

CONCLUSION

In the years following 1900, it became clear that Rodin had changed the terms and expectations for the practice of sculpture and for the persona of the modern sculptor. By his death in 1917, however, there had emerged significant alternatives and deviations from the style he had established.¹ In an inverse relation to the popularity his work began to accrue with the general public and with wealthy patrons (in particular, American collectors), Rodin's avant-garde credibility began to wane in the 1910s and 1920s. As Leo Steinberg and others later discussed, the proliferation of marble sculptures clearly not by Rodin's hand tarnished his reputation as struggling and misunderstood outsider on which his earlier career was based.² Rodin's performative activation of materiality and touch had provided the foundation for the ascendance of such modernist sculptural doctrines as direct carving and truth to materials early in the twentieth century.³ Despite being a catalyst for these developments, however, Rodin came – largely through his twentieth-century marbles – to appear to many as their antithesis. Whereas his handling of clay and plaster established the importance of making sculptural objects and not just sculptural images, the formulaic translation of his touches to marble increasingly came to appear false. For instance, even a more or less non-modernist

110 (*facing page*) Auguste Rodin, *Hand of God*, c.1896–1902/1906. Marble, 73.7 × 58.4 × 64.1 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, gift of Edward D. Adams, 1908 (8.21). Image © The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

sculptor such as Rodin's British contemporary Hamo Thornycroft could criticize Rodin on the contradictions between the myth of his touch and the ubiquitous marbles.⁴ He wrote in one of his sketchbooks in 1920 that

Rodin as a modeller was I think never surpassed, & he knew what form would look right in marble & got men to elaborally [sic] point & carve it – but I believe he never carved himself. His modelling was so complete that it could be copied by skilled Italians in Paris, & the unfinished pieces & bits of the block were purposely left rough, & gave the contrast & enhanced the perfect surface of the finished part, & impressed the ignorant public saying, 'how wonderful' 'his carving is so wonderful!' This wonderful carving *continued* some time after his death however!⁵

In other words, Rodin's marbles became the victim of his own success. He had so earnestly established the importance and centrality of his touch as the primary meaning of his works that the marbles (not to mention the other posthumous works) seemed to betray the mythology that surrounded his handling of clay and bronze. Furthermore, Rodin's chosen subject matter increasingly began to appear overly sentimental and decreasingly "modern." That is, the depiction of love and passion that had energized Rodin's practice became, for some, overdetermined and trite, leading many sculptors to abandon it and return to more austere uses of the nude.

Rodin's most influential contribution, however, came not from his liberated and tortured subject matter or from the way his style seemed to reiterate that purported freedom and expressivity. Rather, Rodin's fundamental impact came from his reorientation of sculptural practice. By shifting the focus from sculptural image to sculptural object and placing his own performed presence as the mediator, Rodin raised the question of the object-nature of sculpture and its relation to its makers and viewers. This move from image to object and the concomitant activation of the sculptor's persona both emerged as central questions for subsequent sculptors – regardless of their embrace or disdain for Rodin's subject mat-



111 Auguste Rodin, *Figure of a Woman*, "The Sphinx," 1880/1909. Marble, 59 × 62.1 × 58.3 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., gift of Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer, 1967.13.6. Image courtesy Board of Trustees, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.



113 Auguste Rodin, *The Evil Spirits*, c.1899. Marble, 71.2 × 75.7 × 59 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., gift of Mrs. John W. Simpson, 1942.5.17. Image courtesy Board of Trustees, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.

ter or embellished style. Again, such modernist ideals as truth to materials and direct carving are in many ways answers to the questions that Rodin raised with his version of modern sculpture. In short, even as Rodin ceased to be the sculptor to emulate, the issues raised by his art-theoretical tactics continued to be transmitted and responded to in debates about how to make sculpture modern. Since the sexual had become the cornerstone of Rodin's innovations at the level of making objects and the denominator of meaning for his practice and persona, it

112 (facing page) Auguste Rodin, *Cupid and Psyche*, c.1898. Marble, 66 cm h. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, gift of the artist, A.49-1914. Photograph © Victoria and Albert Museum.



