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<td>Fig. 1</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Fig. 2</td>
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<td>Fig. 6</td>
<td>Ramshorn Churchyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Fig. 7</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fig. 8</td>
<td>Old Mansion House, Miller Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fig. 9</td>
<td>Alex. Fenwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pl. 1</td>
<td>Mrs Mary Elizabeth Haldane of Cloanden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Pl. 2</td>
<td>Compton Mortuary Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Pl. 3</td>
<td>Frieze, 'The Path of the Just', 'The Spirit of Love'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Pl. 3a</td>
<td>Frieze, 'The Path of the Just', 'The Spirit of Light'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Pl. 4</td>
<td>'The Garment of Praise' (spandrels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pl. 5</td>
<td>Carved oak door, arches and spandrels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pl. 6</td>
<td>Compton Chapel modeller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Pl. 7</td>
<td>Dorothy Eleanor MacCallum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Pl. 8</td>
<td>The 'four permanent hands'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Fig. 10</td>
<td>Pen and ink illustrations for The Word in the Pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Fig. 11</td>
<td>Pen and ink illustration for The Word in the Pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Fig. 12</td>
<td>Pen and ink drawing of the Altar panels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Pl. 9</td>
<td>Gilded terracotta altar in Compton Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Pl. 10</td>
<td>Mrs Watts and helpers, working on gesso panels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Pl. 11</td>
<td>'Winged messengers'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Pl. 12</td>
<td>Interior roof decoration of chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Pl. 13</td>
<td>Interior roof decoration of chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Pl. 14</td>
<td>Gilded terracotta altar front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Pl. 15</td>
<td>Plaster of Physical Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Pl. 16</td>
<td>Plaster of Alfred, Lord Tennyson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Pl. 17</td>
<td>G. F. Watts (terracotta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Pl. 18</td>
<td>G. F. Watts (bronze)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Pl. 19</td>
<td>Rear view of two statuettes of G. F. Watts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Pl. 19a</td>
<td>Front view of two statuettes of G. F. Watts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Pl. 20</td>
<td>Guildford Castle from the Banks of the River Wey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Fig. 13</td>
<td>Queen Victoria Jubilee Invitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Pl. 21</td>
<td>George Frederick Watts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Pl. 22</td>
<td>'Mr G. F. Watts. R. A. in his garden'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Fig. 14</td>
<td>'Love and Death' newspaper article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Fig. 15</td>
<td>'Jubilee Fountain in Comrie' newspaper article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Pl. 23</td>
<td>Photograph of portrait of George Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Pl. 24</td>
<td>Louis Deuchars wielding scythe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Pl. 25</td>
<td>Aldourie Pottery Flower Boxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Pl. 26</td>
<td>Aldourie Pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Fig. 16a</td>
<td>Compton Pottery Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Fig. 16b</td>
<td>Aldourie Pottery mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Pl. 27</td>
<td>St. Andrew, Magersfontein, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Pl. 28</td>
<td>Lovat Scouts Presentation Piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Pl. 29</td>
<td>'Home of the quick and the dead - Loch Ness'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Pl. 30</td>
<td>Another view of Loch Ness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Pl. 31</td>
<td>'G. F. Watts. A Sketch from Life'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Pl. 32</td>
<td>The King's Liverpool Regiment</td>
</tr>
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<td>Cat Page</td>
<td>Plate or Fig. No.</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Pl. 32a</td>
<td>The King’s Liverpool Regiment - ‘Drummer Boy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Pl. 33</td>
<td>Prince Christian Victor by Goscombe John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Pl. 34</td>
<td>Prince Christian Victor, Medals &amp; Inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Pl. 35</td>
<td>King Edward VII by Goscombe John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Pl. 36</td>
<td>Sir Arthur Sullivan Memorial by Goscombe John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Pl. 37</td>
<td>Detail from Sullivan Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Pl. 38</td>
<td>James Reid Memorial by Goscombe John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Pl. 39</td>
<td>Panel on Reid Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Pl. 40</td>
<td>Panel on Reid Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Pl. 41</td>
<td>Deuchars Family at Auchterarder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Pl. 42</td>
<td>‘G. F. Watts, A sketch from life’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94a</td>
<td>Pl. 43</td>
<td>Bottom Farm House, Hughenden, Buckingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95a</td>
<td>Pl. 43a</td>
<td>South African War Memorial, Worcester, by Colton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96a</td>
<td>Pl. 43b</td>
<td>Boer War Artillery Memorial, London, by Colton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Pl. 44</td>
<td>Madonna &amp; Child, St. Cuthbert’s Church, Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Pl. 45</td>
<td>Plaster copy of Madonna &amp; Child, by Michaelangelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Pl. 46</td>
<td>Gladstone Memorial, by James Pittendrigh Macgillivray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Pl. 47</td>
<td>Detail from Gladstone Memorial - ‘Eloquence’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Pl. 48</td>
<td>Thistle Chapel, decorative roof bosses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Pl. 49</td>
<td>Medieval Carving, outside Thistle Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Pl. 50</td>
<td>St. Andrew with his Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Pl. 51</td>
<td>St. Giles with his hind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Pl. 52</td>
<td>Royal Arms of Scotland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Pl. 53</td>
<td>Pelican in her Piety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Pl. 54</td>
<td>Demi-angels bearing arms of original knights of the Thistle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Pl. 55</td>
<td>Musician demi-angels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Pl. 56</td>
<td>Musician demi-angels in Rosslyn Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Pl. 57</td>
<td>Angel with anchor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Pl. 58</td>
<td>Angel with fishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Pl. 59</td>
<td>Ante-chapel main boss; St. Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Pl. 60</td>
<td>Ante-chapel; the entrance arch carvings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Pl. 61</td>
<td>Ante-chapel; demi-angels on entrance arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Pl. 62</td>
<td>Ante-chapel; Arms of Leven &amp; Melville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Pl. 63</td>
<td>Arms of Leven &amp; Melville - detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Pl. 64</td>
<td>Deuchars’s original clay model for frieze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Pl. 65</td>
<td>Demi-angel carved from Deuchars’s model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Pl. 66</td>
<td>St. Andrew, with two angels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Pl. 67</td>
<td>Demi-angel with Thistle of Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Pl. 68</td>
<td>Stone carvers in Colville’s Yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Pl. 69</td>
<td>William Clow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Pl. 70</td>
<td>Alexander Clow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Pl. 71</td>
<td>‘The Innocents Abroad’, Aberdour 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Pl. 72</td>
<td>Carved beast; beaver with fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Pl. 73</td>
<td>Demi-angels on stall canopies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Pl. 74</td>
<td>Demi-angels on stall canopies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Pl. 75</td>
<td>Demi-angel playing viola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Pl. 76</td>
<td>Demi-angel playing bagpipes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Pl. 77</td>
<td>Angel terminating book boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Pl. 78</td>
<td>King’s Stall elbow rest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Pl. 79</td>
<td>Royal Arms of the United Kingdom, King’s Stall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Pl. 80</td>
<td>Royal Arms of Scotland - detail showing rabbit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. No.</td>
<td>Plate No.</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Pl. 81</td>
<td>Angel representing Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Pl. 82</td>
<td>Angel representing Victory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Pl. 83</td>
<td>Queen Margaret of Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Pl. 84</td>
<td>Plaster maquette for St. Margaret group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Pl. 85</td>
<td>Plaster maquette for St. Kentigern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Pl. 86</td>
<td>St. Columba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Pl. 87</td>
<td>Angel supporter on font, Inverkeithing Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Pl. 88</td>
<td>Angel supporters, St. Mary’s Abbey, Rothesay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Pl. 89</td>
<td>Plaster cast of angel supporters, Pilrig House, Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Pl. 90</td>
<td>Angel supporters on Gatehouse of Falkland Palace, Fife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Pl. 91</td>
<td>Angel supporters with Arms of St. Margaret, Thistle Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Pl. 92</td>
<td>Angel supporters with Arms of Scotland, Thistle Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Pl. 93</td>
<td>Angel supporters with Holy Spirit, Thistle Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Pl. 94</td>
<td>Angel supporters with Arms of St. George, Thistle Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Pl. 95</td>
<td>Allegorical winged figure with spear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Pl. 96</td>
<td>Carving of St. Margaret of Antioch from Belgian maquette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Pl. 97</td>
<td>Bronze angel lamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Pl. 98</td>
<td>Contemporary photograph of angel lamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Pl. 99</td>
<td>Bronze demi-angel door handle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Pl. 100</td>
<td>Bronze angel escutcheon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Pl. 101</td>
<td>Colville’s yard; group of workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Pl. 102</td>
<td>Silver key used for opening ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Pl. 103</td>
<td>Angels on Queen’s chair, St. Giles’ Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Pl. 104</td>
<td>Angel Supporters, St. Andrew’s Cathedral, Aberdeen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Pl. 105</td>
<td>Pendant Angels, St. Andrew’s Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Pl. 106</td>
<td>Reredos figures; St. Adamnan’s Church, Kilmavoeonaig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Pl. 107</td>
<td>Reredos angel; St. Adamnan’s Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Pl. 108</td>
<td>Organ Case, Dunblane Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Pl. 109</td>
<td>Angel playing harp on organ case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Pl. 110</td>
<td>Monkey bracket on organ case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Pl. 111a</td>
<td>Demi-angel playing shawm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Pl. 111b</td>
<td>Demi-angel playing bagpipes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Pl. 112</td>
<td>Pendant Angels, terminating cusps between stalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Pl. 113</td>
<td>Pendant Angels, terminating cusps between stalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Pl. 114</td>
<td>Pendant Angels, above the organ console</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Pl. 115</td>
<td>Pendant Angels, above the organ console</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Pl. 116</td>
<td>Angel with curly hair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Pl. 117</td>
<td>Angel with hairband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Pl. 118</td>
<td>Angel bearing shield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Pl. 119</td>
<td>Angel with ribbon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Pl. 120</td>
<td>Monkey eating nut, and Sheep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Pl. 121</td>
<td>Rather smug-looking sleeping Lion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Pl. 122</td>
<td>Reredos angel with ‘orange’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Pl. 123</td>
<td>Reredos angel with ‘hazel’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Pl. 124</td>
<td>The Annunciation of Our Lady, St. Peter’s R. C. Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Pl. 125</td>
<td>St. Joseph and the Infant Christ, St. Peter’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Pl. 126</td>
<td>The Immaculate Lamb, St. Peter’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Pl. 127</td>
<td>Angel holding Model of the Priest’s House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Pl. 128</td>
<td>Pointed Wagon Roof, St. John’s, Alloa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Pl. 129</td>
<td>Angel with Scourge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Pl. 130</td>
<td>Angel with Ladder and Seamless Garment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. Page</td>
<td>Plate or Fig. No.</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Pl. 131</td>
<td>Plain Vestry Screen with later addition of War Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Pl. 132</td>
<td>Organ Case, St. John’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Pl. 133</td>
<td>Angel Supporters on Screen, Church of Good Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Pl. 134</td>
<td>Pendant demi-angels on Screen, Church of Good Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Pl. 135</td>
<td>Communion Table, St. Giles, Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Pl. 136</td>
<td>Angel with Crown of Thorns and Three Nails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Pl. 137</td>
<td>Bas relief panel of St. Giles with Hind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Pl. 138</td>
<td>Demi-angels on Moderator’s Chair, St. Giles Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Pl. 139</td>
<td>Woodcarving of angel from model by Joseph Hayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Pl. 140</td>
<td>Bishop Dowden original photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Pl. 141</td>
<td>Bishop Dowden, brass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Pl. 142</td>
<td>John Fitzstephens Keating, St. Mary’s Episcopal Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Pl. 143</td>
<td>Sophia Jex-Blake, St. Giles’ Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Pl. 144</td>
<td>William Playfair, Holy Trinity Church, St. Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Pl. 144a</td>
<td>Bas relief angels on Playfair Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Pl. 145</td>
<td>Jessie Deuchar Fairweather, Carnebee Church, Fife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Pl. 145a</td>
<td>Original photograph of Fairweather panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Pl. 146</td>
<td>Scott-Plummer Memorial Lectern, St. John’s Church, Selkirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Fig. 17</td>
<td>Drawing of Shetland Pony Stud Society Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Pl. 147</td>
<td>Red Sandstone Hall Fireplace, Formakin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Pl. 147a</td>
<td>Monkey on Formakin Fireplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Pl. 148</td>
<td>Monkey on Lennoxlove Fireplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Pl. 149</td>
<td>Model for chimneypiece panel, Rhu-na-Haven and Kinellan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Pl. 149a</td>
<td>Hoptonwood chimneypiece musicians panel, Rhu-na-Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Pl. 150</td>
<td>Hoptonwood chimneypiece dolphin panel, Rhu-na-Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Pl. 151</td>
<td>Photograph of chimneypiece model (dolphins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Pl. 152</td>
<td>Hoptonwood chimneypiece musicians panel, Kinellan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Pl. 153</td>
<td>Hoptonwood chimneypiece dolphins panel, St. Leonards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Pl. 154</td>
<td>Cornmill Square, Galashiels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Pl. 155</td>
<td>Boy on north Dolphin, Cornmill Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Pl. 156</td>
<td>Boy on south Dolphin, Cornmill Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Pl. 157</td>
<td>Mitchell Memorial, South Leith Parish Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Pl. 157a</td>
<td>‘Charity’, Mitchell Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Pl. 157b</td>
<td>Angels with Inscription, Mitchell Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Pl. 157c</td>
<td>Dr. James Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Pl. 158</td>
<td>Murray Memorial, Caputh Church, Perthshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Pl. 158a</td>
<td>Recumbent Figure and Angels, Murray Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Pl. 159</td>
<td>John Warrack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Pl. 160</td>
<td>Plaster maquette of Orpheus panel, Marchmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Pl. 161</td>
<td>Hoptonwood chimneypiece panel, diningroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Pl. 162</td>
<td>Hoptonwood chimneypiece panel, boudoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Pl. 163</td>
<td>Plaster maquette, corner piece, Music Room frieze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Pl. 164</td>
<td>Plaster maquette, angel with dolphin, Music Room frieze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Pl. 165</td>
<td>Woodcarving of angel with dolphin, Music Room frieze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Pl. 166</td>
<td>Woodcarving of corner piece, Music Room frieze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Pl. 167</td>
<td>Carved oak organ screen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Pl. 168</td>
<td>Carved oak faun, organ screen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Pl. 169</td>
<td>Carved oak female child, organ screen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Pl. 170</td>
<td>Carved oak central group, organ screen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Pl. 171</td>
<td>Carved oak putti bearing music scroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Pl. 172</td>
<td>Cast Iron Orpheus Fireback, Marchmont, Midfield, Dunrobin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat No.</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Plate or Fig. No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Alabaster Orpheus panel, Kellie Castle</td>
<td>Pl. 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Hoptonwood chimneypiece panel, drawingroom, Midfield</td>
<td>Pl. 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Hoptonwood chimneypiece panel, boudoir, Midfield</td>
<td>Pl. 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Photograph of rear courtyard and fountain sculpture, Midfield</td>
<td>Pl. 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Plaster Putto by Andrea del Verrocchio, V. &amp; A.</td>
<td>Pl. 176a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Flora with Children, Midfield</td>
<td>Pl. 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Henry Charles Howard Memorial, Greystoke Church</td>
<td>Pl. 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Plaster maquette for drawingroom chimneypiece, Dunrobin</td>
<td>Pl. 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Hoptonwood chimneypiece panel, Dunrobin</td>
<td>Pl. 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Hoptonwood chimneypiece panel, Dunrobin</td>
<td>Pl. 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Ridge Monkey, Balmanno</td>
<td>Pl. 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Baboon Finial, Balmanno</td>
<td>Pl. 182a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Boy, Balmanno</td>
<td>Pl. 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Girl, Balmanno</td>
<td>Pl. 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>'Rebirth of Goodwill - a dedication to France'</td>
<td>Pl. 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Reredos in Holy Trinity Church, Darlington</td>
<td>Pl. 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Angel Supporters with Trinity</td>
<td>Pl. 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Replica of 'The Adoration of the Magi' by John Duncan</td>
<td>Pl. 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Angel Elbow Rests on Sedilia</td>
<td>Pl. 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Reredos in St. Mary’s Church, Broughty Ferry</td>
<td>Pl. 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Angel Supporters with Agnus Dei</td>
<td>Pl. 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Angel Candlestick Bearer</td>
<td>Pl. 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>'The Annunciation’ on back of Bishop’s Chair</td>
<td>Pl. 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>Angel Supporters with Lily</td>
<td>Pl. 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Reredos, St. Andrew’s Episcopal Cathedral, Aberdeen</td>
<td>Pl. 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Madonna and Child on Reredos</td>
<td>Pl. 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Angels on Reredos</td>
<td>Pl. 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>'Garden of Gethsemane’ by John Duncan</td>
<td>Pl. 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>'The Entombment of Christ’</td>
<td>Pl. 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>'The Empty Tomb’</td>
<td>Pl. 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Angels on memorial to Lieutenant Magnus Gray</td>
<td>Pl. 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Eric Dobson Memorial, Stonyhurst College</td>
<td>Pl. 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Memorial to Mark Tennant, Innes House</td>
<td>Pl. 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Screen and Reredos, St. James the Great Church, Cupar</td>
<td>Pl. 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Pendant angel with 'unfruitful tree with axe at its foot'</td>
<td>Pl. 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>St. Andrew on Rood Screen</td>
<td>Pl. 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>St. George on Rood Screen</td>
<td>Pl. 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>St. Mary on the Rood Screen</td>
<td>Pl. 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>St. John on the Rood Screen</td>
<td>Pl. 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Rood with St. Mary</td>
<td>Pl. 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Christ on Rood</td>
<td>Pl. 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Reredos angels</td>
<td>Pl. 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Reredos angel with lantern, sword and stave</td>
<td>Pl. 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Roof of Glasgow Cathedral Choir</td>
<td>Pl. 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Roof boss ; 'Christ in Glory’</td>
<td>Pl. 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>Roof boss ; 'Crucifixion’</td>
<td>Pl. 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Livingstone centenary panel</td>
<td>Pl. 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Rood Screen, St. James the Less Church, Penicuik</td>
<td>Pl. 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Christ, Rood Screen, St. James the Less Church</td>
<td>Pl. 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>St. Mary &amp; St. John, Rood Screen, St. James the Less Church</td>
<td>Pl. 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>Rood Beam, St. Bride’s Church, Hyndland Road, Glasgow</td>
<td>Pl. 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. Page</td>
<td>Plate or Fig. No.</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Pl. 222</td>
<td>‘A Scottish Peer’s Private Chapel’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Pl. 222a</td>
<td>Photograph of 1911 model of Mount Stuart altar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Pl. 223</td>
<td>Bronze Altar in Chapel, Mount Stuart, Isle of Bute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Pl. 224</td>
<td>‘The Marriage of Canna’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Pl. 225</td>
<td>St. Blane and St. Dey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Pl. 226</td>
<td>‘Feeding the Multitude’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Pl. 227</td>
<td>Bronze Musicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Pl. 228</td>
<td>Photograph of Model for Glenelg War Memorial in Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Pl. 229</td>
<td>Photograph of Model for Glenelg War Memorial in Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Pl. 230</td>
<td>Glenelg War Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Pl. 231</td>
<td>Glenelg War Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Pl. 232</td>
<td>Glenelg War Memorial on plinth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Pl. 233</td>
<td>Plaster Model for Madonna &amp; Child for Old St. Paul’s Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Pl. 234</td>
<td>Madonna &amp; Child in niche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Pl. 235</td>
<td>Canongate War Memorial, High Street, Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Pl. 236</td>
<td>Soldier on Canongate War Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Pl. 237</td>
<td>Sailor on Canongate War Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Pl. 238</td>
<td>Woolhampton War Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Pl. 239</td>
<td>Bronze bas relief memorial plaques in Henshaw’s catalogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Pl. 240</td>
<td>Rev. George Wilson, St. Michael’s Parish Church, Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Pl. 241</td>
<td>Rev. Alexander Hardie, Newbattle Church, Midlothian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Pl. 242</td>
<td>War Memorial - Newbattle Church, Midlothian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Pl. 243</td>
<td>Angel Supporters with Shield on War Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Pl. 244</td>
<td>‘Cupid’, photograph of plaster maquette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Pl. 245</td>
<td>Bronze Fauns, Motor Mascots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Pl. 246</td>
<td>Putti with Shell Dish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Pl. 247</td>
<td>‘Love took up the glass of time’, version 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Pl. 248</td>
<td>‘Love took up the glass of time’, version 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Pl. 249</td>
<td>Study of Head, possibly ‘News from Nowhere’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Pl. 250</td>
<td>‘Love and Death’ by G. F. Watts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Pl. 250a</td>
<td>Detail from ‘Love and Death’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Pl. 251</td>
<td>‘Aspiration’ by G. F. Watts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Pl. 252</td>
<td>Head of ‘Love’, terra cotta relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Pl. 253</td>
<td>‘Courage, Vitality &amp; Endurance’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Pl. 254</td>
<td>Angel Supporters with St. Andrew’s Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Pl. 255</td>
<td>Angel Supporters with St. George’s Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Pl. 256</td>
<td>Pendant Angel on War Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Pl. 257a</td>
<td>Photograph of Clay Model of Angel, St. Luke’s, Kew Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Pl. 257b</td>
<td>Carved Angel, St. Luke’s, Kew Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Pl. 258a</td>
<td>Angel door handle, St. Baldred’s Church, North Berwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Pl. 258b</td>
<td>Commemorative Trowel, St. Margaret’s Church, Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>Pl. 259a</td>
<td>Carved animals &amp; birds, pulpit, Bangour Hospital Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>Pl. 259b</td>
<td>Carved animals, pulpit, Bangour Hospital Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Pl. 260</td>
<td>St. Michael, by Alice Meredith Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>Pl. 261</td>
<td>Armed Forces Frieze, by Alice Meredith Williams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This thesis examines the relationship between sculptors and architects through the biography and catalogue raisonné of Louis Reid Deuchars (1870 - 1927). His career is documented from the early days in Glasgow, to time spent with G. F. Watts and his wife Mary Seton Watts while working on the Compton Chapel, assistantships with Sir William Goscombe John, William Robert Colton, and briefly James Pittendrigh Macgillivray before settling in Edinburgh. He prepared maquettes for the Mount Stuart altar designed by Sir Robert Rowand Anderson and had work from Harold Tarbolton, but his main source of income from 1908 to 1919 was Sir Robert Lorimer. Plaster models for stone and wood carving in the Thistle Chapel progressed to chimney-piece panels and true sculpture, ending with the heroic bronze war memorial at Glenelg. Although Deuchars’s work considerably enhanced Lorimer’s commissions, his contribution was largely anonymous. The opposition by the sculptors, Pittendrigh Macgillivray and William Birnie Rhind, to Lorimer’s election to membership of the Royal Scottish Academy has been documented, but this thesis demonstrates the central role of Deuchars and the Glenelg war memorial. Thereafter he had little work from Lorimer, but succeeding sculptors were duly acknowledged.
ABBREVIATIONS

cat. - catalogue
dia. - diameter
ht. - height
l. - length
L.P. - Lorimer Papers, Special Collections Department, University of Edinburgh Library
neg. - negative
NLS - National Library of Scotland
NMRS - National Monument Record of Scotland
P.C. - Private Collection
RCAHMS - Royal Commission on Ancient & Historical Monuments of Scotland
R.S.A. - Royal Scottish Academy
SRO - Scottish Record Office
SSA - Society of Scottish Artists
U.L.P. - Uncatalogued Lorimer Papers, Special Collections Department, University of Edinburgh Library
V. & A. - Victoria & Albert Museum
INTRODUCTION

In the last twenty years a considerable amount of research has been carried out into the lives and work of prominent architects, sculptors and artists, active in the early decades of the century in Scotland. This thesis builds on those by: Peter Savage on Sir Robert Lorimer, Sam McKinstry on Sir Robert Rowand Anderson, Karen Moon on George Walton, Elizabeth Cumming on Phoebe Traquair, Robin Woodward on Scottish sculptors and Lindsay Macbeth on Lorimer’s furniture.

