



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

### A family affair

**Citation for published version:**

Coltman, V 2021, 'A family affair: John Bacon's monument to Jane Russell, 1810-13', *Sculpture Journal*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 303-322. <https://doi.org/10.3828/sj.2021.30.3.4>

**Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

[10.3828/sj.2021.30.3.4](https://doi.org/10.3828/sj.2021.30.3.4)

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Peer reviewed version

**Published In:**

Sculpture Journal

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



## A family affair: John Bacon's monuments to Jane Russell, 1810-1813<sup>1</sup>

Erected in 1813, John Bacon the younger's marble monument to Jane Russell (fig. 1) remains in situ against the south wall of St. Mary's Church, at Fort St. George in the former Madras Presidency. It was published by Barbara Groseclose in her *British Sculpture and the Company Raj: Church monuments and public statuary in Madras, Calcutta and Bombay to 1858*, Newark and London, 1995, a survey text devoted to sculpture in the three English East India Company stations in the Indian subcontinent prior to Crown Rule.<sup>2</sup> A 'Company of Merchants in a remote Island, whose very existence is hardly understood by the natives of India', is how Lady Mary Hood described the East India Company in her *Sketch of a journey to Seringapatam and Mysoor* which she undertook in 1812 (we will meet Hood again in due course).<sup>3</sup> A black and white reproduction of the monument in its entirety shows its tripartite sculptural sections: a pyramidal crown contains a flying angel carved in low relief, with the figural section in the centre, a dedicatory inscription to the deceased below followed by an eighteen-line epitaph, which is not legible in the accompanying photograph in Groseclose's monograph. The inscription provides the name of the deceased (Jane Amelia) and maps her potted biography in respect of her primary consanguineal and affinal relationships. It records that she was the wife of Henry Russell and the second daughter of J. H. Casamajor; that she was born on 20 August 1789, married on 20 October 1808 and died on 29 December 1808. In other words, it tells us that the deceased was a woman who was nineteen years old when she died having been married for just over two months. Using Bacon's monument as a case study, this article seeks to illuminate issues of death and memorialization in the British colony during the early 1810s. It traces the commission by correspondence, execution in the metropolis and transport to the Indian subcontinent of a monument to a young woman whose death and its commemoration in visual and material culture were, it will be argued, a family affair.

These types of large-scale funerary monuments commissioned from sculptors in London and from the penultimate decade of the eighteenth century, transported to the Indian subcontinent, punctuate what David Arnold has influentially dubbed deathscapes – the spaces and places of colonial India's churches and cemeteries.<sup>4</sup> According to his discussion of literary deathscapes, the Europeans in the first half of the nineteenth century in India 'saw themselves as being pursued by death...[and] subject to an almost unremitting tide of mortality.' This article considers the representation of one particular deathscape and its manifestation in visual and material culture, offering a close reading of a monument whose genre has been more widely documented in Britain's colonies by Groseclose and latterly by Joan Coutu.

In *Persuasion and Propaganda*, Coutu contends that very little documentation concerning the privately commissioned monuments of the eighteenth-century British empire survives, so that 'The monuments themselves constitute the primary source of information.'<sup>5</sup> The monuments Coutu looks at in her India chapter subtitled 'Empire Building as a Moral Imperative' are civic commissions by the East India Company, rather than individual commissions and they are all monuments in memory of men, rather than their female consanguineal or affinal kin.<sup>6</sup> In the case of Bacon's monument to Russell, we have the second iteration of the privately-commissioned monument to a woman which is still in situ in St. Mary's Church and a voluminous paper trail of familiar correspondence which preceded, accompanied and followed it.

This paper trail consists principally of the correspondence of Jane's widowed husband, Henry Russell, who was a senior East India Company official working first at Poona and later at Hyderabad, with his father Henry Russell Senior, his brother Charles and his father-in-law James Casamajor, who were based in Calcutta, Hyderabad and Madras respectively. Casamajor was a member of the Governing Council of Madras, on the south-east Coromandel Coast of India; Russell Senior was Chief Justice of the Supreme Court based in Calcutta, which had been the capital of British India since 1772; Charles also worked for the East India Company, making him and his brother second generation company

servants. Russell's geographically dispersed family included his mother in Britain, who superintended the sculptural commission from London and whose lost letters recount visits to Bacon's Newman Street studio, portions of which were transcribed by her son for inclusion in his own letters to further family members. The archive of this one ruling class Anglo-Indian family is supplemented by another to which they were connected: that of Gilbert Elliot, 1<sup>st</sup> Earl of Minto, in the familiar letters he composed to his absent wife Anna Maria, who remained in Britain during his Governor-Generalship of India from 1807–13.<sup>7</sup>

Among Minto's 'continuous cascade of correspondence', is a letter dated 20 October 1809 in which its author introduces his wife at length and in detail to Henry Russell.<sup>8</sup> A portion of it reads as follows:

'Mr Russell is Sir Henry [Russell]'s eldest & favourite Son. He is distinguished for talents, application for business, & general accomplishment. He is an excellent classical scholar & fond of literature in the European sense of that word, a rare quality in Asia, where a taste for study is naturally thrown into a different field; but he is eminent also as an Orientalist; and to crown these acquired properties, he has the natural excellences of a most honourable, feeling and amiable character, with lively & agreeable manners. He was in our diplomattick line, first assistant to the Resident [British political agent] in Hyderabad, when I appointed him third Commissioner for the investigation of the late Nabob of the Carnatic debts, a place of great trust & of emolument superior to his standing in the service. This brought him to Madras where he soon fell in love with & soon after married poor Jane Casamaijor, whom he lost as quickly as he had acquired her... both he [Sir Henry] and his son have become anxious that the latter should resume his former line in the service, and I have just taken an opportunity to appoint him acting Resident at Poonah, during the absence of the Resident Col[onel] Close; an arrangement as beneficial to the public as it is gratifying to himself. It will not be long duration, however, but some other diplomattick opening may occur, & in the meanwhile he retains his office at Madras, which he has therefore under his lee. You will think I have given Mr Russell, who you don't know, more than his share of a letter which must be a short one [4½ pages]; but he is now connected though not related to us & entitled to a portion of family concern.'<sup>9</sup>