114 Auguste Rodin, *Morning*, 1906. Marble, 60.4 × 28.7 × 33.3 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., gift of Mrs. John W. Simpson, 1942.5.18. Image courtesy Board of Trustees, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.

is not surprising that this issue in particular created significant repercussions. In conclusion, I shall briefly suggest two such effects of Rodin's example: first, the realignment of the possibilities for female modern sculptors and, second, a focused case study of a youthful artist who took on Rodin's sexualizing of sculptural practice in an effort to be "modern." These two schematic propositions will serve to indicate the wider, but as yet incompletely understood, impact of Rodin's sexually grounded version of modern sculptural practice.

Throughout the nineteenth century, the gender of the sculptor repeatedly surfaced as a key issue. The medium itself had long been seen as a masculine endeavor because of the physical exertion purportedly required to produce sculpture, and women were consequently discouraged from practicing it. However, as I discussed in the last chapter, the role of the sculptor in the nineteenth century was supposed to involve not physical exertion but mental conception – form-making rather than object-making. Consequently, a space opened in nineteenth-century sculpture for a substantial number of women artists who exploited this division of labor. Mid-century and subsequent artists such as Harriet Hosmer, Mary Thornycroft, Edmonia Lewis, Emma Stebbins, Marcello, and Camille Claudel all created noteworthy careers despite the sexist stereotype of the sculptor's identity that was frequently used against them.⁶ Rodin himself was an advocate of women's right to be artists, both in the personal case of Claudel but also more generally in his encouragement of such artists as Jessie Lipscomb, Otilie McLaren, Kathleen Scott, and Malvina Hoffman.⁷ Both in Rodin's circle and more generally, it was more possible in the nineteenth century than ever before to be a woman sculptor, yet the first decades of the twentieth century again saw a resurgence of an aggressive and restrictive construction of sculpture as physicalized masculine exertion. While women sculptors continued to emerge in significant numbers early in the twentieth century, the contours of modern sculpture were established primarily in relation to male sculptors. In this swing of the pendulum, the visual impact and wide influence of the persona of Rodin that emerged in 1900 seems crucial. As has been discussed exten-

sively in the literature, modern art, in general, became increasingly identified with and defined through masculinity in the early years of the twentieth century.⁸ Rodin's contemporaries such as Paul Cézanne or Pablo Picasso also made the erotic a central component of their versions of modern art but Rodin's singular and titanic example – with its frequent scandalous associations in the popular media – dominated the understanding of modern sculpture.

Rodin fundamentally altered the terms under which modern sculpture was subsequently developed. By elevating materiality and the objecthood of sculpture and by overturning the dualistic division of conception and execution, Rodin's practice inadvertently foregrounded the importance of sculpture as a physical, material object resulting from an embodied process of manipulation. In Rodin's case, this emphasis on materiality was reliant on the gendered rhetoric of the sculptor as virile creator, vividly displayed in the 1900 exhibition. Regardless of whether or not subsequent artists accepted or rejected his style, this interweaving of materiality and masculinity had a profound impact on discourses of the identity of the modernist sculptor across Europe and America. The renewed interest in stone carving, as mentioned, took on Rodin's emphasis on materiality but broke with his emphasis on clay modelling and reproductive sculptural processes in favor of the immediate confrontation of sculptor and block of stone. With this development, the gendering of the role of the sculptor and of materiality was not lost – by contrast, it was often heightened. In Rodin's wake, sculpture's physicality again became a primary issue and making sculpture was increasingly understood as a process tantamount to sexualized creation.