Prior to this research, little had been published on the oeuvre of Louis Reid Deuchars. During his career he worked with leading artists and sculptors: George Frederick and Mary Watts; Sir William Goscombe John; William Robert Colton; James Pittendrigh Macgillivray; Harold Tarbolton; Sir Robert Rowand Anderson; Sir Robert Lorimer. Deuchars was twice proposed for Associateship of the Royal Scottish Academy, yet his name has been all but forgotten and he is represented in only three public collections. However, there is a greater legacy in his contribution to the work of others. This thesis reveals that Deuchars was probably the lead modeller on the Compton Chapel for Mrs Watts. Drawing on family recollections and material in various archives, it is argued that his unique style enhanced Lorimer’s buildings over a period of ten years, beginning with the Thistle Chapel and culminating in the Glenelg War Memorial, all largely without acknowledgement of his contribution. Similarly, his previously unknown modelling for the Mount Stuart altar is documented. It is argued that this anonymity was symptomatic of the long-running tensions between sculptors and architects. Although Esmé Gordon wrote about the attempt by Pittendrigh Macgillivray and Birnie Rhind to prevent Lorimer from attaining membership status of the Royal Scottish Academy, the basis for the grievance was undefined.¹ This thesis reveals that the cause was Lorimer’s employment of Deuchars. As a result Deuchars received no further sizeable commissions from Lorimer, but thereafter those sculptors employed by him were acknowledged in full. It is argued that, although Deuchars had the potential to be a successful sculptor, as evidenced by the volume of his exhibited work, circumstances conspired against him so that most of what he produced was anonymous until this research was undertaken.
INTRODUCTION

The entries in Thieme-Becker’s *Allgemeines Lexicon der bildenden Künstler*, Bénézit’s *Dictionaire des Peintres, Sculpteurs, Dessinateurs et Graveurs* and *The Dictionary of British Artists, 1880 - 1940*, provided the starting point.\(^2\) Family recollections reinforced by newspaper cuttings, photographs and other personal ephemera led on to numerous small articles documenting Deuchars’s progress in *The Strathearn Herald*. Details of his exhibited work came from the various catalogues, while the Watts Gallery archives provided information for his period at Compton and Aldourie. Evidence of his collaboration with Lorimer relied heavily on the Lorimer Papers in the Special Collections Department of Edinburgh University Library, other Lorimer material in the National Monument Record of Scotland and a private collection. The Bute Archives yielded drawings and information on the Mount Stuart altar. Illustrations of Deuchars’s work for Lorimer, Tarbolton and Henshaw were found in the archives of Charles Henshaw. For the ‘sculptors versus architect’ row in the Royal Scottish Academy, the extensive deposit of Macgillivray’s papers in the National Library of Scotland and the archives of the Royal Scottish Academy were consulted.

---

CHAPTER 1

ARCADIA AT AUCHTERARDER AND COMRIE

At Comrie, Perthshire, on 12th April, 1870, LOUIS REID DEUCHARS was born, third son of the family of Andrew Deuchars, tinsmith and gasfitter and Margaret (née Cameron). Louis Deuchars’s brothers were James, Andrew and John, all family names, but why he was singled out for a French name in 1870 remains a mystery. The boys received their education at Comrie School, and Louis obtained a Certificate of Merit (Commended for Industry) at the Crieff Industrial & Fine Art Exhibition in 1882.¹ The twelve-year-old’s prize-winning water-colours were among a collection of his works exhibited in his father’s shop window (Cat. 1). When the family moved from Comrie to Auchterarder in 1883 a house, shop and garden were rented in the High Street.² Once again the shop window served as exhibition space for Deuchars’s art work, and in 1887 displayed an oil painting of one of the town’s ministers (Cat. 2). At seventeen years of age, Deuchars was considered ‘to have the real art of painting, and must have a promising future before him’.³

Andrew Deuchars, a staunch Liberal, made quite a reputation for himself writing and reciting poetry and regularly had verses published in the local newspapers. His leading role in the Independent Order of Good Templars, a temperance organisation with Christian principles, was reflected in many of his verses. In another of his poems a great future was predicted for ‘my curly heided loon’.⁴ Louis Deuchars had red curly hair and his subsequent career fitted the description, ‘he’s an inventive genius, an’ he has a heid to plan’, although he did not enter the town council, nor parliament, nor uphold the temperance cause, as his father had hoped. For many Auchterarder residents, holidays were spent sailing on the River Clyde from the Broomielaw Pier, Glasgow.⁵ The strong links with the city may have had something to do with James Reid of Auchterarder House who made his fortune from the Springburn locomotive works and spent it on amassing an important collection of contemporary art. However, there was no mention of this capitalist in Andrew Deuchars’s poetry (although Reid was a Liberal until Gladstone’s 1886 Home Rule policy made him change to the Unionist Party).⁶ Another local mansion, Cloanden, home of the Haldane family (of consistent Liberal persuasion) did feature.⁷ From the 1850’s the house had received the
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children of Auchterarder on their annual Trip. After the walk up from the town it appears that there was still enough energy for various games and races and participants enjoyed ‘buns and cookies’.

Andrew’s poetry reveals that the home environment of the Deuchars brothers was literate and creative, yet entrepreneurial, tempered by the moral values of Scottish Presbyterianism. In an agricultural community, where there was great demand for the hand-crafted products of the local tinsmith, Louis Deuchars would have grown up with an awareness of the dexterity and technical knowledge required to fashion the milk cans, flagons and measures from sheets of tinplate in the shop which adjoined the house in Dundas Street, Comrie.8

Not only did Louis Deuchars display artistic talent, he too wrote poems and in 1887 had two published in the Strathearn Herald.9 In one he sang the praises of Aberuchill Castle, a large mansion dating back to the sixteenth century. The locals had free access to the estate and Deuchars found artistic as well as literary inspiration there. In the other poem he described the church and graveyard, expressing what was to be an unfulfilled desire, ‘when I die my corpse shall come to Comrie’. Perhaps it was his impending departure for Glasgow School of Art that prompted the bout of nostalgia. One of his daughters told of ‘a rich gentleman’ who financed him, but the identity remains a mystery. Was it James Reid, or a member of the Haldane family, or even Andrew Deuchars, the proud father?

It appears that Deuchars retained fond memories of his Comrie childhood. Later he described ‘eternal summer’ where children splashed about in the streams and birds and animals seemed to join in.10 In another poem, he wrote of his childhood games,

The youngsters at oor play: “Stan’ back, laddie, to the line!”
It brings to mind the happy game we laddies played aroun’ oor hame,
Nae mair wi’ joy we’ll play at e’en around the smiddy door;
Nae mair upon the village green we’ll roam till gloamin’ oor.11
With the maturity of twenty six years, he recalled

And summer called the darling boys her own,
And gave us days o’ sunlight, nights o’ dreams,
And endless explorations ’mong the fields,
And laughin’ hours to paddle in the burn
Hunting the water hens, or nimble patie-stobies;¹²
And often through the growing corn we’d roam
To gather pea-weeps¹³ eggs, or thro’ prescribed plantations
In later days, wi’ boyish daring true,
To silent hunt the partridge, or rob the pheasant’s nests.
The bravest red-skin ne’er glowed with truer pride
Than Comrie boys who dodged the witching eye,
As in the corner o’ the pine-wood trees
We’d stay and “peerie-winkie”¹⁴ a’ the eggs,
While basking in the burning days we’d lie
Half-covered in the shimmering, glowing sand,
Anon to plunge into the watery Earn,
Frightening the baggies¹⁵ to under the bank;
And sandy swallows from their cavern homes
Would flash among the spray of noisy splashes,
Their twittering laugh would mingle with the glee
Of wee boys bubbling o’er with healthy joy.¹⁶

¹ Deuchars’s family papers. Crieff Exhibition Certificate, photographs and collection of newspaper cuttings originally pasted into an album by Andrew Deuchars, but subsequently torn into separate fragments. P.C. Few extracts give details of date or source; although many may have come from the short-lived Auchterarder Chronicle (1891 - 95?). Unfortunately, this newspaper was not formally deposited with any library, but one surviving example, dated 20 February 1892, is in the A.K. Bell Library, Perth.
³ Deuchars’s family papers, no source.
⁵ Untitled Poem, possibly ‘Doun the Water’, no source. Deuchars’s family papers.
⁶ ‘Sudden Death of the Lord Dean of Guild’, Glasgow Herald, 28 June 1894.
⁸ Comrie Valuation Rolls, 1871-83. A.K. Bell Library, Perth.
¹¹ ‘To the Line’, no source. Deuchars’s family papers.
¹² Sticklebacks
¹³ Lapwings
¹⁴ pierce and blow out contents of
¹⁵ large minnows
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At seventeen years of age, Deuchars went off to Glasgow School of Art, where the records show that he was there during Session 1887/88, describing himself as 'painter', but there is no indication of the mode of attendance.¹ He had lodgings at 48 Shamrock Street, not far from the School, which was then in the Corporation Galleries, Sauchiehall Street.² Fra Newbery had only been Principal for two years, having previously been heavily involved with the English Arts & Crafts Movement and an admirer of William Morris.³ Among a distinguished cohort of students at the time were Charles Rennie Mackintosh and George Walton.⁴ William Kellock Brown, the sculptor and metalworker started teaching at the School of Art in 1887 and may well have had an input to the training of Deuchars.⁵ However, it was with his drawing ability that Deuchars attempted to win an award in the National Competition at South Kensington. Five works were entered in Stage 8b1 - 'figures shaded from the antique' - the traditional method at that time of teaching figure drawing to art college students by utilising the corridors of plaster copies of classical sculpture. Unfortunately, Deuchars was not successful in the competition.⁶ There is no obvious explanation as to why he spent only one session at Glasgow School of Art. However, if it was James Reid, of Hydepark Locomotive Works, who had financed him, then perhaps Deuchars's Liberal father prevailed upon him to refuse further help from a political turncoat.⁷ In that case, Deuchars would have been the loser, since Reid was a considerable patron of the arts.

During his second year in Glasgow, the 1888 International Exhibition to fund the new Art Gallery, Museum and School of Art was staged in Kelvingrove. There, he would have been able to see the largest collection of art brought together in Glasgow. A staggering 2700 exhibits, covering paintings, sculpture, architecture and photography were assembled in ten galleries. The old masters as well as contemporary exponents were represented. (G.F. Watts had some 'good portraits'.⁸) Sculpture was displayed in its own gallery instead of being distributed among the paintings as was customary at that time.⁹ Patronage of some of the 'Glasgow Boys' resulted in Roche, Hornel, Nairn and McGregor Wilson painting murals in three of the galleries, while the
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Dome of the Main Building had allegorical figures by James Guthrie, G.T. Henry, Edward Walton and John Lavery. As well as the recognition of local talent, loans from local collectors, such as James Reid, added to the exhibition. In the sale section, occupying three galleries, Glasgow was well represented, including sculpture by Kellock Brown. 

After his year at the School of Art, there is no firm evidence as to how Deuchars earned his living. The only clue comes from a letter from Mary S. Watts to J. Gleeson White (founder and first editor of *The Studio*), in which she describes Deuchars as ‘the young house painter’. This points to the possibility that he could have worked for one of the high class decorating firms, such as J.&W. Guthrie or perhaps George Walton, who started in business in 1898 and whom Deuchars could have met at the School. Photographs of the period show the walls of middle class homes smothered in hand-painted or stencilled designs. Owners vying with each other to find originality led Walton, MacNair and Mackintosh to create more and more stylised motifs. Certainly, Deuchars must have kept in touch with artistic circles, since Auchterarder’s local newspaper correspondent, probably Andrew, his father, described him in 1895, as ‘an artist both in oils and clay’ who ‘has been favourably known for some time’. It was, without doubt, an exciting time for a young artist and sculptor to be in the city when the Glasgow Style was evolving. William Morris had been lecturing regularly since 1884 in both Edinburgh and Glasgow and in 1890 the London-based Arts and Crafts Exhibition Society put on a display in the Corporation Galleries in Sauchiehall Street.

The Glasgow Institute of Fine Art held annual exhibitions. In 1893, *The Studio* stated that ‘...it decided to hold an exhibition of ‘Old Glasgow’ early next summer in the Institute’s Galleries’. It could be that this was what influenced Deuchars to embark on a numbered series of forty two lithographs entitled, ‘Picturesque Glasgow’, which appeared in *The Bailie Cartoon Supplement* between April 1893 and July 1895 (Cat. 3, Figs. 1-8). He made the most of the medium with a
bold but lively drawing style, almost painterly in its execution. The immediacy and movement in the work would indicate that what appeared in the magazine was aided only by the skill of a practical lithographic printer. Since the drawings are such close representations of the contemporary scenes in the city, it seems that Deuchars used the, then new, technique of drawing in the normal way with chalks on the sheet of transfer paper, instead of mirror image fashion on the lithographic stone. Yet what was transferred to the stone was as true as if it had been drawn directly on to it. The paper was merely a vehicle for the art work, but had the significant advantage of freeing up the artist to work away from the cumbersome stones. There is no explanation in the magazine as to why the series of drawings commenced, appearing two or three times a month at the beginning, nor why they tailed off and disappeared after July 1895.

While *The Bailie* carried a number of illustrations in each issue, there were very few in the newspapers of the period, because of the more primitive printing methods employed. Nevertheless, about that time, a three-quarters portrait of Sergeant Alex. Fenwick appeared in a local Perthshire newspaper, probably *The Auchterarder Chronicle*, ‘engraved from a sketch from life, for which we are indebted to the kindness of Mr L.R. Deuchars’ (Cat. 4, Fig. 9). The constraints imposed by the medium appeared to cramp his style, giving the image a stiffness not apparent in the lively portrayals of the people in *The Bailie* lithographs.

In December, 1894 after six years of planning and construction, the Excelsior Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars opened their own Hall in Abbey Street, Auchterarder. It was a substantial building with a gallery and could hold 350 people in the main hall. Only local tradesmen (and doubtless, all Good Templars, too) were employed on its construction, including Andrew Deuchars who installed ‘an ample supply of artistic gasaliers and brackets’. At the back of the platform was an arched recess, measuring 9 feet by 6 feet which was ‘to be filled eventually with an oil painting on canvas, designed and painted by Mr L.R. Deuchars. This will be a valuable
acquisition, and will, when finished, be very attractive; and will enhance the look of the hall'. In November, 1895, The Strathhearn Herald reported, ‘Only a few months ago he presented a large oil painting representing the “Mission of Christ” to the local Lodge of Good Templars’ (Cat. 5).

With the passage of time and changing moral standards, the number of Good Templars dwindled until they disappeared altogether and the Hall was used for a variety of commercial purposes. But for the name and date plaque on the gable, there would be no trace of its origins. Deuchars’s oil painting has long since disappeared.

In addition to the reference to the painting, The Strathhearn Herald reported that ‘He has also executed several commissions in models and busts for the neighbouring gentry.’ One of these was a plaster bas relief portrait of Mrs Mary Elizabeth Haldane of Cloanden, near Auchterarder (Cat. 6, Pl. 1). As it is doubtful that Deuchars had the benefit of modelling from life, it could be that the portrait was created from a photograph, possibly taken to commemorate the lady’s birthday. It may even have been a gift from Deuchars’s father, Andrew, with the aim of further promoting his son’s career. They possibly hoped that the portrait would be cast in bronze if it found favour.

Whatever Deuchars did in the years after leaving Glasgow School of Art, he must have moved in significant artistic circles, for the same piece in The Strathhearn Herald announced ‘We have pleasure in stating that Mr Louis R. Deuchars has secured an appointment under Mr George Frederick Watts, R.A., Ll.D., London’. In fact, he went to work on the terra-cotta modelling for the Compton Mortuary Chapel for Watts’s wife, Mary, who must have had good reason to pick him, when she had all the talent of London and the Home Counties readily at hand, from which to choose. Unfortunately, because Mrs Watts spent the long years of her widowhood in ‘editing’ and ‘weeding’ the papers at Compton to ensure that the best possible image of her husband was left behind, the reasons for selecting the four permanent craftsmen to work on the Chapel have disappeared. Despite her later disparaging remark that ‘the Scotchman had never used clay and
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had only drawn at a school of art in Glasgow in the ordinary way’, it would seem reasonable to assume that he had indeed been chosen for his modelling skills, indicated by the reference to his use of clay in The Strathearn Herald and the existence of the competent bas relief portrait.\(^4\) There was also a tenuous connection between Auchterarder and Compton. Richard Burdon Haldane, later Viscount Haldane of Cloan, and Lord Chancellor, wrote to his mother (the subject of the portrait discussed earlier) every day after he moved to London. On 16 August 1895, he told her, ‘I have been this afternoon with L’d R. (Lord Ripon). We drove to Watts’s Studio, where his portrait was being painted & I sat & talked with him & then drove back.’\(^26\) Among the correspondence, there does not appear to be any direct reference to Deuchars’s appointment with Mrs Watts, but his move to Compton within two months of Haldane’s visit there, seems to point to some connection.

---

1. Glasgow School of Art Register, 1887-8.
6. Glasgow School of Art, Correspondence with Department of Science and Art, 1884-94, p.28.
9. Ibid.
11. Letter from Mary S. Watts to J. Gleeson White, 31 July 1898. P.C.
18. Deuchars’s family papers, c.1893/4.
19. Ibid, no source.
21. Ibid.
22. P.C.
26. Letter from Haldane to his mother, 16 August 1895. Ms.5954, letter no.68. Haldane Papers. N.L.S.
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It must have been quite an adventure for the twenty-five year-old Deuchars to set off from Scotland for Compton, near Guildford. Although he had spent the first seventeen years of his life in small country towns, the next eight were in Glasgow, the largest Scottish city. Securing the position with the Wattses, landed him in the depths of the Surrey countryside, but in surviving photographs he appeared to be quite at home (Pl. 8 & Pl. 23).¹

George Frederick Watts, the Victorian painter and sculptor, and his wife, Mary Seton Watts (formerly a Fraser-Tytler from Dores near Inverness) had built, just off the Pilgrims’ Way, a large and comfortable house, which they named Limnerslease when it was completed in 1891.² He was 33 years older than Mary, an artist in her own right. By the time Deuchars arrived on the scene, Watts was a venerated elder statesman of the art world. His success, both as a painter and sculptor had been recognised by membership of the Royal Academy in 1867 and honorary degrees from both Oxford and Cambridge Universities in 1882. Twice he turned down the baronetcy offered by Gladstone (although he did eventually accept the Order of Merit from Edward VII in 1902).³ Watts preferred large allegorical canvases, but his sensitive portraits of the rich and famous ensured a steady income. A perfectionist, he was constantly reworking his creations and his sculpture was no exception. Mary seemed content to bask in her husband’s reflected glory. She too could paint well, but, in the gesso decoration of Limnerslease, her considerable talent for modelling was displayed to advantage. Extra special care was taken with the arched niche (inglenook) with its sofa, where Watts could rest, contemplating Mary’s decoration, or she could read to him.⁴ Having studied at the South Kensington School of Art and the Slade, she also took lessons in modelling from the French sculptor, Aimé Jules Dalou, just prior to her marriage to Watts.⁵ For two years she had been teaching modelling in clay two nights a week at St. Jude’s School, Whitechapel. She actually described it as ‘a boys’ club’ where she attempted ‘...to give the lads, who were chiefly shoeblacks, an interesting hour or two, and to arouse in them the knowledge of the pleasure of making something in their leisure time.’⁶
This led to her early participation in the movement to preserve the traditional crafts of the country, which grew into the Home Arts & Industries Association, formalised in 1884. The organisers planned and designed the artefacts which were made by the workers, who, as a result, were intended to ‘develop the innate taste for creating something beautiful which lies in all human beings’. The principles of that organisation were not quite the same as the socialist ones of the Arts & Crafts movement, which aimed at awakening and facilitating creativity among the working class. Ironically, the market for the products of both movements was the same. Only those with money could afford to pay for the high labour content in their creation. Mary persuaded Watts to give his name to a ‘mail-shot’ appealing for funds for the Home Arts & Industries Association and he donated the fees earned from painting two portraits to help with the initial funding. Once moved into Limnerslease, Mary was keen that Compton should take an active part in the Association. The discovery of clay suitable for pottery-making in the grounds clinched the nature of that participation.

