergence of multiple artistic societies: The Salon became Salons. In the second half of the nineteenth century, the annual Salons cohabitated with the Paris world's fairs. According to Patricia Mainardi, the artists' emancipation from the tutelage of the Salon originated with the 1855 and the 1867 world's fairs, which would have opened the path to the development of modernism starting in the 1870s.[119] But in reality, modernism cannot be excluded from the history of the Salon, which became the history of the Salons starting in 1863. That year, the first Salon des Refusés was organized, which is generally considered as the founding event of modern art. Scholars including Alain Bonnet have since deconstructed the mythical dimensions accorded the 1863 Salon des Refusés in the history of the Salons.[120] A similar historiographical fallacy developed around the first exhibition of the Impressionist group in 1874, often singled out because of the revolutionary ambitions of an artists' "group" willing to emancipate itself from a traditional institutional scheme.[121]

---

[118] This analysis has been challenged and denounced by the French scholar Jean-Paul Bouillon, who demonstrated that although the historical development of the nineteenth century was marked by the passage from the Salon to Salons, scholarly discourses singled out the Salon as unique, which did not reflect its historical reality. Jean-Paul Bouillon, "Sociétés d'artistes et institutions officielles dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle," *Romantisme* 16, no. 54 (1986): 90.

[119] Patricia Mainardi, *Art and Politics of the Second Empire: Universal Expositions of 1855 and 1867* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).

[120] Bonnet, *L'enseignement des arts au XIXe siècle*, 11.

[121] Bouillon, "Sociétés d'artistes et institutions officielles dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle," 90.

In 1880 the Salon, for the first time, was coordinated not by the French State but by the artists themselves, organized in a society: the Société des artistes français (SAF), created in 1881. This institutional change went almost unnoticed by its contemporaries, since the SAF, in the legacy of the official Salon, maintained its annual exhibition and its system of jury and awards. This episode in the history of the Salons has also been neglected by art historians, misled by the supposed invisible changes that affected the event, which still transpired at the same time and location.[122] As the State disengaged itself from the organization of the Salon, it established a triennial exhibition destined to become a regular event, but which did not take place until 1883. It was the last official Salon in France. In 1884, a group of artists broke away from the SAF to create the Salon des Indépendants. Arising from the indignation of artists against the refusal of their work at the annual exhibition, this new organization claimed to be "without jury or award."[123]

Following a scandal regarding medals at the 1889 Paris World's Fair, another artistic society that seceded from the SAF emerged: the Société nationale des beaux-arts (SNBA). The French sculptors Dalou and Rodin were among the founding members, and scholars have suggested that Rodin might have played an influential role in attracting contemporary sculptors to join the society.[124] The ambition of the SNBA was to revitalize the concept of the annual exhibition, and it took the unprecedented step of allowing foreign artists to fully participate in the

[122] James Kearns and Pierre Vaisse, eds., *"Ce Salon à Quoi Tout Se Ramène": Le Salon de Peinture et de Sculpture, 1791-1890*, 26 (Bern, Switzerland ; New York: Peter Lang, 2010), 119.

[123] Lobstein, *Les salons au XIXe siècle*, 250.

[124] Dalou was vice president of the new society from 1890 to 1892, when he was replaced by Rodin.

artistic life of the society for the first time in the history of the Salons.[125] Although international artists had been able to participate in the Paris Salon since 1791, and then in the Salon des artistes français starting in 1880, they had never been allowed to be members of its organization. At the SNBA, however, international artists would now have the possibility to participate in the society's board as "associate" members and *sociétaires*. The title of *sociétaire* was honorific, a recognition of an artist's talent by his peers—since this title could be given only by co-optation—but it also corresponded to a function: to guarantee the quality of the works exhibited and decide on the admission of the exhibitors.[126] For international sculptors, this status became a sign of prestige in their home country, as in the case of the American George Grey Barnard, who became *sociétaire* after his success at the 1894 SNBA, and the Argentinian sculptor Rogelio Yrurtia in 1906.[127]

The growing number of foreign exhibitors at the SNBA provoked fierce nationalistic debates. To the French art critic and curator Léonce Bénédite, sculpture constituted "our great national art […] still far from degenerating."[128] However, anxieties about the preeminence of

---

[125] The name itself, "*Société nationale,"* or "National Society," seems to suggest that the society sought to highlight exclusively French artistic production, but it is misleading since by the mid-1890s, more than a quarter of its exhibitors were foreign. Tolède, "Une Sécession Française : La Société Nationale des Beaux-Arts (1889-1903)."

[126] The SNBA welcomed foreign artists with open arms. In 1890, 20 percent of the sculpture section were foreigners, a number that went up to 40 percent starting in 1894. Tolède, 136.

[127] Among the American sculptors involved in the SNBA, Paul Wayland Bartlett (1865-1925) was an associate member from 1890 to 1905 and exhibited at the SNBA in 1892, 1893, and 1894. Gutzon Borglum was associate member from 1892 to 1905 and exhibited there in 1891, 1892, and from 1897 to 1902. Augustus Saint-Gaudens was an associate member in 1899 and then a *sociétaire* from 1901 to 1905. He exhibited at the SNBA in 1898 and 1899.

[128] Léonce Bénédite became the director of the Musée du Luxembourg in 1892 and played a key role in establishing the Musée Rodin at the Hotel Biron in 1919 and became its first curator.

French art were articulated by Paul Gsell in his review of the 1892 SNBA: "We hear, at every moment, that the French school does not exist anymore, that every day foreigners steal our artistic heritage a little more to take advantage of it themselves, and that they will soon become our masters after having been our students."[129] Other critics denounced what they called the "invasion of foreigners in the organization of our national exhibitions and, then, their monopolizing of our market,"[130] based on the fact that at the 1892 SNBA, there were 195 French artists exhibiting versus 141 foreigners. Critics seized on Rodin as the barometer of the French artistic hegemony over foreign artists. In his review of the 1896 Salon, Roger Marx distinguishes between Rodin's French followers and foreigners' pastiches of the French master's creations: "The French escape almost always the danger of copying Rodin with an unintelligent servility; on the contrary, foreigners willingly pour out a purely exterior, superficial imitation; recent American pastiches were doomed."[131]

Today the SNBA is less well known than other Salons that developed during the same period, such as the Salon des Indépendants and the Salon d'Automne, which were more closely

---

[129] Paul Gsell, "L'art Français Moderne. A Propos Du Salon Du Champ de Mars," *Revue Politique et Littéraire: Revue Bleue*, no. 29 (1892): 760. « On entend dire à chaque instant que l'École française n'existe plus, que les étrangers nous ravissent chaque jour un peu plus de notre héritage artistique pour en tirer un meilleur parti que nous-mêmes, et qu'ils deviendront bientôt nos maîtres après avoir été nos élèves. »

[130] Hervé Breton, "Société nationale !" *La libre parole*, January 23, 1893. « L'envahissement des étrangers dans l'organisation de nos expositions nationales et, par suite, l'accaparement par eux de notre marché. »

[131] Roger Marx, "Les Salons de 1896. Au Champ de Mars," *Le Voltaire*, (1896): 2. « Les Français […] échappent presque toujours au danger de copier Rodin avec une inintelligente servilité ; tout à l'encontre, les étrangers versent volontiers dans une imitation purement extérieure, superficielle ; de récents pastiches américains ont été voués au néant […] »

associated with the emergence of new artistic styles, including Neo-Impressionism and Fauvism, respectively. In 1903, art critic and architect Franz Jourdain founded the Salon d'Automne, remembered today for its 1905 Salon associated with the birth of Fauvism and its xenophobic and antimodernist quarrel in 1912.[132] The Salon d'Automne followed organizational statutes similar to those of the SNBA, and foreign artists could also obtain the status of *sociétaires.* Starting in 1907, the Salon d'Automne was considered the successor of the SNBA, with a growing number of international artists exhibiting there. By 1909, one exhibitor out of two at the Salon d'Automne was foreign.[133]

From an exclusive artistic circle at its origin, the Salon then multiplied, attracting a growing number of artists who headed to the French capital to receive training, as well as to establish a name for themselves at the annual exhibitions.[134] Although the modernist narrative has long disregarded the role of the Salons in the development of modern art or confined modernism to the realm of a few, notably, the Salon des Indépendants and the Salon d'Automne, the SAF remained the preferred venue for many international artists who made their way to Paris. Many young artists believed participation in the Salon des artistes français, having modeled itself on the official Salon, with its jury system and awards, to be a prerequisite for a successful career. For instance, Yrurtia first established his success at the SAF before exhibiting at the SNBA. O'Connor participated only once at the SNBA in 1905 before establishing himself permanently at the SAF. Barnard initially

---

[132] Lobstein, *Les salons au XIXe siècle*, 282.

[133] Béatrice Joyeux-Prunel, "L'art de la mesure: Le Salon d'Automne (1903-1914), l'avant-garde, ses étrangers et la nation française," *Histoire & mesure,* Vol. XXII, no. 1 (2007): 152.

[134] Many other artistic societies developed at the turn of the century that offered even more opportunities for artists to showcase their work in the French capital, the Salon de la Rose-Croix and the Salon des aquarellistes, among others.

chose the SNBA, where he achieved his first success in 1894, but he later displayed his massive sculptural groups destined for Harrisburg at the 1910 SAF, perhaps because he needed a more official approval before shipping his monumental ensemble to the United States.

2.3 Crowding the Salons Floors

In the last third of the nineteenth century, a shift occurred in the display of sculptures at the Salons. Panoramic photographs of the center courtyard of the Palais de l'Industrie captured the transformation of the display: sculptures functioned less as decorative pieces spread throughout a garden organized around flowerbeds to increasingly become the main points of attraction for the viewer immersed in the display, turning the space of the Salons into a vast ecosystem of sculptures, ranging from portrait busts to monumental compositions. There is scant visual documentation to allow for a reevaluation of the Salons displays, but we have the "Albums Michelez," a precious photographic record of sculptures shown at the official Salon and, starting in 1880, at the Salons des artistes français (SAF).[135] These were albums of artworks exhibited at the Salons and purchased or commissioned by the French government, published annually, beginning in 1864. Therefore, they tended to feature French acquisitions at the expense of sculptures made by foreign artists that shared the same exhibition space.

---

[135] These albums have been partially digitized by the Archives nationales de France. "Archives Nationales (France) - Base de Données Archim," accessed February 7, 2021, http://www2.culture.gouv.fr/documentation/archim/albumsdessalons.htm. Some of these albums have also been consulted at the documentation of the Musée d'Orsay, Paris.

During the Second Empire, sculptural compositions at the Salon were deployed in an interior garden, while rows of portrait busts were aligned on the second-floor gallery, demonstrating a categorization of sculptures and organizing display that separated sculptures by types and scale. Photographic views of the sculpture garden in the 1860s reveal a profusion of vegetation with a relatively small number of sculptures presented. The use of curtains under the arches of the side galleries reinforces the sense of theatricality of the space, conceived as a site for spectacle and public consumption **(figure 10)**. This arrangement converges with what Alex Potts describes as "the public-parade dimensions of visiting galleries and viewing art," where sculpture was "in some way a public fixture."[136] Although accurate in the description of the SAF in the 1860s, this comment does not reflect the nature of Salon displays during the Third Republic—after the Franco-Prussian War of 1870—when sculptures invaded the center space of the Palais de l'Industrie. A photograph of the 1876 Salon conveys the proliferation of works on view and the immersive environment that was created by large-scale sculptures **(figure 11)**. Starting that year, booklets, possibly gallery guides, were provided to visitors, placed on top of the benches. In 1879, lampposts spread throughout the garden transformed it into a microcosm of modernity.[137]

In the subsequent decade, the central courtyard of the Palais de l'Industrie became saturated with sculptures, leaving less space for vegetation, and this change coincided with the establishment of the newly created Salon des artistes français in 1881. Sculptures were busily arranged around flowerbeds and extended over the central space of the Palais de l'Industrie. A photographic view of the left side of the garden at the 1881 SAF gives an idea of the abundance of sculptures, featuring

---

[136] Alex Potts, *The Sculptural Imagination: Figurative, Modernist, Minimalist* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 18.

[137] See Album Michelez. Salon 1879, garden and sculpture, right side. These lampposts were removed in 1881.

large-scale groups, such as Calixte-Marius Gérard's *Jacob luttant avec l'ange*, Louis Ernest Barrias's (1841-1905) *Monument à la défense de St Quentin*, and Alfred Boucher's (1850-1934) *L'amour filial* **(figure 12)**. Barrias's model for a public monument celebrating the heroic defense of the northern city of Saint Quentin against the Prussians in 1870, prominently placed in the center gallery, demonstrates that no division was made between gallery-sized and monumental sculptures at the Salons.[138] Furthermore, the display of sculptures at the Salons was replicated at the world's fairs. At the 1889 Paris World's Fair, for instance, sculptures and paintings occupied different parts of the building: paintings were on view in the lateral galleries, while sculptures took up the large central space of the exhibition hall. That year, Carpeaux's *The Four Parts of the World Holding the Celestial Sphere*, destined for the Observatory Garden in Paris, was prominently placed at the center of a flower parterre, surrounded by busts and small-scale figures **(figure 13)**.

In the final decade of the century, sculptures took over the large exhibition space of the Salons, turning the leisurely garden into an ecosystem of sculptures. In an adjustment of the Salons displays of the 1870s and 1880s, benches were more scattered in the sculpture hall, leaving ample space for the Salons visitors to closely observe sculptural works **(figure 14)**. The whiteness of the plasters stood out in this sculptural environment. While comfortably seated on a bench at the 1890 SAF, smoking "excellent cigarettes from French national manufacturers," the critic Mathias Morhardt described his transformative encounter with sculptures:

> Their radiant whiteness bothers the eyes. What a disturbing population that these busts […] which seem so sad to have lost the use of their legs! And what frightening characters, those

---

[138] Even after a section on public monuments was added to the Salons catalogues, most plaster models for large sculptural projects continued to be listed under the section "Sculptures."

> who are standing on their pedestal and whose threatening fist indicates, behind the green bushes, invisible but malevolent enemies![139]

In Morhardt's words, the sculptures had metamorphosed into living creatures that threatened the passersby. This hallucinatory vision of the Salons emphasizes the reshaping of the Salons into an ecosystem of sculptures that outnumbered the visitors.

Starting in 1890, the SNBA introduced a new model of sculptural display, with a smaller number of works put on view.[140] The critic Arsène Alexandre proclaimed, "The Champ-de-Mars Salon gave rise to a certain refinement in the presentation of works, which, formerly, were jostling in indigestible crowds."[141] Busts were now placed on top of large pedestals, allowing visitors to go around them, unlike at the SAF, where, it was observed in the press: "we were used to see busts lined up as pieces of an anatomical collection or books on a shelf."[142] As a founder and regular

[139] Mathias Morhardt, "Le Salon des Champs-Elysées," *Petit Patriote de l'Ouest*, Angers, May 13, 1890. « Le jardin de la sculpture est coquettement organisé. Il y a des arbustes verts à profusion et, sous les arbustes verts, des bancs ou des chaises. On s'y peut reposer jusqu'à l'heure de la fermeture, en fumant les excellentes cigarettes de nos manufactures nationales. […] La seule chose qui afflige un peu les yeux ce sont, précisément, les sculptures. Il en faudrait faire abstraction. Malheureusement, leur blancheur étincelante gêne les regards. Quelle inquiétante population que ces bustes, recrépis à la chaux, qui semblent si tristes d'avoir perdu l'usage de leurs jambes ! Et quels effrayants personnages, ceux-là qui sont debout sur leur piédestal et dont le poing menaçant indique, derrière les paisibles arbustes tout verts, d'invisibles et malins ennemis ! »

[140] For instance, in 1893, the SAF counted 1200 works, while at the SNBA, there were 100 works exhibited from 50 artists. In 1897, the SAF counted 836 versus 150 works at the SNBA.

[141] Arsène Alexandre, "À travers Paris. La Société Nationale des Beaux-Arts," *Le Figaro*, April 24, 1896. « Le Salon du Champ-de-Mars fit renaître un certain goût dans la présentation des œuvres, qui jadis se bousculaient en indigestes cohues. »

[142] Jean Darric, "Salon de 1891. La sculpture," *La nouvelle revue*, (1891): 614.

exhibitor at the SNBA, Rodin might have been the decision maker behind such display choices. He was known for giving precise instructions about the installation of his sculptures, paying particular attention to the viewer's ability to move around the works.[143] Moreover, Rodin's status at the SNBA gave him the freedom to set himself apart from the other sculptors.[144] Every year, the SNBA featured a monographic room dedicated to the oeuvre of one of its members. In 1896, Puvis de Chavannes had the place of honor, with his display of paintings and frescoes destined for the Boston Public Library, and Rodin chose to showcase his sculptures in Puvis's room, rather than with all the other statues in the sculpture garden.[145] The following year, he made a statement in placing his *Victor Hugo*, which had been an object of recent controversy, at the entrance of the sculpture garden.[146]

Exceptionally, in 1898 both the SAF and the SNBA shared the same exhibition space in the Galerie des Machines. While two-thirds of the gallery was filled with sculptures from the SAF scattered amid shrubs and plants, against a background of Gobelin tapestry, the remaining third

[143] « Les bustes se détachaient sur de larges piédestaux permettant d'en faire le tour, comme l'exigeait Rodin qui avait l'habitude de donner des instructions précises afin que le spectateur puisse tourner autour de ses œuvres. » Tolède, "Une Sécession Française : La Société Nationale Des Beaux-Arts (1889-1903)," 209.

[144] Rodin himself was highly engaged in the Salons system. He was a member of the SAF starting in 1883. He belonged to the jury of the sculpture section for the 1889 Salon, then also in 1897, 1899, and 1902. Moreover, Rodin was elected vice president of the SNBA and president of the sculpture section, in replacement of Dalou, in 1892.

[145] "Sculpture," *Paris*, April 25, 1896. « Rodin qui préfère avec raison le glorieux voisinage des dessins de Puvis de Chavannes aux promiscuités inquiétantes du jardin, où sont réunies les statues. »

[146] See press cuttings. "Société Nationale Des Beaux-Arts" (Paris, France, n.d.), Archives and Documentation Center, Musée Rodin. The sculpture was refused by its commissioners for the Panthéon and was eventually placed in the Luxembourg Gardens.

accommodated sculptures of the SNBA grouped together on a raised floor, under a canopy projecting from two colonnades with a Roman portico, which formed a sort of temple around the exhibits **(figure 15)**.[147] The Palais de l'Industrie and the Palace of Fine Arts buildings having been demolished to make room for the 1900 Paris World's Fair, the exhibitions of the two Salons, SAF and SNBA, were placed in the grand old machinery shed on the Champ-de-Mars.[148] Critics were pleased with this change of environment: "The Salons are exceedingly well arranged, and if it were not for the suffocating and blinding dust which was first noticeable on varnishing day […] there is no reason why these two important annual collections should not be permanently established in their present site."[149] However, critics had differing points of view regarding the sculptural display. In the *Gazette de France*, a critic lamented that "statues were still quite pell-mell, lodged head to tail, when they had their head and were not scattered, *disjecta membra.*"[150] The *Weekly Sun* remarked that in both displays "the sculpture is seen to great advantage, and the effect of each individual exhibit may be much better judged that when, as at the Academy, they were arranged in rows as at a cast maker's shop."[151]

---

[147] *Weekly Sun*, London, May 15, 1898.

[148] *Liverpool Post*, May 6, 1898.

[149] Rowland Strong, *Times*, New York, May 14, 1898.

[150] *La Gazette de France*, May 15, 1898. « Tous les Salonniers gardent du jardin de sculpture un souvenir très doux. Le cerveau brouille de couleurs, ils allaient s'y reposer un instant, au milieu du tohu-bohu pittoresque que nous avons décrit, fumer un cigare devant l'énigme de Balzac, se délasser les yeux sur la calme blancheur des statues. Malheureusement, elles étaient encore bien pêle-mêle les statues, couchées tête-bêche, quand elles avaient leur tête et n'étaient pas éparses, *disjecta membra*. »

[151] *Weekly Sun*, London, May 15, 1898.

That year, it was Rodin, with his *Balzac*, who univocally gained the favor of the critics. Placed on one end of the architectural portico of the SNBA, the controversial bronze was strategically paired by the sculptor with his marble *Le Baiser*, on view at the center of the canopy. The statue drew the crowds and overshadowed the other works, as evidenced in critical reviews: "His statue of Balzac is without any doubt the great artistic sensation of the year," or "The new Salon is, as a rule, poor in statuary, but this year M. Rodin is a host in himself."[152] Nonetheless, some critics celebrated the presence of other works at the annual event, in particular, the Americans MacMonnies's colossal *Quadrige et Groupe de Chevaux et Cavaliers*, "severely cramped" at the Salons,[153] and Saint-Gaudens's plaster of the *Shaw Memorial*.[154] A British critic expressed his frustration regarding the fact that "Rodin is the one man talked of just now," arguing that

[152] Rowland Strong, *Times*, New York, May 14, 1898, New York.

[153] *Pall Mall Gazette*, London, May 18, 1898. The critic noted that, "it is difficult to judge so vast a work in the relatively confined space of the Machinery Hall, where it is severely cramped, but doubtless it will have a fine effect in Prospect Park, Brooklyn, which is its ultimate destination." Rowland Strong, in *Times*, May 14, 1898 commented: "It will please American pride to know that the most striking exhibit which immediately arrests and holds the spectator's attention on entering the vast hall is the colossal bronze group by MacMonnies […]"

[154] Léonce Bénédite, 'Les Salons de 1898,' *Gazette des beaux-arts*, August 1, 1898. It is interesting to note that by the time Saint-Gaudens displayed his plaster of the Shaw Memorial at the 1898 Salon, the bronze monument had already been put in place in Boston. Scholars have noted that Saint-Gaudens, not satisfied with his final design, kept making changes and modified the plaster before sending it to the Salon. Again, this example emphasizes the importance of the Salon for sculptors: Was Saint-Gaudens trying to get his plaster bought by the French government? See John Dryfhout, *The Work of Augustus Saint-Gaudens* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1982).

MacMonnies deserved more attention by the critics and the public than he had received.[155] Yet year after year, Rodin would continue to use his privileged status at the Salons to reserve for his sculptures a prominent spot on the ground floor of the cupola of the Grand Palais.[156]

At the beginning of the twentieth century, larger-scale sculptures invaded the grounds of the Paris World's Fair and the Salons. Built for the 1900 Paris World's Fair, the Grand Palais became the new exhibition venue for showcasing contemporary art. Here, the central nave of the building followed an organization similar to the Salons displays. Wandering around this saturated space, visitors were transported into an indoor monumental landscape, where sculptures seem to be gazing and gesturing at each other **(figure 16)**. After 1900, the SAF took place in the Grand Palais, presenting an abundance of sculptures of all sizes amassed under the great glass roof **(figure 17)**. The critic Albert Thomas even used the term "*grandes machines*"— or "great machines"—to describe the monumental works on display at the 1903 Salons.[157] The vegetation was then reduced to a decorative role, complementing the space around the placement of sculptures on their pedestals.[158] While the SAF occupied the nave and galleries under the dome of the Grand Palais,

---

[155] *Pall Mall Gazette*, London, May 18, 1898. "but the sculptor [MacMonnies] should not be surprised at the neglect with which he has been treated. Rodin, with whom he deserves to be ranked, in point of view of talent, is the one man talked of just now."

[156] Raguet to Rodin, March 1908. « Monsieur le Président, j'ai l'honneur de vous informer que dans la séance du Comité d'avant-hier, M. Roll, Président de la Société, a donné connaissance de votre désir d'occuper la place habituelle qui vous est réservée chaque année, au rez-de-chaussée de la coupole. » "Société Nationale Des Beaux-Arts" (Paris, France, n.d.), Archives and Documentation Center, Musée Rodin.

[157] Albert Thomas, "La sculpture aux salons," *L'art décoratif*, July - December 1903, 34.

[158] See floor map in the 1903 SAF catalogue, Documentation Center, Musée d'Orsay, Paris.

the SNBA took up the space of the current Palais de la Découverte, including the Salon d'honneur, with sculptures displayed both in an interior nave and, for the first time, in an exterior garden.

Even though press reviews tended to stress the different scales of the sculptures and display strategies at the SAF and the SNBA, in reality they were completely interrelated. Sculptors displayed both monumental works and gallery-sized sculptures at the two Salons, often to the disapproval of critics, who complained about the difficulty of their task:

> When one has wandered for long hours in the sections of sculpture of the *Société nationale* and the *Artistes Français*, looking for a powerful or delicate work by a master or a newcomer, surveying the vast space cluttered with bases and figures, in quest of a new effort or simply a repetition worth being seen again and noted, one succumbs to fatigue, discouraged in face of the immensity of the production, and the rarity of creations ever so little personal or ever so little animated with enthusiasm for beauty and a flame of life.[159]

By 1905, the Salons had become increasingly international, leading to the development of a "universal statuary," as this French critic argued in his Salons review: "I say universal, the increase in communications coinciding with the artistic development in various countries in Europe and America and resulting in a larger and larger collaboration of all creators, of all nationalities, in our artistic events. To such point that the number of French exhibitors is about to be overtaken by the number of foreigners at the Société nationale."[160]

---

[159] Yvanhoe Rambosson, *L'art décoratif*, April - September 1901, 106. « Lorsque l'on s'est promené de longues heures dans les sections de sculpture de la *Société nationale* et des *Artistes Français*, cherchant l'œuvre puissante ou délicate d'un maitre ou d'un nouveau venu, arpentant le vaste espace encombré de socles et de figures, à la poursuite d'un effort neuf ou simplement d'une redite qui valût la peine d'être revue et notée, une fatigue vous vient, un découragement devant l'immensité de la production, et la rareté des créations tant soit peu personnelles, tant soit peu animées d'un enthousiasme de beauté et d'une flamme de vie. »

[160] Yvanhoe Rambosson, "La sculpture aux Salons," *L'art décoratif*, January – June 1905, 266-279. « Je dis universelle, l'accroissement des communications coïncidant avec le développement de l'art dans les divers pays

2.4 Making Modern Sculpture at the Paris Salons: Appropriation, Mutation, and Migration of Sculptural Forms

The crowding of the Salons floors at the turn of the twentieth century coincided with the development of grander, more monumental groupings that transformed the language of modern sculpture. Breaking away from the sinuous outlines and gracious poses of allegorical statues, modern sculptors pushed the emotional boundaries of the figure by reworking its gestures into bodily contortions and rejecting any props or attributes that would limit its meaning. Commonly defined as a movement of a part of the body, such as the hand or the head, a gesture expresses a specific idea or meaning, like the orator arm featured in the emblematic *Primaporta Augustus* that designates a sign of address in classical sculpture. By the early twentieth century, Barnard, O'Connor, Rodin, and Yrurtia, among others, had rejected the conventionalized model of the neoclassical gesture and created a figurative language that unveiled new meanings. Sculptors who sought to move away from the codified visual language of the past adopted movements including contorting, intertwining, extending, pressing together, wrenching, twisting, and angular bending as formal strategies.

Modern sculptors were interested in exploring the emotional possibilities of a given sculptural motif, and they used them widely in different narratives. There is an ambiguity of references inherent in sculptures in which there are no props. Precisely this lack of referentiality interested early twentieth-century sculptors, who circulated the same motifs in different themes

---

d'Europe et d'Amérique et déterminant une collaboration de plus en plus large de tous les créateurs, quel que soit leur nationalité, à nos manifestations artistiques. A tel degré qu'à la Société nationale le nombre d'exposants français est sur le point d'être dépassé par celui des étrangers. »

and topics. For them, the motif was interesting in itself more than for what it meant. For instance, the upper arm raised over the man's head in Rodin's *The Age of Bronze* made its way into many works by his contemporaries, but in different contexts. Although Rodin was singled out as the master of sculptural expressivity, it would be mistaken to suggest that he was the only modern sculptor to pursue that goal. One could trace the genealogy of this specific motif back to earlier nineteenth-century sculptures. Through processes of appropriation and emulation by various sculptors, this motif became versatile, and its meaning transformed. O'Connor, for example, quoted it in his *Barry Monument*, and, as we will see in this section, he was less interested in the conventional meaning of the sculptural motif than in its emotional power.

Scholars have long looked toward the past, particularly antiquity and the Renaissance, to identify the sources of inspiration for nineteenth-century sculptors. While the Musée du Louvre was certainly an influential visual source for artists—studying the casts of Greek classics was part of the academic training for sculptors—the Paris Salons became an even more relevant repertory of forms and motifs, contributed by sculptors who competed with their contemporaries. The ecosystem of the Paris Salons, featuring hundreds of sculptures gathered in the same space for a two-month period, served as a creative ground for sculptors to rethink poses and modify the figurative language of sculpture. One might want to refer to it as the Google Images of today. In order to be part of this selective sculptural arena, artists had to produce works that would enter in conversation with one another. Quotations from other sculptural models were customary, and sculptors often introduced significant shifts in their compositions to make their works stand out from the crowd. They pushed the limits of figuration in producing ever larger sculptures, simultaneously conveying a greater complexity while giving rise to a greater opacity of meaning.

In *Patterns of Intention*, Michael Baxandall cautions his reader about the use of the notion of “influence” in writing art history. He discusses Piero della Francesca’s appropriation of Donatello’s angels from his great *Cantoria* in his *Baptism of Christ*. Although these angels were traditionally associated with the classical group of the Graces because of their striking similarities, Baxandall demonstrates that this analogy was not satisfying because it failed to take into consideration the “active transforming individuality of Piero and his idiom.”[161] What art historians should look for is not a perfect resemblance between two artworks, “not something that looks like Piero’s Angels,” but instead a reference just dissimilar enough that, once transformed, it would become the artwork judged “something that, having been transformed by Piero, would look like Piero’s Angels.”[162] The transformative factor is crucial in dismantling the notion of influence between artists and their hierarchical classification—master versus follower —by art historians. Baxandall’s model proves useful in a study of the nineteenth-century Salons system and its internal network of sculptural motifs, appropriated over and over again by artists.

The Salons could be compared to an artistic playground, in which the players – in this case, sculptors –participated in a sculptural game, choosing, emulating, and adopting motifs for their own works. It was not a case of nineteenth-century sculptors lazily quoting works and appending their signatures on their creations but of their own idiom emerging in their disruption of an original model. The limited figurative vocabulary of sculpture allowed for endless variations on the same theme and encouraged practices of fragmentation, repurposing, and recontextualization of sculptural motifs. The recent exhibition *The Pose: Rethinking Sculpture in 19th century Paris*

---

[161] Michael Baxandall, *Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), 131.

[162] *Ibidem.*

offered an original study of nineteenth-century French sculpture in establishing dialogues between sculptures according to their poses rather than a chronological and stylistic history of art.[163] Thematic sections, such as "Infantile subject" and "Maternity grouping," were juxtaposed with compositional units like "The unposed," "Sitting," "Crouching," or "Intertwined," which encouraged viewers to look closely at each object through a game of formal comparisons. This analysis, though, was limited to the study of French sculpture and failed to take into account the transnational character of the artistic exchanges that transpired in Paris. In the following sections, I map out the genealogy of a selection of sculptural motifs that were particularly revisited repeatedly by sculptors in the nineteenth-century Salons and explore how sculptural forms migrated from works to works, and changed meaning in the process.

2.4.1 Quoting Rodin/Rodin Quoting

Rodin has long been perceived as the unique model for sculptors of his generation to follow—or, at least, respond to or react against. By reinscribing Rodin's sculptures within the collaborative culture of the Paris Salons, I reevaluate the history of modern sculpture without falling into the impasse of Rodin's well-constructed myth of the individual genius. The French sculptor relied on the Salons system as much as he benefited from it. While he had a privileged status in the institutionalized systems of both the SAF and the SNBA, Rodin himself appropriated, emulated, and repurposed sculptural motifs that he redeployed in his own works. Subsequently, Rodin's works were quoted by his contemporaries, securing their success and widespread

[163] Carla Paulino et al., *The Pose: Rethinking Sculpture in 19th-Century Paris* (Lisbon: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, 2018).

dissemination. Close analysis of Salons sculptures allows us to reconstruct these artistic filiations and genealogies of themes, mostly disregarded by critics at the time, who sought to identify individual talents instead of collective endeavors at the Salons.

Anne Wagner demonstrated that Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux's *Le Pêcheur à la Coquille,* submitted as the sculptor's third salon entry in 1858 and again in marble as his fifth-year offering, resembled a crowd of contemporary fisherboys on view at the Salons. Most specifically, Wagner argues that it derived from the works of François Rude (1784-1855) and Francisque Joseph Duret (1804-1865), who were Carpeaux's teachers, and must be viewed as a tribute to them: "It was no doubt an amnesia the artist wished to encourage."[164] This was not an isolated case, as Carpeaux looked at contemporary sculptural motifs in other instances. H. W. Janson showed that although Carpeaux's *Ugolino and His Sons* was made after the sculptor's trip to Florence, where he was profoundly impressed with Michelangelo, "The direct visual antecedents of the group, however, have to be found in recent French sculpture, especially Etex's *Cain and His Race*, which was exhibited in marble at the Paris International Exposition of 1855, where Carpeaux probably saw it shortly before his departure for Rome."[165] The genealogy of the sculptural motif did not stop there, as the contrived posture of the male figure with his elbow placed on his leg in Carpeaux's *Ugolino* was appropriated by Rodin in *The Thinker*. Indebted to Carpeaux's work, this sculpture, which has long become an icon of Rodin, was repurposed by other sculptors who inserted themselves in this long artistic lineage.

---

[164] Anne Middleton Wagner, *Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux: Sculptor of the Second Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 145–46.

[165] Horst W. Janson, *19th-Century Sculpture* (New York: Abrams, 1985), 140.

Since the beginning of his career, Rodin strategically appropriated sculptural motifs from a variety of sculptures at the Salons. The single figure we know as *The Age of Bronze* reveals a debt to motifs and themes that the sculptor had encountered in the 1870s Salons **(figure 18)**. Originally known as *Le Vaincu* or "The Vanquished," *The Age of Bronze* was initially conceived as a tribute to the suffering of the French people in the wake of the Franco-Prussian War. Most of the contemporary sculpture at that time focused on patriotic themes, such as Antonin Mercié's (1845-1916) *Gloria Victis*, Auguste Bartholdi's (1834-1904) *Lion of Belfort*, or Emmanuel Frémiet's (1824-1910) *Jeanne d'Arc.* The gesture of the male figure in *The Age of Bronze,* his raised arm with a hand placed on his head, derives from Michelangelo's (1475-1564) *The Dying Slave*, which Rodin would have certainly seen at the Musée du Louvre. The naturalistic treatment of the "agile, moving, slender body, with its numerous subtle transitions," though, is different, instead resembling the warrior in Mercié's *Gloria Victis*, which was a major success at the 1875 Salon.[166] According to Butler, "Rodin's figure type, his subject, as well as his chosen title, '*Le Vaincu*' all reveal a debt to Mercié."[167] While he based *The Age of Bronze* on Mercié's work, Rodin developed a new take on the idea of victory in his sculpture: instead of a depicting an heroic hero, *The Age of Bronze* shows a man in a state of despair.

While working on his monument to the revolutionary Irish-American hero Commodore John Barry, the Paris-based sculptor Andrew O'Connor repurposed Rodin's *Age of Bronze* into

[166] Butler, "Rodin and the Paris Salon," 33.

[167] Butler, 34. Butler also shows that this is not the only instance when Rodin appropriated contemporary models to create his own works. Rodin's *Eve*, for instance, was undoubtedly influenced by Michelangelo's *Eve* on the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, but also constituted a reinterpretation of Paul Dubois's *Eve*, a triumph at the 1875 SAF, which certainly did not escape Rodin's eyes.

the sculptural group *The Exiles* (**figure 19**). The freestanding group, which, with its lean, muscular young man who holds his right arm bent over his head, looks at first like a direct quote from Rodin's *Age of Bronze*, was part of an enormous, complex representation of the Irish diaspora. In O'Connor's work, a man steps forward, a woman behind him grasps his left hand by his hip, while an old man leans on his back. He gazes straight ahead and walks with purpose, leading these two smaller figures. The naturalistic treatment of their nude bodies accentuates the details of their skin and muscles and emphasizes their different ages. One might also associate the pairing of the young man leading an elderly figure with the fleeing Aeneas carrying his father Anchises out of the fire of Troy. In this instance, though, Aeneas's son, Astyanax, is absent. Instead, we have here a young woman, her head lowered, in a state of profound fatigue. Her left hand placed on top of the young man's hand could also recall Eve following Adam, fleeing the Garden of Eden. While the artist might have combined multiple iconographic sources in his work, the detail of the lifted arm of the young man over his head constitutes a direct quote from Rodin. However, unlike Rodin's figure, who is standing in a controlled *contrapposto,* self-absorbed in his pose with his head lifted toward his right arm, the male figure leading the woman and the old man is clearly heading somewhere, leading the exile of the Irish people fleeing their island. With *The Exiles*, O'Connor demonstrates that a sculptural motif and a theme could be quoted and completely transformed at the same time.

Similarly, the Argentinian sculptor Rogelio Yrurtia demonstrated with his group *The Sinners* that a sculpture can reference Rodin's work while at the same time inserting itself into a broader genealogy of nineteenth-century Salons sculptures. In 1903, Yrurtia encountered his first great success at the SAF with the display of this group. It presented the psychological portrait of a group of female figures standing in a circle, their bodies bent, their shoulders hunched, their heads looking down in an attitude of prostration (**figure 20**). Drapery resembling rags enveloped their

bodies and partially revealed their nudity. In *L'Art décoratif*, the critic Albert Thomas offered a poignant description of Yrurtia's sculpture:

> On a square plinth, six women, young but withered, almost naked despite the drooping rags with which they attempt to veil their bodies, shuffle miserably. They are overcome with shame, hold their breasts, too complaisant to the desire of men, mechanically bite a corner of their torn dress. They remain in this way, unresolved, anticipating a fierce sensation. And the sculptor has rendered, with sincere realism, the weariness of their throats, their necks, their bellies with their deep folds. He expressed their confusion and anguish in the most pathetic way, with the shrug of the shoulders, the flexing of the joined legs, the painful tilt of the profiles.[168]

Some would argue that *The Sinners* was the female equivalent to Rodin's *The Burghers of Calais*, which was first exhibited publicly at the gallery Georges Petit in 1889 **(figure 21)**. At the time, critics commented on Yrurtia's reference to Rodin's work, but also compared it to the fifteenth-century funerary monument to Philippe Pot, in the Louvre collection, and contemporary works by the Belgian sculptor George Minne (1866-1941).[169] The critic might have had in mind

---

[168] Albert Thomas, "La sculpture aux salons," *L'art décoratif*, July - December 1903. « Sur un socle carré, six femmes, jeunes mais flétries, à peu près nues malgré les loques tombantes dont elles tachent de voiler leurs corps, piétinent lamentablement. Elles sont accablées par la honte, tiennent leurs seins trop complaisants au désir des hommes, mordent machinalement un coin de leur robe déchirée. Elles demeurent ainsi, irrésolues, dans l'attente d'un sentiment farouche. Et le sculpteur a rendu, avec un sincère réalisme la lassitude de leur gorge, de leur nuque, de leur ventre aux plis profonds. Il a exprimé leur confusion et leur angoisse de la façon la plus pathétique, par le haussement des épaules, le fléchissement des jambes jointes, l'inclinaison dolentes des profils. »

[169] Camille Mauclair, "Le Salon de la Société des Artistes Français en 1903," *La Revue Bleue*, 1903, 624–29. « J'ai eu la joie de trouver dans un recoin une belle création dont personne, me semble-t-il, n'a rien dit. C'est un groupe de six femmes en plâtre patiné, *Les Pécheresses*, de M. Yrurtia, dont je n'ai jamais entendu parler. C'est de la grande sculpture. Il n'y a rien ici qui l'équivaudrait. Le modelé, le dispositif des figures, s'inspirent du tombeau de Philippe Pot et des *Bourgeois de Calais* de Rodin. J'ai pensé aussi à certaines créations de George Minne, qui a tant de talent et qu'on ignore à peu près en France […] Ces *Pécheresses* sont la seule œuvre que le Salon révèle. »

Minne's *Fountain with Kneeling Youth* from 1898, composed of five identical kneeling figures placed in the round. With his head down, each youth grasps with each hand his opposite shoulder, so as to condense the figure to an L shape with no limb protruding. In the tombstone of Philippe Pot, the figures of the mourners surround the dead. They are anonymous, draped from head to toe, accompanying the deceased. In Yrurtia's group, in contrast, they take on the role of the main protagonists and are individualized. The reference to Rodin, noted by critics, might have served Yrurtia well in his first artistic endeavors at the Salons, but the Argentinian sculptor would soon reject the influence of the French master. In his personal correspondence, Yrurtia freely expressed his feelings about Rodin, and his friend the Argentinian painter Martín Malharro (1865-1911) warned him about his opinions on Rodin, asking him not to share them with anyone, because they could be used against him.[170]

[170] Malharro to Yrurtia, undated. "[…] Efectivamente usted me sorprende con sus juicios sobre Rodin. Como amigo de usted le ruego que no comunique a nadie esas opiniones. Pueden explotarlas en su contra. Ud debe dejar pasar tranquilamente la época de las fuertes impresiones. En la intensificación de la vida ideal que ud vive en estos momentos, me explico esos arranques, nobles por otra parte, que lo presentan hoy renegando de Rodin y de su obra. El hombre que hizo 'Les bourgeois de Calais' no es, no puede ser un mistificador. El escultor de 'El beso' y de San Juan Bautista es un escultor, un artista, y un HOMBRE. Rodin rompió con los moldes entronizados, merced a la rutina; abrió nuevos horizontes, sin límites, sin fines. Puede carecer de mentalidad, puede no saber a qué principios ni a que fines responde; pero el genio suele proceder así, inconscientemente, acertando unas veces, equivocándose otras, cayendo aquí para levantarse allí; pero en sus éxitos y en sus fracasos, en sus rasgos de virilidad con en sus debilidades y cobardías el genio es el genio y los que cultivamos un ideal debemos ser los primeros en considerar que todo en este mundo es susceptible de errores tanto más grandes cuanto más considerable es la personalidad que los comete. En Rodin veo un artista y hasta. Si es perverso o bueno, canalla o hidalgo, logrero o noble ello no importa: es un artista y lastima grande que no lo sea completo: en su vida de arte y en su vida privada, en su obra y en sus actos nada más.

With *The Sinners*, Yrurtia reinterpreted the neoclassical model of the *Three Graces*, in which the elegant gestures of three female figures, seen from three different angles legible at a single glance, emphasize the beauty of their idealized bodies. Before him, Carpeaux had offered his own variation on the theme with *The Dance*, destined for the facade of the Palais Garnier, in which dancing figures mirror each other's postures. But instead of exposing their body, the figures of *The Sinners* are concealing it. Their bodies bear traces of distress: the breasts sag, there are legs pressed together in a gesture of shame, and their hands are clasped closely on their torso or mouth. Their attitude of prostration contrasts with the open joyfulness of the *Three Graces*, in which each figure is linked to another by the gracious play of hands and legs, their bodies lifting upward. For the first work he ever presented to the Paris Salons, Yrurtia strategically chose a sculpture that demonstrated strong affinities with Rodin's style and at the same time inserted itself within the long tradition of sculptural variations on the theme of the Graces.

2.4.2 Modernism and Repetition: The Case of the Kneeling Figure

In her essay "The Originality of the Avant-Garde," Rosalind Krauss places Rodin as a point of departure to introduce the concept of "originality," which "itself emerges from a ground of repetition and recurrence."[171] However, unlike Rodin, who, according to Krauss, was one of the last artists to introduce the narrative in his work and "participate[d] in the transformation of his

[…]" "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

[171] Rosalind E. Krauss, *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1985), 157.

work into kitsch," avant-garde artists would use processes of repetition to serve an agenda that eschewed narration. Krauss demonstrates that the motif of the grid was repeatedly employed by artists such as Piet Mondrian (1872-1944), Josef Albers (1888-1976), Ad Reinhardt (1913-1967), and Agnes Martin (1912-2004) to develop their modernist vocabulary. The grid, defined by "its lack of hierarchy, of center, of inflection," is self-referential and does not allow for any narration.[172] Krauss equates originality and repetition, asserting that the notion of the copy is fundamental to the conception of the original.[173]

Based on Krauss's definition of the avant-garde, I argue that the concepts of originality and modernism could be expanded to nineteenth-century sculptural practices of repetition and recombination. Similar to how avant-garde artists have used the motif of the grid, Salons sculptors appropriated and altered particular motifs for their own agenda. Sculptural variations on the motif of the kneeling figure, for example, proliferated in the nineteenth-century Paris Salons. An attempt to identify a genealogy of this motif shows that the kneeling figure with torso and/or thighs under stress, often alone, sometimes paired with a seated or standing figure facing them, underwent a process of transformation from the prodigal son rushing to the arms of his father to the figure of the lover. In sculpture, motifs had the potential to produce different meanings and to migrate between various themes.

At first sight, Barnard's *The Prodigal Son* looks like a reinterpretation of the biblical story told through the eyes of Rodin **(figure 22)**. The compression of the two figures against one another as they emerge from the same block of marble, the expressivity of the gestures, and the mutation of marble into flesh have long been qualities uniquely associated with the French master. However,

---

[172] Krauss, 158.

[173] Krauss, 166.

it was in the collaborative environment of the transnational Paris Salons that Barnard found the sculptural resources needed to create this group.[174] In 1894, the same year that Barnard showed his works for the first time at the SNBA, the French sculptor Ernest Dubois (1863-1931) was awarded the first-class medal at the SAF with his group *Le Pardon,* or "The Prodigal Son."[175] His sculpture depicts the moment of the return of the prodigal son, in which the father leans forward to take his son's head in his arms **(figure 23)**. This gesture of welcome is emphasized by the placement of the father's left arm on his son's back. The latter has just dropped his walking stick to jump into his father's arms; the shepherd's staff left on the ground in front of the group alludes to the biblical narrative. The figures are treated naturalistically in the nude, their genitals covered. The young man kneels in front of his father, hiding his face in his left arm, while the same arm grabs his father's left shoulder. His right arm is raised up, as if blocked in an awkward gesture under his father's torso.[176]

---

[174] Brian Hack identified the source of the model of the *Prodigal Son* as Ernest Dubois's *Le Pardon*. Brian Hack, "American Acropolis: George Grey Barnard's 'Monument to Democracy', 1918-1938" (New York, City University of New York, 2008), 103.

[175] *Prix du Salon et bourses de voyage, catalogue. Ière exposition quinquennale*, Paris, 1902, 73. Cf. A. Quantin, "Le Salon de 1899," *Le Monde Moderne*, 1899, 99.

[176] Although it is impossible to see it from the photographs of the sculpture that we have, critics highlighted the expressive details of the son's face: in *Les Salons de 1899*, art critic Paul Desjardins wrote, "The head of the repentant son, hidden under the paternal arms, is treated with strength, I will not forget these staring eyes, opened towards the indelible past…" This statement suggests that the sculpture might have been elevated on a pedestal at the 1899 Salon, allowing the viewer to see up through the legs and arms of the son to his face. Paul Desjardins, "Les Salons de 1899", *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 1899, 291. « La tête du fils repentant, qui se cache sous les bras paternels, est traitée avec force, je n'oublierai pas ces yeux fixes, ouverts sur l'ineffaçable passé... » Dubois's *Prodigal Son* was displayed as a marble version at the 1899 SAF.

Barnard must have been impressed by the expressive power of these figures, and in particular, the gesture of the father and son, since he appropriated Dubois's sculptural composition for his own *Prodigal Son*. Yet, although Barnard chose to use Dubois's sculptural motif in his own creation, he went far beyond the simple act of "copying," but rather emulated the model to make it his own creation. This is maybe where Rodinism as a sculptural "tool" can appear as a useful concept to understand Barnard's adaptation of Dubois's model. While the composition of the two groups is strikingly similar, the blocky aspect of the marble in Barnard's group, left raw and unworked in some parts, adds to the feeling that the two figures have merged together. The eye of the viewer is guided to follow the serpentine line of the bodies of the father and his son, as the two bodies almost become one.

Dubois's sculpture has no marble backing, and the empty space between the figures allowed viewers to see the son's face. In Barnard's, the father emerges from the rock. His feet are still in the block, with his back covered by a thin layer of raw marble that goes along his spine. Moreover, Barnard changed the orientation of the figures: in Dubois's composition, the body of the son is facing his father's, his head slightly on the left. In Barnard's, the two bodies are oriented at right angles to one another. The father's body is folded in half, at a 90-degree angle, over the son. It gives the impression that Barnard had compressed the figures one against the other, with the hand of the young man caught in between the bodies of the father and son. This suggests the ambivalence of the gesture of complete mercy: it looks almost as if the father was devouring his son, as in the culmination of the story of *Ugolino*, a group that Rodin composed for his *Gates of Hell*, and from which he extracted his own *Prodigal Son*.

Distancing his composition from the more standard approach of Dubois, Barnard turned the cubic block of marble into an interweaving play of triangles, thus amplifying the dramatic

expression of the group. Barnard enhanced the physicality of the bodies, strengthening the softer, more relaxed bodies of the Salons models and emphasizing their musculature. He also devised more acute and extreme viewing angles. In this, Barnard was certainly anticipating the viewing conditions of his sculpture on an elevated base on top of the stairs of the Pennsylvania State Capitol in Harrisburg. As he borrowed individual figures from the Paris Salons, as he did here with *The Prodigal Son*, Barnard transformed them and rearranged them for inclusion in an ambitious ensemble destined for the Pennsylvania Capitol Building.[177]

With his appropriation of Dubois's work, the American sculptor engaged in a much larger conversation about the aesthetic and emotional possibilities of the kneeling figure. At the turn of the century, sculptors were redeploying the motif of the kneeling figure in various compositions. In 1892, the Belgian sculptor Constantin Meunier presented his own *Prodigal Son* at the SNBA **(figure 24)**. In his rendition, a young man kneels in front of his father, who holds his son's head tenderly with his hands placed on his face. The figures are captured gazing at each other, the movement of their arms and legs echoing each other's, as if one figure was becoming the extension of the other: a delicate moment of tenderness between a father and his son. A year later, at the Exposition générale des beaux-arts in Brussels, the Belgian sculptor Pierre Braecke (1858-1938) offered his interpretation of the prodigal son, with the mother as the parental figure **(figure 25)**.[178] The female figure, her knees slightly bent under her long robe, is pressing the body of a young man against her. She holds him with such a fierce grip that his knees are slightly lifted off of the

[177] Barnard's appropriations of sculptural motifs from the Paris Salons were widespread. Chapter 3 will analyze in more detail other groupings from the Harrisburg Capitol project that also derived from Salon models.

[178] The Belgian sculptor Pierre Braecke became a regular at the SNBA, where he exhibited his works in 1893, 1894, 1895, and 1902. Dugnat, *Les catalogues des salons de la Société Nationale des Beaux-Arts*.

ground. His hands are brought together in prayer; he has assumed the posture of a supplicant. Her back curving down, she bends over to envelop his body in her embrace. As in the other works, the artist brought the bodies together to almost, but not completely, become one. George Minne's *Prodigal Son* from 1896, also found under the title of *The Lost Son*, carries the emotional tension of the reunion of father and son to the extreme **(figure 26)**. In this group, both figures are hyperextended as the father strains to lift the body of his son, which here has the appearance of a corpse.

In this lineage of variations on the theme of the prodigal son, Camille Claudel's (1864-1943) *Vertumne and Pomone* from 1905, also known as *Abandonment*, celebrates the communion of two figures coming together **(figure 27)**. The posture of the female figure, half seated on the stump of a tree, echoes Braecke's female figure. Her body is nude and her head rests on the young man's face. The young man's posture is more active, with his arms circling her body in a gesture of profound veneration. Here, it is not the woman who lifts the man, as in Braecke's, but the man who carries the weight of the woman in complete repose over his body, her left arm left to hang loosely over his right shoulder. The two groups display compositional similarities, but the active and passive roles of the figures are reversed. In Claudel's group, the bodies are interlocked. In a gesture of abandon, her body rests over his, who clasps her in a very strong hold. Museum displays often pair the works of Claudel and Rodin, such as the current arrangement of Claudel's *Abandonment* with Rodin's *The Eternal Idol* and *The Eternal Springtime* at the Musée Camille Claudel in Nogent-sur-Seine, France. Indeed, all these works feature a series of variations on the theme of the lovers and reflect on the shifting dynamics of domination and submission in the couple.

Studying the reoccurring appropriations of the kneeling figure motif in turn-of-the-century sculpture illustrates the transition between the theme of the prodigal son and the subject of the two lovers. At the 1903 Salon, the French sculptor Pierre-Antoine Laurent (1868-1947) presented his group *Héro et Léandre,* in which a female figure draws a young man toward her with her right arm in an attempt to save him from the water **(figure 28)**. Like Braecke's figure of the supplicant, Léandre reaches forward toward Héro. Here, though, his hands are not clasped, but with his left hand, he holds onto a large rock, while his right arm intertwines with the woman's arm. This same gesture was appropriated by the Irish-American sculptor Andrew O'Connor in his group *Tristan and Isolde*, exhibited at the 1928 SAF, and for which he was awarded a gold medal and the Legion of Honor **(figure 29).** Although the protagonists are different, the posture of the woman, bending over the man's body to hold him, is similar. However, O'Connor reworked this composition in his own group by compressing the figures against each other. The rock, which was used as a prop in Laurent's group, takes over the figures in O'Connor's. It is as if the figures were emerging from the block of marble, interlocked one with the other in this gestural play. The very different base takes the form of a play of geometric shapes, perhaps an allusion to the figure of the Pietà at the foot of the Cross. A mechanical device is placed under Tristan's head, a peculiar prop that O'Connor employed in other works.

The analysis of what these sculptures are doing, in the compositional choice of the artist, the placement of the figures, and their interactions with one another, helps us to better understand how the Salons system operated, through strategies of sculptural appropriation, variation, and transformation. The subject of the sculptural group became progressively less relevant than the emotional power of the figures themselves. The disappearance of attributes and contextual clues signaled that clarity of meaning was not the primary goal of the artist. Instead, in the complication

of forms and motifs, the sculptor sought the expressivity of sculpture. Whereas these sculptors, unlike some of their contemporaries, such as the Cubists, were not interested in deconstructing the figure, they were nevertheless engaged in the same quest of pushing beyond reality to create a modern sculptural language, in which a motif could be abstracted from its original meaning and redeployed in a different composition.

2.4.3 Redefining the Heroic Ideal

For nineteenth-century sculptors, artistic conversations with their contemporaries proved more important than the past as a source of inspiration. In participating in the Salons ecosystem, sculptors appropriated, emulated, repurposed motifs from each other's works, enriching dialogues about the expressive possibilities of figurative sculpture. From the depiction of a particular theme, variations and even slippages of meaning were possible. As motifs were redeployed and altered, it became harder to identify their original model. Exploiting the repetitive vocabulary of the body, sculptors increasingly turned away from the clarity of the narration to focus instead on the expressive power of the pose itself. This rejection of the narrative for the benefit of the artistic process of creation is what Krauss identified as a modernist practice.[179] She attributes this invention to Rodin, who used the strategy of repetition in his *Gates of Hell*, but it was within the collaborative ground of the Salons that turn-of-the-century sculptors, Rodin included, transformed sculptural models in innovative ways.

---

[179] See chapter one, "Narrative Time: the question of the *Gates of Hell,*" in Rosalind E. Krauss, *Passages in Modern Sculpture* (New York: Viking Press, 1977).

One of the predominant themes in the nineteenth-century Salons, developed especially in the 1870s, was the victorious hero or scenes of battles, responding to the widely held belief that sculpture was a democratic art able to satisfy patriotic needs. In the late decades of the century, some sculptors began reevaluating the stereotypical model of the hero on a pedestal and transmuted traditional themes of victory, such as the story of Perseus and Medusa, into reflections on the antihero or more nuanced messages. In his *Perseus and Medusa*, showcased at the 1880 SAF, Laurent-Honoré Marqueste (1848-1920) captures the narrative sequence just before the beheading of Medusa **(figure 30)**. With his right foot, Perseus steps onto the body of Medusa, who cries in pain. Perseus's body is projected forward, his torso twisting with his left shoulder in front. The hero holds a sword in his right hand, ready to decapitate his victim. He gazes at her, standing still, as if contemplating her imminent demise at his hands.

Six years later, Henri-Désiré Gauquié (1858-1927) displayed his *Perseus and Medusa* at the 1886 SAF. Like the sculpture in the Piazza della Signoria in Florence by his Italian predecessor Benvenuto Cellini (1500-1571), it depicts the moment just after the beheading of Medusa **(figure 31)**.[180] Perseus stands on the body of Medusa, whose head he has just cut off, and now holds it out to the viewer in a gesture of presentation. In both groups, the standing figure in *contrapposto* wears Perseus's attributes: a cap, winged sandals, and a sword. However, Gauquié's group departs from the Italian model in various ways: with his left shoulder turned forward, Perseus is set in movement. He holds his sword behind him in his right hand, and his gaze is directed to the head of Medusa, whose face is visible only to the viewer. Unlike Cellini's Medusa, Gauquié's is still alive, her eyes wide open. Her body is turned around on her belly, in an active pose, with her

[180] On Cellini's *Perseus and Medusa*, see Michael Wayne Cole, *Cellini and the Principles of Sculpture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 49.

fingers clenched as if she were trying to straighten herself. Although Cellini's bronze is a victorious image of Perseus, the French sculptor shifted the relationship between the figures in the group, giving agency to Medusa and opening the possibility for another ending to the Greek myth. Looked at side by side, Marqueste's and Gauquié's sculptures offer two consecutive sequences of the same narrative.

Faithful to the victorious character of the hero bringing down his victim is a little-known work by Antoine Bourdelle (1861-1929), *Hercule and Cacus*, from 1889 **(figure 32)**.[181] While based on the theme illustrated by the Italian Renaissance sculptor Bacio Bandinelli (1488-1560) from 1534, Bourdelle's group is not as static as Bandinelli's, but more closely resembles Cellini's group. The victim is defeated, her body lying on the ground, as in Cellini's version. However, by twisting Hercules's upper body, as in Marqueste's group, Bourdelle added a rotational movement that sets the group in action. In a gesture similar to Marqueste's Perseus, Hercules stands firmly on his left foot while stepping onto his victim with his right leg. Although Bourdelle is most often regarded as a modern sculptor in the filiation of Rodin, looking at his early artistic production, such as this *Hercule and Cacus*, a reinterpretation of the traditional theme of victory, grounds the artist's sculptural production in the context of the culture of the Paris Salons.

The American sculptor MacMonnies certainly saw Gauquié's group at the 1886 SAF. The young artist had traveled to the French capital in 1884 and settled there two years later.[182] In 1891,

---

[181] It is actually the second version of the group, made seven years after a first version, which is lost today.

[182] Thayer Tolles, Lauretta Dimmick, and Donna J. Hassler, eds., *American Sculpture in the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New York: The Museum, 1999), 428. MacMonnies moved to Europe in the autumn of 1884. By 1886, he had joined the studio of Alexandre Falguière (1831-1900) at the École des beaux-arts and studied privately with Antonin Mercié.

he conceived the group *Civic Virtue* **(figure 33)**, which combined the composition of Gauquié's *Perseus and Medusa* with a quote from Alfred-Désiré Lanson's *The Bronze Age*, displayed at the 1882 SAF **(figure 34)**. As in Gauquié's group, a man, his sword resting on his right shoulder, is stepping astride the body of a female, but this figure, with her right arm held behind her back, is in a position of complete submission to the standing male. The posture of her body on the ground, attempting to rise with her right arm behind her back, echoes Lanson's female figure. Moreover, there is an additional female figure lying on the ground in the back of the composition. Together, the two women were supposed to represent Vice.[183] As in Lanson's work, a magically floating cloth chastely covers the man's genitalia and wraps around the female figure lying contorted on the base of the sculpture with her arm behind her back. In MacMonnies's, the cloth looks more like at a decorative garland that spreads throughout the base of the group. The two figures present stark opposites, the man standing steady on his feet, looking confidently at the viewer, the woman on the ground lying helplessly.

In 1894, Barnard won great acclaim among French critics for his group *Struggle of the Two Natures in Man*, displayed at the SNBA under the title "*Je sens deux hommes en moi,"* or "I sense two men in myself," alongside five other sculptures **(figure 35)**.[184] The French critic Thiébaut-Sisson noted, "The heroic alone seems capable of attracting him [Barnard] but a special kind of

---

[183] Michele Helene Bogart, *Public Sculpture and the Civic Ideal in New York City, 1890-1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 259. In chapter 12, "The Rise and Demise of *Civic Virtue*," Bogart analyzes the controversy of MacMonnies's group, once placed in the public space in New York City. Although conceived in 1891, the group was commissioned for the grounds of Manhattan's City Hall in 1909 but not erected until 1922. According to the author, the public missed the concept and read the image literally: "Taken this way it was a scandalous depiction of a male trampling two females who, to make matters worse, were supposed to represent Vice."

[184] Barnard sent four marbles, a bronze bust, and a plaster head to the 1894 SNBA.

heroic. […] He does not show us one man battling with another, his conception has a far deeper meaning and lesson."[185] Described as a "man fighting with the inner man"[186] by the critic, Barnard's work transformed the ideal depiction of the hero. It is with this work that Barnard began to appropriate sculptures from the Salons, a strategy that contributed to the success of his group in the Parisian artistic environment. Barnard's *Two Natures* was the product of an artistic process of emulation of sculptures that belonged to the long tradition of representing victorious heroes: MacMonnies's *Civic Virtue* but also Marqueste's *Perseus and Medusa* and Lanson's *The Age of Bronze* served as visual sources for *Two Natures*. In his personal collection of reference material, Barnard owned photographs of these sculptures.[187] Moreover, the American sculptor had the opportunity to see Marqueste and Lanson's pieces at the Musée du Luxembourg, where they were put on display, like all contemporary works, after their acquisition by the French government **(figure 36)**.

Two Natures is composed of two greater than life-size male figures in motion, one lying on his right side, the other standing. No props or special attributes help the viewer understand what is going on in the group; rather, the sculptor explores the ambiguity of meaning in the relationship between the two figures. The figure below is pictured sprawling, his body contorted, with his legs twisted and toes curled up. Above him, the other male figure stands with his right foot firmly planted on the ground and his body propelled forward, with his left foot emerging from the left arm of the figure underneath him. Is the upper figure trapped in the body of the one underneath, or is he, on the contrary, freeing himself from it? At this exact junction between the limbs of the

---

[185] Thiébaut-Sisson, *Le Temps*, May 7, 1894.

[186] *Ibidem*

[187] "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

two figures emerges the head of a mysterious creature that looks like a batlike animal.[188] Some have suggested that Barnard's inspiration for the figure below came from Michelangelo's *Twilight* for the Tomb of Lorenzo de' Medici at San Lorenzo in Florence.[189] Although Barnard was an admirer of Michelangelo, and even, perhaps, I would suggest, extracted the mysterious creature head from his figure of *The Slave* as an homage to the great Italian master, *Two Natures* must be understood in the context of the Paris Salons ecosystem.

In *Two Natures*, Barnard reinterpreted the binary opposition between victor and victim and transformed the dynamic of submission versus oppression in traditional sculptural representations of combat. As in Marqueste's Perseus, the upper figure in Barnard's *Two Natures* is projected forward, with one leg straight, well-anchored in the ground, and the other bent. However, instead of stepping on the lower figure, the bent leg emerges from the figure underneath, as if they were part of the same body. Moreover, the bodily torsion of the lower figure in *Two Natures* resembles the figure on the ground in Lanson's *Age of Bronze,* but his hands are freed, not tied behind the figure's back, and his left arm, instead of being subjected to the upper figure, serves as a ground from which the upper figure emerges. Barnard's *Two Natures* is the opposite of a group about the conquering hero standing triumphant. The sculptor altered the depiction of the victorious hero stepping on his victim to show instead two male nudes whose intertwined bodies create one body, in a compressed composition, as if one figure had split in two. Could the mysterious head of a

[188] Scholars have long debated the meaning of this creature and discussed more broadly the symbolic meaning in the relationship between these two figures.

[189] Having studied at the Art Institute of Chicago prior to his sojourn in France, Barnard had certainly become familiar with the plaster casts made after the Italian master's works.

creature at the juncture of the two bodies then be an allusion to the story of Medusa on which this group was based?

In 1887, Barnard traveled for the first time to the quarries of Carrara, Italy, to select a block of marble for his sculpture.[190] Back in his Paris studio, the sculptor remodeled the two figures, originally linked one to the other, by carving out the marble so that the standing figure would eventually take on a life of its own **(figure 37)**. Once the group was completed, Barnard was satisfied with his technical progress and his handling of the material: "Everyone says that the two marble figures are finished in a marvelous way. I handle my marble as clay now."[191] Besides its technical prowess, *Two Natures* proffered a new take on the idea of the heroic statues that had proliferated in Paris as part of the nineteenth-century phenomenon of *statuomania*.

Barnard initially referred to *Two Natures* as "Liberty" when describing the group in progress to his parents in 1888: "Have finished my studies for the group Liberty. […] its opposite to all others ideas of a Victory (those in art at least) I shall try and bring all the anguish that what we call a victor is susceptible to […] why should I represent a Victory raised hand and screeching mouth—'Look at me *above*'—nor shall I—victor shall suffer with the vanquished—if I can write in my art."[192] Barnard claimed that his group first came to mind after seeing, in Paris, statues portraying victory all in a similar manner: "the victor in life is the last one to stand on the pinnacle

---

[190] George Grey Barnard to his parents, March 26, [1887?] First trip to Florence and the quarries of Carrara: "May be will negotiate for a block of marble." "Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard."

[191] George Grey Barnard to his parents, December 1, 1892. "Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard."

[192] George Grey Barnard to his parents, May 25, 1888. "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers"; Harold Edward Dickson, "Log of a Masterpiece: Barnard's 'The Struggle of the Two Natures of Man,'" *Art Journal* 20, no. 3 (Spring 1961): 139–43.

and notify the world of his victories—I determined to do a group wherein the upper figure was not a victor but where the lower figure might be so; dedicated to the uprising and awakening. My 'Two Natures' is the result."[193]

These variations on the theme of *Perseus and Medusa* allowed sculptors to depart from the mythological story and apply this sculptural vocabulary to other compositions about a male-female couple. It could take the form of a body manifested in two figures, as in Barnard's, but also the relationship of domination/submission between male and female, as in MacMonnies's *Civic Virtue*. In 1899, Camille Claudel displayed her own version of *Perseus and Medusa* at the 1899 SNBA, where she added another interpretative layer to the group: Perseus lifts the head of Medusa in his left hand while holding a mirror that allows him to look at the image reflection of the head in his right hand **(figure 38)**. But even as Claudel added a narrative element from the myth that had been missing from the versions of her predecessors, she confused the viewer by inserting very large wings on the back of the female figure, who, on the ground, places her hand over her missing head in a gesture of protection. Winged figures were traditionally allegories of victory, and it might be argued that Claudel combined two stories in her sculpture. The circular movement of the sculpture disrupts the primary focus of the composition away from the standing man, as seen in earlier compositions, to redirect the viewer's gaze to the protective gesture of the winged figure on the ground.

---

[193] Interview of Barnard by Alfred W. Lee, "Is a Great Genius. George Grey Barnard and his magnificent accomplishments", *Muscatine journal*, Nov 27, [year?]. "In my first days in Paris I saw so many of those statues of victory on pinnacles with raised arms and symbols of the triumph, but never met them in the living, so I was impelled to express this truth in a group which did not confess to a false ultimate or to a static condition in the soul of man."

2.5 Conclusion

The use and reuse of figures is, and always was, very common in sculptural practice. Scholars have long focused on how nineteenth-century sculptors appropriated the art of the past.[194] Yet very few have noted that the Paris Salons provided a unique ground for transnational practices of sculptural appropriation, emulation, and repurposing in the late nineteenth century. The multiplication of the Salons and their internationalization allowed for a growing number of foreign sculptors to showcase their works in Paris. There was no other exhibition space in the western world where such a large number of sculptures was grouped together in the same space annually. In contrast to the world's fairs, which featured a competition between the most powerful nations, the Salons provided sculptors with an experimental artistic center and, at the same time, a marketplace. Both public and private sculptures were juxtaposed at the Salons. Both French and foreign sculptures gathered under the same roof. As Wagner noted in her monographic study on Carpeaux, "[The sculptors'] identity, their very existence, was decided by the commissions they won and the Salons at which they showed."[195] Sculptors relied on the annual Salons exhibitions as a means of exposure and a marketing ground for their works. However, more than just a social network between artists, the culture of the Salons operated as a visual repertory of sculptural forms from which artists, French and foreigners, drew to renew the language of modern sculpture. The

---

[194] Francis Haskell and Nicholas Penny, *Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture 1500-1900* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1981); Claire Barbillon, Jérôme Godeau, and Amélie Simier, *Bourdelle et l'antique: une passion moderne*, Paris musées (Paris, 2017). This recent exhibition on Bourdelle offered a new perspective on Bourdelle's relationship to the arts of the past. He used sculpture as models not only from classical Greece but also from earlier times and other regions of the Mediterranean Sea to develop a new visual vocabulary.

[195] Wagner, *Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux*, 17.

modernity of their creations can be recognized in the multiple references that they were able to choose from, combine, and then reinterpret and circulate.

After being acquired by the French government, carved in marble, and displayed in the Luxembourg museum for more than three decades before its closure, Dubois's *Le Pardon* was sent to Philippeville (today Skikda), in Algeria, then French territory. This transfer of artworks from the capital to the provinces was part of the French *politique des dépôts*, and was performed in 1938 at the request of the *sénateur-maire* Paul Cuttoli.[196] In 1988, scholar Anne Pingeot traveled to Algeria to complete a census of French sculptures that had been deposited there. Her photograph of Dubois's *Le Pardon*, taken during the trip, documents that in February 1988 the sculpture remained in Skikda, on the public square Amar Guennoun **(figure 39)**.[197] The story of the transformation and mobility of Dubois's *Le Pardon* emphasizes the multiple ways in which the circulation of sculptural motifs from the Salons operated, and how the meaning of these works shifted over time, through the mobility of the artworks across territories, in a colonial context, or through their appropriation and emulation by other artists until the original model became unrecognizable.

This centralized model of diffusion of works from Paris to the provinces contrasted with the multifaceted system of exchanges between the Paris Salons and the Americas described in the following chapters. In chapter 3, I examine how the Paris Salons operated externally in the

---

[196] Minute de lettre, January 17, 1938, from the Directeur Général des Beaux-Arts to Mr. Cuttoli Sénateur maire de Philippeville. File F.21.4884, Archives nationales, Pierrefitte-sur-Seine. Also Daniel Sherman, *Worthy Monuments: Art Museums and the Politics of Culture in Nineteenth Century France*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1989.

[197] Series of photographs taken by Anne Pingeot in the folder on Ernest Dubois, documentation of the Musée d'Orsay, Paris.

interconnected network of the world's fairs and national exhibitions across the Atlantic, and how the mobility of Salons sculptures across borders participated in the construction of national narratives. I reconstruct the histories of Barnard's *Two Natures* and Yrurtia's *The Sinners* in their transatlantic journeys and explore issues of the materiality and display of sculptures in their various contexts. This chapter also addresses the historiographical divide that has for too long separated monuments and gallery-sized sculptures. The study of Barnard's *Prodigal Son*, and the many other autonomous groups that were "extracted" from the *Life of Humanity* monument, illustrates not only how the sculptor appropriated and emulated sculptural motifs from the Paris Salons in his own sculptures but also how he worked on various scales at the same time, with different artistic and commercial aims.

3.0 Sculptures in Transit: Materiality and Display across the Atlantic

In 1904, the Louisiana Purchase Exposition presented a large number of sculptures of various shapes, materials, and sizes, mounted on pedestals, that followed the same mode of display as the Paris Salons. Its Hall of Sculptures had high walls pierced by large upper-level windows that diffused natural light on the three-dimensional works dispersed in the vast space below. There was just enough room between the pedestals to allow viewers to wander around the works. However, in contrast with the Paris Salons displays, sculptures here were grouped according to national schools. For instance, Yrurtia's *The Sinners* was flanked by Lucio Correa Morales's *Abel* and Mateo Alonso's *Indio Moribundo* **(figure 40)**. At the far-left corner of this photograph, Rodin's *The Thinker* can be discerned in the section of French sculptures, which also included Dubois's *Le Pardon*, featured in the upper-left corner of another photograph **(figure 41)**. Although not visible in these two panoramic views of the Hall of Sculptures, Barnard exhibited *The Hewer* at the Saint Louis world's fair,[198] and O'Connor's allegory of *Inspiration* served as the crowning figure in the pediment of the Art Palace for the exhibition **(figure 42)**.[199] Barnard, Dubois, O'Connor, Rodin, and Yrurtia, whose sculptures were regularly featured and interspersed in the

---

[198] Louisiana Purchase Exposition Saint Louis, *Official Catalogue of Exhibitors. Universal Exposition, St. Louis, U. S. A. 1904. Division of Exhibits ... Department B. Art.* (St. Louis: For the Committee on press and publicity, by the Official catalogue company (inc.), 1904), 58.

[199] Homan Potterton, *Andrew O'Connor 1874-1941: A Complementary Catalogue to the Exhibition Marking the Centenary of the Sculptor's Birth* (Trinity College, Dublin: Gifford & Craven, 1974), 11. The present location of the sculpture is unknown. The Walters Art Museum in Baltimore owns a bronze reduction of *Inspiration*.

multinational environment of the Paris Salons, were segregated across the Atlantic within national frameworks.

"I was worried about what triumphing in Paris meant to me. I had to continue to maintain my prestige as an artist already established in this institutional environment. I was concerned, and I was running feverishly about the next work that would affirm my first triumph."[200] With these words, Rogelio Yrurtia expressed his concerns about the pressure to continue creating and ensuring his triumph in his homeland after his initial success at the Salon des artistes français in 1903. Although the system of rewards and the critical reception of the Salons offered a career springboard for international sculptors, public commissions in their home country did not necessarily follow as a result. Expatriate sculptors had to actively seek out commissions in their homeland, while public orders in France were almost exclusively reserved for native artists. This chapter analyzes what happened after international sculptors encountered their initial success at the Paris Salons, focusing on the circulation of their sculptures abroad and the role they played in the creation of national narratives. In Paris, the Salons operated as a cosmopolitan but enclosed ecosystem in which sculptural motifs circulated, were reconfigured, and subsequently transformed again. But how did these sculptural borrowings operate outside this system? How did the Salons system expand beyond Paris?

This chapter examines how the Paris Salons participated in the internationalization of sculptures at the turn of the twentieth century. The circulation of sculptures between countries

[200] This manuscript of Yrurtia's autobiographical account was left incomplete and unpublished. "Estaba inquieto de lo que significaba para mí el triunfo de París. Debía seguir manteniendo el prestigio como artista ya consagrado en ese medio rector. Estaba preocupado, y de suyo discurría afiebrado, en la próxima obra que podría afirmarme en el primer triunfo." "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Casa de Yrurtia.

relied on a strong network of international and national exhibitions, as well as patrons and intermediaries working as agents on both sides of the ocean. Expatriate sculptors still depended on a national system of patronage, as well as a network of artists, political personalities, and family members to play the role of agents for them in their home countries. For instance, since he had settled in Paris, Barnard maintained a regular correspondence with his parents, who obtained commissions for their son in the United States. On July 14, 1894, having heard about a potential commission for a Lincoln Monument, Barnard wrote to his father: "Please write immediately and find out all you can about it, and see if you have any acquaintances and if we can get any letters to those parties. <u>I must have that order</u>. Don't wait a moment, please."[201] Other sculptors instead leaned on a professional network, such as Andrew O'Connor, who, though living in Paris, benefited from the help of the sculptor French, his former mentor, and the architect Louis Sullivan, among other established artists who provided him with recommendation letters and facilitated his exchanges with American patrons. As for Rogelio Yrurtia, he benefited from a network of Argentinian artists and political personalities, the most important of them being Eduardo Schiaffino, who, trained as a painter, became the founder and director of the National Museum of Fine Arts in Buenos Aires and was an influential figure in Argentinian politics at the time.

In this chapter, I investigate sculptures in transit and examine the tension between the construction of national artistic schools in relation to the burgeoning network of international exhibitions. Inspired by the method developed by the Americanist scholar Jennifer Roberts in *Transporting Visions: The Movement of Images in Early America,* I consider the role of the object itself as a relay across the Atlantic, and reestablish the spatiotemporal dimension in the art

[201] "Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

historical analysis of the object in circulation. Roberts shows that issues surrounding the physical risks of these transatlantic practices relate to the aesthetic and critical precariousness of moving objects between different contexts. After their display at the Paris Salons, Barnard's *Two Natures in Man* and Yrurtia's *The Sinners* were shipped overseas, where they would become identified with national artistic schools, or, perhaps more accurately, the home country of their creators. I explore the different journeys of these objects, the "aesthetic" as well as the "shipping risks" of sculptures on the move.[202] Furthermore, modern sculptors found innovative ways to make a living by creating new markets for their compositions. While working on large-scale sculptures, they also fragmented, recombined, and repurposed sculptural groups that they made autonomous. For instance, Barnard extracted some sculptural groupings – *The Prodigal Son* among them – from his large monumental ensemble *Life of Humanity* and circulated them at various venues. More than just an aesthetic program, it was also a marketing and financial strategy.

