European Journal of Fine and Visual Arts
Vol 2 | Issue 4 | December 2024
ISSN 2976-744X

REVIEW

Grinling Gibbons as a Sculptor of Church Monuments–New Insights into His Work and Achievements

Clive Easter*

ABSTRACT

Grinling Gibbons is rightly recognised as one of the most important woodcarvers in the history of the decorative arts. The style and sophistication of his work is unmatched not only in England but within Europe and even today few craftsmen can emulate his work. His contributions began at a time of renewed interest in ornate decoration and the vitality of his work at Windsor, Hampton Court and country houses like Petworth established his reputation. It was widely thought at the time that if a man could carve in wood, he could carve in marble and stone, and many contemporary craftsmen could do just that. However, Gibbons had difficulty in working marble and stone and his commemorative sculpture does little to enhance his reputation, despite there being evidence that he did very little himself. His known difficulties in carving the human form also failed to enhance his reputation as a monument maker and although many sculpted monuments are attributed to Gibbons his actual contribution to the production process was limited.

Submitted: October 14, 2024

Published: December 13, 2024

10.24018/ejart.2024.2.4.28

Independent Scholar, Plymouth, Devon.

Corresponding Author:
e-mail: clivejeaster@gmail.com

Keywords: Decoration, monument, sculpture.

1. Introduction

Grinling Gibbons was the most celebrated woodcarver of his generation and perhaps the greatest such craftsman in the history of British decorative carving. His work in wood has excited many connoisseurs, and more casual observers, for its complexity, delicacy, intricacy, and great sense of naturalism. Although much of his woodcarving is somewhat formulaic, it has great uniformity and consistency. Scholarly interest in his life and work began with Walpole (1763) and Cunningham (1830), neither of whom considered Gibbons in isolation, but instead offered a critique of his achievements against those of his contemporaries. It was Tipping's (1914) analysis of Gibbons' woodcarving that his contribution to a wider cultural and architectural heritage was first recognized. Tipping provided a detailed analysis of Gibbons' woodcarving and occasional references to his commemorative sculpture. Later publications by Green (1964), Beard (1989), and Estley (1998), while understandably focusing on his woodwork, again makes references to Gibbons' work in marble, stone, and bronze, thus providing further insight into his artistic contributions. Gibbons' entry in the Dictionary of National Biography provides a comprehensive overview of his career and achievements including his authorship of several monuments and statues. Whinney (1988) offers important analyses of both Gibbons, and his business partner Arnold Quellin's, work, while Roscoe *et al*. (2009) provide a comprehensive list of Gibbons' known works including monuments, statues, chimneypieces, and architectural sculpture. In various county guides by Pevsner and his collaborators, references are occasionally made to monuments associated with Gibbons.

The details of Gibbons' early life and training, to his arrival in England, have been exhaustively covered elsewhere, especially his 'discovery' by John Evelyn in January 1671. Gibbons was made free of the Draper's Company, by patrimony, in 1672 and later that year he established a workshop at La Belle Sauvage in Ludgate Hill, London. He married Elizabeth, (surname unknown) also in 1672. By 1677 he was an established member of the workforce at Windsor Castle, initially in the team of Henry Philips, Master Sculptor and Carver in Wood to the Crown. His career at the Royal palaces of Windsor,

Hampton Court, and Whitehall was aided and supported by Hugh May, the celebrated gentleman architect, and Sir Peter Lely, the Court painter. Gibbons also had a long working relationship with Sir Christopher Wren, supplying carved decorative woodwork for some of the churches rebuilt after the Great Fire of 1666, including St James, Piccadilly, and for the Choir of St Paul's Cathedral.

Some of the decorative components used in his woodcarving found their way into the church monuments produced by the workshop, an aspect of his designs discussed below. In keeping with the age, Gibbons was a multi-talented artisan who worked in a variety of materials, especially wood and marble and although his work has received a great deal of scholarly interest, his church monuments remain the least understood products of his workshop.

2. The Early Monuments and Gibbons's Partnership with Arnold Quellin

Despite his lack of experience in working in marble or stone, Gibbons was commissioned by Sir Ralph Verney of Middle Claydon, Buckinghamshire to execute the monument to his friend Sir Roger Burgoyne (1618–1677), at Sutton, Bedfordshire, (monument erected c1679). The finished monument is very similar to a more accomplished piece at Stoke Rochford, Lincolnshire to Alice Cholmeley, died 1678, possibly attributed to CG Cibber. Verney (1899) records that Sir Peter Lely and Hugh May were asked to adjudicate on the finished work and determine the cost-either £100 or £120. The resulting monument is a clumsy piece devoid of any elegance or grace, However, the design was copied for the monument to Lady Frances North (1647–1678) at Wroxton, Oxfordshire, with no appreciable improvement.

Due to other commitments, especially at Windsor, Gibbons may have been unable to provide appropriate supervision to the sculptural side of his business. As he only had a limited understanding of working in marble, he probably left the production of monuments to others. This is borne out by a statement from Vertue (1742) who says that he was:

> A most excellent carver in wood he was neither well skilled or practiced in marble or in brass for which works he employed the best artists he could procure–yet this accident might happen from haste or hurrying, want of attention properly.

The high demand for commemorative sculpture in the post-restoration period and Gibbons's shortcomings evident in the Burgoyne monument suggest that Vertue was right in his assessment. In order to compete for contracts, Gibbons needed to broaden the skills base of his workforce. He thus sought experienced stone carvers, turning initially to Laurence Van der Muelen (1643–1719) of Mechelen who worked for him from c1675 until he returned to his hometown in 1687. In 1680, Gibbons employed Peter Van Dievoet (1661–1729), who worked for him until 1688, and at around that time, he also employed Anthony Verhuke, (nd) who, according to Vertue (1736), worked as a 'statuary' although no works have been attributed to him. In 1681 Gibbons turned to Artus Quellin III (1658–1686), whom he first encountered while working at Windsor in 1678. In about 1680, John Nost I entered the Gibbons workshop, eventually became Quellin's 'foreman', and remained associated with Gibbons until c1690.

Amongst the craftsmen who collaborated with Gibbons, Arnold Quellin III (1653–86) is the best known and was certainly working in England by 1677. By 1681, Gibbons and Quellin had entered into a formal partnership agreement, (PRO C9/415.2503) the contract stipulating that Quellin was to do *all sorts of carved work in stone*, with work to be jointly undertaken between them.

In 1681 Gibbons was commissioned to make monuments to Dame Katherine Percival (nee Southwell 1637–1679) and Dame Katherine's father, Robert Southwell (1608–77) and his wife, Helena Gore, (1613–1679) Loeber (1983) at Kinsale. Co. Cork. Slightly later, the workshop was commissioned to make two further monuments to members of the family at Henbury, Bristol, namely Lady Elizabeth Southwell (1648–1681) and her husband Sir Robert Southwell (1635–1702 monument made earlier). These four monuments are inconsistent in style and of rather poor design, possibly the work of different sculptors. A drawing exists of Sir Robert's monument and records that it was designed by Sir Henry Sheers and carved by Gibbons: the total cost being £62 18s. The individual contributions of those within the sculptural team is unknown although as will be shown, Quellin and Nost made important contributions to several monuments. Van der Muelen was known as a sculptor of fine floral motifs in wood and he collaborated with Van Dievoet on the bronze statue of James II, erected in 1686, in Trafalgar Square, traditionally attributed to Gibbons.

The earliest monument associated with Quellin, and others, is that at Tamworth, Staffordshire to Sir John Ferrers (1629–1680), and his son Sir Humphrey (1652–1678). Probably erected in 1681, the monument has been identified as a Gibbons product through a letter of 1698 by Theophilus Hastings,

Fig. 1. Monument to Tobias Rustat, died 1693, erected c1685 Jesus College Oxford.

7th Earl of Huntingdon, a section of which is quoted below. Elements within the piece appear throughout Gibbons's monument production, especially the shallow sarcophagus and distinctive flame-topped urns. The finely carved festoons of flowers and foliage, very akin to Gibbons' woodworking designs, and the very lively putti, suggest the hand of an experienced carver. The two kneeling figures were very probably Quellin's main contribution and display a rare level of emotional intensity. By English standards, Quellin was a good and innovative sculptor and he was almost certainly responsible for the putti on the slightly later Oxinden family monument at Wingham, Kent of c1682 and that to Tobias Rustat (made c1685) at Jesus College Cambridge (see below).