Minto's extended biography of Russell, which reads like an effusive letter of recommendation, is to be expected from a Governor-General who had accelerated his protégé's promotion through the hierarchical diplomatic ranks of the East India Company. The Russells and Mintos were 'connected though not related' via a third ruling class family based in Madras: the Casamaijors. Minto mentions in passing Russell's marriage to the second Casamaijor daughter Jane which took place in October 1808. Exactly a year later, Minto's son John Elliot, who was employed as his father, the Governor-General's private secretary, married Jane's sister Amelia Casamaijor. 'No girls can have been better brought up, & they are the only persons I have ever seen in India really like young English gentlewomen', Minto wrote to his wife the day before John and Amelia's wedding took place, emphasizing the polite upbringing of the Casamaijor daughters who were in reality of hybrid British, Portuguese and Malay descent via their father.<sup>10</sup> In the period of the early nineteenth century when relations between British men and native Indian women were increasingly denigrated, 'The Englishwoman rose as a valued commodity in the marriage market', notes Joseph, even if, as in the case of the Casamaijor daughters, their Englishness was inculcated rather than innate.<sup>11</sup> Drawing on the familiar correspondence of Henry Russell and to a lesser extent, Minto, this article seeks to contribute to the entwined histories – both colonial and artistic – of these interconnected ruling class Anglo-Indian families via their shared and sustained emotional investment in a monument to the memory of Amelia Russell (née Casamaijor).

Russell's own 'devotion to his wife or rather bride' as Minto described her in another letter, is articulated in the shoals of correspondence concerning the monument that made the approximately six month passage to and from Britain and that criss-crossed the vast Indian subcontinent.<sup>12</sup> The maritime passage of letters has been well-documented by historians of the English East India Company who

note that their dispatch overseas and receipt was seasonal; the season being determined by favourable weather for undertaking the prolonged voyage.<sup>13</sup> A journey from London to Asia usually began between December and April, with a ship leaving Calcutta for Britain every four to six weeks during the sailing season from September to April. The complete operational cycle of sending a letter and receiving a reply took a minimum of sixteen months to cover a round voyage from London to Asia and back and a total distance of over 6,000 miles.<sup>14</sup> In contrast with these overseas lines of communication, little work has been done on the internal transport of letters to and from British colonists stationed within the Indian subcontinent – a lacuna this essay starts to address with reference to the stream of epistolary communications concerning Jane Russell's monument.

Since the publication of her monograph in 1995, Groseclose has proposed a web of imperial monuments whose iconography is related intercolonially; in other words, between the colonies, rather than between the colony and the imperial centre.<sup>15</sup> Both she and Coutu discuss a monument erected at St. Mary's Church at Madras in memory of Lieutenant-Colonel Joseph Moorhouse formerly of the Madras Coast Artillery of the East India Company who was killed at the siege of Bangalore by Tipu Sultan in 1791 (the monument is on the left side of fig. 1.4). The accompanying inscription confirms that the East India Company commissioned the monument; it was executed by the London-based sculptor Charles Peart (whose wife had family connections with the East India Company) and was shipped to Madras. Moorhouse was one of the hoards of young men who perished in military service in India; others were struck down by 'the peculiarly pestilential nature of the country' with its tropical diseases malaria, dysentery and cholera which Europeans constitutions were particularly susceptible to and which took the life of Jane Russell.<sup>16</sup> For John Plotz in his *Portable Property: Victorian culture on the move*, 'the flow of culture-bearing objects from core to periphery is not counterbalanced or interrupted by a flow in the opposite direction. The capacity of an imperium to sustain that kind of asymmetry is a crucial component of its power.'<sup>17</sup> Plotz's claim and his binary terms of reference (core/periphery) are no longer sustainable – historians have demonstrated how a wide array of goods flowed between the Indian subcontinent and Britain: alongside paintings, textiles and furniture, white and mixed-race children were sent from India to be brought up by relatives in Britain.<sup>18</sup> As Filor notes, these children were an embodied connection between distant family members; a reminder that the epistolary exchange that dominates the current historiography should be situated in conjunction with the more intermittent dispatch of their legitimate and illegitimate offspring. What follows, demonstrates that within the Indian subcontinent there was an interior passage of letters and works of art on paper in the form of sketches and designs for Jane's monument that was *intracolonial* (to adapt Groseclose's term) – that was co-ordinated by the colonising imperium in a route that criss-crossed India between family members based in Poona, Madras, Calcutta and Hyderabad. And it was this paper trail, as much as the overseas one, which enabled the Russell monument as a work of art and epitaphy to be a family affair.

\*\*\*\*\*

The central section of Bacon's monument to Jane Russell (fig. 1) can itself be described as a deathscape – a familial grouping executed in marble in which five figures are installed under a semi-circular arc. The arrangement and disposition of the figures follows a second arc below. The composition is dominated on a horizontal axis by the dying figure of Jane Russell, who is shown propped up in the arms of her slightly crouching husband, Henry Russell on the far right. On the opposite side, her mother is represented kneeling at the foot of her daughter's bed, her face obscured by her right hand. Jane's two sisters, Elizabeth and Amelia, are depicted standing between their mother and brother-in-law, their faces inclined towards that of their sister as she expires. On one level, this lachrymose scene conforms to familiar iconographic precedents for the deathbed tableau with the almost supine body of the deceased/dying figure and the accompanying mourning figures at its top and tail. A funerary monument by Bacon's father, John Bacon the elder, to the brewer Samuel Whitbread in St. Mary's Church in Cardington, Bedfordshire conforms to this sculptural template (fig. 2). It was commissioned in 1796 and completed by Bacon the younger in 1799 when he inherited his father's workshop; he often reused aspects of his late father's designs until he laid aside his professional chisel in 1818.<sup>19</sup> The monument depicts a toga-clad Whitbread propped up on a couch

accompanied by Religion who turns his head towards the celestial beams of light at the pinnacle of the monument. As his gaze is directed towards the heavens, his left hand reaches to the pages of a Bible open on the ground at John 11:25, 'I am the Resurrection and the Life: He that believeth in me though he were dead yet shall he live'. At the foot of the tableau a kneeling figure of Benevolence – 'an introspective counterbalance to the animate figure of Religion, in which Benevolence's sorrow is assuaged by Religion's optimism' – is accompanied by a pelican piercing its breast to release blood for its young to feed on which was a familiar allegory for Christian charity.<sup>20</sup> Bacon the younger's monument to Russell in Madras eschews any female personifications, allegorical Christian sentiment and classicizing (un)dress. Instead, 'The scene represented on it is real', as Russell described it in one of his letters.<sup>21</sup> In this, it echoes the monument by Henry Cheere to the 19<sup>th</sup> Earl of Kildare at Christchurch Cathedral in Dublin, which was completed in 1746 (fig. 3). Its composition with the life-sized figures in contemporary dress demonstrates a complete disregard of allegory and fiction in representing the mourning of Kildare's wife and two children over his corpse. It is, writes Craske, 'closer to a glimpse into family life than any other monument of the period.'<sup>22</sup> Bacon's monument to Jane Russell gives us an equivalent glimpse – however chiselled and partial – into a death in the colonial family; an event fixed by representation in the lifecycle of the family in the early nineteenth-century Indian subcontinent, where the marble deathscapes is gendered as the expiring figure is a wife, daughter and sister.