Plasters played an important role in the dissemination of sculptural models across the Atlantic. Historically, plaster models have been dismissed and even destroyed, due to their perceived lack of artistic value. They were not considered the final sculptural work, which would traditionally be made of marble or bronze. Rather, plaster was viewed as a material that belonged to the studio, and if shown publicly, at the Salon, for instance, it was looked on as a substitute model for the potential marble or bronze version; the white plaster provided a good likeness of marble without the cost. Most sculptures on display at the Salons were made of plaster, and once they were awarded a medal or a prize—and, in some cases, bought by the French government—a marble or a bronze version was ordered at the expense of the commissioner. It was not rare to find

[202] Jennifer L. Roberts, *Transporting Visions: The Movement of Images in Early America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014).

a marble or bronze sculpture showcased at the Salons or the world's fairs a few years after the plaster model made its debut.

Tracing the circulation of sculptures between different artistic contexts provides a new understanding of the plaster sculpture as a means to disseminate the sculptor's work. In the following sections, I study how some sculptors, including Yrurtia, would circulate the plaster work before having made the bronze, whereas others, such as Barnard, displayed the marble first, before sending the plaster sculpture of the same work—probably made subsequently—to various international venues. I also compare the transit of Yrurtia's *The Sinners* between Paris, Saint Louis, and Buenos Aires with the mobility of Barnard's *Life of Humanity* between Boston, Paris, and Harrisburg.

3.1 On the Move: Barnard's *Two Natures* between France and the United States

After his success at the 1894 SNBA, George Grey Barnard's patriotic feelings impelled him to return to his homeland. Against the advice of his friends and fellow artists in Paris, Barnard moved back to the United States "purely through a spirit of patriotism." Financial reasons would have encouraged him to stay, but he believed in the role he could play in shaping American art, and asserted that "whatever I possessed of genius I desired to contribute to American art."[203] The American press reported Barnard's urge to contribute to his own national school of art: "Americans

[203] Alfred W. Lee, "Is a great genius. George Grey Barnard and his magnificent accomplishments," *Muscatine Journal*, November 27, [year?]

are needed in America if ever the art of this big country is to be national."[204] However, not everyone applauded the sculptor's decision. The collector and patron Alfred Corning Clark disagreed with his young protégé, declaring: "Give up America as home, or give up art! […] You are throwing your chance, your great chance—away!"[205] Moreover, French artists and critics also thought that Barnard was making a mistake. Rodin believed that Americans would encourage Barnard's "exaggerations and extravagance," and that the sculptor would go after "strength" instead of beauty.[206] The critic Thiébaut-Sisson also urged Barnard to move back to Paris, for "only there can your artistic garden be cultivated and your plants well cared for."[207]

Barnard's homecoming confronted him with a gap between his own ambition and the expectations of American patrons and juries. Soon after settling in Washington Heights, in New York City, the sculptor struggled financially, seeking commissions and teaching at three schools at the same time.[208] In his correspondence, Barnard acknowledged his dissatisfaction with the expectations placed on sculptors to compete for commissions and "just take the crumbs that fall

---

[204] George Henry Payne, "A Philosopher in Marble. George Barnard," *The Criterion*, New York City, April 23, 1898.

[205] Alfred Corning Clark to George Grey Barnard, May 20, 1894. "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers" (State College, PA, n.d.), Centre County Historical Society.

[206] Alfred Corning Clark to George Grey Barnard, May 20, 1894. "He [Rodin] said in substance that you would have all your faults of exaggeration and extravagance developed and emphasized by staying in America, and that you should be in Paris and do something for pure beauty, not for strength alone." "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers."

[207] Thiébaut-Sisson, in *Le Temps,* May 22, 1894. « Car il faut que vous reveniez à Paris. Votre jardin artistique ne peut être bien tenu et vos plantes bien soignées qu'ici. » "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers."

[208] October 11, 1900. "I am very busy and must do hard work and hard thinking to settle my financial troubles, I am teaching in three schools now […]" "Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard."

and call myself blessed to get them." Barnard was full of ambition. He compared his art with the work of Phidias and Michelangelo, wishing that he had "achieved in marble what Victor Hugo achieved in letters."[209] By the fall of 1898, he had grown tired of seeking out orders:

> If my inspiration and ideals had only been like others to "do statues" then were I happy indeed, for there are many to be done, many orders, orders don't interest me, I rebel at any one ordering my thoughts, when thousands of humanity are waiting within my heart and mind for life in marble.[210]

Barnard's lack of interest in decorative sculpture may have been the reason why he did not complete the figures he had been commissioned to produce for the newly built Library of Congress in Washington, D.C.—a typical public commission for which a number of sculptors were hired to each complete a part of the decorative architectural program.[211] The sculptor struggled to meet the expectations of his patrons to execute decorative schemes of architectural buildings and create prototypical statues:

> For I love to death America but the people who make the committees and juries are far from ready to see what my school or meaning are […] the great art, "emotion," mystery and religion of that divine expression the "human form," they are as blind to it, as if I did not exist, and that is my "vision."[212]

In 1897, Barnard organized an exhibition at the Logerot Garden, on West Eighteenth Street in New York City, where he showcased the same group of sculptures that had earned him his

---

[209] [c. 1898?] "I am not going to enter concours or try for any more monuments, just take the crumbs that fall and call myself blessed to get them […] I am capable of doing things equal to Phidias or Michelangelo […] I could have achieved in marble what Victor Hugo achieved in letters" "Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard."

[210] October 15, 1898. "Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard."

[211] Press cutting sent by Edna Monroe, 1894. "Current news in the Fine Arts" The figure of "Religion" was given to Barnard, a bronze door, and the bronze statue of Michelangelo. "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers."

[212] Barnard to his parents, March [1901?] "Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard."

triumph at the 1894 SNBA, capitalizing on his French success. The cover of the exhibition catalogue advertised, "Catalogue of the Sculpture of George Grey Barnard Exhibited at the Salon, Champ de Mars, Paris, 1894." A compilation of reviews by European critics carefully selected by the artist and translated into English accompanied the list of artworks. *Two Natures in Man* was among the eight sculptures presented at the Logerot Garden, listed under the entry number 5, "Colossal Group. 'I feel two natures struggling within me.'"[213] According to Donna J. Hassler, it was Barnard's patron Alfred Corning Clark, owner of the marble group shown at the 1894 SNBA, who had lent his sculpture to the exhibition. After Clark's death on April 6, 1896, the sculpture was bequeathed by his wife to the Metropolitan Museum of Art.[214]

Unfortunately for Barnard, the show did not achieve the success that he had anticipated. After visiting the exhibition, the sculptor George Edwin Bissell (1839-1920) urged Barnard to change his marketing strategy by using the press and targeting businessmen as potential patrons of his works:

> Now that you are in for it—use the press and all other perfectly legitimate methods of getting the public interested […] you will be respected according to your cleverness in getting yourself and your work before the people—by <u>business men</u> and they are your patrons in our blessed country.[215]

---

[213] *Catalogue of the Sculpture of George Grey Barnard Exhibited at the Salon, Champ de Mars, Paris, 1894*. Logerot Garden, West Eighteenth Street, New York City. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

[214] Elizabeth S. Clark to Henry G. Marquand, President, Metropolitan Museum of Art, November 23, 1896, Metropolitan Museum of Art Archives. Quoted in Thayer Tolles, Lauretta Dimmick, and Donna J. Hassler, eds., *American Sculpture in the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New York: The Museum, 1999), vol.1, 422.

[215] George Edwin Bissell to George Grey Barnard, undated. "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers."

In America, Barnard would no longer benefit from the Salons system that had offered such visibility to his art in Paris. However, he would make the most of the success of *Two Natures in Man* at the Salon to circulate a plaster version of the group from exhibition to exhibition throughout the United States, apparently treating the material of plaster as a facsimile for the marble piece to expose his work to wider audiences, and perhaps trying to attract new patrons.

Two Natures in Man was one of the first sculptures to be prominently displayed, along with MacMonnies's *Bacchante*, in the newly built Great Hall of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, which opened to the public in December 1902 **(figure 43)**. Four years later, Barnard's group towered above a forest of marble and bronze sculptures.[216] By then, sculptures crowded the floor of the Great Hall of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, which, with its numerous sculptures on pedestals dispersed throughout the large entrance space surmounted by very high ceilings, resembled a Salon display **(figure 44)**. Although it is difficult to identify the works in this photograph, the Great Hall was designed for the display of both modern European and American sculpture. In the 1910s, *Two Natures in Man* was exhibited in proximity to a group of twenty-four works by Rodin and other contemporary French sculptors.[217] Because of its massive scale, it was later installed under the museum's Great Stairs, surrounded by plaster casts from the contemporary French sculptor Paul Dubois (1829-1905). It was only starting in 1926 that the work was featured in a gallery

---

[216] The museum's Beaux-Arts Fifth Avenue facade and the Great Hall, as we know it today, was designed by the architect and founding museum trustee Richard Morris Hunt, and opened to the public in December 1902.

Thayer Tolles, "The Elephant in the Room: George Grey Barnard's *Struggle of The Two Natures in Man* at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York," in *Sculpture and the Museum*, ed. Christopher R. Marshall (Farnham, Surrey; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011), 122.

[217] Tolles, 123.

specifically dedicated to American sculpture.[218] Barnard's ambition to contribute to the art of his nation was finally recognized. The display history of *Two Natures in Man* demonstrates that the sculpture was "Americanized" not at its onset, but much later. Today, *Two Natures in Man* sits in the skylit courtyard of the American wing of the museum, among the works of such other revered American sculptors as Saint-Gaudens, French, and MacMonnies. One would have to walk across the entire museum to reach the galleries of nineteenth-century European sculptures, with which Barnard's *Two Natures in Man* cohabited originally.

After *Two Natures in Man* entered the institutionalized space of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Barnard used the plaster as a showpiece to disseminate his work beyond New York City. In 1899, a plaster replica was cast from the Metropolitan Museum's marble for the Art Institute of Chicago.[219] A year later, Barnard sent a plaster sculpture of *Two Natures in Man* to the Sculpture Decennial of the 1900 Exposition Universelle in Paris, which earned him the gold medal.[220] In the Grand Palais, *Two Natures in Man* was surrounded by works from the most acclaimed American sculptors of the era, adjacent to Ernest-Louis Barrias's (1841-1905) *Monument to Victor Hugo*.[221] Saint-Gaudens was represented by his equestrian statue of William Tecumseh Sherman, whose

---

[218] Tolles, 123.

[219] Tolles analyzes it as emblematic of the quick acceptance of the sculpture as representative of American sculpture. See Tolles, 2011, 131 (footnote). But it can be argued that *Two Natures* might represent modern sculpture rather than American sculpture. I am not sure if the group was on display at the Metropolitan Museum in 1899 when Chicago commissioned the plaster.

[220] I am not sure if the plaster sculpture made for the Art Institute of Chicago was the same one that circulated to the world's fairs in Paris and Buffalo, or if it was another plaster cast.

[221] *Catalogue officiel illustré de l'Exposition Décennale des Beaux-Arts de 1889 à 1900*. Paris : Ludovic Baschet éditeur, 1900, 265.

bronze, cast in Paris, would be unveiled three years later at the entrance of New York's Central Park. MacMonnies's *Bacchante*, also on display in the Great Hall of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, made the trip to the 1900 Paris World's Fair, where it was shown not far from Barnard's *Two Natures in Man* **(see chapter 2, figure 35)**.[222] The Grand Palais featured a multinational display of sculptures, even though they were organized in two categories, "Section française" and "Section étrangère," according to the map of the fair.[223] Photographs of the Decennial highlight the massive scale of *Two Natures in Man*.[224] The image of a guard dwarfed by Barnard's group emphasizes the spectacular display. There, *Two Natures in Man* is only visible from one side, placed as a decorative feature next to the centerpiece by Barrias **(figure 45)**.

The following year, the plaster of *Two Natures in Man* traveled to the 1901 Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo, where it won another medal. Created in the context of the Paris Salons, as a product of its system of the appropriation of motifs, as described in chapter 2, *Two Natures in Man* went on to produce its own lineage of sculptural motifs in the United States, contributing to the works of American sculptors. Brian Hack argued that the American sculptor Charles Grafly's (1862-1929) work *Vulture of War*, from 1895-96, was inspired by the upper figure in Barnard's *Two Natures in Man.* Furthermore, Grafly explored the theme of the two natures in man in his

---

[222] MacMonnies's *Bacchante* had also been shown at the 1894 Paris Salon des artistes français, where the work had met critical acclaim. That same year, Barnard displayed some of his sculptures, including the marble of *Two Natures*, at the Société nationale des beaux-arts.

[223] *Catalogue officiel illustré de l'Exposition Décennale des Beaux-Arts de 1889 à 1900*. Paris: Ludovic Baschet éditeur, 1900.

[224] See Commission to the Paris Exposition. Peck, Ferdinand Wythe, *Report of the commissioner-general for the United States to the International universal exposition, Paris 1900*. United States, 1901.

sculpture *The Fountain of Man* for the 1901 Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo.[225] Also present at this venue was Saint-Gaudens's relief for the Shaw Memorial, whose monument was dedicated in 1897. It is interesting to note that Saint-Gaudens also circulated his works to world's fairs even after the dedication of a sculpture, and sometimes even rework the plaster model, though a bronze had already been cast.[226] For late nineteenth-century sculptors, plaster represented much more than a simple model to be discarded after turning it into a marble or bronze.

Barnard strategically used his plaster version of *Two Natures in Man* as a simulacrum of the marble in these international venues. It was cheaper to circulate the plaster than the marble, and in deploying the sculpture that marked his early success at the Salon to help market his work at other international venues, he thereby carved for himself a place in the canon of American art. In 1908, an exhibition of Barnard's works was organized by the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, and again a plaster of *Two Natures in Man* was among the works selected by the artist for display.[227] A photograph of the work at the show could certainly mislead the viewer into thinking that it was made of marble **(figure 46)**. The play of light and shadow on the surface of the sculpture accentuates the detail of the musculature of the figures. The sculptural base is left raw, like an unfinished marble piece. The medium of photography seems to have been used here to transmute the plaster of *Two Natures in Man* into marble.

---

[225] Brian Hack, "American Acropolis: George Grey Barnard's 'Monument to Democracy,' 1918-1938" (New York, City University of New York, 2008), 74.

[226] John Dryfhout, *The Work of Augustus Saint-Gaudens* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1982).

[227] See exhibition catalogue, *Exhibition of Sculpture by George Grey Barnard*. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, October 1908. *Two Natures in Man* is no. 16 and appears under the category "*Plaster*." "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

By 1914, Barnard's *Two Natures in Man* had grown in popularity in the United States, where it was reinterpreted by the American cartoonist Lute Pease as a metaphor for Germany during the war. In Pease's caricature, the upper body, a ferocious and hairy figure, has become "military barbarism," stepping out from an old man wearing glasses and a suit, smoking a pipe, and lying on a pile of art, ethics, philosophy, poetry, and science books, representing an allegory of "The German as the World Thought Him" **(figure 47)**. Parodying Barnard's sculpture, the cartoon compares the reported barbaric behavior of the German army during the war with the traditional view of the Germans as civilized people. In the lower left corner of the caricature, the artist signed, "Lute Pease after Barnard's well-know[n] group 'The Two Natures.'" The choice of Barnard's *Two Natures in Man* for the parody demonstrates the sculpture's wide popularity and resonance at that time, as Pease would have expected his audience to recognize the reference used in his cartoon.

After his return to the United States in 1894, Barnard deliberately used *Two Natures in Man* as a showpiece for international and American audiences by circulating it widely between Paris and across the United States. The sculptor certainly valued the medium of plaster for its ability to replicate and diffuse his work. His use of plaster could be compared to the practice of copies after antiquities, which were in vogue in the early twentieth century. A number of collections of plaster casts in American museums were developed to spread the knowledge of antique sculpture. Could Barnard's use of plaster made after his own marble sculptures be understood as a strategy to transform his work into a model of modern American sculpture? Despite their fragility, plaster sculptures were circulated widely across borders. And yet the story of Yrurtia's *The Sinners,* which, like *Two Natures in Man*, was also received at the Paris Salons

with great success before being shipped abroad, shows the challenges of moving sculptures from place to place in the artist’s attempt to make a name for himself in his homeland.

Table 1 Itinerary of Barnard's *Two Natures in Man*

1894	marble	Société Nationale des Beaux-Arts, Paris
1896	marble	Collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, NYC
1897	marble	Logerot Garden exhibition, NYC
1900	plaster	Paris World's Fair
1901	plaster	Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo
1908	plaster	Barnard exhibition at the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston

Table 2 Itinerary of Yrurtia's *The Sinners*

1903	plaster	Salon des artistes français, Paris
1904	plaster	Traveled to Buenos Aires
1904	plaster	Saint Louis International Exhibition
1905	plaster	Traveled to Buenos Aires Exhibited at the Salon Witcomb
1906	plaster	Traveled to Paris to be cast in bronze at the foundry Rudier. Destroyed during journey

3.2 The Transatlantic Risks of Rogelio Yrurtia's *The Sinners*

On August 10, 1904, Rogelio Yrurtia appeared in a caricature published in the weekly Argentinian political and satirical magazine *Caras y Caretas*.[228] Between 1900 and 1913, the famous illustrated magazine included a section dedicated to an ongoing series of "*Caricaturas contemporáneas*" centered on people known for their public achievements, such as politicians, military officials, scientists, writers, and actors, but also artists active in Argentina. At least nineteen visual artists—painters and sculptors—were represented in the caricatures, among them the Argentinian sculptors Lola Mora (1866-1936) and Mateo Alonso (1878-1955), as well as Rodin.[229] In contrast to the other caricatures of artists, Yrurtia is not portrayed as a bourgeois or dressed as an artist with a studio uniform. Standing in a relaxed pose, with his left hand in his pocket and his right arm resting on an elevated pedestal, the sculptor is shown in a three-quarter profile, looking straight at the viewer **(figure 48)**. He is wearing large trousers with a wide leather belt, a red shirt, and a neckerchief in the shape of a small tie, all reminiscent of traditional *gaucho* clothing. The figure of the *gaucho*, an equivalent of the North American cowboy, was widely recognized in Argentina at the end of the nineteenth century, in large part due to the writer Martín

---

[228] *Caras y Caretas* (Buenos Aires), August, 10, 1904, n. 314, 46. José María Cao is considered the father of the political caricature in Argentina.

[229] María Isabel Baldasarre, "Con la paleta, el pincel y el caballete. Los artistas en las 'Caricaturas contemporáneas' de Caras y Caretas," in *Huellas: Búsquedas En Arte y Diseño*, Dirección de Investigación y Desarrollo de la Facultad de Artes y Diseño, 9 (Mendoza: Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, 2016), 81–96.

Fierro. Here, Yrurtia, depicted as a *gaucho*, is clearly identified as a symbol of quintessential Argentinian culture.[230]

The sculptor is depicted with his head placed between the sculpted legs of a figure, a reference to the mockery and derision that he faced after being awarded the gold medal at the 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition for his sculpture entitled *The Sinners*. The sculpture is not even shown, but simply alluded to by the detail of the bottom legs of a figure. Below the picture, a caption reads: "Since his award in Saint Louis, the envious now say: –Oh, how immoral! He triumphed thanks to *The Sinners*!" [231] This caricature is representative of the tension between Yrurtia's international success abroad and his struggles to make a name for himself at home. By emphasizing Yrurtia's Argentinian identity through the *gaucho* clothing, the caricature highlights the triumph of the South American sculptor on the global artistic scene, and then sarcastically denounces the envy and ridicule that the sculptor suffered because of his award for a sculpture called *The Sinners*.

A portrait gallery of the award-winning Argentinian artists at the Saint Louis International Exhibition is displayed in the magazine a few pages after the caricature **(figure 49)**. Of the fourteen artists depicted, Rogelio Yrurtia is first in line, with a "Medal of Honor." Even though Yrurtia would later reject the award, he appears here as a leader among the Argentinian artists who

[230] Baldasarre has argued that Yrurtia's blouse and handkerchief referred to the *camicie rosse* used by the militia and followers of Giuseppe Garibaldi, known as a freemason and a clear reference for the initiated Argentinians. According to Baldasarre, Cao alluded to his own status as Mason and the sympathies of the artist. He gave Yrurtia the mythical character of the Italian leader. Baldasarre, 90.

[231] *Caras y Caretas* (Buenos Aires), August, 10, 1904, n. 314, 46. "Como en San Luis fue premiado, la envidia dice a estas horas: - ¡Oh que inmoral! ¡Ha triunfado gracias a Las Pecadoras!"

participated in the Saint Louis World's Fair. His portrait, however, differs from those of his fellow artists, whose headshots are clearly photographic portraits. Yrurtia's portrait could have been drawn based on the caricature or else used as a model for the caricature. It is difficult to tell if it is based on a photograph later retouched by the artist to emphasize the sculptor's prominent beard and dark hair or if, for lack of a photographic portrait, Cao drew a portrait of the artist.[232] A photograph of the sculptor posing next to *The Sinners* in the studio similarly shows Yrurtia with a large beard and dark hair, and this could have served as a source of inspiration for Cao **(see chapter 2, figure 7)**. Since Yrurtia was based in Paris at the time, perhaps it was not possible to obtain a formal headshot of the sculptor.

The Louisiana Purchase Exposition of 1904 was not the first venue where *The Sinners* was put on display. Created in Paris, the sculpture was first showcased at the 1903 Salon des artistes français, Yrurtia's first sculpture publicly displayed in the French capital. The catalogue entry of the 1903 Salon designates Yrurtia as "élève de M. Jules Coutan," an affiliation with the Parisian artistic milieu that certainly helped the foreign sculptor get his work accepted. That year, at the Salon, Yrurtia's plaster of *The Sinners* drew the attention of some of the most influential French critics at the time. Camille Mauclair and Charles Morice commented at length on Yrurtia's piece in their reviews.[233] Mauclair described his excitement when discovering the group hidden in a nook at the Salon, which he declared the most interesting work featured at the Salon that year (**see**

[232] The face of Emilio Caraffa (1862-1939), first on the third line of the gallery, also seems to have been altered.

[233] Camille Mauclair, "Le Salon de La Société des artistes français en 1903," *La Revue Bleue*, 1903, 624–29; "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín. After Yrurtia's 1903 Salon success, a long correspondence and friendship unfolded between Yrurtia and Morice.

chapter 2, figure 20).[234] Morice addressed Yrurtia with the remark, "You are a danger for France," foreseeing future successes for the young Argentinian sculptor and his threat to the French artistic school.[235] Mauclair and Morice's reviews were immediately translated into Spanish and published in the Argentinian press, bringing the expatriate sculptor to the attention of his peers in his native country. In June 1903, immediately following the closing of the Salon, the Argentinian newspaper *La Prensa* dedicated an article to the success of Yrurtia's *The Sinners* at the Salon (**figure 50**).[236] The misspelling of Yrurtia's name as "Inurtia" in the title of the article demonstrates that the young artist was completely unknown in Argentina before his departure to Paris. Even though Yrurtia was praised by art critics in the local press, his critical success did not compensate for the physical absence of his works in Buenos Aires.

In 1903, the Argentinian painter and politician Eduardo Schiaffino, appointed Commissioner of Fine Arts for the Saint Louis Exhibition, asked Yrurtia to display *The Sinners* with other artworks by Argentinian artists to showcase their national school of art at the 1904 World's Fair. Schiaffino himself had lived many years in Paris, from 1883 to 1891, during which he exhibited his paintings at the Salon and, more important, examined the system of artistic training and academies, which he would later implement in Buenos Aires. Schiaffino played a major role in the institutionalization of the arts in Buenos Aires, as the founder and director of the National

---

[234] Mauclair, "Le Salon de La Société des artistes français en 1903."

[235] The Argentinian painter Martín Malharro quoted Morice in his article dedicated to his friend Yrurtia published in the national newspaper *El Diario* in 1905. Martín A. Malharro, "El escultor Yrurtia. Su próxima llegada. La exposición de Saint Louis. El monumento a los tres López. La exposición bienal de Venecia. La exposición de sus obras en esta capital," *El Diario*, March 27, 1905. «Vous êtes un danger pour la France»

[236] "El escultor argentino Inurtia (sic) 'Las Pecadoras' Su exposición en el salón de Paris" *La prensa*, Buenos Aires, June 1903. "Rogelio Yrurtia" (Paris, France, n.d.), Archives and Documentation Center, Musée Rodin.

Museum of Fine Arts, and then as an Argentinian diplomat in Europe. Having followed the trajectory of the young sculptor since his departure for Europe and his early success at the Salon, Schiaffino especially counted on Yrurtia to be part of this first campaign to promote the image of Argentinian art abroad.[237]

Twice the size of the World's Columbian Exposition, the Louisiana Purchase Exposition was the largest fair ever staged in the United States.[238] Besides marvels of technology, agriculture, art, and entertainment, there were several anthropological exhibitions displaying the cultures of indigenous peoples, Africans, even African Americans, and people from the Philippines and the Artic. The exhibition celebrated a vision of the power of the United States on a global stage. The various stakeholders—that is, the organizers of the Saint Louis Fair, the nation's officials, and the artists themselves—had different agendas. From the perspective of the organizers of the event, the fair's goal was public edification: to commemorate a seminal event in American history and, by implication, the formation of a nation and the expansion of the American empire into the Pacific. However, the invited nations, and even the artists whose works were showcased in the exhibition had other goals in mind. Schiaffino, in his capacity as a representative of the Argentinian government, used the Parisian-made sculpture *The Sinners* to demonstrate the triumph of the Argentinian school of art abroad, while for Yrurtia, *The Sinners* served as a showpiece to establish

---

[237] Schiaffino to Yrurtia, June 12, 1903. "Cuento especialmente con que usted nos acompañara en esa primera campaña en el exterior por la difusión colectiva del arte argentino." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes.

[238] Astrid Böger, *Envisioning the Nation the Early American World's Fairs and the Formation of Culture* (Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag, 2010), 174.

his artistic identity in his homeland. Yrurtia had to work abroad to support his vision of Argentina, where his artistic practice was not yet fully accepted.

3.2.1 To Saint Louis…By Way of Buenos Aires

After the closing of the 1903 Paris SAF, Schiaffino encouraged Yrurtia to keep *The Sinners* in his studio until February of the following year, when the sculpture would be shipped, with the works of the other Paris-based Argentinian artists, directly to Saint Louis.[239] But later that summer, Schiaffino witnessed attacks inflicted on Yrurtia by a local circle of decision makers in Buenos Aires. Schiaffino's protégé failed to receive the prestigious commission for a monument to the Argentinian politician Aristóbulo Del Valle, which instead was given to Lola Mora at a meeting that Schiaffino attended. He reported, "today I had the impression of having seen a death by assassination," referring to the invective leveled by critics of Yrurtia, who was based in Paris at that time and could not defend himself in person.[240] After this event, Schiaffino decided that before reaching Saint Louis, *The Sinners* should first be transported to Buenos Aires in order to give the

[239] Schiaffino to Yrurtia, June 12, 1903. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes.

[240] Schiaffino to José Luis Cantilo, June 23, 1903. Schiaffino thanks Cantilo for his support during the meeting the same day in the office of Saenz Peña, where the commission decided to choose Lola Mora for the monument to del Valle. "Allí se ha consumado la más triste injusticia con el notable artista Yrurtia […] Hoy tengo la impresión de haber visto asesinar un muerto." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes.

locals a chance to admire Yrurtia's artistic creation.[241] In November 1903, in light of the extraordinary award bestowed on *The Sinners* at the Paris Salon. Yrurtia obtained a one-year extension of his government pension in Europe, and it became even more urgent that the Argentinian public become acquainted with Yrurtia's works.[242] The extra layover in Buenos Aires of *The Sinners* in its trajectory from Paris to Saint Louis was highly strategic, and it demonstrates the difficulty encountered by the expatriate sculptor in making a name for himself in his homeland despite the prestige gained at the Paris Salons. However, this stop put the fragile material of the sculpture at risk**.**

3.2.2 *The Sinners* in Saint Louis

Placed within the legacy of major examples of European sculpture at the Paris Salons, *The Sinners* would be displayed as one of the premier examples of the Argentinian school across the ocean. Schiaffino considered the 1904 Saint Louis International Exhibition the perfect opportunity to set forth the idea of a national school of art, to show a foreign audience what "Argentinian" art was. The transnational conversations between artworks that originated in the Paris Salons continued in the galleries of the Saint Louis International Fair, where *The Sinners* was put on display in the international sculpture pavilion dedicated to works from all Western nations **(see**

[241] During the summer of 1903, Yrurtia would display drawings and photographs of his sculptures at the Salon Witcomb in Buenos Aires, which had organized an exhibition based on the works of the Argentinian artists who had received a government grant. However, I have not found any evidence that *The Sinners* was exhibited in Buenos Aires at that time.

[242] Schiaffino to Yrurtia, November 16, 1903. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes.

figure 40). The Argentinian artists featured at the International Exposition won great acclaim: with only nineteen exhibitors, Argentina received an astonishing sixteen prizes. Among the award recipients was Ernesto de la Cárcova (1866-1927) for his painting *Sin Pan y Sin Trabajo* (*Without Bread and Without Work*), which was loaned from the National Museum of Fine Arts in Buenos Aires, and is today considered a masterpiece of nineteenth-century Argentinian art.[243] The official American photographic album of the Saint Louis World's Fair, *Forest City,* featured an illustration of the work and described this painting of poverty as the most powerful work "of the brush" shown in the Argentinian section of the West Pavilion of the Palace of Art **(figure 51)**.[244]

Thirteen years younger than Ernesto de la Cárcova, Yrurtia also contributed to this national success with *The Sinners*, for which he was awarded a gold medal, the top prize in the competition. The twenty-five-year-old Yrurtia won the prestigious honor alongside established international sculptors, among them the Belgian Constantin Meunier and the Americans Paul Wayland Bartlett (1865-1925) and Saint-Gaudens. However, in defiance of Schiaffino's wishes, Yrurtia rejected the award.[245] Schiaffino, who had played an influential role in the attribution of the prize, had

---

[243] Laura Malosetti Costa, *Primeros Modernos: Arte y Sociedad En Buenos Aires a Fines Del Siglo XIX* (Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2001); *Ernesto de la Cárcova*, Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes (Buenos Aires, 2016).

[244] Walter Barlow Stevens and William Herman Rau, *The Forest City: Comprising the Official Photographic Views of the Universal Exposition Held in Saint Louis, 1904 : Commemorating the Acquisition of the Louisiana Territory* (Saint Louis: Puritan Pub. Co., 1904), 388.

[245] Yrurtia to Schiaffino, December 13, 1904. Yrurtia thanks Schiaffino for his help in gaining the great prize in the competition, but then explains his refusal: "que nunca significó nada para mi ningún genero de recompensas […] <u>ningún premio pueda engreírme nunca, ni derrotarme de mis ideales de artista</u> […] Yo no puedo ni debo aceptar esa recompensa." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes.

desperately wanted Yrurtia to be awarded the medal and thereby become the greatest Argentinian sculptor honored at such a young age. He had suggested the names of Arturo Dresco and Yrurtia to the jury committee to be considered for the prize, commenting that despite his young age, Yrurtia be considered because of his great success at the 1903 SAF and with the French critics.[246] However, Yrurtia, who had denounced the inherently corrupting nature of awards at the Paris Salons, did not appreciate Schiaffino's maneuvers. Schiaffino was surprised by Yrurtia's reaction. Based on the young sculptor's decision to compete at the Paris Salon des artistes français the year prior, he had thought of the young man as ambitious:

> The precedent that you set in having sent this group yourself previously and on your own free will to the Salon des artistes français, –which, as you know, is the Salon of awards, not the other one of the Société nationale, where they exhibit precisely those who do not take them into account, has undoubtedly contributed to mislead me about your intentions. […] the great prize at age 25 […] perhaps no other artist has achieved it.[247]

Despite this setback, Yrurtia's *The Sinners* was prominently featured in Schiaffino's article on the 1904 World's Fair, published in *La Nación* on February 14, 1905 **(figure 52)**. Schiaffino interpreted the recognition of the Argentinian artists at the Saint Louis International Exhibition as a stepping-stone in the formation of a young, but promising and successful Argentinian school of

---

[246] Schiaffino to Dresco, October 30, 1904. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes.

[247] Schiaffino, Monticello Hotel in Saint Louis, to Yrurtia, Paris, December 28, 1904. "el antecedente de haber enviado usted anteriormente y de motivo proprio, dicho grupo al Salon des artistes français, -que, como usted sabe, es el Salon de las recompensas, y no el otro de la Société nationale, donde exponen precisamente los que no las toman cuenta, ha contribuido sin duda a inducirme en error sobre sus intenciones […] el gran premio a la edad de 25 años […] quizás a ningún otro artista ha sucedido." "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

art.[248] In his article, Schiaffino denounced the international artistic system based on a center and periphery model, describing the difficulty that Argentinian artists had in finding their own path among the influential national art schools in Europe and North America. He viewed such a system as a method of European propaganda meant to reinforce its cultural hegemony, which drew strength from the perceived superiority of its political models, traditions, race, and history.[249] However, at the same time that he questioned this influential system based on inequal power relations between nations, Schiaffino also seemed satisfied with the progress made by Argentina within this dominant group of Western cultural leaders.

3.2.3 Back to Paris…By Way of Buenos Aires

The itinerant story of *The Sinners* did not end with its display at the Saint Louis International Exhibition. After the fair closed, the sculpture was sent back to Buenos Aires, along

---

[248] Eduardo Schiaffino, 'La exposición de San Luis. La sección artística argentina. Reminiscencias", *La Nación*, February 14, 1905. "La escuela argentina data apenas de 15 años, ha debido desarrollarse sin tradición local, sin maestros, sin museos. La organización de la enseñanza de las bellas artes no puede ser más reciente, pues la fundación del museo y de la academia de Buenos Aires cuenta diez años apenas."

[249] *Ibidem*. "A medida que el argentino viaja en Europa y los Estados Unidos se va convenciendo de que aquella vieja modestia nacional, que nos hacía encontrar bueno todo lo extranjero y malo todo lo que es nuestro, ha dejado de ser cualidad para degenerar en un vicio. […] los argentinos distribuidos y como diseminados entre las agrupaciones extranjeras, disciplinadas todas en un modo nacional, hijo de la raza, de la costumbre y del orgullo nativo, encuentran tanta mayor dificultad en llegar a la conciencia de sí mismos, cuanto que viven en medio de una propaganda continua en favor de las cosas y los hombres europeos, de una depresión latente de las cosas y los hombres nacionales."

with the other Argentinian works displayed in Saint Louis.[250] Yrurtia had given *The Sinners* to the National Commission of Fine Arts in Buenos Aires as the culmination of his studies in Paris. In the documents provided to the transportation company, Schiaffino wrote a special note of caution regarding the fragility of Yrurtia's sculptural group:

> Yrurtia's *The Sinners*, contained in a crate lined with zinc, must be handled with extreme care because of the great fragility of the robes; please ask Don Lucio Correa Morales for help in directing the placement of the sculpture in the museum.[251]

Once it arrived in Buenos Aires, *The Sinners* was showcased in an exhibition at the gallery Casa Witcomb, dedicated to the works of Yrurtia and Schiaffino. The show was probably organized at Schiaffino's request, as a way to promote his own paintings and drawings, while also presenting the works of Yrurtia, coming off his recent success at the Saint Louis World's Fair, to the people of Buenos Aires.[252] *Caras y Caretas* covered the exhibition in an article illustrated with photographs of the show as well as individual sculptures (**figure 53**).[253] Among the many pieces on display were *The Sinners*—which can be seen in the background of the panoramic view of the show—and Yrurtia's monument to Doctor Alejandro Castro, also created in Paris, where it was cast in bronze by Rudier and displayed earlier that year at the SNBA. An early maquette of

---

[250] *The Sinners* appears on the list of works from January 15, 1905, that were presented in Saint Louis and would be sent back to Buenos Aires. The work was recorded as belonging to the National Commission of Fine Arts, in deposit at the museum."Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[251] "*Las Pecadoras* de Yrurtia contenidas en el cajón forrado en zinc…requieren un cuidado extremo por la extraordinaria fragilidad de los ropajes; conviene solicitar la ayuda de Don Luis Correa Morales para dirigir la colocación en el Museo." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[252] Single-artist shows featuring sculptures were not common at the time, and one might think of the pairing Yrurtia-Schiaffino as similar to the duo Rodin-Monet at the Galerie Georges Petit a decade prior.

[253] "Arte nacional. Exposición Irurtia-Schiaffino", *Caras y Caretas*, November 11, 1905.

Yrurtia's monument to the triumph of labor was also shown, which will be studied in the following chapters.

The Sinners, still in plaster, needed to be eventually made in bronze or carved in marble, and Yrurtia wished to have it cast in bronze by the foundry Rudier in Paris, since he insisted that there was no sufficiently competent foundry in Buenos Aires.[254] On December 15, 1905, a contract between Yrurtia and Schiaffino stipulated the conditions for the bronze casting of *The Sinners* with the foundry Rudier. The sum of 16,000 francs for casting also included repair of damages to the plaster sculpture, which had deteriorated since its first showing at the Paris Salon.[255] *The Sinners* was shipped to Paris, and a telegram delivered the Argentinian government's approval of the bronze casting in Paris: "Please Send to Paris Group The Sinners to its Author for the Foundry There On Behalf of the Government: Gonzalez."[256]

In the summer of 1906, the transportation company Maple & Cie carried out the shipping of *The Sinners* to France. On August 23, 1906, an official of Maple & Cie wrote a letter asking Schiaffino about insurance policies: after the first of the six crates of plasters that the company had transported from Buenos Aires to Le Havre was opened, it was discovered that its contents had been badly damaged.[257] In a follow-up letter three weeks later, the company confirmed having

---

[254] Yrurtia, 32 bd Pasteur, Paris, to Schiaffino. October 23, 1904. Yrurtia had already worked with the foundry Rudier for the cast of his monument to Doctor. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación

[255] December 15, 1905. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[256] "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[257] Déménagement et Transport, Maple & Cie. Garde Meuble Maple, 29 rue de la Jonquière, Paris, to Schiaffino, Hotel Continental, Munich, Allemagne, August 23, 1906. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

delivered the six crates of statues to Yrurtia in his studio in Clamart.[258] The next month, Rudier went to see *The Sinners* in Yrurtia's studio, and Schiaffino was expected to pay a visit to Yrurtia as well.[259] This is the last documented trace of the journey of *The Sinners.* It is most probable that the figures of *The Sinners* were in such a damaged state that they were judged impossible to repair by Rudier and Schiaffino. Scholars would later say that Yrurtia, unsatisfied with his early work, destroyed the group himself, turning this unfortunate accident into an interesting anecdote in the construction of Yrurtia's artistic mythology.

Yrurtia's ambition forced him to navigate the art world on both sides of the Atlantic. While the "aesthetic risks" of *The Sinners* were mitigated by Schiaffino, who helped legitimize Yrurtia and his artwork as representative of the Argentinian artistic school at the Saint Louis World's Fair, this strategy did not smooth Yrurtia's path in the competition with established sculptors to gain public commissions in his own country. The showing of *The Sinners* in Buenos Aires incurred "shipping risks," which Schiaffino and Yrurtia accepted in order to increase the visibility of the

---

[258] Déménagement et Transport, Maple & Cie. Garde Meuble Maple, 29 rue de la Jonquière, Paris. Paris, le 17 septembre 1906. Monsieur Schiaffino, Hotel de Ville, Florence. « […] Les 6 caisses de statues venant de Buenos Aires ont été également transportées par nous de la gare et livrées à Monsieur Yrurtia à Clamart, suivant votre désir. » "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación

[259] Rogelio Yrurtia to Schiaffino, October 27, 1906. «Señor D Eduardo Schiaffino, Estimado amigo: Yo no estimo necesaria la presencia de M. Rudier en mi atelier. El fundidor recientemente ha visto mis "Pecadoras".
Yo lo aguardo entonces el lunes a las tres pm. Lo Saluda cordialmente. Rogelio Yrurtia. Clamart (Seine) 27 octubre 1906. 17 rue des Bièvres 17" "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

young sculptor back home.[260] While *The Sinners* might not have been damaged if it had avoided two extra stopovers in Buenos Aires during its round-trip between Paris and Saint Louis, this story of a sculpture in transit demonstrates the difficulties encountered by the sculptor in balancing expectations between the Paris Salons system and art commissions in his homeland. The circulation of Yrurtia's celebrated group *The Sinners* between Paris, Buenos Aires, and Saint Louis thus becomes a metaphor for the sculptor's own career and transatlantic mobility.

Although celebrated at the international Paris Salon des artistes français of 1903 and at the 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition, Yrurtia had to work continuously to maintain a strong presence in Argentina: international success did not ensure domestic success and required a separate effort. Although based in Paris until the early 1920s, the sculptor participated several times in the National Salons in Buenos Aires, where he mostly exhibited private commissions and showcased fragments of monumental works.[261] He also secured for himself important commissions in Buenos Aires, among them *Hymn to Labor*, *Monument to Dorrego*, and *The Poet Facing Sorrow*, the latter being destined for the Jockey Club of Buenos Aires. Yrurtia worked on these commissions from Paris, where he continued to exhibit at the Salons. Having shown a large *Torso* at the Salon, he gathered French reviews of his work to send to his country, and was also

---

[260] I borrow the expressions of "aesthetic risks "and "shipping risks" from Americanist scholar Jennifer Roberts. Roberts, *Transporting Visions*.

[261] The National Salons in Buenos Aires were created in 1911 and ran through 1982. Yrurtia never won a prize at the national salons in Buenos Aires, but he exhibited his works in 1916 (his address was 8 rue Gutemberg, Boulogne sur Seine), 1920, and 1921 (in 1920 and 1921, Yrurtia was back in Buenos Aires, at the address Zabala 2473). The series of catalogues of the national Salons are available at the library of the Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes, Buenos Aires. On the National Salons in Argentina, see Marta Penhos, Diana Wechsler, and Miguel Angel Muñoz, *Tras los pasos de la norma: salones nacionales de bellas artes (1911-1989)*, Ediciones del Jilguero (Buenos Aires, 1999).

thinking of making a plaster of this fragment for the National Museum of Fine Arts in Buenos Aires.[262] All of Yrurtia's endeavors in Paris were destined for his homeland. Despite his strong artistic network in Buenos Aires, among whom were Eduardo Schiaffino and the painter Martín Malharro, Yrurtia encountered resistance in his country, where the Italian sculptural tradition prevailed. It is quite ironic to think that while Yrurtia represented a vision of the Argentinian school abroad, he faced rejection in his own country.

3.3 *Life of Humanity*: Boston (1908)-Paris (1910)-Harrisburg (1911)

"Beloved father and mother, I have good news for us all. Nothing is signed or settled, but I am sure a great work is coming to me, something that will give me every chance for my creative art, and take many years if not the remainder of life to carry out. It seems everything I could hope for."[263] It is with these words of excitement that Barnard announced to his parents what was to become the most ambitious commission of his lifetime: the entire statuary of the new Pennsylvania State Capitol Building in Harrisburg. A native of Bellefonte, Pennsylvania, Barnard was proud to create a monument for his native state. Tired of seeking "orders" and "doing statues," he saw this opportunity as his chance to finally develop a long-term sculptural project expressing his own artistic vision. Indeed, quite unusually, Barnard was chosen as the sole sculptor of the Pennsylvania

---

[262] Yrurtia to Schiaffino, [undated]. "En este momento expongo mi gran Torso en el Salón, el que ha producido una revolución entre los artistas. Dentro de poco, cuando tenga un número suficiente de *coupures*, les haré conocer en mi tierra. Al mismo tiempo, he pensado mandarle un calco de este fragmento para el museo, esperando procurarle placer." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[263] Barnard to his parents, June 8, 1901. "Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard."

State Capitol Building in Harrisburg in December 1901. Working on his sculptural groups for almost a decade, Barnard would develop an ambitious and thoroughly transnational monumental program for an American audience.

The design originally envisioned for the new Pennsylvania State Capitol sought to emulate the program of the United States Capitol in Washington, DC. According to the *Sun Herald* from July 1902, Barnard was to oversee four principal divisions in his scheme for the sculpture, in a program much more ambitious than the one eventually commissioned and completed. A bronze group in front of the base of the dome and above the central facade called "The Apotheosis of Labor," composed of four colossal human figures and three horses thirty-five-feet tall, "perhaps will be the largest work in bronze ever modelled."[264] All the other sculptures would be in marble. On the entablature supporting the great bronze group would be four pairs of caryatids to represent the major industries of Pennsylvania: a pair of miners with pickaxes, a pair of ironworkers with hammers, a pair of lumbermen with axes, and a pair of farmers with spades. Then, on either side of the main entrance, two allegorical ensembles depicting "primitive men, women and children." Finally, four more groups were to be included: two each to flank the two subordinate front entrances at the wings that would represent the four groups of settlers that built up Pennsylvania – the Quakers, the English, the Scotch-Irish, and the Germans. Beyond its decorative purpose,

[264] Press cutting, *The Sunday Herald*, July 1902, 2."George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution ; Wayne Craven, *Sculpture in America: From the Colonial Period to the Present* (New York: Crowell, 1968), 446.

sculpture would play a new role in this architectural setting: a conscious choice was made to place the sculptures near the ground, so that the beholder could enjoy each work in its entirety.[265]

The original sculptural program for the building shared similarities with other state capitols in the country, such as the Minnesota State Capitol in Saint Paul, for which Andrew O'Connor created a monument to Governor John Albert Johnson featuring four figures of life-size workers, also carrying the tools of their profession: blacksmith, farmer, timber cruiser, and miner.[266] But the Harrisburg program also planned to inscribe the Pennsylvania State Capitol even more strongly in its local context by depicting the various historical groups that composed its settlers. Native Americans were included in the sculptural program: "Indians will also be introduced in ways to suggest the peaceful and the hostile relations of the aborigines with the colonists," although the article's description does not present a clear idea of how they would be portrayed.[267] Barnard's contract made no mention of these multiple sculptural schemes, specifying only the two allegorical groups to be placed at the main entrance of the building, thus eliminating the local specificity of the sculptural program.

---

[265] *Ibidem*. "instead of being placed so high that the effect of its detail is entirely lost -as is so frequently the case – will be kept so near the ground that the beholder will enjoy its entire effect."

[266] Doris Flodin Soderman, *The Sculptors O'Connor: Andrew Sr., 1847-1924, Andrew Jr., 1874-1941* (Worcester, MA: Gundi Publishers, 1995), 50–51. Following Governor Johnson's death on September 21, 1909, the decision to erect a memorial statue in front of the Minnesota Capitol in St. Paul was taken, and a list of forty sculptors was suggested by the Secretary to the Executive Committee. From this list, five sculptors were selected, among which was O'Connor.

[267] Press cutting, *The Sunday Herald*, July 1902, 2. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Even though the contract of the sculptural program signed by Barnard was more limited in scope, it was still the largest single sculptural commission in the United States at the time. On December 12, 1902, Barnard signed a contract with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to create two groups of monumental statuary on both sides of the main entrance on the west front of the capitol building that "shall be illustrative or allegorical of 'Life of the People.'"[268] The description of the groups as it appears in the contract, "two groups of statuary containing about fifteen figures in each group, said figures to be heroic in size," corresponds precisely to what Barnard would create. The total sum allocated to Barnard in multiple payments was $100,000, although the sculptor would see his payments stopped, due to a corruption scandal involving the appointed architect of the state capitol building, Joseph Huston, which came to light in 1906.[269] The only condition in the contract that Barnard failed to meet was the completion date, set for the first day of December 1905. The sculptor worked on his sculptural ensemble until 1911, deploying a symbolic narrative at an unprecedented scale in the history of public sculpture in the United States.

The transatlantic story of Barnard's groups began on the boat that led Barnard to France, on Christmas eve of 1902, when Barnard confessed in a letter to his wife Edna, "I lay a bed in the early dark hours of this morning thinking out the two groups 'Baptism of Fire', 'Baptism of Love' for the Capitol. The figures who are to play in these groups gradually walk forth to meet me."[270] This dreamy vision of the sculptures already announced the moral statement of the monument that would figure in the sculptural oppositions. Moreover, the dynamic groupings of figures that

[268] "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

[269] *Ibidem.*

[270] "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers." On paper letter monogrammed "U.S.M.S 'St Paul'", the reference of the boat that bought Barnard to France on December 24, 1902.

emerge from the architectural frame constituted a compositional strategy that Barnard had been experimenting with in his project for a monument to the soldiers of Centre County and Governor Curtin, the governor of Pennsylvania during the Civil War. An unfinished sketch of that group shows a statue of a soldier carrying a flag in front of a large architectural framework, from which emerge two figural groups on both ends **(figure 54)**.[271] It was to be erected in Bellefonte, Pennsylvania, the birthplace of both the sculptor and the governor. Although the model was published in the press at the time, a different contractor was chosen and the monument was built with a different design.[272]

3.3.1 *Life of Humanity*: A Patchwork of Salons Models

Barnard's commission for the Pennsylvania Capitol Building was ambitious, with a total of thirty-three figures of heroic size organized in two groups: *Love and Labor* and *The Burden of Life*. Close analysis of these groupings reveals many instances in which Barnard appropriated and adapted sculptural motifs from the Paris Salons, as in *Two Brothers*; *Prodigal Son; Youth;* and *Mourning Woman.* His *Prodigal Son* is an adaptation of Ernest Dubois's *Prodigal Son* featured at the 1894 Paris Salon, as discussed in the previous chapter **(see chapter 2, figures 22-23)**. Barnard's group *Two Brothers* went through a similar artistic process of sculptural appropriation and transformation. Emulating François Sicard's (1862-1934) composition *Le bon samaritain* or

---

[271] A photograph of the project illustrates the article by Alexander Blair Thaw, "George Grey Barnard, sculptor," *The World's Work*, vol. 5, December 1902, 2837.

[272] Unknown and W. Clark Noble, "Civil War Memorial," sculpture, Inventories of American Painting and Sculpture Smithsonian American Art Museum Research & Scholars Center, 1904. Siris Art Inventory Catalog, Smithsonian American Art Museum.

The Good Samaritan, Barnard pressed the figures against one another at a 90-degree angle **(figures 55-56)**.[273] The supporting figure stands straight, his feet well planted on the ground. Unlike the comparable figure in Sicard's group, he is not burdened under the weight of the other body, the well-defined muscles of his back and his engorged veins emphasizing his strength. Sicard's group shows a man crouching, his legs flexed, as he lifts the body of a young man on top of his right knee. His right hand is placed around the young man's waist, while with his left hand, he grabs his calf. With a bandage on his right arm, the young man, perhaps injured, his eyes closed, rests his head on the shoulder of the supporting figure and wraps his left hand around his head. Visible from various vantage points, Sicard's sculpture emphasizes the supportive figure's strain of lifting the body, carefully balanced on his leg.

Two Brothers can only be viewed from the back, offering a unique vantage point to the viewer. Barnard erased any narrative elements relative to the story of the Good Samaritan to capture instead the climactic moment of these two figures, achieving a sense of universality in the relationship between the two brothers. With a focus on anatomical details, *Two Brothers* celebrates the cult of the body. By showing the figure's veins and back muscles as if they were about to burst, the artist pushed the representation of anatomy toward its realistic limits. The standing man is pressing against him the younger figure, whose arms and legs parallel the shape of his own body. The detail of the right arm, left in the void, emphasizes the contrast between the two figures in this couple: on the one side, a standing man emanating energy, on the other, a weakened body

[273] François Sicard's *Le bon samaritain* was presented in marble at the 1898 SAF under the exhibition number 3855. It was bought by the French government at the Salon, and shown again at the 1900 World Fair. Today, the sculpture is standing in the Tuileries gardens in Paris. "Base Salons," accessed November 13, 2020, http://salons.musee-orsay.fr/.

completely at the mercy of his savior. This same detail of the hand left in the void appears in *The Prodigal Son*, where it is caught in between the bodies of the father and son. As in *The Prodigal Son*, the sculptor used processes of compression and condensation to bring these two bodies together. The emotional power of the group resides in its gestural language; unlike Sicard, Barnard did not individualize his figures; their faces are not visible to the viewer.

Accentuated gesture and prominent musculature also characterize *Youth*, probably adapted from Ernest Legrand's (1872-1913) *Pleading Boy* **(figures 57-58)**.[274] The elongated limbs of the young man depart from the more naturalistic treatment of the body in the French model. Barnard straightened the legs of the man, now on his knees, who instead of holding his hands in an attitude of supplication, raises his right arm as he pushes forward the figure next to him. From the unique vantage point of the viewer in front of the group, the figure's left arm has disappeared, hidden behind his body. Echoing the figure of the pleading boy, his head is raised. His body unfolds in the shape of a strong diagonal that emphasizes his strength, and his posture contrasts with the passivity of the pose of the pleading boy in Legrand's group. By pushing forward his right arm and placing his hand on the burden, *Youth* appears to be helping a figure with a large load on his back: *The Burden Bearer* **(figure 59)** His right foot is placed forward, beyond the frame of the sculptural group, while his left foot is drawn back, and his torso is bent almost at a 45-degree angle. He holds his head down, under the pressure of the weight on his back, which his arms, one forward at the level of his right ear, the other placed at the level of his lower back, are trying to hold up in a very uncomfortable pose. This figure looks like a reinterpretation of Michelangelo's drawing of

[274] Ernest Legrand was a regular at the SAF, where he showed his works from 1891 to 1905 (with the exception of 1896 and 1897). *Pleading Boy* was presented at the 1895 SAF. "Base Salons."

a man carrying a corpse on his shoulder, whose reproduction is in Barnard's archive **(figure 60)**.[275] This reference is not unique in Barnard's visual repertory of sculptural poses. The American sculptor certainly looked at more contemporary representations, such as Ludovic Durand's (1832-1905) *Le Tâcheron* (*The Pieceworker*), displayed at the 1900 SAF **(figure 61)**. In Durand's composition, the man is seated, but the accentuated musculature of his body and the head projected forward as he is trying to carry a large mass on his back recall Barnard's figure.

In *Mourning Woman,* Barnard appropriated the gesture of Louis-Ernest Barrias's (1841-1905) *Nature Revealed by Science*, showed at the 1893 Salon, in which a fully nude female figure lifts the veil covering her head **(figures 62-63)**. The viewer cannot see the face of the figure, projected upward and back, in a unnaturalistic pose similar to that used in the previous groups by Barnard described here. This figure, however, is highly contorted, with her head bent back in a strenuous movement. While based on Barrias's figure of Nature, her pose also calls to mind one of the figures in a mural by Puvis de Chavannes, whose image Barnard kept in his visual archive **(figure 64)**. The classic poses of Puvis's monumental figures were also sources of inspiration for young sculptors active in Paris at the beginning of the twentieth century.[276]

The modification of the motif source has several dimensions here. One is taking the softer, more relaxed bodies of the French models and enhancing their physicality: strengthening the bodies and emphasizing their athleticism. Another element concerns the designing of more acute

---

[275] Michelangelo, *Three men carrying a corpse on their shoulders: study for a Deposition,* drawing, Département des arts graphiques, Musée du Louvre. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

[276] Catherine Chevillot, *La sculpture à Paris : 1905-1914, le moment de tous les possibles* (Vanves: Hazan, 2017) 37-38.

and extreme viewing angles. Barnard was certainly anticipating the viewing conditions of his sculptures on their elevated base on top of the stairs of the Pennsylvania State Capitol in Harrisburg. As he borrowed individual figures from the Paris Salons, Barnard transformed them and rearranged them as part of this ambitious ensemble. Extracted from their original context, these sculptural groupings became part of a new story line in the monumental arrangement. By reinterpreting their postures and recombining their gestures, as well as interlocking them with one another, as in a three-dimensional puzzle, Barnard developed a narrative that took the shape of a living bas-relief, in which the groups, projected out of the facade of the building, break out from their architectural framework.

3.3.2 Transatlantic Crossing: The Harrisburg's Statuary in Boston

In 1908, Barnard was invited to display his works in Boston, and his individual groupings from the Harrisburg commission were presented to an American audience for the first time.[277] It was a singular initiative for the Museum of Fine Arts, which did not usually organize exhibitions of living artists. The Barnard show was initiated by the museum leadership, having learned that the sculptor was in the country on a business trip to help solve financial difficulties related to the commission for the Pennsylvania State Capitol Building.[278] Barnard insisted on showcasing four

---

[277] "Works of George Gray Barnard, Genius in Sculpture", *The Boston Globe*, October 17, 1908. "Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art Records, 1883-1962, Bulk 1885-1940" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

[278] Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. *Annual Report of the Museum of Fine Arts Boston*. Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1908, 44. "The exhibition of the work of Mr. George Grey Barnard in November and December was made possible by a few friends to whom our thanks are due. While it is the policy of the Museum ordinarily to leave exhibitions by

autonomous fragments from his State Capitol ensemble as part of the show. He thought it important to send, in addition to early pieces, some of the figures he had made for the Pennsylvania Capitol Building, which he modestly described as "belonging to the culminating period of his genius."[279] Among the works on display in Boston were the plaster versions of *The Prodigal Son*, *Brothers*, *Youth*, and *Mother*, shipped directly from his studio in Moret-sur-Loing, France. This marked the first exhibition of these sculptures. Individual photographs of the groups were made into postcards, to serve in marketing Barnard's works **(figures 65-66)**.

The exhibition, which opened on October 22, 1908, gave the American public their first opportunity to see two dozen of Barnard's compositions, in plaster, bronze, terracotta, and wax, assembled under one roof. They were displayed in the Textile Room of the museum: the large group in plaster of *Two Natures* was placed in the center of the gallery, with the plaster casts of the colossal figures designed for the main entrance of the State Capitol in Harrisburg showcased in the four corners.[280] Critics noted that the Textile Room was far from being "an ideal chamber for sculpture," since the four plasters of *The Prodigal Son*, *Brothers*, *Youth*, and *Mother* "are too enormous for any but the spot they are intended for. […] Furthermore, they ought to be viewed

---

living artists to other institutions, exceptions have occasionally been made and the interest in Mr. Barnard's highly imaginative work has no doubt strengthened the relation between the Museum and the public." Barnard was doing a trip to the United States at that time to renegotiate the terms of his commission for the Pennsylvania Capitol.

[279] "Barnard's work seen in Boston", *The Evening*, New York City, undated. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

[280] *Boston Evening Transcript*, October 22, 1908. "Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art Records, 1883-1962, Bulk 1885-1940."

from below, and at a distance. Nevertheless, they impress, not alone by mere bulk but by the power of their ideas."[281]

The critic's comment on the massiveness of the individual groups in the exhibition gallery and the difficulty of viewing them emphasized Barnard's contradiction between anticipating the viewing conditions of the State Capitol in his design of the figures and then exhibiting them in a gallery space at ground level. The marble figure of *The Hewer* was the only sculpture to be positioned in the open air of Copley Square in front of the museum, and some critics noted, "Boston deserves unmitigated praise for its artistic courage in placing this naked creature on a public thoroughfare, where thousands pass daily, criticize, admire, criticize, but always stop."[282]

Barnard conceived of his works both as individual groups that could be commercialized and as unified elements for the Capitol composition. With his Boston show, he had hoped to attract the attention of American collectors. In a letter to his parents, the sculptor expressed his disappointment that this advertisement campaign for his work did not lead to some financial gains: "The museum cannot allow things to be sold there. […] I am very commercial now, want money for the fame."[283] Nonetheless, Barnard's sculptures were well received by the Boston audience, and Barnard's sister-in-law described the exhibition as a "howling success."[284] In the press, critics analyzed the importance of the exhibition as twofold: for the artist, to develop public recognition

---

[281] "The Boston Museum. George Grey Barnard", *The Sun*, November 15, 1908."Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art Records, 1883-1962, Bulk 1885-1940."

[282] *Ibidem.*

[283] Barnard to his parents, Oct 29, 1908. "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers."

[284] Alice, Edna's sister, to Edna, October 22, 1908. She describes how the governor of the city art commission opened the show. "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers."

in his own country, and "for the public at large because the appreciation and understanding of fine sculpture in America are needed factors in the progress of our national development in civilization."[285] This exhibition played a role in bringing recognition of Barnard as an American sculptor after his many years spent in France, as noted by the critics: "It is realized that an artistic force is in America, and an artist who is American to the center."[286]

With the success of the Boston show, it seemed an opportune time for Barnard to organize a touring exhibition of his works in the United States. On November 16, 1908, John W. Beatty, the director of the Carnegie Museum of Fine Arts in Pittsburgh, wrote to Barnard to acknowledge receiving copies of the *Boston Globe* from October 17 and 22, which carried illustrations of Barnard's works shown in Boston, and asked for an exhibition catalogue to present to the committee. Despite his interest in Barnard's work, Beatty shared his concerns about the material constraints of transporting the sculptures to Pittsburgh for display:

> I fear the distance to Pittsburgh and the weight of the exhibits will make it impossible to arrange for an exhibition of your works here, however much I, personally, should like to see them in Pittsburgh. The objects being so heavy makes shipment hazardous. How many of the works are in plaster and how many are in marble?[287]

Beatty's questions to Barnard about the number of works in plaster and marble and his worries about the weight of the sculptures suggest that plaster was definitely the preferred material for temporary exhibitions. Barnard informed Beatty that the Boston Museum had raised the funds

---

[285] *Boston Evening Transcript*, October 22, 1908. "Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art Records, 1883-1962, Bulk 1885-1940."

[286] "The Boston Museum. George Grey Barnard", *The Sun*, November 15, 1908. "Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art Records, 1883-1962, Bulk 1885-1940."

[287] John W. Beatty, Director of Fine Arts, Pittsburgh, to George Grey Barnard, New York City, November 16, 1908. "Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art Records, 1883-1962, Bulk 1885-1940."

to hold an exhibition of his works, and suggested that many other museums were interested in having the show:

> The Boston Directors arranged to hold an exhibition of my sculptures, they were entire strangers to me in every way, but did it for art sake. I believe some $6,000 was raised in all for the expenses. Bringing things from France and parts in our country, boxing marbles some dozen. Such a thing of course is impossible in Pennsylvania. However, I hope once my groups are up, it will make people take a vital interest in the expression of sculpture. The Metropolitan Museum as well as other cities museums want the exhibit. Yet I think I will let it go until my return from Europe with the PA marbles.[288]

Following up on the matter, Beatty reported that the museum committee had decided that they could not manage the expense of exhibiting Barnard's works but would be potentially interested in exhibiting his sculptures in the future.[289] Although the Boston exhibition never toured other American cities, Barnard continued to seek to place his sculptures in museum collections in the United States.

In February 1909, Beatty wrote to Barnard with the idea of presenting the entire set of sculptures for the Pennsylvania State Capitol at the Carnegie Institute: "What do you think about the suggestion? Will they all be in the form of casts? I always fear the transportation of marbles."[290] Again, Beatty revealed a clear preference for the display of plaster casts instead of marbles, owing to the risks of damage during shipment. Barnard informed Beatty that the marble groups were to be exhibited at the 1910 Paris Salon, and that they would be finished just in time, in April of that

---

[288] George Grey Barnard to John W. Beatty. Presented to the Fine Arts Committee on November 23rd, 1908. "Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art Records, 1883-1962, Bulk 1885-1940."

[289] John W. Beatty, Director of Fine Arts, Pittsburgh, to Barnard, New York City, November 27, 1908. "Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art Records, 1883-1962, Bulk 1885-1940."

[290] John W. Beatty, Director of Fine Arts, Pittsburgh, to Barnard, New York City, February 23, 1909. "Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art Records, 1883-1962, Bulk 1885-1940."

year. By the spring of 1909, his groups had gained public attention. Barnard wrote Beatty that a friend of his, Mr. Guillemet, asked him if he wanted to do two of the figures for the French government. Moreover, the German critic Clemens was interested in organizing an exhibition of his works in Berlin, adding, “He [Clemens] got up the Rodin exhibit in Berlin five years ago.”[291] None of these opportunities would be realized, but in the summer of 1909, Barnard notified Beatty that he could make plaster casts of his two monumental groups for the State Capitol for the sum of $3,000:

> I have gone over the entire problem of piece moulds from the marble to give you a copy of the 2 groups of the Harrisburg work. It can be done for ($3000) three thousand dollars but no less. There will not be a cent for me, but I am willing to do it for the sake of the casts. Few people can see them in Harrisburg. This will not pay for the two great reliefs, but will pay for complete casts in perfect state of the two great groups containing 23 statues each about 10 feet in height.
> Can you cable me ‘Yes’ and I will begin casts on first group at once as nearly all of first group is finished in marble. Cable Barnard, Moret, France, Yes. The price of boxing will be about 40 dollars apiece.[292]

On October 30, 1909, Beatty received a telegram from Barnard: “Your ordering casts only chance America will have to see groups outside Harrisburg German Government representative wishes exhibit casts in Berlin.” Beatty answered in the negative a few months later: “Committee met today: regrets cannot have exhibition; obstacle arose; am writing.”[293] Beatty explained that the Barnard casts could not be exhibited because of a restructure of the museum and the transfer of a gallery by the Building Committee of the Institute to the Museum Department, depriving them

[291] Barnard to Beatty, undated. “Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art Records, 1883-1962, Bulk 1885-1940.”

[292] Barnard to Beatty, August 19, 1909. “Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art Records, 1883-1962, Bulk 1885-1940.”

[293] Beatty to Barnard, December 7, 1909. “Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art Records, 1883-1962, Bulk 1885-1940.”

of a suitable venue for the sculptures.[294] Despite this setback, Barnard pursued his efforts to sell his work to the Carnegie Art Institute after his triumph at the SAF in 1910.

3.3.3 *Life of Humanity* at the 1910 Salon des artistes français

In 1905, years before the monumental ensemble *Life of Humanity* would even be completed in marble, Barnard had envisioned displaying it at the Paris Salons. Rather than submit individual sculptures such as those he sent to the United States, in Paris, the sculptor would show only the two monumental groupings destined for the Pennsylvania State Capitol. Based in France, Barnard worked on the plaster casts of the Harrisburg commission with his assistants in his studio in Moret-sur-Loing. However, he entrusted the marble carving of the groups to the Piccirilli Brothers in Carrara, Italy.[295] The architect of the Pennsylvania Capitol, Joseph Huston, saw the transit of the plaster models and marble pieces between France and Italy as an obstacle to having the sculptures finished on time for the inauguration of the building in 1906. In a letter from December 15, 1905, Huston urged Barnard to:

> finish the statues as quickly as possible in marble in Carrara, without shipping them back to Paris, and when finished you ship them direct to America and have them set in groups in plaster just as you have modelled them. I know how seriously you feel about French practitioners putting the finishing touches on these statues, but I want to assure you most emphatically that the building is so large and kills scale so rapidly that it would be folly to finish these works like museum pieces. […][296]

[294] Beatty to Barnard, December 13, 1909. "Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art Records, 1883-1962, Bulk 1885-1940."

[295] For more detail about the transnational transit of the groups between France and Italy and issues of labor, see chapter 5 on the labor of monumentality.

[296] Huston to Barnard, December 15, 1905. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

In these instructions, Huston requested that the sculptor ship the marble statuary directly from Carrara to Harrisburg without having it stop in Paris, where Barnard would have had his assistants work on the finishing touches. But Barnard disregarded the architect's demands, and despite the fact that his groups were intended for a public space, he wanted to work on them as if they were museum pieces. With this request, Huston was solely advancing his own agenda, which was to inaugurate his new Capitol Building in 1906 at the cost of Barnard's statuary.

After the corruption scandal about Huston came to light, a group of New York patrons raised money to help Barnard display his sculptural groups at the 1910 SAF:

> it would be a very great pity if they [Barnard's groups] were not exhibited at the Salon this Spring, before their shipment to America. As you know, it is an exhibition like this which caps the climax of an artistic career, and we all feel confident that these great groups, when shown in their entirety, will create a *furore*. […] It would be much to be deplored if they should fail to receive European recognition, which can, under the present circumstances, alone be attained through an exhibition in the Salon.[297]

The contrasting motives of Huston and the New York patrons demonstrate a fundamental difference in regard to the transnational making and transit of Barnard's sculptures. Huston was concerned to get the sculptural groups completed by the inauguration date, from which he would derive personal political gain, whereas the New York committee, which saved Barnard from bankruptcy, was invested in the impact of the Paris Salon on the sculptor's international prestige and the critical perception of the American sculptor in the art world.

Displayed on both sides of the main Salon entrance, Barnard's *Life of Humanity* welcomed visitors to the Grand Palais of the Champs-Elysées in 1910 **(figure 67)**. The massiveness of the

---

[297] Edwin R. Seligman to Mr. A. M. Barnhart, October 26, 1909. The other members of the New York committee are Commodore Frederick G. Bourne, Mr Robert C. Ogden, Mr. Albert Shaw, Mr. Walter H. Page, Sir C. Purdon Clarke, and Mrs William H. Carpenter. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

sculptural groups, with their larger-than-life scale, did not go unnoticed by French critics, who commented on the groups' superb proportions. Indeed, each group, along with its relief, weighed 30,000 kilos **(figure 68)**.[298] Some reviews associated Barnard's taste for the colossal with his American origins.[299] Others, including Thiébaut-Sisson, noted the exceptional character of Barnard's work among his American contemporaries, who "to the present day [have] aspired to nothing beyond the decorative in sculpture. […] American sculpture in this work has taken a most unexpected flight and imposes itself upon the attention and consideration of the Old World by its unprecedented originality."[300] The French critic identified Barnard's work as the first sculpture by an American artist of such grandeur.

Louis Vauxcelles, known as the inventor of the terms "fauvism" and "cubism," recognized Barnard as being from "a powerful and new race," but found the groups confusing: "Too much culture, too many philosophical and social symbols bewilder them. Barnard knows thoroughly the Antique Olympia, and Michelangelo, and Rodin. But his readings, if I might say, have not been digested."[301] The critic highlighted Barnard's emulation of the classics, as well as contemporary

---

[298] The registration file of Barnard's groups at the 1910 SAF records: « Poids 30 mille kilos chaque groupe avec relief. » "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

[299] Estienne Charles, *Liberté*, May 12, 1910. « M. George Barnard, dont l'origine américaine se révèle par un goût de l'énorme […] » "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

[300] Thiébaut-Sisson, "Le Salon du Champ de Mars", *Le Temps*, October 9, 1911. Article translated in English and published in *The Herald*, Washington D.C., December 24, 1911. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

[301] Louis Vauxcelles, "Salon des artistes français", *Gil Blas*, May 7, 1910. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution. « Débarrassons-nous d'abord de M.

sculpture, but at the same time, he used the metaphor of the digestive system, as would Oswald de Andrade eighteen years later, and the process of the assimilation of food to describe Barnard's disappointing application of sculptural appropriation. In his eyes, Barnard's ensemble was a sculptural mishmash.

In the European press, Barnard was recognized as an outsider who could transform the arts of the Parisian artistic milieu in a way that French artists had not. The *London Daily Mail* reported a comment addressed by the French history painter Jean-Paul Laurens (1838-1921) to Barnard:

> We Frenchmen are like colored sweetmeats. We are all packed in the same box, and by our contact with each other we have softened and rubbed off our rough edges. All of us are under the influence of the Salons, the academies, the schools of art. Not one of us would have the hardihood to see things for ourselves, as you have seen them, and to embody what you have seen in our art.[302]

Laurens emphasizes Barnard's difference rather than his debt to the Salons. The painter compares French artists to candies in a box, a metaphor for the ecosystem of the Paris Salons, the academies, and art schools that kept them under control. As their "edges" softened, they were doomed to banality and homogeneity. In contrast, because of his status as a foreigner, Barnard was free from the pressure felt by his fellow French artists and the pervasive influence of their artistic cocoon. Even though Barnard had studied under a French master in Paris and participated in the

---

Barnard, l'Américain dont il a été tant parlé ces jours-ci. On discutera passionnément devant son œuvre immense. On respectera l'effort prodigieux et le savoir. Pour ma part, tout en admirant les beaux morceaux qui composent ces groupes imposants, je regrette que trop de culture, trop de symboles philosophiques et sociaux les embrument. M. Barnard connait à fond l'antique Olympie et Michel Ange et Rodin. Mais ses lectures, si je puisse dire, ne sont pas digérées. Il est d'une race puissance et neuve. »

[302] *The London Daily Mail,* undated, reported on "Extracts from Foreign Papers." "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Salon system, his appropriation of sculptural motifs for his own works was not perceived as a passive act of copying, but rather as a transformative interpretation of French art.

The American press, on the other side, highlighted the visit of former President Theodore Roosevelt to the Salon and his laudatory comments regarding Barnard's statuary.[303] By sending his monumental groups first to Paris, rather than Harrisburg, Barnard got more attention from Americans, exemplified by the positive attention from the ex-president. The cultural dominance of Paris was such that Theodore Roosevelt would cross the Atlantic and see Barnard's groups there, whereas he might not have taken the train to Harrisburg to see them.[304] American expatriates in France also made the trip to the Salon to see Barnard's statuary: "I was most anxious to see your groups in the Salon and they seem vastly interesting to me. I have only been to the Salon once, for a few hours so have not had time to see them as they should be seen," reported MacMonnies, based in Giverny at the time. In his congratulatory letter to Barnard, MacMonnies reflected on the position of the groups in their final location: "I am glad you told me as to the groups being placed much higher. I shall look at these again from the distance and heights you speak of. […] I shall be interested to see the groups in place at Harrisburg for there they will be at their best."[305] Although

---

[303] "Barnard's groups please Roosevelt", I*nquirer*, Philadelphia, PA, April 28, 1910. "Paris, April 27. Colonel Roosevelt today made a special trip to the Salon des Artistes to see George Grey Barnard's groups, 'The Life of Humanity,' which he created for the Pennsylvania State Capitol. The jury has given these groups the place of honor and Mr. Roosevelt felicitated the American sculptor upon his achievement." "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

[304] Theodore Roosevelt had attended the inauguration of the Pennsylvania State Capitol building in Harrisburg in 1906 before Barnard's statues were completed.

[305] Frederick MacMonnies, Giverny par Vernon, Eure, to Barnard, June 4th, 1910. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

the sculptures framed the entrance doors of the Salon, signaling their future placement at the main entrance of the Pennsylvania State Capitol, the height did not correspond to their destined elevated position on top of the stairs leading to the door of the building in Harrisburg.

Barnard's success at the 1910 Salon stirred nationalistic debates among French critics, artists, and juries regarding the possibility of honoring a sculptor from the United States with a medal. Members of the Salon jury had agreed that Barnard was entitled to the distinction of the gold medal, but protesters argued that medals should be restricted to advancing the interests of native French artists. Scandals about awarding medals to foreign competitors belonged to a long tradition of debates in the history of the Salons in the nineteenth century.[306] Barnard, however, denied any interest in receiving a medal. A group of people tried to get up a petition urging that Barnard receive the medal of the Legion of Honor, but the sculptor declared, "Well these are the kind who enjoy the distinction of a medal or decoration. I get nothing in emotion from such things."[307] Good press reviews by critics from both sides of the Atlantic and the president's enthusiasm about his groups were certainly enough success for the sculptor. "As you have perhaps read, I refused to accept any medal at the Salon. It is causing quite a stir," Barnard told his parents after the close of the Salon.[308] The Paris Salon would be the only venue where Barnard displayed his monumental ensemble before shipping it and setting it up in Harrisburg. However, even after

---

[306] A scandal about the attribution of medals to foreign artists had a part in the origin of the creation of the Société nationale des beaux-arts in 1890, in response to the 1889 Paris World's Fair. Olivia Tolède, "Une Sécession Française : La Société Nationale Des Beaux-Arts (1889-1903)" (Nanterre, Université Paris X-Nanterre La Défense, 2008).

[307] Barnard to Edna, July 14, 1910. "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers."

[308] Barnard to his parents, June 2, 1910. "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers." Moreover, Barnard collected press reviews about the 1910 SAF from the US and France press. See "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

the statuary groups were inaugurated in 1911, the sculptor would continue to circulate the sculptural fragments he extracted from the monumental groups to various venues in the United States.

3.3.4 *The Prodigal Son* at the Armory Show

The Prodigal Son is the only fragment from the monumental groups of the Harrisburg Capitol Building from which replicas were created. Although one was most certainly by the hand of the artist, the other was created, at Barnard's behest, by the French practitioner Eugène de Basly for exhibition at the Armory Show in New York City.[309] The commission, made in 1910, gave Basly ten months to complete the marble group for the sum of 5,000 francs. Barnard committed himself to paying Basly the extra sum of 1,500 francs after the sale of the work.[310] It was strategic for Barnard to have his work included in the Armory Show, still considered a major showcase that introduced the European avant-garde to the American public.[311] Among the 140 sculptures on display at the Armory Show in New York City, 105 were by the thirty-four American sculptors

[309] One sculpture is in the collection of the Carnegie Museum of Art in Pittsburgh, and the other, the one displayed at the Armory Show, of the same scale as the monumental group from *Love and Labor*, is today in the collection of the Speed Art Museum in Louisville, KY. On the acquisition of *The Prodigal Son* by the Carnegie Museum, see "Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art Records, 1883-1962, Bulk 1885-1940."