A lengthy document in the Court of Chancery details a dispute between Gibbons and Quellin that ended their partnership in May 1683 (PRO C9/415/250). In 1686, Gibbons and Quellin settled their differences only for Quellin to die, at the tragically early age of 33, in September of that year. However, it is possible that Quellin may have had a separate workshop, with Nost as his foreman, and that he continued to collaborate with Gibbons on a variety of projects. The Thynne monument of 1682 in Westminster Abbey is traditionally ascribed to Quellin alone, suggesting that he and not Gibbons was contracted to make the monument.

The mural monument to Tobias Rustat, at Jesus College Oxford, carved in c1685 and kept by him until his death in 1693, has usually been ascribed to Quellin (see Fig. 1). The lively portrait medallion and well-modelled drapery set a pattern for portrait monuments produced by the workshop while the fruits and foliage seen bordering the inscription are very densely carved and may reflect an input from Gibbons himself (Renfrew & Robbins, 1990). Similarly, The Lady Cornwallis monument at Brome, Suffolk, erected c1682 (see Fig. 2), is also attributed to Quellin based on the similarity of the putti and drapery seen on the Ferrers and Rustat monuments. Meanwhile, the monument to Sir Robert Wyseman, who died in 1684, at St Benet Paul's Wharf, Victoria Street, London is, because of the similarity of its portrait oval with the Cornwallis and Rustat monuments, here identified as a Gibbons/Quellin work.

One of the most unusual monuments of the period that, despite a lack of documentary evidence, can be ascribed to the Gibbons workshop is that at Wingham Kent to members of the Oxinden family. Erected by Sir Henry Oxinden in 1682, the principal feature of the monument is a large three-sided obelisk profusely decorated with carved foliage and flowers. Animated putti placed on the corners of the tomb chest are amongst the best on any monument of the period while the overall level of creativity suggests that it is almost certainly the work of Quellin, possibly with help from Nost, such skilled figure carving being a specialty of Quellin but not a skill that Gibbons ever mastered.

Fig. 2. Monument to Elizabeth Cornwallis 1680 Brome, Suffolk.

The output of the Gibbons workshop in the early 1680s showed considerable stylistic diversity. The originality of the Oxinden monument was one such example while the monument to German Pole (1626–83) at Radbourne, Derbyshire is another. The contract for the monument, dated 1 August 1683, was made by Anne Pole with completion scheduled for four months later. Gibbons was to receive £100 in advance and the remaining £200 when completed and he signed a receipt for £300 for the monument on 22 September 1684.

A non-effigial monument, the sprightly putti that accompany the achievement of arms are certainly within Quellin's lively style and there is some similarity with the winged cherub heads seen in some of the carved wooden decoration produced by Gibbons.

In 1684 three very different monuments were ordered from the Gibbons workshop, each destined to achieve recognition but for very different reasons. Two were ordered by the ninth Earl, later first Duke, of Rutland and a third by the widow of Viscount Campden. The monuments ordered by the Earl of Rutland commemorate the seventh and eighth Earls respectively and are very different in style and execution. That to George Manners, seventh Earl (1580–1641) shows him dressed in Roman military costume with the head turned to his right with the right hand raised to the chest in an affected display of emotion. The positioning of the left hand is comically theatrical with no real attempt at the contrapposto. Any design source remains unknown, but it may have been influenced by John Bushnell's standing figure of Lord Maudaunt, who died in 1675, at All Saints, Fulham, London. The Maudaunt figure is well-balanced, authoritative, and commanding while the figure of the seventh Earl is the total opposite.

George Manners's 2nd cousin was John, 8th Earl of Rutland (1604–1679) and his monument is equally unsatisfactory in terms of design although the theatricality of the former piece has been reduced to a much less affected pose. The figures of the Earl and his wife Frances stand on either side of a large urn and are set against a plain back panel. The figures stand on a deeply moulded base that carries the inscription panel, above which is an open segmental arch with a skull in the centre. The Earl is dressed in Roman military costume and with a voluminous cloak covering the shoulders and most of the torso. His right hand rests on his hip while the outstretched left hand tries to achieve some sense of balance. Lady Frances is portrayed in a short-sleeved loose-fitting dress with a long loose gown worn over all, the skirts gathered in her left hand. What is particularly interesting here is that her under-dress is very low cut and deliberately reveals her left breast, which may be an oblique attempt at portraying her as the goddess Venus.

Fig. 3. Monument to Baptist Noel & Elizabeth Bertie Exton Rutland Erected 1686.

Given that the two Rutland monuments are so very different, the suggestion here is that two, as yet unidentified, sculptors were responsible for them. The possible involvement of Quellin in the monument to the 7th Earl is unlikely given that its operatic pose and absurd sense of drama are unlike anything known to be by him. Nost too is an unlikely candidate for the same reasons while the involvement of Van der Muelen and Van Dievoet is also unlikely as they were busy with the James II statue now in Trafalgar Square. The monument to the 8th Earl shows an overall improvement in design and the carving of the standing figures is very different from that of the 7th Earl. There is a possibility that this could have been carved by Nost and there is a discernible similarity in the style of this figure with that of Baptist Noel at Exton which is here firmly attributed to Nost.

The commission for the monuments to the 7th and 8th Earls was originally intended to go to Caius Gabriel Cibber but, at the behest of the 9th Earl's 3rd wife, Catherine Noel, was given to Gibbons. Catherine was the daughter of Baptist Noel, 3rd Viscount Campden who died in 1682, and his fourth wife Elizabeth Bertie who died in 1683. Their monument, at Exton, Rutland, was erected in 1686 by her third son and executor John Noel at a cost of £1000 (see Fig. 3). As its centrepiece it has two standing figures of Baptist Noel and Elizabeth Bertie. Between the figures is a large pedestal, topped by a globular urn, carrying an inscription set within an oval wreath giving the date of the erection of the monument. Flanking the figures are two tall obelisks topped with black marble urns garlanded with white flowers. These obelisks have, on their fronts, garlanded oval panels of Noel's first two wives. The left panel shows Lady Anne Fielding and her three children and on the right is his second wife Anne Lovett, Countess of Bath, and her only child. On the base of the monument is a panel showing the third wife, Hester Wotton, and her six children. The nine children of Elizabeth Bertie are shown in an oval panel beneath the main figures. These four panels show great sensitivity in the carving, something that Van der Muelen may have been involved with as he was known to produce similar panels in wood. The monument does have some similarities with that of the 8th Earl of Rutland, especially in the design and cutting of the standing figures. For the male figures on both monuments, there is a very similar style to the heads while the skirts of their Roman costume have the same decoration to the broad lower edge. On the female figures, both have the same overall style to their under-dress, that to Elizabeth Bertie not exposing a breast, while the long loose drapery of the outer garment is similar but not identical: their heads are indistinguishable.

It seems likely that the Noel monument was commissioned in 1683, and if it was ordered before May of that year, then Quellin might have been involved in the initial design stages. The only known sculptor within the Gibbons team thought capable of such work was Nost. His possible involvement in the monument is supported by the similarity between the figure of Viscount Noel with other known or attributed Nost monuments including those at Silton, Dorset to Hugh Wyndham, at Yarnton, Oxfordshire, to Sir Thomas Spencer, both of whom died in 1684 and to the Earl of Bristol who died in 1698.

Gibbons almost certainly recognised his own shortcomings in the design and execution of marble products and effectively passed over the making of monuments to others, especially Quellin and Nost, although the possible contributions of Van der Muelen, Van Dievoet, and Verhuke cannot be ignored. The involvement of Nost was to become crucial in many of the later monuments of the 1680s and while

he went on to establish his own studio by the end of the decade, many features seen on much of his later work appear to have been grounded during his time with Gibbons.

3. The Larger Monuments Post 1686

Despite Quellin's untimely death in September 1686, there is evidence to suggest that there was some continuity, albeit with modest adaptations, of existing designs in the production of the larger effigial monuments erected between c1686 and c1693. A modest group of monuments constitutes the only identifiable collection to be produced by the workshop. Given his continued influence, it is highly likely that John Nost made several contributions to monument design and production, possibly accompanied by others within the team. However, towards the end of the decade, Van der Muelen, Van Dievoet, and possibly Verhuke had left the Gibbons practice. Nost left in c1690 to establish his own studio and by the very early 1690s, there was a marked deterioration in the design and execution of the monuments subsequently produced. Given that these key team members had left the practice, and to whom we assume some degree of autonomy was given, it remains speculative as to how the workshop was organised. No sculptor has been identified with this later phase of the workshop and the extent of Gibbons' hands-on involvement remains unknown.