In 1895, the Compton Parish Council, faced with a churchyard which was full, acquired a piece of land for a new cemetery on the outskirts of the village. Since it was some distance from the church (and on the road to their house), Mary had Watts offer to provide it with a Mortuary Chapel, designed by herself and decorated with terracotta modelling (Cat. 7). It has been suggested that she intended it as a memorial to Watts, but as Wilfrid Blunt pointed out ‘Mary built it to the glory, not of her god, but of her God’. Nevertheless, Mary’s virtual worship of Watts, or ‘Signor’ as she called him, had resulted in the subjugation of her own artistic career to his for so long, in her adulatory care for the elderly artist, that the temptation to accomplish one great work of her own in so worthy a cause could not be resisted.
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It is difficult to tease out the truth from Mrs Watts’s edited versions of how the Chapel was built. Feigning modesty, she allowed the myths to circulate that single-handedly she had designed and supervised its erection. She was quite shamelessly ‘economical with the truth’ when documenting the building of the Chapel and when briefing others who wrote about it. Deuchars ‘secured an appointment’ before November, 1895, when the planning must have been in its initial stages. However, Mary Watts wrote in December, 1900,

Our work here began four years ago this month - a small class of perfectly untrained hands met here in the evenings to do some decoration - con amore - for the little chapel in the newly made burial ground of this village. Four out of the number soon became permanent hands.

I designed the chapel (which was my husband’s gift) and all the decoration.....

The four were

Louis Deuchars, George Andrews, Thomas Steadman and Frank Mitchell, without whose intelligent interest and unfailing help the work could not have been done.

George Andrews, whom Mary Watts described as ‘our own gardener or “steward” as he calls himself’ seems to have been employed by the couple prior to the Chapel project. His photographic skills were so well developed that his negatives were used to illustrate Mrs Watts’s book about the Chapel, her biography of Watts and an article in The Studio. Boxes of his glass negatives are still at the Watts Gallery. Considering the photographic equipment available at that time, it appears that Mr Andrews must have had training to achieve such professional standards. Von Schleinitz described him as ‘steward, caretaker of Limnerslease, assistant to the Master and photographer of many of his works’. Thomas Steadman, who carved the door of the Chapel, had other talents too. According to Mrs Watts, ‘the Compton carpenter had also drawn at Guildford’. Frank Mitchell was ‘the kiln-man’ and would have been engaged specifically for his skills to operate the ‘kiln of an approved pattern by William De Morgan’ set up in the grounds of Limnerslease which was about a quarter of a mile from the Chapel site. Thus, George Andrews was, and continued to be, employed by the Wattses. The other three, including Deuchars, were
engaged specifically for the artistic parts of the building. In Mary Watts’s book about the modelling, *The Word in the Pattern*, she was loath to concede this.

As far as possible therefore every bit of the decoration of the chapel, modelled in clay of Surrey, by Compton hands, under unusual conditions - much of the work having been done gratuitously, and all of it with the love that made the work delightful....

Mary’s deception probably arose out of her anxiety to hide the high and mounting costs of the exercise. A figure of £3000 strayed into *The Strathearn Herald*, but Gleeson White was not nearly so indiscreet in *The Studio*, for which Mrs Watts was truly grateful. ‘I am glad you have not said anything about cost! Like the old buildings! I don’t see how anyone can tell what this chapel has cost! They are wild guesses.’ The strain on the finances of the Watts’s household resulted in the sale of a favourite work in November 1898 to James Smith (a Liverpool-based enthusiastic collector of G.F. Watts’s work) for £600. Obviously, money was not going to spoil Mary’s *magnum opus*.

This may have led to the story, which Mary did nothing to correct, that she alone was responsible for building the Chapel. However, she had to acknowledge to Gleeson White ‘the generous help of Mr George Redmayne, architect,’ who ‘overlooked the work of the village architect Mr John Jakes’.

The report of the Consecration of the Chapel gave a fuller version,

..its decoration of Celtic design, was entirely planned by Mrs Watts, assisted by Mr Redmayne of Haslemere. The contractors for the building were Messrs. Heal and Jackson, of Puttenham, who carried out their work well. The structure is of a very substantial character of specially made Roman bricks manufactured at Messrs. E. & A. Miles Guildford works, roofed with Roman tiles made by the same firm at Cranleigh works.

‘Mr Dakers (sic) and Mr Andrews, steward’ are also mentioned. (Obviously, the reporter had trouble with Deuchars’s Scottish name and accent.) Jakes may well have been the local building contractor, but George Tunstal Redmayne, F.R.I.B.A., was a semi-retired architect of some standing. He trained with and was assistant to Alfred Waterhouse, R.A., whose sister he married. After a successful career Redmayne retired to Haslemere. He may have been introduced to the
Wattses by Waterhouse, who then lived near Reading, not too far away. ‘A good crayon portrait of him (Redmayne) by ... G.F. Watts, R.A.,’ was ‘the outcome of a friendship between neighbours and the evidence of an artistic sympathy.’ Redmayne, who was trained in the Gothic revival style, often incorporated Romanesque door and widow openings in his buildings. He frequently used multiple recessing archways and stepped buttresses and on the School of Art, Chorlton-on-Medlock, there are decorated spandrels above the main Romanesque entrance. Since these elements all feature in the Compton Chapel, it appears that Redmayne had a considerable input to the design, although in Mrs Watts’s book about the chapel, The Word in the Pattern, the only acknowledgement of Redmayne’s contribution refers to the design of the wrought iron hinges on the carved wooden door.

Perhaps the Italian Romanesque influence was part of Mrs Watts’s tribute to her husband, who had spent four years in Italy earlier in his career. They had also been in the country together in 1888 in the second year of their marriage and, in Limnerslease, she lived with some of his landscapes of the Tuscan Apennines. The use of ‘Roman’ bricks and tiles would tend to support the view that the Italianate influence was no accident. In turn, Redmayne may have suggested Romanesque, as a reference to the Norman elements of the original Compton parish church of St. Nicholas. Mrs Watts’s preoccupation with Christian and Celtic symbolism dictated the circular and cruciform ground plan, comprising the Cross of Faith intersecting the Circle of Eternity. These are just two of the many references possibly derived from the Handbook of Christian Symbolism. Whether she realised it or not, the plan can also be taken as a representation of the Celtic Cross itself. She acknowledged the influence of the four English round churches, derived from the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, in the design of the building. The circular element could have been yet more homage to her husband, for Watts wrote, ‘The circle is the only perfect form, equal in all its parts and complete....All creation is full of circles which resolve into each other, The divine Intelligence must be the centre of all.’ The overall impression of the building is of a fat-stemmed
mushroom cut into four segments by the Cross, with a slightly cheeky belfry perched on one of the transepts (Pl. 2). Each one terminates in a gable with two soaring round-arched windows separated and framed by demi-columns supporting decorated capitals under a pitched roof. On the south-western slope of the west transept roof (just breaching the apex) and echoing the design of the main building is a small belfry, complete with a single bronze bell. Decorated tiles fill the spaces between the open pediments and the single round arches, supported by small, capital-topped columns on the gables parallel to the crossing. Under the eaves of the other two sides of the belfry are double-arched openings. Decorative rather than functional two-stepped buttresses support each transept. The lower third of each is twice the width of the upper portion and roofed in a scalloped pattern. Each buttress is decorated with pairs of terracotta bricks between narrow demi-columns terminating in decorated capitals. One buttress is continued up through the roof line to support the belfry, while another small plain buttress rises from the curved roof surmounting that segment of the circular wall. The double-arched theme is repeated between these two buttresses, with the central support terminating in a bracket. Three heavily decorated buttresses support the equally ornate recessing triple round arches forming the doorway to the Chapel, while the spandrels also have modelling. Each circular part of the outer wall is surmounted by an overhanging decorated frieze, apparently supported by three decorative stylised figure corbels, but actually resting, throughout its length, on reinforced concrete slabs, probably cast in situ. This feature again points to the very active involvement of the architect, but what cannot be taken away from Mrs Watts is the conception of the Celtic/Art-Nouveau decoration of the building with its high-relief, hand-moulded terracotta panels. The Word in the Pattern, gives little explanation of the actual architecture, pointing to the likelihood that it was mainly a vehicle for her decoration.

According to Mrs Watts, her inspiration came largely from Celtic art, with many of the symbols taken from carved stones and crosses and ancient illuminated manuscripts of the Gospels, but unfortunately she omitted to give specific references. The Wattses had a large library (not
catalogued and now dispersed) and Redmayne would have provided access to architectural volumes. In addition, it is known that Mrs Watts spent time in the Reading Room of the British Museum in London. By examining literature that would have been available to her, it is possible to discover many of her sources, apart from the obvious Biblical references which she could have got from a Concordance.

The buttresses all have representations of ‘The Tree of Life’, apparently based on illustrations of stone fragments at Hexham and Jedburgh in Stuart’s *Sculptured Stones of Scotland*, ‘rising from flower to fruit, from shell to fish, serpent, beast, bird; sun, moon, stars, and angels’. The demi-columns on the buttresses have simple patterns of wavy lines which signify ‘running water’, representing ‘a pure river of life ... proceeding out of the throne of God and the Lamb’. The four capitals take the form of the ‘the four sides of the throne... the lion, ... the calf (sic), ... the man ... and the eagle, ... symbols of the four Evangelists’. Even the scalloped tiles of the roofs of the lower buttress are meant to suggest ‘the breast feathers of the mother bird’ and hence, ‘a feeling of peace’. The demi-columns around the windows on the gables stand on bases ‘engraved with a symbol taken from a Celtic cross at Carew in Wales’. Mrs Watts found the motif of four “Tau” crosses within a swastika in Westwood’s *Lapidarium Walliae* and its construction was also explained in an article by Romilly Allen. When Gleeson White proposed to write about the ‘mystic Svastika’, Mrs Watts had to ask him to ensure that its Christian connections were stressed ‘as otherwise people (will) run away with the idea that I am using “heathen symbolism”’. The capitals crowning the demi-columns bear symbols of the Trinity, which appear to have been inspired by *The Handbook of Christian Symbolism*. The north and south sides of the belfry are decorated with a frieze of zoomorphic doves carrying olive branches, both symbols of ‘the Spirit of God’ from the same source. On the open pediments of its east and west gables ‘are wings rising out of the heart of a great seed husk’, possibly based on an illustration in *The Art of Illuminating*. 
Each of the four decorated friezes rests on three corbels formed by angels carrying shields representing, The Way (the labyrinth or maze from Lethaby’s *Architecture Mysticism & Myth*), The Truth (the boat of the sun, with its double armed cross from *The Handbook of Christian Symbolism*) and The Life (the vine, also from *The Handbook of Christian Symbolism*). The friezes themselves represent ‘The Path of the Just’ with each segment having ‘a central pervading spirit; Hope, Truth, Love and Light’. All four have the same basic design, but the differing themes dictate the actual content, which is virtually symmetrical about the central cross with its own unique feature. The six panels on each section are framed by Celtic knots top and bottom and straps of the vine motif between. Mrs Watts appears to have designed the knots herself as opposed to using known designs, but the vine motif seems to have been derived from an illustration of a gravestone on Iona in Drummond’s book, *Sculptured Monuments of Iona and the Highlands*. The two central angels hover above a pair of zoomorphic birds, while two supporting angels on either side bear roundels containing two opposing ‘comma’ motifs and between them symbols appropriate to the theme of the segment. Mrs Watts may have based her design of the two birds on either side of the cross on an illustration in the *History of Christian Art*. Drawing again from the *Handbook of Christian Symbolism*, Hope’s birds are peacocks, ‘the hope of immortality’ whose tail feathers ‘were cast every year and renewed again’ and the central feature is ‘the anchor of Hope’ with its ‘Latin cross’ for the shank. The four roundels contain the lion of courage, the spider for patience, the dove of comfort and the hart for aspiration. Truth has owls, ‘bird of wisdom’, below a sceptre surrounded by four keys ‘of truth’. Subsidiary qualities are the Law of the Universe (sun and moon), Wordsworth’s shell for ‘Unity of the Universe’, the scales for Justice and the “Perfect Law of Liberty” represented by the flying fish. The stylising of the pelicans for Love makes them almost unrecognisable, but they could have been based on an illustration in the *Book of Kells* (Pl. 3). The legend of the bird pecking its own breast to provide blood to feed her brood as evidence of self-sacrificing love or as a representation of Christ himself is well-known and appears in the *Handbook of Christian Symbolism* and Romilly Allen’s *Early Christian*
Mrs Watts took the central motif of interlaced hearts and circles from 'a Celtic missal' which she appears to have seen in *The Art of Illuminating.* In the roundels she had the lily for purity and the dove of peace (both from the *Handbook of Christian Symbolism*). Mrs Watts referred to Tennyson for the lily and also 'for joy: the happy bells', while she took her symbol for service, the wheel, from the Bible. The segment devoted to Light is represented by eagles 'who can look at the sun ... sometimes used as the symbol of the Holy Spirit, and also of St. John', ideas again in the *Handbook of Christian Symbolism* and *Early Christian Symbolism* (Pl. 3a). The stylised eagles appear to be based on the representation of St. John on the Evangelical Symbols page in the *Book of Kells*, as is her portrayal of wings throughout the frieze. The central motif picks up on one of Mrs Watts's favourite themes of 'circles of suns and stars'. Subsidiary qualities are "God-like" represented by 'the crescent moon ... the symbol of Heaven', "God-ward", 'the flames of the five lamps of the watchful virgins', "God-lit", 'the divine eye of insight in the heart of man' and 'the flame of inspiration, the pentecostal shower, twelve flames descending upon the heads of those chosen messengers'.

At the base of the south transept is the heavily ornamented doorway. The whole area is smothered with Mrs Watts's symbolism, linked up by the 'interlacing cord of Celtic art'. The middle buttresses flanking the Norman arched doorway 'bear the great name "I AM". Interwoven with the initial letter "I" is the hand in the nimbus or glory, the Celtic symbol of God the Creator.' (both from *The Handbook of Christian Symbolism* and the illustration of the hand from Romilly Allen's book). The two flanking buttresses have six repeating interlaced motifs including 'Alpha and Omega', representing God, and stylised figures bearing 'parables from nature' in the form of small roundels. The one representing the heart appears to have been taken from the *Book of Kells*. All the tiles involve heavy undercutting to achieve the desired result. On the inner order of the arch is a 'choir of angels' with some 'looking downward in sympathy or upward in hope'. Redmayne may have suggested this motif adapted from Norman doorways. The interlaced stylised
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‘peacock’s eye’ appears on the middle order, while the outer one features ‘a beautiful knot often found upon Celtic crosses’ which Mrs Watts could have taken from The Sculptured Stones of Scotland.62 The spandrels, or ‘the wall veil (to borrow Mr. Ruskin’s beautiful term) above the archway’ contain ‘The Garment of Praise’ ‘intended to represent an embroidered hanging’ (Pl. 4). On each side, seven symbols represent Isaiah’s words for the oppressed and bereaved, while the two are linked by what Mrs Watts described as a Celtic monogram for the ‘Sanctus’, or ‘S.S.S.’ according to Gleeson White.63 In fact, the S’s are reversed and appear to be based on a reversed image of Trompetenmuster ornaments in the form of a Celtic broken-backed triskele.64 One of the symbols is a phoenix, visually similar to a bird on St. Luke’s initial page in the Lindisfarne Gospels and discussed in The Handbook of Christian Symbolism and Early Christian Symbolism.65 For the carved oak door Mrs Watts took inspiration from two different sources: the interwoven “wattle” cross ‘copied from a gravestone at Iona’ is a mirror image taken from another illustration in Sculptured Monuments of Iona and the Highlands; both the background of interlacing circles and flames on the upper part of the cross and ‘the dragon below, smitten by the cross’ came from a plaster cast in the South Kensington Museum as discussed in a Studio article on Scandinavian wood-carving by Romilly Allen (Pl.5).66

Deuchars’s efforts to get his contribution to this modelling acknowledged resulted in the misquotation of his name in The Surrey Advertiser. It seems he tried again with Gleeson White, but when the latter sent the draft of his article about the building of the Chapel to Mrs Watts for approval, back came the response,

...about the workers. I do not wish to mention one more than the other. The permanent staff were all untrained hands when they came. The young house painter the Scotchman had never used clay, and had only drawn at a school of art in Glasgow in the ordinary way - the Compton carpenter had also drawn at Guildford - besides the Scotchman is not an assistant to my husband who really very rarely has any assistance. The men all worked so splendidly - our own gardener or “steward” as he calls himself, the kiln-man and the village carpenter - that, though Mr Deuchars is now giving himself up to art I cannot say I was any more indebted to him than the others - of course the permanent workers did the bulk of the work. I cannot say too much I am indebted to them all. I never had a
difficulty they did not help to overcome, and they soon were able to work from a rough charcoal drawing, though the first year I had to do the first pattern myself in clay. I think if names are mentioned the generous help of Mr George Redmayne, architect, whom kindly saw that we did not make mistakes, overlooked the works of the village architect Mr John Jakes, should be mentioned, but I should rather prefer it if the personal element was rather less. I hear about "Mrs Watts", but if she must come, then those names perhaps had better be mentioned.\textsuperscript{67}

By this time Gleeson White must have been thoroughly confused. In the published article, 'Mrs Watts' stayed in, 'Mr Redmayne' stayed in, but the others became 'four and sometimes five permanent workers'.\textsuperscript{68} Over the years the architect's role seems to have been forgotten. Wilfrid Blunt, curator of the Watts Gallery, with access to all the material there, and not uncritical of Mary in his biography of Watts, fell into the trap, 'It was erected ... by Mary Watts ... with, it is affirmed, no professional assistance beyond that of the local builder and blacksmith,...'\textsuperscript{69} By summer 1983, Lucinda Lambton enthused, 'The chapel was designed, built and decorated, with only the help of local villagers, by Mary Watts, a woman who at the age of forty six had never built anything before and was never to do so again.'\textsuperscript{70} It would appear that Deuchars's attempts at self-publicity were nowhere near as successful as Mary Watts's. However, he triumphed in the far-off \textit{Strathearn Herald}, which, in its report of the consecration of the Chapel in July, 1898 (probably written by Andrew Deuchars from his son's information), said, 'Much of the decorative work has been executed by and under the direction of Mr Louis R. Deuchars...a pupil of Mr Watts, ... one of the rising school of younger artists'.\textsuperscript{71} Indubitably, Mrs Watts won the battle of words, but the truth probably lies somewhere between the two versions.

For two and a half years, the four permanent workers endeavoured to realise Mrs Watts's dreams. They were assisted by the villagers' Thursday evening class, and the local gentry who came during the day to avoid coming into contact with their tenants and workers.\textsuperscript{72} Perhaps the less artistically talented modellers were given the simple patterns to work on (like the wavy patterns on the demi-columns or the scalloped tiles on the roofs of the lower buttresses), while the high relief Celtic patterns were left to the likes of Deuchars and Thomas Steadman, who had some art school
training. The modelling of the faces on the friezes (full, three-quarter profile and profile) is much more sensitively executed than those on the corbels, pointing to either Mrs Watts herself or Deuchars. On the corbels, slight variations in the interpretation of the figures are evidence of their different creators (Pls. 3 & 3a). Despite the assertion by Ronald Chapman (son of the Wattses’ adopted daughter, Lilian Mackintosh) that ‘the coachman was entrusted with the modelling of angel faces to go over the door’, it is obvious that various hands have been at work. Some faces are beautifully executed, while others are almost rudimentary (Pls. 4 & 5). Since the villagers would pass through the chapel doorway every time they used the building, it seems reasonable to assume that the more artistic among them were allowed to model these angels. But the bulk of the intricate work was probably carried out by the four permanent hands. Apparently, the initial discovery of clay was nowhere near sufficient for the scale of the task and more copious supplies were brought in by the wagon load from an adjacent village, (possibly from the Guildford works where the bricks were manufactured). An album, preserved by Deuchars’s family, contains three photographs showing the modelling of the decorative terracotta bricks. One taken outside a building is of a middle-aged man starting to work on a large block of clay, lying on a table (Pl. 6). Another of a young woman in a studio, is probably Dorothy Eleanor MacCallum, listed in *The Word in the Pattern* as one of those who had ‘modelled any part of the Terra-cotta work on the Chapel’. She appears to be working on one of the evangelist capitals, probably the Eagle of St. John (Pl. 7). The third extremely small photograph (perhaps part of a larger one), shows four males engaged on the modelling. It has obviously been posed, as they are dressed in their Sunday best, all behind one table in front of the Della Robbia roundel on the outside wall of Limnerslease, hardly the ideal setting for such work. It would seem reasonable to assume that these were the four permanent hands, of whom Deuchars appears to be the youngest (Pl. 8).

Acknowledgements in the first edition of *The Word in the Pattern*, refer to photogravures from George Andrew’s negatives, and pen drawings by Louis Deuchars and the author. From
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examination of the originals in a commemorative book, presented to the Wattses on the completion of the chapel in 1898, it can be seen that Deuchars’s are more finely drawn than Mary’s (Figs. 10, 11). A large one by Deuchars, unused in the book, but published in *The Studio* in 1899, shows the small altar, retable and reredos, including a sketch of the centrepiece, Watts’s painting, ‘The All-pervading’ (Fig. 12). This drawing appears to be an accurate representation of the Celtic symbolism now in place, but not yet there in 1898 when the chapel was consecrated.

For the day a temporary altar had been erected with white embroidered cloth, and backed in rich gold and silver and blue curtains. However, it would appear that the terracotta panels had been modelled and it may well be that they were put together temporarily for the ceremony. The altar was exhibited the following year at the Home Arts and Industries Exhibition. Watts only completed his painting, based on the earlier version, in April 1904, but the altar panels were obviously ready six years earlier. In the event, the finished result is slightly different, in that another panel, of much less intricate design, appears below Watts’s painting and the side framing panels have been lengthened by means of very simple additions, possibly because the space the altar had to occupy had been underestimated (Pl. 9).

Wilfrid Blunt described the painting as ‘a small and rather feeble version’, but Watts was eighty-seven by then (and only three months from the end of his life). It is not known whether the painting which was exhibited with the altar in 1899 was Watts’s, as he was known to return again and again to some of his work, or whether another hand (perhaps Deuchars’s, since he included an accurate sketch of it in his drawing of the altar) had made a copy for the occasion.