[310] Contract made between Barnard and de Basly on August 16, 1910. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

[311] Laurette E McCarthy, *Walter Pach (1883-1958): The Armory Show and the Untold Story of Modern Art in America* (Pennsylvania: Penn State University Press, 2012); Casey Nelson Blake et al., *The Armory Show at 100: Modernism and Revolution* (New York; London: New York Historical Society, 2013).

featured in the show, most of whom had traveled to Europe, or even trained in Paris, and exhibited at the Salons.[312] In contrast to the Salons and the World's Fairs, the Armory Show organized sculptures by national artistic schools instead of interspersing them in the same exhibition hall.

The Prodigal Son, prominently displayed as the centerpiece of Gallery A, the front gallery, which showcased American sculpture at the New York City venue, was the first piece that most visitors saw on entering the exhibition hall **(figure 69)**. It was surrounded by the works of various artists, such as Jo Davidson (1883-1952), Mahonri Young (1877-1957), and Abastenia St Léger Eberle (1878-1942), among others.[313] The bas-relief featured on the pedestal of Barnard's *The Prodigal Son* was not by the artist, and its author is unidentified.[314] Surprisingly, none of the critics, whether French or American, commented on the fact that Barnard's *The Prodigal Son* was based on a French model. In Lorado Taft's history of American sculpture, both Barnard's *The Prodigal Son* and Dubois's *Le Pardon* are illustrated in sections about their respective national school, but

---

[312] See Catherine Chevillot's conference paper delivered at the Armory Show conference, Orsay, December 2013. I would like to thank Catherine Chevillot for sharing with me her notes for the talk. Among the American sculptors featured in the Armory Show New York who had participated in the Paris Salons were: Robert Aitken, George Grey Barnard, Solon Borglum, Jo Davidson, James Fraser, Sherry Fry, Arthur Lee, Arthur Putnam, Charles Rumsey, Enid Yandell, and Mahonri Young.

[313] "Gallery A," The Armory Show at 100, accessed February 27, 2021, https://armory.nyhistory.org/category/artworks/gallery/gallery-a/.

[314] By cross-referencing the catalogue of works at the exhibition and the visual material available, I would suggest that this bas-relief might have been the work of Richard H. Duffy called 'Tristesse', a plaster sold for $75, or perhaps Grace Mott Johnson's Relief in plaster, sold for $150. However, there is no certainty about the identification of this work. "Gallery A"; "Base Salons."

the American critic does not discuss their formal analogy.[315] For contemporaries at the time, practices of appropriation and emulation were perhaps an unremarkable part of this complex transnational artistic phenomenon in which everyone participated and to which they were accustomed.

Barnard was very well represented at the Armory Show in New York, with a total of five sculptures, a number of works greater than those featured by most of his contemporaries at the exhibition. Moreover, the sculptor chose to send only marble works to this commercial venue, a strategy in contrast to his use of plaster works for museum exhibitions and world's fairs. Like *The Prodigal Son*, which originated from the *Love and Labor* monumental group for Harrisburg, the four other works were sculptural scenes "extracted" from another of Barnard's sculptures, *Urn of Life*, and featured *The Dying Musician* **(figures 70-71)**; *Solitude,* also called *Adam and Eve* **(figures 72-73)**; *The Birth* **(figures 74-75)**; and *The Mystery of Life* **(figures 76-77)**.[316] Barnard used the same sculptural motifs multiple times in different compositions, a cross-fertilization of sculptures from one group to another. Each of these marble sculptures was on sale for $2,000 at the Armory Show, definitely on the high end of the other American sculptures showcased in Gallery A. But the most expensive sculpture was *The Prodigal Son*, with a price tag of $18,000.[317] The high prices of Barnard's sculptures at the Armory Show, and in particular of *The Prodigal*

---

[315] Lorado Taft, *Modern Tendencies in Sculpture*, The Scammon Lectures for 1917 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1921).

[316] *The Urn of Life* is today in the collection of the Carnegie Museum of Art in Pittsburgh. About its acquisitions, see "Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art Records, 1883-1962, Bulk 1885-1940." *The Dying Musician* (also called *Dying Poet)* is today in a private collection. *Solitude* (or *Adam and Eve*) is at the Taft Museum in Cincinatti. *The Birth* is unlocated, and *The Mystery of Life* is in the collection of the Smithsonian American Art Museum, Washington D.C.

[317] "Gallery A."

Son, reflect the prestige carefully cultivated by the sculptor in his homeland and serve as a testament to Barnard's business skills.

Besides repurposing fragments from his own works into autonomous sculptures to be sold, Barnard, pushed by financial struggles, developed a trade of medieval art and architectural artifacts in France and the United States starting in 1906. In 1918, Barnard made an offer to Beatty, director of Fine Arts at the Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh, to sell him his Cloisters, assembled from medieval fragments encountered during his multiple trips to rural areas in France:

> I have definitely decided to sell the "Cloisters" but with these two conditions. First: they are to remain what they are, a Gothic monument to France, preserved intact in our own country. Second: the price $1,000,000 (one million dollars) to be kept a secret. The sacrifice is too great for Mrs. Barnard and myself to make to keep up and give this collection to the public. Several merchants are at present trying to prevail on me to sell them but as I said, they must be kept intact, and never sold to a dealer.[318]

Although, the Carnegie Institute did not purchase the Cloisters, Barnard succeeded in selling his *Prodigal Son,* a smaller version than the one displayed at the Armory Show, and his *Urn of Life* to the museum.[319] A decade after the display of his Harrisburg marble statuary at the Paris Salon of 1910, Barnard again solicited the Carnegie Institute to become the repository of the

---

[318] Barnard to Beatty, June 1918. "Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art Records, 1883-1962, Bulk 1885-1940."

[319] In a letter from May 2, 1918, Barnard wrote to Beatty about the *Prodigal Son*: "I have always held this group at $15,000, but am in need of money to meet mortgages on the Cloisters land, and shall be glad to sell it for $8000. It is one of my most carefully finished marbles, as you will realize when you see it cleaned. It was carefully pointed from the same size cast, the original statue for the larger group on the Capitol Building. I carried out this group while the larger group was being completed in clay, and it has delicate surfaces proper to a small figure, that are not necessary to the larger work." *Urn of Life* was sold by Barnard to the Carnegie Museum in 1919, and the sculptor redesigned the base of the sculpture for display at the museum. About the purchase of these works see "Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art Records, 1883-1962, Bulk 1885-1940."

plaster casts of his monumental groups for *Life of Humanity* that were still at his former studio in Moret-sur-Loing:

> I need the money very much at once as I have just had word that the one hundred plaster statues the original studies for the Penn Capitol groups are to be dispossessed of their garage in Moret France, where they have been stored since 1911. They form the most valuable documents of that Capitol work and I dread to lose them, unless I send by cable money at once $3,000. They cannot be saved as they must be boxed and shipped to America at once.[320]

Today there is no trace of those plaster casts. They were not purchased by the Carnegie Institute and were likely destroyed. The only versions that remain are the finished marble ensemble at the entrance of the Pennsylvania State Capitol in Harrisburg and the autonomous sculptures, such as *The Prodigal Son,* that originated from it. Before becoming one of the most ambitious examples of American sculpture, *Life of Humanity* was a complex transnational enterprise, relying on both France and Italy as its context of production. To complete this work, Barnard made strategic use of the Paris Salon system in various ways: in the emulation of sculptural motifs, in its exhibition and critical apparatus, as well as in the production process of his work, which included collaboration with the French labor force. Both as a monumental grouping and as individual gallery-size sculptures, *Life of Humanity* embodies the commercial and aesthetic goals of the sculptor, whose appropriative strategies in France, both inside the Paris Salons system and outside it, as a dealer of French antiquities, ensured his recognition in his home country.

---

[320] Barnard to Beatty, July 20, 1920. "Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art Records, 1883-1962, Bulk 1885-1940."

3.4 Conclusion

At the 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition, Rodin's *The Thinker* was on display in the Hall of Sculptures among works by his contemporaries, including Yrurtia's *The Sinners*, as shown in the photograph discussed at the beginning of this chapter **(see figure 40)**. However, Rodin was not merely an exhibitor among others. He was also a member of the jury that selected the artworks for the French delegation at the fair. Not limited to the realm of the Paris Salons, Rodin's influential power expanded internationally as well. And while the Paris Salons contributed to the making of individual careers through its system of jury and awards, the world's fairs served as a forum for nations to project their power and domination. Unlike the Salons, the world's fairs promoted the agendas of the nations over those of the artists, as analyzed in the case of the disagreement between Yrurtia, the sculptor, and Schiaffino, the Argentinian nation's delegate, over the award of the gold medal at the 1904 Saint Louis Exposition. Nations selected the best creations of their national artists for the world's fairs and competed for exhibition space on the grounds of the fair. For instance, in November 1903, the French general commissioner for the Saint Louis Exposition, Michel Lagrave, was satisfied "that the sites reserved for France are much more important than those granted to other foreign powers," enclosing a map of the grounds of the fair in his letter to Rodin.[321]

France was set to be in a strong position for the Louisiana Purchase Exposition. The commissioner of Fine Arts for the French government relied on Rodin's *The Thinker* to ensure the

[321] Michel Lagrave, general commissioner, to Rodin, November 6, 1903. "Je suis heureux de vous faire connaître […] que les emplacements réservés à la France sont beaucoup plus importants que ceux accordés aux autres puissances étrangères. » "Vertical File Etats-Unis - St Louis, Exposition" (Paris, France, n.d.), Archive, Musée Rodin.

country's success, until the French sculptor decided to withdraw his bronze from display a few days prior to the shipment of the works of the French delegation from the port of Le Havre to Saint Louis:

> I cannot believe that after so much expectation, so much effort, so many arrangements for the exhibition of sculpture in Saint Louis where your *Thinker* was to be the center, the keystone of my display, you would withdraw your work purely and simply, for a detail of chisel.[322]

The lost-wax bronze cast made by the Hébrard foundry house after Rodin's *The Thinker* did not satisfy the sculptor, who could not bear the idea of exhibiting the work at the event. The bronze eventually was shipped with the other works from the French delegation to Saint Louis, on January 30, 1904, but it was not put on display. Instead, Rodin had the plaster of *The Thinker* sent on a separate shipment to Saint Louis in March of that year.[323] The sculptor was hoping to later send another bronze of *The Thinker* on which Hébrard was working. This sculpture was probably not finished on time for display in Saint Louis, and the plaster became the sculpture shown at the fair. This was the over-life-size plaster of *The Thinker* that was eventually given as a gift by Rodin and André Saglio, the commissioner of Fine Arts for the French government at the 1904 Saint Louis international exhibition, to the Metropolitan Museum of Art after the conclusion of the show, thus disseminating Rodin's influence in North America **(figure 78)**.[324]

---

[322] André Saglio to Rodin, January 27, 1904. « Je ne peux croire qu'après tant d'attente, tant de dérangements, et tant de combinaisons pour l'exposition de la sculpture à Saint Louis où votre Penseur devait être mon centre, ma clé de voûte, vous me retiriez votre œuvre purement et simplement, pour un détail de ciseleur. » "Vertical File Etats-Unis - St Louis, Exposition."

[323] M. Horteloup to Rodin, March 11, 1904. "Vertical File Etats-Unis - St Louis, Exposition."

[324] On January 1st, 1905, the American sculptor Daniel Chester French, trustee of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, wrote a thank you letter to Rodin for his gift of *The Thinker*. "Vertical File Etats-Unis - St Louis, Exposition."

Exhibition catalogues often list an entry for each artwork on display, following the usual one-line description format of the artist's name, country, object number, title, and material. Instead of the condensed exhibition history of a given object, this chapter sought to unveil the various artistic, political, and commercial agendas of the many agents at play. Beyond the Paris Salons system, a network of international and national exhibitions participated in the circulation of artworks across borders. Shipping delays, material risks, and audiences' expectations feature significantly as key factors in understanding the context in which these objects traveled. The world's fairs, like the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, exported the Salons model overseas, but with different stakeholders, shifting from the artists to the nations' representatives, and these events operated in the context of rising nationalisms in which each country competed against one another.

Despite the fragility of sculptures, their weight, and the complex system of transporters, customs, and insurances to be navigated, Paris-based sculptors shipped their works overseas, participating in an internationalization of sculptures at the beginning of the twentieth century. The circulation of sculptures outside Paris compensated for the limitations of the medium of photography. Schiaffino asked Yrurtia to ship *The Sinners* to Buenos Aires, instead of sending the group directly to Saint Louis, to fulfill the need for an Argentinian audience and local commissioners to see his work in person, and to generate possibilities for the sculptor to receive commissions in his homeland. In the next chapter, I shift focus from the transit and materiality of the objects to the networks of people, issues of patronage, and the various expectations between sculptors and their commissioners in the early twentieth-century transatlantic context. I analyze the "aesthetic risks" faced by O'Connor and Yrurtia as they created monumental projects, *The Barry Monument* (1906-9) and *The People of the Revolution Marching* (1907-9), respectively, both

of which were made in their Paris studios and destined for competitions in their homelands, both of which would ultimately be failures.

4.0 Monumental Failures: Nationalism and Patronage in the Transatlantic World

On May 30, 1909, the front page of *The Washington Post* published photographs of the maquette of Andrew O'Connor's *Commodore Barry Monument*, under the heading "Too Irish For the Irish" written in bold capital letters **(figure 79)**.[325] Based in Paris, O'Connor had become the target of attacks by Irish American associations in Washington, D.C., who denounced his monumental project as unfit for public display in the capital of the United States. Although O'Connor had been awarded the Barry commission following a national competition, his monument was eventually rejected by its sponsor. The sculptor had transformed a monument to the Revolutionary War hero John Barry into an enormous and complex representation of Irish history and its American diaspora. Designed in Paris in 1906, and destined for Washington, D.C., this monumental project and the story of its failure demonstrate the tensions between the transnational artistic system of the Paris Salons and the enduring pull of national affiliation and patronage.

While the Salons functioned as a transnational ecosystem in which sculptors appropriated, circulated, and transformed sculptural motifs for their own works – as seen in chapter 2 – these same sculptors also depended on networks that connected them with their home countries. Capitalizing upon their recognition from the Paris Salons, international sculptors believed they had a role in developing the arts of their nations. Following his success at the 1894 Société nationale

---

[325] Owen Flanders, "Too Irish For the Irish", *The Washington Post*, May 30, 1909. "Records of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital. Records of the Barry Statue Commission." (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-42, National Archives.

des beaux-arts, George Grey Barnard returned to his homeland with the explicit desire to contribute to American art. In contrast, after his initial triumph at the Salon des artistes français, Rogelio Yrurtia chose to stay in Paris, where he created a monument for Buenos Aires to commemorate the Argentinian independence. Similarly, though also based in Paris, O'Connor entered the American competition to create a monument to Commodore Barry in Washington, D.C. These sculptors had to manage the different expectations of their patrons at home, who were in some cases less accepting of new artistic ideas. Consequently, the aesthetic risks that artists took could turn their projects into monumental failures.

At the same time that they produced conventional works, such as portrait busts and prototypical statues of white men on pedestals, modern sculptors created monuments that pushed the boundaries of figurative sculpture. With the confidence of commissions in hand, Barnard, Yrurtia, and O'Connor departed from their original projects and transformed them in various ways by developing ambitious processional groups for their home countries. Their monuments interpreted themes of human progress, labor, and exile, reflecting the sculptors' belief in the edifying function and moral value of public sculpture. Breaking away from the traditional statue of the hero standing on a pedestal, these Paris-based international sculptors developed modern allegories that reimagined collectivity and were dedicated to the history of a people – a community, a collectivity, or a nation.

Even though this chapter focuses on Yrurtia and O'Connor's monumental failures, Barnard also faced rejection with his Lafayette Monument, which he had transformed into a multi-figural ensemble. Before undertaking the statuary for the Pennsylvania State Capitol, Barnard had attempted to work on another transnational monument that marked his shift from "doing" statues to composing complex figurative sculptural groups. In this regard, Barnard's Lafayette project

shows affinities with the design of O'Connor's *Barry Monument*. Around 1899, Barnard created a model for a monument to Lafayette in collaboration with the American sculptor Paul Wayland Bartlett, with whom he had crossed paths in Paris. The monument was destined to be erected in the gardens of the Louvre in Paris, although the commissioning committee seems to have been based in Chicago. Bartlett was in charge of the equestrian statue, while Barnard worked on the accompanying groups that surrounded it.[326] Photographs of Barnard's groups illustrate the sculptor's interest in the narrative capacity of sculpture in his attempt to break away from the gestures of neoclassical models flanked with attributes **(figures 80-81)**.

Barnard's sculptures functioned as modern allegories in their multi-figural and elaborate groupings, here showing a horse and an ox leading a group of figures. These photographs of Barnard's clay models remain the only testimony of what this monument was intended to be. The project was eventually rejected by the architect in charge of the project, who preferred a simple equestrian statue rather than an ambitious sculptural group. In a letter to Bartlett, Barnard shared his disenchantment about the French architect at the Louvre who "has absolutely objected to having anything else than a simple equestrian statue and a pedestal purely architectural in character."[327] The statuary of the Pennsylvania State Capitol building in Harrisburg would provide

---

[326] Letter by George Grey Barnard, December 1899[?]. "Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

[327] Barnard to Paul Wayland Bartlett, July 25, 1899. "All of our plans for working together have been upset by the French architect of the Louvre – Mr. Redon. He has absolutely objected to having anything else than a simple equestrian statue and a pedestal purely architectural in character. […] I suppose the Chicago committee will be disappointed at not being able to erect a large monument. It is to be regretted that we did not know sooner the desires of the French in assigning this site as it would have saved us all a lot of trouble." "Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard."

Barnard with the opportunity to work on a high-profile international project. As he settled in France to undertake the work, Barnard developed his own vision of what a modern monument should be by rejecting the prototypical model of the individual heroic statue.

This chapter also analyzes the mechanisms of artistic patronage across the Atlantic in the turn of the century context of rising nationalisms. How did Paris-based international sculptors negotiate the gap between the transnational Salons system in Paris and their home countries? In their attempt to renew the language of sculpture, expatriate sculptors in Paris faced differing expectations about what constituted an acceptable monument for their audiences at home. This chapter explores both the dynamic potential and the stresses of the transnational artistic system at the turn of the twentieth century. Thanks to extensive archival research on Yrurtia's *People of the May Revolution Marching*, and O'Connor's *Commodore Barry Monument*, I reconstruct the stories of two monumental failures that created an alternative history of monumentality in Argentina and the United States.

In 1907, Yrurtia participated in an international competition to design a monument for Buenos Aires celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of Argentinian independence. The sculptor proposed a distinct type of monument that celebrated Argentina as a modern nation, trading the commemorative statue of a heroic figure for a multi-figural sculpture that emphasized the collective role of the Argentinian people in the nation's progress. Even though Yrurtia represented the national choice in this international competition, his detractors favored the Italianate sculptural tradition in vogue in Buenos Aires. In this chapter, I investigate how Yrurtia's project became the subject of local tensions between the *porteña* elite, represented by Eduardo Schiaffino who closely followed French critics and modern art from Paris, and the established Argentinian artistic sphere who preferred the Italian baroque tradition.

I compare the failure of Yrurtia's monumental project for the Argentinian revolution to O'Connor's *Barry Monument* that was also rejected. However, while Yrurtia represented the national choice in an international competition, O'Connor was disavowed by his fellow Irish Americans in a national competition among American sculptors of Irish descent. Moreover, Yrurtia was adamant about his patriotic role in the development of the arts in Argentina, whereas O'Connor was a cosmopolitan figure who lived in a perpetual state of self-imposed exile. A decade after the rejection of his *Barry Monument*, O'Connor repurposed his second model for the sculpture into a monument to *Justice* destined for the International Court of Justice in The Hague. The sculptor, who had used his Irish ethnicity to participate in the Barry competition, would then market his Americanness, and the American idea of his project, to appeal to the commissioners of the *Justice* statue, based in Washington, D.C.

4.1 Celebrating the Centennial of Argentina's Independence: Rogelio Yrurtia's *To My Homeland*

In 1910, Argentina celebrated the centenary of its independence marked by the May Revolution of 1810 and an international centennial exhibition took place in Buenos Aires.[328] This celebration became an inflection point in the transformation of the monumental landscape in the

[328] In May 1810, the first assembly of a temporary government was formed in Buenos Aires. It marked the start of a political autonomy that led to the declaration of independence in 1816. Marcela Ternavasio, *Historia de La Argentina 1806-1852*, Siglo veintiuno editores (Buenos Aires, 2009); Laura Malosetti Costa, "Arte e Historia en los festejos del Centenario de la Revolución de Mayo en Buenos Aires," *Caiana. Revista electrónica de Historia del Arte y Cultura Visual del Centro Argentino de Investigadores de Arte (CAIA)*, no. 1 (2012): 4.

capital city: A dozen statues to illustrious Argentinians were commissioned, and foreign collectivities donated public sculptures, such as the monuments to the Spanish and to the Germans on Avenue Alvear, the monument to the French in Recoleta, and the Tower of the English in plaza of the English in the Retiro. In addition, a few years prior, in 1907, an international competition for a commemorative monument of the May Revolution was organized. The monument was originally supposed to be inaugurated on May 25, 1910, on plaza de Mayo, the foundational site of Buenos Aires, as well as its political, financial, and administrative center. It was the first time that Argentina organized an international competition so broad in scope: Sculptors from all over Europe and the Americas sent proposals.

In total, seventy-four projects, each composed of a maquette and an accompanying essay, were submitted. In a letter to Schiaffino, Yrurtia commented on such widespread participation, describing the political calculations of the European leaders: "This competition captivated everyone, even the monarchs themselves, who demonstrated great determination and interest in the competition. Everyone wants for their subjects and for the art of their kingdom, the glory of triumph."[329] A selection committee was in charge of choosing five proposals for the competition. However, six projects were eventually selected.[330] Each maquette was made by a sculptor of a

[329] Yrurtia to Schiaffino, undated. "Este concurso ha revolucionado todo el mundo, sacando fuera de sí, hasta los monarcas mismos, quienes han tomado en la contienda gran empeño e interés. Cada uno desea para su súbdito y para el arte de su reino, la gloria del triunfo […]" "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[330] The maquettes were put on public display in the pavilions of the Sociedad Rural de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires on May 14, 1908. Decisions were made by the selection committee on June 5, 1908. The exhibition of the six semifinalist projects opened on May 24, 1909 in the same pavilion. "Comisión Nacional del Centenario de 1910" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

different nationality: the Spanish Miguel Blay y Fábrega (*1810-1816-1910*), the Belgian Jules Lagae (*Sun*), the Italians Luigi Brizzolara and Gaetano Moretti (*Pro Patria et libertate*), the French Paul Gasq (*Ocean*), and the German Gustavo Eberlein (*Fortes Fortuna adjuvant*). The additional sixth project was Yrurtia's triumphal arch. Schiaffino had used his influence among the jury members to make sure that the maquette of the Argentinian sculptor would be included in the competition.[331]

Yrurtia's original model for the monument to the Argentinian Revolution relied heavily on the tradition of monumental sculpture from antiquity. A triumphal arch, crowned with an allegory of *Liberty*, was accompanied on both sides by the figures of *Justice* and *Force* **(figure 82)**. Centrally located under the arch, *Revolution* represented the uprising of the people of Argentina and was certainly the most innovative element of the monument. On each side, two other sculptural groupings, *Fraternity* and *Progress*, supplemented the central sculpture. A series of drawings highlights the sculptor's artistic process and experimentations with different architectural variations on the motif of the arch **(figures 83-86)**: from a temple-like structure, with an altar in front of which *Revolution* took the center stage, to a massive architectural framework, leaving minimal space for sculpture. Yrurtia played with the concept of the triumphal Greco-Roman arch

[331] Malosetti Costa, "Arte e Historia en los festejos del Centenario de la Revolución de Mayo en Buenos Aires," 5; Erika Loiácono, "Festejos monumentales en 1910: el pueblo de mayo en marcha de Rogelio Yrurtia," in *Revista de Artes*, vol. 22, Avances (Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Córdoba, Argentina: Centro de Producción e Investigación en Artes de la Facultad de Artes / Centro de Investigaciones de la Facultad de Filosofía y Humanidades, 2012), 103–19. Loiácono analyzes the reasons why Yrurtia was included in the final phase of the competition and investigates the place occupied by Argentinian art in the elite ideology of Buenos Aires at the time.

in an attempt to reinterpret this symbol of military victory in the commemorative context of the Argentinian independence.

Traditionally dedicated to a military hero, the triumphal arch was repurposed by the sculptor into a collective monument to the people, the Argentinian nation. It took Yrurtia numerous iterations to transform his project of triumphal arch into a complex compositional monument where the original group *Revolution* expanded into a large procession of figures on its own pedestal. The arch itself became more classical in style and less ornamented with only two figures standing in decorative niches. However, Yrurtia made autonomous the accompanying group, formerly *Revolution*, now known as *The People of the May Revolution Marching,* therefore setting apart his project from the prototypical commemorative monuments in the competition **(figures 87-88)**. In the final model, the triumphal arch stands alone, its central bay opened. Placed in front of it, a procession of men and women, on horse or on foot, march in celebration. Raised on top of a pedestal, ornamented with scenes of historical Argentinian battles on each side and allegorical groups on both ends, the people of Argentina have become the hero, about to march under the triumphal arch on their road to glory.

Yrurtia's ambition was to construct "the first triumphal arch in America,"[332] a celebration of the Latinate character of the Argentinian nation. The arch was planned to measure forty-three meters high, just two meters shorter than the Arc de Triomphe in Paris. [333] A twenty-four-meter-long processional group of forty figures was positioned in front of the arch. This processional

---

[332] Yrurtia to Schiaffino, undated. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[333] Press cutting, undated, "La obra del escultor argentino Irurtia para el concurso de 1910." "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Casa de Yrurtia.

group called *People of the May Revolution Marching* was placed in such a way that it gave the viewer the impression that the group was about to pass under the triumphal arch: a clear example of Yrurtia's interplay between sculpture, architecture, and site. In his project for a monument to labor, for instance, started around the same time, Yrurtia would again deploy a processional group that was initially planned to pass under a triumphal arch. But the arch was later abandoned by the sculptor who wanted to better emphasize the expressivity of the figures.[334]

For the second part of the competition, the six finalists submitted the maquette of their final project to the committee. At that time, Yrurtia was based in Paris, where he had worked for four years on the design of his monument to the May Revolution. He worried that he would not be ready on time to submit his project to the commission and asked for a two-month extension to carve the group in stone. Yrurtia argued that the movement of the figures with their limbs extended was extremely fragile and that the plaster maquette could not be shipped to Buenos Aires because of the risk of damage – the sculptor did not want to run another risk after his sculpture *The Sinners* had been destroyed during its transportation from Buenos Aires to Paris, as seen in Chapter 3.[335] The maquette of Yrurtia's monument to the May Revolution, made of stone from Paris, remained unfinished, as suggested by the point marks on some of the bodies of the back figures and the

[334] Yrurtia to Schiaffino, January 11, 1916. "He desistido del arcado que había previsto primitivamente, considerando que no responde, ni a la idea general ni al conjunto decorativo, que lo habría con toda seguridad empequeñecido. Lo que he conseguido es algo humano -eternamente humano- y que seguirá siéndolo tanto que los hombres sean hombres." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[335] Yrurtia's notes, undated sheet of paper. MCY-ME 99. "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Casa de Yrurtia.

traces of unfinished carving of some faces, but it constitutes the only material record of the monument today.[336]

People of the May Revolution Marching shows a frantic group of female and male figures in the nude riding forth on horseback or marching, led by a figure carrying a shield with the coat of arms of Argentina **(figure 89)**. On both ends, leaping horses frame a procession of people whose contorted bodies intermingle in a frenetic dance. The poses and the movements of the figures are not conventionally sculptural. Seen from the side, back, and front, these bodies "detach" themselves from the block of stone. Unbalanced on the top of their toes, these figures push forward as a collective force, expressing a rhythm of dance, joy, and freedom. Yrurtia described his group as "the scream of triumph - of youth, of enthusiasm […] At the front, an epic march - leading the national shield to triumph, next, on the right, the youth bring in ostentation the flag, and beyond, the hymn. On the left, the dance - symbol of happiness, and finally protection."[337] Like Barnard and O'Connor, Yrurtia rejected the neoclassical mode of emblems and attributes. Instead, he represented a large group of nude figures whose interacting, energetic bodies turned into a metaphor for the celebration of the young, hopeful, and united nation.

Yrurtia's interest in the expressive power of the body under stress also characterizes his sculptural group *Impression of Wagner's Music*, in which the gestures of the nude bodies are

---

[336] The sculpture is today in the collection of the Museo Casa Yrurtia in Buenos Aires.

[337] Yrurtia to the President of the Commission of the Centenary, Paris, April 1, 1909. "Este grupo […] significa, un grito del Triunfo -de juventud, de entusiasmo. Varias partes lo componen: delante, una marcha épica, -conduciendo el escudo nacional en triunfo, a continuación, por la derecha la juventud llevando en ostentación la bandera y más atrás el canto. Por la izquierda, la danza -símbolo de alegría y por fin la protección." "Comisión Nacional del Centenario de 1910" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

accentuated to the point of distortion **(figure 90)**. The whirls of the bodies, projected backwards, one over the other, create a composition in the round. One might define these bodies in torsion as "*rodinesque*," a reference to Rodin who used his *Gates of Hell* to disarticulate, and project sculptural bodies in the air, at times even reducing them to fragments, dependent on the viewer's point of view. In contrast to Rodin's project, where each figure is conceived in isolation, Yrurtia, in his *May Revolution* monument, was interested in how all these figures worked together. Although seen from different points of view, rotating, bending, and straining, each individual body becomes one, the body politic, caught in the same frenetic dance.

In May 1909, the maquettes of the finalists for the May Revolution competition were put on public display in the pavilion of the Rural Society of Buenos Aires. The Argentinian press circulated photographs of the exhibition, but Yrurtia's group was not featured among them. The photograph of the exhibition published in *Caras y Caretas* shows the Italian project – the very large-sized *maquette* in the center background – the French and German in the center, the Belgian cropped on the right, and on the left-hand side, the Spanish project, but there is no trace of Yrurtia's monument **(figure 91)**.[338] Moreover, although Yrurtia's project was the biggest among all the monuments presented, it appeared smaller than the other projects in other illustrated magazines. In the supplement of the journal *La Nación*, the scales of the projects were changed in favor of the Belgian Lagaes's. This misleading illustration was condemned by Schiaffino, who advocated for

[338] "El monumento a la Revolución de Mayo – Los bocetos definitivos", *Caras y Caretas*, Buenos Aires, June 26, 1909, no. 560.

an accurate representation of Yrurtia's model in the Argentinian press.[339] Some jury members criticized Yrurtia's project for its scale, arguing that it would be too large to fit in its destined setting on Plaza de Mayo, but Yrurtia was "convinced that an object, of such style and grand majesty, at the same time expressive and triumphal, could not but harmoniously complete the scenery of the place."[340]

Conceived and carved in Paris, Yrurtia's stone maquette for the monument to the Revolution was not exhibited publicly in the French capital, a missed opportunity for the Argentinian sculptor.[341] Having asked for an extension to complete the composition in stone, the sculptor was probably late to ship it to Buenos Aires.[342] However, some French critics did see Yrurtia's maquette in the artist's studio, such as Charles Morice, who had written on Yrurtia's *The Sinners* at the Salon a few years prior. He noted that the project of triumphal arch, signed by a son of the country, was "a work essentially national, patriotic."[343] Although Morice only saw

---

[339] Although Yrurtia's project was the biggest, it appeared smaller than Eberlein's, one of the smaller, and the same size of Blay's, the smallest. Schiaffino, draft of letter, June 24, 1909. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[340] Yrurtia to Schiaffino, undated. "Estoy convencido que una masa, de estilo, de majestuosidad grande al mismo tiempo que expresiva y triunfal, no podría sino completar armónicamente el decorado del lugar." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[341] In her article, Laura Costa Malosetti says that the *maquette* was exhibited publicly in Paris, but this is not the case. Malosetti Costa, "Arte e Historia en los festejos del Centenario de la Revolución de Mayo en Buenos Aires," 6.

[342] I have not found any archival record about when the maquette eventually got to Argentina.

[343] Charles Morice published two articles praising Yrurtia's project in *Le Mercure de France* on March 16, 1909, and in *Paris Journal* on April 25, 1909. Charles Morice, in *Le Mercure de France*, I-III-1909, quoted and translated in Spanish in Ministerio de educación y justicia, *El Monumento a La Revolución de Mayo. Dos Proyectos de Rogelio*

photographic reproductions of the five other contenders, he considered the models presented by Yrurtia's competitors theatrical and formulaic, unfit to represent the Argentinian homeland.[344] Morice's articles were circulated in the Argentinian press, in *El Diario* and *La Razón*, where they were translated into Spanish.[345] The French critic emphasized the joyful and jubilant aspect of Yrurtia's sculpture, which instead of evoking images of violence and homicide, celebrated the independence of the Argentinian people who are dancing naked in a peaceful crowd.[346]

In Buenos Aires, an elite circle of artists and intellectuals gave their support to Yrurtia's project. The magazine *Athinae*, spokesman of artists and students from the Academia Nacional de Bellas Artes, dedicated an important photographic dossier to Yrurtia accompanied by an article by Malharro in April of 1909, celebrating Yrurtia after the first round of selection by the committee.[347] Building upon Morice's comments, the Argentinian journalists emphasized Yrurtia's ability to capture the spirit of the nation in his project:

Yrurtia (Buenos Aires: Museo Casa de Yrurtia, 1959). "se trata aquí, de una obra esencialmente nacional, patriótica, que no llegara a tener verdadero sentido si no está firmada por un hijo del país."

[344] See Charles Morice's article "Art et Patrie" in *Paris Journal* translated and published in *La Razón*, May 14, 1909.

[345] Charles Morice' articles were published in Spanish in the issues of May 15 and May 21, 1909 of *El Diario* in Argentina. On May 14, 1909, *La Razón* published in Spanish Charles Morice's article "Art et Patrie" from the *Paris Journal*.

[346] Charles Morice's article "Art et Patrie" from the *Paris Journal* published in May 14, 1909 in *La Razón*. "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Casa de Yrurtia. "en torno de este aparato de apoteosis, él no ha evocado las imágenes de violencia, ni del homicidio: a la independencia de su pueblo, él ha dado por único defensor su mismo pueblo, una multitud desnuda, pacífica, dichosa, que se prepara para desfilar bajo la bóveda gloriosa de un ritmo de danza."

[347] Martín Malharro, "Rogelio Yrurtia", *Athinae*, second year, no. 8, April 1909, 5-9.

> Rogelio Irurtia, the national artist *par excellence*, is the only one among the participating sculptors in the joust, who, thanks to his profoundly Argentinian soul and his extraordinary talent, has found inside of himself the symbol adapted to our idiosyncrasy of young people: the ascending march towards eternal progress. [348]

Here, the journalist Sebastián F. Viviani used the term "*pueblo*" to refer to the people of Argentina, instead of "*nación*" or "nation," perhaps referring to the various ethnicities that composed Argentina, indigenous populations and European immigrants alike. According to these critics, Yrurtia's nationality played an essential role in the success of his monumental project, but his detractors also used this same nationality against Yrurtia.

As early as August 5, 1908, Yrurtia wrote in a letter to Schiaffino, "Today I know the fight that I have to wage, what resistance to overcome, in order to extricate myself not only from such vulgarity, but also from this strange current of animosity, which I did not know existed against my person."[349] An anonymous article published in *El Diario* casted doubt upon the Argentinian nationality of Yrurtia, arguing that despite the fact that the sculptor was born in Buenos Aires, his

---

[348] Sebastián F. Viviani, "El concurso para el Monumento Nacional", *Athinae*, Buenos Aires, June 1909, no. 10, 9-15. "Rogelio Irurtia, el artista nacional por excelencia, es el único entre los escultores participantes a la justa, que merced a su alma profundamente argentina y a su extraordinario talento ha encontrado dentro de si el símbolo adaptado a nuestra idiosincrasia de pueblo joven: la marcha ascendente hacia el eterno progreso." The critic concluded his article with Charles Morice's quote: "Since the Argentinian Republic has the good fortune to have among its sons one of the best sculptors of its time, they would honor him twice, by entrusting him the interests of their glory."

[349] Yrurtia to Schiaffino, August 5, 1908, from Paris, 83 rue de la Tombe Issoire. "Se hoy recién, la lucha que tuvo que sostener, las resistencias que vencer, para sacarme no solo de tanta vulgaridad, sino también de una corriente de animosidad rara, que no sabía existía hacia mi persona." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

parents were of Basque origins and that his paternal family had emigrated to Uruguay.[350] In the second half of the nineteenth century, Argentina had welcomed tens of thousands of Basque immigrants, though they were less numerous than immigrants of other Spanish regions, such as Galicia, Cataluña, and Andalucía.[351] Facing this hateful campaign against his perceived lack of patriotism, Yrurtia changed the title of his project from "Triumphal Arch" to "To my homeland:"

> During this time, I knew that I was embattled in my homeland, the subject of a hateful campaign, which I understand cannot be but the work of a few enemies, worried that their interests are put in danger by my presence in the competition. That is why I did not give more importance to some publications about my nationality and I have thought of answering by changing the theme of my project, which instead of "Triumphal Arch," will be "To my homeland."[352]

With this new title, Yrurtia aimed to show his homeland that "all the efforts that I did and do in Europe are for the art and culture of Argentina."[353]

---

[350] Loiácono, "Festejos monumentales en 1910: el pueblo de mayo en marcha de Rogelio Yrurtia," 115. She refers to Juan de Zuria, "De nuestra estirpe: Rogelio Yrurtia, máximo artista argentino", *Euzko-Deya*, Buenos Aires, 20.1.1943, 6-7, and to Jorge F. Beramendi, *Rogelio Yrurtia*. Buenos Aires, Fundación Juan de Garay, 2009, 13-19.

[351] See Azcona, José Manuel (ed), *Emigración vasca a Argentina,* Vitoria, Publications du Gouvernement basque, 1992, 273-288; Macías Hernández, Antonio, "La emigración española a América (1500-1914)", Eiras Roel Antonio (ed.), *Emigración española y portuguesa a América*, vol. 1, Alicante, Institut d'Etudes Juan de Garay, 1991, 33-60.

[352] Yrurtia to Schiaffino, undated. "Durante este tiempo, supe se me combatía en mi tierra, con una campana odiosa, que comprendo no puede ser sino la obra de algunos enemigos, inquietos de la suerte de sus intereses que peligran en el concurso con mi presencia. Por esto no he dado mayor importancia a ciertas publicaciones que se han hecho acerca de mi nacionalidad y que he pensado responder con el cambio de tema de mi proyecto, que sea en lugar de 'arco de triunfo', el de 'A mi patria'." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[353] *Ibidem*. "de mis esfuerzos que hice y hago en Europa por el arte y la cultura argentina."

In Buenos Aires, the circle of intellectuals who supported Yrurtia's project anxiously awaited the jury's decision.[354] A week before the announcement, Godofredo Daireaux, a writer who published in major Argentinian newspapers, including *La Nación*, *Caras y Caretas* and *La Prensa*, informed Yrurtia that the jury had made no decision, but among those in the know, his project beat the other ones without comparison. However, Daireaux also mentioned that some of the jury members seemed to misunderstand his project, as they thought that the processional group of figures was intended to be placed on top of the arch.[355]

Not long after the jury selected the work of the Italians Moretti and Brizzolara, Schiaffino declared: "Today is a day of mourning for our nation's art. […] The maquette of our Yrurtia is so far removed from those of the other five attendees – in vulgar, worn forms, without passion or apotheosis that can serve to commemorate any similar event."[356] Here, Schiaffino points out the difference between the more conventional type of the triumphal monument deployed by the five competitors and the modern allegorical mode of representation of Yrurtia's maquette. Deeply embedded in the Italian baroque tradition, Moretti and Brizzolara's monument celebrated the

[354] Yrurtia's project for the monument to Independence was expected by his fellow Argentinians. See the press article "Ultima hora" from June 16, 1909, sent by Delcasse to Yrurtia.

[355] Daireaux to Yrurtia, July 2, 1909. "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

[356] Schiaffino to Fusoni, July 11, 1909. "Cuando leí la noticia del veredicto me dije: este es un día de duelo para el arte nacional. De un jurado hibrido no podía resultar más que un veredicto injusto. No merece otro calificativo. El boceto de nuestro Yrurtia se distancia tanto de los de los otros cinco concurrentes – de formas vulgares, gastadas, sin pasión ni apoteosis que pueden servir para conmemorar cualquier suceso análogo – que la discusión no hubiera sido necesaria, y la duda era imposible. Solo en nuestra tierra, y para […], suceden estas cosas que causan doler el alma." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

apotheosis of the Independence **(figure 92)**. The Argentinian flag crowns a giant pillar decorated with narrative bas-reliefs depicting battles, heroes, and other foundational events of Argentina, and additional allegorical groupings surround its base.[357] Following the Italianate monumental tradition, each gesture and posture of the figures contribute to the unity of the composition and a clear goal, in contrast with the modern allegorical language developed by Yrurtia and his contemporaries, in which the movements of the bodies do not rely on the codified language of emblems and attributes.

Schiaffino's disappointment with his own country was such that he even suggested the idea of promoting a popular subscription to erect Yrurtia's monument in one of the best public sites of the city as an homage to the "Argentinian genius and a national protest."[358] This idea never materialized, even though Yrurtia's project remained part of the visual culture in Buenos Aires, as demonstrated by a picture of the stone group *The People of the May Revolution Marching* that made the front cover of the journal *Pallas* three years later **(figure 93)**.[359] After Yrurtia's project was rejected, Argentinian intellectuals voiced their support for the artist. Among them, the historian Carlos Zuberbühler exclaimed that he was against the trend of having Europeans make monuments in Buenos Aires, and argued that Argentinian sculptors should be picked to create

---

[357] Even though selected by the Commission of the Centenary of 1910, the project was eventually never completed, and no monument to the May Revolution was erected. "Comisión Nacional del Centenario de 1910" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[358] Schiaffino to Fusoni, July 11, 1909. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[359] *Pallas*, Buenos Aires, May 15, 1912, no.1.

monuments for their homeland.[360] This commentary is emblematic of the nationalistic feelings among some members of the *porteña* society in the early years of the twentieth century who sought to give a more prominent role to Argentinian artists. Schiaffino was also a fervent defender of Yrurtia, denouncing the attacks against Yrurtia in national media and encouraging his peers to publish the Spanish translation of Charles Morice's article in the Argentinian press so that the public would hear from different points of view.[361]

The competition for the monument to the May Revolution sparked a controversy in the Argentinian art world as it brought to the forefront questions of patriotism and artistic nationalism. Yrurtia's proposed project confronted the grand Italian monumental tradition so entrenched at that time in Buenos Aires, best represented by the Argentinian sculptor Lola Mora (1866-1936), whose large ornamental *Fountain of the Nereids* had been inaugurated in Buenos Aires in 1903 **(figure 94)**.[362] At first glance, there seems to be some affinities between Yrurtia's monument and Mora's fountain in the ways the bodies of their figures are twisting, and their limbs extended and under stress. But while the postures and the gestures in the fountain constitute coherent elements necessary to the action, such as in controlling the horse's bridle and holding up the clamshell, in Yrurtia's maquette the gesticulating bodies do not serve a unity of purpose. Their contortions

---

[360] Rogelio Yrurtia, *Monumento a la Independencia*, 1909. This publication is based on the text published by Zuberbühler in the newspaper *La Nación* on July 19, 1906. "Los artistas llamados a ejecutar los monumentos nacionales deben ser argentinos."

[361] Charles Morice' articles were translated in Spanish in the issues of May 15 and May 21, 1909 of *El Diario*.

[362] On Lola Mora, see Patricia Corsani, "Conquistas e intenciones de una escultora argentina. Algunos conflictos en torno a Lola Mora y Eduardo Schiaffino", in *IV Jornadas Nacionales de Investigación en Arte y Arquitectura en Argentina,* La Plata, 2006, 1-8. http://sedici.unlp.edu.ar/handle/10915/38610 ; Patricia Corsani, *Lola Mora: El Poder del Mármol: Obra Pública en Buenos Aires, 1900-1907* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Vestales, 2009).

appear pushed to extremes, emphasizing a kind of excess of joy and expressing some inner energy, instead of complying with an external iconographic program.

With his triumphal arch for the monument to the independence, Yrurtia broke away from the conventional commemorative monuments that populated Buenos Aires at the time. Despite his unassailable Argentinian citizenship, his "*Argentinianess*" was pursued as a line of attack by his detractors as a way to undermine his aesthetic choices, which alienated the Argentinian artistic establishment because they did not correspond to the local expectations of a commemorative monument based on an Italianate model. After the rejection of his project, Yrurtia was still convinced that his proposal was the only one in the competition that responded to "our apotheosis - our triumph [as a nation]."[363] He confessed that he was very saddened by the negative attacks in the press "whose only goal was to destroy [him]."[364] Yrurtia would, however, pursue his efforts to earn recognition in his homeland, supported by his friends who encouraged him to transform the monumental landscape in Buenos Aires, where "countless statues to great men are threatening us from everywhere."[365] Yrurtia would not abandon the idea of creating a monument to commemorate Argentinian independence. Starting in 1923, after his return to Buenos Aires, the sculptor developed a new project, very different from his earlier work for the 1907 competition, this time

---

[363] Yrurtia to Schiaffino, August 30, 1909. "Sigo creyendo siempre como usted que es el único de los proyectos [Yrurtia's] presentado en el concurso que responde a nuestra apoteosis, a nuestro triunfo." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[364] *Ibidem.* "con el solo fin de destruirme"

[365] Daireaux to Yrurtia, March 31, 1910. "nos sentimos nerviosos de que todavía no haya venido de usted alguno de esos trozos que lo harán triunfar en su patria. […] nos lluevan las innumerables estatuas de prohombres que nos están amenazando por todos lados" "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

composed of a large column at the base of which was a "Temple for the Homeland" to be located Plaza de Mayo. Again, the project was not completed, but Yrurtia kept transforming it until 1949, and called it the "Hymn to the Victory" of Argentina.[366]

4.2 Sculpting the Irish Exile: O'Connor's *Monument to Commodore John Barry*

Yrurtia was not the only expatriate sculptor who, following success in Paris, would encounter resistance, and stare down rejection in his homeland. In the first decade of the twentieth century, the Irish-American sculptor Andrew O'Connor also struggled to have his project for a Commodore Barry monument accepted by his patrons in Washington, D.C. O'Connor's Irish ethnicity added a layer of complexity to his identity and provided him with a major opportunity in 1906 when he won a competition, only available to Irish descendants, to design a monument to Commodore John Barry, an Irish-American hero of the Revolutionary War. John Barry (1745-1803), born in Ireland to a family of poor farmers, emigrated to the United States, and rose from being a cabin boy on a ship to becoming one of the founding fathers of the American Navy. Initiated by the Irish societies of the United States, the project was carried out under the supervision of the War Department.[367]

---

[366] Ministerio de educación y justicia, *El Monumento a La Revolución de Mayo. Dos Proyectos de Rogelio Yrurtia*.

[367] It was also part of a series of memorials that were built by the government authorities in Washington, D.C., to different heroes in American history who were of foreign birth. For instance, a monument to Thaddeus Kosciusko, a Polish engineer, made by the Polish sculptor Antoni Popiel, was dedicated in 1910 on the northeastern corner of Lafayette Park, in Washington, D.C. "Records of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital. Records of the Barry Statue Commission." (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-42, National Archives.

Their first choice was to give the commission to Augustus Saint-Gaudens, a sculptor of Irish and French descent. A well-established artist at that time, Saint-Gaudens refused to undertake the project for the proposed budget of $50,000 but offered to do it instead for the sum of $90,000. Unable to raise the funds, the commission decided to organize a competition among other artists of Irish descent. The Irish societies were consulted by the War Department regarding which artists to permit entry, and they reserved the right to decide the eligibility of the sculptors in the competition. A list of eligible sculptors was drafted, and artists were asked to submit a model for the statue of Barry. In January of 1909, a jury of three artists inspected the models put on display on the fifth floor of the War Department.[368] O'Connor's model won first place, beating out submissions from Jerome Connor (1874-1943) and John Flanagan (1865-1952).[369]

Created in O'Connor's studio in Clamart, a suburb of Paris, the plaster maquette for the Barry monument was shipped to Washington, D.C., where it was displayed with other models selected for the competition. In the exhibition hall, O'Connor's ambitious compositional ensemble stands out among the heroic statues perched on top of pedestals and flanked by allegorical figures **(figure 95)**. O'Connor's original project included the figure of Barry at the center of a large architectural platform where a balustrade and a basin of water separated the figure from a long altar decorated with a frieze, from which emerged two freestanding sculptural groups on both sides. Working on a bas-relief frieze was not new to O'Connor's artistic practice, since his first monumental commission consisted of a frieze of the Old and New Testaments on the lintel of the

[368] The three artists were D. H. Burnham, Francis D. Millet, and Herbert Adams, and their report was unanimous. "Records of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital. Records of the Barry Statue Commission." (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-42, National Archives.

[369] *Ibidem*

Vanderbilt Memorial in New York City **(figure 96)**. However, the frieze and the two freestanding groups of the Barry maquette transformed the work from a simple hero monument into a memorial about the traumatic experience and difficult history of the Irish diaspora.

Coupled with the two freestanding groups, the bas-relief was to be read from right to left, from east to west, and depicted the history of Ireland and its inhabitants, subjects of the British Empire, leaving for America **(figure 97)**.[370] Based on the surviving large-scale plaster model in the family collection, the right side of the frieze begins with a mass of roughly defined forms, composed of hands and limbs, which take the shape of entangled bodies who, crawling on the floor and reaching toward the west, were described by O'Connor as "the rude uncivilized children of Erin." The sense of confusion and the enhanced expressivity of the gestures are reminiscent of the shipwreck depicted in Théodore Géricault's *Raft of Medusa*, and refer also to the tradition of the narrative bas-relief developed by François Rude (1784-1855).

As the composition develops, the light of Christianity appears in the form of Saint Patrick the apostle baptizing King Aengus. Peaceful times are represented by the harmonious groupings of figures where a couple is embracing, and a musician plays a harp. Then comes the Christian King Brian Boroimhe expelling the Danes, or the Vikings, who had invaded and had held his people in bondage. Another chaotic scene depicts a mass of figures fleeing, while the last segment of the frieze portrays a group of invading warriors who opened the way for the overwhelming forces of the English king and the consequent subjection of the children of Erin who, in their distress, look longingly toward the west. Running along the capstone of the frieze is the rope ornament found on the ancient memorial crosses of the island, and, on this, at intervals, appear

[370] Kirk Savage, *Monument Wars: Washington, D.C., the National Mall, and the Transformation of the Memorial Landscape* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 204.

four shamrocks symbolizing the four counties of Christian Ireland: Ulster, Munster, Leicester and Connaught.

The freestanding group on the right side of the altar depicts an allegory of Erin, the Irish motherland, an embodiment of the vicissitudes of exile and victimhood **(figure 98)**. This sculptural group, gathered at the bow of a ship, is composed of the figure of Erin surrounded by her children, who are drowning in the waves around her. An outstretched human body acts as the hull of the boat. On the left side of the altar is the group of *The Exiles* **(figure 99)**.[371] The group of emigrants is led by a youth, whose shaded eyes are straining eagerly for the first signs of the promised land, symbolizes the exodus of the children of Erin to the land of liberty, of which the eagle, surmounting the frieze, is the emblem. Finally, behind the statue of Barry, a fountain of water protected by a balustrade recalls Barry's native country.

Although O'Connor's project was selected by the art commission, complaints arose from various Irish societies shocked by the depiction of the three naked Irish immigrants and the nude figures in the frieze. The controversy played out in the press as well, and O'Connor defended himself and his project in an interview in which he described his desire to remove any class markers from his figures, a statement that resonated with his own experience as an American of Irish descent:

> "I am of Irish descent and would be the last to submit a model that would reflect discredit on the Irish race. […] In the frieze they [the nude figures] represent the Irish people in the barbaric state, and gradually are brought down to Barry, who shows its highest type. We

---

[371] "Records of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital. Records of the Barry Statue Commission." (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-42, National Archives. The group was described by O'Connor as: "The group of emigrants led by a youth, whose shaded eyes are straining eagerly for the first signs of the promised land symbolizes the exodus of the children of Erin to the land of liberty." A small plaster model of this group exists, in which the arm of the leading male figure is now only suggested by the metal wire, which structures the sculpture.

can't, and I won't deck out barbarians in Directoire gowns nor picture hats. As to the nude figures in the emigrant group, they are undraped. Were they draped they would thus be put in a class. Undraped they stand man to man, woman to woman equal to those of any race. I can't put Greek draperies on them and I won't put rags. […]"[372]

The Ancient Order of Hibernians in America also protested the adoption of what they designated the "Paris model" of the Commodore Barry.[373] The figure of Barry was criticized by some Irish-American organizations as "a Bowery swaggering tough" unfit to the representation of a dignified American commander.[374] Commodore John Barry is depicted standing on a sloping plinth, his right foot slightly in front of the left, the heel of the foot emerging from the base, balancing the posture **(figure 100)**. His arms hang straight down on each side of his body. The left side of his open coat catches the roar of the sea wind. He wears a scarf on top of a buttoned-up blouse, with pockets on both sides. His clothes are carefully detailed; even the folds created by the movement of his feet in his boots are depicted. The commodore's face is turned slightly to his right, where he gazes fiercely. His hair is brought together in the back of his head in a neat ponytail. His eyes are clearly marked by two distinctive V-shaped eyebrows, his nose is straight, and his face punctuated by two prominent cheekbones, and a small, closed mouth.

Everything about this figure—from the slightly elevated heel and the wrinkles in the coat to the oversized hands curled into fists and his facial expression—emphasizes strength and

---

[372] "Barry Sculptor Obstinate", *Washington Star*, March 21, 1909.

[373] Letter from the Ancient Order of Hibernians of America, Ladies's Auxiliary, to the Commission of Fine Arts, December 7, 1909. "Records of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital. Records of the Barry Statue Commission." (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-42, National Archives.

[374] Letter by the Irish Associations to Chairman and Gentlemen of the Barry Statue Commission. April 7, 1909. "Records of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital. Records of the Barry Statue Commission." (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-42, National Archives.

resolution. However, O'Connor's decision not to represent Commodore Barry as either a stylized hero or as a "gentleman," like the other statues in Washington, D.C., sparked a major backlash. The Irish-American organizations expected "an American statue of an American naval officer"[375] that would compare with other statues in the city, such as La Fayette, Rochambeau, Farragut, or Garfield. To them, Barry should be represented as a dignified and traditional American war hero. Kirk Savage describes O'Connor's debt to Rodin's sculptural language "in the oversized hands and feet, the odd poses with straining necks and torsos, and the expressive surface modeling with its scooped-out hollows and prominent ridges that defied traditional anatomical realism."[376] Perhaps, it is this style, that some would call "*rodinesque,*" that elicited the criticism of the model. The innovative treatment of the figure did not correspond to expectations of "Americanness," unprecedented in the tradition of American portraiture.

Some Irish American societies criticized O'Connor's project for being a memorial to Ireland instead of being "patriotic and strictly American," as illustrated in the newspaper headline: "'Too Irish For the Irish,' A Statue too Irish for the Irish! Such is really the one and only great fault the Irish of the United States have to find with the design for a memorial statue to the memory of 'Fighting Jack' Barry, recently exhibited by the distinguished young Irish sculptor Andrew O'Connor, Jr,"[377] featured in the opening of this chapter **(see figure 79)**. To reach a compromise,

---

[375] See the petition about the Barry monument. Letter from the Office of the National Hibernian, received by the Secretary of War, February 19, 1909. "Records of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital. Records of the Barry Statue Commission." (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-42, National Archives.

[376] Savage, *Monument Wars*, 207.

[377] Owen Flanders, "Too Irish For the Irish", *The Washington Post*, May 30, 1909. "Records of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital. Records of the Barry Statue Commission." (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-42, National Archives.

the commission asked O'Connor to submit a second project, which would eliminate all architectural "accessories," implying the nude figures, and would use the heroic statue of Rochambeau in Lafayette square as its model **(figure 101)**.[378]

O'Connor's second project strictly respected the recommendations of the commission: standing on his deck, the marble statue of Barry was to be placed on a pedestal at the base of which two bronze figures would be erected **(figure 102)**. The Republic of America is represented by a nervous woman marching forward. Next to her, Ireland is depicted as a woman carrying the sacred fire of her race, which she cradles protectively in her hands. The harp of Erin is on her back. The two figures walk together, as shown by the movement of their drapery. The shield of the American navy protected by an eagle is above their heads **(figure 103)**.[379] Confident about his second model, O'Connor was nevertheless anxious about the deliberations of the selection committee, as he received numerous attacks directed against him personally.[380] On March 10, 1910, he received the letter of rejection of his two projects. The attacks not only targeted O'Connor's design but his

[378] Letter from March 31, 1909 accompanied with a photograph of Rochambeau's statue in Lafayette park. "Records of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital. Records of the Barry Statue Commission." (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-42, National Archives.

[379] Much like Rodin's *France* based on the portrait of his muse Camille Claudel, O'Connor modeled the face for *The Republic of America*, after his wife Jessie, who served as a model for many O'Connor's figures.

[380] O'Connor to the Commission, from Clamart, January 11, 1910. "Records of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital. Records of the Barry Statue Commission." (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-42, National Archives.

character. O’Connor was not seen as a respectable representative of the Irish Americans because he had abandoned his first wife and daughter to live in Paris with one of his models.[381]

After its display in Washington, D.C., the plaster maquette of O’Connor’s original model of the Barry monument was not returned to the sculptor in Paris.[382] A supporter of the project, Jeremiah O’Connor, who, despite his name was not related to Andrew O’Connor, proposed to keep the maquette in Washington, D.C., where he advocated for the work to be shown publicly. With the permission of the sculptor, Jeremiah O’Connor negotiated with Richard Rathbun, the director of the National Collection of Fine Arts, now the Smithsonian American Art Museum, to have the maquette enter the museum collection under the condition that it would be displayed in its galleries. “It gives me pleasure to present to the Museum the model of Mr. Andrew O’Connor’s design for the Barry Monument. The gift is made with the condition that, should the Museum withdraw the model from exhibition, I may take it back.”[383] Rathbun accepted the gift of O’Connor’s maquette

---

[381] The Committee of American-Irish societies to the Commission, June 26, 1909. “Records of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital. Records of the Barry Statue Commission.” (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-42, National Archives.

[382] Photographs are the only record that survive of O’Connor’s original *maquette* of the Barry monument. Plaster fragments of the bas-relief and the freestanding groups are dispersed in private collections, while figures of Commodore Barry in plaster and bronze are today in museums’ collections in Washington D.C. and Paris.

[383] In addition to the *maquette*, Jeremiah O’Connor gave “a perspective drawing, in water color, which Mr. O’Connor made to show the material to be used in executing the design, should, I think, be exhibited with the model, and I should be pleased to give it to the Museum under the above condition. It is about 3’ x 1-1/2’ and framed, and will be turned over, at any time, to any one whom you may send for it to my house.” Jeremiah O’Connor, 101 2d St. NE, Washington D.C., to Richard Rathbun, Director of the National Museum, April 11, 1910. Smithsonian Institution Archives, Record Unit 311, National Collection of Fine Arts, Office of the Director (Washington, D.C., n.d.) Box 14, Folder 7.

and a watercolor accompanying it, under the aforementioned condition.[384] One might speculate that both objects were put on display in the National Museum in the summer of 1910, but I was not able to find any trace of them after this date.

Meanwhile, the commission would instead ask the sculptor John J. Boyle (1851-1917) for a model of the Barry statue.[385] Boyle's monument, which stands today forgotten in Franklin Square in Washington, D.C., depicts Commodore Barry with supreme confidence of victory, as he surveys the horizon prepared for action **(figure 104)**. His orders grasped in his right hand; he rests firmly on the hilt of his sword. Beneath him, adorning the face of the pedestal, an allegory of *Victory* stands on the bow of a vessel. The marble figure whose sword is sheathed in peace, holds a laurel in her right hand and is accompanied by an eagle, the American emblem of liberty. This monument could not be more conventional: A heroic man standing on a pedestal is accompanied by an allegorical figure, immediately recognizable by her attributes. Boyle's monument constitutes the perfect example of what Barnard would call "doing statues," and stands as a complete antithesis of O'Connor's *Barry*.

With the involvement of various Irish societies, the competition for the Barry monument had turned into a political affair and angered art organizations and artists who respected the initial

---

[384] R. Rathbun, Assistant Secretary in charge of National Museum, to Jeremiah O'Connor, 101 2d St., N. E., Washington D.C., April 18, 1910. Smithsonian Institution Archives, Record Unit 311, National Collection of Fine Arts, Office of the Director (Washington, D.C., n.d.) Box 14, Folder 7.

[385] The monument to Barry that stands today in Franklin Park, Washington D.C., was created by John J. Boyle. The statue was unveiled in 1914. "Records of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital. Records of the Barry Statue Commission." (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-42, National Archives.

decision of the board of artists, and defended O'Connor's project.[386] Among them was the illustrious sculptor French, who declared, "I regard Mr. O'Connor as one of the two or three most able and talented sculptors among the young men. […] Everything that Mr. O'Connor does has the stamp of the artist upon it."[387] The architect Cass Gilbert described O'Connor as "certainly a sculptor of the first rank and is generally so esteemed by architects, sculptors, and painters. The late Augustus Saint-Gaudens on several occasions spoke to [Gilbert] in terms of the highest praise of his work and regarded him as 'head and shoulders' above the group of younger sculptors."[388] The fate of O'Connor's Barry monument illustrates the difference of expectations not only between the international Paris Salons and the national context of the artist's homeland, but also between those in the art world —in this case represented by the Commission of Fine Arts— and a public with strong ideas of how their nation should be represented.

O'Connor's decision to represent Commodore Barry in the context of the broader history of Ireland and the Irish diaspora was too controversial. His monument would have presented the sorrows, the struggles, and the aspirations of the Irish people, but faced the criticisms of societies

---

[386] Art associations such as The American Federation of Arts, The American Institute of Architects, The National Sculpture Society, The National Society of Fine Arts, and individuals among whom were Jeremiah O'Connor, Daniel Chester French, and Gilbert Stuart wrote to the Commission to contest the rejection of O'Connor's project. "Records of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital. Records of the Barry Statue Commission." (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-42, National Archives.

[387] Daniel Chester French to the Secretary of War, April 6, 1910. "Records of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital. Records of the Barry Statue Commission." (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-42, National Archives.

[388] Cass Gilbert to the Commission, July 22, 1909. "Records of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital. Records of the Barry Statue Commission." (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-42, National Archives.

who wanted a "normal" monument to an American hero. O'Connor's *Barry* marked a dramatic shift in the sculptor's monumental conception. Instead of retrenching himself in developing more conventional work, O'Connor repurposed the figures created for the Barry project into other innovative works: *The Republic of America* would be re-used by O'Connor as an allegory of *Justice* for the Peace Palace in The Hague in another national competition a few years later. The accompanying figure of Ireland would become an autonomous figure representing the *Sacred Fire* **(figure 105)**. It would eventually be placed on the grave of the sculptor in Glasvenin Cemetery, Dublin.

4.3 Andrew O'Connor's Cosmopolitanism

Despite facing rejection in his homeland with his *Barry* monument, O'Connor continued to enter into competitions for commissions, and would create many public sculptures in the United States. While in Paris, O'Connor retained his American network to win several commissions in his home country. Even French, who regularly found commissions for O'Connor in the United States, wrote to him in early 1914 about his disappointment regarding O'Connor's choice to stay in France, a declaration underlined by his great admiration for the artist: "I am sure that if you were over here you would have all the work that you could possibly do, and it is an awful pity that a man of your great talent should not be permitted to give to the world all the art this is in him."[389]

The sculptors and architects French, Stanford White, Cass Gilbert, and Louis Sullivan regularly visited O'Connor's studio in Clamart and put him in contact with American clients. In

[389] "Daniel Chester French Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), The Library of Congress.

1909, O'Connor created a statue to *General Lew Wallace* for Crawfordsville, Indiana, the marble version of which was displayed that year at the Salon des artistes français in Paris.[390] The next year, recommended by Cass Gilbert, he designed a monument to Minnesota Governor Johnson, a fragment of which he exhibited at the 1912 SAF.[391] During World War I, around 1916-1917, O'Connor completed a *Spanish War Memorial*, also called *1898*, for the city of Worcester, Massachusetts, and was invited by the Illinois Art Commission to submit a design for a statue of Abraham Lincoln, which was a resounding triumph, and for which O'Connor was awarded the impressive amount of fifty thousand dollars.

At the same time that he sought monumental commissions in his homeland, O'Connor was establishing an international career. Unlike Barnard and Yrurtia, who, after their initial triumphs at the Paris Salons, created their sculptural works almost exclusively for their home country, O'Connor would continue to use the system of the Paris Salons, and other exhibition venues in Europe, to showcase his sculptural projects to international buyers. In 1909, he even entered the competition for the statue of *General Alvear* destined for Buenos Aires, a further indication of O'Connor's international ambitions. He eventually lost the competition to the French sculptor Antoine Bourdelle, whose monument stands today on Avenidad del Libertador, in the Recoleta neighborhood, Buenos Aires.

---

[390] Pierre Sanchez and Xavier Seydoux, eds., *Les Catalogues Des Salons* (Salon (Exhibition : Paris, France), Paris: Echelle de Jacob, 1999). In the catalogue of the 1909 *Salon des artistes français*, the sculpture is listed under the number 3669 as "Le général Lew Wallace ; -statue, marbre."

[391] In the catalogue of the 1912 *Salon des artistes français*, the sculpture is listed under the number 3887 as "Fragment du Monument Johnson – groupe, bronze."

In 1906, O'Connor was the first foreigner to be awarded the second-place medal at the Salon des artistes français with his statue of *General Lawton,* a monument planned for Indianapolis, Indiana. Paul Leroi, a distinguished French critic, dedicated an entire page of his article on the 1906 Salon to the illustration of O'Connor's *General Lawton* in the monthly journal *L'Art*, and commented, "The jury could only have acted justly had it awarded Mr. O'Connor a first-place medal."[392] Leroi goes on to attribute this decision to artistic nationalism. Although O'Connor never explicitly presented himself as an American artist, French critics analyzed his work through that lens. In his review of the 1909 monographic exhibition of O'Connor at the Galerie Hébrard, the critic Louis Vauxcelles stated: "O'Connor has kept his personality intact and he strongly expresses the character of his race. His figures, their musculature, the construction of the ensemble, are clearly American."[393] O'Connor's success in Paris reached its apex twenty years later when his group *Tristan and Isolde* won the 1928 Salon gold medal with the unanimous vote of the jury, the highest honor the French state could pay any artist, and for which he was awarded the Légion d'honneur in 1929.[394]

O'Connor's success at the Paris Salons was greatly commented upon in the French and American press at the time, even if the critic Guy Pène Du Bois noted, "O'Connor's fame is greater

---

[392] Paul Leroi, "Salon de 1906", in *L'Art. Revue Mensuelle Illustrée,* number 66, Paris, Librairie de l'Art, 1906, 184. « Le jury n'eût agi que justement en décernant d'emblée à M. O'Connor une médaille de première classe. »

[393] Louis Vauxcelles, *Le Gil Blas*, May 1909. « O'Connor a conservé intacte sa personnalité et exprime fortement le caractère de sa race. Le type de ses figures, leur musculature, leur construction d'ensemble, sont choses nettement américaines. »

[394]*Tristan and Isolde* entered the collection of the Brooklyn Museum of Art on May 6, 1930. "Andrew O'Connor Vertical File" (New York, n.d.), The Brooklyn Museum.

in France perhaps than it is in America."[395] While in Paris, O'Connor made use of his strategic position at the Salons to showcase his works at other major art exhibitions throughout Europe. He presented his creations at the Fifth International Art Exhibition in Barcelona in 1907[396] and at the Venice Biennale in 1910, where he represented Great Britain, marking perhaps a new shift of his identity.[397] O'Connor was also the subject of two monographic exhibitions: at the Kunstsalon Walther Zimmerman in Munich in 1906, where fifty-one of his works were presented,[398] as well as at the Galerie Hébrard in Paris in 1909, a rare opportunity for any sculptor at the time, regardless of nationality.[399] The French government purchased works by the artist from his monographic show at Hébrard's, distinguishing O'Connor as one of the few American artists whose works entered into the national collection.[400] Ironically, though the Barry monument was rejected in

[395] Guy Pène Du Bois, "Andrew O'Connor and his sculpture," *International Studio*, vol. 86 (January 1927): 55-61.

[396] Exh. Cat. *Souvenir de la V exposition internationale d'art*, Barcelona, Palacio de bellas artes, 1907.

[397] IX Esposizione Internazionale d'Arte della Citta di Venezia, 1910, Venice, catalogue, second edition, 78. « Sala 17. N. 38 O'Connor A. (Granbretagna), Testa di donna (bronzo). »

[398] *Ausstellung von Skulpturwerken Zeichnungen etc. von Andrew O'Connor*, Kunstsalon Walther Zimmermann (Maximilianstrasse 38, München, 1906). On the exhibition catalogue are listed 9 marbles, 10 bronzes, one wax, one silver, 12 clay models, two drawings, two etchings, and 14 photographs by O'Connor.

[399] *Exposition des œuvres du sculpteur O'Connor du 3 au 19 mai 1909* (Galerie A-A. Hébrard. 8 rue Royale, Paris, 1909).

[400] Andrew O'Connor, *Edward Tuck*, 1911, marble, 51x22x27cm, signed on left side "O'CONNOR/1911", Paris, Musée d'Orsay. Andrew O'Connor, *Commodore John Barry*, 1906-1908, bronze A.A. Hébrard, 53x20x17cm, signed on plinth, "O'CONNOR", Paris, Musée d'Orsay. Andrew O'Connor, *Doors of St Bartholomew's Church*, c.1900, bronze, 81x63x32cm, Paris, Musée d'Orsay.

Washington, D.C., a statuette of the Commodore was among the works purchased by the French government.[401]

Like Barnard, Rodin, and Yrurtia, O'Connor participated in the Louisiana Purchase Exhibition in Saint Louis in 1904 – his statue of *Inspiration* was the crowning figure of the Art Palace, as seen in Chapter 3 – but he would not showcase his artistic production, with the exception of his public monuments, to the American public until 1917. That year, his first monographic exhibition in the United States took place at the Seligmann Gallery in New York City.[402] In the preface of the exhibition catalogue, O'Connor articulated his desire to show his works to the American public: "After somewhat more than twenty years of labor, the desire is strong to show my countrymen what I have made in all this time."[403] Showcased at Seligmann's were a large number of sculptures in plaster, marble and bronze.[404] Some of them had already been exhibited at the Paris SAF to great acclaim by French critics, in a similar vein as Barnard's display of sculptures from the 1894 Paris SNBA at the Logerot Garden in New York in 1897. O'Connor, like Barnard, strategically showed both his public and private commissions at the Salons to get critical approval before sending them to their homeland.

[401] In a letter addressed to the Commission of the Barry Monument, O'Connor asked for permission to execute a copy in bronze of his original statue of Barry for the Luxembourg Museum. "Records of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital. Records of the Barry Statue Commission." (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-42, National Archives.

[402] "Andrew O'Connor's Sculpture at Seligmann's", *NY Sun*, December 23, 1917.

[403] Andrew O'Connor, *Exhibition of the works of the sculptor O'Connor: The Galleries of Jacques Seligmann Co.* (Paxton, Massachusetts, 1917), Preface.

[404] *Ibidem*. 48 sculptures were part of the show: 18 marbles, 9 bronzes, 21 plasters.

Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney (1875-1942), who had been O'Connor's student in Paris, helped organize his show in New York City.[405] Passages from her diary demonstrate her profound admiration for O'Connor:

> "It is impossible to be indifferent to his work. His craftmanship may be overwhelming, his emotion at times overridden, his egotism impossible, but shrieking above all his master hand. From the first moment that I saw the doors and frieze of St. Bartholomew's, from the moment I visited his studio at Clamart, I knew that to me at least he possessed the spirit of adventure in art combined with that technical vision that I would ever strive for."[406]

In Paris, O'Connor would visit Whitney's studio for weekly sessions of criticism in the morning, after which he would stay with her for lunch, spending their afternoon "reminiscing about Stanford White, Sargent and many others." O'Connor may have even sculpted on her behalf, like the fountain presented at the Knoedler gallery in New York where people believed they recognized the hand of O'Connor in the work.[407] Indeed, despite O'Connor being in the United States during the war, Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney kept asking him for help with her sculptural projects: a monumental project of memorial in St. Nazaire, France, dedicated to American soldiers who landed there in the war; and a project for a Columbus monument in Huelva, Spain, for which O'Connor worked to the point of exhaustion, and which broke their relationship forever.

Among O'Connor's supporters, French advocated for the recognition of his former student in the United States. He recommended him to his fellow sculptors and played an important role in securing the purchase of O'Connor's works for The Metropolitan Museum of Art. In a letter to

---

[405] "Andrew O'Connor's Sculpture at Seligmann's", *NY Sun*, December 23, 1917.

[406] Smithsonian Archives of American Art: Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney papers, 1851-1975, bulk 1888-1942, Journal 1912-1914.

[407] Doris Flodin Soderman, *The Sculptors O'Connor: Andrew Sr., 1847-1924, Andrew Jr., 1874-1941* (Worcester, MA: Gundi Publishers, 1995), 59. This story is reported in a letter addressed by French to O'Connor.

Saint-Gaudens, French praised O'Connor who "should certainly be in your list of the most prominent young sculptors."[408] He asked the sculptor Herbert Adams (1858-1945), "Have you seen the works of Andrew O'Connor, at Seligmann's, 705 Fifth Avenue? I should like to recommend the purchase of one or two of his works by the Museum in spite of their somewhat high prices."[409] This strategy helped to ensure the purchase of O'Connor's bust of *The Virgin* by The Metropolitan Museum of Art.[410]

Similar to Barnard with his Boston show a decade prior – as seen in chapter 3 – O'Connor had intended to tour his exhibition from the Seligmann Gallery to other cities in the United States. Among the prospective venues was the Carnegie Museum in Pittsburgh, but the material and financial constraints related to a travelling exhibition of sculptures prevented the museum from hosting the show.[411] O'Connor's network of American supporters was crucial in helping him sell his sculptures to American patrons. The purchase of two of O'Connor's works by The Metropolitan Museum parallels their acquisition of Barnard's *Two Natures in Man*, which entered

---

[408] French to Saint-Gaudens, December 21, 1906. "Daniel Chester French Papers."

[409] French to Adams, January 14, 1918. "Daniel Chester French Papers."

[410] Andrew O'Connor, *The Virgin*, 1906, cast 1909, bronze, 43.8.20.3x22.9cm, New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art. The museum also owns a limestone bust of *Abraham Lincoln* from 1916, which was a gift of Mrs. Willard Straight in 1922.

[411] Beatty to O'Connor, New York, March 23, 1918. "Although the Committee did not feel that we could undertake a large exhibition of your important works at the present time however much we desired to do so, it may be possible to present at this time a small group of moderate sized works. […] This would not involve the heavy expense occasioned by great works or a large collection and the broader project might be deferred until some later time." "Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art Records, 1883-1962, Bulk 1885-1940" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

the collection of the museum in 1897 and secured his standing among the best contemporary sculptors of his era. Despite his effort, O'Connor, who chose to stay in Paris, would not garner the same level of recognition in the United States.

4.4 Repurposing *The Republic of America* into *Justice*

In the decade following the rejection of his monument to Barry, O'Connor transformed the figure representing *The Republic of America,* from his second Barry project, into an allegory of *Justice* for the Peace Palace competition. In a twist of fate, O'Connor's statue was eventually endorsed by the selection committee in Washington, D.C., and installed in The Hague in 1924. Throughout his career, O'Connor repeatedly re-appropriated sculptural motifs from his own works, and *Justice* constitutes one of the most brilliant examples of re-appropriation in his oeuvre. O'Connor transformed the meaning of the figure that symbolized *The Republic of America*, then accompanied by the allegory of Ireland **(see figure 103)**, into a celebration of *Justice* at the Peace Palace in The Hague.[412] This metamorphosis of *America* into an international and transatlantic *Justice* offers an insightful parallel with the trajectory of O'Connor, and his mobility from the United States to a transnational career.