Until Gibbons died in 1721, the workshop appeared to have produced about nine large-scale effigial monuments and, despite the issues surrounding his working practices, he must have retained some control over the monuments being produced despite his involvement in high-profile woodworking projects. Some of the subsequent monument designs are cramped and the figures tend to be rather clumsy with only one that can be considered an accomplished piece. Unfortunately, this deterioration in design reached a point where there was even public ridicule of one of Gibbons' more well-known monuments.

In the mid 1680s, Gibbons secured contracts for four monuments to senior ecclesiastics. The earliest, the monument to Archbishop Sterne, (1596–1683), at York Minster, set a design format replicated elsewhere. The figure has a relaxed, reclining pose and excellent facial features, probably based on a painted portrait. The episcopal robes are finely rendered and naturalistic with deep realistic folds. Stewart (1976) claims that the attribution of the monument to Gibbons is proved in a letter sent to his old friend John Etty on 10 July 1684 where he writes:

> I received You'ers and Mr Stavnes today and I toeld him that was to pay the Carvigs and thar fore I wold not medell with the bargine. I hartely beg You're pardon for not writing to You in dead my busnes is so great . . . . . my man will be in Yorck I hoep in 5 or 6 daes for I hoep he has don in darby.

The reference to 'darby' almost certainly refers to the Pole monument at Radbourne while The 'man who will be in York' is very probably a reference to John Nost who it is believed set up the Pole monument. It is possible that the 'Mr Stavnes' should read as Mr Starnes and, in reality, is almost certainly a reference to Richard Sterne, eldest son of the Archbishop. The monument was illustrated by Drake (1736) and remains unchanged except for the railings that are no longer in situ.

Other episcopal monuments following this format are those to Bishop Gunning, (1614–1684), monument erected 1686, at Ely Cathedral attributed to Gibbons, and that to Archbishop Dolben, (1625–1686), also at York Minster. The Dolben monument was contracted for in 1687 and possibly erected the same year. Possibly based on ideas by Quellin and sculpted by Nost, the monument has the added feature of an elaborate back plate above the effigy, consisting of winged cherub heads, within clouds, who are about to bestow upon the deceased the wreath of immortality. This was an element that featured in several later monuments.

A later monument at York Minster, to Archbishop Lamplugh, (1615–1691) and has the standing figure dressed in surplices instead of vestments that are simply shown as a series of vertical folds, the figure being a statement of the middle-of-the-road Protestantism that Lamplugh and his contemporaries practiced. Although the sculptural quality is poor, the facial features are well cut and are possibly based on the portrait of Lamplugh by Sir Godfrey Kneller at Queen's College, Oxford. The Bodleian Library (n.d.) holds a document dated 9 October 1691 in which Gibbons issued a receipt to Revd Thomas Lamplugh, his son, for £100 which reads:

> Re'd then of ye Reverd Mr Thomas Lamplugh the summa of one hundred pounds, on account of a monument I am oblig'e to make for his Father the late Arch Bp of York, wch sd. summe of one hundred pounds I oblige my self heires & Executors to repay to ye aforsed Mr Lamplugh in case the sd monument be not finish'd and set up, witness my hand
> Grinling Gibbons

Fig. 4. Monument to Sir Thomas Longueville 1686 Old Wolverton Buckinghamshire.

Given that Gibbons quotes £100 '*on account of a monument*' suggests that this might be a down payment towards the final sum which remains unknown.

Although the Gibbons/Quellin partnership was dissolved in 1683, it is suggested here that Gibbons subcontracted some work to Quellin including the Sterne and Gunning monuments. These two monuments appear to form the stylistic basis for a small but significant group dating from 1685/86 until c1700, possibly starting with that to Sir Thomas Longueville who died in June 1685, at Old Wolverton Buckinghamshire (see Fig. 4). This very finely executed monument has a semi-reclining figure in Roman military costume, lying on his left side, placed on a thin base that is itself placed on a moulded slab atop a gadrooned chest. The costume is beautifully rendered, with delicate folds to the drapery, and the very realistic treatment of the body has the left arm resting on a cushion whilst the right hand is brought to cover his chest.

What is possibly the next monument in the group is that to John Dolben, Archbishop of York, who died in 1686. The monument was contracted for in 1687 and possibly erected later that same year. The effigy, reclining on its right side, is treated in much the same way as the Longueville monument with the added feature of an elaborate back plate above the effigy, consisting of winged cherub heads, within clouds, who are about to bestow upon the deceased the wreath of immortality, an element that was to feature in several later monuments.

Other monuments within this modest group include Sir Thomas Hare, 1693, Stow Bardolph, Norfolk, Mary Newdigate 1693 at Harefield, Middlesex, Sir John Spencer, 1699, Offley, Hertfordshire, Denzil, Lord Holles, monument erected c1700, Dorchester, Dorset and that to Henry Somerset, Duke of Badminton, 1700, Badminton, Gloucestershire. This group possesses a qualitative difference from other monuments produced during the period c1686–1700 by the Gibbons workshop. Except the monuments to Longueville and Hare, all have almost identical back plates to that seen on the Dolben monument while the Spenser monument is alone in having the added feature of a female figure, possibly his mother, Anne Maynard, who outlived him, pointing to the celestial scene above. The crispness of the carving seen on the Longueville monument is not repeated within the group and, by c1700, while the overall style remains evident in the later monuments, the crispness of execution has gone and we are left with monuments that are pedestrian, and lacking in grace and sophistication.

The Hare and Holles monuments have been ascribed to Gibbons on stylistic grounds alone. Beard (1989) records that the Badminton monument was paid for in three instalments at Childe's Bank, Fleet Street on 3 September 1699 for £250, another on 1 November 1701 for £750 and another on 6 November 1701 for £53 15s. Newdigate-Newdegate (1901) records that for the Lady Newdigate monument, erected in 1694, Gibbons wrote to her husband saying:

> I ombly thanck You for Youer great faver and Extrorney ponuallity I recevfd the fifty pound wich I shall allwaes Aknoligs as a pertickeler faver, as for the grait I will not imply the Smich till I hear Youer Comands. I shoeld thnick that it shoeld be of it self and goe round the monnemint but housoever I will send my man hoem is not kom hoem to bring a gost Akount off bocch the monnemints. A ganst I am favered wich en Anser from You . . . ..

After the monument was finished Gibbons wrote that:

> I holp all things will pleas You wen You see it for I indevered it as much as in me lais, but If you should mislick enny thing, You may be shoer to Comand
> Sr, Your ombell and obegent sarvant
> Grinling Gibbons

Although the spelling is poor and an indicator that Gibbons never really mastered written English, it is interesting for several reasons. It mentions a grate around the monument which does not exist and may never have done so but it also speaks of *bocch the monnemints (both the monuments)* which may be a reference to the monument to Sarah Newdigate, who died 1695, the first wife of the third baronet, discussed below.

Immediately prior to the Newdigate and Hare monuments, the workshop was involved in producing the large monument to Sarah, Duchess of Somerset (1631–1692). In her will dated 17 May 1686, (proved 1704) she specifically asked to be buried in Westminster Abbey and gave directions for her tomb stating that £500 be spent on it with a further £300 for her actual funeral. No sculptor is specified in the document and as she had no surviving children, it was left to her executors to carry out her wishes. The monument was probably erected in c1693. Gibbons' authorship of the monument is confirmed in a letter of 10th September 1698 (Prattington Collection) between Gibbons and Theophilus Hastings, 7th Earl of Huntingdon whose monument is discussed below. In the letter, Hastings writes that:

> I like not your painting of the arms on Sir Humphrey Ferrers at Tamworth, Mr Poole at Redburn nor the Duchess of Somerset at Westminster, which were all your work.

The exaggerated pose of the reclining figure is unlike any other from the Gibbons workshop. It is poorly proportioned, not properly fitting the sarcophagus, a design fault evident in later monuments. Unfortunately, the whole superstructure has been removed, probably in the nineteenth century, but its original form was illustrated by Dart in 1723. From this illustration, it can be seen that there was a celestial scene to which the Duchess was gazing, in a gesture not of resignation but of awe and wonder which explains the seemingly exaggerated pose of the effigy.

The monument to John, 4th Lord Coventry at Croome D'Abitot, Worcestershire, is another unusual piece with no recognisable predecessor. He died unexpectedly on 25 March 1687 aged 33 and the monument was originally sited in the old church. The present church, sited the grounds of Croome Court, was built in 1759–63 to the designs of Lancelot (Capability) Brown and Robert Adam for the 6th Earl of Coventry. The family monuments were brought to the new church soon after its completion, the original medieval church being subsequently demolished. With this monument, there is the possibility of more personal involvement by Gibbons than in many within the Longueville group.