The interior of the chapel is decorated in ‘gesso panels afterwards attached to the chapel walls on a framework of metal lathing galvanised to prevent rust’. Wilfrid Blunt asserts that the decoration was held up by Mrs Watts concentrating on setting up the Compton Potters’ Art Guild, but a photograph of Mrs Watts with her helpers shows Deuchars (and two females) at work with a palette on panels at an advanced stage (Pl. 10). As he did not leave Compton until December
1899, he had eighteen months with the Wattses after the consecration of the chapel. Given the existence of the detailed drawing of the altar in July 1898, it does not seem unreasonable to assume that Mrs Watts made further use of his talents for the gesso decoration. Although publication of the second edition of her book, *The Word in the Pattern*, containing additional material about the interior was delayed until 1905, this could well have been because Watts’s painting was not available until Spring 1904. The pottery seems to have been held in abeyance for at least six months when she ‘parted with our kiln-burner and one other permanent hand’ (Thomas Mitchell and probably Thomas Steadman, the village carpenter, who would have wanted to get on with his own career). The fact that Deuchars stayed on would tend to indicate that he worked on the decoration for the interior of the chapel, although probably not all of it.

In Edinburgh around the same time another mortuary chapel interior was being decorated with murals designed to comfort the recently bereaved. Mrs Phoebe Anna Traquair had been commissioned by the Edinburgh Social Union, an Arts and Crafts organisation, to paint the interior of the chapel at the Royal Hospital for Sick Children in 1885. Mrs Traquair much admired Watts as evidenced by her inclusion of him among a series of miniature portrait medallions of her heroes in the decoration. Another commission for mural decoration of an Edinburgh building was the Song School of St. Mary’s Cathedral, where, on the south wall (1889-90), Mrs Traquair placed a full-length portrait of Watts, dressed in his customary skull cap and artist’s smock. In his hand is a partially rolled version of his painting ‘Love and Death’ which he completed in 1887. The two families had social contact and Mrs Watts visited Mrs Traquair when she was in Edinburgh. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to conclude that Mrs Watts would have known of the Edinburgh mortuary chapel murals in which ‘gold, white and strong reds and blues dominated the decoration’. In 1896 a new hospital was built and Mrs Traquair had to supervise the transfer of the bulk of her earlier work and incorporate it into an enlarged scheme for the new chapel over the following two years. At the same time she was in the later stages of an extensive series of murals
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in the Catholic Apostolic Church, also in Edinburgh, where gilded gesso and tow were incorporated. Although the interiors of the two mortuary chapels are different, 'they shared decorative richness of colour and interdenominational iconography'.

At Compton, because the transepts only project a little way beyond the circumference of the circle, the interior impression is of a circular building with immensely thick walls. The intersection of the spherical section ceilings with the transepts appear as soaring vaulting. All is covered with Mrs Watts's art nouveau 'glorified wallpaper' in rich Victorian colours glowing with gold and silver. Again, the main theme is the 'Tree of Life', a sinuous vine bearing grapes, intertwined 'just above its roots...with a golden girdle', the gilded terracotta dado, 'into which the emblems of the Trinity are wrought' (triskeles and three intertwined hands). Above that are small wild flowers, but the main features are angels, 'winged messengers', encircling the walls (Pl. 11). Alternately, they face inwards and outwards representing Light and Dark and carry glowing enamel-like roundels with symbols of similar qualities to those portrayed on the exterior. In the roof 'four Seraphs clothed in the crimson colour of love and life' offer a blessing (Pl. 12). These angels have stylistic similarities to those painted by Phoebe Traquair on the ceiling of the south aisle of the Catholic Apostolic Church. However, Mrs Traquair not only designed her interiors, but also carried out the painting herself, while close inspection of the interior of the Compton Chapel reveals that Mrs Watts was content to set the overall design and allow individual artists to complete the figures in their own way. Around the seraphs the swirling vine could have been based on an illustration of a mosaic in History of Christian Art. In the centre of the roof is 'the circle of the Eternal - without beginning without end' (Pl. 13). A veritable choir of little cherubs, their wings in stylised art nouveau form, on a background of Celtic tracery and knots, cover the vault ribs, which soar upward terminating in a square frame for 'the circle of the Eternal' at the top of the dome.
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The altar of gilded terracotta repeats themes from the exterior of the chapel (Pl. 9). Every surface glows with the intertwined art nouveau and Celtic symbolism. Strangely, Mrs Watts devoted only thirteen lines in *The Word in the Pattern* to what could be described as the most important item in the chapel. She explained,

The altar frontal is designed to express the words:

"I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, The Tabernacle of God is with men:
He shall dwell with them."

Actually, the words on the altar are ‘The Tabernacle of the Lord is with men; He shall dwell with them’. Mrs Watts may have chosen ‘The Tabernacle’ as a representation of the chapel itself. The unrelieved use of gold on the altar ensures that it is the focal point of the interior, but the architectural composition of the design also suggests the gilded city of Heaven. Equally, the altar front, with its spandrels containing the winged emblems of the four Evangelists, could have been inspired by a canon table in *The Book of Kells* (Pl. 14). In three Romanesque-arched niches separated by art nouveau stylised plant motifs, the Tabernacle quotation is ingeniously incorporated into the Celtic-style interwoven ribbons. Stylised angels appear in all three niches. In the outer two, several are shown surrounding Celtic circular motives. Given Mrs Watts’s fascination with Biblical references to the wheel, it may be that she drew her inspiration from Ezekiel who wrote of the cherubim and wheels bearing the living spirit of the dead to Heaven. The Celtic triskele, as illustrated by Romilly Allen, in the left-hand panel (with the words ‘The Tabernacle of the Lord’) may be an interpretation of the Trinity. The maze in the right-hand panel (over ‘He shall dwell with them’) presumably represents ‘The Way’, as on the corbels on the exterior of the building. In the central panel (‘Is with men’) the art nouveau winged figure with its halo and fish scales could be the embodiment of Christ with the lamp of eternal life burning in his Celtic representational heart, the latter a repeat of the motif used in the roundels on either side of the doorway. Close inspection of the ribbons above the words in this panel reveals four little figures, resembling those found on Celtic crosses, two standing to the left and two kneeling on the right. They presumably relate to ‘men’, but can also be interpreted as a reference to the four permanent hands who worked
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on the modelling of the chapel. On the retable is a frieze of doves bearing ‘the seven gifts of the spirit’, possibly inspired by Didron’s *Christian Iconography*.\(^{103}\) Around Watts’s picture is a complex representation of ‘the bird feeding on the grapes’ in the form of a symmetrical design of four birds each side in bold circular sweeps of the vine, which may be based on another part of the same illustration Mrs Watts used for the four interlaced hearts voussoir motif on the doorway.\(^{104}\) The lower side panels, part of the 1899 exhibit, feature closely worked art nouveau ribbons and scrolls, while the upper side panels, presumably completed after the exhibition, have a much more restrained rendering of the ‘seven-branched candlestick’.\(^{105}\) Deuchars’s detailed portrayal of the altar panels in his signed drawing does tend to point to his involvement in its modelling.\(^{106}\) By the time Mrs Watts produced the second edition of *The Word in the Pattern*, he was long gone from Compton and for some reason his name had been removed from the title page. Perhaps her displeasure was further reflected in the paucity of explanation of the symbolism on the altar.

The photograph of work on the interior decoration shows three fairly complete gesso panels, with Deuchars painting one of the angels, but this could have been a posed shot and it is not known exactly how great was his contribution to the exotic tapestry inside the chapel (Pl. 10).\(^{107}\) Comparison of the features of the faces on two of the panels with some of his later paintings reveals stylistic similarities (Pls. 199, 200).

---

1 Photograph album preserved by Deuchars family. P.C.
2 “Limner”, to keep the remembrance that it was built for an artist, and the word “lease”, as having a double meaning, for we played a little with the old English word “to leasen”, which meant to glean, our hope being that there were golden years to be gleaned in this new home.’ Watts, Mary S., *The Annals of an Artist’s Life*, vol.1 (London, 1912) p.190.
5 Ibid. p.173.
7 Blunt, op.cit. (Watts’s interview given in 1896 to a reporter of *The Westminster Gazette*), p.222.
9 Blunt, op.cit. p.226.
11 Blunt, op.cit. (letter to James Nicol, subsequently Compton Pottery manager) p.231.
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13 Letter from Mary Watts to J. Gleeson White, 31 July 1898, passing comments on his proposed article about the Chapel for The Studio. P.C.
17 Letter from Mary S. Watts to J. Gleeson White.
20 "An Interesting Chapel", ‘Auchterarder Notes’, *Strathearn Herald* 9 July 1898. (information probably supplied by Louis Deuchars)
21 Mary Watts’s letter to J. Gleeson White.
22 Blunt, op.cit. p.224.
23 Mary Watts’s letter to J. Gleeson White.
24 ‘Consecration of the New Cemetery’, *The Surrey Advertiser and County Times*, 2 July 1898.
26 Photographs of buildings in Local Studies Unit, Manchester Library. Scottish Widows’ Fund Offices, ACC No.9887; St. Chrysostom’s Church, ACC No.42853; School of Art, Chorlton-on-Medlock, ACC No.141445.
44 Drummond, James, *Scultped Monuments of Iona and the Highlands* (Edinburgh, 1881), pl.XXVIII, L65.
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55 ‘The Evangelical Symbols’, Fol.27v, Book of Kells.
61 Watts, The Word, p.13. Scottish examples are Dalmeny Church and Dunfermline Abbey. In Yorkshire there is an even better example on the Chancel Arch of the Church of St. John the Baptist, Adel.
64 Watts, The Word, p.14. Such a motif formed a harness-mount, found at the Roman fort of South Shields.
67 Letter from Mary Watts to J. Gleeson White.
75 Watts, The Word, (first ed.) p.27. Comparison of the photograph in Deuchars’s album with one of G.F. Watts’s painting of Dorothy MacCallum in Mrs Watts’s catalogue of Watts’s paintings would indicate that it is the same person. The catalogue is in the Archives at the Watts’s Gallery, Compton.
76 ‘G.F. Watts R.A. and M. Watts.’ Illuminated manuscript presentation book to Mr & Mrs Watts from the parishioners of Compton, Christmas 1898. In the archives at the Watts Gallery, Compton.
78 The Surrey Advertiser and County Times, 2 July 1898.
79 Wood, op.cit., p.99; also portrayed in one of the cartoons published in a newspaper cutting dated 13 May, 1899 and pasted into a book of cuttings by Mrs Watts. Now in the Archives at the Watts Gallery, Compton.
82 Ibid., loc.cit.
83 Ibid., loc.cit. Ibid. pl.23a. (original at Watts Gallery, Compton).
84 Ibid. p.231. (letter from Mrs Watts to James Nicol (later manager of the Potters’ Art Guild), December 1900.)
88 Letters to Percy Nobbs from Phoebe Traquair, P.C.
90 Ibid. p.27.
91 Ibid., loc.cit.
93 Watts, The Word (second ed.) p. 28. (The second of the two versions of p. 28).
94 Ibid., p.29.
95 Cutts, op.cit., p.292.
96 Ibid. loc.cit.
97 Ibid., p.31.
98 Ibid., loc.cit. Quotation from Revelation ch.21, v.3. Revelation ch.21, v.4 is often quoted at funeral services. ‘And God shall wipe away all the tears from their eyes : and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain : for the former things are passed away.’
99 Revelation ch.21, v.21.
101 The mark later devised for the Compton Pottery was of circular design bearing a wheel within a wheel and the words, ‘Their work was as it were a wheel in the middle of a wheel’, taken from Ezekiel ch.1, v.16-17.
104 Watts, The Word (second ed.) p.31. Stuart, op.cit. pl. LXXVIII.
106 Wood, Esther, op.cit., p.103.
107 Blunt, England’s Michelangelo, pl.23a.
ASSISTING G.F. WATTS

In the four years that Deuchars was at Compton, Watts was working on two heroic pieces of sculpture. The equestrian group, which had been started around 1883, featured the classic pose of the male rider controlling the rearing horse. While Watts's earlier equestrian statue, Hugh Lupus (1876-83), was of a traditional nature with an armour-clad figure bearing a falcon, the later work was far more free in conception and execution. However, the label, 'Impressionist', given to it by a friend, was resisted by Watts.

All art is impressionist; the men who use the term do not carry out their own ideal. The aim of their impression is to make evident their own dexterity; the aim should be to give the impression of some great truth of nature....

Gesso grosso (pieces of tow soaked in size and plaster) was used because Watts preferred these materials to wet clay, which adversely affected his rheumatism. The gesso dried quickly and it had the advantage that it could be carved. Besides, Watts loved the textured surface produced by the technique. The composition eventually became known as Physical Energy (Cat. 8, Pl. 15). Critics have pointed out the improbability of the pose, but he did say,

I do not wish my man to be like any model you could find anywhere, and I do not wish my horse to be like a natural horse. I want them both merely to represent the characteristics of the human and of the animal.5

For a sculptor of Watts's age, his experimentation with technique was highly commendable, but it led to continual reworking of the piece as he strove for an unattainable perfection. (He only reluctantly allowed the piece to go for casting in 1902 as a memorial to Rhodes and went happily back to work on the gesso when it was returned in 1904.) In 1887 Mary described Watts in the garden at Little Holland House (their London home in Melbury Road).

sometimes with hammer and chisel, for the gesso was as hard as stone; sometimes modelling up, with small additions of plaster and tow about the size of the palm of his hand, prepared and given to him by his man.

In this case, the assistant was George Thompson, who had been with Watts for many years, despite Mrs Watts's claim that her husband 'very rarely has any assistance'. It is not certain that Deuchars ever worked on Physical Energy, but he must have seen it, since it was not cast until 1902. In fact, he may even have had some involvement with the casting.
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For the other statue, there is evidence of Deuchars’s involvement. ‘Mr Watts and Mr Deuchars are... engaged upon a memorial statue of the late Lord Tennyson, which will ultimately be cast in bronze and erected in his native place’ (Cat. 9). After the wax model was approved by the commissioning committee, Mr and Mrs Watts purchased ‘a small farm-house close to our gate, where a fine old barn was available for such work. The colossal figure was built upon a trolley, and could therefore be brought out of doors with ease.’ Watts was eighty-one when he started on the work, but he was determined to complete his tribute to his long-standing friend and took no fee for the modelling. However, at his advanced age with such a life-long history of ill health, it is understandable that Mary would not have wanted ‘Signor’ to do any of the heavy labour. George Thompson, the ever-faithful assistant was still around (he is mentioned among the workers on the Compton Chapel) and it is probable that both he and Deuchars, working from the model, put the bulk of the gesso on the supporting framework (Pl. 16).

The wax model for the Tennyson statue was produced by Watts in 1898. In the same year, Deuchars sent off his first piece of exhibition work, a wax statuette of Robert Burns, to the New Gallery’s Summer Exhibition (Cat. 10). It must be assumed that Deuchars had the benefit of Watts’s advice, on the choice of medium, the modelling and how to send a piece of work for exhibition. At that time Deuchars gave his address as ‘Farncombe, Godalming’ (a village one and a half miles south east of Compton), but in the following year, he used ‘Limnerslease, Guildford’. It is not known whether he actually moved into the house, but there was certainly plenty of space with thirty two bedrooms.

Deuchars continued to model statuettes; one of Lilian Mackintosh, adopted daughter of the Wattses, and one of G.F. Watts himself (Cat. 11 & Cat. 12). The latter was probably executed first in terracotta (the medium in which Deuchars was well used to working) (Pl. 17). A version
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can be seen in an interior shot of Little Holland House, ‘Under the large, idealised representational picture, we see a little terracotta statuette of the Master by Louis R. Deuchars’. It was also featured in an article in The Studio which explained that there was a ready market for well-executed statuettes, which were much less expensive than full-scale statues. However, it conceded that the art of making statuettes was not an easy one.

It is clear, then, that Mr Louis R. Deuchars, in his statuette of Mr G.F. Watts, has attempted a very difficult thing. Yet we have no doubt that his miniature portrait will be widely appreciated.

Despite the misgivings of Mary Watts about the role of Deuchars at Compton, enough was thought of the statuette for it to be cast in bronze and retained for display in the Watts Gallery (where it is today). However, the extra strengthening material behind the feet has been removed and the cylindrical base has not been included (Pl. 18). Versions of the figure continued to be appreciated, in five exhibitions between 1903 and 1911. Reference was made to Deuchars’s small scale sculpture in a Country Life article.

A seated figure of our late Queen and a statuette or two, very perfect and delicate in finish, attract attention by their excellence of workmanship. One of the latter is of Mr. Watts himself, a charming little work of art not nine inches high; another, also a successful portrait, is a graceful figure of a girl in evening dress, her opera-cloak thrown loosely back in long flowing folds.

The girl was Lily Mackintosh and Deuchars also exhibited that work (Cat. 11).

Statuettes had a long history in France, where sculptors were given ample opportunities to exhibit and sell their work. In March 1902, the Fine Art Society sought to popularise the form in Britain by presenting the exhibition, Statuettes by The Sculptors of Today where works of the leading exponents were gathered together. The review article in The Studio welcomed the initiative, but complained that no new works had been offered to the public. However, sales were promising. Perhaps it was an awareness of this increasing popularity, or simply an imposed economy in material that led Deuchars to experiment with small-scale work.
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As well as modelling, he was drawing, producing lithographs, and painting in oil. In the 1890’s Watts was making lithographs using the old stone technique. Von Schleinitz, describing his activities in 1899, wrote

....we see the grand old man, as he was known at that time, move more and more into a new role as a lithographer. He sent to the South Kensington Museum exhibition of lithographs, two lithographic stones. The Master was very interested in high quality reproduction of his creations and he could do them himself very well, not only theoretically, but also practically and he also taught those around him to do this.

Deuchars did not need to be taught, having already used the medium extensively in Glasgow, but perhaps he was keen to try the traditional methods. One surviving example of his efforts is a charming atmospheric little study of Guildford Castle from the banks of the River Wey over the water meadows at dawn (Cat. 13, Pl. 20).

In 1897 Watts produced, in lithographic form, an invitation to a Celebration of the Jubilee of Queen Victoria held at Monkshatch, the home of the Hichenses, his friends who had originally been instrumental in bringing him to the area (Cat. 14, Fig. 13). One of these invitations was sent to Deuchars’s parents in Auchterarder, but whether they were able to accept is doubtful. The composition appeared to fascinate Deuchars, for he later produced a pencil drawing which played about with the idea, making the putto much more like a young child and reversing the image (Pl. 248). He also later copied Watts’s putto almost exactly in oil on board (not very successfully) (Pl. 247).

Oil had been a favoured medium since his youth. During the time with Watts, he was surely able to pick up hints on technique from the Master. In 1898, the Auchterarder Correspondent of The Strathearn Herald reported, ‘We understand that Mr Louis Deuchars.....is engaged upon a painting in oils from life of his friend and patron, Mr G.F. Watts, the eminent Royal Academician. The painting will probably be exhibited in one of the London Galleries next season.’ (Mrs Watts would certainly not have approved the wording.) It was shown at the New Gallery in May 1899.
The Auchterarder scribe was at work again, ‘We believe this is the first time Mr Watts’s portrait has ever been painted, Sir John Millais having been refused sittings on various occasions. Mr Deuchars is therefore particularly fortunate in being the first artist who has been privileged to paint Mr Watts’s portrait’. Obviously this was patently untrue as there were already in existence several fine portraits of Watts, e.g. Charles Couzens c. 1849 and Cecil Schott, 1887. Von Schleinitz referred briefly to Deuchars’s painting in his book, albeit mistaking the academic dress for ‘painter’s robes’. There was another painting of Watts, which was exhibited after his death in 1904, ‘The late G.F. Watts, O.M., R.A. in his garden at Limnerslease’ (Cat. 16). It would appear that it was painted from a photograph taken by A. Fraser-Tytler which appeared in Macmillan’s book about Watts (Pl. 22). Since that was published in 1903, Deuchars could have worked from the photogravure in it, or he may have got a copy of the photograph from Fraser-Tytler when he went to work near the family home at Aldourie, Inverness. The latter is probably more likely, as infringement of copyright could result in legal action. Watts had his solicitors insert a notice to this effect warning against ‘pirating his pictures by reproductions’. It is not known whether this insertion had anything to do with Deuchars’s newspaper article “Love and Death’. The Language of Nature and the Language of Art’, which included a very poor engraving of Watts’s painting (Cat. 17, Fig. 14, Pl. 250). In view of Watts’s readiness to resort to the law, it can only be assumed that the article was published in some obscure Scottish local newspaper, which would never fall into the hands of either Mr or Mrs Watts.

However, another drawing sent to The Strathearn Herald in 1897 was more successful. Perhaps spurred on by the Jubilee celebrations at Monkshatch, Deuchars prepared a design, apparently appraised by Watts, for a commemorative fountain to be erected in Comrie, the village of his birth (Cat. 18, Fig. 15). Funds were requested and Comrie did get its fountain, but there is only a plain commemorative tablet on it and not Deuchars’s sculpture. Presumably not enough money was
Deuchars was still painting and perhaps encouraged by Watts’ portraiture skill, he made a fine study of George Thompson, his colleague from the Chapel modelling days (Cat. 19, Pl. 23). In 1899, the Royal Academy accepted another oil, ‘The Pilgrims’ Way - Surrey’ (Cat. 20). The sandy bridleway, which runs close to Limnerslea, is part of the ancient route the pilgrims took on their way to Canterbury. Other paintings from Deuchars’s time at Compton were, ‘And Joy and Music pouring forth from every Grove’, ‘Surrey in June’, subtitled “And half the world a bridegroom is and half the world a bride” and ‘A Surrey Sandpit’ (Cat. 21, Cat. 22, Cat. 23). His third work accepted by the Royal Academy was a black and white drawing, ‘The Orange and the Citron Tree’ (Cat. 24).