Russell's insistence on the reality of the composition may appear a highly subjective claim. Yet he provided a detailed first-hand account of his wife's death in Madras in a letter to his brother Charles in Hyderabad, dated three days after the event. Describing how writing offered comfort rather than pain, ('Reflection subdues me, unmans me, it preys upon my mind; or rather, my mind unemployed preys upon itself; and how can I employ myself better, than in writing to those I love, on the only subject which occupies and absorbs all my thoughts?'),<sup>23</sup> a portion of his letter recounts:

'I sat by her on the bed. Her dear head rested upon a pillow on my right arm, and with my left hand I continued to feel her sinking pulse until it could be felt no more. She continued low and faint until about half past 9. Then she was seized with a convulsion... The force of this convulsion raised her in her bed, but she sank again upon my arm, in a state of apparent insensibility – I thought she was no longer conscious; but, when I kissed her, she returned my kiss, clasped my hand, opened her eyes, looked up at me, smiled and closed them again for ever. It was scarcely a minute after this, that, with my ear close to her lips, I faintly heard her last expiring breath. Her spirit hast then fled. Mrs Casamajor sat near her feet, on the same side with me. Elizabeth and Amelia were on the other side; and Mr Casamajor, James [Jane's brother], John Casamajor [a cousin], Underwood, White and, I believe Goldie, were in the Room.'<sup>24</sup>

Later in the same letter, Russell announces his intention to erect a marble monument to be executed by the sculptor John Bacon and thirteen months later Bacon is lauded in a letter to Russell's father-in-law James Casamajor as being 'unquestionably the first Artist in his line in England, and probably the first in Europe.'<sup>25</sup> Russell's letter to his brother additionally reveals that he had had a hand in the design of the monument where under his direction the artist Casselli had made a sketch of the deathbed tableau – 'the Situation in which our beloved actually was at the Monument of her departure' – accompanied by her mother, sisters and husband which Amelia Elliott (née Casamajor) had confirmed as being accurate. This sketch had been dispatched to Bacon and its design on paper duly adopted by him. Russell's letter quotes from a letter of Bacon's in which the sculptor endorsed the widespread lucidity of such a scheme: 'there is not only, in my opinion, no objection, but a material advantage attached – this is a real Scene, in which the feelings of every Individual must be interested: while Allegory and Hieroglyphick are understood by very few.' Bacon's transcribed letter recounts the addition of an angel on the crown of the monument and the inclusion of the open Bible inscribed at Psalm 39 – the latter of which is a detail attributed to Russell's mother and Jane's mother-in-law, Lady Anne Russell. Much as Jane's death was a family affair in reality and in its lasting marmoreal representation, so the preliminary design of her monument solicited input and even the

authentication of its verisimilitude from family members both temporally present at the event and geographically absent.

In the ensuing months as Bacon worked on the monument in London, Russell's copious correspondence makes multiple references to drawings, sketches, designs and even an engraving of it. His letters recount these paper versions having been dispatched and received to and from India and Britain and circulating between himself first in Poona and subsequently in Hyderabad, to his father-in-law James Casamaijor in Madras, his brother Charles in Hyderabad and his father, Henry Russell senior in Calcutta. Though the terminology Russell employs is not as precise as the twenty-first century art historian would wish (sketch and drawing seem to be used interchangeably), it is clear that the paper reproduction of the monument was orchestrated for distribution to dispersed family members as part of a colonial circuitry of mourning in which they were all emotionally invested.

The circulation of the monument on paper entailed serial copies of it being produced and Russell's web of correspondence shows him trying to co-ordinate the receipt, reproduction and interior passage of these copies in a near constant traffic across the Indian subcontinent. Bacon had evidently produced a 'design' for the monument which by February 1810 was en route from London to Casamaijor in Madras on the *Georgiana*.<sup>26</sup> (Correspondents always take the precaution of naming the vessel on which precious items are dispatched to and from India). There is an oblique reference to it being framed. In a letter to Casamaijor, Russell requested that the design should be sketched when it arrived; the sketch to be sent on to family members in Calcutta. Once the sketch had been taken at Madras, the design would then be forwarded to Russell's brother at Hyderabad where 'One of the Engineers who draws well' would take another sketch from it for Charles to keep.<sup>27</sup> Russell's instructions to his brother regarding the packaging and carriage of the image are highly prescriptive: 'When you receive it, open it to look at; and then have it carefully packed up again, must forward it to me by a cooley, or two, if you think it will be better. Perhaps Captain Sydenham [then Resident at Hyderabad] would allow a couple of Sepoys from the unit to accompany it as far as Tooljapoor, where I wish to have two from Poona ready to meet and relieve them', elsewhere estimating the military transport co-ordinated by the colonizing imperium between Hyderabad and Poona to be approximately eighteen to twenty days.<sup>28</sup> By March 1810, Russell writes that he has received a tin roll with an (unframed) drawing of the monument from his mother, which enabled him to see the changes made in the design by Bacon. Mrs Casamaijor is now said to be represented kneeling below the couch rather than sitting on it as she was in Russell's first-hand epistolary account of Jane's death provided to his brother. Two months later, James Casamaijor forwarded from Madras Bacon's design which Russell describes as being 'the original, of which the one my mother sent me is only a copy. The dimensions of the two are the same but the original has of course more ease and spirit than the Copy. It is certainly a beautiful Work.'<sup>29</sup> In differentiating between the original and the copy, Russell demonstrates a reproductive hierarchy for the different versions of the monument on paper. By February 1811, we hear of the display of the work he thought 'beautiful': 'Mr Bacons original Sketch now hangs up in my Bed Room [Russell wrote to Casamaijor]. When I get to Hyderabad, Lady Strange shall take its place. It will always be the first object on which my eyes will open in the Morning, and the last on which they will close at night.'<sup>30</sup> Russell's letter represents his continued devotion to his wife 'whom he lost as quickly as he had acquired' (to quote Minto's letter again) thirteen months after her death in having her monument on paper framed, glazed and hung in his bedroom as a treasured possession. 'Lady Strange' taking its place once in Hyderabad appears to refer to a copy of one of the copies of the monument which was painted on glass by Lady Louisa Strange, the second wife of Sir Thomas Strange, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court in Madras.<sup>31</sup> By May 1811, Russell writes of 'most anxiously' awaiting news of the arrival of the completed monument on board the *Elizabeth* - its having taken longer to execute than the year which had initially been projected. 'I think it probable that he will scarcely finish it quite so expeditiously as he originally said [Russell had rightly predicted in a letter to Casamaijor dated 19 March 1810]. Artists usually exceed the Time proposed for the completion of a Work'.<sup>32</sup> Any time proposed for the completion of a work