The finished work conforms very closely to the details of the contract (Worcester Record Office, n.d.), dated 30th April 1690, which was agreed between Gibbons and the late Lord Coventry's mother, Margaret Tufton. Here, Gibbons entered into a bond for £500 but he was actually paid £322 10 shillings with £107 10 shillings at the start, and that the said Grinling Gibbons:

> shall and will at his own proper costs and charges within the space of one whole year from the date of the contract with his utmost care skill and art will exactly and in workmanlike manner Work, Carve and compleateatly make and Finish a Sepulchral Monument, All of the best and purest white Italian Marble for and in memory of the Right Hon John late Lord Coventry which said monument shall consist of the following parts: Three statues as big as the Life, One, the principall whereof to be the Semblable and perfect Figure of the said John, late Lord Coventry, in all his Barons Robes, lying upon a Tomb properly Adorned, with his Coronet tumbled at his feet, and his Right hand strecht out to catch at a Starry Crown, presented towards him by the Serene Statue, representing Faith and standing at the head of the first Statue. And the Third Statue representing Hope, and standing at the Feet of the said First Figure. Under the Tomb and the said Figures Two pedestals, And between the said Pedestalls a fair smooth Tablet, whereon to write an inscription. On each side of the tomb a Death's head with Bones, adorn'd with Ears of Corn Leaves Flowers or Branches. Upon the pedestals behind the Statues of Faith and Hope Two Pilasters fluted of the Corinthian Order, with its Entablature and proper Adornment. Over that, the Coat of Arms born and quartered by the said Lord Coventry with the crest and supporters. And above that, an Urn finely adorn'd and Carved with Festoons. And the Intercolumniation to contain a large Fair and Smooth Table for the Epitaph, with a handsome Moulding above it. And as many letters to be engraved and written as the inscription and Epitaph shall require. And

> the Name of the said Grinlin Gibbons to be Engraved in some convenient place, as the Artificer of the said Monument. And lastly that the said whole monument shall be fifteen foot and a half high and ten foot broad and in every point Done made and Finished as above said or in better manner and according to the model and draught hereunto agreed . . . .

There was also to be *a strong overall and workmanlike iron grate or rail about the same (monument) four foot and a half high and all painted as is usual in such caces with the heads well gilt . . . .*

No sign of any signature exists although it may have been painted and is now lost. Nor is there any evidence of the 'iron grate' or the 'Starry Crown' but they may have been lost when the monument was moved to its present location. The Earl's coronet has been placed on the top of the main tomb chest, at the feet of Hope, and, in this position, appears almost as if it has been discarded. However, a more likely explanation is that the coronet has been put aside in order that he might receive his heavenly crown–earthly cares have been set aside for more celestial considerations.

The figures of Hope and Faith possess a strong sense of theatricality and while they attempt to provide a degree of balance, their poses highlight a very limited understanding of the human form. The figure of Faith, at the head of the monument, holds up her right hand to present the (now lost) starry crown to the prone figure of Lord Coventry while her left arm is held slightly off the body in an attempt to balance the figure. The weight distribution is such that the left foot is raised at the heel and the knee is slightly bent, an effect that works surprisingly well. However, the drapery of her thin loose robe is confusing, being lifted and knotted at the waist and with a strip over her right shoulder. This appears to have no apparent purpose and is secured under a narrow high girdle that simultaneously lifts the breasts. The figure of Hope has her left arm extended over the feet of the effigy in an attempt to balance the right arm of Faith. Her right hand is brought to cover the right breast, the elbow extended outward. While the overall effect is to balance the figure of Faith, any sense of stability is sadly lacking. All the weight is on her right leg, the left being bent at the knee and the foot placed behind and doing nothing. The thin under gown is visible to mid-chest level and is accompanied by a mass of confused drapery, some of which is confined in the crook of her right elbow.

The figure of Lord John is even more problematic than those of the accompanying personifications. He lies awkwardly, on his right side with his left arm resting on a tasselled cushion supporting the upper body and with his head raised as if to gaze directly at Faith, his right arm extended to receive the starry crown. His robes appear well cut and with none of the confusion surrounding the drapery evident on the personifications but this may be due to there being a portrait of the Earl, currently in the collections at Antony House, Cornwall, that may have been the basis for the effigy. Architecturally, the monument adheres to the contract; the Corinthian pilasters are well cut, as are the flowers and foliage on the entablature. The back wall of the monument is taken up with a very finely cut and lengthy inscription. Overall, the monument is a bold and confident work that makes it a piece to note but it is, ultimately, over-ambitious in terms of figurative design and the handling of the drapery. While the treatment of the figure sculpture is much better than that seen on the monuments to the 7th and 8th Earls of Rutland, it continues to show a lack of any real refinement and the whole effect is awkward and clumsy. The date of erection for the monument is unknown but it post-dates the departure of Nost and others and so the sculptor responsible for the monument must remain speculative, Gibbons being an unlikely candidate as he was busy elsewhere.

Dating from approximately the same time as the Coventry monument is that at York Minster to Archbishop Thomas Lamplugh (1615–91). This monument lacks the elegance, grace, and refinement of the Sterne and Dolben monuments and illustrates rather too well the poor quality of some of Gibbons' output at this time. The simple architectural framing has the standing figure dressed in surplices instead of vestments, these being shown as a series of vertical folds. The tomb chest has a partially gadrooned top but is otherwise plain while the inscription, in a tight oval in the centre of the base, almost appears as an afterthought. Although the sculptural quality is poor, the facial features are quite well cut and are possibly based on a portrait of Lamplugh by Godfrey Kneller at Queen's College, Oxford. On 9 October 1691 Gibbons issued a receipt (Bodleian Library MS Autog) to Revd Thomas Lamplugh, his son, for £100 which reads:

> Re'd then of ye Reverd Mr Thomas Lamplugh the summa of one hundred pounds, on account of a monument I am oblig'e to make for his Father the late Arch Bp of York, wch sd. summe of one hundred pounds I oblige my self heires & Executors to repay to ye aforsed Mr Lamplugh in case the sd monument be not finish'd and set up, witness my hand
> Grinling Gibbons

Given that Gibbons quotes £100 '*on account of a monument*' suggests that this might be a down payment towards the final sum which remains unknown. Gibbons' actual involvement with the design and carving is open to speculation.

By c1700, Gibbons continued to be involved in large-scale projects for the Dukes of Buccleuch and Queensbury in Scotland and at Blenheim Palace, Oxfordshire, but his highly ornate style of woodwork was beginning to decline in popularity At the same time, there were changes in contemporary commemorative sculpture that broadly favoured less ostentation and a leaning to more classical forms. After 1700, the Gibbons workshop produced only two authenticated large-scale effigial monuments and neither has received positive publicity.

The first of these post-1700 monuments commemorates Sir Cloudesley Shovell (1650–1707) who died following a shipwreck on the Isles of Scilly on 23 October 1707. He was buried in Westminster Abbey on 22 December 1707, the monument being paid for by Queen Anne at a cost of £332 10s. The scene of his shipwreck is shown in a finely carved panel on the monument's base, which compares favourably with a similar panel on the Narborough monument discussed below. Here, Shovell reclines uncomfortably on his left side and is shown wearing Roman military costume along with a confusing mass of drapery that might be an attempt at Roman civilian dress to cover the armour. The sarcophagus is too small for the effigy, giving it a very cramped appearance while the two pairs of columns that support the projecting entablatures is a design idea first seen on the monument to the Duke of Badminton. On the top of each canopy projection are winged putti and between them is a large Baldacchino, the drapery of which is drawn up and back and tied to the entablature to reveal, on the back wall, a finely cut and carefully positioned inscription. Unfortunately, the monument attracted the opprobrium of Addison (1711) who wrote:

> I could not but be very much delighted with several modern Epitaphs, which are written with great Elegance of Expression and Justness of Thought, and therefore do Honour to the Living as well as to the Dead. As a Foreigner is very apt to conceive an Idea of the Ignorance or Politeness of a Nation from the Turn of their publick Monuments and Inscriptions, they should be submitted to the Perusal of Men of Learning and Genius before they are put in Execution. Sir Cloudesly Shovel's Monument has very often given me great Offence: Instead of the brave rough English Admiral, which was the distinguishing Character of that plain gallant Man, he is represented on his Tomb by the Figure of a Beau, dress'd in a long Perriwig, and reposing himself upon Velvet Cushions under a Canopy of State, The Inscription is answerable to the Monument; for, instead of celebrating the many remarkable Actions he had performed in the service of his Country, it acquaints us only with the Manner of his Death, in which it was impossible for him to reap any Honour. The Dutch, whom we are apt to despise for want of Genius, shew an infinitely greater Taste of Antiquity and Politeness in their Buildings and Works of this Nature, than what we meet with in those of our own Country. The Monuments of their Admirals, which have been erected at the publick Expence, represent them like themselves; and are adorned with rostral Crowns and naval Ornaments, with beautiful Festoons of Seaweed, Shells, and Coral.