In the wake of the first international peace conference held in the Dutch royal palace of Huis ten Bosch in The Hague in 1898, the industrialist and philanthropist Andrew Carnegie, gave

---

[412] O'Connor had sent his new model to the Barry commission in June 1910, accompanied with a photograph and description of the sculpture. "Records of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital. Records of the Barry Statue Commission." (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-42, National Archives.

500,000 pounds to the Dutch government in 1903 to build a Palace of Peace to house a permanent court of arbitration.[413] The Peace Palace in The Hague was the first institution in history to represent an International Court of Justice, which would supersede the justice systems of individual nations. In a *Memorandum* written in The Hague on May 5, 1908, following the vote of the second peace conference, the board of directors of the Carnegie Foundation suggested the idea of "a marble group of fitting dimensions, representing in classic style and allegory of 'Peace through Justice' to be placed on the first landing of the grand staircase, to which leads the great vestibule of entrance."[414] They emphasized that this sculpture would provide a prominent place for the United States, the country of the founder of the Palace. In the following months, the matter would be submitted to the government in Washington to be voted by Congress, but it was not until March 1913, nearly five years later, that Congress approved the project.[415]

Dedicated in 1913, the Peace Palace was filled with materials and works of art from all around the world. England sent four stained glass windows; France donated Gobelin tapestries; Turkey gave a large carpet; Japan sent a gold cloth tapestry; Sweden provided the granite for the façade of the building; Brazil and El Salvador supplied fine wood for wall panels; and, Argentina sent a reduction of the statue erected on top of the Andes in commemoration of the peace with

---

[413] *The Palace of Peace*, Rotterdam, 1920, 3. Quoted in Henry Nichols Blake Clark and William H Gerdts, *A Marble Quarry: The James H. Ricau Collection of Sculpture at the Chrysler Museum of Art* (New York; [Lanham, Md.]: Hudson Hills Press in association with the Chrysler Museum of Art, 1997).

[414] *Memorandum* written by the board of Directors of the Carnegie Foundation, The Hague, May 5th 1908. "Papers of the Board of the Carnegie Foundation" (The Hague, the Netherlands, n.d.), The Peace Palace.

[415] See correspondence between July 6th, 1908, and March 31st, 1913. "Papers of the Board of the Carnegie Foundation" (The Hague, the Netherlands, n.d.), The Peace Palace.

Chile, among many other nations represented.[416] The United States was the lone hold-out: At the time of the Palace's inauguration, the niche on the main stairway of the building, which had been reserved for the United States, remained vacant. It was only in 1914 that a budget of $20,000 to erect a statue "representing in classic style an allegory of Peace through Justice" to adorn the Peace Palace was decided as an appropriate gift by the American government.[417] After the idea of a competition among artists to build the statue fell through, the Commission of Fine Arts selected Andrew O'Connor's sculptural project among the 363 photographs of works submitted by seventeen American sculptors, among whom were Bartlett, Borglum, and MacMonnies.[418]

Prior to the Carnegie Foundation's proposal to offer a statue for the Peace Palace and Congress's decision to allocate funds for its commission, MacMonnies had designed a monument to be erected in front of the palace. With the announcement in 1905 that a second international peace conference would convene in 1907, the sculptor had conceived an allegorical monument of *Pax Victrix*. On August 31, 1907, the front cover of *Harper's Weekly* showed a full-page illustration of the sculpture, accompanied with a description anticipating the placement of the monument in The Hague, and a duplicate in Washington, D.C.[419] In the tradition of sixteenth-century Italian mannerists, *Pax Victrix* depicts an allegory of Peace preventing a triumphant

---

[416] Complete list of gifts by nations: France, England, Italy, Japan, Turkey, Sweden, Norway, China, Denmark, Switzerland, Germany, Belgium, Austria, Hungary, The Emperor of Russia, Brazil, Salvador, Argentina, The United States (whose symbolic marble statuary was not voted by Congress yet). "Papers of the Board of the Carnegie Foundation" (The Hague, the Netherlands, n.d.), The Peace Palace.

[417] *Ibid.*, *Memorandum*, April 2, 1914.

[418] *Ibid.*, letter from July 27, 1914.

[419] "Pax Victrix The latest work of the distinguished American sculptor, Frederick MacMonnies, which will probably be placed at The Hague, with a duplicate at Washington", *Harper's Weekly*, vol. 51, August 31, 1907, cover, 1259.

warrior from killing his fallen opponent lying at his feet **(figure 106)**. The group is reminiscent of Cellini's *Perseus*, but also of the sculpture *Military Courage* made by the contemporary French sculptor Paul Dubois (1829-1905). The composition of *Pax Victrix* is also similar to another sculpture by MacMonnies, *Civic Virtue,* commissioned for the grounds of Manhattan City Hall in New York City in 1909.[420]

At first glance, *Pax Victrix* suggests some affinities with the works of Barnard, O'Connor, and Yrurtia, in its treatment of the contorted poses of the figures and their interlocking bodies. But here the sole purpose of these devices is to emphasize the dramatic effects of the group and serve a simple heroic narrative, demonstrating MacMonnies's reliance on the Italian sculptural tradition. In *Pax Victrix*, the postures of the figures and their gestures contribute to the main action: while the standing warrior steps with his left foot on the body of his opponent, the victim grabs the foot of his attacker with his right hand in an attempt to resist the assault. An allegory of Peace reaches in front of the warrior with her right arm up, signaling from her firm position her desire to put an end to the attack. The compositional choices made by the sculptor are at the service of a clear story line. The attributes of the warrior, adorned by a helmet and a sword, made him recognizable at first sight, and every figure in the group plays a clear role in the narration. This is not a modern allegory in which the poses and gestures of the figures elude simple unities in order to express more complex facets of human experience.

In 1914, MacMonnies submitted *Pax Victrix* to the competition for The Hague monument, with a curiously identical theme, even though the dynamic and serpentine line that crisscross the

---

[420] MacMonnies recycled the composition of the sculpture into another of his works. *Civic Virtue* is today in Greenwood cemetery. On *Civic Virtue* and its controversy, see Michele Helene Bogart, *Public Sculpture and the Civic Ideal in New York City, 1890-1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 259.

composition, inviting the viewer to move around the three-dimensional group, makes it unfit for display in a niche of the palace. In an interview that he gave in 1927, the sculptor claimed:

> I became very much interested in the idea of peace through justice, so I made this group of two classic warriors and having peace separating them. […] The architect was perfectly willing to have it put in the Palace, […] but then they found that the government could not present this without having a competition, and by the time the competition came, politics had changed and it got into an entirely different thing, and I don't think I was even considered.[421]

While MacMonnies's sculpture was not chosen for the Peace Palace commission, its bronze cast, today in the collection of the Chrysler Museum in Norfolk, VA, constitutes perhaps the only surviving model proposed for the competition.[422]

The Commission of Fine Arts had selected O'Connor's project, but as in the case of the Barry monument, the sculptor soon encountered resistance from the commissioning committee regarding his aesthetic choices for the monument. This was 1914, at the onset of World War I, and O'Connor argued that a "classic" approach to the theme of Peace and Justice would be "fatuous in the face of the war that is desolating the world."[423] In a letter to the committee, O'Connor explained:

> Peace with Justice has not been achieved. But the monstrous horror of war is seen now as never before – the cry of Peace is heard and the necessity for Peace and Justice is felt more strongly than ever and it is thought that a group embodying this situation would be at once

[421] Dewitt M. Lockman, *Interviews with Frederick MacMonnies*, 1927, 7.

[422] Frederick William MacMonnies, *Pax Victrix*, modeled c. 1906-07, cast in bronze by 1918, Chrysler Art Museum, Norfolk. Henry Nichols Blake Clark and William H Gerdts, *A Marble Quarry: The James H. Ricau Collection of Sculpture at the Chrysler Museum of Art* (New York; [Lanham, Md.]: Hudson Hills Press in association with the Chrysler Museum of Art, 1997) 258-260. See also Ethelyn Adina Gordon, *The Sculpture of Frederick William MacMonnies: A Critical Catalogue*, PhD dissertation, NYU Institute of Fine Arts, 1998, 502-504.

[423] O'Connor's statement was transcribed in a letter sent by William Phillips to Colonel Harts, July 21, 1915. "Commission of Fine Arts" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-66, National Archives.

> a vital memorial of a very significant period and an appropriate monument for a building dedicated to the promotion of peace.[424]

O'Connor's original model was composed of two figures, a personification of *Peace*, standing with her right arm raised in the air, and her left hand on the shoulder of *Justice*, to whom she makes her appeal. Hidden under her disheveled hair, her face is not visible, and her chest is bare. *Justice*, on the other side, is looking straight ahead, her hands down, determined **(figure 107)**. "Justice is not blindfolded", claimed O'Connor, "she has seen the hideous wrong, and shocked, has stopped short in her onward sweep. But her pause is only for the moment. Her jaw is set, her whole being throbs with a sense of outrage, she goes forward with a determination which shall be irresistible." The sculptor's intention was to represent "Justice as more simple, robust and aggressive, - a fundamental and ever present ideal; Peace more subtle, delicate, dependent."[425]

A watercolor sketch shows how O'Connor had envisioned his sculptural group to stand in the first landing of the staircase in the Peace Palace **(figure 108)**. However, the Commission of Fine Arts disagreed with O'Connor's artistic vision and asked him to make the group represent an ideal future rather than "the temporary unfortunate condition of war."[426] Similar to the criticisms he had faced with his project to Commodore Barry a decade earlier, O'Connor was encouraged to revise his unsettling imagery of the horrors of the war to instead create an idealized statue celebrating the American values of Peace and Justice.

---

[424] *Ibidem.*

[425] *Ibidem.*

[426] Colonel Harts to William Phillips, July 31, 1915. "Commission of Fine Arts" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-66, National Archives.

O'Connor agreed to submit another design to the committee, but the negotiations were interrupted for the remainder of the war.[427] In 1922, a committee of the Commission of Fine Arts visited O'Connor's studio near Worcester, Massachusetts.[428] The sculptor had abandoned the two-figure composition and kept only the figure of *Justice,* the same figure that had already been proposed as part of his revised monument to *Barry* in 1909. His project of a statue to *Justice* was eventually accepted[429] and, ironically, O'Connor defended his work as an object of art of national production. The statue not only celebrated the value of Justice that the artist argued to be more important than Peace, but also represented a distinct idea of Americanness, based, in O'Connor's words, on "the highest types of American civilization."[430]

Given the specificity of the destined location of the sculpture at the Peace Palace, O'Connor intended to have a plaster cast of the statue made and to take it to The Hague, where he would carve it himself on site:

> the figure is to stand where it is seen from below or as one goes up the stairs. It is lighted through stained glass windows at the back and on the sides. This requires a bold, clear-cut

[427] O'Connor to Mr. Phillips, August 20, 1915. "I have carefully studied the recommendations of the Commission of Fine Arts regarding the design submitted for the group to be placed at The Hague and am now preparing another design embodying its suggestions which I hope to submit to you in the near future." "Commission of Fine Arts" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-66, National Archives.

[428] O'Connor to Charles Moore, Chairman of the Commission, August 30, 1922. In his letter, O'Connor claimed that he had dedicated all of his time to the statue during the past year. "Commission of Fine Arts" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-66, National Archives.

[429] Correspondence between O'Connor and Charles Moore, Chairman of the Commission, during the year of 1922. "Commission of Fine Arts" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-66, National Archives.

[430] O'Connor, hotel Powhatan, DC, to the Commission of Fine Arts, January 14, 1924. "Commission of Fine Arts" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-66, National Archives.

silhouette, and so it is essential that the statue be located and finished in place, so that the height of the pedestal and peculiar conditions of lighting may be dealt with.[431]

In June 1923, the plaster of the statue was sent to the marble quarries in Italy, where O'Connor himself worked the stone. The sculptor had spent his previous winter there searching for a block that suited him.[432] In the autumn of 1924, O'Connor sent a postcard to his son Roderic from Querceta, Italy, where he was working on the marble carving (**figures 109-110**). On the recto of the postcard, O'Connor is photographed standing at the foot of the statue. Traces of white eraser suggest that the sculptor retouched some folds in the lower part of the drape of the figure on the photograph. On the verso O'Connor wrote his son that the figure was almost finished and that in a week he would join his family.[433] One might have expected O'Connor to hire Italian carvers to help him with the completion of the sculpture, but the sculptor worked by himself on the marble. In his letters to Washington, D.C., O'Connor described his months of labor on the sculpture, "It has been a great effort on my part for every inch of the statue was cut in marble by my own hand."[434]

---

[431] O'Connor to the Commission, October 17, 1922. "Commission of Fine Arts" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-66, National Archives.

[432] O'Connor to the Commission, June 20, 1923. "The statue of Justice for The Hague was incased in plaster ready to ship to the marble quarries – where I spent a month last winter searching for a block to suit me" "Commission of Fine Arts" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-66, National Archives.

[433] O'Connor to his son Roderic O'Connor, November 26, 1924. Postcard, O'Connor Family Archive, Dublin.

[434] O'Connor, Lucca, Italy, to Moore, December 20, 1924: "At least I've got the marble finished and am sending it to The Hague as fast as it can go […] It has been a great effort on my part for every inch of the statue was cut in marble by my own hand." "Commission of Fine Arts" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-66, National Archives.

On December 20, 1924, O'Connor sent the finished marble to The Hague, and *Justice* was set in place on the first landing of the main stairway of the Peace Palace **(figure 111)**. O'Connor was greatly satisfied by the display of his sculpture: "to my satisfaction, the marble statue in place being more complete than the plaster model appeared, and in scale exactly right – in my opinion. This is my best work and no effort nor expense has been spared."[435] O'Connor's *Justice* constitutes a modern allegory that stands out from the traditional representation of Justice, blindfolded and recognizable by the beam balance and the sword that she carries as attributes. In a preliminary plaster model, O'Connor's *Justice* holds a shield in her left hand, a clear reference to more traditional representations of Athena, the goddess of war, and her right arm is placed forward at the level of her hip, perhaps ready to carry a prop **(figure 112)**. However, in the final version, the sculptor consciously discarded all attributes, shifting away from this traditional allegorical mode of representation in sculpture.

In O'Connor's modern allegory, the figure of *Justice* looks ahead and marches forward, while her dress hugs the curves of her torso and the fabric folds like waves against her feet **(figure 113)**. She signifies not by her emblems, but by her resolute pose, her dynamic attitude, and her direct gaze that engages the viewers as they walk up the stairs of the Peace Palace. The right arm of *Justice* falls alongside her body, while her left hand, disproportionately large, as in so many other of his compositions, rests on her thigh, similar to the hand of *Barry* overlooking the sea, and to the figure in his memorial to the Spanish-American war, *1898*. The subtle forward movement of *Justice* "is intended to symbolize the American belief that justice is approaching and will ultimately arrive in spite of all appearance to the contrary. The austere character with an inevitable

[435] O'Connor, London, to Moore, from the Commission of Fine Arts, January 1, 1925. "Commission of Fine Arts" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-66, National Archives.

movement forward was necessary to show this."[436] To O'Connor, the American idea of justice is expressed by "a calm and noble detachment, a sense of power and strength without gesture and an oncoming movement, tranquil but irresistible."[437] From its prominent location, the statue continues to welcome to this day all visitors to the building and embodies O'Connor's cosmopolitanism in this international context, adorned by the works of art from many other countries around the world.

O'Connor's career trajectory corresponded to an historical moment when nationalism was reassessed, and international institutions were strengthened. O'Connor's artistic identity questioned the role of national identification in a transatlantic art world. Sculptors have always had to balance the demands of their commissioners with their artistic independence, and in this sense, O'Connor is no different. However, the study of his career and oeuvre underscores the challenges faced by Americans, and, more broadly, foreign artists, who worked in Paris and participated in the Salons, but who generally received the majority of their commissions from patrons from their home countries. In the case of O'Connor, his balancing act between Parisian juries and American patrons was thrown off kilter by his strong sense of artistic agency as he worked to redefine the essence of public sculpture by going beyond the patriotic veneer of exile and war and incorporating the brutality and sorrowful reality endured by so many. Although O'Connor was awarded the highest honor that France could give a foreign artist in 1929, his creative independence, which was so successful in the transnational ecosystem of the Paris Salons, failed to resonate in the homeland he forsook, and which in turn rejected him multiple times.

---

[436] Letter from O'Connor, July 1, 1923. "Commission of Fine Arts" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-66, National Archives.

[437] O'Connor, hotel Powhatan, Washington, D.C., to Commission of Fine Arts, January 14, 1924. "Commission of Fine Arts" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-66, National Archives.

O'Connor grappled with national identity throughout his career, both in works like the *Commodore Barry* and in his personal life. A letter written to an American friend in 1934 sheds a bit of light onto his complicated and tortuous view of his two nominal national identities, Irish and American:

> I think I was cursed from my birth in a nasty New England mill town, inhabited uniquely by mechanics and pawn-brokers – into which a mass of poor Irish was dumped with all their helplessness. As a child I hated these Yankees – with a profound hatred and contempt and a loathing for everything they represented. By the Grace of God, I escaped in boyhood from this welter of misery, poverty and hypocrisy, and was brought in contact with the intellectual honesty of the French […][438]

O'Connor's life and the assessment of his career mirrored the conflicting themes that defined the early twentieth century, namely that of nationalism within an increasingly internationally connected world. The sculptor's complicated identity would draw into question the role of national identification and classification in a transatlantic art world that nevertheless demanded that artists be categorized by country. How O'Connor consciously positioned himself in the context of the Paris Salons demonstrates that the sculptor embraced different parts of his heritage at various times: being of Irish descent in the case of the Barry commission, and later emphasizing his American identity with the *Justice* project for The Hague.

4.5 Conclusion

Circling back to the 1909 newspaper headline denouncing O'Connor's *Commodore Barry* project as "Too Irish For the Irish," this chapter analyzed the disconnect between early twentieth-

---

[438] Andrew O'Connor, London, to Warren Wilmer Brown, February 22, 1934. Curatorial files, Walters Art Museum, Baltimore.

century sculptors participating in the international system of the Paris Salons, and the expectations of their patrons and audiences abroad. Yrurtia and O'Connor were both subject to harsh attacks in their homeland, and the rejection of their monumental projects shows the limits of the globalization of the modern sculptural language, as studied in Chapter 3. Not merely interested in getting orders to erect statues to national heroes, they attempted to redefine what modern public sculpture was, either by integrating the Argentinian people as the hero of the nation, or by treating sensitive historical topics, like the Irish emigration to the United States. In both cases, the projects faced the resistance of local commissioning parties used to didactic statues that defined clear hierarchies, and were averse to the ways in which these monuments reimagined collectivity in their attempt to represent the realm of the human experience and the human condition.

These aborted projects appear today as monumental flops that fell through the cracks of historiographical inquiries and failed to make it into the canon of modern public sculpture. However, their stories provide great insight into turn of the century cross-continental patronage, the commissioning process, and the differing expectations of various stakeholders across the ocean. Even though they were never completed, nor set on public display, Yrurtia's Monument to the Argentinian independence, and O'Connor's Barry project exemplify what could have constituted an alternative monumental landscape in the early twentieth-century Americas. Modern sculptors questioned the values of traditional statues, in their attempts to grasp the realities of some historical events, such as the nineteenth century Irish emigration to the United States, or the Argentinian Revolution of May 1810, in their complex monumental compositions. A century later, as the United States continues to grapple with the legacy of systemic racism, Americans are more than ever aware of issues of representation in public sculpture, and one might find resonances of such modern allegorical sculptures in today's contemporary artistic creations.

The cover of the September 2020 issue of *Vanity Fair* featured a portrait commissioned to the American painter Amy Sherald (b. 1973) of Breonna Taylor, who is depicted almost full figure in an aquamarine blue dress and gazes straight at the viewer **(figure 114)**.[439] The 26-year-old African-American woman and medical worker, who was killed in her home by police officers on March 13, 2020, is memorialized in this portrait as "Lady Justice." Using the artist's own words, Sherald said in an interview, "I wanted this image to stand as a piece of inspiration to keep fighting for justice for her. When I look at the dress, it kind of reminds me of Lady Justice."[440] Very statuesque, Taylor is represented standing in a slight *contrapposto*, with her right hand placed on her hip, accentuating the shape of her well-fitted dress. Her left arm is extended along her left side and her hand rests on her thigh, where the folds of her dress elegantly expose parts of her skin.[441] Staring straight at the viewer, the figure looks imposing and monumental. The figure's dynamic stance, the movement of her dress, her gaze directed straight at the viewer, as well as the detail of her ring, resonate with O'Connor's modern allegory of *Justice* in the Peace Palace in The Hague.

Both works were made at an historical moment when artists strove for socio-political change. O'Connor's statue of *Justice* was designed in the midst of World War I and represented for the sculptor a response to the traumas of war, while Sherald's portrait of Breonna Taylor constitutes today a symbol of the fight for social justice that amplified in the wake of the Black

---

[439] Amy Sherald's portrait of Breonna Taylor is now jointly owned by the Smithsonian's National Museum of African American History and Culture in Washington, D.C., and by the Speed Museum in Louisville, Ky. In the spring of 2021, it is the centerpiece of the exhibition "Promise, Witness, Remembrance" at the Speed Museum.

[440] Miles Pope, "Amy Sherald on Making Breonna Taylor's Portrait," *Vanity Fair*, accessed August 24, 2020, https://www.vanityfair.com/culture/2020/08/amy-sherald-on-making-breonna-taylors-cover-portrait.

[441] *Ibidem*. According to the same interview, Breonna Taylor's crepe dress in the portrait was created by Jasmine Elder of VIBRI, an Atlanta-based fashion designer.

Live Matters protests in the spring 2020. Although *Justice* is not a portrait – and the identity of O'Connor's model is not revealed to the viewer –, in Sherald's painting, the identity of the sitter is crucial to understand the symbolic power of the work. To Sherald, "The monochromatic color allows you to really focus on her face. The whole painting becomes about her."[442] Looking at the portrait of Breonna Taylor standing as "Lady Justice" next to O'Connor's *Justice*, one is made more aware of the modernity of the statue with which the sculptor rejected the neoclassical model of Justice, typically blindfolded and carrying a balance. With her resolute stance and her sense of agency, O'Connor's *Justice* shook the traditional codes of allegorical representation and developed a modern bodily language that finds resonances in Sherald's portrait of Breonna Taylor.

[442] *Ibidem.*

5.0 The Labor of Monumentality: Transnationalism in the Paris Studios

The upper body of a colossal female figure emerges from a block of stone, her head turned backward, her mouth open, crying out in pain, while a second figure, perhaps her son, crouches at her side. The two figures are the only visible elements of the monumental group hidden under scaffolding behind wooden fencing that obscures a portion of the pedestal **(figure 115)**. This photograph offers a glimpse of MacMonnies's 130-foot-tall stone sculpture *The Battle of the Marne* in the making. Also called *Liberty in Distress,* it depicts France as a woman holding a fallen soldier and facing defiantly toward the enemy. Financed by the subscription of four million Americans, *The Battle of the Marne* was a gift from the United States to France, and is shown here being erected in the French city of Meaux.[443] The three workers carving the stone, hammers in hand, are barely noticeable at first. These anonymous men are reduced to diminutive figures in the shadows of the colossal monument. Unlike his colleagues, the head sculptor MacMonnies poses at the foot of the monument, facing the camera. The sculptor is captured in a relaxed pose, his right hand resting on the scaffolding. As early twentieth-century sculptors often preferred to emphasize their manual labor, they tended to conceal any trace of their workshops in photographs; this rare

[443] Four million Americans participated in the subscription to erect this monument celebrating the victory of the French and the British soldiers against the invasion of France by the Germans at the Battle of the Marne, between September 5 and 12, 1914. Johanne Berlemont, "Le Monument de La Bataille de La Marne : « America's Gift to France »," *The Tocqueville Review/La Revue Tocqueville* 38, no. 2 (2017): 255–67.

archival finding constitutes an exception in its representation of the collaborative nature of the sculptural process.[444]

In contrast, the American photographer Doris Ulmann (1882-1934) took a series of portraits of Barnard that highlights the artist's creative gesture. A close-up of the sculptor's hands modelling a piece of clay introduces the viewer to the individual artistic process of the solitary sculptor in his studio. Starting from the detail of the sculptor's fingers imprinting their marks in the clay, Ulmann expands the photographic lens of her camera to include the rest of Barnard, his muscular arms featured as an embodiment of the sculptor's physical labor and masculinity **(figure 116)**. The juxtaposition of MacMonnies with his *Battle of the Marne* behind the scaffolding and Ulmann's intimate portrait of Barnard shaping clay highlights the tension between the individual genius and collaborative labor, and illustrates how modern sculptors used the medium of photography to project their artistic identity. Although Rodin was at the head of a large studio of assistants who worked on his commissions, there is only one known photograph of the sculptor posing with a studio assistant.[445] Similarly, even though Barnard executed *Life of Humanity* with the help of French laborers in Moret-sur-Loing and Italian carvers in Pietrasanta, the American sculptor used the photographic medium to portray himself as a lone creative genius.

---

[444] This photograph was kept in the personal papers of another American sculptor, George Grey Barnard, a friend of MacMonnies. George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

[445] Paul Marsan, known as Dornac, *Rodin dans son atelier devant le monument à Victor Hugo*, 1898, albumen print, inv. Ph 179. Musée Rodin, Paris. There is also a photograph by Frances Benjamin Johnston showing Rodin watching Henri Lebossé and a workman installing the large version of the *Monument to Victor Hugo* for the Pavillon de l'Alma exhibition, n.d., Washington, D.C., Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division, Frances Benjamin Johnson Collection.

MacMonnies originally sent the photograph of *The Battle of the Marne*, found in Barnard's personal papers, to his sculptor friend to illustrate the new technological apparatus invented by the Italian-born sculptor Edmondo Quattrocchi (1889-1966) for his monument. In his letter to Barnard, MacMonnies praised Quattrocchi's invention of a simultaneous enlarging and pointed machine:

> Quattrochi made such a magnificent and scientific enlargement of my Marne Monument, that a distinguished French sculptor (Seysses) said that he did not believe in the history of sculpture anything so perfect has been done. The pitfalls of the antiquated 3 compasses are eliminated and science does the work. Quattrochi would like to show you photos of the Marne in progress. If you are interested it would be a revelation of progress to you as it was to me.[446]

Technological advancements, such as Quattrocchi's machine, help account for the making of increasingly ambitious monuments at the beginning of the twentieth century. Sculpture literally achieved new heights and became "colossal," as Darcy Grimaldo Grisby has demonstrated. The engineering prowess required to build the Eiffel Tower for the 1889 Paris World's Fair encouraged sculptors to compete at a new scale. This, however, did not mean that figurative sculpture was abandoned. What has since become one of the best-known examples of modern statuary, *The Statue of Liberty*, was in fact based on the model of an Egyptian woman, originally conceived as a lighthouse for the entrance of the Suez Canal.[447]

---

[446] MacMonnies to Barnard, February 25, 1935. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

[447] The generalized head that defines *Liberty* originated from the design of a particular figure, which went through a series of transformations that erased its individual features. Frédéric-Auguste Bartholdi, its author, was actually a regular at the Paris Salons, where he showed his works annually starting in 1857 until 1900. Interestingly, Bartholdi would often participate both in the Paris Salons and in the regional Salon de Mulhouse. In 1879, for instance, he displayed the plaster model of his *Liberty lighting the world* at the Salon de Mulhouse. Darcy Grimaldo Grigsby, *Colossal: Engineering the Suez Canal, Statue of Liberty, Eiffel Tower, and Panama Canal: Transcontinental Ambition*

The Paris Salons played a significant role in the development of a new monumentality at the turn of the century. This phenomenon might have been initiated by painters, like Puvis de Chavannes, whom Chevillot refers to as the "reformer of monumental art." A founding member and later president of the Société nationale des beaux-arts, Puvis de Chavannes, known for his murals featuring colossal figures, perhaps had a lasting impact on the artistic choices at the Salons.[448] Though generally destined for the public square, multi-figural sculptures were often exhibited at the Salons beforehand. One may think of Albert Bartholomé's *Monument to the Dead,* displayed at the 1895 SNBA and inaugurated at the Père Lachaise cemetery in 1899 with one hundred thousand attendees, or Antoine Bourdelle's *Monument to the 1870 War*, exhibited at the 1902 SNBA, and then erected on the main plaza in Montauban, the artist's native city.[449] American sculptors likewise displayed their monumental creations at the Paris Salons. For instance, Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney's memorial to the landing of the first American troops in Saint Nazaire on June 26, 1917, was presented at the Paris Salon before its installation in the French coastal city on June 26, 1926.[450]

---

in France and the United States During the Long Nineteenth Century, 1st ed. (Pittsburgh [PA] New York: Periscope Pub; Distributed by Prestel, 2012).

[448] Catherine Chevillot, *La sculpture à Paris: 1905-1914, le moment de tous les possibles* (Vanves: Hazan, 2017), 33–35.

[449] The 1895 SNBA catalogue lists a "Project for a Monument to the Dead" by Albert Bartholomé. Two years later, the sculptor presented a fragment in stone from the same memorial at the 1897 SNBA."Base Salons," accessed November 13, 2020, http://salons.musee-orsay.fr/; Thérèse Burollet and Virginie Delcourt, *Albert Bartholomé: le sculpteur et la mort* (Le Havre; MuMa, Musée d'art moderne André Malraux; Paris: Somogy, 2011).

[450] Photographs and press cuttings of Whitney's *Memorial to the Landing of American troops in Saint Nazaire* at the Paris Salon are conserved in O'Connor's family archive.

By the second half of the nineteenth century, the tradition of American sculptors setting up their studios overseas was well established, primarily in Italy, where they worked with a large team of assistants.[451] At the turn of the twentieth century, Paris had become a magnet for international artists, as well as a major center for the industry of sculpture. In what follows, I analyze how the transnational ecosystem of the Paris Salons extended to the city itself as the global center of sculptural production. Once settled in Paris, international sculptors took advantage of the city's unparalleled resources of a labor force with expertise in many areas of art practices: models, artisans who could carve marble, and foundry workers, among many other professions. Behind the claimed sole authorship of the head sculptor, the reality was more complicated: the studio workers, highly skilled, were not simply copying mechanically. Although they did not compose the monument, they worked out its details in the process of carrying out the design, which had an important impact on the finished piece. Therefore, it is not surprising that some of the most ambitious sculptors of the early twentieth century chose to settle in France to be surrounded by the best carvers.

This chapter moves beyond the binary of authorship versus execution, seeking to demonstrate instead that the labor of monumentality was a collective endeavor. The industry of sculpture in Paris was tied to the Salons system, since the same studio assistants, marble carvers, and *praticiens* worked on the same sculptural groups showcased at the Salons. Moreover, *praticiens* were sculptors themselves, and sometimes even participants in the Paris Salons, where they displayed their own compositions. It is important to make a distinction between the public face of the sculptor, as seen in exhibitions in which they are solely credited with their artwork and

[451] See Melissa Dabakis, *A Sisterhood of Sculptors: American Artists in Nineteenth-Century Rome* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2014).

in their use of the medium of photography, for instance, to present themselves as solitary artists, versus the reality of labor. The technical and technological dimensions of the sculptural process have long been separated from the historiography of sculpture, and this chapter explores the tension between the presumed individual labor of the sculptor and the collaborative industry in the development of modern public sculpture.

This study reconstructs the transnational histories of these monuments by restoring distance, space, and time to the making of these works, with an emphasis on the materiality of the object. Archival sources, including receipts, accounting books, checks, transportation fees, and customs records, help recover the identity of the agents who participated in their construction, making it possible to comprehend these monuments not as the result of sole authorship but as the product of collaborative endeavor. At each step of the creative process, distinct *métiers* were involved, together constituting an artistic community and network, inside the sculptor's studio and beyond, that ensured that the sculptures were completed, transported, and put on display in their destined locations.

Much like sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Italian sculptors who were aspiring architects, late nineteenth-century sculptors had the capacity to design architectural structures for their sculptural projects. During the Italian Renaissance, Cellini's treatise *On Architecture*, from the 1560s, considered architecture as the "second daughter" of sculpture, an allusion to the idea that sculptors were especially capable of designing buildings.[452] Similarly, in the latter half of the nineteenth century, sculptors rejected the idea that sculpture should be dependent on or subordinated to its architectural setting. They were less interested in designing decorative features

[452] Michael Wayne Cole, *Cellini and the Principles of Sculpture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

than creating complex and autonomous sculptural groups with ambitious architectural elements.[453] The monumental turn of the early twentieth century was marked by the issue of labor as both subject and historical context of creation, and these forces informed the development of complex multi-figural sculptures that broke away from the stereotypical statue of the hero on a pedestal.

Each case study in this chapter illuminates various aspects of early twentieth-century sculptural labor: the physical and individual labor of the sculptor, the collaborative nature of the labor industry, the transnational ecosystem of labor in Paris; as well as labor as an artistic theme and as a conceptual technique. First, the fabrication of Barnard's Harrisburg Capitol statuary offers a window into the Paris labor industry system. The circulation of the sculptural groups between Moret-sur-Loing and Pietrasanta before being shipped overseas illuminates the transnational network of assistants, carvers, and models, among others, who participated in the production of Barnard's statuary. Next, I analyze *Hymn to Labor* as a metaphor for Yrurtia's own efforts as a sculptor. I study how Yrurtia departed from the traditional labor monuments that proliferated in Western Europe at the turn of the century in his *Hymn to Labor*, a reflection on the idea of human progress and nation building in Argentina. Finally, I consider the use of the techniques of fragmentation, disassembly, and reassembly in O'Connor's creative process and the sculptor's contribution to redefining the relation between the sculptural fragment and the monumental ensemble. Having found less archival documentation on O'Connor's studio practice than for Barnard and Yrurtia, I analyze the act of sculpting as a coping mechanism for the artist during World War II.

[453] There are strong parallels between sculptors and muralists, both of whom conceived large-scale artistic projects destined for specific sites and had to negotiate between their own artistic ambitions and the expectations of their commissioners.

5.1 The Transnational Labor Industry System: Sculpting the Pennsylvania Capitol Statuary

Returning to the United States on board of the ship *S.S. Celtic*, George Grey Barnard wrote to his parents on New Year's Day in 1903:

> I have decided to settle for the next three years in the little town of Moret just outside Paris. […] Until last night I had decided to stay in America, but I paid a last visit to the Louvre, and seeing again those wonderful works of the Middle Ages caused an abrupt change of mind. […] I felt with a pressure of heart I had been separated too long from fellow laborers.[454]

The low cost of living, the presence of a wide variety of models, and the expertise of the labor force in France encouraged Barnard to return to France a decade after his success at the 1894 SNBA in order to carry out his monumental project for the Pennsylvania State Capitol far from its final destination. This section explores how international sculptors, like Barnard, participated in the transnational network of sculptors, carvers, *praticiens,* and models, among other agents, who were active in the Paris labor industry system.

The earliest conception of the Pennsylvania State Capitol groups is perhaps recorded by a collection of tiny clay models.[455] Barnard experimented with both vertical and horizontal compositions, also working on different groupings of the figures, a traditional step in the sculptural design process. Barnard's clay models are exceptionally tiny. Like the Japanese miniature sculptures known as *netsuke*, they could easily fit in a coat pocket. One could imagine the sculptor travelling back and forth between France and the United States, and, most likely, between Paris

---

[454] Barnard to his parents, January 1, 1903. "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers" (State College, PA, n.d.), Centre County Historical Society.

[455] These clay models are conserved today in the collection of The State Museum of Pennsylvania in Harrisburg, PA.

and Moret-sur-Loing, contemplating his three-inch models. The vertical model shows traces of fingerprints: stacked on top of two blocks placed one over the other, a group of indistinct body shapes protrudes from a background panel **(figure 117)**. The other model, shaped horizontally, is more detailed: balls of clay form the heads of the figures, whose bodies already announce their postures in the final composition of *Love and Labor* **(figure 118).** These clay balls have no facial features. Instead, they present the gestures and positioning of the figures in the sculptural composition. The individual figures are drawn out from the central mass of clay on which they are structurally dependent. Barnard's clay models are suggestive of the final composition: a clay sculpture of a couple constitutes a first conception of *Adam and Eve* for the background group of "The Burden of Life."

These clay models connect Barnard to the tradition of French nineteenth-century sculptors who drew sketches and made clay maquettes as preliminary designs for their monumental compositions. In her discussion of Carpeaux's training in the studio of Francisque Duret (1804-1865), Wagner describes how Duret's clay model, "fully suggestive" of the final appearance of his statue of Chateaubriand, differed from those of his contemporaries. The models of James Pradier (1790-1852) and Henri Lemaire (1798-1880) were "more finished," evoking the presence of the final composition.[456] In his tiny clay sculptures, however, Barnard did not seek to produce a finished model similar to those of Pradier and Lemaire; instead, he constructed the positions and motions of the figures as in Duret's *Chateaubriand*. This emphasis on the movement and gestures of the figures anticipated his large monumental groups, in which the figures are connected to one another by their body placement rather than by their gazes or facial expressions. It is fascinating

[456] Anne Middleton Wagner, *Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux: Sculptor of the Second Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 81–83.

to observe that these miniature models of only a few inches led Barnard to compose monumental groups that are larger than life-size. Working on both micro and macro scales, Barnard would complete plaster models of differing dimensions in his studio in Moret before collaborating with carvers on the marble in Pietrasanta, Italy.

Barnard attributes the origin of the Harrisburg statuary to one of his previous creations, *The Urn of Life,* initially conceived as a marble urn to hold the ashes of the Hungarian musician Anton Seidl: "In the making of the composition known as the 'Urn of Life,' I found the seed which, when planted, grew into the two compositions known as 'Labor' and 'Love' on either side of the Capital [sic] in Harrisburg."[457] The narrative sequence of the sculptural figures assembled in small groupings all around the urn announces the composition of the reliefs at the entrance of the Pennsylvania State Capitol Building. Moreover, Barnard recycled a number of figures from *The Urn* in his Harrisburg groups. For instance, the male figure leaning over the body of the mother in the scene of baptism in "The Burden of Life" group is quoted from *The Urn of Life* **(figures 119-120)**. Even though he is shown standing in the Harrisburg group, the position of his head, bent and hidden behind his hair, and the rotation of his upper body are similar in both groups. This figure is also reminiscent of the father in Barnard's *Prodigal Son* **(see chapter 2, figure 22)**.

[457] Barnard to Beatty, March 26, 1919. "Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art Records, 1883-1962, Bulk 1885-1940" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Table 3 Execution and Itinerary of the Harrisburg Statuary Commission

Location	Agent	Process
Moret-sur-Loing, France [1903-1906]	Barnard's studio (La Grange) Barnard and assistants, including casters, mold makers, and models coming from Paris	Making individual groups in plasticine, and then in plaster of various scales
Pietrasanta, Italy [1907-1909]	Piccirilli Brothers' firm and some of Barnard's studio assistants from Paris	Carving individual groups in marble
Moret and Paris SAF, France [May-June 1910]	Barnard's studio (finishings by the sculptor) and transportation to the SAF	Marble work completed in April 1910, and the groups were displayed at the Salon in May
Pietrasanta, Italy [1910-1911]	Piccirilli Brothers' firm	Covering of genitalia of figures
Harrisburg, PA, USA [1911]	Barnard with Piccirilli Brothers	Installation of the groups in front of the Capitol Building. Inauguration in November 1911

This graph highlights the geographic distance travelled by the Harrisburg statuary groups at different stages of their construction process: from plasticine figures, to plaster groups, to marble compositions of various scales through their multiple iterations. Moreover, it features the many agents involved in this sculptural enterprise, pointing out transnational connections between France, Italy, and the United States.

5.1.1 An American in Moret

It was in Moret-sur-Loing, a French town located an hour south of Paris, where Barnard, with the help of French assistants, produced the plaster models of his sculptural groups destined for the Pennsylvania State Capitol.[458] From December 1903 to February 1907, Barnard's *chef d'atelier* in Moret kept a diary of Barnard's progress on his commission.[459] Everyday activities were listed, including Barnard's work on each figural group, scheduled sessions with his models, weekly trips to Paris, studio visits, family activities, as well as studio expenses. This detailed account of the daily life in Barnard's studio offers a precious record of the sculptor's business at the beginning of the twentieth century.[460] It was not as large as the studio run by Rodin, who, after

[458] Moret-sur-Loing was the town where Edna Monroe, Barnard's wife, was living when Barnard met her in the late 1880s.

[459] "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers" (State College, PA, n.d.), Centre County Historical Society.

[460] "In Rodin's time, sculptors engaged assistants and specialized artisans who took over part of the work to save time: some were modelers and ornamentists who, at the master's request, created secondary elements; others made molds of the works and produced plaster casts from them; assistants using the pointing machines transposed the dimensions of the model to the stone block while practitioners carved the marble, and founders cast figures in bronze. They all worked under the watchful eye of the master who conceived the models, gave orders, and approved each stage of the

1900, employed fifty people, including modelers, casters, mold makers, marble masons, ornamentalists, and enlargers, among others.[461] But Barnard's "La Grange" gathered people in a great variety of métiers: suppliers of raw materials with the Maison J. Ogier – turntable – and Monsieur Reviron – soil –; workers from Maison Gilon, who provided armatures;[462] and Monsieur Roland Ghiloni, who did molding and *estampage*.[463] There were also *praticiens* and models, who took up the largest portion of the budget. Between 1903 and 1905, Barnard's expenses for his labor force grew drastically, from 4,889 francs in 1903, to 32,821 francs in 1904, and 34,650 francs in 1905.[464]

Even though clay models initially played a role in the sculptor's creative process, Barnard's preferred material in the studio was plasticine, a nonhardening clay mixture made with oil or wax that remained workable for long periods of time. The sculptor made plasticine pieces at different scales, from very small models – 40 cm – to slightly smaller than life-size sculptures – 1.20 meters. These pieces were subsequently transformed into plaster by Barnard's casters and mold makers, and only then would Barnard revise the plaster. Plaster models were also executed at different

---

work." François Blanchetière,"Breathing Life into Stone: Rodin and His Marble Statues," in Montreal Museum of Fine Arts (Montreal) et al., *Metamorphoses: In Rodin's Studio* (Milan; Montreal: 5 Continents Editions : The Montreal Museum of Fine Arts, 2015), 155.

[461] About Rodin's studio, see Véronique Mattiussi, " 'In the Studio of the World…,' " in Montreal Museum of Fine Arts (Montreal) et al., 96–105.

[462] The Maison Gilon supplied armatures to Auguste Rodin as well. See receipts by Gustave Gilon in "Vertical File Gustave Gilon" (Paris, France, n.d.), Archive, Musée Rodin.

[463] Every kind of métier associated with sculpture was represented in La Grange except marble carvers, whose services Barnard used in Pietrasanta.

[464] "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers."

scales, and Barnard entrusted the enlargement and reduction of his compositions, executed piece by piece, to Monsieur Haligon. On March 29, 1904, for instance, Barnard, dependent upon the progress of his assistants to make headway on his individual sculptures, was waiting for the pose of an arm and a leg on the *Prodigal Son*. The studio records indicate that the sculpture was finally made into plaster ten months later, allowing Barnard to go ahead with it.[465] The collaborative nature of labor in the studio demanded that the head sculptor maintain a tight timeline to complete its commissions.

Barnard worked regularly with a group of six *praticiens* and hired nine others for periods ranging from one week to a few months in February and March 1910, in the run-up to the opening of the Salon des artistes français in May of that year.[466] Each *praticien* had a personal notebook on which they recorded weekly sessions and daily wages.[467] Even though their names have long been forgotten, many *praticiens* gained recognition within the sculptural community in Paris. They capitalized on the fame of the head sculptors who employed them to build their own reputation. For instance, Paul Husson, Eugène de Basly, Jean Escoula, and Henri Lebossé had all worked for Rodin before entering Barnard's studio.[468] It was not unusual for *praticiens* to provide their

---

[465] Diary entry on January 19, 1905. "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers."

[466] See Barnard's employee time books. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

[467] Daily wages were between 17 and 18 Francs. The employee time books from the Moret studio show that Barnard paid a daily wage of 17 or 18 Francs to his employees between March 1909 and April 1910. In the Rodin archives, the wages around 1900 for his *praticiens* appear to be 15 francs.

[468] This account is a result of a comparison between the list of *praticiens* in the Archives of the Musée Rodin, Paris, and archival material from the Barnard Papers at the Archives of American Art, Washington DC, and at the Centre County Historical Society, State College, PA.

services to different sculptors. In a letter to Rodin inquiring about employment opportunities, de Basly recorded "when I had no work for myself personally, I worked for different artists such as Monsieur Boucher for almost a year and for Monsieur Dumilâtre even more."[469] Another *praticien,* Jean Escoula (1851-1911) first entered Carpeaux's studio before going to Rodin's from 1887 to 1900, and then to Barnard's. By hiring Paris-based *praticiens* to help him in his studio in Moret, Barnard participated in, and at the same time contributed to, the Paris labor industry system.

Even at the beginning of the twentieth century the role of the *praticiens* was little known to the general audience. In the issue of *Le Gil Blas* from July 15, 1897, Marzac dedicated an article to them:

> They [praticiens] are artist workers like the chiselers during the Renaissance, anonymous and yet indispensable collaborators of the head sculptor, who entrusted them with a maquette, sometimes barely sketched, leaving them the task of giving his designs a final and lasting form. He [the praticien] is the one who chooses the marble, does the pointing, smooths the edges off the marble, giving it first the appearance of a snowman, then sharpens it with the chisel, polishes it with a gradine stone, and gives it back to the artist who signs it and passes it *ad unguem*, finalizing it with some file marks.[470]

Marzac's description underscores the fundamental role of the *praticien*, who, from conception to final shape, is considered the main author of the sculptural piece. For Marzac,

[469] « Lorsque je n'ai pas eu de travaux pour moi personnellement j'ai travaillé pour différents artistes tels que pour Monsieur Boucher pendant près d'une année et pour Monsieur Dumilâtre davantage encore. » "Vertical File Eugène de Basly" (Paris, France, n.d.), Archive, Musée Rodin.

[470] *Le Gil Blas*, July 15, 1897. Marzac describes the *praticiens* visiting the Salon: « ce sont des ouvriers artistes comme le furent les ciseleurs de la Renaissance, collaborateurs anonymes et pourtant indispensables du maître sculpteur, qui leur a confié une maquette, parfois à peine ébauchée, leur laissant le soin de donner à ses conceptions une forme définitive et durable […] C'est lui qui choisit le marbre, le met au point, le dégrossit, lui donne d'abord l'apparence d'un bonhomme de neige, l'affine au ciseau, le polit à la gradine et le rend ensuite à l'artiste qui le signe et le passe *ad unguem*, c'est-à-dire l'effleure de quelques décisifs coups de limes. » Archive, Musée Rodin, Paris.

praticiens are the primary sculptors. Their role is not limited to their manual labor, since they often contribute creatively to the maquette, completing the sculptor's preliminary model. This statement underlines the hierarchy between the sculptor and the *praticien*, and the lower status of the latter, whose labor was not recognized outside of the studio environment.

The low rank of the *praticien* would often cause bitter disagreements inside the studio, as shown by a letter written by Escoula to Rodin: "You seem to be completely unaware of all the trouble I have gone to for all your sculptures in the seven years that I have worked for you; I was certainly very devoted to you, because you cannot assume that it is the pecuniary aspect that interested me the most. […] I am really wondering which of us does not know the job."[471] The critic Paul Leroi even claimed in his review of the 1903 Salon that Rodin did not know how to carve marble: "Mr. Rodin, who never knew how to cut marble, as two of our major sculptors could bear witness, MM. Jean Escoula and Victor Peter, too long taken advantage of by him, because of their consistent bad luck."[472]

Even more incisive was a satirical story published in *Le Cri de Paris* with the premise that an Italian photographer visiting Rodin's studio to take a photograph of a sculpture actually completed by the artist would leave with nothing, since all the sculptures were made by the

---

[471] Escoula to Rodin, no date. « Vous semblez ignorer complètement tout le mal que je me suis donné pour tous vos travaux depuis sept ans que je travaille pour vous ; je vous ai été certes très dévoué, car vous ne supposez pas que ce soit le côté pécuniaire qui m'ait le plus intéressé. […] je suis réellement à me demander lequel de nous deux ne connait pas le travail. » Interestingly, this letter was not published in the volumes of correspondence of Rodin. "Vertical File Jean Escoula" (Paris, France, n.d.), Archive, Musée Rodin.

[472] Paul Leroi on the Salons, in *L'Art*, June 1903, 328. « M. Rodin, lequel n'a jamais su tailler le marbre, ainsi qu'en témoigneraient deux de nos principaux statuaires, MM. Jean Escoula and Victor Peter trop longtemps exploités par lui, grâce à leur manque complet de fortune. »

praticiens. A recurring sentence punctuates the story every time the photographer decides to set up his camera in front of an object: "The title only is by Mr. Rodin. The work is by Mr. Escoula. […] The title only is by Mr. Rodin. The work is by Mr. Bourdelle!"[473] Today, Escoula, probably Rodin's most well-known *praticien*, is recognized as the hand behind the most famous pieces of the master. More than simply preparing a plaster from the *maquette*, Escoula also worked directly with models. For instance, a letter indicates that Escoula worked every day with the Italian model Tulio, until his departure from France, before doing the "retouching" with Rodin.[474]

During his employment in Rodin's and Barnard's studios, Escoula submitted his own sculptures to the Salons, where he was a regular for almost four decades, first at the Salon des artistes français and later, beginning in 1891, at the SNBA.[475] In an undated telegram sent by Escoula to Rodin, the *praticien* thanked Rodin profusely after reading in the paper that he received his first medal at the Salon, commenting, "I owe you the biggest part of this success."[476] It was not uncommon for *praticiens* to present their compositions at the Salons, and even to receive awards from the jury. However, the State rarely gave commissions to *praticiens* or bought their sculptures, as it did not want to encourage the efforts of these artist-workers to break free from their studio

---

[473] *Le cri de Paris*, October 13, 1907. Archive, Musée Rodin, Paris.

[474] "Vertical File Jean Escoula."

[475] Jean Escoula exhibited yearly at the Salon from 1876 to 1879, from 1880 to 1888 at the SAF, and then from 1891 to 1910 at the SNBA (with the exception of 1900 and 1901). He received a third-class medal at the 1881 SAF, a second-class medal in 1882, and a gold medal at the 1889 Paris World's Fair. "Base Salons," accessed November 13, 2020, http://salons.musee-orsay.fr/.

[476] Escoula to Rodin, telegram, undated. « Mille fois merci mon cher ami, je viens de voir dans les journaux ma 1ère médaille. Je vous attribue la plus grosse part à ce succès. Je vous serre la main. J. Escoula. » "Vertical File Jean Escoula."

labors.[477] The *praticien* was indeed a sculptor, and often, arguably, more accomplished than the artists who were able to give their names to the finished pieces. They worked on these pieces from start to finish, and even exhibited their own compositions at the Salons, but if the government deemed them worthy of an award, they almost never bought the sculptures for public collections. Escoula, however, stands out as an exception, since one of his marbles was bought by the French government.[478] If it were not for his status of *praticien*, one might think of him as a "sculptor," since he ran his own studio, where he had students, like Jean Baffier (1851-1920). Although critics in the press reviewed Escoula's efforts, they were often compared with Rodin's. At the 1894 SAF, a journalist commented on his marble head *Tristesse*: "Mr. Escoula nevertheless makes the mistake of sometimes trying to imitate some Mr. Rodin, for example this head: *Sadness*, which emerges from a block."[479]

Between December 1903 and 1906, Barnard and his assistants in Moret made steady progress on the Harrisburg commission, and the sculptor regularly sent photographs of his completed plaster groups to his family in the United States. None of his studio assistants is included in the frame of the photographs. Only Barnard, his tools in hand, is seen, his human scale emphasizing the sheer size of his groups. Although Barnard used the medium of photography to

---

[477] Marzac, *Le Gil Blas*, July 15, 1897. « Le jury des expositions accorde assez libéralement des récompenses, - mentions ou médailles - aux praticiens exposants, en revanche l'Etat n'encourage presque jamais par des commandes ou des achats leurs efforts vers l'émancipation. »

[478] At the 1909 SNBA, Escoula showed a marble statue of *La Muse Bagneraise*, which was commissioned by the French government to be erected in Bagnère-de-Bigorre, the sculptor's hometown. "Base Salons," accessed November 13, 2020, http://salons.musee-orsay.fr/.

[479] « Salon de 1894 », *L'Art*, 1894. « M. Escoula a néanmoins le tort de chercher parfois, lui aussi, à imiter quelque M. Rodin, par exemple cette tête : *Tristesse*, qui émerge d'un bloc. »

document his progress on the sculptural groups and keep his close family and friends overseas up to date with his work, he also seemed to have repurposed his studio into a site for photographic experimentation. Two photographs of the sculptural groups for *Life of Humanity*, one featuring an autonomous figure and the other presenting two multi-figural groupings on an elevated base, show a glowing quality of light transforming the plaster figures into evanescent shapes. On the latter, the reflections of the figures from *The Burden of Life* group, like a mirroring effect against the high ceiling, animate the studio with flying souls **(figure 121)**. Perhaps they suggest Barnard's attempt to emphasize the spirituality of his sculptural figures.

Visitors were welcomed into Barnard's studio in Moret. In March 1905, the architect Joseph Huston and the Pennsylvania Committee visited the studio to observe the successful advancement of Barnard's sculptural groups. Additionally, after finishing his first large plaster composition "*Les douleurs,*" or "The Sorrows," the sculptor invited the inhabitants of Moret to come see it. On October 16, 1905, 761 people visited Barnard's studio, and the event was a great success. Barnard's initiative might suggest that the sculptor was attentive to his reception both in France and at home. It also perhaps led Thibaut-Sisson, the influential art critic for the newspaper *Le temps*, to visit Barnard's studio two days later and publish an article on the sculptural group shortly thereafter. At that time, Barnard benefited from growing popularity in France just before the corruption scandal involving Huston, the architect of the Pennsylvania State Capitol, broke in 1906. After negotiating a new contract with the State Capitol Commission in 1908, Barnard secured further funding to complete his statuary and pursued his work on the plaster models with his *praticiens* in Moret. The groups would then be transported to Italy and carved in marble.[480]

[480] "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

5.1.2 "While the heads on many of the figures are American, the models were French or Italian"[481]

In a letter from January 1, 1903, Barnard explained to his parents that the model market in Paris was the major reason why he set up his studio in France: "But what is most important is the models. These I can't get in my own country for the 2 groups and carry work out in time."[482] In turn of the century Paris, models inhabited districts with a high concentration of artists' studios, such as the rue de la Grande Chaumière, in the XVe arrondissement, or the place Pigalle, in the IXe arrondissement. Lists of models' names passed from studio to studio, with artists commenting on their attractive qualities and swapping addresses.[483] Barnard travelled weekly from Moret to Paris to look for new models.[484] His archival records indicate that some of his models came from the Académie Colarossi, located at the rue de la Grande Chaumière.[485] But the distance of Barnard's studio from Paris proved to be an obstacle, as shown by the journal entry from January

---

481 Barnard in an interview for *The New York Times*, "His Statues Cost Him Dear", November 25, 1910, 1. Quoted in Brian Hack, "American Acropolis: George Grey Barnard's 'Monument to Democracy', 1918-1938" (New York, City University of New York, 2008), 106.

482 Barnard to his parents, January 1, 1903. "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers" (State College, PA, n.d.), Centre County Historical Society.

483 See Hélène Pinet, "Rodin and his models: Comedy or Curtain up," in Montreal Museum of Fine Arts (Montreal) et al., *Metamorphoses*, 124–33.

484 Barnard took advantage of these trips to Paris to also visit the Salons. Barnard to his parents, Moret-sur-Loing, May 7, 1903. "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers" (State College, PA, n.d.), Centre County Historical Society.

485 "List of French models, reference Harrisburg group" on a sheet of paper from Académie Colarossi, dated June 20, 1910. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

22, 1904: "Mr. Barnard looked for poses with a female model who was to pose for the model of *The Thinker's Wife*, who refused to continue, wanting to come back to Paris every night."[486] The next day, Barnard went to Paris to look for a new model. In contrast to Rodin's studio, where "models [were] wandering around freely,"[487] Barnard brought one model at a time in his studio, and his progress relied on their availability. On February 15, 1904, for instance, the sculptor was unable to work on the figure of the younger brother for his group *Two Brothers* because the model had stayed in Paris.[488]

However, geographic distance was not the only factor that dissuaded models from working with Barnard. The very nature of the poses demanded by the sculptor, often strenuous and physically demanding, could cause injuries. Between February 19 and 29, 1904, Barnard worked with a model for the figure of the *Kneeling Youth*, and his *chef d'atelier* reported in his daily journal: "The model poses badly. It is the first time that he is posing. Tiring pose for a beginner."[489] The strenuous pose of the *Kneeling Youth* was so painful to hold that a physician advised the model

---

[486] "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers" (State College, PA, n.d.), Centre County Historical Society. « Mr. Barnard a cherché des poses avec un modèle de femme qui devait poser pour l'esquisse de *La femme du penseur* qui n'a pas voulu continuer voulant rentrer tous les soirs à Paris. »

[487] Nathalie Bondil, "Reassembled Profiles of Rodin's Method: 'Understand is a long and difficult process'", in Montreal Museum of Fine Arts (Montreal) et al., *Metamorphoses*, 107.

[488] "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers" (State College, PA, n.d.), Centre County Historical Society. Journal entry from February 15, 1904 : « Barnard n'a pu travailler au frère cadet (*Two Brothers*) le modèle étant resté à Paris. »

[489] "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers" (State College, PA, n.d.), Centre County Historical Society. Journal entry from February 19, 1904. « Mr. Barnard continue la figure de l'homme à genoux. Le modèle pose mal. C'est la première fois qu'il pose. Pose fatigante pour un début. »

to stop posing for the sculpture.[490] Despite this setback, Barnard did not give up on his original idea for the sculpture. The Russian-born American artist Charles Ezekiel Polowetski (1884-1955) became his new model for the group.[491] In general, though, Barnard had specific models in mind for his sculptures: in a letter from December 1905, the sculptor wrote to the colonel of the 54th in Compiègne to obtain permission for the young Huet, enrolled in national military service, to be released from duty for eight days in order pose in his studio, allowing him to finish his group.[492]

Barnard's diary from 1903 to 1907 helps identify a large number of models who posed for the different sculptural groupings of the Harrisburg commission. Among them were family members, that is, Barnard's wife, who posed for the head of the angel; artists, such as the painter Polowetski; models of various nationalities, like the British model William Titterton, and others, whose names have fallen into obscurity– Madame Charron, César, Mlle Cataldi, Loretto Riozzi, François Appruzese, Louis Cataldi, Suzanne Rousseau, Mlle Maréchal, Mlle Geslin, and more.[493] Barnard used some forty models to complete *Life of Humanity*, and claimed that while the "heads

---

[490] Brian Hack, "American Acropolis: George Grey Barnard's 'Monument to Democracy', 1918-1938" (New York, City University of New York, 2008), 96. The author cites Barnard Work Diary 1903-1904, Barnard Papers, SAAA.

[491] Polowetski would also pose for the figure of the son in Barnard's *The Prodigal Son.*

[492] "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers" (State College, PA, n.d.), Centre County Historical Society.

[493] Titterton (le père de famille), Madame Charron (la Marcheuse), César (l'homme au sac), Mlle Cataldi (la grande figure la Marcheuse avec la nature), Loretto Riozzi (l'homme souffrant), François Appruzese (l'homme porté par son frère), Louis Cataldi (le groupe La Famille), Suzanne Rousseau (la Mère), Mlle Marechal (paysanne), Melle Geslin (femme du penseur), and more. See "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers" (State College, PA, n.d.), Centre County Historical Society.

on many of the figures are American, the models were French or Italian."[494] Thus, the monument would be read as "American" once set up at the entrance of the Pennsylvania State Capitol in Harrisburg, yet the workers and models who participated in its making were of many nationalities.

Although Barnard used individual models for his Pennsylvania State Capitol statuary, the sculpted figures appear anonymous: their eyes, barely carved, are reminiscent of antique sculptures. Barnard's choice to minimize the individuality of each figure may have been a device to give his sculptures a sort of universal character. Instead, the emphasis is placed on the bodily gestures. Each figure is connected to one another through their hands and legs, as if forming part of a human chain. Barnard's notes in his listing of models' names and addresses from the Académie Colarossi entitled "French models, reference Harrisburg group" suggest that the sculptor was looking for specific traits in female models: "Ducros, very good but not just what I want"; "Nora Moosdecheff 13 carrefour Odéon / Nouvel Hotel / Very heavy. Will do for mother. Good head."; "Mme Georgette Augier. 13 rue de la Grande Chaumière. Large for mother." [495] These comments indicate that Barnard was looking for a model with a strong and muscular body for the *Mother* figure.

Another list with the heading of Académie Colarossi reads:

> Anaizeau 46 bd Port Royal / fine model of 19 says 27 / solid – good head, black hair, fine torso / May do for the barefoot figure or figure of fronton;
> Agnès Cataldi 48 rue Brocca. Small girl like boy. Very lovely but too boyish;
> Cataldi Marguerite / 6 rue Maison Dieu / very good rather full but good front did not see legs;

---

[494] Barnard in an interview for *The New York Times*, "His Statues Cost Him Dear", November 25, 1910, 1. Quoted in Brian Hack, "American Acropolis: George Grey Barnard's 'Monument to Democracy', 1918-1938" (New York, City University of New York, 2008), 106.

[495] Notebook with heading of the Académie Colarossi, 10 rue de la Grande Chaumière, Paris, dated June 1910. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

> Angèle Valenti 18 ans / 60 bd Quinet / Heavy model 19 ans / fine large lines heavy hips / good head, splendid back / if wanted in frontons / good in all but heavy
> 12 ans Pecci Joséphine 51 Av du Maine not developed[496]

These notes describe very young women and identify a type of voluptuous, or "heavy," woman to embody the idea of motherhood. Barnard's sculptural ensemble ended up featuring specific body types: muscular and athletic for men, as in *Two Brothers*, where the anatomical details are striking, as if the sculptor had shaved down as much skin as possible so that it would barely contain the veins bursting underneath **(see chapter 3, figure 55)**. These figures contrast sharply with the roundness, curves, and full bodies of women, as in *The Mourning Woman,* whose large, round breasts and wide hips are clear references to fertility **(see chapter 3, figure 62)**. This typology of figures developed by Barnard in the Harrisburg statuary functions almost as a visual repertory of the different ages and stages of life: the figure by itself, in a couple, with a family; young, middle-aged, and old. Barnard declared, "The day of gods is passed. This is the day of the people and it is the people that I want to fix in sculpture."[497]

In the Harrisburg groups, it is the relational gestures between figures that create a narrative—bodies bending, bodies carried, bodies supported by one another: they become elements of a story told through the human body. Moreover, their meaning differs when each figure, or group of figures, is taken separately, as seen in chapter 3, detailing Barnard's retrospective exhibition in Boston. As an ensemble, however, each sculptural group contributes to a broader narrative about the "Life of Humanity." While Barnard appropriated sculptural motifs from the Paris Salons for his own compositions – as described in chapters 2 and 3 – he rearranged them within a compositional ensemble for Harrisburg. Received differently at the Paris SAF of 1910

---

[496] "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

[497] "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

and in their final installation in the architectural complex of the Pennsylvania State Capitol, these figural types acquired new meanings in their transatlantic crossing.

5.1.3 From Moret to Pietrasanta

In his personal papers, Barnard conserved two postcards documenting the transportation of marble blocks from the Italian quarries of Carrara to the town of Pietrasanta **(figure 122)**.[498] One could imagine Barnard among these men, selecting marble blocks and having them carried to the nearest town. The sign "Trattoria Americana" on the building's façade might indicate that this Italian town had become a base for American sculptors buying marble, another imprint of transnationality on this international labor system. In Italy, Barnard would work with new collaborators: the Piccirilli brothers, a family of renowned carvers who created some of the most significant monuments in the United States.[499] The Piccirilli brothers are first recorded in Barnard's archives in an entry from January 10, 1905, when they arrived in Moret to undertake the marble carving on the groups.[500] However, it seems that it was later settled that the plaster models would be made in Moret and transported to Pietrasanta, where the Piccirilli brothers would execute the marble carving.

Seven months later, Barnard signed a contract with them for the sum of twenty thousand dollars to have his plaster groups carved into marble. Given Barnard's delays in finishing the

[498] "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

[499] The Piccirilli brothers are particularly remembered in the United States for the carving of Daniel Chester French's Lincoln statue in Washington, D.C.

[500] Harrisburg Sculpture Progress Diary. "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers" (State College, PA, n.d.), Centre County Historical Society.

plaster casts, the cost of labor, and the rising price of materials, the Piccirilli would later ask for an additional sum of money, which Barnard was unable to pay.[501] An additional contract signed on January 28, 1909, between the commissioners of Pennsylvania, representatives in New York City, and the Piccirilli brothers allowed Barnard and the Italian firm to continue their collaboration. That year, Barnard traveled regularly to Italy to oversee the carving and assembling of his marble groups and bas-reliefs in anticipation of their display at the 1910 Paris SAF.[502]

On January 21, 1910, Barnard's studio in Moret-sur-Loing flooded, destroying a large number of plaster models for the Harrisburg statuary. Barnard described the situation on the verso of a photograph: "Six feet of water in studio for fifteen days, entirely destroying big bas-relief and many casts of Harrisburg work."[503] The sculptor documented the damaged sculptures, taking pictures of his sculptural groups floating in the studio **(figure 123)**. Some photographs show figures caught in the flood with water up to their legs, emphasizing the fragility of plaster. Others were taken after the water had receded, with fragments dispersed on the floor as testimonies of the damage. The gestures of some figures, their hands raised to their heads, emphasize the drama of the scene. Fortunately for Barnard, by the time of the flood, the large-scale plaster models must have already gone to Pietrasanta, where the marble groups were brought to completion in time for the opening of the 1910 SAF. After the closure of the Salon, Barnard sent some of his French workers to Pietrasanta to assist in the final stages of completion of the sculptural groups. Among

---

[501] "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives. On August 15, 1905, Barnard signed a contract with them for twenty thousand dollars to have his plaster groups made into marble

[502] The contract shows evidence of when each group was finished and arrived in Paris for the Salons. For instance, on August 13, 1909, Barnard travelled to Italy to oversee the putting together of the groups and bas-reliefs.

[503] "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

them was Paul Husson, who, with Italian coworkers, prepared the marble groups for their shipment overseas.[504]

5.1.4 "Bon voyage to them"

After the closure of the 1910 Salon des artistes français, Barnard remained in France to prepare the shipment of his monumental groups to the United States. On June 29, 1910, he wrote to his wife Edna, on a boat back to the United States, that his large marble relief, almost completed, would be ready to pack after the next day to ship to Harrisburg. He ended the letter with an expression of relief: "and bon voyage to them."[505] The Barnard committee group, based in New York City and led by Frederick G. Bourne and Edwin R. Seligman, which had paid for the expenses to display Barnard's *Life of Humanity* at the Paris Salon, took charge of the shipment of the monumental groups from France to Harrisburg. The correspondence between the Piccirilli Brothers Company and Frederick G. Bourne between the fall of 1910 and the summer of 1911 provides insights about the shipping conditions and the erection of the Barnard statuary groups in Harrisburg.

In November 1910, the Piccirilli Brothers Company received the delivery of boxes containing the bas-relief of *Adam and Eve* in New York, where they arrived on the boat *S.S.*

---

[504] Paul Husson Employee Time Book. « Journées du 9 au 30 juin 1910. 342Fr. Voyage Italia. 95Fr. Reçu à Pietrasanta acompte 100 Fr. Reste au total 347fr. » Back in Paris, Husson continued to work for Barnard in July, August, and September 1910 for 18 francs/hour. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

[505] "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers" (State College, PA, n.d.), Centre County Historical Society.

Perugia, ready to be shipped on to Harrisburg the next day.[506] A week later, seventeen boxes containing two marble groups by Barnard arrived on the steamer *Niagara* of the Compagnie Générale Transatlantique, and were found in perfect condition.[507] On May 17, 1911, the Piccirilli Brothers Company confirmed the arrival of all marble groups and bas-reliefs in Harrisburg, where they were setting in place the last bas-relief.[508] An entire year went by between the closing of the 1910 Paris Salon and the reception of all the monumental groups in Harrisburg. The Piccirilli Brothers not only accepted delivery of all of Barnard's statuary in New York and transported them to Harrisburg, they also added marble blurs to the figures of *Burden of Life* before setting them up. Indeed, Getulio Piccirilli traveled to the Pennsylvania Capitol to install the groups and attach the marble blurs that Barnard had furnished to cover the nudity of the figures. According to the expense report sent to the Barnard committee, the marble blurs added $118.50 to the total cost.[509]

---

[506] Piccirilli Brothers Co. to Frederick G. Bourne, November 28, 1910. "we have this day opened the boxes containing the bas relief of Adam and Eve, which arrived in N Y on S.S. Perugia and found all in good order and condition. We shall ship tomorrow to Harrisburg Pa" "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

[507] Piccirilli Brothers Co. to Frederick G. Bourne, December 6, 1910. "the 17 boxes containing two groups of marble by Mr. George G. Barnard and which arrived on steamer Niagara of the Compagnie General Transatlantic have been inspected and found to be in perfect order. The same have been removed this day and shipped to Harrisburg, Pa." "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

[508] Piccirilli Brothers Co. to Frederick G. Bourne, May 17, 1911. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

[509] "For the carving of six pieces of marble from models furnished to us by Mr. Barnard to cover nudity of figures. $118,50" "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

In the summer of 1911, Barnard travelled to Harrisburg to direct the installation of his monumental groups. He told his wife, "I am at work on the groups here there and everywhere."[510] The erection of the Barnard statuary in Harrisburg was documented by a series of photographs featuring the multiple steps involved in placing the groups in front of the Capitol. A crowd gathered at the foot of the pedestal on which *Burden of Life* was about to be erected. A pulley system had been set up, and the first bas-relief that would serve as a compositional background for *Burden of Life* was mounted on the pedestal. Once this first monumental group was erected and protected under drapes, the pulley system was mounted on the other side door. There, the individual sculptural groups that composed *Love and Labor* were lifted onto their pedestal. The photograph shows the wooden boxes in which the groups were transported, the hammers left on the floor, and the passerby who stopped to observe the scene **(figure 124)**. Once both monumental groups were put in place, the pulley system and the wooden structures were taken away, leaving in plain sight these marble figures that had travelled all the way from Italy and France.

Before becoming one of the greatest commissions of early twentieth-century American sculpture, *Life of Humanity* was a complex transnational enterprise, relying on both France and Italy as its context of production. Barnard made strategic use of the Paris Salons system, not only in the emulation of sculptural motifs on display and in the exhibition and critical apparatus, but also in the construction of his monument, involving collaboration with the French labor force. Issues of labor industry in sculptural practice are hard to solve, as many sculptors' archives do not contain papers detailing the personnel who collaborated with them in their studios. In the cases of Barnard and Rodin, however, their studio practices are well documented, and the cross-reference

[510] Barnard to Edna, from Harrisburg, June 21, 1911. "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers" (State College, PA, n.d.), Centre County Historical Society.

of their respective archives demonstrates that a number of *praticiens* were engaged in the studio of both artists, providing a new perspective on the interconnected Parisian labor system.

5.2 Sculpting Labor: Rogelio Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor*

In the shadow of monumental figures standing on a wooden table, Rogelio Yrurtia, dressed elegantly in a suit, poses for the camera with two of his studio assistants. This photograph pulls back the curtains on Yrurtia's Paris studio located at 83 rue de la Tombe Issoire, in the XIVe arrondissement, circa 1908 **(figure 125)**. Larger than life-size plaster figures dominate the studio, headless, their backs bent, their muscles emphasized by the bright natural light from a large window. Their severed heads are lined up on the edge of the central platform. In the background, fragments and sculptures of various materials and dimensions, some of them in the process of being enlarged, can be seen. The bright spot of light in the upper right corner of the studio signals that the workers often had to face the glare while carrying out their tasks. Ambitious multi-figural sculptures like Barnard's and Yrurtia's necessitated a collaborative effort that involved a team of workers at each step. This photograph constitutes a rare testimony of studio life, as well as the piecemeal process of making monuments, in this instance, Yrurtia's monument to labor.

Hymn to Labor embodies the intense physical labor of the sculptor and his studio assistants; at the same time, it is itself a reflection about labor. It can also be read as the sculptor's direct response to the rejection of his monument to Argentinian independence, discussed in chapter 4.

> I thought that my project to the May commemoration was an eloquent and obvious demonstration of my arduousness. But sadly, I realized that nobody had even appreciated

the spirit of my work, and not even the amount of labor. Then, I have nothing left to say that I made a titanic effort.[511]

In this quote, Yrurtia expressed his frustration with the Argentinian audience, whom he felt did not appreciate the aesthetic qualities of the composition, let alone the value of his physical labor and the gargantuan effort invested in making the monument. Nonetheless, in *Hymn to Labor* Yrurtia redeployed principles similar to those underlying his *Monument to the May Revolution*: he abandoned elements of classical architecture, such as the triumphal arch or the symbolic tower, to focus instead on the greater than life-size figures marching together in unison.[512]

Yrurtia transformed the prototypical labor monument into a celebration of the progress of the Argentinian nation. Originally composed of four figures, *Hymn to Labor* expanded into a large figurative saga with fourteen men, women, and children. The monument embodied Yrurtia's hopes to accomplish what he called "his first real work" and "triumph before the world."[513] Although

---

[511] Yrurtia to Carlos Delcasse, August 12, 1909. "Me parecía que mi proyecto de mayo fuese una prueba elocuente, evidente, de mi laboriosidad. Pero me apercibo tristemente que ninguno no solamente no supo apreciar el espíritu de mi obra, sino tampoco la suma de labor - A mi entonces me queda decirles que mi esfuerzo es solo de Titanes." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[512] In an early version, Yrurtia's monument to labor had an architectural arch, but the sculptor later decided against it since, according to him, "it did not correspond to the general idea, nor to the decorative ensemble." Yrurtia to Schiaffino, from Paris, April 18, 1909: "le he mandado fotografías, de un trozo del grupo 'Canto al Sol' para la municipalidad, así, como varios fragmentos del grupo en yeso de mi proyecto, figuras, y por fín el arco mismo." Yrurtia to Schiaffino, from Boulogne sur Seine, January 11, 1916: "He desistido de la arcada que había previsto primitivamente, considerando que no responde, ni a la idea general, ni al conjunto decorativo." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[513] Yrurtia to Schiaffino, August 30, 1909. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

committed to contributing to the arts of his nation, Yrurtia drew from the repertory of sculptural forms in the transnational Paris Salons to create his own labor monument. The Argentinian sculptor would remain in the French capital for more than a decade until the completion of the final model *before Hymn to Labor* was cast in bronze. During that time, Yrurtia exclusively took on commissions that he secured in Buenos Aires, but he also presented his sculptures at international venues, including Barcelona and Edinburgh.[514] Yrurtia later claimed that he had refused orders from North America because his duty was to work for his homeland.[515]

5.2.1 "It is not a Triumph-to-Labor but rather A March of Suffering"[516]

On October 14, 1907, Yrurtia and Carlos Torcuato Alvear, the mayor of Buenos Aires, signed a contract engaging the sculptor to construct a monument symbolizing the "triumph to labor" following the original maquette that Yrurtia had presented to the Commission of Public Art. The contract stipulated that the sculptor would receive 50,000 pesos in three installments, and that

---

[514] In 1911, Yrurtia showed some of his works in the foreign section at the Fifth International Exposition in Barcelona, Spain: a woman's torso (bigger than life-size); a man's torso (bigger than life-size); a head "*Vida interior*" (life-size). Price: torsos 2.500 fcs each one; head 600 fcs. Yrurtia to Schiaffino, August 8, 1912. Yrurtia mentions his bronze sculpture, "*Serenidad*": "cuando me lo devuelvan de Edimburgo, en donde lo tengo expuesto." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[515] "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Casa de Yrurtia.

[516] Yrurtia to Schiaffino, from Paris, August 19, 1911. "no es un 'Triunfo-del-Trabajo', sino una 'Marcha de Dolor.'" "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

the monument would be carved in Carrara marble.[517] A clause gave Yrurtia the right to change the placement and the poses of the figures in the maquette, if doing so would improve the final piece. At the time of the commission, Yrurtia had already planned to complete the group in the French capital, since the contract stated explicitly that the mayor had the right to inspect the work in Paris, where it was to be executed.[518] The monument, however, would eventually be cast in bronze and transformed into a much more ambitious group than originally planned. Although Yrurtia's aforementioned maquette has since been lost, a series of photographs of clay and plaster models takes us inside the sculptor's studio in Paris circa 1908.