One of Rodin's close followers and ardent supporters, Malvina Hoffman (1887–1966), provides an example. Hoffman had an extensive and successful career that, in addition to her work, involved writing a number of widely read books on sculpture. In one, she clearly articulated the difficulties that faced the woman sculptor attempting to be a modern sculptor. Writing about the period in the early 1910s after she had met Rodin and devoted herself to becoming a sculptor, she remarked:



115 Malvina Hoffman, *Head of Pavlova*, 1924. Wax on plaster with pigment, on wood mount, 40.6 × 23.5 × 15.9 cm. The Art Institute of Chicago, gift of Mrs. James A. Cook, Mrs. T. Clifford Rodman, and Joseph Nash Field, 1969.833. Photograph © The Art Institute of Chicago.

It was about this time that I began to realize what a serious handicap it was for a woman to attempt competition with the men in the field of sculpture. There was absolutely no traditional credit given to a woman in this field of activity, and I felt convinced of the necessity of learning my profession from the very beginning, so as to be able to control the workmanship of the great number of craftsmen with whom I was obliged to come into contact, both in France and in America.⁹

Whereas in the nineteenth century, the division of labor in sculptural production allowed for the insulation of the artist from the labor of producing the final object, Hoffman felt the need to attend to the materiality of the object and learn each stage and step. While many sculptors felt the need for a working knowledge of the basics of carving and bronze casting, Hoffman implied that she had to learn more than was expected in order to compete. Rodin himself, she no doubt understood, was not required to have the same knowledge of all processes. Hoffman, by contrast, had to work to overcome the prejudices she faced due to the expectations of the physicality of sculpture in a way that Rodin never had to.

This same differential expectation based on the gender of the sculptor was also confronted, albeit in a more personal way, by Camille Claudel (1864–1943). Her development represents an early confirmation of the difficulty felt by Hoffman. Claudel worked closely and collaborated with Rodin, and their works from especially close moments are often nearly indistinguishable.¹⁰ When Claudel repudiated her personal and professional relationships with Rodin, however, she was required to establish an entirely different mode of practice. The activated surfaces and dramatic subject matter of her earlier work were read as too much like Rodin's. He had so effectively established the *non-finito* and the rough surface as *his* touch that other artists working in similar modes seemed, again, merely to refer back to him. Claudel moved away from her earlier, looser mode of handling and began to reinvest in high polish (informed by an emerging Art Nouveau sensibility) and to explore multiple materials, as in the *Gossips* of 1897 or the *Wave* of 1897–1902. These moves away from Rodin's practice register the meaning of his technique as being all about Rodin



116 Camille Claudel, *The Wave*, 1898. Bronze and onyx, 61 × 48 × 61 cm. Private collection. Photograph: Banque d'Images, ADAGP/Art Resource, New York. Copyright 2010 Artists Rights Society (ARS), New York/ADAGP, Paris.

and the signature style and meaning he had so effectively established. His style and technique were, thus, not neutral or natural – which is how his supposedly freer handling of surface is sometimes characterized. Instead, Rodin's way of making sculpture “modern” was pernicious in always refer-

ring back to him and his example. The performative gambit of his technique, in other words, was effective even beyond works that were authored by him and infected other artists' works who similarly sought to display acts of making. Rodin's overwhelming influence – which many twentieth-century artists came to resent – enforced the ironclad connection of that technique with his example.

Both Claudel and Hoffman, that is, responded to Rodin's activation of the material object but had to go further in securing their relation to it. Claudel's later works, for instance, pursued tactics to prove her virtuosity in carving marble and her (unquestionable) superiority to Rodin in this material. Hoffman reiterated this imperative to prove oneself, outlining the difficulty of the woman sculptor in the twentieth century:

I remember very well that Mestrovic, the Yugo-Slav sculptor, said to me when I first met him, that *the first thing I must do as a woman was to learn the principles and technical side of my work better than most men, before I could start even*, without the handicap of a preconceived idea that women were amateurs in art and generally took up sculpture as a diversion or a pastime. I wonder if the women in other professions, such as music and literature, have ever realized what a serious obstacle this femininity becomes in the field of sculpture – and with good reason, for the work itself demands that we stand on our feet from morning until night, lifting heavy weights, bending iron, sawing wood, and building armatures; we must know how to use carpenters' tools and plumbers' tools, and be able to calculate the strains and necessary supports to build up the clay figures. These last are often treacherous and collapse at just the moment when we are enthusiastically bringing them to completion.¹¹

Hoffman's discussion indicates how the assumptions about the physical labor required of sculpture were used to restrict women's access to it. This situation became amplified in the wake of Rodin, effectively narrowing the space that had been made for women sculptors in the mid- to late nineteenth century. Again, this is especially ironic because, as has been

seen, Rodin was, if anything, more reliant on the labor of others than even his academic predecessors. Of course, I am not implying that there was a level playing field or that women had full access before this to the practice of sculpture. There was, however, in the conventional separation of the intellectual labor of form-making from the physical labor of object-making the possibility to circumvent the long-standing prejudice against women as object-makers based on the assumptions about the demands of physical labor. In the nineteenth century the range of women sculptors increased in response to this opportunity, yet this growth was inhibited as Rodin's gendered and sexualized version of modern sculpture took the lead around 1900.

Beyond Rodin's impact on the gendering of the persona of the modern sculptor, his example also disseminated the issues of gender and sexuality into sculptural practice. That is, the patterns that Rodin put into place with regard to the sculptural material being the gendered counterpart to the virile sculptor were transmitted to the succeeding generation as they looked to emulate or diverge from Rodin's titanic example. To discuss this I shall briefly examine one exemplary case, that of Henri Gaudier-Brzeska (1891–1915). The young French-born sculptor felt an early passion for Rodin's work and methods and took him as his prototype. Intense, precocious, and impetuous, Gaudier achieved a good deal of notoriety before he died in combat at the age of twenty-three, and it is the shifting enthusiasms and lack of perspective that his youth affords which are helpful in thinking through the impact of an iconic forebear like Rodin.

From the time the eighteen-year-old Gaudier arrived in Paris late in 1909, he began to adopt a reverential attitude toward Rodin.¹² For instance, writing in a letter on New Year's Day 1910, he declared: "We shall never see a greater sculptor than Rodin [. . .] Rodin is for France what Michelangelo was for Florence, he will have imitators but never rivals."¹³ Over the following years, Gaudier continued to use Rodin as his touchstone and his letters are littered with praise and critical engagement with Rodin's sculpture and his writings. For instance, in a letter to his partner Zofia (Sophie) Brzeska in 1912, he spent five pages summarizing