Addison's comment was the first published attack on an individual monument. The use of the periwig with Roman military costume particularly annoyed him as he considered this to be pompous, ostentatious, and at odds with the admiral's character. As the monument had been commissioned by Queen Anne, in attacking it in the way he did, Addison was effectively criticizing the Court and Courtly tastes. Dart (1723) also thought little of the monument, saying that it is *rich in marble and mean in design*.

The second post-1700 monument commemorates James Brydges who, in 1719, became 1st Duke of Chandos. The monument, designed by James Gibbs, was erected in 1717 in the extravagantly Baroque Chandos mausoleum, next to the church of St Lawrence, Whitchurch, in the London Borough of Harrow. Dressed in Roman armour with a periwig, the Duke stands in the centre of the composition against a backdrop of looped drapery. On either side of the Duke are kneeling figures of his two wives: Mary Lake who died in 1712 on the left, and Cassandra Willoughby, his cousin, who died in 1735 on the right. Both figures are dressed in long flowing robes, their heads covered, and their kneeling postures appear almost as if in supplication. Cherry and Pevsner (1999) describe the monument as one of a *grand and noble restraint* and while it is an improvement on the Shovell monument of a decade earlier it again illustrates the poor quality of the figurative carving produced by the workshop at this time when compared with the work of contemporaries such as Edward Stanton and Thomas Green.

By the time this monument was erected, Gibbons was nearly seventy years old and while he may have maintained overall control of the workshop's output, it is perhaps unlikely that he had any real involvement in the carving, a task doubtless delegated to one or more as yet unidentified sculptors. In

a letter (Baker & Baker, 1949) of January 10th, 1718, the Duke wrote to Gibbons challenging his bill the actual cost of which is unknown.

> To Mr Gibbons
> Sr I have ye fav of yours & must own I think ye demand you make for ye monument & statues to be excessive high, however since you say, you have never yet in any dealings you have had had any abatement made in yr prices, I have directed Mr Zollicoffe (The Dukes Secretary) to pay you ye 350£ remainder of yr bill. You'l forgive me if I can't but add that I believe there never was so much reason from ye workmanship to allow of an abatement in this case–from ye judgement of every one who has seen ye figures–Bea.

The last sentence suggests that the quality of the work had been criticised, possibly by the Duke or someone close to him.

The Gibbons workshop produced only one fully authenticated kneeling effigial monument after the Ferrers example at Tamworth. This commemorates Mrs. Mary Beaufoy, who died in 1705, in Westminster Abbey. Here, the figure is placed in a simple architectural frame accompanied by two weeping putti that are placed above a shallow gadrooned sarcophagus which itself rests on a plain chest with the inscription on the front. Surrounding her head are cherubs who are about to crown her with the wreath of immortality. The inscription carries a direct instruction to the reader to as follows:

> Let the sight of this tombe imprint in thy Mind that Young and Old (without distinction) leave this world and therefore fail not to secure the next.

Such sentiments were not lost on Dart (1723) for his comment on the monument suggests that the advice given in the inscription to the living is excellent. The date of death is added in very small letters after the inscription, and in the bottom right corner, we are told that *This monument was made by Mr Grinling Gibbons*. Her somewhat affected pose, with her right hand, brought to her breast and the left hand extended outwards, combined with the awkward drapery around her waist, creates an overall impression of simulated theatricality but, as Dart points out, the pose suggests religious devotion while also showing an awareness of the life lived. Unfortunately, the monument was given an unfavourable review in a guide to Westminster Abbey by the early Victorian critic, Cunningham (1842), who described it as *a poor monument from so famous a carver*.

The Beaufoy monument appears to have been the template for the monument at Tamlaght Finlagan, Ballykelly, County Derry to Mrs. Jane Hamilton who died in 1716. Here, the urn and foliage, removed from the Beaufoy monument in the eighteenth century, are the same as seen in Dart's engraving but the most notable difference is in the poses of the putti, both of whom are clearly lamenting her decease. She too is about to be given the crown of immortality although the clouds and winged putti are simpler than on the Beaufoy monument and the whole effect is less crowded. The monument has no shallow sarcophagus, just a gadrooned shelf, while the inscription tablet is placed between two curved console brackets. Given the considerable similarities between these two monuments, it is here proposed that the Hamilton piece is a product of the Gibbons workshop.

It is appropriate at this point to consider two drawings by Gibbons, elements of which incorporate ideas taken from existing monuments while also acting as a vehicle for concepts seen in later works. The first drawing was for a monument to Mary Stuart, Queen Mary II, who died aged 32 on 28 December 1694 (All Souls College). She was buried in Westminster Abbey on 5 March 1695. Immediately following her death Wren and Gibbons were engaged in the design and creation of her catafalque pending the construction of a monument that was intended for the Henry VII chapel.

The scale of the intended monument was highly ambitious. The Queen, attended by an angel, lies on a couch with a lion and unicorn appearing from beneath the drapery as oblique references to her Royal status. She gazes up towards a gilded sun that appears through billowing clouds while two putti within the clouds hold a crown and laurel wreath, poised to confirm her immortality. Two further angels sit on the arch of the canopy each supporting the crown and with an orb beneath while a full Royal coat of arms appears in the centre. The frieze is decorated with fleur–de–lis alternating with thistles as direct references to her Stuart Ancestry. Architectural ideas include paired Solomonic columns on the right accompanied by plain columns with composite capitals on the left. On the extreme left is an unidentified female figure while on the base is a relief of St George and, in the centre, a personification of Charity.

The second drawing, in the British Museum (n.d.), is for a monument to William and Mary and can be dated to 1702, the year King William died. The design, somewhat more ambitious than that to Queen Mary, is totally within the English Baroque tradition. Figures of the King and Queen, coloured yellow and probably intended to be in gilt bronze, stand on a tall plinth, the front of which would have carried the inscription, while beneath them are two crowns and crossed sceptres indicating the

joint monarchies. Standing below the monarchs on block plinths are personifications of Hope and Justice on the left and Prudence and Charity on the right, an interesting and unusual blend of the Theological and Cardinal virtues. In the centre, beneath the crowns, is a mourning Britannia with two female attendants. The upper section of the drawing shows a deep entablature, supported on paired Corinthian columns and pilasters, with the Garter badge and panels of St George and the Dragon. Above these are trophies of arms accompanied by a lion on the left and a unicorn on the right. The dominant feature of the whole of the upper section is an enormous Baldacchino, a recognised symbol of celestial glory, and given its yellow tinting on the drawing, presumably to be made in gilt bronze. The drapes are held apart by angels blowing trumpets and reveal a celestial scene of billowing clouds, with sun's rays, and cherubs with one holding a wreath while the lowest pair hold a crown and palm branch. However, for all their ambition and scale, there was no suitable site within the Henry VII Chapel, the intended site for both monuments. There was no tradition of Royal monuments at St George's Chapel, Windsor and St Paul's Cathedral was unfinished at this date. The Office of Works was not involved in these projects and eventually both schemes came to nothing but if they had, they would have been amongst the finest Baroque monuments in northern Europe.

The inconsistencies of design and execution all too evident in the larger post-1686 monuments are in stark contrast to the wood carving being produced by the Gibbons workshop at that time. The gradual departure of the known craftsmen suspected of involvement in monument production must have been a severe blow to Gibbons as the qualitative output of the monuments workshop appears to have declined rapidly. The extent to which Gibbons was personally involved in the design of monuments remains speculative and his shortcomings in handling the human form are clear, the Coventry monument at Croome D'Abitot being an obvious example. By contrast, however, the designs for the monuments to Queen Mary and William and Mary show a better understanding of the English baroque style than many of the monuments executed by the workshop at that time.

4. The Non-Effigial and Smaller Monuments Post 1686

The range of smaller monuments associated with the Gibbons workshop varies considerably. When compared with the larger monuments, the smaller ones tend to be somewhat more successful in terms of design and execution, and an analysis of trends, styles, and the continuation or adaptation of existing design ideas is a more suitable approach than the chronological method of the previous sections. It remains an ever-present possibility that Gibbons himself may have been instrumental in many of the draughts for these monuments and he was probably more at ease with non-effigial designs.