in London had to be extended by approximately six months to allow for its always protracted and on occasion precarious maritime passage to the East Indies.

In the letter to his brother Charles, dated 1 January 1809, in which he revisits the circumstances of Jane's death (previously quoted), Henry Russell refers to her corpse being interred in St. Mary's Church in Madras where it was 'protected from the vicisitudes [sic] and inclemencies [sic] of the weather'. The same cannot be said of the marble monument by Bacon which in its first iteration was lost at sea when in December 1810 the *Elizabeth* on which it was being transported was shipwrecked off the coast of Dunkirk. Russell was informed of the loss of the vessel after the obligatory six-month delay of news between Europe and India when he received a letter from his mother and read a notice in the Bombay Paper. 'This is vexatious indeed [he wrote to Casamaijor]; and although almost the whole of the Ships Crew, and among them several Females, had perished, I cannot help looking upon my Share of the Calamity as a large one. This ought not to be; but it is natural. the all of us, I am afraid, are too apt to estimate the magnitude of a publick calamity by the extent of our own individual interest in it.'<sup>33</sup> His letter announces his intention to have a replacement monument commissioned immediately and adds with a hyperbolic flurry of widower steadfastness: 'We are but selfish animals at the best. the delay however will be the only inconvenience occasioned by this loss; for if five hundred monuments are lost, and I live long enough, I will have a five hundred and first made to supply their place.'

The contingencies of seasonality and territorial politics, or 'weather & war', to quote from another of Minto's letters, were two of the vicissitudes of a prolonged sea passage between Britain and the colonies and must account for an array of items of portable property being habitually lost and apprehended.<sup>34</sup> In December 1809, for instance, Minto wrote to his wife of having 'reason to tremble' when two ships had been taken by French frigates at the mouth of the Bay and there was little chance of a third having passed unscathed.<sup>35</sup> 'I can hardly expect to escape the loss of some letters by the capture of three out of seven ships', he conceded. Minto's eldest son Gilbert mentioned a James Marjoribanks again 'as I do not feel sure that a letter I wrote to you about him has not gone down in the Elizabeth.'<sup>36</sup> This was the vessel that was carrying Bacon's monument to Madras and it is only from the epistolary record that we are able to intercept it en route to the Indian subcontinent and to recognize that the erected monument in Madras is a replacement one; the composition in its second, reworked iteration.

In the commissioning of a second monument to replace that lost at sea, an 'unseen cargo...on hold in the hold', Russell was able to revise the poetic epitaph which was always intended to accompany it.<sup>37</sup> His initial resolve in January 1809 to get the epitaph composed by some celebrated literary man in England was soon aborted in favour of a verse of his own composition.<sup>38</sup> Predictably (by now), the various versions of the text as it evolved were circulated and subjected to the criticisms of Russell's brother Charles, their father Henry Russell and Russell's father-in-law, Casamaijor. Even Minto as the patriarch of the imperial family was consulted – although Russell 'upon mature and I hope impartial Reflection' chose to ignore his recommendation that it be written in the third person rather than the first; writing to Casamaijor 'don't say a Word about it to Lord Minto'.<sup>39</sup> The eighteen-line epitaph 'written' in lower case script, rather than the formal typography of the inscription, is composed in rhyming couplets, 'a kind of stable, monumental meter' that adorns the pedestal or lowest strata of the monument (fig. 1).<sup>40</sup> A truncated and amended version of a twenty-two line predecessor in Russell's hand which survives among his letters, it begins by taking the form of an apostrophizing personal lament – an address to Jane ('dear Saint') written on the 'cold Stone' from her bereft husband from whom it recounts she was 'untimely severed'.<sup>41</sup> As it proceeds, this stationary text invites passing strangers 'who read the faithful Line' to 'pause in Solemn Silence at thy Shrine' and to join with Russell in mourning his wife 'Torn from the nuptial Altar to the Tomb'. The second half of the

epitaph summarily references Jane's physical appearance ('lovely in thy Youth') and the many commendable character traits that she displayed on her deathbed ('gentle without Fear', 'so resign'd'), so making her death a communal loss and 'a colonial performance of martyrdom'.<sup>42</sup> The verse ends with the familiar epitaphic praise of Jane as an exemplar – 'A Model how to live, alas! And how to die'. As Broughton has written in reference to Anglo-Indian deathscapes in mid nineteenth-century Calcutta, Russell's monument by Bacon rehearses 'a distinctive encounter between literary and material culture, between description and inscription [and], between autobiography and collective biography', where the epitaph invokes Russell as a grieving husband and those strangers with wider cultural investments in the 'colonial project'.<sup>43</sup> Broughton's rubric gives the inchoate 'colonial project' a coherent determinism or a determined coherence it lacked during this very transitional period from 1780 to 1830 and one we should be wary of being seduced by.<sup>44</sup> Having said that, Russell and members of his consanguineal and affinal family were profoundly invested in the monument he commissioned to his deceased wife in which they, rather than allegorical figures, were depicted. This speaks to the institution of the colonial family within one of the multiple and contested colonial projects.