With the barn, purchased for the Tennyson statue, came some land, where a garden was created for Watts to rest from his labours on fine days. According to his wife, he helped to create the garden, ‘...he was very happy when, wearing a strong pair of gloves, he pruned back tangles of bramble and thorn with a reaping hook, no one else being trusted to do this for fear too much of the beauty of wild nature should be lost.’ However, it is highly unlikely that an octogenarian, and one of indifferent health, could possibly have swung the two-handed scythe. It is much more likely that he directed the clearing operations. Two surviving photographs show Deuchars wielding the implement, dressed in his artist’s smock and attacking the undergrowth with such vigour that his hat has fallen off (Pl. 24).

However, such frolics were not contributing to his artistic career. At the end of 1899, he went off to Florence, ostensibly ‘to study under several of the Italian masters’, but it seems more likely that he accompanied Watts’s entry to the competition organised ‘by Cav. Vittorio Alinari, the well-known photographer, in March 1900. The subject set ... was Madonna with the Holy Infant, or
Deuchars used his sojourn in Italy to good effect, later exhibiting a piece of sculpture, 'Through the Vineyard' and a painting, 'A View of Florence, from Mujano' (Cat. 26, Cat. 27). However, by Spring of 1901, he was involved in the pottery at Aldourie, set up by Mrs Watts, 'on the banks of Loch Ness (my old home) where a class has been started under this one, and is enthusiastically taken up.'

Exactly how that came about is not known, but Mr and Mrs Watts went up to Inverness in July 1898 after the dedication of the Compton Chapel. A journey of around 650 miles was no mean feat at that time, requiring several changes of train and a final coach trip. They stayed in a lodge in the hills above her family home and Watts made sketches for several paintings from the protection of a portable shelter. Mary even got her 'Signor' up one of the mountains on horseback. Unfortunately, he caught pneumonia, which delayed their return south by several weeks. When not engaged in nursing her husband, Mary would have had ample time to plan the setting up of another pottery in the north. There is no indication that Deuchars went with them, but Mary must have felt that he was the best person to oversee the enterprise. Presumably it took the following three years to organise everything.

Another reason for his departure from Limnerslease may have been the nature of his friendship with Dorothy MacCallum, whose likeness appears three times in Deuchars’s photograph album of his time at Compton (Pl. 7). If it was of a romantic nature, this may not have been to Mrs Watts’s liking and it could have prompted her to send him north. In 1904 Dorothy married Captain George Macpherson-Grant of the Cameron Highlanders.
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At the Home Arts and Industries Exhibition in the Albert Hall in 1900, terracotta garden ornaments (the sundial bearing Watts's motto and 'simple bowl shapes') made by the 'Linnerslease class' were shown. The Potters' Art Guild grew out of the experience gained in the decoration of the Compton Chapel. When that work was complete, Mrs Watts allowed the evening class to continue for at least six months, but she let go the kiln man. However, she soon discovered the problem in getting the work fired and 'asked the burner to come back, and proposed that he should try to make a few pots to repay some part of the expense of having him permanently.' From the beginning of 1899, the commercial side continued to grow and the Compton pottery effectively came into being. At the end of 1900 Mrs Watts successfully wooed James Nicol, another Scot, to be manager, pointing out that, since the Home Art and Industries Exhibition earlier that year, they had been overwhelmed by orders. Initially production concentrated on garden ornaments; large pots, flower-boxes and sundials. Inspiration came from Italy, Greece, England and, of course, the Art Nouveau Celtic imagery developed for the Chapel. Slab-sided flower boxes had applied relief designs such as the Tudor Rose or more adventurous ones featuring putti. The latter type came in sets of three. The central one had a full face framed by wings, while the pair of outer ones bore full-length figures reclining across opposite diagonals of the decorated sides. The modelling on the putti boxes bears a similarity to that carried out by Deuchars in his later career. In 1902 Mrs Watts succeeded in having her pottery included in Liberty & Co.'s Book of Garden Ornaments. Fourteen from Compton vied for attention with nineteen by Liberty, several of which have been attributed to Archibald Knox. Various authors on Liberty and Knox have asserted that all Liberty pottery was made by the Compton pottery. However, since there appears to be no supporting documentation and the clays used in the two wares are completely different, this cannot have been the case. The confusion may have arisen because, at the front of the catalogue, there is a note about the Compton pottery and in the preface, C. J. ffoulkes noted that '...the present exhibitors have struck out into untrodden paths, and, in this instance largely aided and advised by Mrs G. F. Watts...'. It seems that she had insisted on her name appearing in the catalogue, but Liberty,
following their usual practice, omitted their designers’ names. Motifs from the chapel featured on some of Mrs Watts’s pots and sundials, others were more classical, while those of Liberty were characterised by the Celtic designs of Knox. Pot prices ranged from five shillings to ten guineas, depending upon design and size, with the majority costing around one or two pounds. The Wagnerian titles of 1902 were replaced by more modest English ones in a 1915 Compton catalogue, following the outbreak of the First World War. Popular patterns for the pots were ‘Wottan’/ ‘Scroll’ (a wide-mouthed amphora with large scroll handles on either side); ‘Asgrim’/ ‘Celtic’ (hemispherical, covered with incised and applied Celtic/Art Nouveau circular designs; and ‘Fafnir’/ ‘Cobra’ (plain with snakes coiled around the outside). In 1904 Compton pots and sundials again appeared in a Liberty exhibition. The 1915 catalogue illustrated other items with varying amounts of sculpture on them, some relating to the designs on the Chapel, but the modeller was not acknowledged.

The circular impressed mark for the pottery designed by Mrs Watts required explanation.

...in the symbol ... is embodied the aspiration desired for the work, with its words from the mystic prophet’s vision, “Their work was as a wheel in the middle of a wheel”, and its outer and inner winged wheels. The idea is of the wheel of labour, almost mechanical in its daily round, yet part of a vast accomplishment, and winged by human hand and thought for the spiritual flight into the unseen, of which, as well as of shelter, protection, movement, and life, the wheel was the fine old symbol. Within the inner wheel is also a Celtic symbol of the sun, a reminder that the wheel of life must move “sunwise”.

Round the outside were the words, “Their work was as a wheel in the middle of a wheel”, while “Limnerslease Compton” were in the inner circle (Fig. 16a).

At the same time Mrs Watts’s initiative was getting under way at Aldourie, Inverness-shire. It appears that Deuchars went there around the Autumn of 1900, but he must have gained prior experience in the Surrey pottery. Accompanying an article published in Country Life in March 1902, one of George Andrews’s photographs featured Deuchars, described as ‘A Compton workman’, measuring up one of the large scroll pots. The northern endeavour was also referred
it has thrown off a branch to Scotland, where a goodly number of Highlanders are being taught artistic pottery. One of the potter’s wheels, of which there are two, is worked by a village lad, who has become surprisingly expert in shaping thereon the graceful forms peculiar to the Compton Industry.\(^{14}\)

Another source claimed that the pottery began in 1899 and ‘was organised as a home industry, the workers being taught to carry on the designing, modelling, and hand-painting of the ware in their own homes.’\(^{15}\) However, this probably relates to their activities being carried on in the buildings erected especially for the venture. According to members of the Fraser-Tytler family, there were three wooden buildings, one for the pottery and two for the workers, presumably Deuchars and others who were not local. The only snag was that there was no handy source of clay, as at Guildford, but that did not deter Mrs Watts, who arranged for supplies to be sent north. The exact route is not recorded, but it was probably by various railway lines to Inverness, or perhaps to Fort Augustus, and then by boat to the pier at Aldourie, whence a horse and cart transported it the mile to the pottery. Considerable quantities of clay would have been required for the heavy garden pots, which must have been difficult to manage on the two potter’s wheels at one end of the building. In the same area other wares, such as the sundials and flower boxes, were cast from moulds, while the kiln occupied the opposite end. Outside, the pots stacked against the red-roofed wooden building made a pretty picture for the passing tourist.\(^{16}\)

Most of the surviving examples of the artefacts produced at the Aldourie Pottery are of the same design as those shown in the Liberty and Potters’ Art Guild catalogues (Cat. 28, Pl. 25). One notable exception is a garden pot bearing the words, ‘ALDOURIE POTTERY DORES’ around the rim, which appears to have been based on ‘Floreat’ in the Liberty catalogue.\(^ {17}\) It may have been made as some form of advertisement (Cat. 29, Pl. 26).\(^ {18}\) The mark for the Aldourie pottery was the same as that for Compton, with the words “Ardour Dorees” substituted in the inner circle (Fig. 16b).
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According to the Valuation Roll, Mrs Watts had tenancy from 1902 till 1937 (the year before her death at Compton) of a house called ‘Pottery House’ and also the pottery building itself. Both were owned by the Aldourie Estate at that time. It is not clear whether Deuchars lived in the large, turreted, Victorian, Aldourie Castle itself or whether initially he rented accommodation in the village of Dores, on the shore of Loch Ness. There seems to be some debate about how long the pottery actually survived. In her book, Mairi MacDonald gives the same version as the family sources, namely that the enterprise failed when the young men went off to fight in the First World War. However, an article written in 1907-8 states, ‘but unfortunately the enterprise failed after a short time, apparently because the Watts had not sufficient leisure to direct matters more themselves.’ Mrs Watts was certainly at Aldourie in October 1900, but unfortunately there is no other evidence of her direct involvement in the management of the pottery. As her husband was a failing octogenarian, it must have been increasingly difficult for her to control the outpost. A Government Report written in 1914 commented, ‘After some years, this interesting experiment was not continued…The experiment at Dores was interesting, and perhaps deserved a longer trial. As far as can be gathered, the want of suitable clay was one of the impediments to the continuance of the work.’ So, it would appear that the pottery had, at most, a life of only five or six years. It is doubtful if it ever was commercial owing to the high cost of importing the clay. After Watts’s death, in 1904, Mary was probably unable to sustain the drain on her finances. Output from the pottery does not seem to have been great, for the surviving examples are either in Inverness Museum or with the Fraser-Tytler family. Without any evidence to the contrary, it is assumed that prices were similar to those charged for the Compton pots, but the enterprise was probably never commercially viable, owing to the high cost of importing the clay.

Those pots bearing the ‘Aldourie’ mark which, like those in Inverness Museum, have been kept indoors are still like new. Unfortunately, a claim made for the Compton garden pots that ‘the clay
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in which they are fashioned withstands sudden changes of temperature and is unaffected by frost' does not seem to have been fulfilled by those made at Aldourie. Many used for their original purpose have not stood up well to the ravages of the Scottish winters. Included in this category are the panels which were incorporated into the village War Memorial. The decoration has completely fallen off, but at the unveiling ceremony the description was,

The arch is of plain design and handsome proportions. It is solidly built with red panels of pottery work in the face. The design of the front is called “the garment of praise,” and each of the panels in it has a symbolical meaning... The idea and design of the archway, unique as a memorial in the North, originated with Mrs George Frederick Watts; the sculpture work was executed at the Dores pottery...28

According to Mrs Christian-Fraser Tytler, the pottery panels were discovered in the pottery building and it was decided to use them on the memorial, as some of the workers had been among those who had lost their lives. She recalled that “the garment of praise” had been sent to Glasgow for exhibition. The title is the same as that given to the decoration of the spandrels above the door on the Compton Chapel and it may be that Deuchars made some similar panels at Dores. They may even have been shown at one of the ‘Home Arts and Industries Association Exhibition’ to which Mrs Watts sent annual entries from 1899.29

When his statuette of Lily Mackintosh appeared at the New Gallery in 1901, it seems to have made an impression, for, in May of that year, it was reported that, ‘The Corporation of Nottingham has asked Mr Louis R. Deuchars to allow his statuette “Miss Lily” to be exhibited at their Loan Exhibition’ (Cat. 11).30 Curiously, the figure does not appear in the catalogue, but there is an entry in the Museum Day Book which records the receipt on loan of ‘Bust of Girl (Plaster)’ from L.R. Deuchars, Inverness.31 Whether this was merely careless use of language or a different work is not clear. Towards the end of the year, he was ‘engaged on a portrait of the daughter of Sir Edward Lyall, K.C.B.’ (Cat. 32).32 Actually, the Knight was Sir Alfred Comyn Lyall, a distinguished Anglo-Indian administrator and writer (1835-1911).33
Apart from his activities at the pottery, Deuchars was engaged in other modelling. He seems to have been given some work for a 'Monument to be erected at Magersfontein, South Africa', which did appear in the Nottingham Exhibition catalogue for 1901, described as a 'Plaster copy in relief' (Cat. 30). His growing success with sculptural pieces gave him the confidence to enter a competition to design a memorial statue of Queen Victoria for the City of Liverpool, but he was unsuccessful (Cat. 31).

Deuchars had one sculptural commission of some significance during his sojourn in the Highlands. In 1900 Lord Lovat raised the First Contingent of the Lovat Scouts to fight in the Boer War. Two of the 2nd Lieutenants were Fraser-Tytlers from Aldourie and the other officers came from equally well-known Highland families. At the end of a successful campaign, the officers commissioned Deuchars to mark their respect for the Adjutant, Captain A.W. MacDonald. Deuchars created an eighteen inch high silver-bronze cylindrical 'casket', with high relief sculpture of the officers with their horses and art nouveau motifs (Cat. 33, Pl. 28). The bronze caster, Parlanti of London, must have been considerably challenged by the top with its three-dimensional drama. But all the skills and talents came together to produce an appropriate vehicle for the obvious respect and affection felt for Captain "Willie" MacDonald by his fellow officers, who subscribed to the unique commemorative piece, which must have occupied Deuchars for a considerable period.

Perhaps inspired by Watts's example as an artist-sculptor, Deuchars was painting as well as modelling. The surrounding scenery which had provided inspiration for 'Signor' in 1898 was portrayed by his pupil in at least four oil paintings which found buyers. (Cat. 34 - 37 incl., Pls. 29 & 30). Writing about one of them, a critic described Deuchars as 'evidently an artist who is to make his mark.' His landscapes were competent reproductions of the Highland scenery, meticulously executed, in the manner of Watts and other Victorian painters, but they lacked the
spontaneity of his sculptural work. In 1903, possibly realising that his future lay in developing his
modelling skills, Deuchars turned his back on the painter’s paradise and headed for London.
Perhaps the pottery had already faltered and he had to find alternative employment.
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Deuchars obviously enjoyed painting the Highland scenery, but it seems that by Spring of 1903, he had opted for sculpture and was working as assistant to William Goscombe John, in his Woronzow Studio in St. John’s Wood, London. Just how he came to move from the north of Scotland to the metropolis is not clear, but it may have been through Frank Dicksee, through whose agency Deuchars submitted paintings for exhibition. Dicksee lived close to Goscombe John’s studio in Woronzow Road. Another link with London was the Parlanti Bronze Foundry at Parson’s Green, where Deuchars sent his Lovat Scouts piece for casting. Alternatively, working at the Aldourie Pottery, which was effectively an out-station of the Watts’s ménage, possibly kept Deuchars in touch with the contemporary art scene in London.

Goscombe John was ten years older than Deuchars and an established sculptor who was described as ‘a kindly figure with a somewhat elfin quality’ who ‘was a lively little Welshman, entertaining in conversation, and fond of dwelling upon his alleged humble origin’. His own training had begun in his father’s workshop in Cardiff where Thomas John, was in charge of woodcarving and marquetry for the Third Marquess of Bute. Models for stone and wood carving for the restoration of Cardiff castle were made in the Lambeth studio of the sculptor, Thomas Nicholls, with whom William Goscombe John became a journeyman stonecarver. He attended evening classes in modelling at the Lambeth City and Guilds School of Art and subsequently at the Royal Academy Schools, where he was exposed to the influences of the ‘New Sculpture’. He also travelled extensively in Europe and spent a year in Paris, where he was able to study the techniques used by French sculptors, including Rodin.

Following his election as an Associate of the Royal Academy in 1899, Goscombe John continued to attract lucrative and challenging commissions and by 1903 he had a great deal in hand. Deuchars is recorded as assisting him with ‘Prince Christian Victor’, ‘H.M. King Edward VII’ and the ‘Kings Liverpool Regiment Memorial’. Other major works in Goscombe John’s studio in the same
year were ‘The Capetown Volunteers Memorial’, ‘Sir Arthur Sullivan Memorial’ and ‘James Reid Memorial’.

It is not surprising that he required assistance to fulfil all these commissions. According to Luke Fildes, Goscombe John’s grandson, he had ‘many pupils and assistants over the years, but there is no record of who they were or when they worked with him’.

Having remained a bachelor for thirty three years, Deuchars appears not to have wasted any time in finding a bride in St. John’s Wood. Kathleen Louisa Hancock was the daughter of a stained glass painter, Albert Hancock. It would seem to be the classic case of the lodger marrying the landlady’s daughter, since both bride and groom gave 52 St. John’s Wood Terrace on the marriage certificate and the Hancock family was also listed at that address from 1884 to 1905. The three-storey London-brick terraced house in the elegant suburban street would have had ample room for a studio for Albert Hancock and rooms to let too. It was also very convenient for Goscombe John’s studio in Woronzow Road, which ran at right angles to the Terrace. Kathleen Hancock was ten years younger than Deuchars when she went up the aisle of St. Stephen’s Church, Hampstead on 26 July 1903. At some point the couple moved to number 51 where their first child, a daughter, Frances Louisa, was born on 5 August 1904.

In 1903 Deuchars exhibited his terracotta statuette of Watts for the first time in the New Gallery and later that year another version was shown in the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool (Cat. 12, Pl. 17, Cat. 38, Pl. 31). At first glance, the figure appears to be the same as the bronze cast made for the Wattses. However, closer inspection reveals subtle differences which serve to improve the sculpture. It would seem that Deuchars was given advice by Goscombe John on how to refine the work.

There were many large commissions in the studio in 1903. In November 1902 the Committee set up to organise a memorial to the Kings Liverpool Regiment met and agreed to choose one of the
designs which Goscombe John, who was present at the meeting, had submitted. £3,000 was collected by subscription and the sculptor was asked to prepare models, from which the final choice was made in April, 1903.\textsuperscript{16} The design was an imposing composition subsequently erected in St. John's Gardens directly in front of the Walker Art Gallery (Cat. 40, Pl. 32). Four heroic figures, symbolic equipage of war and lettering were all executed in bronze and strategically set on granite platforms of varying heights. All the numerous applied bronze components would have provided ample opportunities for Deuchars to be involved in the working up of them from Goscombe John's sketch models. This may have been why he was originally employed.

The work for the bronze heroic figure of Prince Christian Victor, a grandson of Victoria, was also progressing in 1903 (Cat. 41, Pl. 33). Goscombe John had received the commission through the auspices of a Windsor doctor friend.\textsuperscript{17} The full size model was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1904.\textsuperscript{18} Detailing on the figure would probably have been given to Deuchars and he may even have been entrusted with the inscribed panel (Pl. 34). At the same time he was assisting Goscombe John with the colossal statue of King Edward VII for Capetown (Cat. 42, Pl. 35). Also for the city was the memorial to the Capetown Volunteers, commemorating its British South Africans who fell in the Boer War.\textsuperscript{19} Behind the symbolic seated female figure of 'Hope' in classical drapery is a soldier in the uniform of the Volunteers. Both are staring out to a better future. Although there is no record of Deuchars having helped with this work, he would at least have seen it being created in the studio.

The Sir Arthur Sullivan Monument in the Temple Gardens on the Embankment is another composition of 1902-3 which integrates stone and bronze, where the various elements of the composition would once again have lent themselves to the involvement of an assistant (Cat. 43, Pl. 36 & Pl. 37). Goscombe John's other major work in 1903 was a statue of James Reid (of Auchterarder and the Hyde Park Locomotive Works) erected at the highest point of Springburn...
Park, Glasgow (Cat. 44, Pl. 38). It is curious that the reports in *The Strathearn Herald* make no mention of the coincidence that Louis Deuchars, son of the ex-Bailie of Auchterarder, Andrew Deuchars, was working in the studio of Goscombe John while this memorial to the wealthy past member of the community was being sculpted. It could have been due to that gentleman’s change of politics in 1886 from Liberal to Unionist, something for which he would never have been forgiven by Andrew Deuchars, the staunchly Liberal, Auchterarder correspondent of *The Strathearn Herald* (and father of Louis). However, it must be assumed that Louis Deuchars was aware of the work proceeding on the statue and, as assistant to Goscombe John, that he would probably have been involved. At the time of Reid’s death in 1894, he was Lord Dean of Guild of Glasgow and it is in this role he is portrayed in bronze on a granite plinth. The features of two females on the plaques on the plinth bear a strong resemblance to those of Kathleen Deuchars, Louis’ wife, pointing to the possibility that Deuchars could have been responsible for these panels (Pls. 39, 40, 41).\(^\text{20}\)

It is sad, but true, that war, or rather the peace that follows it, provides many opportunities for sculptors in the commemoration of the casualties. Other Goscombe John commissions in the aftermath of the Boer War included bronze bas reliefs in St. Paul’s Cathedral. The South African Journalists Memorial plaque was unveiled by Lord Roberts in the Crypt in January, 1905. The journalists who lost their lives are listed on the left-hand two thirds of the plaque, while a pensive draped female figure holding a laurel wreath is seated in front of a landscape of mountains, and facing the inscription, on the right-hand third.\(^ \text{21}\) Goscombe John was an accomplished exponent of the bas relief technique, one later used to equal effect by Deuchars. It is conceivable that Kathleen Deuchars could also have been the model for this plaque and it, too, could have been modelled by her husband. In the South Aisle of the Nave is the bronze bas relief Coldstream Guards Memorial. (The plaster model was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1904.)\(^ \text{22}\) In the foreground of the scene in the veldt, a soldier of the Second Battalion holds a dying colleague from the First Battalion in his
arms. Above them, in the rays of the setting sun, soldiers of earlier campaigns, including the mounted figure of General Monck, await the arrival of the latest casualty of battle. Deuchars may have been involved in some of the modelling in view of his experience with the Lovat Scouts commemorative piece while at Dores.

Although named in the St. Paul’s Memorial, the Marquis of Winchester is commemorated by a marble relief plaque in Amport St. Mary Church, near Andover. Exhibited in the Royal Academy in 1905, the Winchester memorial features a bas relief portrait medallion of the Marquis. Another casualty of the Boer War was Professor Alfred Hughes, whose memorial at Corres in Merionethshire is a Celtic Cross resting on a cuboid base, which bears a bas relief portrait in bronze of Professor Hughes. Deuchars obviously absorbed the technique of posthumous portraiture in bas relief from photographs, since he went on to model several in his later career.