Yrurtia's clay models explore a number of variations on the body in movement. His sculptures are composed of fragmented bodies, some lean, others rotund, balancing on one leg or on the soles of their feet, with or without a head. Projected forward, a figure stands on a single leg by means of a device supporting it from behind **(figure 126)**. The figure gazes forward and down, as if trying to reach beyond its elevated base. Arms cut at the level of the shoulders, the figure could be reduced to a single V line with the leg slightly bent, accentuating the projection of its

[517] The contract is conserved in "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

[518] Yrurtia would have to take care of the cost of packing and transporting the sculpture to the port of Buenos Aires, after which the mayor of Buenos Aires would pay for unloading it, transporting it and making a pedestal. In a letter written by Yrurtia to Joaquín Samuel de Anchorena, dated October 27, 1911, one learns that Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor* was originally intended to embellish the Parque Tres de Febrero in Buenos Aires. "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

body in space.[519] Another sculpture showcases the muscular body of a male figure in torsion **(figure 127)**. The facture of the clay highlights the thickness of the muscles of both the torso and legs. The head is unfinished, and the arms are cut into stumps. On the photograph, a handwritten inscription indicates: "Beginning of a figure for the *Hymn to Labor* that I had to abandon due to the model's illness. The figure is life-size."[520] Amputated—missing a leg, arms, and/or a head—a series of autonomous sculptures made after *Hymn to Labor* illustrate how Yrurtia thought of each individual figure as a variation on the body in motion, testing the limits of sculptural representation **(figure 128)**.

Yrurtia progressively transformed his *Hymn to Labor* into a national monument. In 1912, the artist received permission from the Municipality of Buenos Aires to enlarge his sculptural group to make it comparable with any of the most valued national monuments in other nations.[521] After a decade spent in Paris, fighting for recognition in his home country, where he had many detractors, the Argentinian sculptor had finally gained the trust of critics and members of the

---

[519] The inscription on the lower left corner of the photograph indicates that this clay figure destined for *Hymn to Labor* was destroyed: "Esboso de una figura del 'Canto al Trabajo' destruida. París, 1909." "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Casa de Yrurtia.

[520] The inscription on the photograph reads: "Comienzo de una figura para el 'Canto al Trabajo' que tuve que abandonar por enfermedad del modelo. La figura es de tamaño natural." "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Casa de Yrurtia.

[521] Joaquín Samuel de Anchorena to Consejo Deliberante, Buenos Aires, April 27, 1912. Yrurtia asked to modify the project: "con el propósito de la intendencia de dotar al municipio de un monumento que fuera el exponente del arte nacional, comparable con cualquiera de los de mayor valía de otras naciones, su idea tenía ahora un desarrollo muy superior al del proyecto que sirvió de base." "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

Commission of Fine Arts in Buenos Aires. That summer, the Argentinian newspaper *La Nación* announced that the mayor of Buenos Aires had declared that "the high artistic value of this work [*Hymn to Labor*] and its extraordinary ornamental character, and even a patriotic duty forced the commune to make this new disbursement, given that, on the other hand, the work had been accepted by the unanimous opinion of the members of the Commission of Fine Arts and the judgment of journalists."[522] Schiaffino celebrated Yrurtia's recognition in his homeland: "It is clear that your reputation has come a long way in Buenos Aires. And knowing our compatriots, I appreciate this result […] when your work will be translated into marble; then you will have a clear path to glory."[523]

On February 10, 1913, the new mayor of Buenos Aires, Joaquín Samuel de Anchorena, and Carlos Delcasse, Yrurtia's lawyer and lifelong friend, officially modified the original contract of the monument to labor, expanding it from four to fourteen figures and quadrupling its cost to

[522] *La Nación*, July 3, 1912. The sum of $200,000 was added to the original contract signed on October 14, 1907, for the monument of "Triumph to Labor" because of modifications to the original project of the monument. "Agregaba el intendente que el alto valor artístico de ese trabajo y su extraordinario carácter ornamental y aun un deber patriótico obligaban a la comuna a hacer ese nuevo desembolso habiendo, por otra parte, sido aceptada esa obra por el dictamen unánime de los miembros de la comisión de obras de arte, el juicio de la crítica periodística […]"

[523] At that date, the monument was still destined to be made in marble. Schiaffino to Yrurtia, Dresde to Paris, August 5, 1912. "Esta patente el camino recorrido por su personalidad en Buenos Aires. Y conociendo nuestros compatriotas, aprecio este resultado […] cuando su obra haya sido trasladada al mármol; entonces usted tendrá vía libre para la gloria […] a recoger laureles." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

200,000 pesos.[524] In an early version of the project, five female figures lead a caravan of people **(figure 129)**. Reminiscent of Carpeaux's *The Dance* on the façade of the Paris Garnier Opera, four women encircle a man in Yrurtia's composition. Standing on tiptoe, with their faces hidden under the arms of the male figure, they pull the body of the man forward from his waist. The awkwardness of the hand gestures and the entanglement of the bodies make the composition difficult to read. The movements of the bodies look almost like a ballet choreography. The male figure stands as the focal point of the sculptural group, his two arms raised with his fists clasped over his head. His exaggerated musculature and the compression of his body on a single vertical line, with all the body weight transferred to his left leg, constitute a technical achievement, further pushing the balance of the figure.

Framed by the black veil of the photographic apparatus, two photographs of Yrurtia's figures for his *Hymn to Labor* place the viewer in the position of the photographer behind the camera in the sculptor's studio **(figures 130-131)**. The sculptural group is seen from behind, from two different vantage points. The sunshine entering the studio from the large upper window animates the bodies of the figures, whose musculature and arched backs shine in the light. Some structural elements support the figures who are grouped together in the central platform. Mounds of rubble have been pushed under the table, alluding to the laborious process of making such a large plaster group. A photograph of Rodin's *St Jean-Baptiste* similarly shows the sculpture in a studio with a pile of rubble in the corner and a bright light entering from the back window **(figure**

[524] On May 7, 1920, Yrurtia asked the Consejo deliberante for the sum of 60,000 pesos, corresponding to the cost of materials and workforce, to finish his *Hymn to labor*. He had not yet received the total sum of 200,000. Press cutting, "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

132). But whereas it features an independent figure, the photographs of Yrurtia's multi-figural group emphasize the challenges of photography to capture monumental sculpture in the artist's studio. In his correspondence with Schiaffino, to whom he regularly sent photographs of his works, Yrurtia confessed that his monument to labor was so large that he could not fit the piece in its entirety in the photograph: "I could not have it made better because there was no space to have it done with a bigger equipment given the very large dimensions of the work. I hope that you can get an idea of the whole – although the stone that will follow the group is missing – and that will completely explain the subject."[525]

Schiaffino paid frequent visits to Yrurtia's studio in Paris and commented on his *Hymn to Labor* while it was in the making. Surprised by the ambitious scale of the project, Schiaffino had expressed his concerns about the technical difficulties of taking on such a colossal group: "I am intrigued by one thing: your group is so dense that I do not understand how you would be able to carve the figures in the inside and the interior sides of the external figures."[526] The sculptor would solve this problem by transposing the plaster into bronze instead of marble. As the project progressed over time, Yrurtia's laborious efforts on the group translated into the struggle depicted

[525] Yrurtia to Schiaffino, from Boulogne sur Seine, January 11, 1916. "Le adjunto una pequeña fotografía que me pide de mi grupo. No he podido hacerla hacer mejor por no tener espacio para hacerlas con un aparato mayor dado a las grandes dimensiones del trabajo. Espero podrá darse una idea del conjunto – aunque falta la piedra que seguirá al grupo – y que explicará completamente el sujeto. […] lo que he conseguido es algo humano – eternamente humano – y que seguirá siéndolo tanto que los hombres serán hombres." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[526] Schiaffino to Yrurtia, Dresde to Paris, August 5, 1912. "una cosa me intriga: su grupo es tan denso que no me explico como usted hará para tallar las figuras interiores y los costados internos de sus figuras exteriores […]" "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

in the monument itself. In 1909, Yrurtia confessed to his friend Carlos Delcasse that he worked sixteen hours on his group every day, an "excessive" time, "without rest, and with the mind and body sick."[527] Two years later, the sculptor changed the title of his sculpture, which had become intimately linked with his own condition as sculptor: "I have completed my group for the Municipality! […] but I will have to change its name because this is not a 'Triumph-to-Labor,' but rather a 'March of Suffering.' It reflects all my sufferings and all my struggles."[528]

Yrurtia later described his difficulties to complete his monument to his friend Schiaffino: "I am finishing up my group - exhausted! When will I be able to tell you about my dreams, my disappointments, my enthusiasms, and my sad convictions! My sky is filled with sun – and it gets dark with dark clouds many times a day: I am finishing my group. I am finishing it."[529] Despite the physical and emotional impact of his labors, Yrurtia was not toiling by himself in his Paris studio. A team of twelve workmen helped him, but the sculptor expressed virulent criticism towards his French assistants in his letters:

---

[527] Yrurtia to Carlos Delcasse, August 12, 1909. "Estoy en plena tarea cumpliendo con mis compromisos, forzando todo lo que puedo mi cerebro y mi cuerpo enfermo, - con 16 hora de trabajo diario y sin descanso -.". "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[528] Yrurtia to Schiaffino, from Paris, August 19, 1911. "Ya he concluido mi grupo de la Municipalidad! […] pero tendré que cambiarle de nombre porque este no es un 'Triunfo-del-Trabajo', sino una 'Marcha de Dolor.' Tiene bien el reflejo de todos mis sufrimientos, de todas mis tantas penas." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[529] Yrurtia to Schiaffino, December 20, 1912. "Termino pues mi grupo- rendido de fatiga! ¡Cuando podré contarle mis ilusiones, mis desilusiones, mis entusiasmos, y mis convicciones tristes! Mi cielo se llena de sol y se oscurece con nubarrones negros muchas veces al día: termino mi grupo. Lo termino." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

> Twelve workmen are molding my figures, twelve terrible workmen […] You do not know the French worker, in full revolution as we are. It is the vilest and most unconscionable creature. I want to let him know that I have to waste a lot of strength to control these vandals whose spirit is upside down -and- my heart and body are broken.[530]

Yrurtia's letters lay bare the impatience of the sculptor to finish his group, expressing how his own pains and efforts manifested themselves in the monument, transforming the meaning of the composition over time. Yrurtia's disdain for his French employees emphasizes the hierarchy of labor in the artist's studio. Ironically, all of these workers and assistants who contributed to the making of Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor* remain anonymous.

5.2.2 In the Tradition of Monuments to Labor

At the turn of the twentieth century, a new interest in monuments to labor emerged in the Western world. In France, Dalou, Rodin, and Henri Bouchard (1875-1960) developed grandiose projects of monuments to labor that were never completed. The labor monuments projected by Dalou (1889-1902), Rodin (c. 1898), the Belgian Constantin Meunier (1884-1905), and Bouchard (1902-1906) were to be the apotheosis of the worker in sculpture.[531] Among them, Meunier was

---

[530] Yrurtia to Schiaffino, August 19, 1911. "Doce obreros me moldean mis figuras, doce mouleurs infernales […] Usted no conoce el obrero francés, en plena revolución como estamos. Es lo que hay de más vil y sin conciencia. Quiero decirle pues, que tengo que gastar una cantidad de fuerza enorme, para dominar esos vándalos de espíritu al revés -y- que estoy roto alma y cuerpo." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[531] On the monuments to labor see: John M Hunisak, "Rodin, Dalou, and the Monument to Labor," in *Art the Ape of Nature*, ed. Moshe Barasch and Lucy Freeman Sandler, Harry N. Abrams (New York, 1981), 689–705; Marie Bouchard, *Les quatre projets du "Monument au travail" d'Henri Bouchard (1902-1906)*, Bulletin de l'Association des amis d'Henri Bouchard 34 (Paris: Association des amis d'Henri Bouchard, 1984); Amélie Simier and Marine

the only one who became known as the artist of the workers, and his monument to labor, completed posthumously, remains one of the few testimonies of this early twentieth-century enthusiasm for monuments to labor. In his *Hymn to Labor*, Yrurtia drew from contemporary representations of labor, but at the same time, he defied the traditional genre of monuments to workers.

At the rear of *Hymn to Labor*, three male figures are pulling a boulder bound by a rope **(figure 133)**. This large rock has no instrumental value, as, for instance, a component of mining equipment, but here it might serve instead as a metaphor for life. Yrurtia, who drew upon contemporary representations of laborers, may have been aware of Dalou's project for a labor monument, for which the French sculptor created a series of small-scale clay figures of different métiers.[532] Among them, *Les débardeurs poussant un bloc* depicts a group of workers with their backs arched and legs flexed, pushing a large block **(figure 134)**. Even though the block is pulled, not pushed, by the workers in Yrurtia's composition, the body language of the figures, with their feet rooted in the ground, their backs bent, their torsos and legs prominently muscular, toiling in unison, is reminiscent of Dalou's clay model.

Moreover, Yrurtia's monument can be placed within a broader nineteenth-century context of sculptural representations of physical labor, such as André d'Houdain's (1860-1904) *La Pesée*, displayed in plaster at the 1897 SAF and in marble at the 1903 SAF, in which three male figures

---

Kisiel, *Jules Dalou, le sculpteur de la République: catalogue des sculptures de Jules Dalou conservées au Petit Palais* (Paris: Paris-Musées, 2013); Cécilie Champy-Vinas and Cécile Bertran, *Meunier, Dalou, Rodin...: les sculpteurs du travail* (Gand : Snoeck ; Nogent-sur-Seine : Musée Camille Claudel, 2020).

[532] Jules Dalou, widely recognized for his *Triumph to the Republic*, was the first to take up the project of making a monument to workers. For twenty years, from 1879 to 1899, Dalou worked on his project, which was never completed. Simier and Kisiel, *Jules Dalou, le sculpteur de la République*.

are seen using a wooden stick as a lever. In addition, Yvonne Diéterle (1882-1974)'s bas-relief *La poussée* or *Départ pour la pêche à Yport*, showcased at the 1904 SAF, represents a group of four sailors dragging a boat on a riverbank **(figures 135-136)**. On the same theme of sailors, Henri Bouchard's "*Le Haleur"* or *Puller of Net* shows a man tightly grasping a cord that goes around his body as he pulls an unseen net, using his body as a counterweight **(figure 137)**. However, Yrurtia's group of men pulling a boulder, unlike the compositions by Bouchard, Dalou, Diéterle, and d'Houdain, is part of a larger sculptural ensemble. The drapes that fall from their hands and are tied to the waists, heads, and arms of the figures preceding them, as if they were chains, constitute the only element that unites the entire caravan **(figure 138)**.

Ahead of the three men pulling the boulder, a procession of male and female figures preceded by children advances in confused order. Women are looking after men who are moving forward with difficulty. On one side of the composition, a woman protects the head of a man as they march together. One may be given the impression that they are fleeing: the male figure, whose head is covered in an expression of shame, could refer to biblical representations of Adam ejected from Eden. His curved body parallels the S-shape of the silhouette of another male figure in front of him who is pulling a rope above his head **(figure 139)**. On the other side, a woman is pulling forward a man with all of her strength. She turns her back to the front of the monument, as if she were going to fall backwards. Next to them, a young man is carrying a tool in his right hand and pulling something from over his shoulder with great effort **(figure 140)**. Here, the composition appears to be dangerously unstable, as if the bodies were about to fall forward. Forming the shape of the letter X with their bodies, two women are pushed against each other, propelling the composition into a dynamic choreography of jumbled bodily movements.

Leading the caravan are three children, followed by a man and a woman (**figure 141**). The male figure, rising over the crouched bodies behind him, towers over the composition. Displaying a perfectly proportioned body, he stands on tiptoe, his head straight and his arms elevated like wings above his shoulders. At his side, a female figure also stands on tiptoe, her hands brought to her forehead, shielding her view from the sun and seeking a path ahead. The strong diagonal that runs from her hips to the top of her arm over her head imbues her with an air of determination and a sense of propulsion. Her pose is evocative of *Night*, an allegorical figure that functions as a pendant of *Day* at the base of Rodin's *Tower of Labor* (**figure 142**).[533] With her arms brought to her forehead, *Night* also hides her face, and she holds an owl under her right arm. Both figures are projected forward on tiptoe, in a precarious balance. However, Yrurtia's figure breaks away from the allegorical mode of representation. Looking ahead, the woman provides guidance to the caravan of people, showing the path to the children who are reaching forward.

As the bodies progressively straighten and elevate, passing from muscular, brutish strength to leaner figures with their heads held up and looking ahead, *Hymn to Labor* embodies the idea of human progress. The rhythm of the procession shifts from the manual labor of a group of men pulling a boulder to the family unit leading the caravan. Although the figures are not individualized, their bodies are gendered: men are associated with physical strength, whereas women are valued for their guiding role, their sense of caring, and their foresight. *Hymn to Labor* does not share some of the most notable features of Western labor monuments in that era, such as

[533] Yrurtia would have had the opportunity to see Rodin's plaster maquette of his *Tower of Labor* in the sculptor's studio c. 1904-1905. The photographer Jacques-Ernest Bulloz took pictures of the sculpture in Rodin's studio around that time. Today, the *Tower of Labor* survives as a plaster maquette. Hélène Pinet, ed., *Rodin et La Photographie* (Paris: Gallimard : Musée Rodin, 2007), 126–27.

the heroic male figure represented with his tools, marching to or returning from work, as, for instance, in the Argentinian sculptor Ernesto Soto Avendaño (1886-1969)'s *Al Trabajo* or *At Work.*[534] However, *Hymn to Labor* shows striking similarities with the Swiss sculptor James Vibert (1872-1942)'s multi-figural monument "*L'effort humain*" or *Human Effort* **(figure 143)**, which was presented at the 1903 Salon d'Automne, the same year that Yrurtia's *The Sinners* was on display at the SAF.

A former *praticien* of Rodin, James Vibert was a regular exhibitor at the SNBA and a successful Symbolist sculptor, although he has since sunk into oblivion.[535] *Human Effort* was hailed as a masterpiece at the 1903 Salon d'Automne and bought by the French government, which deposited it at the Jeu de Paume (it is today lost).[536] This large-scale procession represented the strenuous march of a group of men, women, and children, who are dragging what appears to be a large boulder. Their heads down, a group of men are leading the group, tied together with a belt-like contraption that they are pulling forward. Accompanying them is a female figure, who, like a

---

[534] Today located on Plaza Primero de Mayo in Buenos Aires, Ernesto Soto Avendaño's *Al Trabajo* was showcased at the 1921 Salon national de Buenos Aires, and inaugurated in its public square in 1928. The sculpture represents a nude male figure who carries a hammer in his right hand. His forward attitude and muscular body reflect his vigor and virility. Nicolás Gabriel Gutierrez, *Mármol y Bronce: Esculturas de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires*, Olmo Ediciones (Buenos Aires, 2015), 31.

[535] James Vibert admired the French sculptor, with whom he maintained a correspondence even after having left his studio. See his letters from May 16, 1898, stating his support after the Balzac controversy, and April 25, 1899, about his rejection from the SNBA."Vertical File James Vibert" (Paris, France, n.d.), Archive, Musée Rodin.

[536] In 1935, James Vibert was commissioned to produce a stone version of the sculpture to be placed in front of the former International Labor Organization in Geneva, today the World Trade Organization. See photograph by Sylvie Bazzanella: https://notrehistoire.ch/entries/V6aW3vjV8QX, consulted on April 10, 2021.

pietà, carries the body of a child in her arms. In the back of the composition, another woman holds a lyre, perhaps chanting at the departure of the group of men, women, and children. It is not so much a celebration of labor as a reminder of the physical cost of arduous manual labor. Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor* could almost be interpreted as a pendant to Vibert's pessimistic view of human labor. Even though *Hymn to Labor* starts off with a march of suffering, centered around the group of men pulling a boulder, it progresses toward a celebration of life and human achievement.

5.2.3 Yrurtia's Monumental Polyphony

In the decade following its commission, *Hymn to Labor* went through a series of transformations and enlargements that departed dramatically from its original maquette. Like O'Connor, who turned his project for *Commodore Barry* into a monument to the Irish exile – as seen in chapter 4 – Yrurtia transformed his monument to labor into "a hymn to love."[537] Throughout the years, the Argentinian sculptor used various titles to designate his monument: suffering, celebration, and love were successively the main themes. The fluidity of these names with different emotional resonances reflects Yrurtia's evolution of the idea of the monument. In

[537] *Crítica*, August 10, 1922. "La idea central de mi obra es el amor. "El Canto del Trabajo", es el canto del amor. Yo no he querido significar otra cosa. En mi obra hay mujeres que acarician y hombres que, sintiéndose acariciados, tiene fe y luchan. El amor es la fuerza propulsora de la naturaleza. Sin él, no se pondrían ningún entusiasmo en el trabajo…" "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

1909, Yrurtia initially called his sculpture "*Canto al Sol*" or "Hymn to the Sun." [538] Two years later, he referred to it as "*Marcha de dolor*" or "The March of Suffering."[539] But once completed, the project would take on a new meaning, which defied the traditional genre of monuments to labor:

> "Hymn to Labor" is not a biased theme as some have claimed. Its true meaning is a hymn to love, a representation of what the woman means in the life of men, as support, energy, and hope in the struggle. She knows how to guide them from distress (last group) to the triumph of family (first group) completed by the allegory of hope with the three happy children. I think that with its clear composition, 'Hymn to Labor" will teach the worship we owe to women, the unique source of inspiration of our noble gestures and heroic actions.[540]

Hymn to Labor became a "hymn to love" in Yrurtia's words. Although the sculptor's conception of women as figures of support to men's heroic deeds is rather conventional, women are given agency in his monument. In contrast with MacMonnies's *Civic Virtue*, where two female figures are stepped upon – see chapter 2 – or Barnard's *Love and Labor*, in which women merely

---

[538] Yrurtia to Schiaffino, April 18, 1909. "le he mandado fotografías, de un trozo del grupo 'Canto al Sol' para la municipalidad, así, como varios fragmentos del grupo en yeso de mi proyecto, figuras, y por fin el arco mismo." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[539] Yrurtia to Schiaffino, August 19, 1911. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[540] Rogelio Yrurtia to Don Antonio Zaccagnini, Buenos Aires, October 5, 1925. "El 'Canto al Trabajo' no es un tema tendencioso como se ha pretendido. Su verdadero significo es un canto al amor, una representación de lo que la mujer significa en la vida de los hombres, como sostén, como energía y esperanza en la lucha. Así le sabe llevar de la angustia (grupo ultimo) al triunfo con la familia (grupo primero) que completa la alegoría de la esperanza con los tres felices niños. El "Canto al Trabajo" creo pues, enseñara con el desarrollo de su clara composición, el culto que debemos a la mujer, única inspirado de nuestros nobles gestos y de nuestras heroicas acciones." "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

stand as symbols of fertility, Yrurtia's monument depicts women in action: their energy and dynamism are what drive the men forward. Let's also note that *Hymn to Labor* was dedicated to Yrurtia's first wife, whose name, Gerdita, is inscribed on the base of the monument. In the years leading up to the inauguration of *Hymn to Labor* in Buenos Aires, Yrurtia was vocal about his interest in the relation between love and labor, a theme that had also been explored by Barnard in his sculptural ensemble for the Pennsylvania State Capitol:

> The concept that gave birth to my work […] is the male effort, arduous and continuous, which finds its support in female affection. In the exaltation of labor and love.[541]
> My work expresses the labor of the man, coronated by the love of the woman. I want to say that, without love, there is no effort possible. …[542]

Furthermore, since the beginning of his project, Yrurtia referred to his monument not as a "Triumph" but as a "*Canto*" or a "Hymn." Both his *Monument for the May Revolution* and *Hymn to Labor* demonstrate Yrurtia's interest in dance and musical rhythms in their sculptural representation of the body in motion, and this theme is developed as a thread throughout Yrurtia's oeuvre.[543] In Paris, Yrurtia was associated with a milieu of intellectuals, and in May 1912, the Argentinian poet Leopoldo Lugones (1874-1938) visited Yrurtia in his Paris studio and sent him

---

[541] *La Razón*, February 6, 1920. "El concepto que ha dado vida a mi obra -nos dice el señor Irurtia- es el esfuerzo varonil, penoso y constante que encuentra su apoyo en la ternura femenina. En la exaltación del trabajo y del amor."

[542] *La Razón*, April 20, 1921. "Mi obra expresa -dice Yrurtia- el trabajo del hombre, coronado por el amor de la mujer. Quiero decir que, sin amor, no existe esfuerzo posible…"

[543] Starting in 1923, Yrurtia conceived the large composition of '*Human Symphony,'* which he continuously expanded to include a total of two hundred figures. Preparatory drawings are today in the collection of the Museo Casa de Yrurtia in Buenos Aires, but the sculptor had envisioned creating a sculptural procession of three-meter-high figures in stone and bronze. Museo Casa de Yrurtia, ed., *Dibujos de Rogelio Yrurtia*, Ministerio de Educación y Justicia (Buenos Aires, 1962).

a letter in which he confessed his "veneration" for the sculptor, "the highest representative of our race." It was Lugones who coined the title "Hymn to labor," underlined in the letter. The poet clearly established an analogy between sculpture and music:

> Your hymn to labor, if you would allow me to call it this way, given that his marble sings […] will bring Buenos Aires to its peak. […] I cannot find any precedent to your hymn, neither in the concept, nor in its particular beauty, nor in the ambition of its magnitude and of its effort, but only in the remote analogy with the Beethoven symphonies. […][544]

At that time, Yrurtia was still planning to execute his monument in marble. However, the outbreak of World War I and technical issues would prevent Yrurtia from carving *Hymn to Labor* in marble. In July 1914, having expanded each of the fourteen sculptural figures of the monument by forty centimeters – from two meters to two meters forty in length – Yrurtia declared to his friend Delcasse that "the material indicated for this sculptural group is bronze. With this alone, I could obtain the result that I seek of grandeur, of strength, of monumentality, of powerful impression."[545] Yrurtia had recalled a trip to Italy where he had observed marble monuments and realized that "the sun, the strong light of our sky would absorb entirely the richness of the

---

[544] Leopoldo Lugones to Rogelio Yrurtia, Paris, May 17, 1912. "Su himno al trabajo, déjeme llamarle así, puesto que su mármol canta […] hará de Buenos Aires una cima. […] Pero no encuentro precedente a su himno, ni por el concepto, ni por la belleza particular, ni por el coraje estupendo de su magnitud y de su esfuerzo, sino en la analogía remota de las sinfonías beethovenianas. […]" "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

[545] Yrurtia to Intendente Municipal de la Capital, Boulogne sur Seine, January 6, 1916. Yrurtia cites a letter he wrote to his friend Delcasse in July 1914. "la materia indicada para este grupo escultórico es el bronce. Con este solo podría obtener el resultado que busco de grandiosidad, de fuerza, de monumentalidad, de impresión poderosa." "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

modeling, of the forms, which I achieved after so much research and so many difficulties."[546] Finally, with the outbreak of World War I, all of Yrurtia's workers in Paris were sent to war, and the sculptor was expecting at least a five-year delay for the monument to be turned into marble if they had to wait until the end of the war.[547]

In August 1914, Yrurtia had to disassemble his monument in order to hide it in a safe place, away from the Germans. In a letter to the Municipal Intendant in Buenos Aires two years later, Yrurtia explained that this was why he had been unable to send him photographs of his completed sculptural group.[548] In March 1916, Yrurtia left Europe, seeking refuge in Argentina. In a letter to Schiaffino, sent from Pernambuco, in Brazil, on his way to Buenos Aires, Yrurtia wrote that he had had to leave Paris hastily, and was overjoyed to be on South American soil: "Today the view of America, of this America which is my soul, fills me with happiness, and with so much hope for us. I have never felt more American!"[549]

At the end of the war, Yrurtia returned to Paris, but only for two years. Back in his studio in Boulogne-sur-Seine in 1918, the sculptor struggled with the rising wages of the labor force and

---

[546] *Ibidem*. "El sol, la luz fuerte de nuestro cielo absorbería por completo toda la riqueza de modelados, de formas, que he logrado obtener luego de tantas *recherches* y un sinfín de dificultades."

[547] *Ibidem*. "Por otra parte, las circunstancias actuales harían imposibles su ejecución en mármol. Todos los obreros de que necesitaría están movilizados, y no podría ocuparlos sino una vez las hostilidades terminadas […] retardar la entrega del trabajo a cinco años por lo menos […]"

[548] *Ibidem*. At the time of this letter, dated January 6, 1916, Yrurtia had started the bronze casting of three figures, and was asking for money to continue casting the rest of the monument.

[549] Yrurtia, Pernambuco, Brazil, to Schiaffino, March 21, 1916. "Hoy la vista de América, de esta América que es mi alma, me llena el corazón de alegría, y de esperanzas muchas para nosotros. ¡Nunca me he sentido más americano!" "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

the higher costs of metal and raw materials due to the war. “Everything has increased three or four times its value,” he described to the Municipal Intendant in Buenos Aires, and asked for funds in order to complete the casting of his plaster group in bronze.[550] The sculptor had initially planned to have his *Hymn to Labor* cast in bronze by the Fonderie Nationale des bronzes in Brussels, but because of the fragility of the plaster models, he eventually decided against the transportation of the plasters to Belgium. Instead, the fourteen figures from *Hymn to Labor* were sent to Rudier’s foundry house in Paris, while the large boulder was cast in bronze in Brussels.

In 1920, Yrurtia returned permanently to Buenos Aires, from where he supervised the final stages of production of his monument. Yrurtia corresponded with a man named Stevens in Brussels, whom he put in charge of overseeing the casting in bronze by the foundry workers in Belgium.[551] The sculptor expressed his concerns about the eight-year delay, based on the commissioning contract, in completing the monument. At the same time, he worried about the quality of the bronze work:

> I beg you, don’t neglect these people, and follow them closely, without allowing them to take care of other jobs, but; in no way should this haste of mine excuse a hurried and poorly done execution. I hope you will be able to counsel them to apply all the attention necessary to obtain a <u>thorough cast and chiseling</u> and in accordance with all the rules of art.[552]

---

[550] Yrurtia, Boulogne sur Seine, to Municipal Intendent in Buenos Aires, November 28, 1918. “Rogelio Yrurtia Papers” (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

[551] Yrurtia, Buenos Aires, to Stevens, Brussels, August 1920. “Rogelio Yrurtia Papers” (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

[552] *Ibidem*. “te ruego, no descuides a esta gente, y las sigas de cerca, sin permitirles se ocupen de otros trabajos, pero; de nunca manera este apuro mío, podría excusar, una ejecución precipitada y mal cuidada. Espero sabrás recomendarles toda la atención necesaria para obtener una <u>fundición y cincelados esmerados</u> y conforme con todas las reglas del arte.”

Yrurtia was torn between the urgency of completing the monument and ensuring the quality of the bronze casting. The geographic distance between him, in Buenos Aires, and the foundry houses, in Paris and Brussels, caused him much anxiety:

> I have spent five years executing those works, with a black slave job. I do not need to tell you either that the discovery of a defective casting would mean my suicide. Here I no longer sleep since I arrived, and I inconsolably regret the unhappy idea that I had to leave Europe without having embarked on these works together.[553]

In addition, Yrurtia corresponded with Señora Champon and her son, José Bourdon, in Paris, who were in touch with Rudier, and arranged with them the packing, transportation, and shipping of the sculptural groups to Buenos Aires. In November 1920, Yrurtia asked Champon to monitor the work done by "the thief" Rudier while the fourteen figures of *Hymn to Labor* were at the foundry house.[554] Yrurtia was outraged by the packing and shipping costs for the group, a total of 30,125.55 francs, which he described as more than half the expense of casting the sculptural ensemble in bronze. On February 25, 1921, the entire bronze cast of *Hymn to Labor*, including the fourteen figures and the boulder, was shipped from the port of Antwerp in Belgium, on the steamboat *Bellatrix*, to Buenos Aires.[555]

---

[553] *Ibidem.* "He pasado cinco años para ejecutar esas obras, con un trabajo de esclavo negro. No necesito tampoco decirte, que significaría mi suicidio, la constatación de una fundición defectuosa. Aquí ya no duermo desde que llegue y me arrepiento sin consuelo de la infeliz idea que tuve dejar a Europa sin haber embarcado con nosotros estos trabajos." Slavery was finally abolished in Buenos Aires in 1861 and was later followed by the period of blanqueamiento.

[554] Yrurtia's draft of a letter to Señora Champon, November 26, 1920: "ruego se ocupe de vigilar 'Canto al trabajo'- manifiesto desconfianza sobre el pillo Rudier" "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Casa de Yrurtia.

[555] Draft of letters between Yrurtia and José Bourdon from February 15, 1921, to March 16, 1921. "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Casa de Yrurtia.

Although *Hymn to Labor* came out of Yrurtia's studio in Paris, the sculptor decided not to show it at the Salons, claiming that he had decided to "save it for his homeland."[556] His strategy was the opposite of Barnard's, for whom the success of his groups for the Pennsylvania State Capitol at the Paris Salons would resonate across the ocean. Yrurtia's friends and critics in Paris, however, had the opportunity to see *Hymn to Labor* in the sculptor's studio. Moreover, while still working on the commission, Yrurtia displayed autonomous sculptures extracted from his monumental ensemble in Buenos Aires. The Argentinian musician Julián Aguirre (1868-1924), for instance, mentioned that Yrurtia's fragment from *Hymn to Labor* displayed at the Witcomb gallery in Buenos Aires seemed "aesthetically and materially colossal." Impressed by Yrurtia's artistry, he even declared: "I think that we do not deserve an Yrurtia as we do not deserve a Schiaffino."[557] *Hymn to Labor* would be considered Yrurtia's first major public monument in his homeland.

5.3 Fragmenting, Disassembling, Reassembling Sculpture in Andrew O'Connor's Oeuvre

Only two years after Andrew O'Connor settled in France, the French critic Maurice Guillemot dedicated a five-page article to the Irish American sculptor in the magazine *L'Art et les Artistes*.[558] The article's front page featured a cropped photograph of the sculptor in his studio

---

[556] Yrurtia's interview for *Crítica* published on August 10, 1922. "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

[557] Julian Aguirre to Schiaffino, December 27, 1911. "Creo que no nos merecemos un Yrurtia como no nos merecemos un Schiaffino." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[558] Maurice Guillemot, "Un sculpteur américain : Andrew O'Connor, " *L'Art et les Artistes*, July 1905, 141-145.

posing next to his composition *The Slave,* or *L'Esclave* **(figure 144)**, one of the earliest examples of O'Connor's use of the processes of fragmentation, disassembly, and repurposing: a window into O'Connor's sculptural labor. Set up high on top of a tripod, *The Slave* is placed sideways, signaling to the viewer a sculpted body finely emerging from the marble. Two individual marble sculptures of *The Slave* are known today **(figure 145)**.[559] The line running alongside the body of the figure all the way to the top of the back, where the right shoulder in torsion is largely carved out of the marble, emphasizes the high relief of the sculpture. This sculptural motif originated from the frieze of the lintel of St. Bartholomew's Church, where O'Connor extracted the figure of the slave and made it autonomous **(figure 146)**.[560] These sculptures exemplify O'Connor's process of creation and his artistic labor in the recycling of his own pieces. Like other nineteenth-century sculptors, O'Connor worked on various scales at the same time, redefining the relationships between the whole – the monument – and the fragment – the autonomous sculpture.

The contemporary French audience might have recognized in the pose of the *Slave*, especially the gesture of the figure's right arm, brought on top of his head, a resemblance to

---

[559] One sculpture is in the collection of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, the other one is in storage at The Hugh Lane Gallery in Dublin. My thanks to Cindy Veloric, researcher in the Department of American painting and sculpture at the PMA, for organizing for me the viewing of *The Slave* in the off-site storage of the museum in April 2019. According to Veloric's research, William Henry Fox, a native of Philadelphia, who was curator and then director of the Central Museum of the Brooklyn Institute of Arts & Sciences from 1913 to 1934, could have bought *The Slave* at the O'Connor exhibition at Seligmann in 1917, and donated it to the Philadelphia Museum of Art.

[560] O'Connor worked on the bas-reliefs on both sides of the front portal, depicting the Old and New Testaments. He also made the bas-relief on top of the front door and two bronze doors. The triple portal and the three sets of bronze doors were designed by Stanford White as a memorial to Cornelius Vanderbilt II and incorporated into the previous Madison Avenue St. Bartholomew's Church in 1903. O'Connor worked with French on the sculptural commission.

Rodin's *The Age of Bronze*. It is as if O'Connor's *The Slave* had been a preliminary stage of Rodin's *The Age of Bronze*, when the male figure, knees bent and brought together, initiates a gesture of emancipation of the body from the block of marble. However, the source of the motif actually originated from O'Connor's years as a young apprentice in New York City, where the sculptor was carrying out the commission for St Bartholomew's Church, and it is unlikely that O'Connor was familiar with Rodin's sculpture at the time. This is merely one instance of the importance of locating the source of a sculptural motif, which can help to more accurately explain a sculptor's artistic process and reexamine claims about artistic influences.

While chapter 2 analyzed how modern sculptors participated in the transnational ecosystem of the Paris Salons, appropriating each other's sculptural motifs, which they emulated and transformed in their own compositions, this section demonstrates that sculptural appropriation could take a different form: sculptors were also invested in repurposing motifs from their own creations, a shortcut in the making process of their sculptures. This was both part of a creative process as well as a marketing strategy to disseminate one's work. For instance, Barnard's *Prodigal Son* functioned on both registers: originating from a Salon appropriation of Dubois's *Le Pardon*, Barnard's group was both part of the monumental ensemble of *Love and Labor* and performed as an autonomous sculpture in the museums' collections of the Carnegie Museum of Art in Pittsburgh and the Speed Art Museum in Louisville. Like Barnard, who would extract multiple groupings from his Harrisburg sculptural ensemble, O'Connor used his early project for the Vanderbilt Memorial as a visual repertory of motifs that he would revisit at different moments in his career. Furthermore, O'Connor employed collage and paper cutouts as an experimental process to repurpose his sculptural groupings, from monumental ensembles to individual sculptures. Such artistic techniques are traditionally referred to as modernist practices, in the vein

of Matisse and Picasso, and O'Connor's oeuvre offers a new lens through which to understand the relationship between the individual labor of the sculptor and such modernist practices.

Although the archival material on O'Connor does not offer as much insight into his collaborative studio practice as that for Barnard and Yrurtia, it may be fair to assume that O'Connor, too, engaged helpers, *praticiens,* and carvers at various stages of the sculptural process, and probably did only the most specialized carving on his works. However, his interest in marble and in the Michelangelesque idea of the struggle with the material is what differentiates him from his fellow sculptors. In contrast with MacMonnies, who represents the figure of the entrepreneur and the businessman fascinated by the most advanced mechanisms of sculptural enlargement – as discussed in the introduction to this chapter – O'Connor was invested in the physical process of giving birth to the marble, which would lead to the direct carving movement of the 1930s.

5.3.1 From Monument to Autonomous Sculpture

In his fundamental essay on Rodin published in *Other Criteria: Confrontations with Twentieth-Century Art*, the American art critic Leo Steinberg analyzes the artistic practice of extraction, fragmentation, and repurposing in Rodin's oeuvre, defining *The Gates of Hell* as a modernist endeavor. The technique of multiplication of figures, either one figure replicated in two or three bodies, or one figure given multiple roles or locations at once, allowed Rodin to redouble the energy of the sculptural form. By splitting the figure into autonomous fragments, adaptable and interchangeable, Rodin conceived the part as the whole.[561] Steinberg's analysis of Rodin's

[561] Leo Steinberg, *Other Criteria: Confrontations with Twentieth-Century Art* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972), 355–58.

creation, which allowed for a reconsideration of the French master's oeuvre as pioneering after decades of dismissal, infused Rosalind Krauss's account of what constitutes modern sculpture in her groundbreaking publication *Passages in Modern Sculpture*.[562] More recently, the 2015 exhibition *Metamorphoses in Rodin's Studio* analyzed Rodin's experimental practice of sculpture through the specific lens of his process of fragmentation, assemblage, repetition, and enlargement of his works. After 1900, Rodin exploited the repertoire of his earlier realizations in a myriad of ways instead of inventing entirely new ones. Sophie Biass-Fabiani defines this method as "*ars combinatoria,*" the art of combining sculptural forms taken out of their original contexts and played off against a number of other forms to expand the possibilities of new compositions.[563] Rodin's figures never belonged to just one composition but instead migrated to and reappeared in various pieces. It is not the repertoire itself that matters as much as the way Rodin used it.

If Rodin took fragmentation, multiplication, and recontextualization to a new level, he did not invent them. Neoclassical sculptors like Hiram Powers (1805-1873) and Harriet Hosmer (1830-1908) in the mid-nineteenth century were savvy about working at different scales, though they did not fragment nor recycle in the same way. Other Western sculptors, such as Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, with his *Genius of the Dance* in France, and Thomas Crawford (1814-1857), with his *Dying Indian Chief* in the United States, opened the way to sculptural fragmentation and repurposing in the nineteenth century. While Carpeaux extracted the *Genius of the Dance* from his composition of *The Dance* from the façade of the Paris Opera Garnier, Crawford remodeled in the round the figure of *The Dying Indian Chief Contemplating the Progress of Civilization* after his

---

[562] Rosalind E. Krauss, *Passages in Modern Sculpture* (New York: Viking Press, 1977).

[563] Sophie Biass-Fabiani,"Rodin Metamorphoses" in Montreal Museum of Fine Arts (Montreal) et al., *Metamorphoses*, 20–27.

figure for the pediment frieze of the Senate wing of the United States Capitol in Washington, D.C.[564]

Extracted from St Bartholomew's Church, O'Connor's *The Slave*, like Barnard's *Prodigal Son*, "taken out" from the Harrisburg Capitol group *Love and Labor,* belong to this genealogy of American and French sculptural precedents. Like Carpeaux and Crawford, Barnard and O'Connor were aware of the commercial advantages of extracting a "fragment" from a larger monumental composition and making it autonomous. The history of modernist sculpture has long divided public sculptures from gallery pieces, but sculptors were working on different scales at the same time before the twentieth century. Beyond their aesthetic possibilities, techniques of fragmentation and repurposing allowed sculptors to take apart and recycle their compositions for different settings and markets. For instance, O'Connor's *The Slave* travelled to international venues: from Paris to Barcelona and to New York City. In Barcelona, the sculpture was displayed among pieces by Spanish and Portuguese sculptors in the main hall of the Fifth International Art Exhibition in the Palace of Fine Arts in 1907 **(figure 147)**. Two years later, a plaster of *The Slave* was showcased at the monographic exhibition of O'Connor's works organized at the Galerie Hébrard in Paris in May 1909. A marble *Slave* would also travel overseas and be featured at the O'Connor exhibition in the Galleries of Jacques Seligman Co. at 705 Fifth Avenue, New York, in 1917.[565]

---

[564] On Carpeaux, see Wagner, *Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux*. Thomas Crawford, *The Indian: The Dying Chief Contemplating the Progress of Civilization,* 1856, white marble, New York Historical Society.

[565] *Exposition des œuvres du sculpteur O'Connor du 3 au 19 Mai 1909* (Galerie A-A. Hébrard. 8 rue Royale, Paris, 1909), 4–5; Andrew O'Connor, *Exhibition of the Works of the Sculptor O'Connor: The Galleries of Jacques Seligmann Co* (Paxton, Massachusetts, 1917), 95.

O'Connor's early project for the Vanderbilt Memorial offered a visual repertory of motifs that he would revisit throughout his career. Around 1906, he extracted from it the group of *Adam and Eve* **(figures 148-149)**.[566]A photograph of O'Connor in his Parisian studio shows the sculptor at work on the group. The point marks on the marble are visible on the body of Eve on the right side of the photograph **(figure 150)**. Looking at the final composition, Eve is seated on her knees, offering an apple to Adam, whose left arm is lifted over his head again, as in Rodin's *The Age of Bronze*. O'Connor certainly had multiple iconographical sources for his *Adam and Eve*. The sculptor's personal archive contains pages cut out from an art history manual illustrating depictions of *Adam and Eve* by Raffaelo Sanzi, Marcantonio Raimondi, and Antonio Federighi.[567]

Within the architectural constraints of the bas-relief, O'Connor transformed the arcs and serpentine curves of earlier, more classical compositions into a compressed, angular, and rather uncomfortable grouping. O'Connor pushed the figures towards the extremes of emotion, giving a new sense of urgency and emotional tone to the group, a strategy used also by Barnard in the treatment of his *Prodigal Son*. Moreover, the gesture of Eve, with her right hand, fist clenched, hidden behind her back, is unusual. To my knowledge, the only occurrence of Eve depicted with such a contorted arm can be found in *The Birth of Passions*, by the Belgian sculptor Antoine Wiertz (1806-1865), where Eve is hiding the apple behind her back **(figure 151)**. But there is little

---

[566] O'Connor's *Adam and Eve* entered the collection of the Corcoran Gallery in Washington DC in 1914 as a gift of Edward Tuck. "Andrew O'Connor Vertical File" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), The National Gallery of Art. I would like to thank Alison Luchs at the National Gallery of Art, Washington DC, for her generosity and for allowing me to access O'Connor's sculpture in the museum's storage in July 2016.

[567] "Andrew O'Connor Papers" (n.d.), Private Collection.

probability that O'Connor would have been aware of this sculpture at the time, when he was still based in New York City, working on the Vanderbilt Memorial.

In the aftermath of World War I, during which O'Connor fled Paris for the United States, the sculptor began new projects relating to the trauma and disfigurement of the war, reimagining the form of the traditional war memorial. O'Connor again employed the processes of fragmentation, disassembly, and reassembly as the basis for his reflection on the trauma of war. Once more, O'Connor returned to the Vanderbilt Memorial as a laboratory of forms, from which the sculptor extracted the figure of Christ crucified on the architrave frieze of the Vanderbilt Memorial doors **(figure 152)**. This group, composed of Christ on the Cross, with a female figure kneeling at its foot, her right arm brought around her head in a gesture of despair, was remodeled in the round in the marble group entitled *Crucifix*, displayed at the Galleries of Jacques Seligman Co. in 1917 **(figure 153)**.[568]

The figure of Christ alone became *Desolation*, and it was repurposed in O'Connor's composition of a *Triple Cross*. A plaster maquette of *Desolation* shows the figure of the crucified Christ against a curved crucifix within an overhanging dome **(figure 154)**. His legs are pulled up, his knees at a ninety-degree angle, and his head hangs forward under a tress of hair, emphasizing a feeling of profound mourning. Behind the crucifix is a protruding form, a mysterious device that appears repeatedly in O'Connor works. Moreover, a paper cutout of *Desolation* demonstrates that O'Connor experimented with processes of fragmentation and recombination in other media as well **(figure 155)**.[569]

---

[568] O'Connor, *Exhibition of the Works of the Sculptor O'Connor: The Galleries of Jacques Seligmann Co*, 95.

[569] "Andrew O'Connor Papers" (n.d.), Private Collection.

Unlike *The Slave* and *Adam and Eve*, both extracted from the Vanderbilt Memorial and made autonomous, O'Connor's *Christ in Desolation* became the point of departure for a larger sculptural composition, *Triple Cross.* This memorial to World War I was composed of three sides: the suffering Christ, called "Desolation," from the Vanderbilt Memorial; the redemptive Christ, or "Consolation," in which the arms of Christ are detached from the Cross; and the resurrected Christ, or "Triumph," that presents a man standing, free and strong. The memorial to the war dead was displayed at the 1926 SNBA, with another of O'Connor's sculptures, a large statue of a sailor, which was no less than a repurposed monumental figure of his early Commodore Barry. Diffused in various national newspapers, photographs of O'Connor's *Triple Cross* at the Salon captured the figure of a visitor at the foot of the group, emphasizing the sheer size of the monument towering over its neighboring sculptures **(figure 156)**. Though the artist intended it as a war memorial, French critics were confused by the surprising format of the structure, in particular, its composition with the motif of the helmet appearing on top of the cross. Critics mocked the juxtaposition of Christ with the representation of the French soldier, the "poilu."[570]

O'Connor's oeuvre can be understood as a genealogy of sculptural motifs repurposed again and again by the sculptor, recalling Rodin's *ars combinatoria*. The Vanderbilt Memorial was not the only early project that served as a repertory of forms for the sculptor. The façade of St Patrick's Cathedral in New York City, a lesser-known sculptural project, which, to my knowledge, was never completed, also constituted a reference for O'Connor. Two drawings show different stages

[570] *Journal des débats*, May 5, 1926. « Quel débordement d'imagination quasi burlesque ! Que peut bien signifier le Monument aux morts de l'Américain Andrew O'Connor ? Cette triple croix ressemble à un Poteau indicateur. On croit deviner qu'un « poilu » s'y trouve supplicié à côté du Christ […] que de confusion, de surcharge dans la partie supérieure ! »

or variations of the sculptural program that O'Connor intended for one of the doors of the cathedral: one is a watercolor sketch highlighting the details of the different sections of the door, the other features a collage of the group of the *Descent from the Cross* on top of the door **(figures 157-158)**. One could imagine the sculptor playing with this paper cutout, moving the group around on various sections of his architectural doors in order to find the perfect fit.

Three decades later, then settled in London, O'Connor extracted *Descent from the Cross* from its architectural setting and made it autonomous **(figure 159)**. In his correspondence, the sculptor mentioned, "This Descent from the Cross occupies me now to the exclusion of all other things." O'Connor described himself as a "pagan," but "how much pleasure I get taking the subjects the great men of the past have worked on and doing them again, as I think they should be done."[571] As he extracted sculptures from earlier pieces, O'Connor also renamed his groups. *Descent from the Cross* became *The Ghosts*. It is under this title that the marble group entered the collection of the Tate Museum in London **(figure 160)**.[572] A plaster cast of the same group was placed above the main door of the Church of Our Lady of the Rosary in Limerick, Ireland, where it functioned as a "Descent from the Cross." The interchangeability of the sculptures' titles, as well as the recycling and transfers of sculptural motifs from one composition to another, participated in the multiplicity of O'Connor's sculptures, and could be viewed as shortcuts in the otherwise lengthy labor of the sculptor.

---

[571] O'Connor to Warren Wilmer Brown, from London, 50 A Glebe Place, Chelsea, October 3, 1933. "Andrew O'Connor Vertical File" (Baltimore, n.d.), The Walters Art Museum.

[572] *Ghosts* is no longer part of the Tate collection. I found remarks indicating that the group had been later transferred to Campion Hall, a Jesuit house in the UK. It may be in a private collection today.

5.3.2 Sculptural Labor and the Trauma of War

From the early 1930s until his death in 1942, O'Connor maintained a correspondence with the Baltimore-based poet and his longtime friend, Warren Wilmer Brown.[573] O'Connor's letters from 1940, sent from London, where the sculptor had relocated with his wife in a studio in Chelsea, bear witness to O'Connor's fear of the war and the bombing of London. On February 19, 1940, he wrote:

> I've got a beautiful block of marble, a ton of it set up in my studio and on those days when I can stand on my feet, I beat the hell out of it – but after a few hours – I'm flat – mourning my lost strength and the futility of my efforts. […]
> I am myself full of fears, when the sirens sounded in the middle of the night and I was shaken to the middle of my bones
> […] I work as hard as I can, I beat on the marble hoping something will happen.[574]

Three months later, O'Connor continued:

> I am old – much broken – and tortured by the loss of my two oldest sons – who have disappeared into this misery since the Germans entered Belgium. I work when I am able to – I beat the hell out of a block of marble. If my time has come, I prefer to die in the midst of things I've worked for – the things I've made. I'm not the kind that runs –frightened like a scared chicken – before an enemy.[575]

The expression "I beat the hell out of a block of marble," appears here as a leitmotif. It not only identifies O'Connor as a carver but is also representative of how O'Connor's personal life and his experiences of trauma resonated, and even shaped, his artistic creations. O'Connor imprinted his own frustrations and fears onto the marble, even though one might never be able to

[573] "Andrew O'Connor Vertical File" (Baltimore, n.d.), The Walters Art Museum.

[574] Andrew O'Connor to Warren Wilmer Brown, February 19, 1940. "Andrew O'Connor Vertical File" (Baltimore, n.d.), The Walters Art Museum.

[575] Andrew O'Connor to Warren Wilmer Brown, June 23, 1940. "Andrew O'Connor Vertical File" (Baltimore, n.d.), The Walters Art Museum.

identify what sculptures O'Connor was wrestling with during these very dark months in the British capital.

Trauma as a theme and a sculptural technique resurfaced multiple times in O'Connor's oeuvre, from the trauma of exile depicted in his initial project for a *Barry monument* to *Le débarquement*. The violence expressed by the sculptor in reaction to war found its full artistic expression after World War I with O'Connor's sculptural project of the return of a dead soldier attached to his bier **(figure 161)**. The corpse was accompanied by two female figures, known as *The Mother* and *The Wife*, whose bodies demonstrate violence, and perhaps even traces of mutilation **(figures 162-163)**. In *Le débarquement*, all three figures came together as an ensemble – as I will analyze in chapter 6 –, but at the same time, each of them functioned independently, like *The Wife*, for instance, which entered the collection of Tate Britain as an autonomous figure during O'Connor's lifetime.

For O'Connor, marble carving was perhaps as a coping mechanism in the face of stressful political situations. This prompts us to wonder if carving, as described by O'Connor in his letters, corresponded to a creative, maybe therapeutic act, or a destructive gesture. The labor of the sculptor was not limited to his carving practice, but included also his poetry, which O'Connor, like no other sculptor of his era, used in his sculptural compositions.[576] Similar to the repetition of the expression, "I beat the hell out of a block of marble," sounding like a chorus in his letters to his friend, O'Connor reused the same sculptural motifs throughout his oeuvre. One might wonder if the process of fragmentation and iteration reduced the artist's labor. Did it, as in Rodin's oeuvre,

[576] A manuscript of poetry authored by Andrew O'Connor was found in the family's archive. "Andrew O'Connor Papers" (n.d.), Private Collection. Moreover, quotes were inscribed on the bases of the figures from *Le Débarquement.*

intensify the meaning of the sculptural medium to better reflect on the traumas of exile and war in O'Connor's work?

In the autumn of 1940, after having spent five weeks under the stairs, day and night, as he wrote to his friend, O'Connor fled to Dublin. He said in this letter, dated October 16, 1940—the last letter of his correspondence: "My studio was still standing with its contents intact a few days ago."[577] In Dublin, he arrived deaf and unable to work. He passed away a year later. O'Connor's career offered multiple instances during which the sculptor's own mobility and preoccupations about the traumas of exile and the world wars would resonate with the themes he chose to depict, his sculptural techniques, and his poetry. Besides serving as a subject matter for O'Connor, trauma had a direct influence on his artistic technique. Although Rodin is still considered today the master of the experimental processes of fragmentation and repurposing, with his *Gates of Hell* in particular, other sculptors, such as O'Connor, were invested in rethinking sculptural forms and practices. O'Connor's oeuvre can be read through the prism of the modernist narrative as a thread of a genealogy of motifs that appeared and were reassembled over and over again.

5.4 Conclusion

The transnational nature of monuments created by international sculptors based in France at the turn of the twentieth century relied on the Paris labor system, the circulation of the labor force – *praticiens*, models, modelers, carvers, suppliers, and transporters, among many other

[577] Andrew O'Connor to Warren Wilmer Brown, October 16, 1940. Walters Museum of Art, Baltimore. "Andrew O'Connor Vertical File" (Baltimore, n.d.), The Walters Art Museum.

métiers – and the transit of materials across borders. The Paris Salons formed part of a multidimensional labor system that was instrumental in the fabrication of colossal sculptures. Barnard's *Life of Humanity*, for instance, is the product of a network of people and materials that circulated between Moret-sur-Loing, Paris, Carrara, and Harrisburg. Labor was also a popular subject matter for Western sculptors at the time. Among them, the Argentinian Rogelio Yrurtia transformed a monument to labor, commissioned by the Municipality of Buenos Aires, into a reflection on the artist's own sculptural labor, or a "hymn to love," in the sculptor's own words. Moreover, sculptural labor could involve processes of fragmentation, recombination, and recycling that contributed to the development of modernist sculpture. The study of O'Connor's cutouts and sculptural compositions, for example, helps determine genealogies of sculptural motifs and repurposing practices within the artist's oeuvre.

This chapter challenged the notion of the sculptor's unique authorship, instead acknowledging the labor hierarchy that operated in French studios and the multiple agents involved in the creation of modern public sculptures. The collaborative nature of the sculptural industry was in tension with the publicly presented individual labor of the head sculptor. A thorough study of archival material, including contracts, employee books, insurance and customs papers, among others, provided the identity of transnational agents who participated in the Paris labor industry in the early twentieth century. Furthermore, when not reduced to the work of a single author, public sculptures were framed within national categorizations. Although characterized by critics as "American" or "Argentinian," these sculptures were in fact deeply cosmopolitan in their iconography through their participation in the ecosystem of the Paris Salons and their circulation of sculptural motifs, themes, and ideas, as seen in the previous chapters, as well as in their process

of construction, which involved models, casters, foundry workers, and others of various nationalities.

Beyond the migration of sculptural motifs to various compositions, the sculptures themselves were mobile and transported overseas. O'Connor's figures for *Le débarquement*, for instance, which revealed the violence and traumas of World War I, traveled with the sculptor from studio to studio across the Atlantic and the English Channel. Once their monuments were completed, sculptors could choose to present them to an international audience at the Paris Salons, as did Barnard with his Harrisburg statuary at the 1910 SAF, or to have them transported directly to their destined location, such as Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor,* shipped directly to Buenos Aires to be unveiled there. The following chapter explores the process of transformation of these ambitious modern public sculptures between Paris and their local destination, and their reception abroad. How did the transnationality and collaborative nature of these monuments translate overseas?

6.0 Monuments *in Situ*: From Paris to the Public Square Abroad

On July 24, 1926, a crowd of locals gathered on the plaza Suipacha in Buenos Aires to witness the unveiling of Rogelio Yrurtia's Monument to Colonel Manuel Dorrego. An Argentinian military figure and politician, Dorrego (1787-1828) held administrative positions starting in the early 1820s, and became governor of the province of Buenos Aires in 1827. A year later, he was caught and executed by an army group.[578] A photograph captured the people standing in grandstands at the base of the pedestal and perched upon their balconies, as they looked at the white piece of drape being pulled off, revealing the equestrian statue **(figure 164)**. At first glance, Yrurtia's statue looked like a typical equestrian monument with a figure astride a horse on top of a pedestal. However, once fully unveiled, a closer look reveals a complex sculptural grouping composed of a winged figure guiding the horse, at the base of which an allegory of *Fatality* battling a serpent is standing **(figure 165)**.[579] Commissioned twenty years earlier, following a competition to erect a statue to Dorrego in 1907, Yrurtia's monument was created in the artist's studio in Paris.[580] Rampant inflation and a lack of material during World War I delayed its completion, but

---

[578] Marcela Ternavasio, *Historia de La Argentina 1806-1852*, Siglo veintiuno editores (Buenos Aires, 2009), 163–65 and 177.

[579] Taken shortly after the inaugural ceremony ended, a photograph shows the crowd slowly going back to their daily routine. In the image we can see a man staring at the camera on the foreground of the picture, a cigarette in his mouth and holding a journal. "Rogelio Yrurtia File" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación, Departamento documentos fotográficos.

[580] On September 4, 1905, the Argentinian government passed a law to erect a monument to Dorrego. A commission was organized, and a competition for projects was called. Maquettes for the monument were put on display on May

the monument was eventually cast in bronze by a Belgian foundry before being shipped to Buenos Aires.

As an "*estatuario-architecto*," or "sculptor-architect," an expression carved into the statue's pedestal, Yrurtia conceived the Monument to Dorrego in its entirety, designing both the sculpture and architecture. He broke away from the conventional role of the sculptor who collaborated with architects, like the partnership between Saint-Gaudens and the architect Charles McKim to create the *Sherman Monument* erected on Manhattan's Grand Army Plaza, another equestrian statue of a general guided by an allegorical figure. For the Argentinian sculptor, the successful completion of a monument was not limited only to its physical production, but also encompassed its display in an appropriate and thoughtful setting. The harmony between the monument and its architectural frame was fundamental in his conception of the perfect viewing experience for the spectator. Yrurtia regarded *Dorrego* as a perfect fit in its architectural context, but he struggled with city representatives to agree on the right location for his *Hymn to Labor*.

Dorrego's original maquette differs greatly from the monument today standing on plaza Suipacha in Buenos Aires (**figure 166**). Originally, the architectural base of the monument was shaped like a tomb, and the allegorical groups surrounding the equestrian figure were very different: *Charity* would be replaced by an allegory of *History*, and *Fatality* was previously composed of a male figure intertwined with a serpent-woman, as illustrated in Yrurtia's

---

7, 1907, in the Argentinian Pavilion, then the seat of the National Museum of Fine Arts. Yrurtia's project arrived from France a month later, and was selected as winner of the competition. Erika Loiácono, "Fatalidad y victoria. El monumento al coronel Dorrego de Rogelio Yrurtia," in *Revista de Artes*, vol. 18, Avances (Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Córdoba, Argentina: Centro de Producción e Investigación en Artes de la Facultad de Artes / Centro de Investigaciones de la Facultad de Filosofía y Humanidades, 2010), 172–75.

preparatory drawing **(figure 167)**. In its final form, the male figure would be shown fighting a serpent, and *Charity* was eventually recycled by Yrurtia in his monument to Rivadavia. As for the allegorical figure leading the hero astride his horse, she did not have wings at first, but was partially covered in drapes, her head bent back, with her arm raised over head as in a reinterpretation of Rodin's *The Age of Bronze*. At the same time that he simplified the composition of his sculptural group, Yrurtia added greater expressivity to the movement of the figures in his final sculpture.

Some might argue that the winged figure leading Colonel Dorrego on his horse was inspired by the allegory of *Victory* in Saint-Gaudens's *Sherman monument*. Holding a palm in her left hand, she raises her right arm to illuminate the path to follow. However, the dramatic gesture of Yrurtia's winged figure distances itself from traditional allegory: her body is bent forward in a strenuous effort; her right hand, placed at a right angle in front of the figure, emphasizes her aerial movement. More visible in the plaster model, the figure has her mouth open, perhaps catching her breath, and her left hand raised over head with her fingers clenched, as she pulls the horse forward **(figure 168)**. Yrurtia developed a series of variations on this female figure: in *Hymn to Labor*, the woman leading the caravan is projected forward in a similar manner, with her arms shielding her eyes from the sun, gazing straight ahead **(see chapter 5, figure 141)**.

Yrurtia's *Dorrego* was part of a large, government-led program to celebrate national heroes, and cement the foundation of the Argentinian nation. The monument belonged to a long tradition of nineteenth-century equestrian statues dispersed throughout Buenos Aires. However, due in part to its complex iconography, and its prominent location in a central plaza, *Dorrego* stood out from its counterparts. Unlike the vast majority of nineteenth-century statues, Dorrego is not a decorative feature, but its sculpture-architectural ensemble constituted a landmark in the public space of the Argentinian capital at the time of its erection **(figure 169)**. Moreover, it distinguished

itself from other monuments like Antoine Bourdelle's statue of the General Alvear dedicated in October 1926, for being the product of an Argentinian sculptor.[581] In the following decades, however, Yrurtia's *Dorrego* would lose its luster. It is today enclosed by a metal gate in a crowded urban space, hidden by large trees that inhibit contemplation of the work – Yrurtia would have certainly disapproved of such a *mise en place* **(figure 170)**.

The transatlantic story of Yrurtia's *Dorrego* neatly encapsulates the issues highlighted in this final chapter. From the time of their original conception to their creation and display in their destined public square, monumental projects underwent several transformations in response to their various audiences. Once installed in a public space, monuments participated in the production of a national narrative, and were individualized, noted as the products of a sole sculptor. The transnational nature of these monuments, products of a collaborative system of labor, was sanded down and simplified when inaugurated: there was no place for recognition that did not celebrate the artist, the subject, or the nation.

This final chapter can be viewed as a counterpart to the second chapter of the dissertation, which analyzed how sculptural motifs traveled fluidly through a system of exchanges between artists at the Paris Salons. In the French capital, the appropriation and repurposing of sculptural motifs from works to works participated in their success at the Salons. However, once on public display, these same monuments became political, propagandistic, and purposeful. The opacity of these sculptures erected in the public square often made them illegible to their new audiences: taken out of their original context of creation, and reassembled abroad, they took on new

[581] Facundo las Heras, "El 'Dorrego' de Yrurtia," *El Hogar*, November, 10, 1939. "Pocas veces se detiene el viandante apresurado para contemplar en la esquina de Viamonte y Suipacha el monumento a Dorrego que en paridad de valores disputa al Alvear de Bourdelle el mérito de ser su autor un argentino."

connotations. Once placed in a plaza, these monuments became part of a globalized network of sculptures, a sort of globalization of modern sculpture in the early twentieth century.

In what follows, I interrogate the instrumental role played by monuments in the construction of public spaces, and in nation-building within the public consciousness. Breaking away from the prototypical statue of the hero standing on top of a pedestal, Paris-based international sculptors, like Barnard, O'Connor, and Yrurtia, developed ambitious monumental projects dedicated to the people as an entity: a community, a collectivity, or a country. A shift occurred from ornamental sculptures conceived as decorative features, which straightforwardly honored the heroes of the great past, to monuments with an edifying mission, encouraging the viewing public to reflect upon and internalize moral values.

The notion of site-specificity, almost exclusively used by scholars to describe the works of the minimalists in the 1960s, is applied here to the display of early twentieth-century monuments in urban space. The temporal and spatial dimensions are considered as major factors in the life of the monuments analyzed through the prism of the socio-political changes that occurred between the commission of the works and their display. "Public space", from *polis*, the 'city' in Latin, does not merely refer to the open space of the city, but it also describes its material space, and the sphere of human action. The Argentinian scholar Adrián Gorelik describes public space as "a dimension that mediates between society and the state, in which multiple political expressions of the citizenship are made public in various forms of association and conflict with the state."[582] Gorelik

[582] Adrián Gorelik, *La Grilla y El Parque: Espacio Público y Cultura Urbana En Buenos Aires, 1887-1936*, La Ideología Argentina (Buenos Aires: Universidad Nacional de Quilmes, 1998), 19. "El espacio público es una dimensión que media entre la sociedad y el estado, en la que se hacen públicas múltiples expresiones políticas de la ciudadanía en múltiples formas de asociación y conflicto frente al estado."

analyses how the city of Buenos Aires was at the center of discussions of nineteenth-century intellectuals and politicians, who debated the role that the public space of the Argentinian capital could play in defining the new nation: the transformation of the city was closely associated with the evolution of Argentinian society at a national scale.[583]

In the context of the United States, Kirk Savage showed that originally most public monuments were built not by the federal government, but by relatively small, politically connected interest groups, who were much more interested in their individual agenda than in creating a spatial ensemble.[584] By the beginning of the twentieth century, though, a new notion of public monument had emerged. In contrast with prototypical heroic statues, ambitious public monuments became "a place to be experienced rather than an object to be revered."[585] Savage identifies this new type of public sculpture as "The Spatial Monument." Saint-Gaudens's *Monument to Abraham Lincoln* in Chicago, from 1887, can be seen as a prototype of a spatial monument, whose architectural setting draws the viewers into the narrative sequence of the monument.[586] Barnard, O'Connor, and Yrurtia can all – to various degrees – be categorized as spatial designers, who did not only create statues, but public ensembles that were both sculptural and architectural.

This chapter first examines issues of mobility and politics regarding Yrurtia's *Hymn to labor* in the urban environment of Buenos Aires. The Argentinian sculptor believed in the moral and edifying mission of public sculptures, and attached as much importance to the conception and

---

[583] Gorelik, 28.

[584] Kirk Savage, *Monument Wars: Washington, D.C., the National Mall, and the Transformation of the Memorial Landscape* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 15.

[585] Savage, 197.

[586] Savage, 197–98.

the design of the monument as he did to its public display, and the relationship between sculpture and its surrounding space. Then, I analyze the iconography and local reception of Barnard's *Life of Humanity* in the context of the early twentieth-century construction of whiteness in the United States. Finally, I reconstruct the histories of O'Connor's *Le débarquement* and *Triple Cross*, two exemplary cases of sculptural repurposing in regard to meaning and site. Both projects were conceived and created in Paris in the aftermath of World War I, before being shipped to Ireland. The three figures from *Le débarquement* were recombined in a square in Dublin, although they failed to recreate the original display intended by the sculptor. As for *Triple Cross*, the monument was originally thought of as a memorial to the dead of the war, and presented as such at the 1926 Paris Salon des artistes français, before being repurposed into a national monument to *Christ the King* on the shore of Dun Laoghaire, a major entryway to the country.

6.1 "*Monuments must live*": *Hymn to Labor* and the Monumental Landscape of Buenos Aires

On May 26, 1926, *El Telégrafo* published a caricature of Yrurtia, dressed as a businessman, holding a cattle prod and leading a group of oxen dragging a cart containing a procession of figures with their heads bent down grimly **(figure 171)**. This was clearly a satirical depiction of the sculptor's *Hymn to Labor.* With the city skyline in the background, Yrurtia's monument is identified by the inscription "*El canto al laburo,"* a play on the words "*laburo,*" or "labor," and "*buro,*" or "donkey," written in capital letters on the side of the carriage. The oxen's mouths are covered with muzzles. Each of them is tagged by an inscription on their back: "*comisión de ornatos*", "*intendencia*", "*ediles*", and "*prensa metropolitana,*" designating the various

stakeholders in the final destination of the monument. In contrast with Yrurtia, walking with a firm step, the oxen's heads are pulled down by the weight of the sculptural group they are dragging. Standing in the back of the cart, an Argentinian man calls out: "Yrurtia, stop at once, the oxen are going to get tired."[587]

This caricature, featured in an article entitled, "Location required for a monument that nobody knows where to set up", ridicules the artist for having disapproved of some twenty places suggested to house his monument.[588] Yrurtia is not depicted as a sculptor, but rather as a businessman in a tuxedo and top hat, smoking a cigar, who has silenced the various commissions, and is leading his sculpture from site to site throughout the capital. By 1926, the publication year of this cartoon, Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor* had already been on Argentinian soil for four years, and no agreement could be found between the sculptor and the various decision-makers of Buenos Aires as to where to display the monument.

Shipped to Buenos Aires after its completion in bronze, *Hymn to Labor* was first unveiled in 1922 inside the National Museum of Fine Arts, where it was temporarily housed until it found a permanent home in a public space within the capital. It would remain in the museum for several years. Calling into question the prevalent idea of the monument as a permanent fixture of the urban landscape, this caricature featuring *Hymn to Labor* on wheels, brings to light the mobility of public sculpture, dragged from place to place throughout the Argentinian capital, even after its transatlantic journey from Europe. Having finally reached its destination, fifteen years after being commissioned, the monument could not find a permanent setting in its homeland. Although *Hymn*

[587] Anonymous, "Se precisa ubicación para un monumento que nadie sabe donde cuajar," *El telegrafo*, May 26, 1926, "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín. English translation for: "Che Yrutia[sic] párate de una vez que se te van a cansar los bueyes!"

[588] *Ibidem*.

to Labor was destined for the Parque Tres de Febrero at the time of its commission, the socio-political situation of Buenos Aires had changed by the 1920s, and the monument was left without a home.

This section questions the role played by Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor* in the commemorative landscape of Buenos Aires. What does the mobility of the monument in the *porteña* city demonstrate about Yrurtia's conception of public sculpture and site-specificity? More broadly, this case study also highlights the inspirational values that modern sculptors, like Yrurtia, aimed to spread in their attempt to transform their nation, society, and people. I analyze how the design of the nineteenth and early twentieth-century monumental landscape of Buenos Aires participated in the construction of the Argentinian national identity. The transit of Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor* throughout the capital helps to illuminate the role of various stakeholders in deciding the location of public sculptures in the urban space, and the divergent expectations between the political program of the city's representatives and the artist's own artistic agenda.

6.1.1 "The pedagogy of statues"

During the fifty-year period between the 1880s and the 1930s, a metropolitan public space emerged in Buenos Aires. This transformation was led by the state, which became involved in the modernization of the capital. The center of the city was converted into the "heart of the nation" with the remodeling of the Plaza de Mayo, and the opening of the Avenidad de Mayo, whose goal was to monumentalize the civic space.[589] In the 1860s, Domingo Faustino Sarmiento, the seventh president of Argentina, had developed a political program based on the idea that transforming the

[589] Gorelik, *La grilla y el parque*, 102.

capital would change society as he sought to strengthen the federal structure of the country. Sarmiento was aware of the educational potential of urban space, and believed that the city molded the society who inhabited it. Inspired by both European and North American models, the Argentinian president understood the importance of parks in the transformation of the urban landscape, and ordered the construction of a green belt around the historical core of the city.

This development included the design of the park of Palermo, also known as Parque Tres de Febrero, for which Yrurtia's monument to labor was initially destined. The area around the Parque Tres de Febrero was originally the private retreat of the nineteenth-century dictator Juan Manuel de Rosas, which only became public parkland after his fall from power on February 3, 1852, hence its new name. It was an extraordinary gesture, emblematic of Sarmiento, to transform and repurpose the site of a former residence of the dictator to a public park, and no less symbolic than the idea of commissioning a monument celebrating the "the triumph to labor" to occupy this space. After Sarmiento's death in 1888, a project to erect a commemorative statue to the former president on the site of the Parque Tres de Febrero was undertaken. Rodin was commissioned to create the monument, which was eventually inaugurated in 1900.

For a long time, the commemorative landscape of Buenos Aires was underdeveloped for a city of its size and standing, and the scholar Marina Aguerre distinguishes three historical periods in its construction during the nineteenth century.[590] She locates its origins in the desire to emphasize important figures in Argentinian history, which were initially commissioned by private groups. These monuments were part of an effort to create a group of founding fathers, and they

[590] Marina Aguerre, "'Espacios simbólicos, espacios de poder: los monumentos conmemorativos de la colectividad italiana en Buenos Aires,'" in *Italia en el horizonte de las artes plásticas: Argentina, siglos XIX y XX* (Buenos Aires: Asociación Dante Alighieri de Buenos Aires, 2000), 61–88.

would tend to take certain formulaic forms: strong, militaristic men on horseback; proud politicians standing straight; and intellectual men seated with books. These statues established a patriotic and official imagery composed of portraits, symbols, and the recreation of historical scenes. These representations prioritized clear, easily recognizable and reproducible, archetypical representations for patriotic mass consumption that helped establish a pantheon of heroes of the nation. Somewhat ironically, most of these stereotypical monuments were produced by Italian artists, to whom Argentinians readily attributed artistic excellence.[591]

In nineteenth-century Argentina, public sculptures participated in the construction of the idea of the nation, which Gorelik calls "the pedagogy of statues."[592] Similar to the phenomenon of *statuomanie* in Europe and the City Beautiful movement in the United States, monuments were commissioned in Buenos Aires to be placed in specific public sites. The monument's aesthetic qualities and its sense of permanence were the major criteria assessed to help ensure a "successful" monument. There were two primary ways of financing monumental projects: building them piece by piece, and adding to the budget as the project grew; or building the main statue, and then fundraising to complete the monuments thanks to public donations.[593]

The beginning of the twentieth century marked an intensifying moment in the politics of statues with the preparation for the celebration of the Centenary of the May Revolution in 1910.

---

[591] Other monuments were made by French sculptors. For instance, Louis-Joseph Daumas's equestrian monument of Don José de San Martín erected in 1862, and the statue of General Belgrano in the actual Plaza de Mayo, completed by Albert-Ernest Carrier-Belleuse and Manuel de Santa Coloma. Aguerre, 66.

[592] Gorelik, *La grilla y el parque*, 206.

[593] Eduardo Schiaffino to Luis Monteverde, Intendente Principal de La Plata, August 10, 1899. Letter about a monument to the fraternity Italo-Argentinian to elevate on plaza de Italia. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

An international competition for a commemorative monument to the May Revolution was undertaken in 1902, as discussed in chapter 4. During these first two decades of the century, a new type of public space was constructed, which responded to the growing number of immigrants from Europe settling in Buenos Aires, and the active presence of these communities in local politics.[594] In 1895, 25% of the Argentinian population was foreign-born, and by 1914 that number topped 30%. In the 1880s alone, more than one million immigrants entered the country.[595] The rapidly growing number of immigrants led to rising concerns regarding the question of who belonged to the nation, and encouraged the construction of material points of reference. Monuments from that era reflect a search for models that would address both the native-born Argentinian people as well as immigrants, allowing recent arrivals to incorporate themselves into an identity that tied them to a new physical space.

6.1.2 The Controversy of Rodin's *Sarmiento*

The inauguration of Rodin's statue to Sarmiento in Palermo on May 25, 1900 was the first great sculptural event that mobilized public opinion around the question of monumentality. Known as "the father of the classroom," Sarmiento was the founder of the lay school system in Argentina,

---

[594] Aguerre analyzed the sculptural initiatives of the Italian community in Buenos Aires, whose goal was to anchor their Italian identity within the confines of the Argentinian state as a way to assert their presence in the young nation. Aguerre, "'Espacios simbólicos, espacios de poder: los monumentos conmemorativos de la colectividad italiana en Buenos Aires,'" 63.