In a letter to Lady Mary Hood, the wife of Sir Samuel Hood, Commander in Chief of the East Indies, dated 26 June 1813, Russell cites a familial precedent in the epigraphic tradition for the monument to his deceased wife:

'an epitaph which was composed for my father's first wife by Hayley and Astey and altered by Dr. Johnson, though there are many points in composition, and this I think is one among the Number, where I cannot admit that we are bound to follow an arbitrary rule which is built on custom alone; and has no rational principle for its support. I was no advocate for the Precedent without Reason. I have a favourite couplet in the epitaph [to Jane], which perhaps you will discover in other respects I wish I thought as well of it now as I did when I wrote it four years ago. But it is not of what we write only that our opinions are altered by time and reflection and nobody perhaps but those who have attempted to write an epitaph, can tell how difficult a task it is.'<sup>45</sup> Russell rated Lady Hood highly, as being 'one of the very few really superior women I have met with in India'; a view he echoed three months later: 'She is a woman of judgment and feeling, and has a taste in which the opinions of the Head are blended with the sentiments of the heart.'<sup>46</sup> The epitaph he cites as being composed by Christopher Anstey and William Hayley and altered by Samuel Johnson consists of sixteen lines of rhyming couplets accompanying a marble relief sculpture executed by John Flaxman to Henry Russell Senior's first wife Ann, in the south aisle of the vestry at Lydd Church in Kent (fig. 4).<sup>47</sup> Flaxman was one of the sculptors with Joseph Nollekens that the second Lady Russell had reportedly named as being 'inferior to Bacon' once the commission for Jane's monument had been undertaken by his rival.<sup>48</sup> The dedicatory inscription confirms that she died on 25 November 1780 aged thirty-one, while her only son Henry died the following year on 15 January aged four. The poetic epitaph is composed in the third person – as if being spoken by the angel to the deceased Ann Russell. The second line invites her to 'Receive thy darling Infant to thine Arms' and the accompanying scene represents their celestial reunion in stone with Ann's arms outstretched to embrace her young son. Ann and two attendants are seen floating on what the art historian Nicholas Penny describes as 'outmoded pastry clouds'.<sup>49</sup> Like the later epitaph to Jane Russell, it stresses Ann's mortal exemplarity in the face of her suffering: 'Conceal the Tear, repress the strugg'ling Sigh/And leave a bright Example how to die'.

Henry Russell's authorship of the epitaph to Jane indicates his poetic pretensions and confirms Minto's earlier recommendation of him in a letter to Lady Minto as being 'fond of literature in the European sense of that word.' Another of his letters to Lady Hood represents the unique composition ('the only thing of the kind I ever wrote') as another manifestation of his continued devotion, where 'I thought it would be a sort of impiety to let any hand but my own inscribe my wife's monument.'<sup>50</sup> Russell's allusion to the earlier epitaph to his father's first wife situates Jane Russell's monument in Madras as part of a familial axis of monuments that was geographical and temporal, erected in Britain

and India and between one generation and the next. There is also another intracolony axis between the monument to Jane and that to Thomas Humberston Mackenzie which Lady Hood was having erected to her cousin, a captain in the 78<sup>th</sup> Regiment of the Ross-shire Highlanders who was killed on 8 August 1803 at the storming of the Pettah during the second Maratha war. Acting as Hood's agent a decade later in the summer of 1813, Russell's letters to her describe the procurement of a colossal slab of granite from Ahmednugur and an inscription being cut in large characters 'as neatly cut as they could be in London' by his servants. He later asks Hood to supply the Gaelic mottoes to accompany the carved stag's head to either side in a V-shaped formation, even 'though an Englishman could as soon jump over the moon than pronounce either of them'.<sup>51</sup> Her manuscript *Diary of a cruise in HMS Illustrious from Trincomalee to Bombay with inland journeys made by Lady Hood in Ceylon and India* in 1812 recounts riding out at sunset to the Pettah Gate a mile from the fort at Ahmednugger in the Bombay Presidency, where her cousin was killed. It describes a monument she had had erected on the spot, consisting of an oblong piece of granite six feet high inscribed in memory of Humberstone Mackenzie and others in his regiment who died in 1783. The Gaelic mottoes are those of the Seafort family and the 78<sup>th</sup> regiment accompanied by what is supposed to be the head and horns of a highland stag (fig. 5).<sup>52</sup> Like the contemporaneous monuments to Jane Russell, that to Humberston Mackenzie was familial and especially genealogical in its commission, affording the patron 'a stake in some plot that tracked generationally'.<sup>53</sup>

Much of the existing literature on the literary technologies of death is at pains to point out the *differences* between the poetic epitaph and the printed obituary, where the rise of the latter coincided with the concomitant decline of the former. Petrucci describes the epigraphic text as being 'bound by its material link with the tomb, by its enforced solidarity with the corpse', unlike the newspaper obituary that could 'circulate, be read, revisited, quoted, exchanged and reproduced' within a literate society.<sup>54</sup> In a process of apparently straightforward literary emancipation, the text was freed from the 'immobile singularity' of the epigraph and entrusted to the 'mobile reproductibility' of the page. In terms of the posthumous social construction of Henry Russell's wife, there are notable parallels in the content of her epitaph and her obituary published immediately after death in the *Madras Gazette* (fig. 6), especially in the poetic language of the obituary, which Russell informed his brother was written by one Parker and altered by him.<sup>55</sup> The Christian name of 'this amiable and lamented young Woman' is nowhere recorded in the text which refers to her as being 'In the first and gayest bloom of youth', describing the 'calamity' of her death and the circumstances of her burial. For Bytheway and Johnson obituaries offer 'a sense of being in touch with a world that is constantly being reconstituted through the processes of birth, life and death.'<sup>56</sup> Their statement is particularly relevant to early nineteenth-century colonial India where, in David Arnold's account of literary productions, death was omnipresent. While the obituary as we know it first emerged in the seventeenth century in Britain, and gained a place in print culture in the 1720s, the obituary column was introduced later in 1780.<sup>57</sup> Literary historian Elizabeth Barry rightly stresses the broad social purview of the genre, with magazine obituaries devoted to gentlemen and tradesmen.<sup>58</sup> Jane Russell's obituary published in the *Madras Gazette* shifts our emphasis from social issues of class to gender, to death and the nabobina, rather than her male equivalent, the nabob, as documented by Travers.<sup>59</sup> According to Nechtman, nabobinas represent such a small community as to be almost demographically insignificant, yet Jane Russell's tripartite memorials – her published obituary, her monumental tomb with its veristic sculptural composition and epitaphic composition – provides a counterpart to the machismo that still pervades colonial deathscapes and their study.<sup>60</sup> Rather than a teleological approach starting with deathscapes, perhaps we need to think through this material more cyclically, regarding lifescapes or lifecycles, which would begin with birthscapes and so necessarily be more inclusive (relative to their low numbers) of the members of the colonial female population of wives, mothers and daughters.<sup>61</sup>