In 1904, a newspaper article referred to several of his own works in the galleries, including ‘The Swallow Catcher’ which seems to have been a piece of sculpture (Cat. 45) and another in the Paris Salon which was actually ‘La Fee’ (‘The Elf’) by Goscombe John. According to Luke Fildes, his grandson, ‘Any of W.G.J.’s works to be shown at the Paris Salon would almost certainly be escorted there, and if my grandfather was too busy with recent commissions he would surely have sent one or more of his current assistants in his place.’ Family recollections confirm that both Louis and Kathleen Deuchars had enjoyed visiting Paris on several occasions.

Although Deuchars travelled the length and breadth of Britain and had journeyed to Italy and France, he does not appear to have been home to Perthshire very often, but when the young Frances Louisa was about three months old (October or November 1904), the family made the long rail journey north to Auchterarder, where they posed for a photograph with Deuchars’s parents outside their house in the town’s High Street (Pl. 41). This may have been the first time that Mr and Mrs
Deuchars, senior, had met Kathleen and, of course, baby Frances.

However, Andrew Deuchars’s pride in his son’s achievements seems to have outweighed any hurt at Louis’s apparent dereliction of his filial duties. In April 1905, he reported in The Strathearn Herald,

A Successful Auchterarder Artist - In the New Gallery, London, this year, Mr L.R. Deuchars, has a picture of Kew in the early Spring - a bit of the western lake well known to visitors - showing the rare specimens of strange Japanese firs, etc, there; also a picture of the late G.F. Watts, O.M. R.A., sitting by a sundial at evening-tide in his old garden in Surrey where Mr Deuchars studied for nearly ten years. He also shows a bust of the distinguished painter in the sculptor section. Mr Aitchison, R.A., the well-known architect has just purchased one of his busts.29

The painting in the New Gallery was actually titled ‘Early June in the gardens of Kew’ and was probably executed the previous year (Cat. 46).30 The portrait of Watts has been described earlier (Ch. 4, Cat. 16).31 The ten years claimed for Deuchars’s time at Compton is far in excess of the actual period of four and a half years at most, as previously reported in the pages of the same journal. There is no record of the bust of G.F. Watts in the New Gallery, but the statuette was subsequently shown there in 1907. George Aitchison (who resigned from the Royal Academy in 1905) was Professor of Architecture. He is best known for the house he built for Lord Leighton, but it is not known what ‘bust’ he purchased. It may even have been one of Goscombe John’s pieces. His plaster bust of Sir Aston Webb, P.R.A., the architect of the Victoria Memorial and also the Victoria and Albert Museum, was exhibited in the Royal Academy in 1905.32 Deuchars could have contributed the more mundane modelling of the clothes.

Deuchars must have been kept busy with work for Goscombe John, for he did not have anything in other galleries that year. He was probably still working on the large commissions which Goscombe John had started in 1903. Also, in 1905, there were two commissions for seated figures, with plenty of detail to occupy an assistant.33 In the same year Goscombe John sold bronze castings of his ‘Hermes’ and ‘Muriel’ (head and shoulders of his daughter, first exhibited at the Royal
Academy in 1897) to the Harris Museum and Art Gallery in Preston.34 It appears that, at the same time, a casting of Deuchars’s statuette of Watts, apparently from the same maquette as that used for the version shown earlier in the Walker Art Gallery, was purchased (Cat. 38, Pl. 31). However, the Harris statuette is on a slightly deeper rectangular base, with the incised inscription, ‘G.F. Watts, A sketch from life by L.R. Deuchars’ (Cat. 47, Pl. 42).35 The gallery had a long tradition of purchasing work from established artists, mainly from the Royal Academy exhibitions, but it would appear that other channels were employed as well.36 Although Deuchars initially used Goscombe John’s Woronzow Studios for his exhibition entries, in 1904 and 1905 it was 51 St. John’s Wood Terrace, indicating that he had some studio space there, but by November of the latter year, Deuchars had moved on to another position. In the two and a half years with Goscombe John much valuable experience was gained. In contrast to his period with Watts, who liked to mix painting with sculpture, Deuchars had been immersed totally in sculpture and had seen all media at first hand. Goscombe John’s training as a stone carver meant that he could translate his work into marble, as easily as he could prepare it for bronze casting, but Deuchars preferred to stick to clay or plaster.

---

1 'Auchterarder Notes', Strathearn Herald, 2 May 1903. “This popular artist who has been favourably reported as an assistant in the studio of Mr George F. Watts, O.M., R.A. and who is now engaged with Mr Johns (sic), A.R.A., St. John’s Wood, London...”
2 Pearson, Fiona, Goscombe John at the National Museum of Wales (Cardiff, 1979) p.12.
4 Pearson, op.cit. p.9.
5 Ibid. p.77.
6 Ibid. p.10
7 Ibid. p.11.
8 Ibid. p.13.
9 ‘Presently he is engaged on a statue of Prince Christian Victor, and also a huge statue of the King for Cape Colony. Press of work has prevented him from having special exhibits in the Royal Academy, the Corporations of Cardiff and Liverpool having asked him to undertake special work.’ ‘Auchterarder Notes’, Strathearn Herald, 2 May 1903. All these commissions were, of course, Goscombe John’s. The work for Liverpool was ‘The Kings Liverpool Regiment Memorial’.
11 Letter from Luke G. Fildes to Louise Boreham, 24 October 1982. However, this is contradicted by Pearson, op.cit., p.16, ‘T.J. Clapperton and Leonard Merrifield, had been assistants in Goscombe John’s studio, as had Harold Youngman’.
12 Marylebone Local Directories, 1884, 1898, 1905 & 1906.
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[Text continues with numbered references and notes.]
By November 1905 Deuchars had secured an appointment as assistant to the sculptor, William Robert Colton. In the early years of this century, the latter had studios in St. John’s Wood, where Deuchars would probably have come into contact with him. Colton was an exponent of the naturalism of the ‘New Sculpture’ and had spent time in Paris, with the result that his work was also influenced by French romanticism. He was elected an Associate of the Royal Academy in 1903. Perhaps because of his indifferent health, Colton ‘was never a prolific exhibitor’, and there was a diminution of work shown during the years following 1904, but that was because he was engaged in a number of significant commissions. Such was the volume that it appears that he required assistance and Deuchars was employed.

Colton had a ‘country house in the heart of Buckinghamshire’ where he did most of his work at that time. At first it appears he stayed at ‘Newhouse’, a farmhouse about two and a half miles north of Disraeli’s former home at Hughenden Manor, but in 1908, Colton had ‘New Place’ built close to his original house. The farm had large barns, where the sculptor could work, although, in time, a studio was built near the lodge at the entrance to the driveway. Deuchars rented Bottom Farm House, about two miles south of Colton’s property (Pl. 43). The typical two-storey flint cottage, with brick reinforcement of quoins and door and window jambs, was part of the tenancy of Church Farm, belonging to the Disraeli estate, and was usually occupied by the cowman on the farm. Behind the property was a large barn with weatherboard cladding, ample accommodation for a working sculptor.

The move was timely for the growing Deuchars family. A son born on 11 November 1905 was named George Dalginross. The first name was a tribute to Deuchars’s former mentor, George Frederick Watts (the second name deriving from an area of Comrie). The cottage’s four rooms and kitchen with garden formed an ideal environment for the two young children, who were joined by a third offspring, Albert Louie, on 15 August 1907. Their mother, Kathleen Deuchars later spoke
HALCYON DAYS AT HUGHENDEN

fondly of the halcyon days in the Buckinghamshire farmhouse.

During the three years that Deuchars worked with Colton, several large commissions were completed. In 1906, for the new Grammar School at King’s Lynn there was a heroic bronze of King Edward VII, seated on an ornate chair (Cat. 48). The South African War Memorial, consisting of an angel and a soldier, outside Worcester Cathedral was unveiled by General Sir Neville G. Lyttelton, on 23 September 1908 ‘after four months in casting’ (Cat. 49, Pl. 43a). The Boer War Royal Artillery Memorial for St James Park had a winged figure holding a horse, both raised on a pedestal (Cat. 50, Pl. 43b). The sculptural parts, especially the bas relief panels around the pedestal were praised in Colton’s obituary in The Times, but it went on, ‘on the whole it cannot be considered to be very successful. It fails where so much sculptor’s work fails: the general design, as well as the detail, of the architectural part, is unimpressive...’ This is one of three instances of similar criticism contained in the piece, somewhat at odds with the accepted etiquette of obituary writers, but serving to illustrate the tension which appears to have existed between architects and sculptors over such large commissions.

In 1908 Colton employed bas relief in the memorial to George and Sir Richard Tangye, for the main stairway of the Birmingham Municipal Art Gallery and School of Art (Cat. 51). It is not known if Deuchars participated in this work, but it would have been in the studio while he was in Buckinghamshire and he could thus have gained further experience in modelling bas relief portraits posthumously from photographs of the two brothers.

Colton also received ‘several commissions for India’ for which he went to that country, ‘where he remained many months and studied on the spot the art, ancient and modern’. ‘The Late Maharajah of Mysore’, a stately, life-size portrait, was ‘of exceptional interest because it was modelled, not in clay, but directly in plaster’. The full ceremonial dress, as befitted the State Prince, would have
provided ample scope for a sculptor's assistant. Colton had carved in marble, but whether he personally executed the marble version for the white marble temple built by the new Maharajah is not known.

While with Colton, Deuchars had a number of works in the New Gallery. In the catalogues his address was given incorrectly as 'Bolton Farm House'. This could be seen as an attempt to 'gentrify' 'Bottom Farm' (literally at the bottom of a hill), but the mistake more likely arose because of Deuchars's untidy handwriting when submitting his paperwork. From the titles of the paintings, it seems they were landscapes begun earlier (Cat. 27 & Cat. 52), but in the sculpture section he had 'Icarus', probably a statuette, (Cat. 53), and his figure, 'The Late G.F. Watts, O.M., R.A. From Life A.D. 1891 (sic)' (Cat. 46). Obviously the date is wrong, as Deuchars did not go to Compton until 1895, but it is probably yet another misreading of his hand-writing on the label.

This statuette seems to be a reworking of the terracotta one shown in the New Gallery in 1903 and possibly the maquette for the bronze casting purchased by the Harris Museum & Art Gallery in 1905 (Cat. 47, Pl. 42).

By February of 1908, Deuchars and his family appear to have returned to London. However, in the two and a half years he was with Colton, he was exposed to a wide variety of styles, techniques and subject matter, on all of which he was to draw in his later career.

---

3 Letter from F.W. Pomeroy, the London-based sculptor to James Pittendrigh Macgillivray, Edinburgh sculptor, 9 December 1908; "G. John and Colton have had him working for them and they speak well of him." Letter in deposit of Pittendrigh Macgillivray's Papers at the National Library of Scotland, DEP 349/106.
4 Whitley, p.181.
5 In 1914 Colton exhibited 'The Rt.Hon. Benjamin Disraeli as Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1852 - statuette. Sketch for proposed memorial.' London, Royal Academy Summer Exhibition Catalogue, 1914. Cat.no. 2069. It would appear that the memorial was not erected. Information about the house from Letter from Colton's daughter, Mrs Kerr, 9 December 1956, in Tate Gallery catalogue files. 1908 date obtained from present owners.
6 Now demolished.
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7 Presumably this should have been ‘Louis’ like his father, but the Registrar clearly did not know how to spell the name and the poor harassed mother, who reported the birth, must have missed the error.
10 For some reason there was a gap of eight years before this work was exhibited. London, Royal Academy Summer Exhibition Catalogue, 1916. Cat.no. 1825.
11 Whitley, pp.178, 180.
12 Whitley, p.177, ‘every part of the marble version of ‘The Crown of Love’ shown at Burlington House in 1902 was carved lovingly by his own hand’.
16 Address given in Royal Glasgow Institute of Fine Art (February) and Royal Academy (May) catalogues for 1908 was ‘Devon Villa, Aquila Street, St. John’s Wood’.
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It is not clear why Deuchars went back to St. John’s Wood. Possibly Colton had decided to work in his studios there and Deuchars went with him. Alternatively, if the contract ended, Deuchars would have returned to the area of London he knew, where there was a concentration of sculptors. At first his address was Devon Villa, Aquila Street, St. John’s Wood whence, in May 1908, he sent to the Royal Academy ‘A phantasy of fairyland - statuette (bronze)’, a complex composition (Cat. 54). The review of the exhibition in The Times was extremely encouraging,

Sculpture is at last getting its chance, and the exhibitions show that the chance is being taken. We have spoken of several really fine things to be seen this year; and there are others that are at least full of promise. We do not speak of the decorative or memorial works of men so well known as Mr. Alfred Drury, who is doing much for South Kensington, or Mr. Pomeroy, or Mr. Colton, but of such things as the relief shown by Mr. Nicholson Babb, of the “Love, Pain, and Solitude” by Miss Lillie Reed, and of a large number of statuettes and other small pieces, which prove that competent sculptors exist in plenty. Deuchars’s statuette would presumably have been included among the latter items.

The address for the work sent to the New Gallery in May of that year reverted to ‘Bolton Farm House, Hughenden’. This may have been a mistake on the part of the cataloguing staff, or, perhaps the rest of the family stayed on in Buckinghamshire. When he sent it to the Walker Art Gallery in September, his address had changed to ‘c/o Mrs Buchan, 16 Roseburn Place, Murrayfield, Edinburgh’, while the birth of his fourth child, Dorothy Margaret, born on 4 November 1908, took place at 3 Poplars Avenue, Willesden, London. Thus it seems that Kathleen remained in the south with the family, while Louis took lodgings in Edinburgh. Exactly what precipitated his move north is not clear.

George Deuchars, Louis’s eldest son said that his father was responsible for the sculpture on the font in St. Cuthbert’s Church in Princes Street Gardens in Edinburgh (Cat. 55, Pl. 44). There is no documentary evidence to support the family story, but neither is there anything to disprove it. Investigation has revealed that this work was indeed carried out in 1908.

...the present font was presented to the church by Professor Hunter Stewart as a
memorial of his deceased wife. The design, from drawings by the late Mr. Thomas Armstrong, C.B., Director of the Fine Arts Department in the South Kensington Museum, is an adaptation of the hexagonal font in the Cathedral of Siena, designed by Jacopo della Quercia, in the fifteenth century. The font and steps are constructed of Greek marble from Pentelicus, and the riser of the steps of marble from Siena. One of the panels is occupied by a bronze relief of the wife of the donor, executed by Mr. Macgill, sculptor; the other five are filled with singularly fine marble from the island of Skyros. Above the font, in place of the original Tabernacle, is the figure of a mother and child, cast in aluminium bronze. The original is attributed to Michael Angelo (sic), and may be seen in the chapel of the Mosheroni (sic) in the Cathedral of Notre Dame in Bruges.5

A letter, dated 5 June 1908 from the architect, Hippolyte Blanc, including a reference to ‘Messrs. Farmer & Brindley, the Sculptors’, indicated that all was ready to commence the installation of the font.6 Blanc continued, “I have seen the Design, and a model of the Font.”7 Reference to the model also appeared in a 1912 Report following a series of complaints by Jacob Primmer, a well-known and consistent campaigner against ‘Popery’. He had alleged that the figures were representations of the ‘Virgin and child’ and as such ‘in violation of the Constitution, laws, and usages of the Church of Scotland’.8 Apparently,

Before the design was finally approved of by the Kirk-session a full-sized papier-mâché cartoon of the font prepared in South Kensington was set up in the church. A model of the font in plaster was also submitted to the Kirk-session.9

There is no indication of who made the cartoon or the model, but it could be that Deuchars had received the commission from Farmer & Brindley. Hippolyte Blanc referred back to a letter of ‘16th of April’ indicating that work on the memorial had started earlier in the year which was when Deuchars was at the St. John’s Wood address.10 Farmer & Brindley were ‘modellers, sculptors, carvers, art workers in marble, stone, alabaster, granite, wood, plaster’ and considered to be the leading London firm in their field.11 They were located in Westminster Bridge Road which would have been within travelling distance for Deuchars. If he had been unable to earn enough from sales of his own work, nor successful in securing a position with one of the leading sculptors, he may well have looked to this firm for something to tide him over. Having worked as an assistant for so long he would have been perfectly capable of making exact copies.
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Thomas Armstrong, a painter, was appointed director for art at South Kensington Museum (now Victoria and Albert) in 1881 and retired in 1898. In 1873 the Museum’s collection of casts of the world’s finest works of sculpture and architectural decoration was placed in the Cast Courts and Armstrong continued to add items during his time as director. However, the copy of the Bruges ‘Madonna and Child’ was obtained in an exchange with the Belgian Government in 1872 (Pl. 45). Thus it would have been a familiar piece to Armstrong. After his retirai, he is reported as having taken up painting again, but it would appear that he also undertook commissions and presumably was able to arrange for a full size copy to be made (probably by Farmer & Brindley’s staff) of the figures in the Museum. Perhaps Deuchars himself was involved, but it is more likely that he could have made the model and cartoon. It is conceivable that he went to Edinburgh to liaise with the architect, since Armstrong was seventy eight years old by then.

The use of aluminium as a metal for sculpture was less than twenty years old, but it may have been used in St. Cuthbert’s for its lightness, since the marble of the base itself required extensive foundations. Farmer & Brindley’s expertise with marble was renowned and their craftsmen would have made the font itself, but the bronze bas relief of Anna Maria Stewart on the front panel of the hexagonal sides was by the sculptor, David McGill. Professor Hunter Stewart chose the mother and child copy because of ‘his wife’s devotion to children and admiration of the Michael Angelo (sic) group at Bruges as emphasising the charm of childhood in its innocence and reliance’.

In 1912, after much deliberation, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland accepted that the intentions of the donor were genuine and, although the originals of the two figures on the font in St. Cuthbert’s Church were ‘probably...a representation of the Virgin and Child’, they had been ‘introduced into the church without any idolatrous intent’. Primmer’s complaint was dismissed, with the recommendation, however, ‘that plans and particulars of novel or unusual decorations or
extensive alterations are submitted to the Presbytery of the bounds for approval before the same are carried out'.

What Deuchars was doing in Edinburgh in the second half of 1908 is unclear. If he had been involved in the models for the mother and child group, that work would have been finished in the early stages of the process. Apart from the September address, evidence is contained in a letter, dated 24 December 1908, from Thomas Hunter, Town Clerk of Edinburgh, to James Pittendrigh Macgillivray, the sculptor, in connection with his Gladstone Memorial (Cat. 56, Pl. 46). 'I regret that you have had disappointments in connection with the assistance which you desired, but I trust that the new man, Mr Deuchars, will be satisfactory, and that you will make good progress.'

There is no other direct reference in the Gladstone Memorial correspondence, but there are two earlier letters referring to assistants. The first, again from Mr Hunter, in April of that year states, 'They will allow two additional assistants, but for a limited time.' The second, dated 9 July 1908, from Mr Hunter, mentions a 'cheque for £50' as payment 'towards your outlays to assistants'. The intervening period could be interpreted as the duration of the two assistants sanctioned in April. Thus Deuchars could have begun with Macgillivray at any time between July and December. However, a letter from F.W. Pomeroy, the London sculptor, dated 9 December, 1908, tends to indicate that he had started by the beginning of December, at least. 'About your Deuchars, I don't know his work personally, but have heard that he is a good hard working fellow and one willing to do what he is told. Goscombe John and Colton have had him working for them and they speak well of him.'

Macgillivray commenced the Gladstone Memorial in 1900 and finally finished all the bronze sculpture by 1912. The December letter from Mr Hunter refers to the '5th figure - one of the big ones'. It was probably 'Eloquence', who is portrayed laying forth to the world with outstretched hand (Pl. 47). As the years passed, on the instructions of the Council, poor Mr Hunter tried to get
Macgillivray to speed up. A succession of assistants came and went between 1908 and 1910. Whether Deuchars’s contribution to ‘Eloquence’ survived is not known, but his time with Macgillivray lasted only a few weeks. Apparently, Deuchars claimed that he had lost his letter of engagement and thus had no redress, but Macgillivray contended that no sculptor would give a written contract for a specific number of years, especially when he had no prior knowledge of the assistant nor his work. Given that Macgillivray had taken the precaution of seeking advice from another prominent sculptor of the day before engaging Deuchars, this judgement is rather harsh, but it does seem unlikely that he would have secured a contract in view of the rapid turnover of Macgillivray’s assistants. Deuchars was probably wistfully thinking back to his two year periods with Goscombe John and Colton. Nevertheless, Macgillivray was forced to make a settlement through his solicitors. Thus at the beginning of 1909, Deuchars found himself with four of a family to support in London, while he was in lodgings in Edinburgh with no job.

1 London, Royal Academy Summer Exhibition Catalogue, 1908. Cat.no. 1838.
2 Royal Academy Exhibition - Second Article’, The Times, 21 May 1908, p.13a.
3 London, New Gallery Summer Exhibition Catalogue, 1908.
4 Liverpool, Walker Art Gallery Exhibition Catalogue, 1908. Cat.no. 2056.
5 A Handbook to the Church of St. Cuthbert, p.19. Ref. CH2/718/324. SRO.
6 Minute Book of the Kirk Session, pp.131-2. Ref. CH2/718/35. SRO.
7 Ibid., p.132.
8 Muir, Very Rev. Dr McAdam, Convenor, Report of the Committee to Inquire with reference to the Baptismal Font in St. Cuthbert’s Church, Edinburgh to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland (1912) p.893. Ref. CH2/718/307. SRO.
9 Ibid. p.894.
10 Minute Book, p.132.
14 Victoria & Albert Museum Inventory No. Repro. 1872-62. Information from current label text.
16 Ibid., p.56.
19 Ibid., pp.898, 903.
20 Ibid., p.903.
21 Now in Coates Crescent Gardens, Edinburgh.
22 James Pittendrigh Macgillivray’s Papers, DEP 349/83. NLS.
23 Ibid., loc.cit.
24 Ibid., loc.cit.
25 Ibid., DEP 349/106.
26 Ibid., DEP 349/83.
27 Ibid., loc.cit.
28 Ibid., loc.cit.
30 Macgillivray’s Papers, DEP 349/92.
31 Ibid., loc.cit. Kathleen Deuchars (wife of Louis) always maintained that ‘Jimmy Deas’ as she called Macgillivray, owed Louis money.
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To ensure that his work was kept in the public eye, Deuchars sent, from his lodgings at Roseburn Place, Edinburgh, his ‘Bust - My son Georgie’ to the February 1909 exhibition of the Royal Glasgow Institute of Fine Art (Cat. 57). This was presumably a plaster cast since it was quoted at £50 for marble and £20 for bronze. At the same time, in the Royal Scottish Academy, he had ‘A Phantasy of Fairyland’, ‘well placed and much admired.’ (Cat. 54) That it was offered at £25 instead of the £40 asked when shown the previous year at the Walker Art Gallery is perhaps an indication of increasing financial pressures. However, the reduced price seems to have resulted in a sale, since the work did not appear in any subsequent exhibition catalogues. It was the first of many submissions to the R.S.A. Summer Exhibitions.