- des Beaux-Arts* 114, no. 1448 (1989), 102. The letter was a riposte to Rodin's defense in print of Serge Diaghilev's ballet *L'Après-midi d'un faune*. See further Butler, *Rodin*, 471.
- 96 Again, Rilke is a central source: "Rodin had the theory that if insignificant movements of the model, when he believed himself to be unobserved, were caught rapidly, they would give a vividness of expression of which we have no idea because we are not accustomed to follow them with keen, alert attention." Rilke, "Rodin-Book: First Part," 114.
- 97 Even as late as in Alain Kirili, "The Scandal of Rodin and His Models," in *Rodin: Eros and Creativity*, ed. Rainer Crone and Siegfried Salzmann (Munich: Prestel, 1997), 210–13.
- 98 Eric Gill, "M. Rodin's Secret," October 23, 1934, unpublished MS, Eric Gill Papers, William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, University of California Los Angeles, box 35, folder 1.
- 99 "Vous savez bien que mes ennemis me traitent couramment de satyre et de sodomite. Je ne m'en étonne point" (14). "L'art, disait-il, n'est en somme qu'une volupté sexuelle. Ce n'est qu'un dérivatif à la puissance d'aimer. [. . .] Dans tout ce que [l'artiste] peint, dessine, sculpte, écrit, il fait déborder sa tendresse. Quand il copie une belle nudité féminine, il lui rend un hommage d'adoration. Par les lignes, les formes, les couleurs, il exprime son idolâtrie. Il façonne une réalité nouvelle. Il la caresse. Il la pare des attraits les plus séduisants. Il est l'amant. Elle est l'amant" (9). Quoted in Paul Gsell, "Les dessins de Rodin," in *Douze Aquarelles de Rodin* (Geneva and Paris: Editions Georg, 1920). Contemporaneous translation from Gsell, "Drawings by Rodin," 14, 9.
- 100 "The Exhibition of M. Rodin's Works in Paris," *International Studio* 11, no. 42 (1900), 90.
- 101 Kassner, "Rodin's Sculpture," 103 and 102. My emphasis.
- 102 Rilke, "Rodin-Book: First Part," 110.
- 103 "Rodin un homme de talent, un sensuel tourneur des ondoyances lascives ou passionnées du corps humain, mais avec des défauts de proportion, et presque toujours avec des extrémités qui ne sont pas entièrement exécutées." Edmond de Goncourt, July 11, 1889, in Goncourt, *Journal*, 3: 294.
- 104 Ciolkowska, *Rodin*, 12–13. The embedded quotation is attributed to Arsène Alexandre by Ciolkowska.
- 105 Isadora Duncan, *My Life* (New York: Liveright, 1927), 90.
- 106 *Ibid.*, 90–91. My emphasis.
- 107 See Intro. above, n. 13.
- 108 This was discussed at length in Wagner, "Rodin's Reputation," 191–242.

- 109 See Intro. above, n. 1. For context on Symons and Rodin see Claudine Mitchell, "Rodin and the Baudelairean Legacy: Arthur Symons on the Sculptor as Poet," in Mitchell, *Rodin*, 73–94.
- 110 Antoine Bourdelle, *La sculpture et Rodin* (Paris: Editions Emile-Paul Frères, 1937).
- 111 Daudet, "La nouvelle orientation de la critique." See Intro. above, n. 13.

CONCLUSION

- 1 This was charted well by the 2009 exhibition at the Musée d'Orsay, *Oublier Rodin? La sculpture à Paris, 1905–1914*.
- 2 Leo Steinberg, "Rodin" (1963), *Other Criteria: Confrontations with Twentieth-Century Art* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972), 330–31.
- 3 For a useful account of direct carving see Judith Zilczer, "The Theory of Direct Carving in Modern Sculpture," *Oxford Art Journal* 4, no. 2 (1981), 44–9.
- 4 Thornycroft was a key player in the British alternative to Rodin's development of modern sculpture but in the twentieth century became less sympathetic to the ways in which his own innovations were built on by self-identified modernist sculptors. For a brief discussion of this shift see David Getsy, "William Hamo Thornycroft (1850–1925)," in *Sculpture in 20th-Century Britain*, ed. Penelope Curtis et al. (Leeds: Henry Moore Institute, 2003), 336–9.
- 5 Hamo Thornycroft, journal entry for January 7, 1920, Thornycroft Papers, Henry Moore Institute Archive, Leeds, Sketchbook Tii-S3. Similarly, Paul Gsell, co-author of Rodin's widely read dialogues on art, wrote that same year, "By drawing, Rodin gratified a need. As soon as he was installed at the Hôtel Biron, he practically had no other occupation. He hardly sculpted any more. He contented himself by superintending the figure-carvers, who, under his eyes, carved little groups in marble from the models he had formerly made." Paul Gsell, "Drawings by Rodin," in *Twelve Aquarelles by Auguste Rodin*, trans. Ronald Davis (Geneva and Paris: Georg Editions, 1920), 7.
- 6 See e.g. Claudine Mitchell, "Intellectuality and Sexuality: Camille Claudel, the Fin De Siècle Sculptress," *Art History* 12, no. 4 (1989), 419–47; Joy S. Kasson, *Marble Queens and Captives: Women in Nineteenth-Century American Sculpture* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1990); Tamar Garb, *Sisters of the Brush: Women's Artistic Culture in Late Nineteenth-Century Paris* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994); Mark