The monument to Jane Russell had its own lifecycle of commission, design, execution, transportation, erection and display, the later stages of which were prematurely terminated when the *Elizabeth* sank and Bacon started working on its replacement. As Russell is said to have made a slight alteration in

the prose part of the epitaph for the monument in its second iteration, so Bacon amended the sculptural composition, again at Russell's recommendation.<sup>62</sup> In a letter to Casamaijor dated 25 July 1812, Russell quotes from an epistle of his mother's in which the changes Russell made to the male figure had been implemented by the sculptor.<sup>63</sup> It also paraphrases a letter of Bacon's where he recounts making a new model for Russell's figure and wanting to dispatch the completed monument with the first fleet of the upcoming sailing season. By April 1813, Russell was arranging for Colonel James Caldwell, the engineer of the centre division of the Madras army, to superintend the erection of the monument in St. Mary's Church in his absence – once again recruiting the professional expertise of members of the colonizing imperium. 'If I were at all master of my own Time, this should be no Man's Task but mine', Russell writes with characteristic bravado to Casamaijor, asking him to ensure that due caution is taken in landing the different cases in which the monument is packed on the *Bridgewater*.<sup>64</sup> 'having got safely through the surf' (a reference to the notorious triple wave surf at Madras) and arrived 'free from Injury of any Kind', Russell asks Casamaijor to commission an outline drawing so that he might be informed of the dimensions of the monument and the relative size of the figures.<sup>65</sup> An outline drawing would proffer information that was more technical and less aesthetic than its predecessors, giving a sense of the architecture of the structure in three-dimensions. By early August, the monument has been deposited in St. Mary's Church in pieces prior to its being assembled and erected.<sup>66</sup> Russell once again asks Casamaijor for a sketch of the built monument with a scale; wanting to know in a rapid succession of letters how it differed from the sketch of its previous iteration that was lost. He is emphatic that neither Lady Hood nor Lady Strange are to see it disassembled and in pieces.<sup>67</sup> Finally by 4 September nearly five years after he married Jane Casamaijor, Russell writes to his father-in-law, the monument having finally been erected 'to the memory of our darling' in St. Mary's Church:

'Lady Strange has written me a long Account of the whole Monument, and speaks in Terms of great Praise both of the Design and the Execution. She describes the alteration in the attitude of the male, and in some measure also of the recumbent figure, just as you do; and from what you both say, I can understand exactly what it is. Bacon must have conformed in that respect to Girardon's design of Richelieu's Monument. In all other respects I thought Bacon's design the better of the two.'

François Girardon's tomb for Cardinal Richelieu in the Sorbonne Chapel, 1675–94, was considered to be one of the most beautiful monuments of sculpture by later eighteenth-century visitors to Paris.<sup>68</sup> Commissioned by Richelieu's niece and heir, the Duchesse d'Aiguillon and carved in the round in Parian marble, it represents Girardon's life sized figure semi-reclining in state on a bed in a devotional pose, with one hand pointing to his heart, the other to a book. He is accompanied by a female personification of religion (or Piety as she was identified in the contract between sculptor and patron) at the head of the monument supporting him in her arms. At its foot, another female figure representing Science (Doctrine) is shown seated turning her back towards Richelieu and facing away from him as she weeps. Immediately behind Richelieu and Religion, two small winged putti hold the Cardinal's coat of arms. A print by Bernard Picart shows a view of the monument *in situ* at an angle off the main axis of the church (fig. 7). It follows a curving S-formation in the sculpted interaction of the three kneeling, reclining and seated figures. Russell's letter to Casamaijor cites Girardon's monument to Richelieu as an iconographical precedent for John Bacon's representation of his own figure and that of Jane, in which he is similarly shown supporting his wife at the head of the monument. In ranking Bacon's design above that of Girardon, the patron puffs the former as being superior to a work which a piece in the *European Magazine* for 1793 hailed as 'the *chef d'oeuvre* of modern sculpture'; a design to which Russell is also known to have contributed!<sup>69</sup>

In summary, this article has demonstrated the extent to which the monument to Jane Russell by John Bacon the younger in St. Mary's Church, Madras, was a family affair on a number of interpretative strata. From its commission by her grieving husband; in its iconographical representation of her actual deathscape surrounded by an inner sanctum of family members, to its serial reproduction on paper in drawings and sketches that were trafficked across the Indian subcontinent. For Travers, 'Death was not merely a statistical challenge to the British population [in India], but a central theme in their imagination of community.'<sup>70</sup> The extended Russell-Casamaijor-Minto family was an iteration of the

wider colonial community. The premature death of one of their own, who was variously a wife, daughter, sister and sister-in-law, provided an opportunity for imaging that affective grouping in marble; in a lasting material monument to a young woman that due to the exigencies of empire had to be recommissioned when its primary version was lost at sea.

In the transport of objects extra- and intra-colonially, Russell's monument additionally conforms to what Roberts in her *Transporting Visions*, has designated 'a highwayman's art history', being one that intercepts objects on the road, on the sea, on the move.<sup>71</sup> Roberts's study of 'the material mobility of pictures' in early America by artists John Singleton Copley, John James Audobon and Asher B. Durand argues that they could and did register the frictions of their own transmission. She writes in the epilogue as follows: 'Art history needs to look beyond the theories of illusion, representation and iconography that underlie its formation as a modern discipline and confront the unavoidable material basis of its referential operations, the weight and heft of the stuff of which its images are made.'<sup>72</sup> Using the shoal of correspondence concerning John Bacon's monuments to Jane Russell, this article has suggested that theories and material do not have to be mutually exclusive. In other words, that it is possible for art history to do both simultaneously: to look at the representation of an actual deathbed tableau figured in marble *and* to confront the vagaries of its transport to and across the Indian colony. Moreover, art historical objects are not always weighty and hefty, as the monument's serial reproductions on paper attest. The innovative methodological framework advocated here, of a lifecycle or lifescape of things as well as of the people who commissioned, owned, viewed and displayed them, becomes a potent means of integrating these two seemingly separate approaches and moving beyond a methodological impasse.

#### List of Figures:

Figure 1: John Bacon the younger, *Monument to Jane Russell*, erected in 1813 in St. Mary's Church, Madras. (Photo: A.P.S. Vijendran). Marble.

Figure 2: John Bacon the elder, *Monument to Samuel Whitbread*, erected in 1799 in St. Mary's Church, Cardington, Bedfordshire. Permission granted by the holder. Marble.