[595] More than a million immigrants arrived in Argentina between 1880 and 1890. There were 800,000 in the 1890s, and 1.2 million in 1905. Buenos Aires grew from a population of 663,000 inhabitants in 1895 to 1,575,000 in 1914. José Luis Romero, *Breve historia de la Argentina* (Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2013), 113–14.

and was instrumental in the organization of modern Argentinian society. Sarmiento's well-known motto, "civilization and barbarism," "differentiated the indigenous-mestizo – uncultured – pole of the society from the progressive and educated development (defined by the Creole groups) which made possible the nation's existence."[596] Honored in his time and in the decades following his governance, Sarmiento's politics have been called into question recently, particularly in regard to the liberal education system that he founded, which was based on the exclusion of the indigenous inhabitants.

In *Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity*, the scholar Néstor García Canclini argues that "Latin American nation-states adopted modernization and national culture as their project."[597] Canclini analyzes the ambivalent relation between modernity and the past in Latin America, through the examination of operations of cultural ritualization, and the role played by museums and monuments in particular, which functioned as the sanctuary of the nation's identity.[598] Argentina constitutes a particular case in South America: in contrast to other neighboring countries, it sought to build something entirely new and reject tradition. Argentina did not look to its past, but instead modeled itself after Europe. Choosing Rodin, a French sculptor of rising international fame, to create the effigy of Sarmiento, the founder of modern Argentina, was emblematic of the effort to make Buenos Aires into a capital worthy of Europe.[599]

---

[596] Néstor García Canclini, *Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005), 112.

[597] *Ibid*. Foreword by Renato Rosaldo, xi-xvii.

[598] *Ibid*. See Chapter 4, "The Future of the Past," 107-144.

[599] It seems, not without surprise, that Eduardo Schiaffino was the one who proposed Rodin's name to carry out the work.

On April 5, 1896, Rodin and Ventura Miguel Marcó del Pont, the Paris-based delegate of the committee in charge of erecting a monument to Sarmiento in Buenos Aires, signed a contract that set up the financial and material conditions for the commission of the Sarmiento statue.[600] The monument would be composed of a two-meter high bronze figure of the former president standing on a pedestal, made of white marble and carved in high relief, with an allegorical figure of Apollo fighting the Hydra **(figure 172)**. Rodin was given three and a half years to complete the group, and a budget of seventy-five thousand francs to cover his expenses for the making of the monument and its packing.[601] The terms of the contract and the design choices for the monument resulted from ongoing conversations between Rodin, Aristóbulo del Valle, in charge of the commission for the monument in Buenos Aires, and Marcó del Pont, who visited the French sculptor weekly at his studio on rue de l'Université.[602]

[600] Just two days after the news of Sarmiento's death on September 11, 1888 was known, two members of the city council proposed to erect a monument to the former president in the Parque Tres de Febrero. The 1890 revolution would change the course of the monument. A commission presided by Torcuato de Alvear took up again the project, with a sub-commission for art led by Aristóbulo del Valle. "Vertical File Argentine - Buenos Aires (Monument à Sarmiento)" (Paris, France, n.d.), Archive, Musée Rodin; María Teresa Constantin "El Sarmiento de Rodin," in Antoine Amarger, ed., *Rodin En Buenos Aires* (Buenos Aires: Fundación Antorchas, 2001), 68–82; María Teresa Constantin, "Auguste Rodin, en medio de pasiones argentinas", in Andrés Duprat et al., *Rodin. Centenario en Bellas Artes*, Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes (Argentina, 2018), 108–15.

[601] This sum did not include the transportation fees, dependent on the committee. The monument was erected with public subscription funds.

[602] The correspondence between Marcó del Pont and Rodin started in January 1894. "Vertical File Argentine - Buenos Aires (Monument à Sarmiento)."

After the death of del Valle in 1896, the monument fell under the direction of Miguel Cané, Argentina's new plenipotentiary minister in Paris, and member of the committee for the statue, who corresponded frequently with Rodin to ensure its timely completion. On April 16, 1900, in the month preceding the inauguration of the statue of Sarmiento in Buenos Aires, Cané sent a letter to Rodin, in which he drew a sketch of the site where the monument would be unveiled, ensuring him that:

> the place where the work will be mounted, is, by all accounts, one of the most beautiful and propitious for an artwork we could dream for. It will be erected in the little square marked by an 'a' [on the sketch] at the best location of the roundabout formed by two of the most beautiful avenues of our large and beautiful promenade.[603] **(figure 173)**

The erection of Rodin's *Sarmiento* on the site of the recently demolished home of the nineteenth-century dictator Rosas, was greatly symbolic, establishing a victory of "civilization" over "barbarity," to use Sarmiento's own terms, for the Argentinian commissioners.

However, on the day of the inauguration, a controversy arose in regard to the aesthetic qualities of the artwork: Rodin's statue of *Sarmiento* lacked resemblance with the historical figure. Cané complained to Rodin: "Sarmiento's figure […], while being very beautiful and very elegant, does not correspond to the real man whose memory is still alive in Buenos Aires."[604] Two days later, Cané described in a letter to Rodin the debate that was taking place in Buenos Aires:

---

[603] Miguel Cané to Rodin, April 16, 1900. « L'endroit où l'œuvre va se monter, est, de l'avis général, un des plus beaux et favorables pour une œuvre d'art qu'on puisse rêver. Il s'élèvera dans le petit carré marqué 'a', au meilleur endroit du rond-point formé par les deux plus belles avenues de notre grande et belle promenade. » "Vertical File Argentine - Buenos Aires (Monument à Sarmiento)" (Paris, France, n.d.), Archive, Musée Rodin.

[604] Miguel Cané to Rodin, August 24, 1896. « La figure de Sarmiento […], tout en étant très belle et très élégante, ne répond pas au type réel dont le souvenir est vivant encore à Buenos Aires. » "Vertical File Argentine - Buenos Aires (Monument à Sarmiento)" (Paris, France, n.d.), Archive, Musée Rodin.

> We are still right in the midst of a battle of opinions […] I spent two years begging you, and you know how insistently, that you grant the greatest degree of similarity possible to Sarmiento's head and facial features […] You had promised me to keep our reasoning in mind, which in the end would not affect in the least your general ideas about what a commemorative monument should be […] Here I have the result: instead of being received by general acclamation as it deserved, because I find your work to be very beautiful, everyone is disconcerted by the simian-like figure of Sarmiento, his low forehead, his small piercing eyes, while he had them round […] his hair falling in the back of his head, while he had almost none […] I would have liked to write a different letter; you know of my admiration and my affection for you, but […] you should recall the loyal forthrightness with which I have always made my observations.[605]

On June 2, 1900, the satirical magazine *Caras y Caretas* captured the controversy over the sculpted representation of the former Argentinian president on its front-page caricature of Rodin and Sarmiento discussing the statue in the sculptor's studio **(figure 174)**.[606] The fictional dialogue between Rodin and his sitter mocks the French sculptor, who takes his symbolist style as an excuse to explain the distortions of Sarmiento's body. Yet, it was not due to a lack of knowledge that

---

[605] Miguel Cané to Rodin, May 27, 1900. "Vertical File Argentine - Buenos Aires (Monument à Sarmiento)" (Paris, France, n.d.), Archive, Musée Rodin.

[606] "Otra estatua simbólica", in *Caras y Caretas*, Buenos Aires, 3rd year, no. 87, June 2, 1900. Below is the English translation of the dialogue between Rodin and Sarmiento that accompanies the image:

"-the sculpted: I do not have such a prominent jaw, an abdomen so inflated, nor such large sleeves, and I do not need anyone to hold me.

-the sculptor: This is how people will remember you as part of history, my general. Do not forget that this is a symbolist portrait.

-the sculpted: But it turned out tough

-the sculptor: Of course, that is made of rock!"

Rodin portrayed Sarmiento the way he did, since the sculptor had in his possession photographic portraits of Sarmiento.[607]

After the unveiling of the statue, Rodin's admirers, unaware that the French sculptor had received all the documentation necessary to depict a likeness of Sarmiento, would blame the Argentinian commission in charge of the monument for Rodin's misstep; and Rodin himself would not deny this version of the facts. In his correspondence, Alfred Ébelot, a member of the French intellectual elite who emigrated to Argentina, described to Schiaffino his recent visit to the sculptor's studio in Paris:

> I did not hide to Rodin that, in my humble opinion, Sarmiento is not Sarmiento […] in my view, it is not his fault […] Rodin […] confessed that he knew rather poorly the author of *Civilización e barbarie,* and his features […] He told me that he had offered to remake the head […] I think that it would be worse to alter the monument with this kind of modifications. *A lo hecho, hecho*. [608]

Rodin never carried out his offer of a new head for the *Sarmiento* statue. The sculptor had dismissed Cané's remarks during the making of the monument, and probably neglected the

---

[607] A letter from May 14, 1896 listed that two photographs of Sarmiento, described as "very faithful portraits," were sent to Rodin. Archive, Musée Rodin. "Vertical File Argentine - Buenos Aires (Monument à Sarmiento)" (Paris, France, n.d.), Archive, Musée Rodin.

[608] Alfred Ébelot to Eduardo Schiaffino, Paris, November 6, 1900. "Comme il faut toujours dire la vérité, surtout aux gens qu'on aime et qu'on admire, je n'ai pas caché à Rodin qu'à mon humble avis son Sarmiento n'est pas Sarmiento […] à mon sens ce n'était pas lui qui en avait la faute. […] Rodin, qui est très orgueilleux, mais pas prétentieux pour deux sous, et qui est très accommodant quand on sait le prendre, m'a écouté avec beaucoup d'attention et avoue qu'il connaissait en effet fort mal l'auteur de *Civilización e barbarie*, et même la tournure physique de ce court-rude, aux pesantes épaules, mais si expressif dans ses moindres gestes. Il m'a dit qu'il avait offert de refaire la tête, si celle qu'il avait mise sur les épaules de Sarmiento ne ressemblait pas. Je crois que ce serait pire de procéder par retouches de ce genre. *A lo hecho, hecho*.» "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

photographic material on Sarmiento. In all likelihood, Rodin knew what he was doing: he was not interested in the facial expression of the man, but rather in the figure itself.

The Argentinian indignation in response to Rodin's *Sarmiento* came to the attention of Yrurtia, who had recently settled in Paris at the time of the monument's inauguration. His friend and confidant, the Argentinian painter, Martín Malharro, wrote to Yrurtia about his impressions regarding the *Sarmiento*:

> I went to see Rodin's *Sarmiento*. It confused me entirely. The first few times, I could not understand many things that today I was able to figure out. I think that this is a major artwork in terms of its artistic capabilities: but a failure in terms of its interpretation of the brilliant figure of Sarmiento. The Apollo on the pedestal is something sublime [...] Regarding the statue of Sarmiento, it is undeniable that this is not Sarmiento. It is the symbolic figure of a Blanqui, of a Rousseau, a Diderot, or any French fighter, but not the figure of a fighter like Sarmiento, it is not the figure of an American fighter, nor the immortal figure of the author of *Facundo*.[609]

Malharro was an admirer of Rodin, and he did not blame the French sculptor, "who never visited America," for not having captured the personality of Sarmiento, but rather the members of the Commission appointed to oversee the sculpture, who, according to him, did not provide Rodin with the necessary documentation, materials and explanation to make the figure.[610] This testimony

---

[609] Martín Malharro to Rogelio Yrurtia, February 12, 1902. "Estuve a ver el Sarmiento de Rodin. Me confundió completamente. Las primeras veces no pude darme cuenta de muchas cosas que hoy he llegado a descifrar. Creo que nos encontramos ante una obra superior como manifestación de arte: pero ante un fracaso como interpretación de la figura genial del Sarmiento. El Apolo del pedestal es algo sublime [...] En cuanto a la estatua de Sarmiento es indudable que no es Sarmiento. Es la figura simbólica de un Blanqui, de un Rousseau, de un Diderot, de un luchador francés cualquiera, pero no la figura de un luchador como Sarmiento, no la figura de un luchador americano, no la figura inmortal del autor de 'Facundo.'" "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

[610] *Ibidem*. "Y se comprende fácilmente que un hombre como Rodin, que no visitó nunca América, que no ha podido darle cuenta del carácter particular de las multitudes argentinas y por consiguiente del temple especial del hombre que

highlights the gap between Rodin's deliberate artistic vision, the expectations of his Argentinian commissioners, the local audience, and people from the art world. Rodin's fame would actually grow out of the scandals that successively marked his monumental projects, and by 1900, his reputation was so well-established that it could repel controversies, as in the case of the Sarmiento statue. However, pushing artistic boundaries and expectations would prove more difficult for young sculptors, such as Yrurtia, whose project for the May Revolution of 1910 was eventually rejected – as seen in chapter 4. His commission for a monument to labor, known today as *Hymn to Labor*, would finally establish Yrurtia's renown in his homeland.

6.1.3 *Hymn to Labor*: "A Living Architecture"[611]

On October 14, 1907, Yrurtia signed a contract for the commission of a monument "to the triumph of labor" with the mayor of Buenos Aires, Carlos Torcuato de Alvear (1860-1931), the son of Torcuato de Alvear (1822-1890), also known as the "Argentinian Haussmann."[612]

---

dominó esas multitudes, esas barbaries, distintas en sus manifestaciones como distintas en sus composiciones e idiosincrasias, se comprende repito que no haya interpretado la figura de Sarmiento porque estaba totalmente inhibido para concebirla. […] El fracaso no es de Rodin, es de la Comisión nombrada para dirigir la obra la que no ha sabido proporcionar los materiales, la documentación necesaria o la explicación de la figura tan complicada, grande y original como la de Sarmiento. ¡Cosas de la tierra!" "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

[611] In his letter to Yrurtia, dated August 11, 1922, the Argentinian sculptor Agustín Riganelli praises *Hymn to Labor* as "a living architecture." In Spanish: "ese monumento es toda una arquitectura viviente." "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

[612] Gorelik, *La Grilla y El Parque*, 101.

Haussmannism in Latin America produced figures similar to the French administrator as the ideal governor of the city, who similarly proposed a large-scale renovation of the Argentinian capital. Torcuato de Alvear was the president of the Municipal Commission of Buenos Aires between 1880 and 1883, and its first mayor between 1883 and 1887. During his administration, Buenos Aires, which in 1880 had become the capital city of Argentina, witnessed the beginning of a bold urban transformation that paralleled the dramatic growth of the economy between 1880 and 1914 due to Argentina's role as a major exporter of raw materials. During this economic boom, Buenos Aires gained the nickname of "the Paris of South America."[613] It was in this context of economic expansion and urban development that Yrurtia's project for a monument to labor originated.

Hymn to labor was not initiated by an association nor a private group, like the majority of public sculptures in the Argentinian capital, but was instead commissioned by the Municipality. Yrurtia's monument would become an exception in the urban landscape of Buenos Aires, which until then consisted almost exclusively of statues to individual heroes. With its fourteen larger than life sized figures, *Hymn to Labor* corresponded to a new type of commemorative monument in Buenos Aires. Yrurtia's multi-figural group did not express a clear ideological meaning, as illustrated in the official imagery, but required the passerby to stop, observe, and move around the monument to make sense of the various groupings and the intricate gestures of the figures. It called upon different analytical tools than other public sculptures, whose imagery referred to symbolic and allegorical realms.

The inscription "A Geerdita, Rogelio Yrurtia Estatuario Paris 1907/1911" engraved in capital letters on the base of the monument points to its transnational journey. Beyond the

---

[613] María Isabel Baldasarre, "Buenos Aires: An Art Metropolis in the Late Nineteenth Century," *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide* 16, no. 1 (2017), https://doi.org/10.29411/ncaw.2017.16.1.2.

dedication of the sculptural ensemble to Yrurtia's wife, it signals to *porteños* that this monument, now placed on Argentinian soil, was made in Paris by an Argentinian "*estatuario*", or, in English, "monumental sculptor."[614] Yrurtia, who worked with a team of assistants in his Paris studio – as described in chapter 5 – took full credit for the monument. He shared his contentment with Schiaffino: "I am satisfied of my effort that is mine exclusively, architecture and sculpture."[615] Despite being the product of a collaborative endeavor, *Hymn to Labor* was individualized by the personal narrative of the artist. Furthermore, Yrurtia sought to secure a location in Buenos Aires that would enhance the moral value and the unifying role of the monument, in addition to enhancing its prestige. However, the sculptor faced the resistance of city representatives, and had to defend his claims regarding his preferred location for *Hymn to Labor* in the urban space of the capital.

When it reached Buenos Aires in 1922, *Hymn to Labor* was first unveiled in the entry hall of the Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes.[616] It was inaugurated in the presence of representatives of the art world, politicians, and the foreign ministers of Brazil and Mexico, among others famous

---

[614] Geerdita was Yrurtia's first wife, whom he had met in Paris. In Buenos Aires, Yrurtia would remarry with Lía Correa Morales, the daughter of Lucio Correa Morales, the Argentinian master under which Yrurtia had trained as a young sculptor. Lía Correa Morales was also an artist. See Georgina Gluzman, *Trazos invisibles: mujeres artistas en Buenos Aires (1890-1923)*, Editorial Biblos (Buenos Aires, 2016).

[615] Yrurtia to Schiaffino. April 18, 1909. "Estoy satisfecho de mi esfuerzo que es exclusive mío, arquitectura y escultura." "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

[616] It was the former site of today's Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes in Buenos Aires.

and influential personalities (**figure 175**).[617] Curtains and wall hangings were placed in the space surrounding the group to help create an artistic architectural effect. One may imagine the technical difficulties that had to be overcome to fit this monumental sculpture in the enclosed space of the museum. Symbolically, the display of *Hymn to Labor* in the National Museum of Fine Arts ensured its institutionalization, and its evolution from a transnational sculpture to national monument.

Local critics were effusive in their admiration for Yrurtia's artwork. The Argentinian sculptor Ernesto Soto Avendano praised the profound humanity of the monument, which he described as a symbol of life in front of which a viewer could not help but be moved.[618] Most critics commented upon the optimism of the sculpture, but Roberto Cugini's article entitled "'Triumph to Labor' and its philosophical pessimism," questioned how such tormented bodies in distress and herculean figures painfully contorted, could represent a triumph to labor.[619] The opacity of meaning of Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor* allowed people to project various ideas. Some even "wrongly considered [*Hymn to Labor*] of anarchist tendency," commented Yrurtia.[620] This variety of interpretations about the symbolic meaning of the monumental ensemble certainly contributed to the difficulty the Municipality had in choosing a site for its display.

---

[617] See press cuttings: "'El Canto del Trabajo' Inauguración del monumento," in *Crítica*, August 10, 1922; and *La Nación*, August 11, 1922. "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

[618] Ernesto Soto Avendano, *La Vanguardia*, August 20, 1922.

[619] Roberto Cugini, "'El Canto al Trabajo' y su pesimismo filosófico", *Diario de Plata*, May 7, 1923.

[620] Rogelio Yrurtia to Antonio Zaccagnini, from the Commission of Public Works, Buenos Aires, October 5, 1925. "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

On May 25, 1926, the newspaper *La Fronda*, published an article signed by the pen name "Ignotus" – which could have been Yrurtia himself – that made the following observation:

> Monuments and statues, in order to be useful in their artistic, ethical and social effects, need to live together with people, have contact with its inhabitants and permanently receive an homage of admiration and passion from the environment for which they have been created […] monuments must live.[621]

This idea of the living monument, made for people, reiterates the importance of the site-specificity of public sculptures, which was one of Yrurtia's main concerns regarding his monuments. To Yrurtia, the placement of the viewer and their vantage point were fundamental in determining a suitable location for the monument. The viewer needed to be in a position from which they could establish a relationship between the sculptural masses and the elements of the urban environment around them. Yrurtia followed a law of proportions distributing and establishing balance and harmony between the volumes of its components.[622] According to this theory, a monument needed to fit within a rich architectural frame in order to be valued as a work of art. The longitudinal structure of *Hymn to Labor* required a site that conformed to all these criteria for it to achieve its desired effect.

Hymn to Labor was not the prototypical statue to the hero so prevalent in Buenos Aires, and became the subject of heated debates between Yrurtia and the Municipality regarding its

---

[621] Ignotus, *La Fronda*, 25 May 1926. "Los monumentos y las estatuas, para que sean útiles en toda su proyección artística, ética y social, deben convivir con el pueblo, rozarse con sus habitantes y recibir permanentemente el homenaje admirativo y apasionado del ambiente para el cual han sido creados, o mejor todavía, por el cual han sido creados […] los monumentos tienen que vivir."

[622] Rogelio Yrurtia to Antonio Zaccagnini, from the Commission of Public Works, Buenos Aires, October 5, 1925. "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

permanent home. First, the sculptor contested the proposal of the city government to place his monument in front of the new Post Office building on Avenida Alem.[623] Designed by the French architect Norbert Maillart (1856-1928), the new Post Office was a Neoclassical Beaux-Arts style building with Second Empire elements. One might argue that the choice of the Municipality to place Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor* in front of this "French" building corresponded to their understanding of the monument associated with French style. However, in a lengthy letter to the Commission of Public Works, Yrurtia voiced his disagreement and cited his theory on the display of public sculpture in urban space.

Inspired by the many years he had spent in Paris and his observations of the city's urban planning, Yrurtia had specific examples in mind. For instance, he compared the location of Notre-Dame, whose monumental grandeur of Gothic style is reinforced by the old and narrow streets that surround it on its three sides, to the *Arc de Triomphe* on Place de l' Étoile, whose enormous proportions seem reduced due to the lack of reference points in its overly large setting.[624] For Yrurtia, his *Dorrego* erected in the square Suipacha and Viamonte in Buenos Aires constituted a successful example of a monument in a public space. The sculptor noted that *Dorrego* retained all of its scale – proportion and volume – given its relationship with the buildings that surrounded it. The sculptor would repeatedly use Paris as a point of reference:

> In Paris, […] Rodin's *Thinker* is located in front of the Pantheon, where the bodies of the great men of France are buried; *Voltaire* is on the Plaza of the French Institute, *Danton*

---

[623] *Ibidem.*

[624] *Ibidem.*

> ironically breathing revenge, in the Boulevard Haussmann, the aristocratic neighborhood by excellence […][625]

This letter was effectively intended by Yrurtia to serve as a lesson in urban planning for the Commission of Public Works, while allowing the sculptor to defend his work by appealing to their sense of patriotism. For Yrurtia, *Hymn to labor* played an inspirational and engaging role in the society, but to do so, it needed to be located in a suitable location: "*Hymn to labor* does not have anything to do with the stamps of the Post Office Building, nor with the mortgage titles or any other activities that take place in this establishment."[626] The sculptor was infuriated by the proposition of the Commission, as underlined by the handwritten note added in blue marker on the front page of his letter: "What an outrageous thing – how much nonsense went into recommending the location! God help me! I must not complain about my reputation as a clumsy madman!"[627] **(figure 176)**.

Yrurtia eventually convinced the commission against the decision to place *Hymn to Labor* in front of the Post Office Building, and suggested other locations for the monument.[628] The triangular space in front of the plaza San Martín was one of them. However, this site was rejected

---

[625] *Ibidem.* "En Paris […] se ha colocado el 'Pensador' de Rodin en la fachada del Panteón donde descansan los restos de los prohombres de la Francia; el "Voltaire" en la Plaza del Instituto de Francia, 'Dantón' como por una ironía respirando venganza, en el Boulevard Haussmann, barrio por excelencia aristocrático […]"

[626] *Ibidem*. "me parece que nada tenga que hacer el 'Canto al Trabajo' con las estampillas del edificio de Correos, no con los títulos hipotecarios o de otras especias que se cotizan en este establecimiento comercial de enfrente."

[627] *Ibidem*. "¡Qué barbaridad – cuantos desatinos puede aconsejar la coloca! ¡Dios me asista! ¡No debo quejarme de mi fama de loco torpe!"

[628] Yrurtia to Schiaffino, November 17, 1925. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

because of its proximity to the statue of the national hero José de San Martín, which they feared would be diminished in the presence of Yrurtia's sculptural grouping. Another recommended site was the intersection of Diagonal Norte and Florida streets, in front of the First National Bank of Boston, "where *Hymn to Labor* would fit with an admirable precision within the rich architectural frame, an architecture that would allow a fair assessment of the importance of this work, both in its richness of detail and significance as well as in its volume and dimensions, completing the building with the work, and the work with the building of the place."[629] However, the Municipality rejected this location as well, and Yrurtia then proposed the plaza Dorrego, at the intersection of the streets Defensa and Humberto I.[630] The sculptor claimed that the dimensions of this plaza constituted the perfect frame for his sculptural group, given that "a more open space or a large perspective would diminish the importance of the composition and would erase the delicacy of the modelling."[631]

---

[629] *Ibid.* "Esto me conduje a encontrar el nuevo triangulo que existe en la intersección de la diagonal Norte y de Florida frente al First National Bank of Boston, en el cual el "Canto al trabajo" se encuadraría con una admirable precisión dentro de una rica arquitectura como marco, arquitectura que permitiría valorar con justeza la importancia de esta obra, tanto en su riqueza de detalle y significativo como en su volumen y dimensiones, completándose de suyo la edificación con ella, y ella con la edificación del lugar."

[630] Yrurtia to Municipal Intendente Horacio Cesco, June 9, 1926. "Lamentando no me sea concedida la plazoleta situada en la Diagonal Norte y Florida para la ubicación de 'Canto al Trabajo', ruego a usted quiere acordarme, en su reemplazo, la plaza Dorrego que queda en el ángulo de las calles Defensa y Humberto I." "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

[631] Yrurtia to Horacio Cesco, June 1926. Referring to the plazoleta Dorrego: "En este sitio, en razón de sus dimensiones, que no deberían ser ampliadas, encuadraría perfectamente ese grupo conservando la proporción monumental buscada, a la vez que los valores esculturales que con tanto tesón he perseguido. Un espacio demasiado abierto o una gran perspectiva, disminuirían la importancia de su composición y borrarían las morbideces del

On September 10, 1927, *Hymn to Labor* was finally installed on the plaza Dorrego in the historic neighborhood of San Telmo, where it was placed on a granite pedestal.[632] A public inauguration was celebrated, and the mayor, surrounded by a crowd of locals, unveiled the monument **(figure 177)**. On a trip at the time, Yrurtia was not present at the ceremony. However, the press noted the public's applause at the moment of the unveiling.[633] Documented in photographs taken on site in 1930 and 1931, the monument is well integrated into the historical neighborhood of San Telmo **(figure 178)**. Men are seated on benches around the monument located at the center of the plaza. They are either in conversation with one another, resting, smoking, or reading a newspaper. None of them are actually engaging with the monument, which they seem to be ignoring. This contrast between the symbol of labor represented by the monument, and the placid docility of the people napping on the benches of the plaza, under the midday sun, was commented upon by the press at the time.[634] In spite of years of efforts that Yrurtia put into finding the right site for his work, his monument still did not animate the site as he had hoped.

Two years after the installation of *Hymn to Labor* on the plaza Dorrego, Yrurtia expressed his disappointment to the new municipal intendent José Luis Cantilo regarding the location of his monument. His words are in perfect contradiction with his own opinion about the site three years prior: "[*Hymn to Labor*] has become neglected, in its features and proportions, in the mentioned

---

modelado." "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

[632] The plaza Dorrego, located in San Telmo, has nothing to do with the Statue of Dorrego, discussed earlier in this chapter, which is erected on plaza Suipacha, in microcentro, Buenos Aires.

[633] "El 'Canto al Trabajo' de Irurtia puede ya ser admirado", *La Epoca*, September 11, 1927.

[634] *Ideales*, August 11, 1929.

site [plaza at the corner of the streets Defensa and Humberto I], whose architectural frame is poor, whose proximity to a public urinal is ungrateful, and the height of the pedestal too short."[635] The sculptor proposed to move *Hymn to Labor* to the public square in front of the north façade of the Teatro Colón, but the Municipality decided instead to transfer the monument to the newly built avenue of Paseo Colón.

In 1937, following a change in government, *Hymn to Labor* was installed opposite the Ministry of Agriculture on Paseo Colón, a modern avenue that connected the harbor of Buenos Aires to the Casa Rosada, the seat of the Argentinian government.[636] "It had been placed in a dark corner of the Municipality," one reads on the front page of the *Boletín del trabajo de la republica argentina* in December 1937, featuring the monument in its new location. "The current municipal administration has given the location it deserved to that magnificent conception, to offer it not to the distracted and the sad, but to all those who parade through the city pushed by strong passions. There is in Yrurtia's work, beauty, color, vital breath, progress towards the future. We are pleased to have contributed to its new location," stated the Department of Labor.[637] Yet journalists noted

[635] Yrurtia to Intendente José Luis Cantilo, September 1929. "[*Canto al trabajo*] que la obra de referencia queda deslucida, en sus características y proporciones, en el emplazamiento citado [plazoleta a la esquina de las calles Defensa y Humberto I], cuyo marco arquitectónico es pobre, ingrata la proximidad a ella de un mingitorio público y escasa la altura de su pedestal. […] Ordene a quienes corresponda, el traslado de dicha obra a la plazoleta situada en frente a la fachada norte del Teatro Colón […]" "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

[636] Contemporary press cuttings seem to indicate that there had been no inauguration ceremony in 1937.

[637] *Boletín del trabajo de la republica argentina*, December, 31, 1937 – January 1, 1938. "Se le había emplazado en un oscuro rincón del Municipio. La actual intendencia municipal le ha dado la ubicación que merecía a esa magnifica concepción, para ofrecerla no a los distraídos y a los tristes, sino a cuantos desfilen por la urbe empujados por fuertes

that the modern and opened avenue of the Paseo Colón with its perspective and light providing a sense of emulative exaltation, did not correspond to the lamentation and painful complaint represented by *Hymn to Labor*.[638]

The difficulty to find an appropriate site for *Hymn to Labor* can be interpreted as a monumental failure, much like O'Connor's *Le débarquement*, dismembered and placed today in an inappropriate setting in Merrion Square, Dublin, as we will see in the following sections. Pushed away from the heart of the city center, *Hymn to Labor* appears isolated in the middle of the large avenue of Paseo Colón, with no architectural framework in its immediate vicinity **(figure 179)**. Instead of being part of an architectural setting where the sculpture would play a complementary role, it has now been reduced to a simple decorative fixture. Worse still, the monument is surrounded by a spartan metal fence that does not allow any direct relation between the viewer and the sculptural work, and greatly detracts from its aesthetic qualities.

Since its commission in 1907, *Hymn to Labor* underwent a profound transformation, from a group of four figures dedicated to the "triumph to labor," to a procession of fourteen massive bronze figures that took more than a decade to come to life. After years in the making in the sculptor's French studio, and political changes in the Argentinian capital, the local expectations regarding Yrurtia's sculptural group had evolved. Once it reached Buenos Aires in 1922, *Hymn to Labor* had to find its place in a monumental landscape predominantly composed of Italianate

---

pasiones. Hay en la obra de Yrurtia, belleza, color, aliente vital, avance hacia el futuro. Nos congratulamos de haber contribuido a su nuevo emplazamiento." "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

[638] "Lo que sugiere el 'Canto al trabajo' de Irurtia en su nuevo emplazamiento del Paseo Colón", *La Vanguardia*, February 13, 1938.

sculptures such as Lola Mora's *Fountain to the Nereids*, and heroic statues to the Argentinian nation's great men – including Rodin's *Sarmiento*.[639]

The displacement of *Hymn to Labor* in the city, illustrated in the caricature at the beginning of this section, operates not only physically, but symbolically as well. Through mutations of space, audiences, society and socio-political contexts, the meaning of public monuments continuously changes over time. In 2010, a series of stamps for the Republic of Argentina was released, featuring an illustration of *Hymn to Labor* juxtaposed with Eva Perón's words, "*Donde existe una necesidad nace un derecho*," or "Where There is a Need, a Right is Born" **(figure 180)**. More than a century after the monument was commissioned, *Hymn to Labor* was associated with the powerful symbol of Peronism in Argentina, shifting once more the meaning of Yrurtia's sculpture.

6.2 Barnard's *Life of Humanity*: "The Portal of the People"

What would a visitor at the 1910 Salon des artistes français possibly have in common with a resident of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, visiting the State Capitol Building on legal matters? At the very least, the two of them would have experienced the enormous physicality of Barnard's statuary *Life of Humanity.* In both contexts, the sculptural groups of *Love and Labor: The Unbroken Law*

---

[639] In 1926, the sculptural-architectural ensemble of Antoine Bourdelle's *Monument to the General Alvear* would also leave its imprint on the *porteño* monumental landscape. Schiaffino was commissioned an article on Bourdelle for the French newspaper *L'Amour de l'art*, and he decided to dedicate it more broadly to Bourdelle and French sculptors in Buenos Aires. Indeed, Schiaffino was skeptic about Bourdelle's art, confessing that "Bourdelle no es escultor de mi predilección." Eduardo Schiaffino, « Bourdelle & L'Argentine : Les artistes français à Buenos Aires », *L'Amour de l'art*, January 1, 1930, 15-19.

and *The Burden of Life: The Broken Law*, which compose *Life of Humanity*, operated as architectural framing devices. A photograph of Barnard's monument on display at the 1910 SAF shows the two greater than life-sized groups enclosing the entrance doors of the Grand Palais **(figure 181)**. The photograph was taken outside of the public hours of the Salon since no visitors are present. Portrait busts are aligned alongside parterres of flowers, while a musician, a runner, and a mother with her child, among others, animate the space. Dispersed throughout the sculpture hall of the Grand Palais, they function as *Life of Humanity*'s only audience.

Eighteen months later, on the other side of the Atlantic, *Life of Humanity* welcomed visitors at the stairway to the main entrance of the Pennsylvania State Capitol building. A postcard of the period features people chatting in small groups on the terrace in front of this processional space flanked on both sides by Barnard's statuary **(figure 182)**. In Harrisburg, no artificial parterres surrounded the monumental groups, but instead the statuary looked out onto the trees and bushes of a park-like landscape. At the Salon in Paris, Barnard's groups towered over the artificial plantings inside the vast greenhouse-like space of the Grand Palais. In contrast, the monumentality of the sculpted figures was partially absorbed by the architectural background of the Capitol Building in Harrisburg. The Paris Salon presented a carefully organized and grandiose aesthetic space for a select audience of art lovers, artists, bourgeois, jury members, and art critics. Across the Atlantic, *Life of Humanity* functioned as a liminal space for local residents between the bustling noises of everyday city life and the administrative tasks within the civic building.

During its unveiling in Paris, Barnard's *Life of Humanity* was praised by French critics and artists for its aesthetic qualities – as seen in chapter 3. Among them, the sculptor Hippolyte Lefebvre (1863-1935), a longtime friend of Barnard since their formative years in Cavelier's

studio,[640] placed the American sculptor within the legacy of Western art: "The genius is American; the talent is French. The culture is French, with all our studies of Greek art, and of Italian art of the Renaissance."[641] A year and a half later, during the dedication ceremony of the statuary in Harrisburg, the monument would not be defined by its artistic virtues, but rather by its role in instilling moral values. Among the inauguration speeches given on October 4, 1911, Barnard's father, a Presbyterian minister, remarked:

> Gathered here to-day […] to dedicate these groups of sculpture, may we take in some larger sense of the meaning and worth of life; of its varying moods and boundless possibilities, its sorrows and its joys, its fears and its hopes, its failures and its triumphs. May we learn to prize more highly the thought of the human Brotherhood and the golden value of faith, and virtue, and knowledge, and temperance, and patience, and godliness, and brotherly kindness, and charity.[642]

In his own writing, Barnard had compared state capitols to modern cathedrals: "All Capitol buildings are, or should be, the portal of the people."[643] Similar to the portals of cathedrals, Barnard's *Life of Humanity* sought to engage the citizens of Pennsylvania in an inspirational and encyclopedic journey that started at the entrance of the Capitol Building. It was further developed inside its walls, as part of a comprehensive iconographic program. Monuments embody multiple

---

[640] « Le statuaire Hippolyte Lefebvre vu par sa fille », *La Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, January 1949. "George Grey Barnard Vertical File" (Paris, France, n.d.), Documentation Center, Musée d'Orsay.

[641] Extract from a letter written by Hippolyte Lefebvre to *Le Siècle*, Paris, June 3,1910. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

[642] *Dedication Ceremonies of the Barnard Statues, State Capitol Building*, Harrisburg, PA, October 4, 1911 (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania State Capitol, 1912), 12-13

[643] "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution. Modern sculptors like Rodin were fascinated by these majestic structures. See Auguste Rodin and Dominique Dupuis-Labbé, *Les cathédrales de France* (Paris: Bartillat, 2012).

layers of meanings that do not rely uniquely on their aesthetic or artistic elements, but also include iconographic choices, both social and political, and how they resonate within a particular historical context. The issues of site-specificity that marked *Hymn to Labor* are absent in the case of Barnard's sculptural groups which were commissioned specifically for the façade of the architectural ensemble of the Capitol Building. This study of *Life of Humanity* touches on a different aspect of monumentality than Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor* – the politics of iconography and its reception in the public sphere.

Barnard's *Life of Humanity* is today recognized as one of the largest commissions of American sculpture ever completed. This statement may be surprising given that the only "American" elements of this sculptural ensemble are the nationality of its lead sculptor, and the site where the groups were installed. As seen in the previous chapter, the models of the figures, the labor force and the materials were mostly European, and this section explores how *Life of Humanity* became "nationalized" once it crossed the Atlantic. In choosing to emulate sculptural motifs from the Salons, Barnard inscribed his statuary within an international context of artistic creation. Although this network of sculptural citations, as mapped out in chapters 2 and 3, was entirely comprehensible in the transnational ecosystem of the Paris Salons, it became illegible in the public space of Harrisburg, where the references to the sculptural motifs were lost. This section will first examine the transformations made to the marble figures in Harrisburg as a response to the public controversy regarding the nudity depicted in the work. It will then evaluate the participation of the monument in the construction of whiteness in the United States and the commodification of the sculptural groups after their unveiling in Harrisburg.

6.2.1 *Life of Humanity* and The Scandal of Nudity

On January 15, 1911, the front page of the *Chicago Examiner* juxtaposed a picture of Barnard's *Love and Labor* on top of a photomontage of the group with its figures dressed in togas, concealing their genitalia **(figure 183)**. In contrast to its reception in Paris, the frontpage article's humorous title, "Clothing Prices Low; Why Not Drape the Bernard[sic] Group? U.S. Too Modest to Condone Nudity, like Wicked Paris. Pennsylvania blushes at art applauded in Old World Salons,"[644] sarcastically condemned the nudity of Barnard's statuary in Pennsylvania. Known for its sensational stories, the *Chicago Examiner* covered the acrimonious debate that took place in Harrisburg before the inauguration of the monument. A commentary pamphlet "How Nude in Art Depends on Point of View" accompanied the newspaper's illustration:

> Shall we defer to the easy conscience of the French salon?
> Shall we permit our old men and matrons, young men and maidens to accustom their eyes to these undraped metaphors?
> Or shall we take advantage of January sales in clothing?
> Pay no attention to its beauty - its symbol of purpose, its grandeur of conception.
> Only think how you would look if you would appear in this fashion on State street. Such is the noble, the sublime intent of art.[645]

Ironically, this writer sees the undressed marble figures in *Life of Humanity* as "living" metaphors in the public space of the State Capitol, threatening to incite the citizens of Pennsylvania to abandon decorum and their morals.

---

[644] Roswell Field, "Clothing Prices Low; Why not Drape the Bernard[sic] Group? U.S. Too Modest to Condone Nudity, like Wicked Paris," *Chicago Examiner*, January 15, 1911. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

[645] *Ibidem.*

Although clearly sarcastic in its tone, this article satirizes the many real attacks against Barnard's monumental groups after their image was made public in September 1910. Writing from Moret in March 1911 to his parents, Barnard rejected the harsh indictment from his fellow countrymen by stating, "Thousands of articles have been written about the question of the nude, but this of course is nothing to do with me, but a national question."[646] However, willing to appease the Pennsylvania audience, Barnard had his workers cover the genitals of the figures with marble "blurs," a modern reinterpretation of the traditional fig leaf. Barnard must have anticipated the criticisms of the nudity of the figures in his monumental groups, since already at the 1910 SAF, *Love and Labor* featured figures with the coverings. Yet, perhaps due to time constraints in transporting the groups on time to the Salon, the genitalia of the figures of the matching group, *Burden of Life*, remained visible **(figure 184)**. After the Salon closure, both groups were shipped to Harrisburg, where the Piccirilli brothers added marble blurs on the remaining figures before their unveiling **(figure 185)**.

Even in "wicked" Paris, consternation regarding the theme of the nude in sculpture had graced the front pages of major media outlets. In 1896, the weekly magazine *Le Rire* published a front cover entitled "*Au Salon*" or "At the Salon," depicting a caricature of an upper-class lady taking great pleasure in inspecting the naked body of a male figure in marble carrying a lyre like Apollo **(figure 186)**.[647] As she ogles the genitals of the statue with her opera glasses, she exclaims, "*Tiens! mon ancien cocher!*" ("Hey! My former coachman!"). Elevated on a pedestal, the statue is

[646] Barnard to his parents, March 15, 1911. At that time, only one bas-relief had been erected at the State Capitol, and Barnard was complaining about delays in Harrisburg. "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers" (State College, PA, n.d.), Centre County Historical Society.

[647] Lucien Métivet, "Au Salon", *Le Rire*, May 23, 1896, no. 81, second year, cover page.

shown from the back, its buttocks placed squarely at the eye level of the visitors, emphasizing the sexual charge of the gaze of the "libertine" woman, carrying a small dog in her arms. In the background, a conservative husband wearing a top hat scowls at her, while his wife discreetly glances at the marble nude.

In his caricature, Lucien Métivet (1863-1932) plays on the different gazes of the characters. The reader of *Le Rire* is left to piece together the visual cues of the caricature juxtaposed with the crude joke at the bottom of the frame. The morality of the well-to-do woman is certainly called into question by the top-hatted gentleman, an emblem of traditional, conservative French Catholic morality. In contrast to Harrisburg, it is not the sculptor and the statues themselves that are targets of attacks, but it is the public's reactions that are ridiculed, either for being too prudish, or too frivolous. In Paris, the subject is treated mainly with humor, while in Harrisburg, the virulence of the debate highlights the perceived threat of nudity vis-à-vis the moralizing pedagogical role of art.

The vitriol over the nude figures of *Life of Humanity* in Harrisburg was neither the first attack toward an American sculptor with regards to the portrayal of the nude, nor was it the first against Barnard's sculptures. In 1897, Barnard's statue of the Greek god *Pan* had become the subject of debate regarding its installation in Central Park, Manhattan. On June 11 of that year, the *New York World* published a caricature of *Pan* holding a public pamphlet placed strategically over his genitals, which read: "Rejected by the Park. Commissioners for want of a suitable place" **(figure 187)**.[648] The god had given up playing the flute, and was yawning as he proclaimed, "That gives me an awful tired feeling!", seemingly longing for a place to be displayed. That same day,

[648] *New York World*, June 11, 1897. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

the front page of *The Evening Telegram* featured a caricature of Barnard's *Pan* paired with MacMonnies's *Bacchante with an Infant Faun,* designated as "The Two Orphans." This cartoon was to accompany an article entitled "Where Maybe the God Pan Rest?".[649]

In the case of MacMonnies's *Bacchante,* its rejection was not only based on the aesthetic qualities of the work but also because of its bold representation of nudity. It is important to consider this piece in the context of how it translated from the gallery space of the Paris Salon to the American public square, where the sculpture triggered issues of civic order in public spaces.[650] MacMonnies's *Bacchante* was a gift of the architect Charles F. McKim, to the newly built Boston Public Library.[651]According to Julia Rosenbaum, "The furor the statue caused had less to do with the squeamishness over nudity or overzealous sobriety than with competing claims to social legitimacy."[652] Rosenbaum demonstrates that in response to the flow of immigrants into Boston in the 1870s, the local elite had sought to strengthen itself by constructing cultural barriers to avoid the absorption of lower-class and Irish immigrant groups into Bostonian society: "To install the

---

[649] *The Evening Telegram*, New York, June 11, 1897, cover page. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

[650] On the *Bacchante* controversy, see Julia Rosenbaum, "Displaying Civic Culture: The Controversy over Frederick MacMonnies' 'Bacchante'", *American Art*, vol. 14, num. 3 (Autumn, 2000), 40-57; Walter Muir Whitehill, "The Vicissitudes of Bacchante in Boston," *The New England Quarterly*, Vol. 27, No. 4, (December, 1954), 435-454. See also Thayer Tolles, "Bacchante and Infant Faun: Tradition, Controversy, and Legacy," *Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, vol. 77, no. 1, summer 2019.

[651] Charles F. McKim was also the architect of the Boston Public Library. It opened in 1895 as part of a network of institutions that had emerged in the city, along with the Museum of Fine Arts and the Symphony.

[652] Julia Rosenbaum, "Displaying Civic Culture: The Controversy over Frederick MacMonnies' 'Bacchante,'" *American Art* 14, no. 3 (October 1, 2000): 43.

statue in the courtyard would have meant for some the collapse of cultural and civic order."[653] Unlike today, where libraries are meant to be inclusive centers for learning, in MacMonnies's era, the library's role in the United States was to mold the citizen and edify civic culture, specifically in the image of the New England protestant elite.

Such considerations regarding the pedagogical aspirations of the Boston Public Library could be extended to other major public edifices, such as the Pennsylvania State Capitol Building. One could argue that the attacks against Barnard's statuary were not motivated by the artistic value of nude sculptural figures, but by their perceived capacity to threaten the social and moral order of American society. Like the Boston Public Library, the newly built Pennsylvania State Capitol was a complex ensemble of architecture, mural painting, sculpture, tile work and stained glass offering a complete aesthetic experience.[654] Barnard's statuary was part of a larger artistic program for the Capitol Building. Though referred to stylistically as *beaux-arts* architecture, the Capitol Building constituted a patchwork of various historical and geographical styles appropriated to represent an American landmark. As part of this ensemble of multiple styles, Barnard's monumental groups constituted a reinterpretation of the Salons models that were reassembled for a new project. The original Salons references were now lost. Their meaning had been transformed by the sculptural reconfiguration of the Harrisburg installation.

Despite the nudity of the figures, seen by his detractors as inciting the viewer to inappropriate behavior, Barnard's *The Burden of Life* and *Love and Labor* were actually developed

[653] Rosenbaum, 52.

[654] See Sally Promey on her discussion about Sargent murals as civic edification: Sally M. Promey, *Painting Religion in Public: John Singer Sargent's Triumph of Religion at the Boston Public Library* (Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1999).

around a narrative based on maintaining moral and social order in society. At the 1910 SAF, some European critics had identified something that they believed distinguished Barnard from his fellow Salons sculptors. Among them, the French Louis Vauxcelles commented in *Gil Blas*, "He [Barnard] is of a race puissant and new."[655] The famous German critic, Paul Clemen, who had curated an exhibition of Rodin's works in Berlin and who now planned to organize a retrospective show on Barnard, remarked: "His [Barnard's] sculpture is so full of virility and power that it makes all other works in the Salon look effeminate."[656] By contrasting the "virility" and "power" of Barnard's statuary with the "effeminate" Salons sculptures, Clemen read *Life of Humanity* not merely as a decorative sculpture, but in terms of the contemporary interest in eugenics.[657]

During his visit to the 1910 SAF, Theodore Roosevelt, the former President of the United States, spoke with great enthusiasm about Barnard's statuary, highlighting the role of Barnard's moralistic tale in the context of the Harrisburg Capitol, where the figures would serve as models for their fellow citizens:

> I recognize in the foreground two symbols which are supremely contrasted. One is Humanity pausing, being dominated by the influence of past error; the other is Humanity advancing, being inspired by the gospel of work and brotherhood. These groups are my

---

[655] *Gil Blas*, Paris, May 1910. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

[656] "Extracts from foreign papers," in "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

[657] The term "Eugenics" comes from the Greek words "well" and "born." It was coined by the British statistician Francis Galton, whose ideas found fertile ground in turn of the century America, where waves of European immigration, perceived by some as a threat to the "American Race" and its manhood, were changing the population makeup of the country. The Eugenics movement developed between 1890 and 1930 with the goal of preserving hereditary stock, assuring racial purity, and preventing the "race suicide" of white protestant Americans.

ideal of what should decorate a Capitol; they realize in sculpture what ought to constitute the ideal of the generations to come. I am proud of this work, - proud, proud, proud![658]

Roosevelt already envisioned Barnard's creation in its destined space in Harrisburg, where he had given an inaugural address at the newly rebuilt Capitol building in 1906. Roosevelt, who defended the idea of the preservation of the "American race" by invoking nostalgic ideals of the farmer and the rural family, found in Barnard and his monumental groupings a perfect illustration of his ideas about the conservation of the race to advance his political agenda.[659] Barnard's *Life of Humanity*, by referring to a presupposed ideal past, participated in the construction of whiteness in the United States.

6.2.2 American Modernism and the Construction of Whiteness

Life of Humanity constitutes a didactic saga of human progress. The sculptural groups of *The Burden of Life* and *Love and Labor* emerge from a towering bas-relief representing the origin of humankind. Placed in front of each other, the two groups create a mirroring effect, and present "a Bible in stone" to the viewer as they enter the Capitol Building **(figure 188)**.[660] The visual vocabulary developed by Barnard, that he borrowed from the Paris Salons, was repurposed in his

---

[658] *Le Siècle*, Paris, June 1910. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

[659] See Chapter 5, "Men as trees walking. Theodore Roosevelt and the Conservation of the Race." Laura L Lovett, *Conceiving the Future: Pronatalism, Reproduction, and the Family in the United States, 1890-1938.* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009), 109–10."

[660] I borrow the expression "A Bible in stone" from Brian Hack, who uses it as a section head in his dissertation. Brian Hack, "American Acropolis: George Grey Barnard's 'Monument to Democracy', 1918-1938" (New York, City University of New York, 2008), 90.

sculptural ensemble to advance certain moral values. Muscular male bodies in motion contrast with the protective gestures of the rounded female figures. Humans are represented at different stages in life: from infant to child, from the lithe bodies of youth to the athletic and full-figured shapes of the male and female adults. Although each figure is based on a living model – as noted in chapter 5 – they appear typified, their eyes empty. By erasing any naturalistic features, Barnard moved from the particular to the universal. The variation of the poses and the composition of the groupings illustrating different stages of life, found new meaning in the context of the Capitol Building.

The aesthetic of Barnard's sculptural bodies has long been associated with Rodin. The 1995 exhibition *The Figure in American Sculpture: A Question of Modernity* at LACMA located the source of modernism in the United States in Rodin's art and included works by Barnard.[661] Dismissed by the rise of abstraction, American figurative sculpture was reconsidered as part of the history of modernism. According to the co-curators of the exhibition, "Modern sculpture […] blossomed as Americans enthusiastically adopted the human figure as the primary vehicle of exploration and experimentation."[662] Rodin and his powerful modeling, muscular bodies and the construction of figures with limbs and torsos contorted obliquely, were identified as aesthetic models that had a lasting impact on an entire generation of American sculptors. Like Rodin, Barnard employed expressive poses and gestures of the nude to convey the universal condition of

[661] Ilene Susan Fort and Mary L. Lenihan, *The Figure in American Sculpture: A Question of Modernity* (Los Angeles, Calif: Los Angeles County Museum of Art in association with University of Washington Press, 1995). One of its major contributions lied on the fact that it presented modernist artists using news sources of inspiration in archaic, folk, and primitive cultures.

[662] Fort and Lenihan, 8.

humankind. However, the American sculptor put this sculptural vocabulary, appropriated from the Paris Salons, into the service of a different narrative structure. Instead of illustrating ideas of despair or trauma, as in Rodin's *Burghers of Calais* for instance, Barnard constructed a new ideal of the progress of humanity in *Life of Humanity* that aligned with the socio-political context of early twentieth-century America.

Applying a solely modernist prism to view these works does not account for the broader context in which American sculptors had worked since the 1890s. In *The Living Line: Modern Art and the Economy of Energy,* Robin Veder argues that the nude, unavoidable in the American art of the 1910s and 1920s, must not be analyzed only in the figurative tradition of classicism, but rather in relation to contemporary body cultures.[663] Brian Hack analyzed the relationship between Barnard's sculptural practice and the eugenics movement, in particular Barnard's project for a monument to democracy, which was initially promoted as a memorial to the fallen soldiers of World War I. The author argues that figurative sculpture in the age of modernism was "an active response to what was perceived as the degradation of the form (and by extrapolation of society)."[664] To Hack, Barnard's *Life of Humanity* already "addresses issues of human betterment - if not the regeneration of the human race – through productive labor, moral behavior and intellectual endeavors."[665] I have not found any correspondence, or archival documentation, establishing a clear relationship between Barnard and eugenics organizations of the time.

---

[663] Robin Veder, *The Living Line: Modern Art and the Economy of Energy* (Hanover, New Hampshire, 2015), 37.

[664] Hack, "American Acropolis: George Grey Barnard's 'Monument to Democracy', 1918-1938," 12.

[665] Hack, 17. On page 78, Hack also describes *Life of Humanity* as "a morality tale in stone that advanced the notion of human betterment through pure living, intellectualism and the pursuit of labor for its own mental and physical rewards."

In *Visualizing Labor in American Sculpture*, Melissa Dabakis interprets Barnard's *Life of Humanity* as a monument to labor that encoded the work ethic ideology within a nationalist spirit: "Didactic in nature, this sculptural program rehearsed the belief of the chiefly Protestant middle class of Harrisburg while providing a model of decorum for the population of immigrant workers newly arrived from Eastern Europe."[666] Beyond the politics of labor, Laura Lovett's concept of "modernist nostalgia" can help us analyze Barnard's Progressive era monument in the United States.[667] Lovett demonstrates that modernists were influenced by a profoundly nostalgic culture, and based the image of their desired future society on the representation of an idealized past. The expression "modernist nostalgia" highlights the tension between tradition and progress, which are embodied in *Life of Humanity*. The monument celebrates the myth of an idyllic agrarian past, based on the values of family and labor. The male figures are valued for the strength of their disciplined bodies. The female figures, with their round and voluptuous shapes, incarnate fertility and motherhood. Together with their children, they form a united family. Such sculptural representation offers a perfect expression of the pronatalist campaigns and agrarianism that developed in the early twentieth-century United States.[668]

---

[666] Melissa Dabakis, *Visualizing Labor in American Sculpture: Monuments, Manliness, and the Work Ethic, 1880-1935*, Cambridge Studies in American Visual Culture (Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 4.

[667] Lovett, *Conceiving the Future*.

[668] Lovett, 2.

6.2.3 The Inauguration in Harrisburg

On October 4, 1911, *Life of Humanity* was finally inaugurated. The initial controversy regarding the nudity of the figures subsided, and gave way to a great triumph. Barnard was welcomed as a hero in his home state of Pennsylvania. Invitation cards from the Governor of the Commonwealth and the Legislative Commission to attend the inauguration of the monumental groups were distributed and a pamphlet entitled "The Sculptor's Story of his Famous Statues" was circulated. The crowd gathered in the streets, and locals stepped out on their balconies, decorated with American flags **(figure 189)**. The day of the inauguration was declared "Barnard day," with no classes for schoolchildren, who assembled in front of the sculptures to sing a hymn dedicated to the great Pennsylvania sculptor. Frederick Richard Benjamin was the composer of this "Barnard March." Moreover, the monument also entered local households through postcards and mass-produced commemorative objects, such as medals featuring the two statuary groups **(figure 190)**. The commodification of Barnard's monument and its circulation through various media gave way to several imaginative new arrangements of the statuary groups. A postcard, identified in the verso as "The Famous Barnard Statues," presented the two groups juxtaposed against one another in a modernist collage, playing with the mirroring effect of the sculptures **(figures 191-192)**.

The Harrisburg statuary held a particular significance for Barnard, who wrote in his will that his final desire was to be buried in Harrisburg in a cemetery upon a hill so that, from his plot he could look over the Capitol Building and contemplate his great creation. Barnard's reliance on the Salons system, from the appropriation of sculptural motifs from his peers to the use of the French labor force and their expertise, were two key drivers in his success in his homeland. The Pennsylvania Capitol Building commission allowed Barnard to develop his vision, and he also knew that the approval of the Salon des artistes français would help secure his artistic legitimacy

in Harrisburg. Once erected in the public square, the monument became nationalized, and was celebrated as a great example of American Art – thereby shedding its transatlantic and foreign attributes. *Life of Humanity* would come to represent for the inhabitants of Pennsylvania a new moral order driven by a white, protestant image of the United States.

In 1918, deceived by the belated involvement of the United States in World War I, Barnard would take on a new ambitious monumental project called *The Monument to Democracy* that he described as:

> something inspired by our part in the war to summarize in marble, bronze and granite our American life – our labors, aspirations and rewards. Let us use the war only as a starting point for such an expression of the souls of the people as might become for our nation what the Parthenon was for Greece; what her cathedrals are for France and Westminster Abbey for England.[669]

Barnard had incredible ambitions for the role of sculpture in society and envisioned this project as an American equivalent of the Acropolis in Athens. Destined to be erected in Washington Heights, New York, atop the highest point in Manhattan near the original Cloisters and the sculptor's studio, Barnard's project was unprecedented in scale and symbolism. Composed of a multi-part monument in a space organized with sculptural gardens, the project was never completed, although the sculptor continued to work on it at his own expense until his death in 1938.[670] *The Rainbow Arch*, a single component of the larger monumental project, was exhibited publicly in 1933. Today, *Monument to Democracy* is documented through drawings, charts,

[669] "A Dream that can come true," *The North American*, Philadelphia, February 26, 1921. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

[670] Hack, "American Acropolis: George Grey Barnard's 'Monument to Democracy', 1918-1938," 147. See chapter 3.

photographs, and archival material, but almost no physical traces remain of this massive sculptural endeavor.[671]

6.3 "Sculpture is monumental and out of doors" – Andrew O'Connor

A male figure, perhaps a corpse, lies strapped to a rather harrowing bier. He is life sized and completely exposed; his head is inclined to the left and his mouth is half open. On the left, a woman in a long robe with ample folds that cover her body kneels in a position of prayer. Standing to the right, another female figure extends her right arm in the direction of the victim's plinth. Held back by an amorphous restraint around her head, her body evinces profound fatigue: her breasts droop down her chest and her belly protrudes markedly from her torso. This bronze group is on display in a recessed space within Merrion Square in Dublin, a public park with playgrounds, where it seems curiously out of place (**figure 193**). Conceived in the aftermath of World War I by the Irish-American sculptor Andrew O'Connor, this group known as *Le débarquement*, and sometimes as *The Arrival* or *The Debarkation of the Returned Soldier*, initially included the dead soldier, mourned by his wife and mother as part of a complex architectural and sculptural program. Today's grouping in Merrion Square constitutes only a fragment of the originally planned memorial. Consequently, this arbitrarily curated display of the figures clouds the initial vision O'Connor had for the work.

---

[671] In his dissertation, Hack analyzes the *Monument to Democracy* in terms of contemporary interest in eugenics. The few plaster fragments that survived are in the collection of the Philadelphia Museum of Art.

A lifelong project, these figures accompanied the sculptor from studio to studio and city to city. They held a special significance for O'Connor who himself paid to have them cast in bronze by the French foundry Rudier.[672] The sculptor would give the sculptures as a gift to the Hugh Lane Municipal Gallery in Dublin in 1939-40. Transported across the English Channel to be displayed among O'Connor's creations in a museum gallery dedicated to the artist, the figures were then most likely held in the museum's storage until the early 1970s, when Irish scholar Homan Potterton organized an exhibition to celebrate the centenary of O'Connor's birth. A photograph of the figures on display at Trinity College Dublin Library for the Andrew O'Connor centenary exhibition shows a similar arrangement of the figures as that currently on display in Merrion Square.[673] The two female figures are placed on both sides of the soldier strapped onto his bier, all at ground level. Shortly after the exhibition closed, the Civic and Amenities Department of Dublin chose to set up the group in Merrion Square.[674]

Le débarquement is not the only work by O'Connor to reflect on the traumas of World War I. In 1926 at the Paris Salon des artistes français, the sculptor showcased another monument to the war dead known as *Triple Cross*. Both memorials would eventually make it to Ireland, but *Le débarquement* would be displayed incompletely and in a different manner than that of the artist's original vision. *Triple Cross* would be repurposed into a national monument to *Christ the King* in Dun Laoghaire. I will now begin an exploration into the fate of O'Connor's monuments to World War I that reimagined the form of the traditional war memorial and analyze the failure in the

[672] See the series of letters between O'Connor and Eugène Rudier between October and November 1939. My thanks to Gabrielle Andries for sharing with me this correspondence from the private archive of the foundry house.

[673] Sheila Walsh, "Plea for a 'forgotten' sculpture," *Irish Press*, 12 September 1974.

[674] "Andrew O'Connor Papers" (Dublin, Ireland, n.d.), The Hugh Lane.

display and repurposing of these works across the English Channel. I will study the shifts in meaning of these sculptures brought about by their physical displacement across borders. The repurposing of *Triple Cross* into a monument to *Christ the King* in Dun Laoghaire also questions the role of religious sculpture in a post-war public square. The fate of these monuments is emblematic of O'Connor's turn towards his ancestral country in the last decade of his life and the later reclamation of his oeuvre by the Irish people.

6.3.1 [Dis]figuring War : *Le débarquement* (1918-1931, cast 1938)

In 1926, O'Connor opened the doors of his Paris studio to the American journalist Florence Gilliam. In her article, "Round the Paris Studios," the Paris-based reporter remarked upon the size of the studio – not vast but with very high ceilings and tall enough for the memorial that O'Connor had just finished. Perhaps referring to *Triple Cross* exhibited at the SAF that year, the journalist picked up on O'Connor's interest for monumental sculpture, and his indifference towards small interior pieces, or *"garniture de cheminée"* ("fireplace ornaments") as he called them. To O'Connor, these small sculptures did not exist for themselves, but as part of a larger ensemble, "just like a rose window is part of a church." As he would remark, "Sculpture is monumental and out of doors."[675] *Le débarquement* is emblematic of O'Connor's modern conception of what a monument should be. This project for a memorial to the return of the dead soldier began in the United States, where O'Connor had found refuge at the advent of World War I. The sculptor recounted its origin story to Gilliam:

[675] Florence Gilliam, "Round the Paris Studios", newspaper unknown, [1926?]. "Andrew O'Connor Papers" (Dublin, Ireland, n.d.), Center for the Study of Irish Art, National Gallery of Ireland

> When I was in America, a few years ago. I was living in the country, and I had a very beautiful garden. I used to think I'd like to turn that garden up on end so that other people could see it. That is what I did. […] In the center will stand a girl contemplating the scene below. Here and there is to be a basin with a soldier lying in state, and his mother, wife and children forming a group around him.[676]

Similar to the original project for the *Barry monument*, where the statue of Barry emerged out of a bas-relief frieze behind which there was a basin of water, *Le débarquement* was designed as an environment that immersed the viewer in a sculptural and architectural ensemble. Instead of a reflection on the Irish exile, *Le débarquement* offered a meditation on the consequences of World War I. O'Connor's interview suggests that the sculptor originally conceived the monument as a multi-scene sculptural garden: a girl contemplating the scene below, where a dead soldier surrounded by his mother, wife, and children would be displayed in a basin. While the victim (dead soldier), his mother, and his wife can be seen today in Merrion Square, there are no known sculptures of children. As for the sculpture of the girl surveying the group from above, it was displayed as a single work at the 1929 SAF. *Le débarquement* would never be exhibited in its entirety. The ambitious scale of the monument might have been considered an obstacle for its display and acquisition.

Even though it originated in the United States, *Le débarquement* was implemented in the sculptor's studio at 17 rue Campagne Première, one of multiple ateliers O'Connor would rent in Paris to use as storage for the pieces he considered finished.[677] The artist used his studio to recombine and re-contextualize his sculptures, and to develop multiple narratives by reassembling and staging his works in different ways as various *mises en scène*. Photographs of this process reveal an interesting array of arrangements. One such photograph presents the Victim, standing

---

[676] *Ibidem.*

[677] *Ibidem.*

alone against a studio wall, among figures from other monuments, highlighting different points of view of the piece. They show traces of *détourage,* or carve-out, of the figure with a blue marker, suggesting that the sculptor manipulated the images in order to emphasize the figure of the Victim *(***figure 194)**. Displayed vertically against the wall, the dead soldier closely resembles the Christ strapped to the cross in "Consolation," one of the three sides of *Triple Cross*, emphasizing the analogy between the figure of the dead soldier and the sacrifice of Christ **(figure 195)**.

Other studio photographs present various arrangements of the figures of *Le débarquement* displayed at different heights. In one, O'Connor poses in front of the Mother standing on an elevated base, such that her right arm raises above the base destined for the Victim **(figure 196)**. This detail of the falling arm of the female figure on top of the body of the soldier lying on the bier is particularly telling – emphasizing the feelings of loss and despair. This same arrangement is featured in a photograph also showing the Wife in prayer at the foot of the elevated base. Behind her, the Victim is laying horizontally on its bier **(figure 197)**. A drawing found in the artist's archive with details of the measurements of each figure and its base **(figure 198)** suggests the different levels of setting of the figures that corresponded to a conscious choice by O'Connor to construct his composition. Although this sculptural arrangement most likely corresponds to O'Connor's original vision, the current display in Merrion Square appears to be an arbitrary configuration of the figures that are shown at ground level.

O'Connor's original project included the corpse of a dead soldier mourned by two female figures within a complex architectural program juxtaposed by a prolific ornamentation of a decorative wall that contemporaries often attributed to his Celtic origins. The three figures were conceived as a group to be displayed below a large, decorated wall at the center of which a young

girl, referred to as the Virgin, or the Motherland, was to stand in a niche.[678] This highly decorative architectural framework, which no longer exists, was displayed at the 1929 SAF. The colossal scale of the monument can be seen in a photograph showing a visitor standing next to the wall **(figure 199)**.[679] The viewer stands in the position in lieu of the figurative group of the soldier mourned by his wife and mother. In a detailed photograph of the niche, one can discern four heads, those of the sculptor's wife Jessie, and three of his four sons, indicating that O'Connor integrated elements of his own personal story into the memorial.[680] Despite its conception as an ensemble, the memorial has always existed as fragmentary pieces.

The main sculptural group of the memorial depicts the suffering of a mother and wife mourning the return of their deceased son and husband **(see figure 193)**. Instead of depicting the glorified hero marching off to war, O'Connor portrays the soldier in the aftermath of the war – his death and the despair brought to his loved ones. The figure of the hero is here replaced by the defeated man, the victim stretched naked on a slab, who becomes the symbol of all the men killed in war and returned to their families. The oddly shaped, quasi-mechanical bier upon which the dead young man lies, seems to refer to the industrial war machines of World War I. The figure's arms lie on each side of the platform, held by straps that keep the figure in place, emphasizing the

---

[678] Hélène Desmaroux, *L'œuvre du sculpteur O'Connor* (Paris: Librairie de France, 1927), 114.

[679] "'A Fragment to The Monument to the Dead,' designed by Andrew O'Connor, American Sculptor, the Only One of His Countrymen to Receive a Gold Medal at the Salon des Artistes Français in Paris, Where the Work is Now on Exhibition," *New York Times*, June 23, 1929.

[680] Fragments from the wall, such as the standing figure of *The Virgin*, can be found in the collection of The Hugh Lane in Dublin.

physical and psychological weight of the body. The shape of the plinth lifts the body of the victim at the level of the torso and knees, emphasizing the anatomical depth of the corpse.

What is also striking about this figure is the peculiar elements like the trowel-like object on his right shoulder and the strange, vaguely mechanical construction behind his head, which seems to refer to the mechanized warfare of the Great War. Yet, this fairly violent posture does not manifest itself in the serene expression of his face. The eyes, incised, half-open, seem frozen, and the gaze is empty. Anatomical details are precisely rendered, and one can notice the figure's veins in his hands and feet, as well as a nail in his knuckle, perhaps a biblical reference to the tortured Christ on the cross. An inscription engraved on the base of the *Victim:* "Naked you came into the world, and naked did you die, nailed to the cross" is a reference from the life of Saint Elizabeth of Hungary by Montalembert and further reiterates the parallels of sacrifice between religious references and the atrocities of World War I. With the *Victim*, O'Connor conflates the figures of the soldier and Christ, in a similar way as he did in *The Triple Cross*.

The Mother stands at the side of her dead son, holding her right arm in the direction of the victim's plinth. This gesture causes the cloth draped over her shoulder to fall away enough to reveal part of her emaciated torso and belly. Her lower body is covered by a skirt. All of these details underscore the total despair of the figure that is even further amplified by her face. Her facial expression is frozen, eyes looking down to the Victim, her mouth half-open as if she were crying out in anguish. Her hair, disheveled, falls on her right shoulder. While her left arm hangs as if paralyzed, her extended right arm gestures ominously towards the Victim – the poignant moment just before the Mother touches her fallen son.

On the other side of the Victim, the Wife, also referred to as "The Mother of Sorrow" or "The Virgin" depicts a woman on her knees, leaning forward, eyes looking down or shut, mouth

closed behind her hands held in prayer. She is wearing a long robe with ample folds covering her body, hiding any physical features. Her body is pierced in two points of her torso by rods that run through her back, perhaps suggesting her profound pain and suffering. On the front of the base of the figure, are inscribed the words: "As Cranes Chanting /Their Dolorous Notes Traverse the Sky," taken from a translation of Dante's *Infierno,* Canto V. This inscription refers to the story of Paolo and Francesca and alludes to the theme of displacement. The migratory travel of the crane reinforces the significance of the return of the figure of the Victim from afar and the mourning of his death by his wife.

Displayed together, The Victim, The Wife, and The Mother resemble a lamentation scene. O'Connor drew on both a contemporary and a more traditional imagery of the suffering body. With tortured limbs but a calm visage in the abandonment of the last sleep, this humble corpse invokes not only the image of the unknown soldier as a symbol of all the war dead, but also the of Christ' descent from the Cross. The art historian Philip Ward-Jackson has compared the figures at Merrion Square with "a late medieval *Lamentation* group, seen through the eyes of a follower of Rodin,"[681] suggesting that O'Connor's monument was the result of multiple layers of artistic appropriation. In their demonstration of pain, despair, and victimhood, these figures recall Rodin's *Burghers of Calais. Le débarquement* is reminiscent of the expressivity of the gestures, and, in particular, the hands of the figures in Rodin's monument: Andrieu d'Andres lifting his hands to his head, hiding his face, and bending forward, while Pierre de Wissant raises his right arm ahead **(see chapter 2, figure 21)**.

[681] Philip Ward-Jackson, "O'Connor Andrew," in *Sculpture 1600-2000: Art and Architecture of Ireland*, ed. Paula Murphy (Dublin: London: Royal Irish Academy; The Paul Mellon Centre, 2014), 267.

Meunier's *Le grisou*, or *Explosion*, perhaps served as a source of inspiration for O'Connor, who seems to have re-contextualized the body of the mine worker into the context of the Great war's aftermath **(figure 200)**. Nevertheless, there is a notable difference between O'Connor's war memorial and both Rodin's and Meunier's sculptures. The Rodin and Meunier pieces were meant to be read horizontally, with the figures placed at ground level so that the viewer relates to them directly. *Le débarquement* was originally designed to be displayed vertically, at multiple levels. In so doing, O'Connor would transform the relationship between the sculptural group and the spectator – the spectator becoming a mourner along with *The Wife* and *The Mother*, as they all stand at the foot of the elevated base on which *The Victim* is laying.

There is no evidence that the monument was the product of an official commission. However, according to the artist's son, Hector, it was destined for Washington, D.C., and "it produced a bad impression as the local idea of a war memorial did not mean death and misery as the price of victory."[682] In evoking society's sense of loss in the wake of World War I, rather than grand ideals of nationalism, O'Connor sought to provoke a more visceral and emotional reaction to his work. Hidden from public view for decades after its completion, *Le débarquement* is among the few monumental groups of its time to interpret the horrors of World War I. MacMonnies's *The Battle of the Marne* – introduced at the beginning of chapter 5 – constitutes a successful example of a monument about the carnage of the war that was publicly displayed. Whereas O'Connor monumentalized the figure of the dead soldier, Barnard drew some sketches in pencil on the back of an envelope, illustrating two scenes of "war" **(figure 201)**. There, the corpse lies not on a bier, but is placed on a stretcher with wheels carried by another figure. The second scene shows a child pulling on the dress of his mother, emphasizing the consequences of the war on the families of

---

[682] "Andrew O'Connor Vertical File" (London, n.d.), Tate Britain.

soldiers who died at war. From small sketches to colossal monuments, American sculptors responded to the traumas of the war in ways that challenged the stereotypical commemorative heroic statues.

Two decades later, anticipating the devastation of a new war, O'Connor wrote to Warren Wilmer Brown: "I was and am greatly disturbed at the thought of war which I fear and hate and the thought of all the destruction and the millions of young men to be slaughtered fills me with horror."[683] The vision of the wartime massacres of soldiers described here by O'Connor is reminiscent of The Victim in *Le débarquement.* At the time of the outbreak of World War II, O'Connor had left Paris for London, though continued a correspondence with the foundry house of Eugène Rudier and the transportation company of the Maison Lefebvre-Foinet in Paris that would be in charge of the casting and shipping of the figures of The Mother, The Wife, and The Victim to Dublin. Between September and November 1939, O'Connor sent payments to Rudier's foundry to have the three figures cast in bronze.[684]

The sculptures were eventually shipped to the Hugh Lane Municipal Gallery in Dublin, where they would be included in the donation the artist made that year to the museum. On November 28, 1939, O'Connor wrote to John F. Kelly, Director of The Hugh Lane, "The two most important statues are finished, ready to ship from bronze founder in Paris […] It's hard to find a ship that won't get blown up! I hope and believe that before long, these two statues, among the

[683] Andrew O'Connor to Warren Wilmer Brown, from London, 66 Glebe Place, Chelsea, February 23, 1939. "Andrew O'Connor Vertical File" (Baltimore, n.d.), The Walters Art Museum.

[684] See correspondence between O'Connor and Rudier. Private archive of the foundry house.

best I've ever made, perhaps the best, will be in your possession."[685] Beyond the artist's desire to secure his legacy in his ancestral land, O'Connor expressed his concerns about the safe arrival of his statues in Dublin. The journey of these sculptures, from their early conception in the midst of World War I, to their final destination in Dublin at the onset of World War II, is emblematic of O'Connor's own personal trajectory.

6.3.2 From the Paris Salon to Dun Laoghaire: A Memorial to World War I Becomes a Statue to Christ The King

In 1926, a strange monument to the dead of the Great War in the shape of a monumental three-sided cross was displayed at the Salon des artistes français. American, French, and German newspapers called it a *chef d'oeuvre*, or a *meisterwerk,* and disseminated photographs of O'Connor's ambitious cross hovering over its neighboring sculptures in the open exhibition space of the Salon **(see chapter 5, figure 156)**.[686] A man wearing a hat and holding a cane, standing at the foot of the cross towering over him, emphasized the sheer size of the monument. At the top of a tall pillar, three scenes depicted three aspects of Christ's life: the desolation, the consolation, and the triumph. A heavy canopy surmounted the top of the cross, as it can still be partially viewed in

---

[685] O'Connor to John F. Kelly, November 28, 1939. See also mentions of the figures from *Le débarquement* in O'Connor's letters from June 2, 1939: "The Mother of a hero, a statue in bronze about 7 feet tall has left the foundry, on its way to your museum;" and April 7, 1940: "I am happy the Mourning woman arrived. I have a weakness for her." "Andrew O'Connor Papers" (Dublin, Ireland, n.d.), The Hugh Lane.

[686] See *Action Française*, May 7, 1926; *Liberté*, June 1, 1926, and other press cuttings from untitled newspapers in Germany and the United States in "Andrew O'Connor Papers" (Dublin, Ireland, n.d.), Center for the Study of Irish Art, National Gallery of Ireland.

the small plaster fragment of *Desolation* **(see chapter 5, figure 154)**. Despite its success at the 1926 SAF, *Triple Cross* would not be erected on French territory, as had other similarly themed works – such as Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney's memorial to World War I, exhibited at the Salon that same year, and later erected in Saint Nazaire. However, it would eventually be repurposed as a national monument and rechristened as Christ the King for the city harbor of Dun Laoghaire in Ireland.

On March 30, 1932, O'Connor wrote to his friend Warren Wilmer Brown that he had been traveling frequently to Ireland in recent years, where he was working to "build a stone statue 115 feet tall on the coast overlooking the Irish Sea." The statue committee provided him with a house near Dublin, called Leixlip Castle, in which he would begin work on the monument.[687] On June 9 of the previous year, a group of laymen had decided to erect a monument to Christ the King during a public town hall in Dun Laoghaire. The theme of the statue referred to the 1925 Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius XI, which proclaimed to the Christian world the Kingship of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and instituted the Feast of Christ the King to be held on the last Sunday of October. A committee was established, which decided that the monument should extend beyond the scope of the parish, or even the county, to embrace the whole nation, so that all Irish people would unite in homage.[688]

Dun Laoghaire, known as the "Gateway to Ireland," was considered a perfect location for a national monument. Nestled into the shore of Dublin Bay, it was the pier from which most visitors to the island made their entry into the country. The committee for the monument visited

[687] O'Connor to Wilmer Brown, March 30, 1930, from 17 rue Campagne Première, Paris. "Andrew O'Connor Vertical File" (Baltimore, n.d.), The Walters Art Museum.