- Stocker, “‘My Masculine Models’: The Sculpture of Kathleen Scott,” *Apollo* 150, no. 451 (1999), 47–54; Claudine Mitchell, “Facing Horror: Women’s Work, Sculptural Practice and the Great War,” in *Work and the Image: Vol. 2, Work in Modern Times*, ed. Valerie Mainz and Griselda Pollock (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), 33–60; Odile Ayrat-Clause, *Camille Claudel: A Life* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2002); Claudine Mitchell, “Style/Ecriture: On the Classical Ethos, Women’s Sculptural Practice and Pre-First-World-War Feminism,” *Art History* 25, no. 1 (2002), 1–22; Caterina Pierre, “‘A New Formula for High Art’: The Genesis and Reception of Marcello’s *Pythia*,” *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide* 2, no. 3 (2003), n.p. (online journal); Siân Reynolds, “Art Education in the Rodin Circle and Women’s Relation to the Avant-Garde: The Case of Otilie McLaren,” in *Rodin: The Zola of Sculpture*, ed. Claudine Mitchell (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 201–16; Fiona Darling-Glinski, “The Privilege of Patronage: Mary Thornycroft and the Sculptural Aesthetic,” *Sculpture Journal* 11 (2004), 55–68; Shannon Hunter Hurtado, “Going Public: Self-Promotion Strategies Employed by ‘First Wave’ Victorian Women Sculptors,” *Sculpture Journal* 13 (2005), 18–31; Odile Ayrat-Clause, “Women Sculptors in Nineteenth-Century France,” in *Camille Claudel and Rodin: Fateful Encounter* (Québec: Musée National des Beaux-Arts du Québec, 2005), 315–23; Charmaine Nelson, *The Color of Stone: Sculpting the Black Female Subject in Nineteenth-Century America* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007); Penelope Curtis, “Sculpture et vérité: L’exemple de Malvina Hoffman,” *Revue de l’art* 162, no. 4 (2008), 79–84; Marjan Sterckx, “The Invisible ‘Sculpteuse’: Sculptures by Women in the Nineteenth-Century Urban Public Space – London, Paris, Brussels,” *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide* 7, no. 2 (2008), n.p.
- 7 See Ruth Butler, “Rodin – ein Feminist?” in *Auguste Rodin: Eros und Leidenschaft*, ed. Wilfried Seipel (Vienna: Kunsthistorisches Museum, 1996), 97–114.
- 8 The literature on this topic is vast and includes the identification of modernism with masculinity and the concomitant difficulties faced by women working either through or outside an identification with modernism. Central references include: Carol Duncan, “Virility and Domination in Early Twentieth-Century Vanguard Painting,” *Artforum* (1973), 30–39; Bonnie Kime Scott, ed., *The Gender of Modernism: A Critical Anthology* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990); Lisa Tickner, “Men’s Work? Masculinity and Modernism,” in *Visual Culture: Images and Interpretations*, ed. N. Bryson, M. A. Holly, and K. Moxey (Hanover, N.H.: Wesleyan