The most common design feature within the non-effigial, post-1686 monuments, a continuation of that seen on the larger effigial monuments, is the semi-dragooned shallow sarcophagus, occasionally unfinished at the ends. Another style, which can be seen up to c1710, consists of a large urn on a curved base with reclining putti or a large urn standing on the sarcophagus accompanied by standing putti. The earliest monument to illustrate some of these design characteristics is that at Faringdon, Berkshire to Sir Henry Purefoy (1650–86). Here, finely carved putti recline on a fluted base that supports a shield of arms and with a panel of clouds and winged cherub heads above. In this instance, and it appears not to have been repeated elsewhere, the sarcophagus has been replaced by a bow-fronted chest that carries the inscription on its front. With Sir Henry's death in August 1686, it is highly unlikely that Quellin had any influence in the design and the possibility must therefore exist that Nost, or someone close to him, may have been involved in the design and execution of this surprising sophisticated monument.

At Hatfield Broadoak, Essex, the monument to Sir John Barrington (1670–91) displays broadly similar features to the Purefoy monument (see Fig. 5). It also sets the tone for many of the later examples seen within a recognisable subgroup, the central element being a large flame-topped urn flanked by two large and chubby putti. Unlike some later examples, the urn is not set within a niche but is free-standing, the whole arrangement set against a simple architectural background with well-cut foliage and flowers accompanying a shield of arms on the back panel. On the superstructure, two birds with outstretched wings flank a pedestal upon which is a cushion with a skull and bones, again a feature repeated elsewhere.

This arrangement of the shallow gadrooned sarcophagus with an urn above was a feature employed on a further three authenticated Gibbons monuments. These commemorate Charlotte Mostyn, (nee Digby), (nd-1694) at Nannerch, Flintshire, Lady Dorothy Clarke (c1630-95) at Fulham, London, and Admiral George Churchill (1654–1710) at Westminster Abbey. The Mostyn monument is unusual in having two winged cherub heads on the underside of the sarcophagus and the extant monument is unchanged from an engraving by Simon Gribelin (1661–1733) published sometime before 1700. An inscription on the bottom left of the drawing states *G Gibbons Fecit*. Other examples of this particular design, considered here as full products of the Gibbons workshop, can be seen to Sir John and Lady Nicholas (nd-1703/4), West Horsley, Surrey, and Lord Bradford, (nd-1708), at Wroxeter,

Fig. 5. Monument to Sir John Barrington 1691 Hatfield Broadoak Essex.

Shropshire. These two monuments, along with that to Admiral Churchill, all have precisely the same style of urn, supported on curved bases accompanied by winged cherub heads and set within niches, as well as the usual shallow gadrooned sarcophagi. Two variations of this format can be seen in the monuments to Robert Lovett (1623–99) at Soulbury, Buckinghamshire, and to Sir Thomas Winford, (nd-1702) at Astley, Worcestershire (fig 40). Both examples have the standard thin sarcophagus, resting on short supports, ungadrooned in the Lovett example, large urns on pedestals, the Winford example being decorated with festoons of flowers not unlike the woodwork produced by the workshop. Architecturally, both monuments are rather plain. The Lovett example has a panel behind the urn showing clouds with cherub heads, including one prominent cherub with a palm branch and a starry crown, all very similar to that seen on the Spencer monument at Offley. As the monument has no effigy, the offering of the starry crown retains its meaning within the overall concept of commemoration and the afterlife, especially with regard to his soul. An unusual feature on both monuments is the inclusion of free-standing obelisks at the sides, both topped by birds but on the Winford example there are winged cherub heads with foliage halfway up.

Perhaps the least successful example within this group in terms of design, is that at Spetchley, Worcestershire, to Robert Berkely (nd-1693). Here, a central shield of arms flanked by a very finely cut display of flowers, foliage, and winged cherub heads, all in the manner of Gibbons' woodcarving, has been placed on top of the sarcophagus along with another head that appears above the shield. Winged putti flank the sarcophagus while the simple architectural canopy has an urn at the top accompanied by festoons of foliage and the same birds as seen on the Barrington monument. A later inscription to Elizabeth Berkeley, who died in 1708, is revealed by parted curtains suspended between the pilasters. Although no documentary evidence concerning this monument has been found, the design of the foliage, cherub heads and urn all point to a convincing attribution to the Gibbons workshop. The

monuments following that to Lady Clarke at Fulham are all quite elegant, well-proportioned, and well-executed and represent a mature and confident style that offers a refined and stylish format that are quite the best examples of their type anywhere at that time.

Like all sculpture workshops, that of Grinling Gibbons produced several unique monuments that have little or no relation to other products from the workshop. Such monuments include some that have been positively identified as Gibbons' work as well as some that have been convincingly attributed to the workshop by virtue of their similarity with other pieces. There are also some that could be products of the Gibbons workshop but an attribution is difficult to confirm. These are discussed below.

Within this particular group is the small monument to Henry Newdigate (nd-1629), at Ashtead, Surrey, erected in 1693. The attribution of this simple monument to Gibbons is proved by a contract with Sir Richard Newdigate of Arbury, Warwickshire dated 22 July 1693: it was to cost only £10, £5 of which had already been paid. Very easily overlooked, the monument has been described by Pevsner as 'shockingly rough' but it could be deliberately archaic, in the style of Henry Newdigate's own time.

Another instance of an easily overlooked monument is that to Wren's sister Susanna (1623–88), married to Dr William Holder (1616–98) and commemorated by a mural monument in the crypt of St Paul's Cathedral. Given the close association between Wren and Gibbons, Gibbons would be the obvious choice to produce the monument, and his drawing for it survives in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. The monument has two winged putti who hold apart drapery to reveal the inscription while at the top and bottom are graceful garlands of flowers and foliage. The completed monument exactly copies the drawing which in itself is an elegant piece of work. The left hand inscription is by another hand.

The monument to Rachel Chambrelan (died 1687) at St Helen's Bishopsgate, London Is thought likely to be by Gibbons because of the relationship between Gibbons and Rachel's husband, Sir Charles Chambrelan. Here, the central inscription panel is flanked by two animated putti surmounted by a plain entablature with a curved plinth topped by an urn, flaming oil boats and swags of foliage. The incomplete gadrooning on the main shelf is repeated on other monuments but the odd arrangement of winged cherub heads with small circular wreaths beneath the shelf is quite unlike any other known Gibbons monument.

At Clifton on Teme, Worcestershire, the monument to Elizabeth Jeffreyes (died 1688) also departs from the usual styles of the Gibbons workshop. A contract for the monument in the Prattington Collection, Society of Antiquaries, London (n.d.), commissioned by her husband, Henry, is dated May 10th 1689, and identifies the monument as a Gibbons product where he was to receive an initial payment of £10 and a further £30 when the monument is set up. The finished work is faithful to the design and, as he had produced other monuments for the wider family, Gibbons may well have reduced the price. In the same church is an almost identical tablet to Jane Jeffreyes (died 1718), cousin and adopted heir to Henry. The sculptor of this monument is unknown although Pevsner claims that it is attributed to Thomas White, architect and sculptor of Worcester. However, given the overall similarities between the two monuments, it is here believed that this monument is fully attributable to the Gibbons workshop.

The format of the portrait oval within a moulded frame, as seen on the Cornwallis, Rustat and Wyseman monuments, remained a feature of a several smaller monuments produced by the Gibbons workshop into the very early years of the eighteenth century. A passable attempt at employing this format was made on the monument to Sir Richard Head (1609–89) in Rochester Cathedral and were it not for a comment by Collins and Wotton (1741) stating that the monument is by Gibbons, it may have gone unrecognised as such: the attribution is accepted here.

Possibly the finest post-Quellin expression of the oval portrait format is in the monument at Conington, Cambridge, to Robert Cotton who died in 1697. This monument is the only one signed by Gibbons which suggests that he actually carved it. Two further monuments at Conington, Cambridgeshire–formerly Huntingdonshire which, since 1974, has been within the altered boundaries of Cambridgeshire, commemorate Sir John Cotton (1621–1702) and his second wife Elizabeth Honywood (n.d.-1702). The portrait of Lady Elizabeth bears a striking resemblance to Lady Cornwallis at Brome while the monument to Sir John has a very finely cut three-quarter profile portrait bust set within a palm-fringed frame and, like the monument to his wife, has two winged cherub heads at the bottom of the panel. It is only in the materials used that there is any real difference between these two monuments-Sir John's has a veined black marble gadrooned support for the portrait panel, -while the inscriptions, on panels of looped drapery with shields of arms in the centre and finely carved small groups of flowers and foliage, are identical. The execution of these beautiful portrait panels is certainly equal to those by Quellin but the actual sculptor, if not Gibbons himself, remains unidentified. They are fully recognised here as products of the Gibbons workshop.