[688] "Christ the King Committee Papers" (Dun Laoghaire, Ireland, n.d.), DLR Lexicon Library.

several sites, looking for a place that would allow for an uninterrupted view of the monument for ships entering and leaving the harbor, as well as for those traversing the bay, and also for people who wished to visit the monument by land. Saint Michael's Wharf was selected as the site that would satisfy every vantage point, though it would take forty-seven years for the statue to be finally erected there.[689]

In 1932, the statue committee chose O'Connor as the sculptor of Christ the King monument. According to the Irish press, the artist had approached the committee about creating an original model for the sculpture to be erected in Ireland.[690] However, on the cover of the subscription booklet published that year, a sketch of the *Triple Cross* was reproduced. O'Connor's memorial to the Great War, which had garnered much success at the 1926 SAF, would be repurposed into Christ of King monument for Dun Laoghaire. In the subscription booklet, O'Connor compared his three-sided cross to a "Tree of Life" around which "the story of the faith of people unfolds itself." According to the sculptor, there was "nor front nor back to this monument." The Cross was a symbol of Irish faith, a "form common to all Irish art from the earliest

---

[689] *Ibidem.*

[690] "Shortly after the decision to erect a monument was made known, an approach was made by the eminent Irish-American sculptor Andrew O'Connor then living in Paris, who had been engaged for some time on an original conception of a monument of this character and who was anxious that it should be erected in Ireland. Discussions with Mr. O'Connor elicited that his ideas as to the cost of the monument and the base were far in excess of the amount in the hands of the Council. Although no decision was reached or commission given, the sculptor was so keen that the monument should be erected in Ireland that he came to live here, set up a studio, and proceeded with his idea." "Christ the King Committee Papers" (Dun Laoghaire, Ireland, n.d.), DLR Lexicon Library.

times to our own days."[691] Some members of the Christ the King committee argued that the shape of the symbol of the cross might refer to famous Irish shrines, such as Saint Patrick's Shrine, in the collection of the National Museum of Ireland in Dublin.[692] In Christ the King monument, the former soldier of World War I became the crucified son of God, who turned into the symbol of the sacrifice and suffering of the Irish people.

A national campaign of public subscription was launched to raise funds to cast the monument in bronze. Local initiatives were also organized, including a fundraising concert for the monument in the town hall of Dun Laoghaire.[693] The Rudier foundry house was subsequently put in charge of the bronze casting, which they completed in 1939. However, the outbreak of the war interrupted the payment. On May 29, 1940, O'Connor, then based in London, addressed a letter to Rudier, in which he acknowledged his financial distress: "In regards to the Great Cross - it is pointless to talk about finances in this time. I am almost out of money and I do not have the slightest hope to find any before the end of the war."[694] The *Triple Cross*, which weighed three and a half tons, and measured nine feet across the top, tapering to four at the base, was buried by the Rudier

---

[691] Subscription booklet entitled "Christ the King. Monument to be Erected at Dun Laoghaire," 1932. "Andrew O'Connor Papers" (Dublin, Ireland, n.d.), Center for the Study of Irish Art, National Gallery of Ireland.

[692] See letter in Triple Cross folder, Center for Irish Studies, National Gallery of Ireland. "Andrew O'Connor Papers" (Dublin, Ireland, n.d.), Center for the Study of Irish Art, National Gallery of Ireland.

[693] Fundraising acknowledgment cards for subscriptions to Christ the Kind Monument and admission tickets for Christ the King Monument Concert, January 22, 1932, Town Hall, Dun Laoghaire. "Christ the King Committee Papers" (Dun Laoghaire, Ireland, n.d.), DLR Lexicon Library.

[694] O'Connor to Rudier, May 29, 1940 : « Pour la Grande Croix – c'est inutile de parler de finance en ce moment je suis à peu près sans argent et avant la fin de la guerre je n'ai pas le moindre espoir d'en trouver. » Private Archive, Rudier family.

family in the Paris suburbs for fear that it might be melted down for its metal by the occupying troops. After O'Connor passed away in Dublin on June 9, 1941, the fate of the statue would be left to the artist's family.

In February 1949, the Christ the King monument committee organized a visit to Paris, where they saw O'Connor's Great Cross at Rudier's foundry house in Malakoff, and met with Roderick O'Connor, one of the sculptor's sons. [695] They declared the sculpture a most fitting monument for Dun Laoghaire.[696] That same year, the cross was shipped to Dun Laoghaire, but due to a disagreement between a local priest and Dublin's archbishop, the monument was not erected.[697] It was instead left to languish for many years in the backyard of one of the sculpture's committee members.[698] In 1968, discussions began regarding the possibility of loaning the monument to the National Gallery of Ireland for a short time period, but in February 1971 the museum board rejected the request. They felt that the large scale of the monument made it

[695] Liam S. Gogan, "Christ the King Monument Committee. Report of Delegation's visit to Paris," Dublin, 24 February 24, 1949. It included a letter by M. Sullivan: "All three of us saw the Monument in Mr Rudier's works at Malakoff, Paris, and spent a considerable time there with the bronze founder and with M. Roderick O'Connor, the sculptor's son who resides in Paris." "Andrew O'Connor Papers" (Dublin, Ireland, n.d.), Center for the Study of Irish Art, National Gallery of Ireland.

[696] Elgy Gillespie "Andrew O'Connor's 'Christ the King,'" *The Irish Times*, August 6, 1976.

[697] December 22, 1949: "The statue is now being collected and put on the steamer for Dublin." "Christ the King Committee Papers" (Dun Laoghaire, Ireland, n.d.), DLR Lexicon Library.

[698] The sculpture lies on its side in the garden of M. Edward J. Kenny's house on Rochestown Avenue, Dublin. "Andrew O'Connor Papers" (Dublin, Ireland, n.d.), Center for the Study of Irish Art, National Gallery of Ireland.

impossible to accept on loan.[699] It was only after O'Connor's centenary exhibition in Trinity College Dublin in 1974, where photographs and a 24-inch maquette of the three-sided cross were showcased, that the subject of the fate of the Christ the King monument was decided.

In December 1978, *Christ the King* was finally installed on Haigh Terrace in Dun Laoghaire. After being restored in 2012, during the construction of the DLR Lexicon Library at Moran Park, the monument was reinstalled on June 10, 2014. Today, *Christ the King* stands on the western end of Moran Park in Dun Laoghaire, located on a promontory adjoining the Library **(figure 202)**. Its new home corresponds to the original site agreed to for the landmark: it is highly visible for viewers in the harbor as well as visitors in the immediate surroundings. This new location, in the heart of the reconfigured and extensively landscaped Moran Park, reflects the important cultural status of the monument.

The erection of *Christ the King* in Dun Laoghaire, decades after the sculptor's death, helps account for the recent and renewed interest in O'Connor's oeuvre.[700] Although the meaning of *Triple Cross* shifted from a monument to the dead of the Great War to a celebration of Christ the King, certain sculptural elements, such as the soldier's helmet, referring to World War I at the very top of the cross above a tree-like shaped symbol, looks out of place today in a monument to Christ **(figure 203)**. The only compositional elements added to the sculpture after O'Connor's death are

---

[699] See 1968-69 correspondence to James White, director of the NGI, to take on loan the monument for a period of 5-10 years. "Andrew O'Connor Papers" (Dublin, Ireland, n.d.), Center for the Study of Irish Art, National Gallery of Ireland.

[700] The donation of papers from the Kenny's family to the Dun Laoghaire library in 2015 led to an exhibition on the Christ the King monument organized by the dlr Lexicon's library in partnership with students from the School of History MA in Archives and Records Management Program at University College Dublin. More information on the exhibition can be found at: https://libraries.dlrcoco.ie/library-services/local-history/christ-king-exhibition

the two panels at the base of the monument, on which are engraved the names of the original commissioners' members, and the history of the monument going back to the first display of *Triple Cross* at the Paris 1926 Salon. Despite the sculpture's unusual composition, O'Connor successfully recycled his monument to the Great War into a national monument to Christ the King, a final acceptance of his oeuvre in Ireland.

Although O'Connor's monumental ensemble for *Le débarquement* was eventually displayed fragmented, incomplete, and out of place in the recreational park of Merrion Square in Dublin, *Triple Cross* turned into a successful example of sculptural repurposing, once appropriated by the Irish as their national monument to Christ the King. Both projects originated as a reflection on the disasters of World War I and both included elements from religious imagery. Today, these monuments offer an opportunity to consider the links between sculpture, religion, and war, and the politics involved in the display of O'Connor's works. Throughout his career, O'Connor, like so many classically-trained artists, used Christian imagery as a repertory of motifs that he revisited repeatedly. He would then transform them into his own: the representation of the body of the victim in *Le débarquement,* surrounded by his loved ones, as in a *Deposition* scene; and the use of the symbolic cross in *Triple Cross* as a reinterpretation of the *Crucifixion of the Christ.* In addition, the sculptor integrated elements referring to modern warfare, such as the mechanical devices around the figures or the stanzas of poems inscribed on the base of the figures in *Le débarquement,* which expanded the traditional genre of the war memorial. In his sculptural creations, O'Connor sought to create a new experience of contemplation for the viewer, perhaps based on a certain form of religiosity.

A drawing of 1934 by O'Connor "Memorials of the Dead. Aran 1934" shows a landscape overlooking the sea, populated by Irish crosses and rocks that look like mechanized contraptions,

reminiscent of the torture devices that surround the necks of the Victim and the Mother in *Le débarquement*. These devices also appear in other works by the artist **(figure 204)**. However, the setting in this drawing lacks any human presence, leaving the view to meditate upon a rather alien landscape that resembles a cemetery. Could this landscape represent O'Connor's ultimate idea of what a memorial landscape should look like? The sculptor's difficulty in securing sites for his monuments did not allow O'Connor to develop in sculpture his vision for a memorial garden. The relationship between sculpture and nature was crucial for O'Connor, as noted by Desmaroux, in the manuscript draft of her memoirs on the sculptor:

> The works of O'Connor are marked by the Celtic spirit […] It is necessary to insist on the value of closely allying the work with its environment. […] From the beginning, O'Connor sets himself out to attune his work to the environment they are to ornament and symbolize.[701]

O'Connor's monumental projects offered a new experience for the spectator, inviting them to engage with sculptures in a contemplative way, perhaps similar to what the contemporary visitor experiences today at the site of Maya Lin's *Vietnam Veterans Memorial* in Washington, D.C. In his oeuvre, O'Connor moved away from the traditional heroic monument to honor the war soldier, and instead depicted the repercussions of the massacres of the war on the lives of men and women. This abstracted landscape does not show the corpses of the victims of the war, as in *Le débarquement*, but here, the mechanized implements of warfare become suggestive of the dead bodies, as an invitation for the viewer to take a reflective walk through this memorial landscape overlooking the Irish sea.

[701] "Andrew O'Connor Papers" (Dublin, Ireland, n.d.), Center for the Study of Irish Art, National Gallery of Ireland.

6.4 Conclusion

The shifts between the transnational ecosystem of the Paris Salons and municipal contexts abroad, from the collective labor industry of the French capital to the individual authorship of the sculptor overseas, marked the journeys of the monuments discussed in this chapter. Fundamentally, the transitory histories of these sculptures underscore that there is nothing permanent about monuments. Even after they reached their final destination, the inauguration of the works did not serve as elegies to mark their final resting place: public sculptures would be moved from site to site without the artist's consent – Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor*, the site of display and curation could misrepresent the vision of the creator – O'Connor's *Le débarquement*, and they could even be repurposed in a different context and for a new audience – O'Connor's *Triple Cross*. Over time, monuments were also subject to an evolving political climate and weather damage.

Barnard, Yrurtia, and O'Connor all conceived of sculpture as an agent of societal change. They did not care for "doing statues," to use Barnard's words, or ornamental sculptures: O'Connor claimed that "sculpture is monumental and out of doors." Instead, their ambitious compositions addressed the major matters of their times: the strive for progress, issues of labor, and the trauma of war. They aimed to engage viewers on multiple levels, far beyond the aesthetic. Instead of glorifying or celebrating historical figures or events, these artists sculpted works that reflected upon traumas, exile, displacement – O'Connor, nation-building – Yrurtia, and the creation of an ideal citizen – Barnard. Their works can be defined as engaging and even moralizing, especially in the case of Barnard. However, over time, they have mostly lost their edifying power. The complexity of the works is probably one of the main reasons why they have been so long overlooked.

From the time of their commission to their inauguration, long periods of time often elapsed, and the monuments did not respond to the same needs of their original commissioners and audiences, nor were they able to anchor themselves deeply enough into popular culture to remain relevant. Evolving political and societal factors impacted the choice for a site and the meaning of the work, as in the case of Yrurtia's works. The transition from the Parisian international gallery system to the public space did transform sculptures into civic monuments; instead of being judged primarily upon aesthetic criteria, *Life of Humanity* became a moralizing tale for the inhabitants of Harrisburg. Finally, in some cases, sculptures never ceased to be fragmented, repurposed, and recombined, as in the case of O'Connor's *Le débarquement* and the *Triple Cross/Christ the King* monuments.

The final display of a sculpture in public space obscures its full story, from its original context of creation in the artist's French studio, to its multiple receptions: in Paris, Buenos Aires, Harrisburg, or Dublin. Once on display in the political sphere of the plaza, sculptures can become nationalized, indeed that is often the intent, and their meaning transformed by locals over time. Monuments might not find a site for display – Yrurtia, they may be shown fragmented, repurposed, and incomplete – O'Connor, or melt into the background and become meaningless for its viewers – Barnard. Although they responded to a particular need at the time of their commission, new generations and political regimes emerge, which can render them inconvenient, or unsuitable for the contemporary public.

On May 7, 1910, in the aftermath of the rejection of O'Connor's project of *The Barry Monument* by the Irish-American organizations in Washington, D.C., William Allen Wood, Attorney and Counselor at Law, Indianapolis, addressed a letter to William Howard Taft, the twenty-seventh President of the United States, that read:

> Every American interested in the nation's art feels that a great mistake is being made from the artistic standpoint and that a great injustice is being done to America's best sculptor since Saint-Gaudens […] Washington is now a charnel house for "dead" statuary, statuary that has no more value than so much junk, statuary without art value, and, in keeping with the new ideas as to the city's beautification, from this time on only statuary of definite artistic worth should be given space. Will you not help to right this wrong and give Washington at least one more among a few decent statues?[702]

Wood regrets the missed opportunity that O'Connor's project would have offered to transform the city's environment. He considered the monument for its artistic value, in contrast to the "dead statuary" that was so prevalent in Washington, D.C. While this final chapter examined the relationships between sculpture and a public space, it is paramount to highlight the rich historical and artistic value of monumental failures. What would the memorial landscape look like if we were to consider the many sculptural projects that were prematurely aborted or rejected?

---

[702] William Allen Wood to William Howard Taft, May 7, 1910. "Records of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital. Records of the Barry Statue Commission." (Washington, D.C., n.d.), RG-42, National Archives.

7.0 Conclusion

7.1 'Taking Down' Rodin

"Is the Spirit of the People of Buenos Aires an Enemy of Statues?" questioned the journalist and political activist Dardo Cúneo in the Argentinian weekly magazine *El Hogar*.[703] His article, a double-page spread, included a sidebar entitled "The mutilated statues" and a cartoon featuring four men attacking Rodin's *The Thinker* with a pickaxe, a bar, a jackhammer, and a hand drill **(figure 205)**. This act of vandalism is reported in the column listing Rodin's statue along with Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor*, the *Dorrego*, and many other public sculptures that were neglected by city officials and damaged by *porteños*. "[Buenos Aires] does not respect the statues. They break them. They mutilate them. They abandon them. They disfigure them. Mistake of Buenos Aires," denounced the author.[704] Although this statement could be mistaken for a contemporary conservative critique of the state of sculptures in many Western countries, it was actually published in 1939, not long after some of these sculptures were erected. For instance, only twelve years had passed since Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor* was first installed on the plaza Dorrego, in the historic neighborhood of San Telmo.

Despite their inspirational ambitions, modern sculptors, like Yrurtia, saw their sculptures become obsolete with time, a process that would sometimes begin soon after they were put on

---

[703] Dardo Cúneo, "¿Es el espíritu porteño enemigo de las estatuas?," *El Hogar*, March 17, 1939, 4-5.

[704] *Ibidem*. "[Buenos Aires] No respecta a las estatuas. Las rompe. Las mutila. Las abandona. Las afea. Error de Buenos Aires."

public display. Even though Cúneo set out to defend the importance of public sculptures in Buenos Aires, he ironically undercut his own argument: he effectively relegated monuments to the status of urban ornaments to be respected by city dwellers instead of considering them as agents with a role in shaping society. *The Thinker*, long divorced from its original setting, perched on top of *The Gates of Hell*, became an icon of and even a metaphor for Rodin's far-reaching ambitions. "It will be an honor for me to have my artwork from the Panthéon erected in both extremities of the Americas, in New York and Buenos Aires," declared the French sculptor in a statement that celebrated his growing international fame.[705]

After donating the plaster of *The Thinker* on display at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (chapter 3), Rodin sold a bronze of *The Thinker* to the city of Buenos Aires, at Eduardo Schiaffino's instigation. A few months after the installation of the statue in front of the Paris Panthéon in April 1906, Schiaffino commissioned a cast of *The Thinker* from Rodin. He wanted to erect it on the very steps of the National Congress building, to stand there as a symbol of Argentina following the successful path of France's cultural achievement and modernity.[706] However, *The Thinker* instead was installed in a vacant space on the Plaza del Congreso under renovation. Two decades later, Schiaffino remained vocal about the display of *The Thinker*, which, in his words, "looks like a fly on a billiards table," isolated in the

---

[705] « Ce sera un honneur pour moi, que mon œuvre du Panthéon s'érige aussi aux deux extrémités d'Amérique, à New-York et à Buenos Aires » Rodin quoted in Eduardo Schiaffino, "La urbanización del municipio de la capital," *La Nación*, April 25, 1926.

[706] Schiaffino to Municipal Mayor of Buenos Aires, February 27, 1907. "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación. Schiaffino paid Rodin 15,000 francs for the sculpture of *The Thinker* and asked to have it made with a green patina similar to Rodin's *Saint Jean* sculpture.

middle of a vast and empty square.[707] In 1926, he published a photomontage of Rodin's statue on the steps of the National Congress building **(figure 206)**. Subject to various acts of vandalism, as denounced in Cúneo's article, *The Thinker*, in the center of the plaza, was later surrounded by a fence, with the National Congress building in the distance **(figure 207)**.

While for Rodin, the exportation of *The Thinker* to the Americas embodied his international triumph, for Schiaffino, Rodin's statue for Buenos Aires situated Argentina within the culturally dominant group of prosperous Western nations. Six years earlier, another one of Rodin's statues, his *Sarmiento*, had been erected on Argentinian soil, sparking a controversy in Buenos Aires about the statue's lack of resemblance to the former Argentinian president (chapter 6). In Argentina, Schiaffino played an influential role in the early twentieth-century expansion of the capital's monumental landscape, which helped transform the city into a modern, sophisticated metropolis.

Schiaffino's conception of modern sculpture was not limited to Rodin and French art; rather, it reflected his cosmopolitan taste formed in the Paris Salons. He bought sculptures that had received prizes at the Salons, like *Los primeros fríos*, by the Spanish Miguel Blay y Fábregas, and *Sagunto*, by Agustín Querol, for instance, which were shipped to Buenos Aires to join the national collection.[708] These purchases contributed to Schiaffino's efforts to construct a national school of Argentinian art. In a similar vein, after Yrurtia's triumph with *The Sinners* at the 1903 SAF, Schiaffino became a strong advocate of the sculptor in Buenos Aires, seeing in Yrurtia an artist who could elevate the standing of Argentine art to an international level. He chose to showcase

---

[707] Schiaffino, "La urbanización del municipio de la capital."

[708] "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino." See also: Clarisse Fava-Piz, "Spanish Sculptors and the Paris 'Salon Culture', 1880–1914: The Case of Miguel Blay y Fábrega," *Sculpture Journal* 27, no. 1 (2018): 47–60. Blay y Querol's sculptures are today on display in the botanical garden in Buenos Aires.

The Sinners at the Saint Louis International Fair, where he lobbied for Yrurtia to be awarded the gold medal, which the sculptor eventually rejected (chapter 3). Despite Yrurtia's decision to remain in Paris for almost twenty years, Schiaffino helped him establish a name in his homeland, molding his international profile as a representative of Argentinian sculpture.

This dissertation has metaphorically "taken down" Rodin from his pedestal as the father of modern sculpture in order to reveal and analyze the system that produced him and other Salons sculptors and put their sculptures in motion. I proposed that we flip the expression "*Rodin was the problem*,"[709] used to emphasize the inability of an entire generation of sculptors to break free from Rodin's artistic influence, and suggested instead that no sculptor could escape the unequal power dynamic between them and Rodin. A broader definition of modern sculpture beyond the individual "genius" of Rodin is thus called for, one beyond the modernist narrative that reduces modern sculpture to abstract gallery-sized works. As opposed to the historiography of sculpture, which has misleadingly divided modern small-scale sculptures and monuments, it has been demonstrated that sculptors worked on various scales at the same time and ran their studios as businesses.

Drawing upon sculptural forms, motifs, and themes from the ecosystem of the Paris Salons, modern sculptors used techniques of appropriation, fragmentation, and repurposing to rethink the language of sculpture. Through the prism of the works by Barnard, Yrurtia, and O'Connor, this study analyzed how a generation of international sculptors active in Paris in the age of Rodin rejected the neoclassical didacticism of allegorical sculptures to create a modern sculptural language based on the expressivity of the human form. Their multifigure sculptures

[709] In 1900, Rodin was sixty years of age, and he continued to exhibit and make sculpture almost until his death in 1917. For many young artists seeking to grow and establish their own identity, Rodin was the problem." Albert E. Elsen, *Origins of Modern Sculpture: Pioneers and Premises* (New York: G. Braziller, 1974).

commemorated collective struggles (Barnard and Yrurtia) and traumatic events (O'Connor), rather than celebrate the heroic deeds of a man on a pedestal. Not only conceived as monuments, these sculptures also existed as autonomous groups to be commercialized and displayed in both public and private galleries.

This study has located the development of modern sculpture within the cosmopolitan ecosystem of the Paris Salons. Instead of a monolithic center, Paris is redefined as a multidimensional platform of exchanges wherein the Salons constituted a rich repertory of sculptural forms, motifs, and themes, which sculptors emulated in their own creations. Rodin, like any other sculptor active in fin-de-siècle Paris, participated in and benefited from the Salons system. The Salons were here analyzed as a modern spectacle that operated internally as a transnational ecosystem of multidirectional exchanges that profoundly transformed modern sculpture.

Even though sculptures were perceived through nationalistic lenses at the Paris Salons, their circulation at international exhibitions participated in the construction of national narratives. As we have seen, their transatlantic journeys, motivated by a need for recognition at home or by commercial gains, put the materiality of the objects at risk. Emblematic of the tensions between international aims and national expectations, modern sculptures served as political currency in positioning a country on the world stage. This compelled Paris-based sculptors to navigate the various expectations of the Salons juries and critics, on the one hand, and their patrons abroad, on the other. In some cases, their ambitious sculptural projects broke away from the predominant model of the heroic statue and turned into monumental failures.

This study showed that modern sculptors engaged in modernist practices of labor, at a time when labor became a popular subject matter in sculpture. Unveiling the identity and the role of the

many agents – *praticiens*, models, suppliers, transporters, among others –involved in the making of monuments offers a new understanding of the participation of international sculptors in the collaborative labor industry of the Paris Salons. Finally, it has been demonstrated that when they reached their destination in the public square, modern sculptures became political. Their local urban environment created new challenges for these monuments, which were nationalized, and whose meanings continued to evolve over time. Concurrently, they became part of a globalized network of modern sculptures.

As I conclude this dissertation, the world is grappling with dual pandemics, one new, one old: the COVID-19 virus, and systemic racism. Six years have passed since I began this project, and today, one might read Dardo Cúneo's 1939 article describing the violent acts of vandalism against monuments in Buenos Aires in a new light and question the role of public sculpture differently in society. Scholars and public officials are now confronted with a new set of questions, regarding not only who is represented in the public space, but how: what narrative(s) are on display and, more important, whom do they benefit? Looking back at the legacies of Barnard, O'Connor, and Yrurtia's monuments, one can observe that O'Connor's *Barry* and *Le débarquement*, which represented universal themes like the traumas of exile and war, were, in the first case, rejected and replaced by an unobtrusive statue in Franklin Square in Washington, D.C.; and, in the second case, left incomplete and relegated to a corner of a park in Dublin. However, Barnard's *Life of Humanity* and Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor,* which promoted an idea of human progress predicated upon white hegemony—given the marked absence of people of color and indigenous groups in their sculptures—still stand today in public spaces, in, respectively, Harrisburg and Buenos Aires.[710]

[710] In addition to moving away from indigeneity, Barnard and Yrurtia were also participating in Jim Crow and blanqueamiento in their exclusion of African-ness from American-ness.

All three sculptors believed in the unifying power of monuments to shape society as well as influence individual beliefs. But whereas O'Connor represented the violent history of the Irish exile and the victims of World War I to little success with his commissioners, Barnard and Yrurtia contributed to the promotion of an ideology of white supremacy in the United States and Argentina. Although *Life of Humanity* and *Hymn to Labor* are today largely ignored by passersby, they perpetuate narratives of whiteness in the public spaces they occupy. Most notably, they promote an idea of progress and civilization as a movement away from indigenous cultures and towards Europe. These works are inscribed within the long tradition of academic sculpture, which has been instrumental in the construction of whiteness, harkening back to the eighteenth-century theoretical discourses of Johann Joachim Winckelmann, who claimed that "a beautiful body will be all the more beautiful the whiter it is."[711] By recalling the origins of these monuments in the context of the Paris Salons and exploring the histories of their making and their circulation in various contexts, we bring to light additional layers of meanings of these complex and multifaceted objects and demonstrate that these histories still matter today.

Although this study traces the origins of the development of the language of modern sculpture to the cosmopolitan Paris Salons, it does not begin to encompass the truly international dimension of the Salons system: the Salon des artistes français and the Société nationale des beaux-arts, which form the base of my analysis, did not include artists from Africa, Asia, and Oceania,

---

[711] See Emerson Bowyer's essay "The Presumption of White" in Luke Syson et al., eds., *Like Life: Sculpture, Color, and the Body* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2018) 78. Full quote: "Since white is the color that reflects the most rays of light and thus is most easily perceived, a beautiful body will be all the more beautiful the whiter it is." From Johann Joaquim Winckelmann, *History of the Art of Antiquity*, trans. Harry Francis Mallgrave. (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2006) 195.

who were left out of this global ecosystem. A new area of research to explore could then interrogate the role played by the Paris Salons system in the French colonies.[712] As seen in chapter 2, where I followed the history of Ernest Dubois's *Le Pardon*, sent to Skikda, Algeria, after the closure of the Luxembourg museum, Salon sculptures were circulated in the French colonies through the *politique des dépôts* of the French government. Further research on the role played by Salons sculptures in the construction of French imperial culture would help contrast the multifaceted system of exchanges between the Paris Salons and the Americas, analyzed here, with the centralized model of diffusion of sculptures from France to its former colonies and protectorates.

7.2 The Sculptors' Legacies

The works of Barnard, O'Connor, and Yrurtia are brought together here to describe an expanded field of modern sculpture in the age of Rodin. Although all three sculptors participated in the ecosystem of the Paris Salons, where they won awards, their legacies diverged greatly. Barnard is mostly recognized today as a collector of medieval art and the founder of The Cloisters collection in New York City. Even though most of his sculptures entered museum collections in the United States, Barnard's career as a sculptor – and as the artist behind the *Life of Humanity*

[712] In 1908, the *Société coloniale des artistes français* was founded, and further study on its participants and their artistic production could provide a new understanding of the relationships between colonialism and the transnational system of the Paris Salons. See Pierre Sanchez and Stéphane Richemond, *La Société coloniale des artistes français puis Société des beaux-arts de la France d'outre-mer: répertoire des exposants et liste de leurs œuvres, 1908-1970* (Dijon: L'échelle de Jacob, 2010); Stéphane Richemond, *Les salons des artistes coloniaux suivi d'un dictionnaire des sculpteurs* (Paris: Éditions de l'Amateur, 2003).

ensemble at the entrance of the Pennsylvania State Capitol in Harrisburg – is relatively unknown to the American public. Yrurtia's sculptures, on the other hand, prominently grace the streets of Buenos Aires. Among them, *Hymn to Labor* stands in the center of the Paseo Colón, one of the busiest avenues of the capital. As for O'Connor, he is the most obscure figure of all three, perhaps because his cosmopolitan career led him from New York City, to London, Paris, and then Dublin, and his works ended up in collections throughout western Europe and the United States.

7.2.1 Rogelio Yrurtia

In 1920, Yrurtia left the plaster model of *Hymn to Labor* in the hands of the Rudier foundry in Paris and returned permanently to Buenos Aires. Back in his homeland, the sculptor assumed new official functions and became a spokesman for the development of the arts of his nation. That year, he urged his fellow citizens to participate in the development a national school of art:

> we need […] to have artists, not improvisers, and to help them, that way we will have national art. Until now we have been a 'market for unscrupulous artists and for foreign dealers' […] we have to […] stimulate everything that is ours, everything national. In Europe, on the other hand, nationalist tendencies in art are becoming more intense every day, to this, we must oppose, in order not to deviate from our nationalism, our patriotism.[713]

[713] Press cutting. "Con el escultor Rogelio Irurtia. El monumento al trabajo -lo que opina sobre arte nacional – sus propósitos," *La Razón*, February 6, 1920. "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín. "Necesitamos que […] tengamos artistas, no improvisadores y ayudarlos, que así tendremos arte nacional. Hasta ahora somos un 'mercado para los artistas poco escrupulosos y para los 'marchands' extranjeros' […] hay que [..] estimulando todo lo que sea nuestro, todo lo nacional. En Europa, por otra parte, las tendencias nacionalistas en el arte, son cada día más intensas, a ello, debemos oponer, para no desviarnos, nuestro nacionalismo, nuestro patriotismo."

During two consecutive years, Yrurtia showcased his sculptures at the 1920 and 1921 national Salons in Buenos Aires. He was appointed professor of sculpture at the Academia Nacional de Bellas Artes and member of the Comisión Nacional de Bellas Artes in 1922, and then served as a sculpture juror at the national Salons from 1923 to 1928, where he assumed an influential role, similar to Rodin's in the Paris Salons. While assuming these official functions, Yrurtia competed in exhibitions in Argentina and Chile, where he received many prizes.[714] However, in 1931, he suffered an ignominious rejection from his adopted country of France: the curators of the Musée du Jeu de Paume in Paris turned down Yrurtia's proposal of an exhibition project of his works because of what they described as the artist's lack of talent.[715]

Besides the many monuments that dot the city of Buenos Aires, one of Yrurtia's lasting legacies is his house museum, renovated by the sculptor in a neocolonial Hispano-American style, and located at 2390 Calle O'Higgins, Belgrano, Buenos Aires. Yrurtia founded the museum with his second wife, the painter Lía Correa Morales (1893-1975), and bequeathed it, along with his sculptures and collection, to the Argentinian government in 1942.[716] Like Rodin, who donated his house with his collection and archives to the French state in 1917, Yrurtia wanted to ensure his

---

[714] "Ernesto de La Cárcova Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Academia Nacional de Bellas Artes. Yrurtia won the gold medal at the 1925 and 1937 Salons of Fine Arts in Rosario, Argentina. He also received the prize of honor at the VII Salón de Verano in Viña del Mar, Chile.

[715] "Rogelio Yrurtia File" (Paris, France, n.d.), 20144795/46, Archives nationales de France. Letter dated September 23, 1931 in response to Yrurtia's request: 'le talent de M. Rogelio Yrurtia ne semble pas permettre d'envisager le prêt des salles du Musée du Jeu de Paume pour une exposition de ses œuvres. […] »

[716] On Lía Correa Morales, see Georgina Gluzman, *Trazos invisibles: mujeres artistas en Buenos Aires (1890-1923)*, Editorial Biblos (Buenos Aires, 2016); Georgina Gluzman, "Reflexiones sobre la actuación y obra de Lía Correa Morales en el museo Yrurtia," *Anais Do Museu Paulista, São Paulo* 20, no. 2 (2012): 93–118.

legacy within his country. The museum opened to the public in 1949, a year before the artist's death.[717] A photograph shows Yrurtia posing in his home, surrounded by a selection of sculptures perched on top of columns spread throughout the gallery. Among them are fragments of figures from *Hymn to Labor,* portrait busts, a small bronze of the original design of the figure battling with the snake for the *Dorrego Monument*, and a plaster of *Wagner* **(figure 208)**. This display is reminiscent of Rodin's sculpture arrangement at the Pavillon de l'Alma in 1900, recently re-created in a gallery at the Musée Rodin in Paris. Dressed in a suit, his right arm placed on top of a sculpture covered by a drape, Yrurtia gazes straight at the viewer, celebrating a lifetime of artistic accomplishment.

By the end of his life, Yrurtia demonstrated clear fascist sympathies. In his diary entry for November 18, 1944, the artist recorded: "The system that is undoubtedly in place in the organizations of Hitler and Mussolini, I think will be of great benefit to the country in every way. At last, we could see more well-disciplined men, instead of troublemakers."[718] Apart from this one record, however, I have not found any trace of active political involvement of the sculptor with the extreme right-wing ideology, which leaves some doubt about how to interpret Yrurtia's fascist tendencies in regard to his artistic production. However, his *Monument to Bernardino Rivadavia*, along with other of the sculptor's later designs, can reasonably be analyzed as a proto-fascist construction, given its severe architecture and the grandeur of its aspirations. Dedicated to the first president of the Argentinian Republic, who took office in 1826, Yrurtia's *Monument to Bernardino*

---

[717] Museo Casa de Yrurtia, ed., *Catálogo*, Ministerio de Educación y Justicia (Buenos Aires, 1957).

[718] "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers." Yrurtia's diary, entry of November 18, 1944: ""El sistema que esta sin duda en las organizaciones Hitlerianas y Musolinas creo que será de gran provecho para el país en todos los sentidos. Al fin podremos ver más hombres de bien disciplinados, en lugar de pendencieros."

Rivadavia was inaugurated at the plaza Miserere in Buenos Aires in 1932.[719] Further research on the socio-political context in twentieth-century Argentina might shed light on the possible impact of the legacy of Yrurtia's monuments during the Peronist regime.[720]

Over the past decade, a number of exhibitions, research initiatives, and the renovation of the sculptor's house museum have demonstrated a renewed interest in Yrurtia's oeuvre in Argentina.[721] In 2015, at the occasion of the inauguration of the Kirchner Cultural Center in the former Post Office Building of Buenos Aires, the artist and curator Santiago Villanueva organized an exhibition featuring Rogelio Yrurtia's sculptures and his archival correspondence.[722] That same year, the Archivo Ruiz de Olano, one of the two major depositories of the artist's papers, was donated to the Universidad Nacional de San Martín in Buenos Aires, where it is undergoing digitalization. After many years of renovation, Yrurtia's house museum reopened in July 2019, and during this time, the monumental landscape of Buenos Aires saw major transformations. Most

---

[719] Teresa Espantoso Rodríguez and Cristina Serventi, "Mausoleo a Bernardino Rivadavia," *Estudios e Investigaciones Instituto de Teoría e Historia Del Arte Julio E. Payro*, no. 4 (1991): 161–97; Erika Loiácono, "Un quiebre en la representación del prócer argentino: el monumento a Bernardino Rivadavia de Rogelio Yrurtia," in *Arte Americano e Independencia. Nuevas Iconografías. Quintas jornadas de historia de arte*, ed. Fernando Guzmán and Juan Manuel Martínez (Santiago de Chile, Chile, 2010), 107–16.

[720] In her study on sculpture and fascism, Penelope Curtis showed that monuments and modernism were in creative tension in fascist Italy. See Penelope Curtis and Paolo Campiglio, *Scultura lingua morta: Scultura nell'Italia Fascista; Dead language sculpture : sculpture from Fascist Italy* (Leeds: Henry Moore Institute, 2003).

[721] An exhibition dedicated to *Hymn to Labor* was organized by Andrea Elías, Director of the museum house of Yrurtia at the Museo del Tigre from April 28 to July 29, 2018. Andrea Elías, "Rogelio Yrurtia: Canto al Trabajo," Museo Casa de Yrurtia, accessed December 8, 2020, https://museoyrurtia.cultura.gob.ar/exhibicion/rogelio-yrurtia/.

[722] I would like to thank Santiago Villanueva for his generosity and help with my research on Yrurtia.

notably, in 2013, the *Columbus Monument* was dismantled (**figure 209**). Designed by the Italian sculptor Arnoldo Zocchi (1862-1940), the sculpture was a gift of the Italian community of Buenos Aires to the city in 1906.[723] In its place—behind the Casa Rosada, the seat of the Argentinian government, located just north of Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor* on the Paseo Colón—the presidents Cristina Fernández de Kirchner, of Argentina, and Evo Morales, of Bolivia, inaugurated, in July 2015, a contemporary monument to the revolutionary independence leader Juana Azurduy de Padilla (**figure 210**). In September 2017, the sculptural group was relocated to Plaza del Correo, in front of the Kirchner Cultural Center. The substitution of the statue of Christopher Columbus by a monument to Juana Azurduy de Padilla marked a shift in the commemorative landscape of Buenos Aires and raises new questions about the meaning of Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor* in today's society.

7.2.2 Andrew O'Connor

At the end of his life, O'Connor donated more than two dozen of his sculptures, drawings, and photographs to The Hugh Lane Gallery in Dublin, formerly called the Municipal Gallery of Modern Art, which became the major repository of the sculptor's oeuvre. Founded by Hugh Lane, a dealer, collector, and donor who bequeathed his collection to this public gallery, the eponymous

[723] On monuments erected by the Italian community in Buenos Aires, see Marina Aguirre, "'Espacios simbólicos, espacios de poder: los monumentos conmemorativos de la colectividad italiana en Buenos Aires,'" in *Italia en el horizonte de las artes plásticas : Argentina, siglos XIX y XX / Diana Beatriz Wechsler (coordinadora)* (Buenos Aires: Buenos Aires : Asociación Dante Alighieri de Buenos Aires, [2000], 2000), 61–88.

museum was the first municipal gallery of modern art in the world.[724] In 1933, while working on a commissioned statue of Daniel O'Connell, considered the first great nineteenth-century Irish nationalist leader, in Leixlip Castle, near Dublin, O'Connor visited The Hugh Lane, and the museum made an impression on him.[725] The sculptor wished to be represented among these Irish artists: "I am sorry to see nothing of mine in the gallery, but sometime we may find someone able to offer a work that would show my place in Irish art."[726] Six years later, at the onset of World War II, O'Connor made a gift of twenty-four sculptures to The Hugh Lane for an exclusive permanent exhibition, with the ambition "to make this gallery as complete a history of my best works as possible."[727] The sculptor planned to build the most comprehensive collection of his works: "I want this exhibition to be the best I can possibly get together. I expect to have at least 8 statues in bronze, 2 in marble, 10 bronze heads, 3 in marble, 30 pictures of statues in public spaces in various countries and a collection of my best drawings and sketches."[728] In June 1939, O'Connor sent three photographs under glass that showcased a selection of his public sculptures in various parts of the world, creating a microcosm of his oeuvre in the gallery.[729]

---

[724] Morna O'Neill, *Hugh Lane: The Art Market and the Art Museum, 1893-1915*, Yale University Press (New Haven and London, 2018) 19.

[725] O'Connor to Reynolds, 1933. "Andrew O'Connor Papers" (Dublin, Ireland, n.d.), The Hugh Lane. "Your new gallery is as handsome and well lighted as any and the pictures look splendid on the walls."

[726] *Ibidem*. O'Connor to a curator at The Hugh Lane, October 1st, 1933.

[727] *Ibidem*. O'Connor to The Hugh Lane, January 3, 1939.

[728] *Ibidem*. O'Connor to John F. Kelly, curator at The Hugh Lane, April 10, 1939.

[729] *Ibidem*. O'Connor to John F. Kelly. June 27, 1939. "These pictures represent certain of my works in various places in the world and I hope, when my collection is installed, that these will add to its interest."

O'Connor became the curator of his own works at The Hugh Lane. He provided the museum with a floor plan of his sculptures, drawings, and photographs, using an alphabetic numbering system to identify the works and their location in the gallery. He also sketched each pedestal for every sculpture, indicating their shape, material, and dimensions. The press reported that O'Connor "was deeply moved by the arrangement for giving a special room in the Municipal Gallery to his works." In his words, "It is one of the biggest things of my life! […] it is the culmination of my career."[730] Unfortunately, the sculptor died before the official opening of his gallery at The Hugh Lane on April 13, 1942. In his opening remarks, John F. Kelly, the museum curator, honored O'Connor's cosmopolitan identity and his final gift to the country of his ancestors: "Though born in America and practically all his commissions received outside Ireland, his generous desires were of the land of his father and forefathers."[731] Prominently displayed in the sculpture hall of The Hugh Lane, O'Connor's works occupied one of the most beautiful rooms of the historic Charlemont House, situated at the entrance of a series of gallery rooms. A short film from 1959 offers a glimpse into the O'Connor gallery: a dozen sculptures are placed on display, including the monumental figures from *Le débarquement* and the *Barry* project, and a selection of modernist sculptures in marble set on high pedestals ranged alongside the gallery walls **(figures 211-212)**.

Known for its strong core of French impressionist paintings by Manet, Monet, and Renoir, the Hugh Lane collection was both national and cosmopolitan in scope. In her study on the museum founder, Morna O'Neill demonstrated that "Lane envisioned Irish art and Irish identity beyond the

[730] London column of the 'Irish Press' 5-8-1939.

[731] John F. Kelly to 'Lord Mayor', April 8th, 1942. "Andrew O'Connor Papers."

boundaries of the British empire."[732] Lane collected modern French art, and by forming a collection for Dublin, his selection of works revealed his ambition to reconsider modern Irish art in an international context.[733] For instance, the invitation cards for the opening of his gallery in 1908 bore an outline of Rodin's *The Age of Bronze*, and the labels and catalogue were printed in both Gaelic and English, demonstrating the aim of Lane's collection "to be both modern and Irish, cosmopolitan and national."[734] In that regard, The Hugh Lane appears as a particularly good fit for O'Connor's oeuvre. The donation of O'Connor's collection to the museum in the year preceding the artist's death marked his final shift of identity as a return to his Irish ancestry.

Overlooked after his death, especially by American scholars, O'Connor was adopted posthumously by Ireland, thanks to his bequest to The Hugh Lane and the 1974 exhibition organized by the Irish scholar Homan Potterton to celebrate the centenary of the artist's birth. The accompanying catalogue of this exhibition that took place at Trinity College, Dublin, remains the most comprehensive publication on the sculptor's work.[735] O'Connor's collection at The Hugh Lane, though, has not been on view for decades, and today lays dormant in the museum's

---

[732] Morna O'Neill, *Hugh Lane. The Art Market and the Art Museum 1893-1915*. New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2018, 70.

[733] *Ibid.*, 83. See also Fintan Cullen, *Ireland on Show: Art, Union, and Nationhood* (Farnham, Surrey ; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012).

[734] *Ibid.*, 99.

[735] Homan Potterton, *Andrew O'Connor 1874-1941: A Complementary Catalogue to the Exhibition Marking the Centenary of the Sculptor's Birth* (Trinity College, Dublin: Gifford & Craven, 1974). Potterton's research archives and correspondence, today held at the Center for the Study of Irish Art at the National Gallery of Ireland in Dublin, demonstrate the scope of his research, with the help of the artist's family, to identify and locate O'Connor's works in Europe and the United States.

basement. This is also the fate of many other sculptures by the artist that entered collections in France (Musée d'Orsay, Paris), England (Tate Britain, London), and the United States (Philadelphia Museum of Art; National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., and the Walters Art Museum, Baltimore).[736] O'Connor's public works, however, including his *Lafayette Monument* in Baltimore, remain in public view.

O'Connor's subversion of the traditional hero monument to represent the traumas of exile and war allows for a reconsideration of the early twentieth-century American commemorative landscape. His sculptural projects also appear as precursors to more reflective monuments like Maya Lin's (b. 1959) *Vietnam War Memorial* on the National Mall, in Washington, D.C., and the *Okinawa Prefectural Peace Memorial Museum* in Okinawa, Japan. In the latter, the names of all the victims of the war, inscribed on a wall facing the ocean, include not only soldiers but also civilians, offering a parallel with O'Connor's *Le débarquement*, where the figures of the Mother and the Wife gather around the Victim's bier. Moreover, regardless of their side in the war, the names of all fallen soldiers and civilians, including Korean, Taiwanese, Americans, and Britons, are inscribed on the wall of the *Peace memorial* in Okinawa. While *Le débarquement* depicts the anonymous victims of World War I, the Okinawa monument specifically memorializes the collective trauma of World War II.

---

[736] With the exception of the Brooklyn Museum of Art, where the group of *Tristan and Isolde* was put on display in its Luce Center galleries in the fall of 2019 thanks to the initiative of Margarita Karasoulas, whom I'd like to thank for her help in giving me access to the sculpture. Moreover, O'Connor's sculpture of *The Virgin* and his bust of *Lincoln* are on view in the visible storage of the Luce Center at The Metropolitan Museum of Art. I would like to thank Thayer Tolles for her help in accessing the artist and object's file. My thanks also go to Joe Briggs at the Walters museum, Alison Luchs at the National Gallery of Art, Cindy Veloric at the Philadelphia Museum of Art, Ophélie Ferlier at the Musée d'Orsay, and Caroline Corbeau-Parsons at the Tate Britain.

7.2.3 George Grey Barnard

The triumph of *Life of Humanity* at the 1910 Paris Salon des artistes français anticipated the success of the monumental groups in Harrisburg and marked Barnard's return to the United States. Back in his homeland, the sculptor created statues of Abraham Lincoln and conceived a monument to World War I to which he devoted the rest of his life.[737] Instead of glorifying the war, Barnard's project was conceived as a monument to peace. Like O'Connor's *Le débarquement,* Barnard envisioned a monument that would transform the prototypical war memorial, but it was never finished. Instead, *Life of Humanity* remains today the last ambitious monument that Barnard completed. In contrast to O'Connor, Barnard integrated himself successfully into the canon of American sculpture, even though he is too often labelled the "American Rodin." Barnard's friendship with the American sculptor and art historian Lorado Taft secured him a place in his reference publications on the history of sculpture.[738] In addition, during his lifetime, art critics

---

[737] Barnard was commissioned by Charles P. Taft to create a statue of Abraham Lincoln for Cincinnati, which turned into a controversy about the realistic portrayal of the sixteenth president of the United States. On Barnard's statues of Abraham Lincoln, see Harold Edward Dickson, "George Grey Barnard's Controversial Lincoln," *Art Journal* 27, no. 1 (Autumn 1967): 8–15; Frederick C. Moffatt, *Errant Bronzes: George Grey Barnard's Statues of Abraham Lincoln* (Newark : London: University of Delaware Press ; Associated University Presses, 1998).

[738] Lorado Taft, *The History of American Sculpture*, New ed., rev [1903] (New York: The Macmillan company, 1924); Lorado Taft, *Modern Tendencies in Sculpture*, The Scammon Lectures for 1917 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1921).

began work on monographs of his oeuvre, though all of their projects were eventually aborted.[739] Most notably, Harold Dickson, a scholar at Penn State University, published a large number of comprehensive articles on Barnard's oeuvre.[740] More recently, Brian Hack's dissertation focused on Barnard's project for a World War I monument— later abridged in the *Rainbow Arch*—in the context of the twentieth-century eugenics movement in the United States.[741] In spite of this focus, Barnard's legacy survives more for his contribution as a dealer of medieval art and architecture than as a sculptor.

Barnard's most famous creation culminated not with the Harrisburg groups, but rather with what is known today as the Met Cloisters. Originating as a mishmash of medieval pieces from sites across France, the Cloisters Museum was born from the financial difficulties faced by the artist while working on the Harrisburg statuary. Starting in 1906, the sculptor travelled throughout the south of France, hunting for medieval artifacts that he could sell to dealers in France and collectors in the United States to finance his work. In 1914, Barnard gathered fragments of French monasteries in his studio in Washington Heights, in New York City, and opened it to the public. He donated the admission fees from his studio to the Société des artistes français to provide support for artists and their families during World War I.[742] Barnard's visual reference for his Cloisters

---

[739] See the research papers of Ruth Morris in "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution; "Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

[740] "Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers" (State College, PA, n.d.), Centre County Historical Society.

[741] Brian Hack, "American Acropolis: George Grey Barnard's 'Monument to Democracy', 1918-1938" (New York, City University of New York, 2008).

[742] Barnard's correspondence with the French sculptor Hippolyte Lefebvre, and the president of the Société des artistes français. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

was certainly based on the Musée de sculpture comparée in Paris, a collection of plaster casts composed of the best examples of French medieval architecture and statuary. In 1925, Barnard sold the Cloisters for $600,000 to John D. Rockefeller Jr., who then gave it to the city of New York. The sculptor would later build a second medieval collection, "The Abbaye," which was purchased by the Philadelphia Museum of Art in 1945.[743]

Barnard did not shy away from the opportunity to make a profit by monetizing the taste developed by American collectors at the time for ruins and monumental sculptures. On the verso of a postcard featuring the cloister of Saint Michel de Cuxa in the Pyrénées orientales in France, Barnard inscribed: "My property GGB. This is a fragment of the cloister of Saint Michel de Cuxa near Prades in France. This part of the cloister I will leave up to be shown to anyone who desires until cloister is sold to America." **(figures 213-214)** Much as he had appropriated and emulated Salon models in his sculptural practice, Barnard created an assemblage of architectural and sculptural fragments from various monasteries in France to form the Cloisters. Barnard's translocation of a monumental heritage from France to the United States arose from a business strategy similar in some ways to his practices of extraction and commercialization of autonomous groups from large, monumental ensembles, best illustrated in *Life of Humanity*. As both sculptor

[743] Harold Edward Dickson, "The Origin of the Cloisters," *The Art Quarterly* 28, no. 4 (1965): 253–74; Mahonri Sharp Young, "George Grey Barnard and the Cloisters," *Apollo* 106, no. 189 (1977): 332–39; J. L Schrader, "George Grey Barnard: The Cloisters and the Abbaye," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 37, no. 1 (1979): 3–52; Elizabeth Bradford Smith et al., *Medieval Art in America: Patterns of Collecting, 1800-1940* (University Park, Pa.: Palmer Museum of Art, the Pennsylvania State University, 1996); Timothy B Husband, "Creating The Cloisters," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 70, no. 4 (2013): 1–48; Céline Brugeat, "Monuments on the Move: The Transfer of French Medieval Heritage Overseas in the Early Twentieth Century," *Journal for Art Market Studies* 2, no. 2 (May 24, 2018), https://doi.org/10.23690/jams.v2i2.32.

and art dealer, Barnard had a discerning eye for the works of others, along with a modern sensibility in his ability to appropriate from a range of artistic sources to create his art and commercialize it.

Barnard, O'Connor, and Yrurtia's attempts to develop a monumental language that would profoundly transform society at the beginning of the twentieth century can be perceived today as a failed endeavor. However, a century later, artists have taken on the challenge to rethink the role of public sculpture in society. Collective monuments that break away from the representation of the individual hero have transformed the monumental landscape in recent decades. There are some important structural differences between then and now: in the early twentieth century, the Salons constituted an exclusionary system that predominantly admitted white male sculptors and was difficult for foreigners to access; today, the players who have entered the monumental field have diverse backgrounds, although the art market and curatorial systems remain influential in maintaining the status quo.

7.3 Challenging Monumentality Today

In recent years, many contemporary artists have taken over the tradition of monumental sculpture and used it as a critical mode of representation to denounce the histories of oppression and colonialism. Kara Walker's (b. 1969) *Fons Americanus*, and Kehinde Wiley's (b. 1977) *Rumors of War*, for instance, exemplify the appropriation of traditional types of public sculpture – the Italian Baroque fountain, in one case, and the equestrian statue, in the other – to comment on the United Kingdom's colonial past and the history of racial injustices in the United States, respectively. At the same time, an alternative language of monumentality emerged that

commemorates the collectivity rather than the individual hero. It is perhaps best illustrated in Maya Lin's *Vietnam Veterans Memorial* on the National Mall in Washington, D.C. Many contemporary artists have sought to develop alternative monuments dedicated to a group, resonating with the ambitious multifigure groups of modern sculptors a century ago, even though they are more likely today to embrace abstract forms. The *Memorial to the Enslaved Laborers,* inaugurated this past summer in Charlottesville, illustrates this new type of monumentality that deploys abstract architectural shapes to memorialize a community, in this precise case, the lives of the enslaved peoples who built the University of Virginia and sustained its everyday life.

Installed in the Turbine Hall of the Tate Modern in London in 2019, *Fons Americanus* is a nearly 43-foot-tall sculpture in the form of a four-tiered fountain inspired by the Victoria Memorial, located in front of Buckingham Palace in London **(figure 215)**. Designed in 1901 and inaugurated in 1911, the Victoria Memorial is a contemporary of the sculptures of Barnard, O'Connor, Rodin, and Yrurtia, but borrows from the artistic legacy of the Italian Baroque tradition, which these sculptors were moving away from in their work. With her fountain, Walker inverts the usual function of the memorial: instead of celebrating the British Empire, as in the Victoria Memorial, the artist explores "the interconnected histories of Africa, America and Europe" through the use of water as a key theme, alluding to the transatlantic slave trade and its traumas.[744] In some aspects, Walker's *Fons Americanus* can be compared to O'Connor's *Barry* project in their portrayal of the sufferings brought about by the displacement and exile of peoples, one in the context of the colonial system of slavery, the other in relation to famine and poverty. However, O'Connor circumscribed the history of the Irish exile to the bas-relief and its two free-standing

[744] "Kara Walker's Fons Americanus," The Tate, accessed December 21, 2020, https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artists/kara-walker-2674/kara-walkers-fons-americanus.

groups delimited by a basin of water. Furthermore, the ephemerality of Walker's sculpture, made of recycled and reusable material, reassesses the idea of the permanence of monuments and the veneer of authority that the materials of marble and bronze seek to convey to the public.

First unveiled in Times Square in New York City on September 27, 2019, *Rumors of War* was inaugurated three months later in its permanent location in Richmond **(figure 216)**. Erected in the front plaza of the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Wiley's monument stands as an "anti-Confederate memorial" in the commemorative landscape of the capital of Virginia.[745] The artist's purposeful use of bronze places the young black man on a rearing stallion in dialogue with the equestrian statues of the Confederate generals a few blocks away on Monument Avenue. Indeed, Wiley used as his model the statue of the Confederate Army General James Ewell Brown "J. E. B." Stuart created by Frederick Moynihan in 1907, replacing the original subject with a young African-American man dressed in a hoodie and Nike high-tops.[746] *Rumors of War* is situated in the lineage of the artist's early 2000s series of paintings in which he appropriated the Western tradition of aristocratic portraiture, substituting the white subjects with young African American men dressed in hip-hop street fashion. Wiley's equestrian statue constitutes an intervention in the history of public sculpture that creates a dignified space in the art historical canon for people of color, particularly Black American men, who have been relegated to subservient depictions, when not omitted entirely. Wiley took over the triumphal language of memorialization to subvert its meaning and, in the process, to heroize the people who have been left out of the colonialist narratives of power in Western art.

---

[745] Kriston Capps, "Kehinde Wiley's Anti-Confederate Memorial," The New Yorker, accessed December 21, 2020, https://www.newyorker.com/culture/culture-desk/kehinde-wileys-anti-confederate-memorial.

[746] On July 7, 2020, the Stuart statue was removed from its pedestal on Monumental Avenue and moved to storage.

Instead of inventing a new genre of monumental sculpture, Walker and Wiley revisited a model of sculptural representation immediately recognizable by the public and already spread across public plazas throughout the transatlantic world. They appropriated the celebratory modes of representation of public sculpture to question their role in the construction of narratives of power and the perpetuation of various forms of oppressions. Their works can be studied through the lens of what is now termed decolonizing art history, and, in the case of these sculptural projects, an ambition to decolonize the Western monumental landscape.

Simultaneously, another trend in the contemporary field of sculpture seeks to develop an alternative language of monumentality. A century after Barnard, O'Connor, Rodin, and Yrurtia's sculptural efforts, the desire persists to make a monument to a collectivity rather than to an individual hero. Maya Lin's *Vietnam Veterans Memorial* offers a collective space of introspection rather than a celebration of individual triumphs. Dedicated in 1982 on the National Mall, the *Vietnam Veterans Memorial* "was the capital's first true victim monument – a monument that existed not to glorify the nation but to help its suffering soldiers heal."[747] Its sunken black granite walls carry the names of the fifty-eight thousand U.S. servicemen who lost their lives in the war, but instead of delivering a pro- or antiwar message, its meaning is generated by the viewer's experience of it.[748] While Lin herself negates the traditional monumentality of her work in calling it an *antimonument*, one could argue that the roots of this alternative monumentality can be found in early twentieth-century modern sculpture that aimed at memorializing collective traumas, such as O'Connor's *Barry* project and *Le débarquement*.

---

[747] Kirk Savage, *Monument Wars: Washington, D.C., the National Mall, and the Transformation of the Memorial Landscape* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 266.

[748] Savage, 267.

However, Lin's shift from figurative to abstract language relocated the meaning from the object itself to the viewer. In seeing themselves reflected in the polished surface of the black stone, visitors are drawn to engage with the *Vietnam Veterans Memorial*, and thereby become part of this collective community of people. This transformation of the monument into a space of engagement by the viewer was a goal that early twentieth-century sculptors pursued, even though their multifigure groups, like Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor*, faced limitations once erected in the public space. Some contemporary monuments, however, in the lineage of the *Vietnam Veterans Memorial,* have traded the image for the word – the language of figuration for abstract forms – developing a new type of monumentality, collective and introspective at the same time.

Delayed by the COVID-19 pandemic, the *Memorial to the Enslaved Laborers* was dedicated in the summer of 2020 on the grounds of the University of Virginia in Charlottesville. It is composed of two open, concentric, carved granite rings that have been compared to broken shackles and a ceremonial dance floor. A circle of grass occupies the central space of the memorial, inviting visitors to use it as a gathering space **(figure 217)**. In contrast with traditional monuments, the *Memorial to the Enslaved Laborers* is not officially attributed to an individual sculptor, but instead to a team of architects and artists.[749] Particular attention was given to the origin of the granite material, which was sourced from a local quarry, departing from early twentieth-century examples, such as Barnard's *Life of Humanity*, whose marble came from Carrara, in Italy, and Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor* as well as O'Connor's *Le débarquement*, whose bronze was cast in French and Belgian foundry houses. Even though the *Memorial to the Enslaved Laborers* seeks to

[749] Eric Howeler and Meejin Yoon, with Mabel O'Wilson, Gregg Blean, the artist Eto Otitigbe, and the landscape architect Frank Duker. "Memorial to Enslaved Laborers at The University of Virginia," accessed December 15, 2020, https://www2.virginia.edu/slaverymemorial/design.html.

honor the lives of a community of people, its meaning resides not in its use of figurative language, as in Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor,* but rather in the power of words.

Comparable to Maya Lin's project, the *Memorial to the Enslaved Laborers* displays a wall of names that memorializes the collective stories of people that have been lost to history. To this day, scholars have recovered only 578 names out of the estimated 4,000 enslaved African Americans who built the university and sustained its life since its founding by Thomas Jefferson. In order to acknowledge all these lives, the *Memorial to the Enslaved Laborers* identifies some slaves by their names and others by their jobs or their social roles. Each word is underlined, and about halfway through the wall, blank lines appear without words, leaving space for the names yet to be uncovered. These incisions on the granite have been interpreted as memory marks that run down like tears when it rains.[750] This interplay between symbols and abstract shapes creates a wider range of interpretations for the viewer than the traditional language of figurative sculpture could ever provide. The adoption of abstract forms as a privileged tendency in contemporary public sculpture has reduced figuration to a minimum and transformed monuments into spaces of dialogue.[751]

---

[750] Philip Kennicott, "A Powerful New Memorial to U-Va.'s Enslaved Workers Reclaims Lost Lives and Forgotten Narratives," *Washington Post*, August 13, 2020, sec. Museums | Review, https://www.washingtonpost.com/goingoutguide/museums/a-powerful-new-memorial-to-u-vas-enslaved-workers-reclaims-lost-lives-and-forgotten-narratives/2020/08/12/7be63e66-dc03-11ea-b205-ff838e15a9a6_story.html; Holland Cotter, "Turning Grief for a Hidden Past Into a Healing Space," *The New York Times*, August 16, 2020, sec. Arts, https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/16/arts/design/university-of-virginia-enslaved-laborers-memorial.html.

[751] In the *Memorial to the Enslaved Laborers,* the only signs of figuration are a pair of eyes carved on the outside circle of the external ring.

Today's memorials, like the *Vietnam Veterans Memorial* and the *Memorial to the Enslaved Laborers,* demonstrate the capacity of monuments to tell complicated stories. A century earlier, modern sculptors had aimed to transform the prototypical statue into a collective monument, pushing beyond its architectural boundaries to offer a complex narrative that engaged with its spectators. However, these intricate multifigure groups, difficult to comprehend, failed to gain cultural traction in the public space, and the opacity of these monumental ensembles has long contributed to their obsolescence. While monumentality keeps being reinvented as the needs of society change, one might wonder what is to be done with century-old public sculptures that do not reflect their present-day community.

In recent years, new initiatives have attempted to address the role of monuments in our society. In 2019, the Philadelphia-based collective Monument Lab organized the exhibition "A Call to Peace," co-curated with New Arts Justice in Newark, New Jersey, in response to Borglum's *Wars of America* monument, a landmark of Military Park in Newark.[752] This multifigure sculpture celebrates a collective group of people instead of a single hero, following the same principles as Barnard's *Life of Humanity* and Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor*. Indeed, Borglum was part of this same generation of international sculptors who were active in Paris at the turn of the twentieth century, where he exhibited both at the SAF and the SNBA.[753] His extended correspondence with Rodin demonstrates Borglum's deep admiration for the French sculptor, who even wrote letters of

---

[752] "A Call to Peace," Monument Lab, accessed December 30, 2020, https://monumentlab.com/projects/a-call-to-peace; "A Call to Peace," New Arts Justice, accessed December 30, 2020, https://www.newartsjustice.org/peace.

[753] "Base Salons," accessed December 30, 2020, http://salons.musee-orsay.fr/. Borglum participated at the SAF in 1891, 1898, 1899, 1900 and 1901; at the SNBA in 1891, 1892, 1897, 1898, 1899, 1902 and 1906.

recommendation for the young American at the beginning of his career.[754] Today, Borglum is mostly known as the sculptor of *Mount Rushmore National Memorial* in the Black Hills region of South Dakota. Deeply involved in the Ku Klux Klan, he designed a monument to Confederate leaders on Stone Mountain in Georgia, and used granite from this quarry to make the pedestal for his sculpture in Newark.

The relationship between Borglum's racist affiliations and *Wars of America* cannot be overstated. Initiated after World War I, *Wars of America* is composed of 42 figures, soldiers and civilians, accompanied with horses, on and off the battleground. Originally, a reflecting pool extended outward in the shape of a sword before it was converted into a flower bed. Erected in 1926, the monument was meant to honor all of America's war dead.[755] Contemporary with Barnard and Yrurtia's multifigure groups, Borglum's *Wars of America* sheds light on their contributions to the construction of whiteness in Argentina and the United States, respectively. *Life of Humanity* and *Hymn to Labor* celebrate a widely prevalent fin-de-siècle idea of human progress based on white, Judeo-Christian, European supremacy. Their ambiguous monumental endeavors do not include indigenous figures, or any other people, other than to serve as representatives for the "civilizing" work left to achieve. Even though Barnard and Yrurtia disengaged themselves from the traditional aesthetic of the heroic monument, they still perpetuated an idea of whiteness through their "universalized" types of men, women, and children.

The exhibition "A Call to Peace" that took place in Newark in 2019 was framed around the question, "What is a timely monument for Newark?" With the premise that monuments are not

---

[754] "Vertical File John Gutzon de La Mothe Borglum" (Paris, France, n.d.), Archive, Musée Rodin.

[755] "Wars of America, (Sculpture)," Smithsonian Institution, accessed December 30, 2020, https://www.si.edu/object/siris_ari_2965.

timeless, four contemporary artists, Manuel Acevedo (b. 1964), Chakaia Booker (b. 1953), Sonya Clark (b. 1967), and Jamel Shabazz (b. 1960), were invited to respond to the exhibition's central question by designing four temporary prototypes of monuments. In addition, New Arts Justice and Monument Lab developed a participatory research lab on site, where passersby were encouraged to contribute their own speculative monument proposals.[756] As part of the contemporary projects developed in Military Park, *Cam-Up*, created by the Newark native and multimedia artist Manuel Acevedo, interrogated the forgotten history of Borglum's *Wars of America* **(figure 218)**. During a series of "happenings," Acevedo covered *Wars of America* with camouflage veils and various materials, concealing and disguising the monument, to bring a new perspective to the object and its history. Having long documented Borglum's *Wars of America* and its relationship with people in the park, Acevedo observed that the larger-than-life figures of the monument did not reflect the local community. "By covering or veiling the monument, we get to think about what it means to uncover the history," the artist said in an interview. Acevedo's artistic intervention sought to bring to light "hidden narratives in site," unveiling Borglum's affiliation with the KKK.[757]

At a time when the United States reckons with its history, monuments have returned to the spotlight. Defaced, moved, torn down, fought over, covered with graffiti, venerated, displaced, they are no longer hidden in plain sight. Recent initiatives like the 2019 exhibition "A Call to

---

[756] The 186 hand-drawn monument projects gathered over the duration of the exhibition were then digitized and made available online. "A Call to Peace," Monument Lab, accessed December 30, 2020, https://monumentlab.com/projects/a-call-to-peace. Projects are accessible through the links: https://airtable.com/shrVblU57GarKhwI2/tblILhQhzb9LaoJxw; and https://www.flickr.com/photos/monument_lab/albums/72157715114996713

[757] School of Arts & Sciences-Newark, *Manuel Acevedo Re-Imagines Military Park War Monument In "A Call to Peace" Exhibition*, 2019, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MmlzW6AUqEY.

Peace" call into question the idea of the permanence of monuments and ask contemporary audiences what public sculptures mean in today's society. In October 2020, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation launched The Monuments Project, a $250 million grant to "transform the way our country's histories are told in public spaces and ensure that future generations inherit a commemorative landscape that venerates and reflects the vast, rich complexity of the American story."[758] Such an ambitious endeavor makes the study of the construction of the monumental landscape and its transformation over time more important than ever.

The stories of Barnard, Yrurtia, and O'Connor's monuments have shown that the national lens through which one tends to analyze such objects eludes the broader historical context of transnational exchanges in which they came about. The nineteenth-century audience at the Paris Salons was different from the local populations in Harrisburg, Washington, D.C., or Buenos Aires, and they differ from today's constituents. In order to adapt to their communities, monuments need to be constantly reassessed, reinvented, and actualized. Contemporary examples of monumental substitution, with the *Columbus* monument in Buenos Aires, for instance; monumental confrontation, such as Wiley's *Rumors of War* near Monument Avenue in Richmond; and monumental intervention, like Acevedo's *Cam-Up*, show us how we can reinvent our monumental landscape today.

[758] The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, "The Monuments Project," The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, accessed December 30, 2020, https://mellon.org/initiatives/monuments/.

Appendix A List of Referenced Figures

Images have been redacted for copyright purposes.

Figure 1 Daniel M. Williams, manuscript draft, page 373. “Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard” (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

Figure 2 Daniel M. Williams, manuscript draft, page 381. “Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard.” (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

Figure 3 George Grey Barnard in his Paris Studio, c. 1885, “George Grey Barnard Papers” (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Figure 4 Press cutting, Portrait of Rogelio Yrurtia, 1910, photograph, “Rogelio Yrurtia Papers” (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

Figure 5 Andrew O’Connor in his Paris studio, n.d., photograph, “Andrew O’Connor Papers” (Dublin, Ireland, n.d.), Center for the Study of Irish Art, National Gallery of Ireland.

Figure 6 Anna Bilinska, Portrait of George Grey Barnard, 1888-1890, oil on canvas, presented at the 1890 Salon des artistes français, The State Museum of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg.

Figure 7 Rogelio Yrurtia posing with *The Sinners*, c. 1902-3, photograph, Museo Casa Yrurtia, Buenos Aires.

Figure 8 Andrew O’Connor wearing the coat of Lew Wallace, 1910-1911, photograph, annotated in the back by the artist, “Lew Wallace’s Coat. A.O.C. 1910-11. à Clamart”, “Andrew

O'Connor Papers" (Dublin, Ireland, n.d.), Center for the Study of Irish Art, National Gallery of Ireland.

Figure 9 Andrew O'Connor, Lew Wallace, 1909, marble, National Statuary Hall, Capitol, Washington, D.C.

Figure 10 Salon 1864, general view of the garden, left side, photograph, Album Michelez.

Figure 11 Salon 1876, general view of the garden and sculpture, center, photograph, Album Michelez.

Figure 12 Salon des artistes français, 1881, garden and sculpture, left side, photograph, Album Michelez.

Figure 13 Sculptures exhibited in the central vestibule, Palace of Fine Arts, Paris 1889 Exposition, 1889, photograph, Library of Congress.

Figure 14 Salon des artistes français, Palais de l'Industrie, Paris, 1896, photograph.

Figure 15 Salon des artistes français and Société nationale des beaux-arts in the hall des machineries, Paris, 1898, photograph.

Figure 16 International Sculpture Decennial, Grand Palais, Paris. Exposition 1900, in Paris Exposition Reproduced from the Official Photographs Taken Under the Supervision of the French Government for Permanent Preservation in the National Archives, New York: R. S. Peale, 1900.

Figure 17 Hall of Sculptures, Salon des artistes français, Grand Palais, Paris, 1901, photograph.

Figure 18 Auguste Rodin, *The Age of Bronze*, 1877, bronze, 180.5x 68.5x54.5cm, Musée Rodin, Paris.

Figure 19 Andrew O'Connor, *The Exiles*, 1906, clay model, 12 ½ x 8 x 4 inch., location unknown, model probably destroyed, National Archives, Washington, D.C.

Figure 20 Rogelio Yrurtia, *The Sinners*, 1902-1903, photograph of plaster (destroyed), inscribed on lower right, "'Las Pecadoras'/Rogelio Yrurtia/Paris 1902", Museo Casa Yrurtia, Buenos Aires.

Figure 21 Auguste Rodin, *The Burghers of Calais*, 1889 (date of plaster cast), bronze, Musée Rodin, Paris.

Figure 22 George Grey Barnard, *The Prodigal Son*, c.1904-1906, marble, Carnegie Museum of Art, Pittsburgh.

Figure 23 Ernest Dubois, *Le Pardon*, plaster, 208 x 110 x 145 cm, Salon des artistes français 1894, N° 3048, photograph, Album Michelez.

Figure 24 Constantin Meunier, *Le Pardon*, first displayed at the SNBA in 1892, bronze, Musées royaux des beaux-arts de Belgique, Brussels.

Figure 25 Pierre Braecke, *Le Pardon*, 1893, marble, 147,5 x 70,5 x 126, Musées royaux des beaux-arts de Belgique, Brussels.

Figure 26 George Minne, *The Prodigal Son*, 1896, plaster, 58.7x34.9x15cm, Museum of Fine Arts, Ghent.

Figure 27 Camille Claudel, *Vertumne and Pomona* or *L'Abandon*, 1905, marble, 91x80.6 x41.8 cm, Musée Rodin, Paris.

Figure 28 Pierre-Antoine Laurent, *Héro et Léandre*, SAF 1903, photograph, Album Michelez.

Figure 29 Andrew O'Connor, *Tristan and Isolde*, 1928, stone, Brooklyn Museum, New York.

Figure 30 Albert Marqueste, *Persée et la Gorgone*, presented at the SAF 1880, Musée du Luxembourg, photograph. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Figure 31 Henri-Desiré Gauquié, *Persée Vainqueur de la Méduse*, plaster, presented at the 1886 SAF, today in Musée de Castres, photograph, Album Michelez.

Figure 32 Antoine Bourdelle, *Hercule et Cacus*, 1889, terracotta, Musée Bourdelle, Paris.

Figure 33 Frederic McMonnies, *Civic Virtue*, photograph, "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Figure 34 Alfred-Désiré Lanson, *L'âge de fer*, SAF 1882, photograph. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Figure 35 George Grey Barnard, *Struggle of Two Natures in Man*, 1888, SNBA 1894, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.

Figure 36. Gallery of Sculptures at the Musée du Luxembourg, n.d., photograph. On the right: Marqueste, *Perseus and Medusa*.

Figure 37 Barnard at work on *Two Natures*, n.d., photograph. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Figure 38 Camille Claudel, *Persée et la Méduse*, plaster presented at the SNBA in 1899, and marble at the SNBA in 1902, Musée Camille Claudel, Nogent-sur-Seine.

Figure 39 Ernest Dubois, *Le Pardon*, marble, Square Amar Guennoun, Skikda, Algeria. Photography taken by Anne Pingeot in February 1988.

Figure 40 View of the Hall of Sculptures at the Saint Louis International Exhibition, 1904, photograph, "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes.

Figure 41 View of the Hall of Sculptures at the Saint Louis International Exhibition, 1904, photograph, "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes.

Figure 42 Andrew O'Connor, *Allegory of Inspiration*, 1903, bronze, 23 x 21 inches, signed on the left side "A. O'CONNOR", and stamped "CIRE PERDUE A.A. HEBRARD", Walters Art Museum, Baltimore.

Figure 43 George Grey Barnard's *Two Natures in Man* in the Great Hall of the Metropolitan Museum, c. 1902, photograph, press cutting "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Figure 44 George Grey Barnard's *Two Natures in Man* in the Great Hall of the Metropolitan Museum, 1906, photograph, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

Figure 45 George Grey Barnard's *Two Natures in Man* at the Paris World Fair, 1900, photograph, United States Commission to the Paris Exposition, Report of the commissioner-general for the United States to the International universal exposition, Paris, 1900 ... February 28, 1901 v. 2. Washington: Govt. print. off, 667.

Figure 46 Baldwin Coolidge, George Grey Barnard's *The Two Natures* on display at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1906, photograph, "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Figure 47 Lute Pease, Caricature of Barnard's *The Two Natures*, drawing, c.1914-1918, drawing, annotated in the margin "After Barnard's well-know[sic] group 'The two natures", Library of Congress, Washington D.C.

Figure 48 José María Cao, Caricature of Rogelio Yrurtia posing in front of *The Sinners*, *Caras y Caretas*, Buenos Aires, August 10, 1904, n. 314, 46, Biblioteca Nacional de España, Madrid

Figure 49 "Los artistas argentinos premiados en la Exposición de San Luis", *Caras y Caretas*, Buenos Aires, August 10, 1904, n. 314, 48, Biblioteca Nacional de España, Madrid

Figure 50 Rogelio Yrurtia's *The Sinners*, 1903, press cutting, "El escultor argentino Inurtia (sic) 'Las Pecadoras' Su exposición en el salón de Paris", *La prensa*, Buenos Aires, June 1903. "Rogelio Yrurtia" (Paris, France, n.d.), Archives and Documentation Center, Musée Rodin.

Figure 51 Ernesto de la Cárcova's *Sin Pan y Sin Trabajo*, in Walter Barlow Stevens and William Herman Rau, *The Forest City*, comprising the official photographic views of the Universal exposition, held in Saint Louis, 1904, commemorating the acquisition of the Louisiana territory. St Louis: Thompson, 1904, 388.

Figure 52 View of the Section of Argentinian Sculpture at the 1904 Saint Louis International Exhibition, in Eduardo Schiaffino's article, *La Nación*, February 14, 1905, "Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino"

Figure 53"Arte Nacional. Exposición Irurtia-Schiaffino", *Caras y Caretas*, November 11, 1905. no. 370. Biblioteca Nacional de España, Madrid.

Figure 54 George Grey Barnard's unfinished sketch for the memorial to the soldiers of Centre County, Pennsylvania, and to Governor Curtin, War governor of Pennsylvania, press cutting, *Worlds Work*, December 1902, "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Figure 55 George Grey Barnard, *Two Brothers*, c. 1905-1910, marble, detail from *Love and Labor (The Unbroken Law)*, North Group, The Pennsylvania State Capitol Building, Harrisburg.

Figure 56 François Sicard, *Le bon samaritain*, 1896, marble, 230x136x144 cm, Jardin des Tuileries, Paris.

Figure 57 George Grey Barnard, *Kneeling Youth*, c. 1905-1910, marble, detail from *The Burden of Life (The Broken Law)*, South Group, The Pennsylvania State Capitol Building, Harrisburg.