- University Press and University Press of New England, 1994), 42–82; Gillian Perry, *Women Artists and the Parisian Avant-Garde: Modernism and Feminine Art, 1900 to the Late 1920s* (Manchester University Press, 1995); Terry Smith, ed., *In Visible Touch: Modernism and Masculinity* (University of Chicago Press, 1997); Patricia Mathews, *Passionate Discontent: Creativity, Gender, and French Symbolist Art* (University of Chicago Press, 1999); Janet Wolff, *Anglomodern: Painting and Modernity in Britain and the United States* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2003); Griselda Pollock, *Avant-Garde Gambits, 1888–1893: Gender and the Color of Art History* (London and New York: Thames and Hudson, 1993).
- 9 Malvina Hoffman, *Heads and Tales* (New York: Charles Scribner’s, 1936), 45.
- 10 See Musée National des Beaux-Arts du Québec, *Camille Claudel and Rodin: Fateful Encounter*, trans. David Wharry (Musée National des Beaux-Arts du Québec, 2005); Ursula Heiderich, “The Muse and Her Gorgon’s Head: On the Problem of Individuation in the Work of Camille Claudel,” in *Rodin: Eros and Creativity*, ed. Rainer Crone and Siegfried Salzmann (Munich: Prestel, 1997), 222–6.
- 11 Hoffman, *Heads and Tales*, 45–6. My emphasis.
- 12 The importance of Rodin is often cited in the literature on Gaudier. See, e.g., Evelyn Silber, *Gaudier-Brzeska: Life and Art* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1996); Sebastiano Barassi, “A Pioneer of Avant-Garde Sculpture,” in *“We the Moderns”: Gaudier-Brzeska and the Birth of Modern Sculpture* (Cambridge: Kettle’s Yard, 2007), 8–59. In addition to sketches after Rodin’s *Thinker* and *St. John the Baptist Preaching*, there is a pair of satirical drawings (Kettle’s Yard) from July 1909 when Gaudier was in Munich that refer to Rodin. Both represent works by and have reverential captions to the French sculptor. See Barassi, “A Pioneer,” 8–9.
- 13 Gaudier to Dr Uhlemayr, January 1, 1910, trans. in H. S. Ede, *Savage Messiah* (1931; London: Abacus, 1972), 19. Gaudier was in Paris at this point and writing to the head of the household in Nuremberg at which he had lodged in 1909.
- 14 “Tous nos suffrages pour Rodin, n’est-ce pas [?]” Gaudier to Sophie Brzeska, November 3, 1912, Henri Gaudier-Brzeska Papers, Albert Sloman Library, University of Essex. Trans. in part in *ibid.*, 107, as “All our sympathies are with Rodin, are they not[?]” Ede reprints much of the letter but not the five-page précis, which focuses on Rodin’s discussions of “character” as central to art. For the text Gaudier discusses, see Auguste Rodin and Paul Gsell, *Art: Conversations with Paul Gsell*, trans. J. de Caso and P. Sanders (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 14–21.



RODIN

Sex and the Making of
MODERN SCULPTURE

David J. Getsy

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS
New Haven and London

Copyright © 2010 by David J. Getsy

All rights reserved.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that copying permitted by Sections 107 and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law and except by reviewers for the public press), without written permission from the publishers.

Permission to quote from Eric Gill's papers courtesy of the William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, University of California Los Angeles, and the Bridgeman Art Library

Designed by Gillian Malpass

Printed in Singapore

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOGING-IN-PUBLICATION DATA

Rodin : sex and the making of modern sculpture / David Getsy.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-300-16725-2 (cl : alk. paper)

1. Rodin, Auguste, 1840–1917—Criticism and interpretation.

2. Sex in art. 3. Sculpture, modern—Technique. I. Title.

NB553.R7G48 2010

730.92—dc22

2010021334

Page i Unknown photographer, *Auguste Rodin*, c.1890–1900.

Photograph, 15.7 × 20.3 cm. René Huyghe Archive, Department of Image Collections, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. Image courtesy Board of Trustees, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.

Frontispiece Unknown photographer, *Auguste Rodin posing with "The Kiss" in Marble*, c.1898. Albumen print, 11.5 × 11.6 cm. Iris & B. Gerald Cantor Center for Visual Arts, Stanford University, gift of Albert E. Elsen, 1994.56.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	vii
Introduction	i
1876	
Michelangelo and Rodin's Desires	29
1900	
Material Evidence, the <i>Gates of Hell</i> , and the Making of Rodin	59
Conclusion	173
Notes	194
Bibliography	221
Index	237