The William Windham monument, erected in 1691 at Felbrigg, Norfolk is known to be by Gibbons only through the mention of its cost-£50-in a family history book by Ketton-Cremer (1962). This tablet

is a little more elaborate than the Jeffreyes monument having an inscription panel flanked by foliage and flowers while on the entablature two weeping putti stand either side of an urn that sits on a little gadrooned base. A quite nicely carved shield of arms with simple foliage is placed in the centre while beneath the plain shelf is a shallow fluted apron and two quite charming winged cherub heads.

Theophilus Hastings, 7th Earl of Huntingdon died in 1701 but his monument at Ashby de la Zouch, Leicestershire, was erected c1698/99. The Harleian Manuscripts in the British Library (n.d.) document the Earl's interest in monuments and one letter, dated 10 September 1698 to Mr Cromp in the Herald's Office, proves the Gibbons connection. It states that:

> I have now made a perfect agreement, with Mr Gibbons the Carver, in Bow Street for the monument which if made according to the modell, I shall like very well: I will therefore desire you to doe me the kindness to Call on him to see in what forwardnesse it is in, and what your judgement is of it, Particularly as to the Armes.

Work proceeded and the monument was nearing completion by the summer of 1699, the Earl writing on 31 July again to Cromp '*to overlooke the Cutting of the Lettters and the Cotes of Armes*'.

Here, an inscription tablet is bordered by elaborately carved flowers and foliage while two projecting columns with composite capitals, support an entablature decorated with acanthus leaves and topped with winged cherub heads and a very detailed shield of arms. In the lower section, beneath the inscription panel, are three coronet-topped shields of arms, that in the centre in a scrolled oval. On the frieze beneath the entablature are the words SURSUM CORDA (Lift up your Hearts)–the opening dialogue to the Preface of the Eucharistic Prayer-with the IHS monogram in the centre. Hastings was politically active and although a non-Catholic, remained loyal to James II after the cataclysmic events of November 1688. The finished monument, erected in the Hastings chapel at Ashby, is of a style not previously associated with Gibbons and as such could be easily overlooked. It is, however, of a style that would sit very comfortably within the output of William Stanton's workshop.

The Royal administrator and Courtier Sir Stephen Fox (1627-1716) employed the fashionable architect Hugh May to design his new house at Chiswick and in realizing the project, May employed a distinguished team of craftsmen including Antonio Verrio and Grinling Gibbons. It is through his work at Chiswick that Gibbons was asked to produce a monument to Fox's first wife, Elizabeth Whittle, who had died in 1696. The resulting monument, at Farley in Wiltshire, was erected in 1700 and is known to be by Gibbons because of a receipt dated 30 April 1700 which records that Gibbons was paid £60 for the carved work. with £20 being paid to John Goodfellow of Salisbury for erecting the monument in the church. Millar (1995) records this association with Goodfellow and it is the only known instance, since the death of Quellin, of Gibbons actively collaborating with another sculptor although it was not uncommon for London sculptors to pay local masons to erect a finished monument.

The Fox monument has a portrait bust in a niche, framed by half-open curtains, and placed beneath an arched canopy supported on two columns. A flaming urn at the top accompanied by two flaming dishes and delicate swags of flowers and foliage, clearly within the Gibbons workshop style, completes the arrangement. The inscription is placed between the two supporting console brackets. The portrait bust shows a modestly plump lady wearing a thin undergarment worn off the left shoulder and with a mantle secured on the left shoulder. It is similar in its overall style to the figure of Viscountess Noel at Exton but the general sculptural quality is at best average.

Stylistic analysis suggests that Gibbons' last non-effigial large-scale monument was that erected to Archbishop Narcissus Marsh (1638–1713) in St Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin. The monument has no effigy and its architecture is a copy of the Cloudesley Shovell monument as discussed. As it was the figure of Shovell that so offended Addison, the exclusion of an effigy, thus reducing the cost, results in a slightly more satisfying composition.

5. Other Monuments that have been Associated with the Gibbons Workshop

Some monuments have been identified from various sources that might be products of the Gibbons workshop or of someone associated with the workshop. These monuments differ from known mainstream Gibbons products in terms of design and overall sculptural quality and are not therefore acknowledged here as Gibbons products. However, further research may result in these monuments being re-evaluated. Following established art-historical methods of attribution, these monuments have thus been designated as being from the school of Gibbons, after Gibbons, by a follower of Gibbons, in the style of Gibbons or, perhaps highly unlikely, in imitation of Gibbons.

1. **Lady Dionys Williamson died 1684, Lodden Norfolk:** The figure of Lady Williamson reclines on her left side; the drapery being extremely well rendered. On stylistic grounds, it does not bear any

similarities with monuments produced by the Gibbons workshop at this date. It is considered here to be of the school of Gibbons.

2. **Sigismund Trafford died 1723, monument erected c1689, Walthamstow, London:** Two standing figures have between them a figure of their daughter that has similarities with the two boys on the Duchess of Somerset's monument in Westminster Abbey. The theatricality evident in the poses of the figures is ineffective, and the modelling is poor. The monument is thus considered here to be by a follower of Gibbons.
3. **George Savile Marquis of Halifax 1695 Westminster Abbey, London:** A bulbous tomb chest carries a poorly laid out inscription and is surmounted by a thin sarcophagus on plain block supports. An oval portrait medallion is accompanied by two well-carved winged putti holding wreaths, not unlike those seen on the Chambrelan monument. This monument is considered here to be by a follower of Gibbons.
4. **William Fitzherbert 1697, Tissington, Derbyshire:** A wall monument with a poorly laid out eulogising inscription with simple drapery at the sides that is a copy of that seen on the Jeffreyes monument at Clifton-on-Teme. At the bottom of the eulogising inscription is a shield of arms with winged cherub heads as seen on the Berkeley monument at Spetchley. This monument is considered here to be of the school of Gibbons.
5. **Edward Stillingfleet, 1699 Worcester Cathedral:** A finely rendered inscription is revealed by parted curtains with very well cut winged cherub heads in the corners. The simple architectural style, shallow sarcophagus, and finely cut lettering all point to the Gibbons workshop but a positive attribution remains uncertain. The monument is therefore considered here to be of the school of Gibbons.
6. **Henry and Thomas Belasyse, c1700 Coxwold, Yorkshire:** Two standing male figures are positioned within a plain architectural frame. An achievement of arms is placed on the front of a rising plinth whose sides are decorated with finely carved flowers and foliage in the manner of Gibbons's woodcarving. The left figure is very similar to that of Sigismund Trafford while that on the right is taken from an engraving by Robert White, published in 1679 after a portrait by an unknown artist. On the back wall is a celestial panel of cherubs and the crown of immortality which is of a standard Gibbons workshop type. The monument is here attributed to being of the school of Gibbons.
7. **John Churchill 1703 Chapel of Kings College, Cambridge:** A free-standing box chest has well-carved winged cherub heads supporting a shield of arms with a coronet at the ends while a thin moulded slab with a gadrooned top supports a flame-topped urn. This monument is considered to be in the style of Gibbons
8. **Benjamin Godfrey, 1704 Norton, Kent:** This monument, with its urn accompanied by festoons of flowers and foliage and two weeping cherubs standing on either side of a later inscription panel, is very Gibbonsesque in its overall style. An inscription panel, carved on drapery, is placed on the partially gadrooned main shelf, which is supported on two console brackets, is. It is considered here that this monument is after Gibbons.
9. **Lady Frances Dawes, 1705 chapel of St Catherine's College, Cambridge:** A large standing wall monument. The long Latin inscription is framed by a simple architectural surround. Very similar in style to the Stillingfleet monument, the Dawes monument is here considered to be of the school of Gibbons.
10. **Sir James Smyth, 1706, All Saints, West Ham, Greater London:** An architectural monument consisting of a base carrying the inscription, a shallow plain sarcophagus and two putti supporting a shield of arms. Behind is a backdrop of a plain back wall, while two simple Tuscan columns support a projecting entablature which is surmounted by a short plinth with a simple finial. This monument is here considered to be in the style of Gibbons.
11. **George Stepney 1707 Westminster Abbey, London:** This monument is constructed from different types of marble, a feature not normally associated with the Gibbons workshop. Overall, the carving is good and there are similarities with the monument at Newbold on Avon, Warwickshire to Sir William Boughton (1663–1716) which is signed by John Hunt, a known apprentice of Gibbons. The monument is therefore considered here to be by a follower of Gibbons.
12. **Sir Joseph Ashe and wife Mary c1705 Twickenham, London:** This monument is similar in overall style to that of William Windham, 1686 at Felbrigg, Norfolk. As Ashe was Windham's father-in-law, such a similarity in their monuments is unsurprising. Given the family relationship and the similarity with the Felbrigg piece this monument is considered to be after Gibbons
13. **George Cartwright 1710, Ossington, Nottinghamshire:** The unusual design of this monument has two tall obelisks decorated with festoons of foliage and flowers. The central festoons also support a shield of arms, all of it being poorly cut. At the bottom, between the obelisks, a winged putto stands behind a panel of drapery that carries the inscription. Two urns flank this arrangement,