Figure 58 Ernest Legrand, *The Pleading Boy*, presented at the 1895 Salon des artistes français, photograph, Album Michelez.

Figure 59 George Grey Barnard, *Burden Bearer*, c. 1905-1910, marble, detail from *The Burden of Life (The Broken Law)*, South Group, The Pennsylvania State Capitol Building, Harrisburg.

Figure 60 Michelangelo Buonarotti, *Three men carrying a corpse on their shoulders: study for a Deposition?*, drawing, inv. 704 verso, Musée du Louvre, Paris. Reproduced in "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Figure 61 Ludovic Durand, *Le Tâcheron* or *The Pieceworker*, presented at the 1900 Salon des artistes français, photograph, Album Michelez.

Figure 62 George Grey Barnard, *Mourning Woman*, c. 1905-1910, marble, detail from *The Burden of Life (The Broken Law)*, South Group, The Pennsylvania State Capitol Building, Harrisburg.

Figure 63 Louis-Ernest Barrias, *La Nature mystérieuse se dévoile devant la science*, presented at the 1893 Salon des artistes français, photograph, Album Michelez.

Figure 64 Pierre Puvis de Chavannes, *L'été* or *The Summer*, mural (detail), Salon d'Arrivée, Hotel de Ville, no date, photograph, "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Figure 65 Baldwin Coolidge, George Grey Barnard's *Mother* on display at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1906, photograph, "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Figure 66 Baldwin Coolidge, George Grey Barnard's *Brothers* on display at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1906, photograph, "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Figure 67 George Grey Barnard's *Life of Humanity* at the Salon des artistes français, 1910, photograph, "Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard" (Philadelphia, PA. n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

Figure 68 Registration file of Barnard's *Life of Humanity* at the 1910 Salon des artistes français. "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

Figure 69 George Grey Barnard's *The Prodigal Son* at the Armory Show in New York City, 1913, photograph, "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Figure 70 George Grey Barnard, *Urn of Life* (detail), c. 1898-1900, marble, 37 7/8 × 32 1/4 × 30 1/4 in (96.20 × 81.92 × 76.84 cm), Carnegie Museum of Art, Pittsburgh.

Figure 71 George Grey Barnard, *Dying Poet* or *Dying Musician*, c. 1906, marble, private collection.

Figure 72 George Grey Barnard, *Urn of Life* (detail), c. 1898-1900, marble, 37 7/8 × 32 1/4 × 30 1/4 in (96.20 × 81.92 × 76.84 cm), Carnegie Museum of Art, Pittsburgh.

Figure 73 George Grey Barnard, *Solitude (Adam and Eve)*, c. 1906, marble, Taft Museum of Art, Cincinnati.

Figure 74 George Grey Barnard, *Urn of Life* (detail), c. 1898-1900, marble, 37 7/8 × 32 1/4 × 30 1/4 in (96.20 × 81.92 × 76.84 cm), Carnegie Museum of Art, Pittsburgh.

Figure 75 George Grey Barnard's marble *The Birth*, c. 1913, photograph, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Figure 76 George Grey Barnard, *Urn of Life* (detail), c. 1898-1900, marble, 37 7/8 × 32 1/4 × 30 1/4 in (96.20 × 81.92 × 76.84 cm), Carnegie Museum of Art, Pittsburgh.

Figure 77 George Grey Barnard, *The Mystery of Life*, 1895-1897, marble, 54 x 35.8 x 24.1 cm, Smithsonian American Art Museum, Washington D.C.

Figure 78 Auguste Rodin, *The Thinker*, 1904, plaster, 179.1 x 141.6 cm, Gift of André Saglio, Commissioner of Fine Arts of the French Government at the St. Louis Exposition, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

Figure 79 Owen Flanders, "Too Irish For the Irish", *The Washington Post*, May 30, 1909, RG-42, National Archives, Washington D.C.

Figure 80 George Grey Barnard, Project for a Monument to Lafayette, photograph, no date, "Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard" (Philadelphia, PA. n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

Figure 81 George Grey Barnard, Project for a Monument to Lafayette, photograph, no date, "Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard" (Philadelphia, PA. n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

Figure 82 Rogelio Yrurtia, Triumphal Arch of the May Revolution, c. 1908, photograph, "Comisión Nacional del Centenario de 1910" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

Figure 83 Rogelio Yrurtia, Monument to the May Revolution, 1908, drawing, "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Casa de Yrurtia.

Figure 84 Rogelio Yrurtia, Monument to the May Revolution, 1908, drawing, “Rogelio Yrurtia Papers” (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Casa de Yrurtia.

Figure 85 Rogelio Yrurtia, Monument to the May Revolution, 1908, drawing, “Rogelio Yrurtia Papers” (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Casa de Yrurtia.

Figure 86 Rogelio Yrurtia, Monument to the May Revolution, 1908, drawing, “Rogelio Yrurtia Papers” (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Casa de Yrurtia.

Figure 87 Rogelio Yrurtia’s maquette for the Monument to the May Revolution, in Caras y Caretas, Buenos Aires, June 26, 1909, n. 560.

Figure 88 Rogelio Yrurtia’s maquette for the Monument for the May Revolution, in Athinae, Buenos Aires, June 1909, n. 10, 2nd year, 9.

Figure 89 Rogelio Yrurtia, *The People of the May Revolution Marching*, stone, c. 1908, Museo Casa de Yrurtia, Buenos Aires.

Figure 90 Rogelio Yrurtia, *Impression about Wagner’s Music*, plaster, n.d., Museo Casa de Yrurtia, Buenos Aires.

Figure 91 Panoramic view of the maquettes for the Monument to the May Revolution, in “El monumento a la Revolución de Mayo – Los bocetos definitivos”, *Caras y Caretas*, Buenos Aires, June 26, 1909, n. 560.

Figure 92 Gaetano Moretti and Luigi Brizzolara, Project for the Monument to the May Revolution, maquette, c. 1909, “Comisión Nacional del Centenario de 1910” (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo general de la nación.

Figure 93 Rogelio Yrurtia’s The People of the May Revolution Marching, photograph, front cover of *Pallas*, Buenos Aires, May 15, 1912, n. 1.

Figure 94 Lola Mora, *Fountain of the Nereids*, 1903, marble, Plazoleta Las Nereidas, Buenos Aires.

Figure 95 Andrew O'Connor's Commodore Barry Monument displayed on the top floor corridor of the War Department, 17th street, Washington DC, photograph, 1909, RG-42, National Archives, Washington DC.

Figure 96 Andrew O'Connor, large frieze and statuary, c. 1898, stone, St Bartholomew's Church, New York City.

Figure 97 Andrew O'Connor, Frieze for Commodore Barry Monument, c. 1906, bas-relief in plaster, private collection, Dublin.

Figure 98 Andrew O'Connor, *The Genius of Ireland*, 1906, plaster, private collection, Washington D.C.

Figure 99 Andrew O'Connor, *The Exiles*, 1906, plaster, private collection, Washington, D.C.

Figure 100 Andrew O'Connor, *Commodore John Barry*, n. d., bronze, H. 21 1/16; W. 7 ¼; D. 4 1/16, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.

Figure 101 Detroit Publishing Company, Rochambeau statue, Lafayette Park Square, Washington DC, c. 1900-1910, photograph, Photographic Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Figure 102 Andrew O'Connor's second project for Commodore Barry Monument displayed on the top floor corridor of the War Department, 17th street, Washington DC, photograph, RG-42, National Archives, Washington, D.C.

Figure 103 Andrew O'Connor's second project for Commodore Barry Monument displayed on the top floor corridor of the War Department (detail), 17th street, Washington DC, photograph, RG-42, National Archives, Washington, D.C.

Figure 104 John Boyle, *Commodore John Barry*, 1911-1914, bronze and stone, Franklin Square, Washington, D.C.

Figure 105 Andrew O'Connor, *Sacred Fire*, plaster, n. d., private collection, Dublin.

Figure 106 Frederick William MacMonnies, *Pax Victrix*, modeled c. 1906-07, cast in bronze by 1918, 94.9x 36.2x31.1 cm, inscribed on shield on front of pedestal: PAX VICTRIX; on pedestal at right rear below drapery hanging down: F. MacMonnies; foundry mark inscribed in plinth at right rear: JABOEUF ROUARD PARIS, The Chrysler Museum of Art, Norfolk.

Figure 107 Andrew O'Connor, First project of *Justice* for The Peace Palace in The Hague, n.d., photograph, "Andrew O'Connor Papers" (Dublin, Ireland, n.d.), The Hugh Lane.

Figure 108 Andrew O'Connor, Sketch of first project of *Justice* for The Peace Palace in The Hague, watercolor on paper, 84 x 84.1. x 2.2 cm (framed), inscribed and dated, in pencil, lower right, "A O'CONNOR", 1912. Inscribed, in pencil, lower right, "THE HAGUE". The Hugh Lane, Dublin.

Figure 109 Andrew O'Connor posing with his statue of *Justice* in Querceta, Italy, 1924, postcard, recto, private collection, Dublin.

Figure 110 Andrew O'Connor posing with his statue of *Justice* in Querceta, Italy, 1924, postcard, verso, private collection, Dublin.

Figure 111 Andrew O'Connor, *Justice*, 1924, Carrara marble, The Peace Palace, The Hague.

Figure 112 Andrew O'Connor, *Justice carrying a helmet*, n.d., plaster, private collection, Camaiore.

Figure 113 Andrew O'Connor, *Justice*, 1924, Carrara marble, The Peace Palace, The Hague.

Figure 114 Amy Sherald, *Portrait of Breonna Taylor*, 2020, magazine cover, *Vanity Fair*, September 2020.

Figure 115 Frederick MacMonnies's *The Battle of the Marne* under construction, n.d., photograph, "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Figure 116 Doris Ulmann, Portrait of George Grey Barnard in his studio, n.d., photograph, "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Figure 117 George Grey Barnard, *Life of Humanity*, c. 1903, terracotta, The State Museum of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg.

Figure 118 George Grey Barnard, *Life of Humanity*, c. 1903, terracotta, The State Museum of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg.

Figure 119 George Grey Barnard, *The Baptism*, c. 1905-1910, marble, detail from *Love and Labor (The Unbroken Law)*, North Group, The Pennsylvania State Capitol Building, Harrisburg.

Figure 120 George Grey Barnard, *Urn of Life* (detail), c. 1898-1900, marble, 37 7/8 × 32 1/4 × 30 1/4 in (96.20 × 81.92 × 76.84 cm), Carnegie Museum of Art, Pittsburgh.

Figure 121 George Grey Barnard's studio in Moret-sur-Loing with sculptural groups from *Life of Humanity*, n.d., photograph, "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Figure 122 Pietrasanta Piazza Giosuè Carducci, n.d., postcard, "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Figure 123 George Grey Barnard's studio in Moret-sur-Loing during the flood of January 21, 1910, 1910, photograph, "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Figure 124 George Grey Barnard's statuary being hoisted in place at the Pennsylvania State Capitol, July 10, 1911, photograph, Capitol Preservation Committee, Pennsylvania State Capitol, Harrisburg.

Figure 125 Rogelio Yrurtia and his assistants with plaster models from *Hymn to Labor* in the studio, n.d., photograph, "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Casa Yrurtia.

Figure 126 Rogelio Yrurtia, terracotta model of a figure for *Hymn to Labor*, 1909, photograph, "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Casa Yrurtia.

Figure 127 Rogelio Yrurtia, terracotta model of a figure for *Hymn to Labor*, n.d., photograph, "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Casa Yrurtia.

Figure 128 Rogelio Yrurtia, bronze sculptures made after a selection of figures from *Hymn to Labor*, Museo Casa Yrurtia, Buenos Aires.

Figure 129 Rogelio Yrurtia, original plaster model for *Hymn to Labor*, n.d., photograph, "Rogelio Yrurtia Vertical File" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Pagano, Museo de Arte Moderno.

Figure 130 Rogelio Yrurtia's studio with plaster figures for *Hymn to Labor*, n.d., photograph, "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Casa Yrurtia.

Figure 131 Rogelio Yrurtia's studio with plaster figures for *Hymn to Labor*, n.d., photograph, "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Museo Casa Yrurtia.

Figure 132 Auguste Rodin's *St Jean Baptiste* in plaster, c. 1884, photograph, Inv. Ph. 277. Musée Rodin, Paris.

Figure 133 Rogelio Yrurtia, *Hymn to Labor*, 1907-c.1919, bronze, Avenida Paseo Colón, Buenos Aires.

Figure 134 Jules Dalou, *Les débardeurs poussant un bloc*, 1889-1898, terracotta, Petit Palais, Paris.

Figure 135 André d'Houdain, plaster of *La Pesée* presented at the 1897 SAF, photograph, Album Michelez.

Figure 136 Yvonne Diéterle's plaster of *La poussée* or *Départ pour la pêche à Yport*, presented at the 1904 SAF, postcard, musée des beaux-arts, Le Havre.

Figure 137 Louis Henri Bouchard, *Puller of Nets (Le Haleur)*, 1905, bronze, Academia Nacional de San Carlos, Mexico City.

Figure 138 Rogelio Yrurtia, *Hymn to Labor* (detail), 1907 - c.1919, bronze, Paseo Colón, Buenos Aires.

Figure 139 Rogelio Yrurtia, *Hymn to Labor* (detail), 1907 - c.1919, bronze, Paseo Colón, Buenos Aires.

Figure 140 Rogelio Yrurtia, *Hymn to Labor* (detail), 1907 - c.1919, bronze, Paseo Colón, Buenos Aires.

Figure 141 Rogelio Yrurtia, *Hymn to Labor* (detail), 1907 - c.1919, bronze, Paseo Colón, Buenos Aires.

Figure 142 Auguste Rodin, *Tower of Labor*, 1898-1899, plaster, Musée Rodin, Meudon.

Figure 143 James Vibert, *Human Effort*, presented at the 1903 Salon d'Automne, photograph, documentation, Musée d'Orsay, Paris.

Figure 144 Maurice Guillemot, “Un Sculpteur Américain ANDREW O’CONNOR”, *L’Art et les Artistes*, 1905, 141-146.

Figure 145 Andrew O’Connor, *The Slave*, c. 1906, marble, 34x10 ¼ x 16 ½ inches (86.4x26x41.9cm), Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia.

Figure 146 Andrew O’Connor, *Vanderbilt Memorial* (detail), St Bartholomew’s Church, New York City, c. 1898.

Figure 147 View of the main hall of the Fifth international art exhibition in the Palace of Fine Arts in Barcelona in 1907. Andrew O’Connor’s *The Slave* is located at the center left of this photograph, documentation Musée d’Orsay, Paris.

Figure 148 Andrew O’Connor, *Vanderbilt Memorial* (detail), St Bartholomew’s Church, New York City, c. 1898.

Figure 149 Andrew O’Connor, *Adam and Eve*, c. 1906, marble, 52 x 62 3/8 x 23 inches, National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C., from the Corcoran Legacy Collection now part of American University, Washington, D.C.

Figure 150 Andrew O’Connor in his studio posing with *Adam and Eve*, n.d., photograph, private collection, Camaiore.

Figure 151 Antoine Wiertz, *The Birth of the Passions*, c. 1860, marble, Musée Wiertz, Brussels.

Figure 152 Andrew O’Connor, *Vanderbilt Memorial* (detail), St Bartholomew’s Church, New York City, c. 1898.

Figure 153 Andrew O’Connor, *A Crucifix*, n.d., marble, on view at the 1917 exhibition at the Galleries of Jacques Seligmann Co., New York City.

Figure 154 Andrew O’Connor, *Desolation* (detail of *Triple Cross*), plaster, 79 x 70cm (31 x 27 ½ inches), Centre for the Study of Irish Art, National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin.

Figure 155 Andrew O'Connor, Cutout of *Desolation*, pencil on paper, private collection, Camaiore.

Figure 156 Andrew O'Connor's *Triple Cross* on view at the 1926 SAF, newspaper illustration, Times Wide World Photos, Paris Bureau.

Figure 157 Andrew O'Connor, Sculptural program for the façade of St Patrick's Cathedral in New York City, n.d., pencil and watercolor on paper, private collection, Camaiore.

Figure 158 Andrew O'Connor, Sculptural program for the façade of St Patrick's Cathedral in New York City, n.d., pencil and collage on paper, private collection, Camaiore.

Figure 159 Andrew O'Connor, *The Ghosts*, n.d, photograph, "Andrew O'Connor Vertical File" (Baltimore, n.d.), The Walters Art Museum.

Figure 160 Andrew O'Connor with *The Ghosts* at the Tate Gallery, London, n.d., photograph, private collection, Dublin.

Figure 161 Andrew O'Connor, *The Victim*, n.d., plaster, private collection, Dublin.

Figure 162 Andrew O'Connor's *The Mother* in the artist's studio, n.d., photograph, private collection, Dublin.

Figure 163 Andrew O'Connor's *The Wife* on display at the Tate Britain, n.d, photograph, "Andrew O'Connor Vertical File" (London, n.d.), Tate Britain.

Figure 164 Unveiling of Rogelio Yrurtia's Monument to Dorrego on July 24, 1926, photograph, 1926, Departamento documentos fotográficos, Archivo general de la nación, Buenos Aires.

Figure 165 Unveiling of Rogelio Yrurtia's Monument to Dorrego on July 24, 1926, photograph, 1926, Departamento documentos fotográficos, Archivo general de la nación, Buenos Aires.

Figure 166 Rogelio Yrurtia, Monument to Dorrego, first maquette, dated July 1907, photograph, Departamento documentos fotográficos, Archivo general de la nación, Buenos Aires.

Figure 167 Rogelio Yrurtia, Early sketch of Fatality for the Monument to Dorrego, dated 1906, pencil on paper, Museo Casa de Yrurtia, Buenos Aires.

Figure 168 Rogelio Yrurtia, Winged figure for the Monument to Dorrego, no date, plaster, Museo Casa de Yrurtia, Buenos Aires.

Figure 169 Rogelio Yrurtia, Monument to Manuel Dorrego, no date, photograph, Archivo Pagano, Buenos Aires.

Figure 170 Rogelio Yrurtia, Monument to Manuel Dorrego, 1907-1926, bronze and stone, plaza Suipacha, Buenos Aires.

Figure 171"Se precisa ubicación para un monumento que nadie sabe donde cuajar," *El telegrafo*, May 26, 1926, "Rogelio Yrurtia Papers" (Buenos Aires, Argentina, n.d.), Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

Figure 172 Auguste Rodin, Monument to Sarmiento, 1896-1900, bronze and marble, Avenida del Libertador y Avenida Sarmiento, Buenos Aires.

Figure 173 Letter from Miguel Cané to Rodin, April 16, 1900, Archive, Musée Rodin. "Vertical File Argentine - Buenos Aires (Monument à Sarmiento)" (Paris, France, n.d.), Archive, Musée Rodin.

Figure 174. "Otra estatua simbólica," *Caras y Caretas*, Buenos Aires, 3rd year, no. 87, June 2, 1900.

Figure 175 Inauguration of Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor* in the Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes in Buenos Aires, *Crítica*, August 10, 1922, Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín, Buenos Aires.

Figure 176 Letter from Rogelio Yrurtia to Antonio Saccagnini, Buenos Aires, October 5, 1925, Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín, Buenos Aires.

Figure 177 Inauguration of Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor* on plaza Dorrego, San Telmo, Buenos Aires, photograph, *Mundo Argentino*, September 14, 1927, Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín, Buenos Aires.

Figure 178 Rogelio Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor* on plaza Dorrego, San Telmo, Buenos Aires, photograph, January 24, 1931, Departamento documentos fotográficos, Archivo general de la nación, Buenos Aires.

Figure 179 Rogelio Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor* on Paseo Colón, Buenos Aires.

Figure 180 Stamps of the Republic of Argentina featuring Yrurtia's *Hymn to Labor* with Eva Perón's words: "Donde existe una necesidad nace un derecho," 2010.

Figure 181 George Grey Barnard's *Life of Humanity* at the Salon des artistes français, photograph, 1910, "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Figure 182 "Entrance of the State Capitol, showing Barnard statues, Harrisburg, PA," postcard, c. 1911, Pennsylvania Capitol Preservation Committee, Pennsylvania State Capitol, Harrisburg.

Figure 183 Roswell Field, "Clothing Prices Low; Why Not Drape the Bernard[sic] Group? U.S. Too Modest to Condone Nudity, Like Wicked Paris," *Chicago Examiner*, January 13, 1911, "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Figure 184 George Grey Barnard's *The Burden of Life* at the Paris 1910 SAF, photograph, 1910, "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Washington, D.C., n.d.), Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Figure 185 George Grey Barnard, *The Burden of Life (The Broken Law)*, South Group, c. 1905-1910, marble, The Pennsylvania State Capitol Building, Harrisburg.

Figure 186 Lucien Métivet, "Au Salon," *Le Rire*, May 23, 1896, no. 81, second year, front page.

Figure 187"Pan – 'Say, That Gives Me an Awful Tired Feeling!'", *New York World*, June 11, 1897. "George Grey Barnard Papers."

Figure 188 George Grey Barnard, *Life of Humanity*, c. 1905-1910, marble, The Pennsylvania State Capitol Building, Harrisburg.

Figure 189 Inauguration Ceremony of Barnard's Statuary, October 4, 1911, photograph. Capitol Preservation Committee, Pennsylvania State Capitol, Harrisburg.

Figure 190 "Unveiling Ceremonies Barnard Statues", medal, c. 1911, Capitol Preservation Committee, Pennsylvania State Capitol, Harrisburg.

Figure 191 *The Famous Barnard Statues*, State Capitol Harrisburg, PA, 1911, postcard, recto, "George Grey Barnard Papers." (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

Figure 192 *The Famous Barnard Statues*, State Capitol Harrisburg, PA, 1911, postcard, verso, "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

Figure 193 Andrew O'Connor, *Le débarquement*, 1918-1931, bronze, Merrion Square, Dublin.

Figure 194 Andrew O'Connor's studio with *The Victim*, 1925, photograph, signed on the verso: "Vizzanova, 65 rue du Bac, Paris, VII" and dated "1925", "Andrew O'Connor Papers" (Dublin, Ireland, n.d.), Center for the Study of Irish Art, National Gallery of Ireland.

Figure 195 Andrew O'Connor, *Christ the King*, c. 1920-1939, bronze, Dun Laoghaire, Ireland.

Figure 196 Andrew O'Connor in his Paris studio with *Le débarquement*, no date, photograph, inscription on lower right side: "Henri Manuel, 27 rue du faubourg Montmartre," private archive, Dublin.

Figure 197 Plaster figures from *Le débarquement* in O'Connor's studio, no date, photograph, "Andrew O'Connor Papers" (Dublin, Ireland, n.d.), Center for the Study of Irish Art, National Gallery of Ireland.

Figure 198 Andrew O'Connor, Sketch of *Le débarquement*, no date, pen and pencil on paper, private archive, Dublin.

Figure 199 "'A Fragment to The Monument to the Dead,' designed by Andrew O'Connor, American Sculptor, the Only One of His Countrymen to Receive a Gold Medal at the Salon des Artistes Français in Paris, Where the Work is Now on Exhibition," *New York Times*, June 23, 1929, "Andrew O'Connor Papers" (Dublin, Ireland, n.d.), Center for the Study of Irish Art, National Gallery of Ireland.

Figure 200 Constantin Meunier, *Le grisou*, 1889-1890, bronze, 151.5x 212x 109.05 cm, Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels.

Figure 201 George Grey Barnard, "War" sketches, no date, pencil on paper on the back of an envelope, "George Grey Barnard Papers" (Philadelphia, PA, n.d.), Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

Figure 202 Andrew O'Connor, *Christ the King*, c. 1920-1939, bronze, Dun Laoghaire, Ireland.

Figure 203 Andrew O'Connor, *Christ the King* (detail), c. 1920-1939, bronze, Dun Laoghaire, Ireland.

Figure 204 Andrew O'Connor, *Memorials of the dead. Aran 1934*, c. 1934, pen on paper, inscription on the lower right corner, private collection, Dublin.

Figure 205 Dardo Cúneo, "¿Es el espíritu porteño enemigo de las estatuas?", *El Hogar*, March 17, 1939, 4-5.

Figure 206"Emplazamiento adecuado de 'El Pensador' de Rodin", in Eduardo Schiaffino, "La urbanización del Municipio de la Capital", *La Nación*, April 25, 1926.

Figure 207 Auguste Rodin, *The Thinker*, 1907, bronze, located on Plaza del Congreso, Buenos Aires.

Figure 208 Rogelio Yrurtia posing with his works in his house museum, c. 1940, photograph, Casa Museo Yrurtia, Buenos Aires.

Figure 209 Statue of Christopher Columbus being removed from its monument behind the Casa Rosada, Buenos Aires. Photograph published in Lucas Parera, "Retiraron la figura de Cristóbal Colón del monumento," *La Nación*, June 29, 2013.

Figure 210. Andrés Zerneri, Monument to Juana Azurduy, 2015, bronze, at its former location behind the Casa Rosada, Buenos Aires.

Figure 211 Display of O'Connor's sculptures at the Hugh Lane, Dublin, film stills from, "Ireland: Dublin Municipal Art Gallery Prepares for Lane Collection," 1959.

Figure 212 Display of O'Connor's sculptures at the Hugh Lane, Dublin, film stills from, "Ireland: Dublin Municipal Art Gallery Prepares for Lane Collection," 1959.

Figure 213 The Cloister of St Michel de Cuxa, Pyrénées-Orientales, no date, postcard, recto, annotated by George Grey Barnard.

Figure 214 The Cloister of St Michel de Cuxa, Pyrénées-Orientales, no date, postcard, verso, annotated by George Grey Barnard.

Figure 215 Kara Walker, *Fons Americanus*, 2019, cork, wood, metal, acrylic and cement composite, 13 meters high, Turbine Hall, Tate Modern, London.

Figure 216 Kehinde Wiley, *Rumors of War*, 2019, bronze, located in front of the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond.

Figure 217 Höweler + Yoon Architecture, *Memorial to Enslaved Laborers*, 2020, granite, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

Figure 218 Manuel Acevedo, *CAM-UP*, 2019, Military Park, Newark.

Bibliography

Archival Collections

Andrew O'Connor Papers. Dublin, Ireland. The Hugh Lane.

Andrew O'Connor Papers. Dublin, Ireland. Center for the Study of Irish Art, National Gallery of Ireland.

Andrew O'Connor Papers. Private Collection.

Andrew O'Connor Vertical File. London, England. Tate Britain.

Andrew O'Connor Vertical File. New York City, NY. Whitney Museum of American Art.

Andrew O'Connor Vertical File. Pittsburgh, PA. Carnegie Museum of Art.

Andrew O'Connor Vertical File. Paris, France. Archives and Documentation Center, Musée Rodin.

Andrew O'Connor Vertical File. Washington, DC. The National Gallery of Art.

Andrew O'Connor Vertical File. Brooklyn, NY. The Brooklyn Museum.

Andrew O'Connor Vertical File. Cleveland, OH. The Cleveland Museum of Art.

Andrew O'Connor Vertical File. Baltimore, MD. The Walters Art Museum.

Andrew O'Connor Vertical File. Paris, France. Documentation Center, Musée d'Orsay.

Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art Records, 1883-1962, Bulk 1885-1940. Washington, DC. Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Christ the King Committee Papers. Dun Laoghaire, Ireland. DLR Lexicon Library.

Comisión Nacional Del Centenario de 1910. Buenos Aires, Argentina. Archivo general de la nación.

Commission of Fine Arts. Washington, DC. RG-66. National Archives.

Daniel Chester French Papers. Washington, DC. The Library of Congress.

Daniel M. Williams Biographical Collection of George Grey Barnard. Philadelphia, PA. Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

Ernesto de La Cárcova Papers. Buenos Aires, Argentina. Academia Nacional de Bellas Artes.

Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino. Buenos Aires, Argentina. Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes.

Fondo Eduardo Schiaffino. Buenos Aires, Argentina. Archivo general de la nación.

Frederick MacMonnies File. Norfolk, VA. The Chrystler Museum of Art.

George Grey Barnard Papers. Pennsylvania State Capitol, Harrisburg, PA. Pennsylvania Capitol Preservation Committee.

George Grey Barnard Papers. Philadelphia, PA. Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives.

George Grey Barnard Papers. Washington, DC. Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

George Grey Barnard Vertical File. Pittsburgh, PA. Carnegie Museum of Art.

George Grey Barnard Vertical File. New York City, NY. Metropolitan Museum of Art, Department of American Painting and Sculpture.

George Grey Barnard Vertical File. Paris, France. Documentation Center, Musée d'Orsay.

George Grey Barnard Vertical File. Paris, France. Archives and Documentation Center, Musée Rodin.

Harold E. Dickson/George Grey Barnard Papers. State College, PA. Centre County Historical Society.

Papers of the Board of the Carnegie Foundation. The Hague, the Netherlands. The Peace Palace.

Records of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital. Records of the Barry Statue Commission. Washington, DC. RG-42. National Archives.

Rogelio Yrurtia File. Paris, France. 20144795/46. Archives nationales de France.

Rogelio Yrurtia File. Buenos Aires, Argentina. Archivo general de la nación, Departamento documentos fotográficos.

Rogelio Yrurtia Papers. Buenos Aires, Argentina. Museo Casa de Yrurtia.

Rogelio Yrurtia Papers. Buenos Aires, Argentina. Archivo Ruiz de Olano, Fundación TAREA/Universidad de San Martín.

Rogelio Yrurtia Vertical File. Paris, France. Archives and Documentation Center, Musée Rodin.

Rogelio Yrurtia Vertical File. Paris, France. Documentation Center, Musée d'Orsay.

Rogelio Yrurtia Vertical File. Buenos Aires, Argentina. Archivo Pagano, Museo de Arte Moderno.

Société Des Artistes Français. Paris, France. Archives and Documentation Center, Musée Rodin.

Société Nationale Des Beaux-Arts. Paris, France. Archives and Documentation Center, Musée Rodin.

Vertical File Argentine. Paris, France. Archive, Musée Rodin.

Vertical File Argentine - Buenos Aires (Monument à Sarmiento). Paris, France. Archive, Musée Rodin.

Vertical File Etats-Unis - St Louis, Exposition. Paris, France. Archive, Musée Rodin.

Vertical File Eugène de Basly. Paris, France. Archive, Musée Rodin.

Vertical File Gustave Gilon. Paris, France. Archive, Musée Rodin.

Vertical File James Vibert. Paris, France. Archive, Musée Rodin.

Vertical File Jean Escoula. Paris, France. Archive, Musée Rodin.

Vertical File John Gutzon de La Mothe Borglum. Paris, France. Archive, Musée Rodin.

Secondary Sources

"A New American Sculptor of Genius." *Current Literature*, March 1907, 281–83.

Academia Nacional de Bellas Artes. *Historia general del arte en la Argentina*. Vol. 7. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Academia Nacional de Bellas Artes, 1995.

Aguerre, Marina. "Espacios simbólicos, espacios de poder: los monumentos conmemorativos de la colectividad italiana en Buenos Aires." In *Italia en el horizonte de las artes plásticas: Argentina, siglos XIX y XX*, 61–88. Buenos Aires: Asociación Dante Alighieri de Buenos Aires, 2000.

Amarger, Antoine, ed. *Rodin en Buenos Aires*. Buenos Aires: Fundación Antorchas, 2001.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1991.

Ando, Erica, J. Rachel Gustafson, and Ellen E. Roberts. *Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney: Sculpture*. West Palm Beach: Norton Museum of Art, 2018.

"Andrew O'Connor. A Sculptor Who Finds His Inspiration in American Leaders and American Youth." *Arts and Decoration* 12 (December 1919): 85.

Appadurai, Arjun. *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Armstrong, Tom, Wayne Craven, Norman Feder, Barbara Haskell, Rosalind E. Krauss, Daniel Robbins, and Marcia Tucker. *200 Years of American Sculpture*. Whitney Museum of American Art. Boston: David R. Godine, 1976.

Ausstellung von Skulptur Werken Zeichnungen Etc. von Andrew O'Connor. Kunstsalon Walther Zimmermann. Maximilianstrasse 38, München, 1906.

Baldasarre, María Isabel. "Buenos Aires: An Art Metropolis in the Late Nineteenth Century." *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide* 16, no. 1 (2017).

———. "Con La Paleta, El Pincel y El Caballete. Los Artistas En Las 'Caricaturas Contemporáneas' de Caras y Caretas." In *Huellas: Búsquedas En Arte y Diseño*, Dirección de Investigación y Desarrollo de la Facultad de Artes y Diseño., 81–96. 9. Mendoza: Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, 2016.

———. *Los dueños del arte: coleccionismo y consumo cultural en Buenos Aires*. Buenos Aires: Edhasa, 2006.

———. "Peregrinaciones al santuario del arte moderno. Obras, artistas e intelectuales de América Latina en el taller de Auguste Rodin." *Nuevo mundo mundos nuevos*, 2017.

Baldasarre, Maria Isabel, Laura Malosetti Costa, and Carolina Vanegas Carrasco. *Ernesto de la Cárcova*. Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes. Buenos Aires, 2016.

Barbillon, Claire, Jérôme Godeau, and Amélie Simier. *Bourdelle et l'antique : une passion moderne*. Paris Musées. Paris, 2017.

Barringer, T. J., Martina Droth, Jason Edwards, and Michael Hatt. *Sculpture Victorious: Art in an Age of Invention, 1837-1901*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014.

Barryte, Bernard, and Roberta K. Tarbell, eds. *Rodin and America: Influence and Adaptation, 1876-1936*. Stanford, CA: Milano, Italy: Iris & B. Gerald Cantor Center for Visual Arts, Stanford University; Silvana Editoriale, 2011.

Baxandall, Michael. *Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

Beach, Caitlin. "John Bell's American Slave in the Context of Production and Patronage." *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide* 15, no. 2 (2016).

Beausire, Alain, and Hélène Pinet. *Correspondance de Rodin*. Paris : Musée Rodin, 1985.

Beramendi, Jorge Fernando. *Rogelio Yrurtia*. Fundación Juan de Garay. Buenos Aires, 2009.

Berger, Martin A. *Sight Unseen: Whiteness and American Visual Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

Berlemont, Johanne. "Le Monument de La Bataille de La Marne: « America's Gift to France »." *The Tocqueville Review/La Revue Tocqueville* 38, no. 2 (2017): 255–67.

Berman, Marshall. *All That Is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982.

Blake, Casey Nelson, William C Agee, Marilyn S Kushner, and Kimberly Orcutt. *The Armory Show at 100: Modernism and Revolution*. New York; London: New York Historical Society, 2013.

Bobrowska-Jabulovski, Ewa. "Le Milieu Des Artistes Polonais En France 1890-1918." Université Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne, 2001.

Bogart, Michele Helene. "In Search of a United Front: American Architectural Sculpture at the Turn of the Century." *Winterthur Portfolio* 19, no. 2 (1984): 151–76.

———. *Public Sculpture and the Civic Ideal in New York City, 1890-1930*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Böger, Astrid. *Envisioning the Nation: The Early American World's Fairs and the Formation of Culture*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag, 2010.

Bondil, Nathalie, and Sophie Biass-Fabiani. *Metamorphoses: In Rodin's Studio*. Milan; Montreal: 5 Continents Editions: The Montreal Museum of Fine Arts, 2015.

Bonnet, Alain. *L'enseignement des arts au XIXe siècle : la réforme de l'Ecole des Beaux-Arts de 1863 à la fin du modèle académique*. Rennes : Presses Universitaire de Rennes, 2006.

Bouchard, Marie. *Les quatre projets du "Monument au travail" d'Henri Bouchard (1902-1906)*. Bulletin de l'Association des amis d'Henri Bouchard 34. Paris : Association des amis d'Henri Bouchard, 1984.

Bouillon, Jean-Paul. "Sociétés d'artistes et institutions officielles dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle." *Romantisme* 16, no. 54 (1986): 89–113.

Bozo, Dominique, ed. *Qu'est-Ce Que La Sculpture Moderne ?* Paris : Centre Georges Pompidou, 1986.

Brauer, Fae. *Rivals and Conspirators: The Paris Salons and the Modern Art Centre*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014.

Brugeat, Céline. "Monuments on the Move: The Transfer of French Medieval Heritage Overseas in the Early Twentieth Century." *Journal for Art Market Studies* 2, no. 2 (May 24, 2018).

Burns, Emily. "'A Baby's Unconsciousness' in Sculpture: Modernism, Nationalism, Frederick MacMonnies and George Grey Barnard in Fin-De-Siècle Paris." *The Sculpture Journal* 27, no. 1 (2018): 89–103.

———. "'With Eyes Half Shut': George Grey Barnard, the Innocent Eye, and American Nationalism in Paris." In *Prestige in Modern and Contemporary Sculpture: Modern Sculpture and the Question of Status*, edited by Cristina Rodríguez Samaniego and Irene Gras Valero. Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona, 2018.

Burollet, Thérèse, and Virginie Delcourt. *Albert Bartholomé : le sculpteur et la mort*. Le Havre ; MuMa, Musée d'art moderne André Malraux ; Paris : Somogy, 2011.

Butler, Ruth. "Rodin and the Paris Salon." In *Rodin Rediscovered*, 19–49. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1981.

———. *Rodin: The Shape of Genius*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

Carpenter, Andrew, Rachel Moss, Nicola Figgis, Paula Murphy, Rolf Loeber, and Catherine Marshall, eds. *Art and Architecture of Ireland*. Dublin: London: Royal Irish Academy; The Paul Mellon Centre, 2014.

Carter, Karen L., Susan Waller, and Norma Broude, eds. *Foreign Artists and Communities in Modern Paris, 1870-1914: Strangers in Paradise*. Farnham Surrey, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2015.

Cattaruzza, Alejandro. *Historia de La Argentina: 1916-1955*. Biblioteca Básica de Historia. Buenos Aires: Siglo Veintiuno Editores; Fundación OSDE, 2009.

Cazes, Laurent. "L'Europe des arts : La participation des peintres étrangers au Salon, Paris 1852-1900." Université Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne, 2015.

Champy-Vinas, Cécilie, and Cécile Bertran. *Meunier, Dalou, Rodin... : les sculpteurs du travail*. Gand : Snoeck ; Nogent-sur-Seine : Musée Camille Claudel, 2020.

Chevillot, Catherine. *La sculpture à Paris : 1905-1914, le moment de tous les possibles*. Vanves : Hazan, 2017.

Chevillot, Catherine, and Antoinette Le Normand-Romain. *Rodin : Le Livre du Centenaire*. Paris : Réunion des musées nationaux, 2017.

Chevillot, Catherine, Musée d'Orsay, and Fundación Mapfre. *Oublier Rodin ? La sculpture à Paris, 1905-1914*. Paris: Hazan, 2009.

Clark, Henry Nichols Blake, and William H Gerdts. *A Marble Quarry: The James H. Ricau Collection of Sculpture at the Chrysler Museum of Art*. New York: Hudson Hills Press in association with the Chrysler Museum of Art, 1997.

Claustrat, Frank. “Les artistes Suédois à Paris 1908-1935 : tradition, modernisme et création.” Université Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne, 1994.

Cole, Michael Wayne. *Cellini and the Principles of Sculpture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Colom González, Francisco, ed. *Relatos de nación: La construcción de las identidades nacionales en el mundo hispánico*. 2 vols. Madrid: Iberoamericana - Vervuert, 2005.

Corsani, Patricia. *Lola Mora: El poder del mármol: obra pública en Buenos Aires, 1900-1907*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Vestales, 2009.

Cortissoz, Royal. *American Artists*. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1923.

———. “The Work of Andrew O’Connor.” *Art and Progress* 1, no. 12 (October 1910): 343–49.

Craven, Wayne. *Sculpture in America: From the Colonial Period to the Present*. New York : Crowell, 1968.

Crespon-Halotier, Béatrice. *Les peintres britanniques dans les salons parisiens des origines à 1939 : répertoire*. Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art. Dijon: Echelle de Jacob, 2003.

Cullen, Fintan. *Ireland on Show: Art, Union, and Nationhood*. Farnham, Surrey; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012.

Cúneo, Dardo. “¿Es El Espíritu Porteño Enemigo de Las Estatuas?” *El Hogar*, March 17, 1939.

Curiel, Gustavo, Renato González Mello, and Juana Gutiérrez Haces, eds. *Arte, historia e identidad en América: visiones comparativas*. Estudios de arte y estéticas 37. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas, 1994.

Curtis, Penelope. “After Rodin: The Problem of the Statue in Twentieth-Century Sculpture.” In *Rodin, the Zola of Sculpture*, edited by Claudine Mitchell, 237–44. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004.

———. “Émile Antoine Bourdelle and Monumental Sculpture.” Courtauld Institute, 1990.

———. *Sculpture 1900-1945: After Rodin*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Curtis, Penelope, and Paolo Campiglio. *Scultura lingua morta: Scultura nell’Italia Fascista; Dead language sculpture: sculpture from Fascist Italy*. Leeds: Henry Moore Institute, 2003.

Curtis, Penelope, and Keith Wilson, eds. *Modern British Sculpture*. London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2011.

Dabakis, Melissa. *A Sisterhood of Sculptors: American Artists in Nineteenth-Century Rome*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2014.

———. *Visualizing Labor in American Sculpture: Monuments, Manliness, and the Work Ethic, 1880-1935*. Cambridge Studies in American Visual Culture. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Desmaroux, Hélène. *L'œuvre du sculpteur O'Connor*. Paris : Librairie de France, 1927.

Dhaenens, Laurens. "Mapping the Texts and Travels of Eduardo Schiaffino between 1882 and 1891: A Study of An Itinerary between Countries, Languages, Perspectives and Positions." *Caiana. Revista de Historia Del Arte y Cultura Visual Del Centro Argentino de Investigadores de Arte (CAIA)*, no. 7 (2015): 37–54.

Dickson, Harold Edward. "Barnard and Norway." *Art Bulletin* 44, no. 1 (March 1962): 55–59.

———. "Barnard's Sculptures for the Pennsylvania Capitol." *Art Quarterly* 22, no. 3 (Summer 1959): 126–47.

———, ed. *George Grey Barnard: Centenary Exhibition, 1863-1963*. University Park, Pa: Pennsylvania State University Library and the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, Harrisburg, 1964.

———. "George Grey Barnard's Controversial Lincoln." *Art Journal* 27, no. 1 (Autumn 1967): 8–15.

———. "Log of a Masterpiece: Barnard's 'The Struggle of the Two Natures of Man.'" *Art Journal* 20, no. 3 (Spring 1961): 139–43.

———. "The Origin of the Cloisters." *The Art Quarterly* 28, no. 4 (1965): 253–74.

———. "The Other Orphan." *American Art Journal* 1, no. 2 (Fall 1969): 108–18.

Diderot, Denis. *Salons*. Edited by Michel Delon. Gallimard. Paris, 2013.

Droth, Martina, and Michael Hatt. "The Greek Slave by Hiram Powers: A Transatlantic Object." *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide* 15, no. 2 (2016).

Dryfhout, John. *The Work of Augustus Saint-Gaudens*. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1982.

Dugnat, Gaïte, ed. *Les catalogues des Salons de la Société Nationale des Beaux-Arts*. Paris : Échelle de Jacob, 2000.

Duprat, Andrés, Mariana Marchesi, Patricia Corsani, and Paola Melgarejo. *Rodin. Centenario en Bellas Artes*. Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes. Argentina, 2018.

Édouard-Joseph, René. *Dictionnaire biographique des artistes contemporains, 1910-1930*. Paris : Art & édition, 1930.

"El Concurso de Pensionados." *Caras y Caretas, Buenos Aires*, November 25, 1899.

Elsen, Albert E. *In Rodin's Studio: A Photographic Record of Sculpture in the Making*. Oxford: Ithaca, N.Y: Phaidon Press; Cornell University Press, 1980.

———. *Origins of Modern Sculpture: Pioneers and Premises*. New York: G. Braziller, 1974.

———. *Rodin*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1963.

———. ed. *Rodin Rediscovered*. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1981.

———. *Rodin's Thinker and the Dilemmas of Modern Public Sculpture*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

———. *The Partial Figure in Modern Sculpture: From Rodin to 1969*. Baltimore, 1969.

Eschelbacher, Andrew, ed. *A New American Sculpture, 1914-1945: Lachaise, Laurent, Nadelman, and Zorach*. Portland, Maine: Fort Worth, Texas: Portland Museum of Art; Amon Carter Museum of American Art, 2017.

———. "Environment of Memory: Paris and Post-Commune Angst." *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide* 8, no. 2 (2009).

Espantoso Rodríguez, Teresa. "Imágenes para la nación argentina: conformación de un eje monumental urbano en Buenos Aires entre 1811 y 1910." In *Arte, historia e identidad en América: visiones comparativas*, edited by Gustavo Curiel, Renato González Mello, and Juana Gutiérrez Haces, 2:345–60. 37. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas, 1994.

Espantoso Rodríguez, Teresa, and Cristina Serventi. "Mausoleo a Bernardino Rivadavia." *Estudios e Investigaciones Instituto de Teoría e Historia Del Arte Julio E. Payro*, no. 4 (1991): 161–97.

Exposition des œuvres du sculpteur O'Connor du 3 au 19 mai 1909. Galerie A-A. Hébrard. 8 rue Royale, Paris, 1909.

Fava-Piz, Clarisse. "From Commodore John Barry to Le Débarquement: Embodying Mobility in Andrew O'Connor's Oeuvre." In *Sculpting Abroad: Nationality and Mobility of Sculptors in the Nineteenth Century*, edited by Marjan Sterckx and Tom Verschaffel, Brepols Publishers., 85–97. Turnhout, 2020.

———. "Spanish Sculptors and the Paris 'Salon Culture', 1880–1914: The Case of Miguel Blay y Fábrega." *Sculpture Journal* 27, no. 1 (2018): 47–60.

Fehrer, Catherine. *The Julian Academy, Paris: 1868-1939*. Shepherd Gallery. New York, 1989.

Fink, Lois Marie. *American Art at the Nineteenth-Century Paris Salons*. Washington, D.C.: Cambridge; New York: National Museum of American Art, Smithsonian Institution; Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Fort, Ilene Susan, and Mary L. Lenihan. *The Figure in American Sculpture: A Question of Modernity*. Los Angeles, Calif: Los Angeles County Museum of Art in association with University of Washington Press, 1995.

Fusco, Peter, and H. W. Janson, eds. *The Romantics to Rodin: French Nineteenth-Century Sculpture from North American Collections*. Los Angeles, Ca: New York: Los Angeles County Museum of Art; G. Braziller, 1980.

Galesio, María Florencia, ed. *Memoria de la escultura 1895-1914: colección MNBA*. Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes. Buenos Aires, 2013.

Goldscheider, Cécile, ed. *Auguste Rodin, 1840-1917: An Exhibition of Sculptures and Drawings*. New York: Charles E. Slatkin Galleries, 1963.

García Canclini, Néstor. *Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity*. Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, 2005.

Garcin, Marie Françoise Bénédicte. "Les sculpteurs allemands ayant exposé à Paris au début de la Troisième République 1867-1904. Contribution à l'étude des relations franco-allemandes." Master thesis, Ecole du Louvre, 1978.

Garvey, Timothy J. *Public Sculptor: Lorado Taft and the Beautification of Chicago*. Urbana : University of Illinois Press, 1988.

Gaudichon, Bruno, ed. *Des amitiés modernes : De Rodin à Matisse : Carolus-Duran et La Société Nationale des Beaux-Arts, 1890-1905*. Paris : Roubaix : Somogy ; La Piscine, Musée d'art et d'industrie de Roubaix, 2003.

Gell, Alfred. *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Getsy, David. *Body Doubles: Sculpture in Britain, 1877-1905*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.

———. *Sculpture and the Pursuit of a Modern Ideal in Britain, c. 1880-1930*. Aldershot, Hants, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004.

Gibbon, Monk. "Andrew O'Connor Sculptor." *Ireland of the Welcomes* 24, no. 2 (April 1975): 7–10.

Gluzman, Georgina. "Reflexiones sobre la actuación y obra de Lía Correa Morales en el Museo Yrurtia." *Anais Do Museu Paulista, São Paulo* 20, no. 2 (2012): 93–118.

———. *Trazos invisibles: mujeres artistas en Buenos Aires (1890-1923)*. Editorial Biblos. Buenos Aires, 2016.

Goldwater, Robert John. *What Is Modern Sculpture?* New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1969.

Gorelik, Adrián. *La Grilla y El Parque: Espacio Público y Cultura Urbana En Buenos Aires, 1887-1936*. Buenos Aires: Universidad Nacional de Quilmes, 1998.

Greet, Michele. "An International Proving Ground: Latin American Artists at the Paris Salons." *Nuevo Mundo Mundos Nuevos*, June 6, 2017.

———. *Transatlantic Encounters: Latin American Artists in Paris Between the Wars*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018.

Grigsby, Darcy Grimaldo. *Colossal: Engineering the Suez Canal, Statue of Liberty, Eiffel Tower, and Panama Canal: Transcontinental Ambition in France and the United States During the Long Nineteenth Century*. Pittsburgh, PA; New York: Periscope Pub, 2012.

Gsell, Paul. "L'art français moderne. A propos du Salon du Champ de Mars." *Revue Politique et Littéraire : Revue Bleue*, no. 29 (1892) : 760–64.

Guillemot, Maurice. "Un sculpteur américain : Andrew O'Connor." *L'Art et Les Artistes*, July 1905, 141–46.

Gutierrez, Nicolás Gabriel. *Mármol y Bronce: Esculturas de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires*. Olmo Ediciones. Buenos Aires, 2015.

Gutman, Margarita, and Thomas Ford Reese, eds. *Buenos Aires 1910: El imaginario para una gran capital*. 22. Buenos Aires: Eudeba, 1999.

Hack, Brian. "American Acropolis: George Grey Barnard's 'Monument to Democracy', 1918-1938." City University of New York, 2008.

Hamill, Sarah. *David Smith in Two Dimensions: Photography and the Matter of Sculpture*. Oakland, Ca.: University of California Press, 2015.

Hargrove, June Ellen. *The Statues of Paris: An Open-Air Pantheon*. New York: Vendome Press, 1989.

Hargrove, June Ellen, and Neil McWilliam, eds. *Nationalism and French Visual Culture, 1870-1914*. Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 2005.

Harvey, David. *Paris, Capital of Modernity*. New York: Routledge, 2003.

Haskell, Francis, and Nicholas Penny. *Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture 1500-1900*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1981.

Heinich, Nathalie. *Être artiste : les transformations du statut des peintres et des sculpteurs*. Paris: Klincksieck, 2012.

Higonnet, Anne. “The Social Life of Provenance.” In *Provenance: An Alternate History of Art*, edited by Gail Feigenbaum and Inge Jackson Reist. Issues & Debates. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2012.

Huebner, Steven, and Federico Lazzaro, eds. *Artistic Migration and Identity in Paris, 1870-1940: Migration Artistique et Identité à Paris, 1870-1940*. New York: Peter Lang, 2020.

Hunisak, John M. “Rodin, Dalou, and the Monument to Labor.” In *Art the Ape of Nature*, edited by Moshe Barasch and Lucy Freeman Sandler, Harry N. Abrams., 689–705. New York, 1981.

Husband, Timothy B. “Creating the Cloisters.” *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 70, no. 4 (2013): 1–48.

Ignatiev, Noel. *How the Irish Became White*. Routledge. London and New York, 2015.

Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, Mass; London, 1999.

Janson, Horst W. *19th-Century Sculpture*. New York: Abrams, 1985.

———. *La scultura nel XIX secolo*. Bologna: Ed. Clueb, 1984.

Joseph, Edouard. *Dictionnaire biographique des artistes contemporains 1910-1930*. Art Édition. Paris, 1931.

Joyeux-Prunel, Béatrice. “L’art de la mesure : Le Salon d’Automne (1903-1914), l’avant-garde, ses étrangers et la nation française.” *Histoire & mesure* Vol. XXII, no. 1 (2007): 145–82.

———. *Les avant-gardes artistiques 1848-1918 : Une histoire transnationale*. Folio Histoire. Paris : Gallimard, 2015.

———. *Nul n’est prophète en son pays ? L’internationalisation de la peinture des avant-gardes parisiennes, 1855-1914*. Paris: N. Chaudun : Musée d’Orsay, 2009.

———. “The Uses and Abuses of Peripheries in Art History.” *Artl@s Bulletin* 3, no. 1 (June 24, 2014).

Junyk, Ihor. *Foreign Modernism: Cosmopolitanism, Identity, and Style in Paris*. Toronto; Buffalo; London: University of Toronto Press, 2013.

Kahn, Gustave. “Un sculpteur américain Andrew O’Connor.” *L’art et les artistes* 4 (July 1905): 142–43.

Kaspi, André, and Antoine Marès, eds. *Le Paris des étrangers depuis un siècle*. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1989.

Kaufmann, Thomas DaCosta, Catherine Dossin, and Béatrice Joyeux-Prunel, eds. *Circulations in the Global History of Art*. Farnham Surrey, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2015.

Kearns, James, and Alister Mill, eds. *The Paris Fine Art Salon/Le Salon, 1791-1881*. French Studies of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries 33. Oxford : Peter Lang, 2015.

Kearns, James, and Pierre Vaisse, eds. *"Ce salon à quoi tout se ramène" : Le salon de peinture et de sculpture, 1791-1890*. 26. Bern, Switzerland; New York: Peter Lang, 2010.

Kennicott, Philip. "A Powerful New Memorial to U-Va.'s Enslaved Workers Reclaims Lost Lives and Forgotten Narratives." *Washington Post*, August 13, 2020.

Korobkin, R. Tess. "The Greek Slave and Materialities of Reproduction." *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide* 15, no. 2 (2016).

Krauss, Rosalind E. *Passages in Modern Sculpture*. New York: Viking Press, 1977.

———. "Sculpture in the Expanded Field." *October* 8, no. Spring (1979): 30–44.

———. *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1985.

La sculpture du XIXe Siècle, une mémoire retrouvée : Les fonds de sculpture. Rencontres de l'Ecole Du Louvre. Paris : Documentation française, 1986.

Lagrange, Marion. *Les peintres italiens en quête d'identité : Paris 1855-1909*. Paris : INHA, Institut national d'histoire de l'art, 2010.

Le Men, Ségolène, and Aline Magnien, eds. *La statuaire publique au XIXe siècle*. Paris : Monum, 2004.

Le Normand-Romain, Antoinette. "Le symbolisme." In *La sculpture française du XIXe siècle*, 380–92. Paris : Réunion des musées nationaux, 1982.

———. *Rodin*. Paris : Citadelles & Mazenod, 2013.

———. *Rodin : La porte de l'enfer*. Paris: Musée Rodin, 1999.

———. *Rodin: The Burghers of Calais*. Paris : Musée Rodin, 2001.

Lebon, Elisabeth. *Dictionnaire des fondeurs de bronze d'art : France, 1890-1950*. Perth: Marjon, 2003.

Lemmey, Karen. "From Skeleton to Skin: The Making of the Greek Slave(s)." *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide* 15, no. 2 (2016).

Leroi, Paul. "Salon de 1906." *L'art. Revue Mensuelle Illustrée* 66 (1906).

Lobstein, Dominique. *Dictionnaire des indépendants, 1884-1914*. Dijon : Echelle de Jacob, 2003.

———. *Les salons au XIXe siècle : Paris, capitale des arts*. Paris : La Martinière, 2006.

Loiácono, Erika. “Campos de poder: el monumento a la bandera de Rogelio Yrurtia.” In *IX Jornadas de Estudios e Investigaciones Artes Visuales y Música*, 351–62. Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina, 2010.

———. “Fatalidad y victoria. El monumento al coronel Dorrego de Rogelio Yrurtia.” In *Revista de Artes*, 18:171–87. Avances. Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Córdoba, Argentina: Centro de Producción e Investigación en Artes de la Facultad de Artes / Centro de Investigaciones de la Facultad de Filosofía y Humanidades, 2010.

———. “Festejos monumentales en 1910: el pueblo de mayo en marcha de Rogelio Yrurtia.” In *Revista de Artes*, 22:103–19. Avances. Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Córdoba, Argentina: Centro de Producción e Investigación en Artes de la Facultad de Artes / Centro de Investigaciones de la Facultad de Filosofía y Humanidades, 2012.

———. “Fragmentos de admiración: El Canto al Trabajo de Rogelio Yrurtia.” In *VII Jornadas Nacionales de Investigación en Arte en Argentina*, 9. La Plata, Argentina, 2010.

———. “Modernidad y pecados. Las Pecadoras de Rogelio Yrurtia en la pluma de Rubén Dario.” In *La Autonomía Del Arte: Debates En La Teoría y La Praxis*, 365–77. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Centro Argentino de Investigadores de Artes, 2011.

———. “Pecados Efímeros. La construcción pública de la imagen de Rogelio Yrurtia (1899-1905).” Master’s thesis, IDAES, UNSAM, 2012.

———. “Tras los pasos de la ciencia: El monumento al Dr. Alejandro Castro de Rogelio Yrurtia.” In *Revista de Artes*, 19:165–76. Avances. Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Córdoba, Argentina: Centro de Producción e Investigación en Artes de la Facultad de Artes / Centro de Investigaciones de la Facultad de Filosofía y Humanidades, 2011.

———. “Un quiebre en la representación del prócer argentino: el monumento a Bernardino Rivadavia de Rogelio Yrurtia.” In *Arte Americano e Independencia. Nuevas Iconografías. Quintas jornadas de historia de arte*, edited by Fernando Guzmán and Juan Manuel Martínez, 107–16. Santiago de Chile, Chile, 2010.

Louisiana Purchase Exposition Saint Louis. *Official Catalogue of Exhibitors. Universal Exposition, St. Louis, U. S. A. 1904. Division of Exhibits ... Department B. Art.* St. Louis: For the Committee on press and publicity, by the Official catalogue company (inc.), 1904.

Lovett, Laura L. *Conceiving the Future: Pronatalism, Reproduction, and the Family in the United States, 1890-1938.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009.

Luke, Megan R., and Sarah Hamill, eds. *Photography and Sculpture: The Art Object in Reproduction*. Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute, 2017.

Magaz, María del Carmen. *Escultura y poder en el espacio público*. Buenos Aires: Acervo Editora Argentina, 2007.

Mainardi, Patricia. *Art and Politics of the Second Empire: Universal Expositions of 1855 and 1867*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

———. *The End of the Salon: Art and the State in the Early Third Republic*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Maingon, Claire, and Daniel Bergez. *Le Salon et ses artistes : une histoire des expositions du Roi Soleil aux artistes français*. Paris: Hermann, 2009.

Malosetti Costa, Laura. "Arte e historia en los festejos del centenario de la revolución de mayo en Buenos Aires." *Caiana. Revista electrónica de Historia del Arte y Cultura Visual del Centro Argentino de Investigadores de Arte (CAIA)*, no. 1 (2012): 12.

———, ed. *Cuadros de viaje: artistas argentinos En Europa y Estados Unidos, 1880-1910*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2008.

———. *Primeros modernos: Arte y sociedad en Buenos Aires a fines del siglo XIX*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2001.

Malosetti Costa, Laura, and Diana Wechsler. "La iconografía nacional del mundo hispánico. iconografías nacionales en el cono sur." In *Relatos de nación: La construcción de las identidades nacionales en el mundo hispánico*, edited by Francisco Colom González, 2:1177–98. Madrid; Frankfurt am Main: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto de Filosofía: Organización de Estados Iberoamericanos; Iberoamericana; Vervuert, 2005.

Marcoci, Roxana, Geoffrey Batchen, and Tobia Bezzola. *The Original Copy: Photography of Sculpture, 1839 to Today*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2010.

Marshall, Christopher R. *Sculpture and the Museum*. Farnham, Surrey; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011.

Martin-Fugier, Anne. *La vie d'artiste au XIXe siècle*. Paris : L. Audibert, 2007.

Mauclair, Camille. "Le Salon de la Société des artistes français en 1903." *La Revue Bleue*, 1903, 624–29.

Maurice Agulhon. "La « statuomanie » et l'histoire." *Ethnologie française* 8, no. 2/3 (1978) : 145–72.

McCarthy, Laurette E. *Walter Pach (1883-1958): The Armory Show and the Untold Story of Modern Art in America*. University Park, Pa: Penn State University Press, 2012.

McCullough, David G. *The Greater Journey: Americans in Paris*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2011.

Meagher, Timothy J. *Inventing Irish America: Generation, Class, and Ethnic Identity in a New England City, 1880-1928*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.

M.G. “Les monuments de Rodin.” *L’art décoratif,* first semester (October 1898): 205–6.

Ministerio de educación y justicia. *El Monumento a La Revolución de Mayo. Dos Proyectos de Rogelio Yrurtia*. Buenos Aires: Museo Casa de Yrurtia, 1959.

Moffatt, Frederick C. *Errant Bronzes: George Grey Barnard’s Statues of Abraham Lincoln*. Newark: London: University of Delaware Press; Associated University Presses, 1998.

Morice, Charles. “Art Moderne.” *Mercure de France*, March 16, 1909, 365–69.

Mumford, Lewis. “The Death of the Monument.” In *Circle; International Survey of Constructive Art*, edited by Leslie Martin, Ben Nicholson, and Naum Gabo, 263–70. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971.

Murphy, Paula. *Nineteenth-Century Irish Sculpture: Native Genius Reaffirmed*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2010.

Museo Casa de Yrurtia, ed. *Catálogo*. Ministerio de Educación y Justicia. Buenos Aires, 1957.

———, ed. *Dibujos de Rogelio Yrurtia*. Ministerio de Educación y Justicia. Buenos Aires, 1962.

Nelson, Alice M. “George Grey Barnard, Le Rodin Américain.” *La Flandre Libérale*. April 18, 1938.

O’Connor, Andrew. *Exhibition of the Works of the Sculptor O’Connor: The Galleries of Jacques Seligmann Co*. Paxton, Massachusetts, 1917.

O’Neill, Morna. *Hugh Lane: The Art Market and the Art Museum, 1893-1915*. Yale University Press. New Haven and London, 2018.

Pachet, Pierre, and Antoinette Le Normand-Romain. *Du fragment*. Ophrys. Paris : Institut national d’histoire de l’art, 2011.

Pagano, José León. *El arte de los argentinos*. Buenos Aires: Edición del autor, 1940.

Painter, Nell Irvin. *The History of White People*. New York; London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2011.

Paulino, Carla, Ana Teresa Santos, Benjamin Lamblin, and Patrícia Simões. *The Pose: Rethinking Sculpture in 19th-Century Paris*. Lisbon: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, 2018.

Pène du Bois, Guy. “Andrew O’Connor and His Sculpture.” *International Studio* 86 (January 1927): 55–61.

Penhos, Marta, Diana Wechsler, and Miguel Angel Muñoz. *Tras los pasos de la norma: salones nacionales de bellas artes (1911-1989)*. Ediciones del Jilguero. Buenos Aires, 1999.

Penny, Nicholas. *The Materials of Sculpture*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

Pinet, Hélène, ed. *Rodin et la photographie*. Paris: Gallimard: Musée Rodin, 2007.

Pingeot, Anne, ed. *La sculpture française du XIXe siècle*. Paris : Réunion des musées nationaux, 1982.

———, ed. *Le corps en morceaux*. Paris : Réunion des musées nationaux, 1990.

Potterton, Homan. "A Celtic Sculptor in America: The Monuments of Andrew O'Connor (1874-1941)." *Country Life* 155, no. 3993 (1974): 16–17.

———. *Andrew O'Connor 1874-1941: A Complementary Catalogue to the Exhibition Marking the Centenary of the Sculptor's Birth*. Trinity College, Dublin: Gifford & Craven, 1974.

———. "The Sculptors O'Connor: Andrew Snr. 1847-1924. Andrew Jnr. 1874-1941" 13 (1997): 210–11.

Potts, Alex. *Flesh and the Ideal: Winckelmann and the Origins of Art History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

———. *The Sculptural Imagination: Figurative, Modernist, Minimalist*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

Promey, Sally M. *Painting Religion in Public: John Singer Sargent's Triumph of Religion at the Boston Public Library*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Rambosson, Yvanhoe. "La sculpture aux Salons." *L'art Décoratif*, second semester (June 1899).

Richemond, Stéphane. *Les salons des artistes coloniaux suivi d'un dictionnaire des sculpteurs*. Paris : Éditions de l'Amateur, 2003.

Rinaldini, Julio. *Rogelio Yrurtia*. Losada. Buenos Aires, 1942.

Roberts, Jennifer L., ed. *Scale*. Chicago: Terra Foundation for American Art, 2016.

———. *Transporting Visions: The Movement of Images in Early America*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014.

Rodin, Auguste, and Dominique Dupuis-Labbé. *Les cathédrales de France*. Paris : Bartillat, 2012.

Rodin en 1900 : l'exposition de l'Alma. Paris : Réunion des musées nationaux, 2001.

Rodríguez Samaniego, Cristina, and Irene Gras Valero, eds. *Prestige in Modern and Contemporary Sculpture: Modern Sculpture and the Question of Status*. Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona, 2018.

Roediger, David R. *Working Toward Whiteness: How America's Immigrants Became White*. Basic Books. New York, 2018.

Romero, José Luis. *Breve historia de la Argentina*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2013.

Rosenbaum, Julia. "Displaying Civic Culture: The Controversy over Frederick MacMonnies' 'Bacchante.'" *American Art* 14, no. 3 (October 1, 2000): 41–57.

Rydell, Robert W. *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Rydell, Robert W, and Brandon Brame Fortune, eds. *Revisiting the White City: American Art at the 1893 World's Fair*. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1993.

Sábato, Hilda. *Historia de La Argentina: 1852-1890*. Buenos Aires: Siglo Veintiuno Editores: Fundación OSDE, 2012.

Sanchez, Pierre. *Dictionnaire du salon d'automne : répertoire des exposants et liste des œuvres présentées, 1903-1945*. Dijon : Echelle de Jacob, 2006.

Sanchez, Pierre, and Stéphane Richemond. *La Société coloniale des artistes français puis Société des beaux-arts de la France d'outre-mer : répertoire des exposants et liste de leurs œuvres, 1908-1970*. Dijon : L'échelle de Jacob, 2010.

Sanchez, Pierre, and Xavier Seydoux, eds. *Les catalogues des salons*. Paris : Echelle de Jacob, 1999.

Sanxay, Olive. "'Parentage of Genius. The Story of George Gray [Sic] Barnard's Life and Work.'" *The Indianapolis News*, October 4, 1898.

Savage, Kirk. *Monument Wars: Washington, D.C., the National Mall, and the Transformation of the Memorial Landscape*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009.

———. *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War, and Monument in Nineteenth-Century America*. 2nd edition: 2018. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Schiaffino, Eduardo. "La Urbanización Del Municipio de La Capital." *La Nación*. April 25, 1926.

———. *Urbanización de Buenos Aires*. Buenos Aires: M. Gleizer, 1927.

Schrader, J. L. "George Grey Barnard: The Cloisters and the Abbaye." *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 37, no. 1 (1979): 3–52.

Senie, Harriet, and Sally Webster, eds. *Critical Issues in Public Art: Content, Context, and Controversy*. New York: IconEditions, 1992.

Sherman, Daniel J. *Worthy Monuments: Art Museums and the Politics of Culture in Nineteenth-Century France*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Simier, Amélie, Claire Boisseroles, and Stéphane Ferrand. *Transmission / Transgression : Maîtres et Élèves Dans l'atelier : Rodin, Bourdelle, Giacometti, Richier...* Musée Bourdelle. Paris : Paris Musées, 2018.

Simier, Amélie, and Marine Kisiel. *Jules Dalou, le sculpteur de la République : catalogue des sculptures de Jules Dalou conservées au Petit Palais*. Paris: Paris Musées, 2013.

Smith, Anthony D. *The Nation Made Real: Art and National Identity in Western Europe, 1600-1850*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Smith, Elizabeth Bradford, Kathryn McClintock, R. Aaron Rottner, and Sarah Andrews. *Medieval Art in America: Patterns of Collecting, 1800-1940*. University Park, Pa.: Palmer Museum of Art, the Pennsylvania State University, 1996.

Soderman, Doris Flodin. *The Sculptors O'Connor: Andrew Sr., 1847-1924, Andrew Jr., 1874-1941*. Worcester, MA: Gundi Publishers, 1995.

Steinberg, Leo. *Other Criteria: Confrontations with Twentieth-Century Art*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Sternberg, Maximilian. "Modern Stagings of the Medieval at the Schnütgen-Museum in Cologne (1910–1939)." *The Art Bulletin* 102, no. 1 (January 2, 2020): 79–105.

Stevens, Walter Barlow, and William Herman Rau. *The Forest City: Comprising the Official Photographic Views of the Universal Exposition Held in Saint Louis, 1904: Commemorating the Acquisition of the Louisiana Territory*. Saint Louis: Puritan Pub. Co., 1904.

Syson, Luke, Sheena Wagstaff, Emerson Bowyer, Brinda Kumar, and Bharti Kher, eds. *Like Life: Sculpture, Color, and the Body*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2018.

Taft, Lorado. *Modern Tendencies in Sculpture*. The Scammon Lectures for 1917. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1921.

———. *The History of American Sculpture*. New ed., rev [1903]. New York: The Macmillan company, 1924.

Tarbell, Roberta K. "The Impact of the Armory Show on American Sculpture." *Archives of American Art Journal* 18, no. 2 (1978): 2–11.

Ternavasio, Marcela. *Historia de La Argentina 1806-1852*. Siglo veintiuno editores. Buenos Aires, 2009.

Terpak, Frances, Rebecca Peabody, Steven Nelson, and Dominic Richard David Thomas, eds. *Visualizing Empire: Africa, Europe, and the Politics of Representation*. Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute, 2021.

Testard, Maurice. “Andrew O’Connor: Sculpteur Américain.” *L’Art Décoratif*, May 1907, 187–94.

Thomas, Albert. “La Sculpture Aux Salons.” *L’art Décoratif*, December 1903.

Tolède, Olivia. “Une Sécession Française : La Société Nationale Des Beaux-Arts (1889-1903).” Université Paris X-Nanterre La Défense, 2008.

Tolles, Thayer. “The Elephant in the Room: George Grey Barnard’s Struggle of The Two Natures in Man at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.” In *Sculpture and the Museum*, edited by Christopher R. Marshall, 115–31. Farnham, Surrey; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011.

Tolles, Thayer, Lauretta Dimmick, and Donna J. Hassler, eds. *American Sculpture in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*. 2 vols. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1999.

Tucker, William. *The Language of Sculpture*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1974.

United States Commission to the Paris Exposition 1900. *Report of the Commissioner-General for the United States to the International Universal Exposition, Paris, 1900.* Washington: G.P.O., 1901.

Unknown, and W. Clark Noble. “Civil War Memorial.” Sculpture. Inventories of American Painting and Sculpture Smithsonian American Art Museum Research & Scholars Center, 1904.

Vaisse, Pierre. *La Troisième République et les peintres*. Paris: Flammarion, 1995.

Veder, Robin. *The Living Line: Modern Art and the Economy of Energy*. Dartmouth College Press. Hanover, New Hampshire, 2015.

Vincent, Sybil. “In the Studio of Andrew O’Connor.” *Country Life* 114 (August 1937): 79–82.

Wagner, Anne Middleton. *Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux: Sculptor of the Second Empire*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.

Walton, William. “Andrew O’Connor, Sculptor.” *Scribner’s Magazine* 45 (May 1909): 637–40.

Ward-Jackson, Philip. “O’Connor Andrew.” In *Sculpture 1600-2000: Art and Architecture of Ireland*, edited by Paula Murphy, 3:265–67. Dublin: London: Royal Irish Academy; The Paul Mellon Centre, 2014.

———. *Public Sculpture of the City of London*. Public Sculpture of Britain, v. 7. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2003.

Wechsler, Diana, and Laura Malosetti Costa, eds. *Desde la otra vereda: Momentos en el debate por un arte moderno en la Argentina, 1880-1960*. Archivos Del CAIA 1. Buenos Aires: Ediciones del Jilguero, 1998.

Wechsler, Diana, María Lía Munilla Lacasa, and Asociación Dante Alighieri. *Italia en el horizonte de las artes plásticas: Argentina, siglos XIX y XX*. Buenos Aires: Asociación Dante Alighieri de Buenos Aires, 2000.

Weller, Allen S., Robert G. La France, and Henry Adams. *Lorado Taft: The Chicago Years*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2014.

Weller, Allen Stuart, and Lorado Taft. *Lorado in Paris: The Letters of Lorado Taft, 1880-1885*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985.

White, Harrison C., and Cynthia A. White. *Canvases and Careers: Institutional Change in the French Painting World*. New York: Wiley, 1965.

Wiesinger, Véronique. "La politique d'acquisition de l'Etat français sous la Troisième République en matière d'art étranger contemporain : l'exemple américain (1870-1940)." *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art Français*, 1993, 263–99.

———. *Le Voyage de Paris : les Américains dans les écoles d'art, 1868-1918*. Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux, 1990.

Wijnsouw, Jana. *National Identity and Nineteenth-Century Franco-Belgian Sculpture*. New York; London: Routledge, 2018.

Williams, Daniel M. "George Grey Barnard." *North American Review* 243, no. 2 (Summer 1937): 276–86.

Wilson, Sarah, and Eric de Chassey, eds. *Paris: Capital of the Arts, 1900-1968*. London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2002.

Wittkower, Rudolf. *Sculpture: Processes and Principles*. Icon Editions. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.

Wood, Jon, David Hulks, and Alex Potts, eds. *Modern Sculpture Reader*. Leeds; Los Angeles: Henry Moore Institute; J. Paul Getty Museum, 2012.

Young, Mahonri Sharp. "George Grey Barnard and the Cloisters." *Apollo* 106, no. 189 (1977): 332–39.

Databases and Online Sources

Monument Lab. "A Call to Peace." Accessed December 30, 2020. https://monumentlab.com/projects/a-call-to-peace.

New Arts Justice. "A Call to Peace." Accessed December 30, 2020. https://www.newartsjustice.org/peace.

BLARB. "A Call to Peace: Monuments in New Jersey." Accessed December 29, 2020. https://blog.lareviewofbooks.org/essays/call-peace-monuments-new-jersey/.

"À Nos Grands Hommes - La Monumentalité En Cartes Postales." Accessed November 21, 2020. https://anosgrandshommes.musee-orsay.fr/.

"Archives Nationales (France) - Base de Données Archim." Accessed February 7, 2021. http://www2.culture.gouv.fr/documentation/archim/albumsdessalons.htm.

"Base Salons." Accessed November 13, 2020. http://salons.musee-orsay.fr/.

Capps, Kriston. "Kehinde Wiley's Anti-Confederate Memorial." The New Yorker. Accessed December 21, 2020. https://www.newyorker.com/culture/culture-desk/kehinde-wileys-anti-confederate-memorial

Google My Maps. "Collections Rodin Dans Le Monde." Accessed December 2, 2020. https://www.google.com/maps/d/viewer?mid=1ZxjuljoocvXSQjCJJDt8fJNw018.

Cotter, Holland. "Turning Grief for a Hidden Past Into a Healing Space." *The New York Times*, August 16, 2020. https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/16/arts/design/university-of-virginia-enslaved-laborers-memorial.html.

Elías, Andrea. "Rogelio Yrurtia: Canto al Trabajo." Museo Casa de Yrurtia. Accessed December 8, 2020. https://museoyrurtia.cultura.gob.ar/exhibicion/rogelio-yrurtia/.

España, Biblioteca Nacional de. "Hemeroteca Digital." Biblioteca Nacional de España. http://www.bne.es/en/Catalogos/HemerotecaDigital/.

Foundation, The Andrew W. Mellon. "The Monuments Project." The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Accessed December 30, 2020. https://mellon.org/initiatives/monuments/.

The Armory Show at 100. "Gallery A." Accessed February 27, 2021. https://armory.nyhistory.org/category/artworks/gallery/gallery-a/.

The Tate. "Kara Walker's Fons Americanus." Accessed December 21, 2020. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artists/kara-walker-2674/kara-walkers-fons-americanus.

"Memorial to Enslaved Laborers at The University of Virginia." Accessed December 15, 2020. https://www2.virginia.edu/slaverymemorial/design.html.

Issuu. "Monument Lab & New Arts Justice: A Call to Peace (2019)." Accessed December 30, 2020. https://issuu.com/monumentlab/docs/ml_-_acalltopeace_newspaper_f_web.

Pathé, British. *Ireland: Dublin Municipal Art Gallery Prepares For Lane Collection.* Accessed December 10, 2020. https://www.britishpathe.com/video/VLVA693OO0B1TQIDXRRVOA4AE2IR2-IRELAND-DUBLIN-MUNICIPAL-ART-GALLERY-PREPARES-FOR-LANE/query/Municipal+Art+Gallery.

Pope, Miles. "Amy Sherald on Making Breonna Taylor's Portrait." *Vanity Fair*. Accessed March 8, 2021. https://www.vanityfair.com/culture/2020/08/amy-sherald-on-making-breonna-taylors-cover-portrait.

School of Arts & Sciences-Newark. *Manuel Acevedo Re-Imagines Military Park War Monument In "A Call to Peace" Exhibition*, 2019. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MmlzW6AUqEY