In seeking work in Edinburgh, Deuchars was fortunate that an empathetic culture had been established between architects and the decorative arts employed by them. Sir Robert Rowand Anderson, Scotland’s acknowledged foremost architect at that time, had been the driving force behind the founding of the School of Applied Art in 1892. In the early 1850’s he had benefited from classes at the Trustees’ Academy in the Royal Institution where both fine art and ornament and design were taught to painters, sculptors, architects, designers and craftsmen. However, in 1858 this broad range of activities was curtailed by the national scheme for art education administered from South Kensington, which consisted of elementary drawing up to the ‘antique’ stage and painting. To make matters worse, a system of payment by results for teachers had been instituted, tending to smother individuality in the students. In Anderson’s opening speech at the new School of Applied Art, he explained that the teaching was not only to be for architects. ‘All who contribute to the completion of a building must understand one another. They must all be able to speak the same language, if they are to work in harmony with one another and realise the complete conception of the Architect.’ Regarding sculptors, Anderson pointed out that it was important for them to understand the various styles of architecture they might be called on to decorate. There is nowhere better to appreciate his philosophy than on Anderson’s Gothic
National Portrait Gallery, opened in 1889, where the exterior is encrusted with statues, both historical and allegorical, as well as heraldic and decorative elements. He was anxious that Scottish sculptors should receive the commissions with the result that, from the opening until 1906, John and then William Binnie Rhind, Macgillivray, the Stevenson brothers (David Watson and William Grant), John Hutchison, Archibald Shannan, Waller Hubert Paton, and Henry Snell Gamley all contributed figures, while William Beveridge carved corbels and coats of arms.

The advertisement for students for the School of Applied Art intimated that it had been 'established for the purpose of giving advanced education in art design as applied to Industries, to Architects, Decorators, Sculptors, Wood-carvers, Metal Workers, Silversmiths, Plasterers, Bookbinders, Printers, Glass Painters, etc.', although the letter books reveal that not all classes were offered, owing to lack of sufficient interest in some areas. Among those on the initial committee was William Binnie Rhind and it was he who interviewed the first modelling teacher, Robert Innes. Casts were purchased from various sources and taken directly from sculpture on Scottish buildings. A succession of sculptors and carvers, including Beveridge, followed Innes. Unfortunately the financial state of the School of Applied Art was never very healthy. In 1903 it was amalgamated with the Trustees’ School of Design, continuing until 1907 when the combined operation became part of the new Edinburgh College of Art, where architecture and its associated decorative arts continued to be offered as well as fine art. Thus Anderson’s educational ideals and philosophy were upheld.

After parting company with Macgillivray, Deuchars would probably have sought work among those engaged in sculpture in Edinburgh. It appears he found his way to the ‘Dean Studio’ at 4 Belford Road. When the small ‘Neo-Norman Free Church’ was no longer required for ecclesiastical purposes in 1890 it became increasingly a centre for the Arts & Crafts movement in Edinburgh. Since the building was on a steeply-sloping site, there was considerable
accreditation in the underbuilding, accessed from another entrance in the Dean Village. By 1909 a number of artists, sculptors and craftworkers had studio space there, including Phoebe Traquair, Joseph Hayes and Thomas Beattie. Both men did architectural modelling, with Hayes specialising in stone carving, while Beattie concentrated on plaster work.

Phoebe Traquair was a friend of G. F. Watts’s widow, Mary, (discussed in Chapter 3) and it could be that in conversation with Mrs Traquair, Deuchars had discovered that they had a mutual acquaintance. At that time, Phoebe Traquair was a highly respected member of the Edinburgh artistic community and had long been friendly with the architect, Robert Lorimer, who had been pupil and assistant to Anderson in the 1880’s. Lorimer also gave commissions to both Hayes and Beattie. Recalling later how Deuchars came to his attention, Lorimer wrote,

About the time that the modelling work in connection with the Chapel of the Thistle was beginning, a well known Edinburgh lady came to me and asked if I could find employment for a sculptor who had recently come to Edinburgh and brought an introduction to her from Mrs G.F. Watts. She further told me that he had been induced to come up to Edinburgh by Mr Macgillivray who had promised him a years engagement, but had in a few weeks quarrelled with him and turned him off and that he therefore found himself stranded in Edinburgh without work with a wife and family to support.

The late Joseph Hayes had the architectural modelling work in connection with the Thistle Chapel in hand. I instructed Mr Hayes to give this Sculptor a trial. He very soon got into the type of work that was wanted and ultimately modelled the figure work both stone and wood....

Although Deuchars had worked for Goscombe John and Colton after leaving Mrs Watts’s employ, he probably still had a reference from her. Also, in discussion with the Dean Studio tenants, Deuchars would have outlined his previous experience, including his period with Mrs Watts at the Compton Chapel. This may have proved of interest to Mrs Traquair (a long-time admirer of G.F. Watts). She herself had dabbled with sculpture when, in 1905, she worked on a four and a half feet high statue of a female ‘in Mr Hayes’ studio as mine was too small’. She could have been the ‘well known ...lady’ who provided the introduction to Lorimer. However, there was a gap between the early weeks of 1909 when it appears that Deuchars ceased to work for Macgillivray, and the
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start of the work for the Thistle Chapel in the later part of the year (Cat. 58). He was still at the Roseburn Place address in February when his sculpture was in the two exhibitions, but moved to 13 Caledonian Place sometime before June when presumably he brought his wife and four children to Edinburgh.\(^{15}\)

The Order of the Thistle was revived in 1687 by James VII, who ordered the abbey-church at the Palace of Holyroodhouse to be refurbished as a Chapel Royal and Chapel for the Order.\(^{16}\)

Unfortunately, the Knights were never able to enjoy their new building, as in December 1688, rioting Protestants destroyed the Roman Catholic furnishings.\(^{17}\) For two centuries, the Order was without a home, although plans had been drawn up in the nineteenth century for restoring the Chapel Royal and areas of St. Giles' Kirk had also been considered.\(^{18}\)

During the reign of King Edward VII, the Earl of Leven and Melville set up a Trust with £40,000 to restore the Chapel Royal, but it was found that the ruin was unable to support the planned new roof and the scheme was abandoned.\(^{19}\) After the Earl's death in 1906, the sum reverted to the family estate. However, in March 1909, it was reported in The Scotsman that the new Lord Leven & Melville and his brothers had placed their share of the original sum, estimated to be £20,000 - £25,000, 'at the disposal of His Majesty' for the creation of a Chapel for the Knights of the Thistle.\(^{20}\)

Lord Knollys wrote on behalf of King Edward VII to the Dean of the Order of the Thistle and minister of St. Giles' Cathedral, Dr Cameron Lees, asking whether the chapel could be accommodated in the Cathedral.\(^{21}\) Perhaps because of the latter's dual role, 'the Kirk Session...received the gracious communication...with much favour.'\(^{22}\)

A reply was sent to the King 'acknowledging the honour done to the Cathedral Church by such a proposal having been made, and expressing the view that if such a work can be carried out without interfering with the primary object for which the church exists the session will do all in its power to further it.'\(^{23}\)

Lorimer cut out the article and lost no time in drawing up plans and putting his ideas on paper.\(^{24}\)
‘Plan... shows the suggested site which is the only corner of St. Giles’ where it is possible to build a structure of any height without interfering materially with the structure of the existing fabric or the light from the existing memorial windows... If the Chapel be placed where shown it will hardly project at all beyond the main lines of the existing structure and it would not therefore block up or spoil the proportions of Parliament Square.’

The site chosen was at the south east corner of the Cathedral where he proposed a ‘Scotch Gothic’ building which would blend in with the fabric of St. Giles'.

Lorimer was formally offered the position of architect on 24 April 1909 and accepted by letter on 28 April. However, perhaps fearing that control was slipping away, J.A.S. Millar, Secretary to the Managing Board of the Cathedral, wrote to Lorimer, ‘I think it would probably be desirable that I should see you in regard to this matter before you proceed to prepare any plans.’

In the event, Lorimer deviated little from his original ideas. On 21 May, he presented them to the Trustees (the Duke of Buccleuch, Earl of Rosebery, Earl of Leven & Melville) and Sir Schomberg McDonnell of the Office of Works at Westminster, before being received by the King the following day. This required a flurry of telegrams back to Edinburgh to ensure that his frock coat and black waistcoat were sent to him at the Arts Club in Piccadilly. He was also reminded by McDonnell that ‘the clocks at Buckingham Palace are five minutes fast, and that we ought, therefore, to be there not later than 11-20.’ It would appear that all went well and ‘His Majesty gave his approval in principle’.

Once the plans had successfully gone through the Dean of Guild Court on 28 July, a description of the proposed chapel was sent to the Press the following day. The building was to be ‘35 feet long, 17 feet wide and 35 feet high to the apex of the vaulting’ entered via a low ante-chapel. (The final interior measurements were 36 feet long, 18 feet wide and 42 feet to the apex after Lorimer found that his original measurements did not allow sufficient height to do justice to the Knights’ stalls.) The west end of the chapel was to be square with the east apsidal. The two-light traceried windows, to be filled with heraldic stained glass were to rise from the sills at 18 feet high, while the...
central window in the apsidal end was to be a single light containing the figure of St. Andrew. The oak stalls for the Knights were to be ‘richly carved, surmounted by elaborate canopy work, each canopy being finished by the helmet and crest of the Knight, coloured with proper heraldic colours’. In the centre of the east wall was to be placed the ‘King’s stall with the stalls for the two special Knights - the Prince of Wales and the Duke of Connaught.’ ‘A feature of the interior’ was to be the ‘elaborately vaulted stone roof’. There were to be ‘richly carved bosses at all the intersections’ of the moulded ribs with ‘some of these bosses’ having ‘heraldic and symbolic devices carved on them’. Outside, ‘at the apex of the apsidal end’, there was to be ‘a figure of St. Andrew - patron saint of the Order’ carved in stone.34 Lorimer did not appear to be at all concerned that the lavish decoration might be considered too florid for the Protestant High Kirk of Scotland, where at the time of the Reformation, Knox had denounced such frivolity. The architect determined to pour into his creation all the gothic decorative elements he had been accumulating over the years to provide a jewelled chapel worthy of the Sovereign and the Knights of the Thistle.

However, Lorimer was clearly anxious to get the project moving, even before all the formalities had been completed. As early as 23 April 1909, he wrote to Louis Davis of Pinner, regarding the stained glass windows for the chapel, ‘there is no man I should like so much to do the glass as you, but the question is, in the event of my being able to put the work your way - which is of course not certain - would you be able to take the matter up...?’35 Davis immediately responded in rather frivolous language to the effect that he would put aside all other work in favour of Lorimer’s commission.36 By early May, Lorimer provided Davis with sketches and information, asking him for his ideas for the windows, ending with, ‘Please regard all this as strictly private; also the Chapel designs, as nobody is supposed to have seen them as yet, ...return all the drawings and tracings as soon as you possibly can.’37 However, when Lorimer met with the Trustees on 21 May, he was told that ‘they are anxious that all the work, if possible, including the glass should be done in Scotland, as the Thistle Chapel is a national thing.’ Lorimer told them that, ‘there was nobody in
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Scotland that I thought could do the glass as it should be done.'38 He mentioned 'Strachan of Aberdeen', but dismissed him as not having had 'sufficient experience'.39 Extremely relieved at getting the Trustees' approval, Lorimer asked Davis to proceed with the design of a trial light in July.40 In the middle of the month, Lorimer referred to 'the Builder's yard where I have the model of the wooden stall erected' and again at the end of the month to 'the shed I have had erected in the builders' yard'.41

Thus it seems that the stained glass was not the only part of the work to have been started early. Lorimer appears to have commissioned woodwork and probably the modelling for the carving. So, if the example of Davis was taken up elsewhere, Deuchars could well have been given trial pieces as early as April of 1909. Through August, Davis continued to work on a trial light for Lorimer, who again mentioned 'the shed in which we are making our models of the stalls, to correct height...

The little angel I have shown above the window is the termination of the vaulting rib.i42 The 'little angel' referred to was one of the many models Deuchars made for the chapel.

Letters flew back and forth between Lorimer and Davis refining designs until the trial light was seen by the Trustees in December 1909. Then the blow fell. It would appear that Lorimer may have chosen to ignore the Trustees' stated preference for all the work on the chapel to be carried out in Scotland, believing that Davis's excellent stained glass would win them round. However, in December, he had to inform Davis that the Trustees had indicated that they would prefer the work to go to Douglas Strachan, who was working in Edinburgh. Lorimer tried to assuage the wrath he realised he would incur from Davis.

It has several times occurred to me that these windows, seeing that they are purely heraldic, are more or less mechanical, and not quite the type of work over which a man like you should be spending his time - that you would be much better occupied doing the imaginative type of work that you are so good at.

I presume you have more work than you can comfortably put through, even if this commission were to break down.
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In the event of this Thistle work breaking down I need hardly say that you would of course be paid for your sketch of the St. Andrew window: also for all the time and expenses you have been put to over the trial light.41

Davis was not to be put off, reminding Lorimer that he had been working on the designs for seven months and ‘it would never do for a man of my reputation to have his work set aside and something less good substituted.’ Davis had submitted a design for the east window featuring St. Andrew. Lorimer suggested to Sir Schomberg McDonnell, who had been sucked into the dispute, that Davis should be paid £150 for this and the trial light and ‘walk out’.45 The architect had also decided to go along with the ‘Trustees’ decision that Strachan’s sketch for the east window was the preferred design, citing his artist brother John in support.46

Thereafter, the correspondence became more and more fraught until Davis’s solicitors became involved, culminating in a threat to pursue legal action in respect of ‘the injury to his reputation as an artist.’47 Sir Schomberg McDonnell rebuked Lorimer for his handling of the affair, writing that ‘the matter would require very delicate handling. I am sorry to say that this desirable result seems to me to have been imperilled by your last two letters to Mr Davis: however, the only thing now is to endeavour to come to an amicable understanding at our Meeting on Thursday’.48 He forbade Lorimer to communicate further with Davis, pending a meeting of all three.49 A settlement was reached whereby Davis did all the windows except the east one of St. Andrew, which was designed by Douglas Strachan.50 However, the close personal relationship between Lorimer and Davis was inevitably soured. When invited to spend the night with Lorimer’s family in Edinburgh, Davis frostily replied that the visit was a business one and that he and his wife would ‘spend the night at the Waverley (hotel)’.51 He reworked the trial light, reflecting that a fresh start was required, but the problems were not over and there was fresh acrimony over Davis’s estimate of the cost of the work.52 Nevertheless, he went on to complete the seven heraldic windows, but at the formal opening ceremony of the chapel, it was reported that, ‘Mr Louis Davis, who was entrusted with the stained glass window work with the exception of the east window, although invited, was unable to
Having made his point, it seems that Davis’s attitude subsequently softened and he accepted further commissions from Lorimer in the following years.\(^54\)

All through the saga of the stained glass, Lorimer was careful to take advice from the Court of the Lord Lyon regarding the heraldic aspects, as he continued to do with other elements in the chapel. By good fortune, Sir James Balfour Paul, Lord Lyon King of Arms, was able to offer Lorimer the eight original Knights from 1687 when the Order was first ‘revived’, plus the six from the time of Queen Anne in 1703, which neatly made up fourteen for his shields on the roof bosses. When it came to the motto for St. Andrew, Lyon thought of ‘Beatus Sanctus Andreas’ but, ‘Jacob P. would object to the Beatus and probably to the Sanctus also’. However, he offered to consult Professor James Cooper of Glasgow University, ‘the best ecclesiologist’.\(^55\) Professor Cooper replied with ‘“Sanctus Andraeas Ap. M” (Apostle and Martyr) “Patronus Scotiae”’ and added ‘You need not mind Jacob Primmer. All Scotland will be with you.’\(^56\)

There is no evidence that any protest was forthcoming and Lorimer’s decorative scheme evolved under Lyon’s guidance. The three-bay groin-vaulted roof, based on late fifteenth century Scottish Gothic, with its elaborate pattern of ribs springing from moulded capitals, has richly carved bosses at each intersection. Viewed from the floor the roof resembles three intersecting spiders’ webs populated by a myriad of assorted arachnids (Pl. 48). Closer inspection reveals that the majority of the bosses have stylised motives drawn from nature; ‘the thistle, the vine, the rose, the acorn, the horse chestnut, the hawthorn’.\(^57\) In October and November of 1909, in ‘the big hall’, Phoebe Traquair watched

> the model going up in the Dean Studio every day. It is full size and only 8 feet short of real height. A section, of course.\(^58\)

Joseph Hayes had the contract for all the stone carving, but she was not too impressed with the work his men were doing on the naturalistic bosses. One thing watching it has convinced me is that really good decorative stone
carving is not possible till this is done by men of education and brains. There are some 8 men working, making full size models of the bosses at the intersections of the roof. They chatter all day, all have something to copy, the spirit of which they lose in their easy mechanical working, every bit with the same ordinary care but not a spark of fire or play in it. How can there be with men who just put in their 8 or 9 hours a day for their pay.59

Along the transverse ridge rib, the five main bosses (from west to east) represent the royal arms, St Giles and his hind, the star of the Order of the Thistle, St. Andrew in front of his cross and carrying a scroll in his left hand, duly surrounded by the inscription recommended by Professor Cooper, and the Pelican in her Piety.60 Lorimer could have found inspiration in the fifteenth century bosses in the choir of the main cathedral, where there are foliated examples and an angel holding a shield and on the east wall of the Preston aisle (just outside the Thistle Chapel) there is a late medieval heraldic carving of an angel holding the Arms of Edinburgh (Pl. 49).61 However, the carving is crude when compared to those on the roof of the chapel. Since Deuchars did not work in stone, it is a credit to Joseph Hayes’s stone carvers that they have reproduced faithfully the angels and the figures of St. Andrew and St. Giles from his plaster models (Pl. 50 & Pl. 51). The lively representation of the Royal Arms of the United Kingdom as used in Scotland and of the Pelican suggests that these were also modelled by Deuchars (Pl. 52 & Pl. 53). It would have been simple to have used the same design for each angel figure, since they are so remote from the floor, but when captured by a telephoto lens, their individual features can be seen. The folded wings of each figure are all slightly different and the shields are confidently borne by delicately modelled, yet somewhat enlarged hands in varying positions (Pl. 54).62 The transverse and longitudinal ridge ribs terminate in further demi-angels, this time playing assorted musical instruments, including the bagpipes (Pl. 55). Deuchars moulded the figures in clay and then cast them in plaster for the stone carvers to work from.63 Lorimer was probably aware of similar examples of angels playing musical instruments in Melrose Abbey, or in the fifteenth century Rosslyn Chapel (Pl. 56).64 However, the modelling of Deuchars’s figures owes something to the Pre-Raphaelites. There is no record of what Phoebe Traquair thought of his work, but she certainly could not have described it as ‘mechanical’. According to James Grieve, the Master of Works, who started on 1 August 1909,
in the roof there are over 200 tons of Cullaloe stone from the quarry near Aberdour in Fife.65

At the east end of the chapel, flanking Strachan’s St. Andrew window, are two carved stone full-length angels, looking down demurely, a device frequently employed by Deuchars possibly to avoid the necessity of representing the difficult details of the eye (Pl. 57 & Pl. 58). The north wall of the chapel (abutting the ante-chapel) has no stained-glass windows, but Lorimer created two matching stone ‘two-light’ gothic frames and filled them with carved armorial achievements, to match Davis’s heraldic windows, so that the fourteen knights of 1909 could all be represented. The lively modelling of the animal supporters could indicate Deuchars’s work.

The two-bay groin-vaulted roof of the ante-chapel (25 feet by 14 feet) is in a slightly later Gothic style than the main chapel roof.66 It is lower, but also features ribs adorned at the intersections by decorative bosses. On one, St. Andrew with his cross in a shield, is surrounded by the same inscription provided by Professor Cooper for the chapel (Pl. 59), while another features the Royal Arms of Scotland. There are seventy tons of stone in the roof, but it ‘was more difficult to fix than the main Roof of Chapel it was so flat’.67 The carved stone cusped arch framing the entrance to the chapel has, as terminals to the cusps, four pendant ‘demi-angels holding shields and scrolls - quaint and sweet little figures they are’ (Pl. 60 & Pl. 61).68 In fact, the two outer figures are holding open song sheets and ‘the two in the centre are singing with open mouths, the bars of music on their ribbons are the first lines of “Old Hundred” and the other “Our National Anthem”’.69 In the apex of the inner arch is the eagle of St. John the Evangelist (Pl. 60 & Pl. 61).70 Although not as stylised as the image of the apostle on Compton Chapel, there are some similarities. The demi-column on the right hand side of the door arch extends upwards to terminate in another larger demi-angel, bearing in the oversize hands, so characteristic of Deuchars’s modelling, the inscription ‘Pax Intrans’ supplied by Professor Cooper (Pl. 61).71 To the right and below this angel is the elaborate representation of the full armorial achievement of the Earl of Leven and Melville (Pl. 62). Closer
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examination of the enthusiastic interpretation, in particular the supporters, reveals the hand of the knight (on the left) of a large size and a very lively portrayal of the ratchet hound (on the right) which would tend to point once again to Deuchars's modelling. The foreground comprises some rough pasture with clumps of flowers and two rabbits emerging from burrows, but it is not known why the flora and fauna were introduced. The full-face portrayal of one of the animals depicts the ears drooping curiously on either side of the head (Pl. 63).