Figure 3: Detail of Henry Cheere, *Monument to Robert, 19<sup>th</sup> Earl of Kildare*, completed in 1746. Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin. (Photo: David J. Bridgwater, bathartandarchitecture.blogspot.com). Marble.

Figure 4: John Flaxman, *Monument to Ann Russell and her son Henry*, 1780s. All Saints, Lydd, Kent. (Photo: © [d.campbell@me.com](mailto:d.campbell@me.com)). Marble.

Figure 5: Monument at Ahmednuggur erected by Lady Hood to Thomas Humberstone Mackenzie. From H. Davidson, *History and Services of the 78<sup>th</sup> Highlanders*, Edinburgh and London, 1901, volume I. National Library of Scotland (Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 International Licence). Photograph.

Figure 6: 'Madras Deaths': Jane Russell's obituary from the *Madras Gazette*. University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. c. 156 folio 135. Printed paper. 9.2 x 6.8 cm.

Figure 7: Bernard Picart, *Print dedicated to Charles Maurice Le Tellier showing a view of Girardon's Monument to Richelieu*, c. 1695 © The Trustees of the British Museum. Etching and engraving. 33.8 x 36.5 cm.



<sup>1</sup> Thanks to the Henry Moore Foundation for the award of a small research grant in 2016 which funded a visit to Chennai and the photography of the Russell monument with the kind permission of Reverend Krubha. I began working on this material while collaborating with the ‘East India Company at Home’ team, Margot Finn, Kate Smith and Ellen Filor, whose individual and collective works have profoundly shaped the finished product. One of my former PhD students, Sydney Ayres, was working on death as part of her project and I consulted many of the secondary sources she identified on obituaries. Catriona Murray, Oliver House at the Bodleian Library, Robert Wenley and staff at the Highlanders’ Museum, Fort George, provided invaluable input and James Collet-White helped me to locate Figure 2.

<sup>2</sup> B. Groseclose, *British Sculpture and the Company Raj: Church monuments and public statuary in Madras, Calcutta and Bombay to 1858*, Newark, University of Delaware Press and London, Associated University Presses, 1995, pp. 98–99.

<sup>3</sup> National Records of Scotland (NRS), GD46/17/39. *Sketch of a journey to Seringapatam and Mysoor*, 18.

<sup>4</sup> D. Arnold, ‘Deathscapes: India in an age of Romanticism and Empire, 1800–1856’, *Nineteenth-century contexts*, 26, 4, 2004, pp. 339–353.

<sup>5</sup> J. Coutu, *Persuasion and Propaganda: Monuments and the eighteenth-century British Empire*, Montreal and London, McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2006, p. 83.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 270–321.

<sup>7</sup> Margot Finn has published on aspects of the Russell and Minto papers in two ground-breaking articles, see her ‘Colonial Gifts: Family politics and the exchange of goods in British India, c. 1780–1820’, *Modern Asian Studies*, 40, 1, 2006, pp. 203–31 and ‘Family Formations: Anglo India and the familial proto-state’, in D. Feldman and J. Lawrence (eds.), *Structures and Transformations in modern British History*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2011, pp. 100–117. My own work on this material is deeply indebted to hers.

<sup>8</sup> The phrase ‘continuous cascade of correspondence’ is M. Finn’s in her ‘Family Formations’, *ibid.*, p. 104.

<sup>9</sup> 20 October 1809. National Library of Scotland (NLS), MS 11064 folios 184–86. On folio 183 Russell recounts that he had already provided an account of John’s wedding in two letters previously sent by different fleets. Four and a half pages is a short letter for Minto whose subsequent letter dated 20 December is just over seventeen pages long.

<sup>10</sup> 19 October 1809. NLS, MS 11064 folio 176.

<sup>11</sup> B. Joseph, *Reading the East India Company, 1720–1840: Colonial currencies of gender*, Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press, 2004, p. 107.

<sup>12</sup> NLS, MS 11064 folio 183.

<sup>13</sup> H. V. Bowen, *The Business of Empire: The East India Company and Imperial Britain, 1756–1833*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006, p. 154.

<sup>14</sup> K. N. Chaudhuri, *The Trading world of Asia and the English East India Company, 1660–1760*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1978, p. 74.

<sup>15</sup> B. Groseclose, ‘Death, glory, empire: art’, in J. F. Codell and D. S. Macleod (eds.), *Orientalism Transposed: The impact of the colonies on British culture*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 1998, pp. 189–201.

<sup>16</sup> Arnold, as at note 4, p. 340. P. D. Curtin, *Death by Migration: Europe’s encounter with the tropical world in the nineteenth century*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989, looks at European soldiers in the tropics from around 1815–1914. See too T. Wilkinson, *Two Monsoons: The life and death of Europeans in India*, London, Duckworth, 1987 and M. Harrison, *Climates & Constitutions: Health, race, environment and British Imperialism in India, 1600–1850*, Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1999.

<sup>17</sup> J. Plotz, *Portable Property: Victorian culture on the move*, Princeton and Oxford, Princeton University Press, 2008, p. 2.

<sup>18</sup> E. Filor, ‘“He is hardened to the climate & a little bleached by it’s [sic] influence”’: Imperial childhoods in Scotland and Madras, c. 1800–1830’, in S. Sleight and S. Robinson (eds.), *Children, Childhood and youth in the British World*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, pp. 77–91.

<sup>19</sup> *A letter to the Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel, Bart., M.P., on the appointment of a commission for promoting the cultivation and improvement of the fine arts with some suggestions respecting a former commission denominated ‘The Committee of Taste’*, London, 1834, p. 3. See I. Roscoe, *A Biographical Dictionary of Sculptors in Britain, 1660–1851*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, pp. 44–54 for a summary of Bacon’s career and list of works. A. Cox-Johnson, ‘Gentleman’s Agreement’, *Burlington Magazine*, 101, 1959, p. 240, is unduly harsh in her comment that the Bacon firm ‘was responsible for many tasteless and ugly monuments in our parish churches.’

<sup>20</sup> S. Burnage, ‘The works of John Bacon, RA (1769–1799)’, unpub. PhD thesis, York University, 2007, p. 15.

<sup>21</sup> NRS, GD46/15/3/9.

<sup>22</sup> M. Craske, *The Silent Rhetoric of the Body: A history of monumental sculpture and commemorative art in England, 1720–1770*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2007, p. 342.

<sup>23</sup> 1 January 1809. Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. c. 156 folio 137.