the whole placed on a semi-gadrooned shel. Despite the poor cutting of the foliage, the rest of the carving is good and while it is not fully attributed to Gibbons, it is thought here to be by a follower of Gibbons

14. **Nathaniel Palmer 1717 Stogursey, Somerset:** The inscription on this monument is placed on the front panel of the base while above it is a thin moulded shelf that supports a deep plinth upon which stands an obelisk flanked by two putti. The obelisk has, on its front face, a shield of arms and a very finely rendered display of foliage, not unlike that seen on the Oxinden monument at Wingham. The obelisk and putti are carved from white marble, and the remainder is carved from variegated marble. The monument is listed as of the school of Gibbons in the files of the Conway Library and this attribution is accepted here.

6. Conclusion

This paper has attempted to evaluate the known and traditionally attributed sculpted monuments by Gibbons and his workshop. During the research, several new attributions could be made and in examining the sculptural output of the workshop, the comments by Vertue regarding Gibbons' employment of '*the best artists he could procure*' is a very telling statement. This statement also has implications about how the workshop operated but, indirectly, suggests how the business was set up. The partnership with Quellin has been documented elsewhere while the contribution of Nost, which must have been quite considerable, is only just beginning to be fully appreciated. Similarly, while no monuments can be convincingly attributed to them, the influence of Van der Muelen, Van Deivot, and Verhuke, remains largely unknown but could have been considerable. For a short time, Francis Bird and CG Cibber were employed by Gibbons and went on to have successful independent careers but their work within the Gibbons workshop cannot be identified. For practical reasons, no references have been made to other Gibbons products e.g., sculpted free-standing figures and domestic sculptural work.

A detailed examination of some of the decorative elements on some of his monuments has revealed a strong link with the carved woodwork for which he is famous. For a little over forty years, Gibbons was a leading producer of commemorative monuments, some very good in terms of design and quality of execution, others much less so. A mark of just how well thought of he must have been is his work, with Wren, for two colossal Royal monuments. his business must have been a successful one as an engraving taken from a now-lost painting by Closterman of c1691 shows Gibbons and his wife Elizabeth very much at ease in a refined setting and dressed in their best clothes, Gibbons with his arm resting on a sculpted relief panel, thus alluding to his trade.

The short partnership with Quellin produced some of the most outstanding monuments of the period and it is a pity that most of the subsequent monuments were of much lesser quality in terms of design although boldness of execution was seldom an issue. Where therefore does Gibbons fit into the development of commemorative sculpture in this period? John Bushnell was an important contemporary (he died in 1701) and made outstanding contributions to the genre. He could have gone on to bigger and better things and might have been a more serious rival to Gibbons, certainly in terms of design, were it not for a difficult personality and possible mental health issues. The Stantons (William and later Edward) had a far greater output than Gibbons and the quality of their effigial work, by the end of the seventeenth century, was superior to that of the Gibbons workshop. There is no known evidence to support Addison's criticism of the Shovell monument and we must assume that contemporaries were satisfied with the end product although the Duke of Chandos might have been right in his criticism of the costs. Throughout his long career, Gibbons produced monuments that were generally conservative in style and although he attempted to introduce some bolder baroque elements into his work, these were seldom successful.

The mason-sculptor tradition, so long the basis of much English sculptural work, was, by the early eighteenth century, becoming increasingly challenged by the influx of continental artists, many of whom produced new and innovative designs in keeping with the fresh appreciation of artistic developments on the continent. However, despite his many shortcomings, Grinling Gibbons remains one of the most important sculptors of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries and his contribution to commemorative sculpture spans the period from the developed baroque of Bushnell to the arrival of the mature classicism of J. M. Rysbrack.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

References

Addison, J. (1711). Reflections in Westminster Abbey. *The Spectator*, *26*, 1–4.

Baker, C. H. C., & Baker, M. I. (1949). *The Life and Circumstances of James Brydges, First Duke of Chandos: Patron of the Liberal Arts*. Clarendon Press.

Beard, G. (n.d). *The Work of Grinling Gibbons*. John Murray.

Bodleian Library (n.d). *Guard-book of letters, 18th-20th cent Autog D11*. vol. 3. www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk.

British Library (n.d). *Harleian Manuscripts, MSS 4712 ff 366, 368-9, 375, 379, 384*.

British Museum. (n.d). *Catalogue Entry (1881,0611.164)*. https://doi.org/10.32604/iasc.2023.032883.

Cherry, B., & Pevsner, N. (1999). *The Buildings of England: London Vol. 3 North West*. Yale University Press.

Collins, A., & Wotton, T. (1741). *The English Baronetage Vol. 3 Part 2: Containing a Genealogical and Historical Account of All the English Baronets, Now Existing*. Kessinger Publishing.

Cunningham, A. (1830). *Lives of the Most Eminent British Painters and Sculptors* (vol. 3). John Murray.

Cunningham, P. (1842). *Westminster Abbey: Its Art, Architecture, and Associations—A Handbook for Visitors*. Kessinger Publishing.

Dart, J. (1723). *Westmonasterium or the History and Antiquities of the Abbey Church of St. Peters Westminster* (Vol. *2*). University of Lausanne.

Drake, F. (1736). *Eboracum or the History and Antiquities of the City of York*. William Bowyer.

Estley, D. (1998). *Grinling Gibbons and the Art of Carving*. Victoria & Albert Museum.

Green, D. (1964). *Grinling Gibbons: His Work as Carver and Statuary*. Country Life.

Ketton-Cremer, R. W. (1962). *Felbrigg: The Story of a House*. Rupert Hart-Davis.

Loeber, R. (1983). Arnold Quellin's and Grinling Gibbons' monuments for Anglo-Irish patrons. *Irish Quarterly Review*, *72*(285), 84–101.

Millar, O. (1995). Artists and craftsmen in the service of Sir Stephen Fox and his family. *Burlington Magazine*, *137*(1109), 518–528.

Newdigate-Newdegate, A. E. G. (1901). *Cavalier and Puritan in the Days of the Stuarts*. South: Elder & Co.

Renfrew, J., & Robbins, M. (1990). Tobias Rustat and his monument in Jesus College Chapel, Cambridge. *Antiquaries Journal*, *70*, 416–427.

Roscoe, I., Hardy, E., & Sullivan, M. G. (2009). *A Biographical Dictionary of British Sculptors, 1660–1851*. Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art.

Society of Antiquaries, London. (n.d.). Prattington Collection. https://collections.sal.org.uk/prattinton.07.05.39.

Stewart, D. J. (1976). New light on the early career of Grinling Gibbons. *Burlington Magazine*, *118*(880), 508–509.

Tipping, H. A. (1914). *Grinling Gibbons and the Woodwork of his Age (1648–1720)*. Country Life.

Verney, M. M. (1899). *Memoirs of the Verney Family* (vol. IV). Longmans: Green & Co.

Vertue, G. (1736). *Notebooks* (vol. IV). The Walpole Society.

Vertue, G. (1742). *Notebooks* (vol. V). The Walpole Society.

Walpole, H. (1763). *Anecdotes of Painting in England* (vol. 3). J. Dodsley.

Whinney, M. (1988). *Sculpture in Britain 1530–1830* (Rev. ed.). Penguin Books.

Worcester Record Office. (n.d.). Croome Collection. *Worcestershire Government, Worcester Record Office*. https://e-services.worcestershire.gov.uk/calmview/Record.aspx?src=CalmView.Catalog&id=350.