<sup>24</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. c. 156 folio 138.

<sup>25</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. d. 164 folio 121.

- <sup>26</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. d. 164 folio 121.
- <sup>27</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. d. 164 folio 133.
- <sup>28</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. d. 151 folio 18; Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. d. 162 folio 14.
- <sup>29</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. d. 162 folio 23.
- <sup>30</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. d. 162 folio 151.
- <sup>31</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. d. 162 folio 191. Glass was fragile but more robust than paper in India's tropical climate.
- <sup>32</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. d. 164 folio 140.
- <sup>33</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. d. 163 folio 7. T. Grocott, *Shipwrecks of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Eras*, London, Chatham, 2002, p. 304, records that the *Elizabeth* was a 650 tons burthen, with 380 passengers of which 30 were passengers, 100 seamen and 250 lascars. There were 22 survivors.
- <sup>34</sup> J. L. Roberts, *Transporting Visions: The movement of images in early America*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 2014, p. 1. NLS, MS 11064 folio 188–9.
- <sup>35</sup> NLS, MS 11064 folio 188.
- <sup>36</sup> NLS, MS 11088 folio 18.
- <sup>37</sup> Roberts, as at note 34, p. 15.
- <sup>38</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. c. 156 folio 139.
- <sup>39</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. d. 164 folio 130.
- <sup>40</sup> A. Yarrington, 'The poetics of sculpture: Pedestal, verse and inscription', A. Gerstein (ed.), *Display and Displacement: Sculpture and the pedestal from Renaissance to Post-Modern*, London, Paul Holberton, 2007, p. 79.
- <sup>41</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. c. 156 folio 198.
- <sup>42</sup> A. Chadha, 'Ambivalent heritage: Between affect and ideology in a colonial cemetery', *Journal of Material Culture*, 11, 2006, p. 353. J. Scodel, *The English Poetic Epitaph: Commemoration and conflict from Jonson to Wordsworth*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1991, especially chapter ten, "'kindred spirits": The proper reader in the mid eighteenth-century to early nineteenth-century epitaph', pp. 312–351 is invaluable.
- <sup>43</sup> T. L. Broughton, 'The Bengal Obituary: Reading and writing Calcutta graves in the mid nineteenth century', *Journal of Victorian Culture*, 15, 1, 2010, p. 40 and p. 48.
- <sup>44</sup> T. Fulford and P. J. Kitson, 'Romanticism and colonialism: Texts, contexts, issues', *Romanticism and Colonialism: Writing and Empire, 1780–1830*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998, p. 3.
- <sup>45</sup> NRS, GD46/15/3/9.
- <sup>46</sup> 13 May 1813. Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. d. 164 folio 38; 3 August 1813. Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. let. d. 164 folios 60–61.
- <sup>47</sup> NRS, GD46/8/1.
- <sup>48</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. d. 164 folio 121.
- <sup>49</sup> N. Penny, 'English church monuments to women who died in childbed', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 38, 1975, p. 325 n. 32.
- <sup>50</sup> 5 November 1813. NRS, GD46/8/1.
- <sup>51</sup> NRS, GD46/15/3/14.
- <sup>52</sup> NRS, GD46/17/39. *Diary of a cruise in HMS Illustrious from Trincomalee to Bombay with inland journeys made by Lady Hood in Ceylon and India*, pp. 92–94.
- <sup>53</sup> E. A. Povinelli, *The Empire of Love: Toward a theory of intimacy, genealogy and carnality*, Durham and London, Duke University Press, 2006, p. 214. It is worth noting in passing that previous Mackenzie's had been patrons of John Bacon the elder; see the sculptor's five unpublished letters dated 1796 to Francis Humberston Mackenzie (NRS, GD46/17/4), which are especially iconographically rich in describing the portrait sculpture of the Anglo-Indian Sir William Jones, commissioned by the East India Company for St. Paul's Cathedral, 1799.
- <sup>54</sup> A. Petrucci, *Writing the Dead: Death and writing strategies in the Western tradition*, California, Stanford University Press, 1998, p. 81.
- <sup>55</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. c. 156 folio 139. A copy of the obituary is Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. c 156 folio 135.
- <sup>56</sup> B. Bytheway and J. Johnson, 'Valuing Lives? Obituaries and the life course', *Mortality*, 1, 2, 1996, p. 232.
- <sup>57</sup> E. Barry, 'From epitaph to obituary: Death and celebrity in eighteenth-century British culture', *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 11, 3, 2008, p. 262 and p. 267.
- <sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 261.
- <sup>59</sup> R. Travers, 'Death and the nabob: Imperialism and commemoration in eighteenth-century India', *Past & Present*, 196, 2007, pp. 339–353.
- <sup>60</sup> T. W. Nechtman, *Nabobs: Empire and identity in eighteenth-century Britain*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2010, p. 188.

<sup>61</sup> This gender bias is still maintained. When two sociologists studied 86 obituaries published in the *Guardian* for June 1995 they found the majority of obituarists and their subjects were male. Bytheway and Johnson, as at note 55, p. 223.

<sup>62</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. d. 164 folio 56.

<sup>63</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. d. 163 folio 128.

<sup>64</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. d. 164 folio 34.

<sup>65</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. d. 164 folio 57

<sup>66</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. d. 164 folio 60.

<sup>67</sup> Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. lett. d. 164 folio 63.

<sup>68</sup> L. Dutens, *Journal of Travels made through the Principal Cities of Europe*, London, 1782, p. 9. A. Maral, *François Girardon (1628-1715): Le sculpteur de Louis XIV*, Paris, Arthena, 2015, pp. 331–343; F. Souçhal, *French sculptors of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries: the reign of Louis XIV*, Oxford, Cassirer, 1981, Volume II, no. 38.

<sup>69</sup> *European Magazine*, 24 (1793), 248. The short text on the monument opined ‘It is much to be feared, that the modern savages (I will not call them by the dignified name of Goths) of Europe will not refrain their murdering and destroying hands from this wonderful triumph of art’.

<sup>70</sup> Travers, as at note 58, p. 88.

<sup>71</sup> Roberts, as at note 34, p. 2. See also V. Coltman, *Classical Sculpture and the Culture of Collecting in Britain since 1760*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009, chapter 4, pp. 117–158 which looks at the acquisition, exportation and transportation of ancient marbles to Britain in the later eighteenth century and how they were embroiled in contemporary politics.

<sup>72</sup> Roberts, as at note 34, p. 162.