Outside, there is direct evidence of Deuchars’s heraldic modelling in the central panel of the carved frieze over the fifteenth-century Romanesque Revival arched entrance to the ante-chapel. (The arch was carefully dismantled and rebuilt for the fourth time, its immediately previous incarnation having been part of the Royal Porch.)72 Within a wooden moulded cusped framework, Deuchars modelled in clay a demi-angel holding a shield bearing the King’s Scottish Arms (Cat. 59, Pl. 64). According to James Grieve, the clerk of works, it was carved by a talented employee of Hayes, a Greek (Pl. 65).73 ‘King Edward wanted the Chapel built by Scotsmen if possible, these men (the stone carvers) are all Scotsmen, one only....was a Greek, but was for 10 years to my knowledge a “climatized” Scot. He was a gem of a stone carver with the touch of an artist.’74 Lorimer was fortunate that Deuchars was a native-born Scot, thus conforming to the Trustees’ criteria.

All around the exterior of the building are other examples of his modelling.

The whole design of the east end of the Chapel is crowned by a figure of the patron saint of the Order. Saint Andrew, surmounted by two angel figures holding his cross and crown, set under a rich Gothic canopy which rises above the highest line of the parapet wall.75

The saint, clutching two fish, stands in his niche below the two demi-angels carrying the saltire shield (Pl. 66). Below his feet is one of the demi-angels which punctuate the cornice at the base of the parapet. As with the interior of the chapel, all have been individually moulded. Below the west window the corbelling terminates in two demi-angels holding a shield bearing the Arms of St. Margaret. The elaborate carving over the ogee arch above the window is supported by two further
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demi-angels, which, like the others on the exterior of the building, appear to have been influenced by the romantic style Deuchars witnessed during his time with Colton.

Lorimer’s device of placing grotesques at the top of the buttresses and on the small tower allowed Deuchars’s creative imagination full reign. According to James Grieve, they represent ‘evil spirits attempting to get into the Chapel by the window tops (Pl. 67). Inside the Architect placed Angel Figures on each Key Stone each playing a musical instrument to frighten the outside demons away.‘76 (Pl. 55) Although based on medieval carving, they do not appear wholly evil and have more than a touch of whimsical humour about them. Surmounting the tower is a very jolly Lion of Scotland, crowned, and holding a sword and sceptre. Between the south-west buttress and the hexagonal tower, Lorimer placed yet another grotesque to get over the change in levels of the stonework, while one more serves as a gargoyle spouting into an ornate lead rainwater drainpipe. The stone carving was all done at the Dalry yard of Colville & Co. whence it was taken, over 1000 tons of it, to St. Giles’ by a horse and cart (Pl. 68).77

Nathaniel Grieve of Washington Lane had the contract for the oak interior, while the specialist carving was executed by William and Alexander Clow, two brothers, whom Lorimer claimed almost exclusively for himself (Pl. 69 & Pl. 70). They had started up in business in 1891 and met Lorimer the following year.78 Although there were ten years between them, Hussey described them as ‘identical’.79 The ‘master craftsmen...spent much of their time when on holiday in churches at home and abroad studying the woodcarving’ which gave them ‘a wide knowledge of medieval sculpture and more especially of the refinements of technique.’80 The whole chapel was completed on time because Lorimer had ‘a full size model of the Chapel at the Joiners workshop into which all wood work was fitted months before the stone building was completed.’81 This is probably the same model that Lorimer referred to as being in ‘the Builder’s yard’, but according to Phoebe Traquair he also had ‘a section’ in the Dean Studio, where Deuchars did all his modelling, in
Hussey asserted that Lorimer’s ‘Gothic idiom can be traced directly to Bodley’. However, its foundation was probably laid during Lorimer’s time with Rowand Anderson. From there, Lorimer went to the office of G.F. Bodley in London. ‘To him Lorimer indirectly owed much that is best in the Thistle Chapel’. Although Lorimer had returned to Scotland in 1891, his ecclesiastical commissions prior to the Thistle Chapel were comparatively restrained with little hint of the Gothic extravaganza which was to come. Lorimer’s appreciation of carved woodwork derived from Bodley’s association with William Morris and the Arts and Crafts movement. Having secured the commission for the Thistle Chapel, it was almost as if he had to incorporate into the woodwork every Gothic device he had ever absorbed, in case he never had such an opportunity again. He was also fortunate in that over the years he had assembled a number of craftworkers who could deliver the high standard of work required. Joseph Hayes, the Clow brothers, Thomas Hadden (wrought iron), Phoebe Traquair (enamels), Moxon & Carfrae (gilding and tincturing) and Thomas Beattie (hand modelled plasterwork and models for stone and wood carving) had all worked for him for a number of years. Hayes and Beattie would probably have had all the modelling for the Thistle Chapel had Deuchars not arrived on the scene. Since Hayes still had the contract for all the stone carving, he would not have been too unhappy, but Beattie’s reaction is not known. Evidence of the considerable esprit de corps which had built up among the Thistle Chapel team can be found in a photograph taken of the summer outing to Aberdour in 1910 (Pl. 71).

In March of 1910, Lorimer went to St. George’s Chapel at Windsor ‘to make sketches of the woodwork’, but he was not given ‘permission for any of the crests, helmets or mantling to be taken down.’ He was advised to use ‘a good opera glass’. As Lorimer observed at the time, ‘The only existing examples of Ecclesiastical woodwork in Scotland, of any importance, are the few stalls at
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Dunblane Cathedral, and the woodwork in King’s College, Aberdeen. There were therefore no traditional Scotch examples of woodwork to draw on. However, Lorimer’s overall design may have been influenced by the stalls in Beverley Minster, and Carlisle Cathedral. The pendant angels, a feature almost over-used by him, are similar to those on the stalls in Chester Cathedral. Alternatively, he could have seen Breton examples. In addition, his close friend at that time, Sir William Burrell, amassed a collection of medieval ecclesiastical sculptures in wood, of which Lorimer may well have been aware. Before finalising the interior design of the Thistle Chapel, he made enquiries about the forms of service used by both the Order of the Garter at Windsor and the Order of St. Patrick in Dublin.

On 24 February 1910, Lorimer and the Trustees had a private audience with the King in London, where the interior of the chapel was discussed, together with plans for the ceremonial. ‘An oak carved panel, showing the colour and finish proposed for the oakwork of the interior, was also shown, as were photographs of the models of the stone vaulted roofs’. Apparently, the King took especial interest in the proposed enamel stall plates, based on those at St. George’s Chapel, Windsor. The preparation of the copper plates and engraving were by Alexander Kirkwood & Son prior to the champlevé enamelling by Phoebe Traquair. Although her translucent enamelling over a metallic base was unique, she was restrained by the design drawn up by the Herald Painter, Graham Johnstone. General royal approval for the overall design of the interior was granted and a delighted Lorimer gave details to journalists. The following day a report appeared in The Scotsman and other newspapers. This immediately brought down the wrath of Sir Schomberg McDonnell of H.M. Office of Works who had himself been summoned by the King to explain the impropriety. Lorimer was informed that ‘he (the King) was much surprised and annoyed that it should have appeared without his permission...it was hardly possible to imagine that you were not aware that it was most improper to publish any report of any conversation or meeting with him without leave...he doubted if it would be possible for him to receive you again’. Lorimer lost no
time in penning the requested letter of contrite explanation and fulsome apology for his 'grave breach of propriety' which was graciously accepted by the King. The irony is that Lorimer was never received again by Edward VII, who died in May of 1910.

It was fortunate that the King's approval had been given, for Lorimer had probably been working on elements of the interior for nearly a year. Beneath the stained glass windows, there is a riot of Gothic spires and panels in oak, encrusted everywhere with carving. In 1911, The Scotsman described the stalls,

The Royal stalls are set on a dais about two feet in height at the west end of the Chapel - His Majesty's in the centre, the Prince of Wales's on his right, and the Duke of Connaught's on his left. On each side of Royalty there is a stall for each of the senior knights - Argyll and Atholl. All the stalls in the Chapel are of carved oak of a beautiful soft tint, all are carved in a light and elegant Gothic style with gablets and pinnacles and pierced work, the King's stall and canopy being the richest of all.....The canopies and heraldic finials of the five stalls at the west end of the Chapel are "stepped" - an arrangement which is at once decorative and gives greater dignity to that of the King. They rise from 25 feet or thereby at the sides to 33 feet, which is the height from the ground of the surmounting Royal crest. The King's stall is a double one; all the others are single.....The other stalls for the knights, fourteen in number, are arranged six on the north wall and eight on the south. Each has a single canopy supported on slim twisted columns, and like all the woodwork (is) delicately carved.  

The 'soft tint' referred to was achieved by a special treatment which Lorimer had Moxon & Carfrae apply to the oak. The wood was first treated with paint stripper, next it was bleached with oxalic acid, then coated with chloride of lime. Each of these chemicals was well washed off with water, before the next was applied. Finally, when dry, the oak was polished with 'brushes and ball beeswax'.

As well as all the naturalistic carving of fruit, flowers, leaves, animals, birds and dolphins on the stalls, Lorimer has introduced among the tracery, figures of saints and angels, modelled by Deuchars. In addition, 'all the elbows of the seats have carved beasts - some of them taken from the armorial bearings of the knights.' (Pl. 72) It would appear that the Clows were expected to carve these from a very rough sketch by Lorimer and heraldic devices supplied by Sir James.
Balfour Paul, Lord Lyon, but Deuchars may well have provided models. Pendant from the cusps of the stall canopies are demi-angels, some carrying shields and others ribbons. As with the stone carving, every figure has been individually modelled with lively expressions. Some of the double ones are singing, while others appear to be giggling over a secret joke (Pl. 73 & Pl. 74). The Clows have sympathetically carved them from Deuchars's plaster models. Other demi-angels between the canopies are playing various musical instruments, including the bagpipes (reflecting those on the roof) (Pl. 75 & Pl. 76). Deuchars's distinctive modelling style appears on the book boards (Pl. 77), the lectern and the two elbow rests of the King's stall (Pl. 78). With four children under the age of five, he was not short of youthful models and in return, his daughters were allowed to have any spoiled plaster casts as dolls.

The book rest of the King's stall is filled with the Royal Arms of the United Kingdom as used in Scotland (Pl. 79). As with the coat of arms of Lord Leven & Melville, the Supporters (the Unicorn on the left and the Lion on the right) have been vigorously modelled in high relief with sensitivity to natural form, while adhering to the heraldic requirements, suggesting Deuchars's involvement. He may have been referring back to techniques picked up during his time with Colton. However, in the Royal Arms it is not known whose idea it was to incorporate the whimsical touch of two rabbits into the stylised waves on either side of the Jewel of the Order of the Thistle, suspended from its collar, which surrounds the shield. These animals are very similar to the carved stone ones below the Arms of Leven and Melville in the ante-chapel. Was it Lorimer's whimsy or the Herald Painter's? Or, was it Deuchars's? The same unnatural position of the ears of the forward-facing rabbit on both Arms would tend to indicate that they were modelled by the same hand (Deuchars's) and faithfully copied by both stone and wood carvers (Pl. 80). Almost lost against the rich representation of the coat of arms, in the cusped spandrels above, are two of Deuchars's bas-relief demi-angels blowing trumpets.
Above the carved canopies of the stalls are niches, themselves with pinnacled canopies, supported by more slow turn columns, all surmounted by different animals which appear to be upright versions of those on the elbows of the seats. The niches flanking the King’s stall and those placed to coincide with the bays of the roof on each side of the chapel have been filled with Deuchars’s full-length angels bearing shields with relevant symbols (Pl. 81 & Pl. 82). Perhaps Lorimer hoped that over time the other niches would be suitably filled, but it seems there were insufficient funds. There are so many figures, angels, saints and animals integrated into the carving that it is possible to overlook some of the finer detail. For instance, Lorimer could have finished the slow turn columns separating the niches above the stalls by crockets, but he chose instead to use a different animal for each column. Despite being constrained by the cuboid shape, the animals have lost none of their robust character.

In the large niche above the King’s stall there are three Scottish saints. At first Lorimer thought of St. Michael, St. Columba and St. Giles, but St. Michael was dropped as ‘he has another order of his own, viz. St. Michael and St. George’ on the advice of Balfour Paul, who himself sought guidance from Professor Cooper, whose answer was,

Above the King’s stall the patron saints should be a St. Andrew, who might bend over the Royal Arms as he does over the portrait of James III. at Holyrood, and St. Ninian, the first Apostle of our country, and the Apostle of the whole of it; who was, moreover always venerated in this capacity, and St. Margaret, the sainted ancestress of the King.

St. Ninian is described by David Lindsay as bearing a stick, or crosier (sic); St. Margaret has of course her crown, her two long tresses plaited, and the Black Rood of Scotland.

If St. Columba is to be introduced, his emblems are the Dove, with white pinions, and his Abbatial staff, the head of which is turned inwards to himself. He is “Abbot and Confessor”, and Apostle of the Highlands, while St. Ninian is Bishop and Confessor, Apostle of Scotland. St. Margaret is described as Queen and Widow.

In the central hexagonal niche, Lorimer placed St. Margaret, choosing to pick up on her love of
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reading and children; her own, or the orphans for whom she made provision (Pl. 83). Deuchars produced a plaster model of the whole group in its niche (Cat. 60, Pl. 84). On either side of Saint Margaret are two other saints, but Lorimer seems to have rejected Professor Cooper’s advice in part, choosing to depict, on the right of St. Margaret, St. Kentigern (or Mungo), patron saint of Glasgow (Cat. 61, Pl. 85), instead of St. Ninian and on the left, St. Columba (Pl. 86).

At the apsidal end of the chapel, where Lorimer placed the Investiture Chair, above the linenfold panelling are projecting carved and pierced canopies, with pendant demi-angels terminating the cusps of the ogee arches. Over the chair itself, the canopy is octagonal and the pendant angels are double. Framed by crocket studded columns which punctuate the pierced band of vine tracery along the top of the canopies are three pairs of bas-relief kneeling angels, holding between them crowned shields (Pl. 91, Pl. 92 & Pl. 93). Another pair are above the door (Pl. 94). The composition has strong heraldic elements and can be traced back to Renaissance Italy. Angels have appeared as supporters in stone carvings on ecclesiastical buildings since the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In Scotland, Lorimer may have been familiar with carving on the fourteenth century font in Inverkeithing Church or the fourteenth century knight’s tomb in the south wall of St. Mary’s Abbey, Rothesay (Pl. 87 & Pl. 88). At Pilrig House, Edinburgh, the eighteenth century family crest of the Balfours has two angel supporters which are stylistically similar to the ones Deuchars modelled for Lorimer (Pl. 89). In more recent times, as part of the late nineteenth century restoration of the Gatehouse at Falkland Palace by John Kinross for the Third Marquess of Bute, angels were used as supporters for the Arms of Stuart of Bute, the County of Fife and the Royal Arms of Scotland (Pl. 90). Lorimer may well have been influenced by these earlier stone carvings. Close inspection of those in the Thistle Chapel reveals that Deuchars has given their modelling the same individual attention as elsewhere in the building. Their features are much more natural than the earlier ones on which they are based. One of Lorimer’s clients commented after a visit to the completed chapel,
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the carving is too lovely & very remarkable all the expression that has been got into the angels faces

Beneath the canopy over the chair ‘in a niche is placed an allegorical winged figure with spear treading on and overcoming a dragon symbolical of evil.’ This could be a representation of the earlier St. Margaret, of Antioch. A similar pose (although laterally reversed) was used in a bas relief representation of the saint on the Ranworth Rood-screen. However, that figure has no wings, although there is a winged angel in the lunette above. Given Lorimer’s fastidious attention to ecclesiastical and heraldic detail, it is curious that he allowed a human saint to be represented with wings. Deuchars has succeeded in effectively contrasting the sweetness of the female’s face with the vicious-looking dragon. The Clow brothers carved another version of the saint from a plaster maquette which was made in a Belgian atelier. According to the Lorimer family, it was intended for the Thistle Chapel, but never used there. However, that figure is much less combative. Dressed in hood, cape and long dress, with the dragon by her side, looking more like a pet dog, she carries a staved wooden bucket from which she is sprinkling holy water with a branch of hyssop. It may be that in the very early days of work on the chapel, Lorimer had asked the Clows to carve the figure from the maquette which he had purchased on his foreign travels, but had discarded it once he realised that he had found a sculptor who could produce much more naturalistic and lively work.

This talent was further used in the bronze fittings. Four lamps were cast by the Bromsgrove Guild from Deuchars’s model of an angel (Cat. 62, Pl. 97 & Pl. 98). The lamp was subsequently exhibited at the Arts and Crafts Society Exhibition in London in 1912. So captivating was Deuchars’s work that it brought complimentary comments from a visitor to the chapel, ‘The modelling is reverend and beautifully done like some Italian work......A Frenchman would finish his description of these little lamps by the one word “superb” (sic)’. The door handles on both sides of the oak door into the chapel feature Deuchars’s angels and another is perched on top of the escutcheon (Pl. 99 & Pl. 100).
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Originally, it had been intended that King Edward VII open the chapel on St. Andrew’s Day 1910. However, when the King died in May 1910, the opening was postponed until it was performed by the new King, George V, on 19 July 1911, although the original date was left on the inscribed tablet in accordance with His Majesty’s wishes. Essentially the chapel was built in twenty one months, but the extra time allowed further refinements to be made to the stonework in the autumn of 1910. Joseph Hayes had to re-engage his team of stone carvers to adjust the roof bosses and put the finishing touches to the lion for the top of the turret. Deuchars was required to ‘see the corbel’, presumably to carry out further work (Pl. 101).

Lorimer was determined that nothing would spoil his overall design and persuaded Sir Schomberg McDonnell that he should commission the initial individual Knight’s crests, instead of having each Knight provide his own. His enthusiasm seems to have resulted in a considerable overspend on the project as a whole. In December 1910, upon receipt of a financial statement of the projected cost, McDonnell wrote to Lorimer that ‘I am sorry to say that I cannot pretend that it is not a great disappointment, because it shows a maximum exceeding of £1642 over the sum of £22,000 allotted for the Chapel...and further a total exceeding of £2781, if the cost of achievements, etc. is included...I have shown the accounts to the Duke of Buccleuch and to Lord Leven, who entirely share my view that it is hardly possible to regard this excess expenditure as otherwise than most unfortunate.’ To prevent any further financial embarrassment for the Trustees, Lorimer was told not to order Banners, soft furnishings, nor a special key for the opening ceremony. However, it would appear that funds were found for the key bearing St. Andrew, and two angels, with the modelling showing every indication of Deuchars’s hand (Pl. 102).

When the opening of the chapel finally arrived, all the great and the good of Scotland were assembled to witness the royal party’s procession along the coronation carpet, brought up from
CHAPTER 9

EDINBURGH AND THE THISTLE CHAPEL

London for the event. Just outside the Thistle Chapel, the Queen closely examined ‘the new oak canopied chair which has been specially made for her use’. Also designed by Lorimer, ‘the chief motif which runs through its decoration is very appropriately the lily, the flower of Mary’. Its canopy has two groups of three pendant demi-angels and is supported by brackets in the form of two more angels (Pl. 103). Since the modelling of the figures is so similar to that in the Thistle Chapel, it would appear that Deuchars was responsible. After inspection of the Royal Pew, Lorimer’s selected list of ‘craftsmen’ were presented:

James Grieve, clerk of works; John Kennedy (representing Colvilles), builder; Joseph Hayes, stone carving and modelling; Robert (sic) Grieve, contractor for oak work; William and Alexander Clow, wood carving; Thomas Hadden, iron screens; Mrs Traquair, enamelled stall plates; Alexander Kirkwood, engraver of stall plates; Douglas Strachan, stained glass in east window; Alfred Nison (Moxon & Carfrae), decoration and emblazoning of ceilings; Mrs Drew, who embroidered the mantling; James Beveridge, carver of crests and swords.

Despite having ‘modelled all the angels, saints and figures’, and probably animals too, in a wonderfully fresh and vibrant manner, Deuchars was not included in the line-up. However, he may have taken comfort from the knowledge that during the tour of the chapel, ‘his work...was much admired by King George’ and a silver version of the key was presented to the King when he opened the chapel. In order to avoid getting into trouble over anything appearing prematurely in the newspapers, Lorimer had required them all to undertake not to publish material previously supplied by him until 12 July 1911. The Scotsman gave extensive coverage to the events of the day, but delayed publication of details of the building until a week later.

Although Hussey claimed that the work ‘was carried out within the sum given by Lord Leven’, the final certified cost of the chapel as at 24 November 1911 was £25,735:2:9, exceeding Lorimer’s May estimate by £80:4:9 and well over the £22,000 originally allocated. Since the Trustees had always intended that an endowment of £2,000 would be provided to cover the running costs of the building, they had to find nearly £4,000 more than originally envisaged. The final sum included £3,400 to Joseph Hayes, ‘for internal and external carving including models’ and £5,075 to
Nathaniel Grieve ‘for Oak stalls & all internal woodwork of Chapel (including carving) ... Angel figures & Groups and additional pendant Angels’. Payment to Deuchars must have been included in these amounts. Such was the stunning beauty of the overall conception, that Lorimer was forgiven for the overspend and shortly after the opening ceremony was knighted for his efforts. Good wishes flowed in from all over the country, including a telegram from Hayes, ‘A thousand congratulations, we think the honour is appreciated by everybody who has been associated with you’, but there is no record of anything from Deuchars. However, when Lorimer received a number of ecclesiastical commissions following his success in the Thistle Chapel, he continued to offer modelling work to him.

Not all the critics were delighted with Lorimer’s work in the chapel. The Connoisseur opined, ‘The first impression on entering the chapel is disappointment, for, owing to the omnipresence of heraldry, the general effect inclines to the bizarre.’ The article also complained that there was an excess of decoration, made worse by the colouring of the carvings. However, some of Deuchars’s work found favour.

...the chapel yet embodies many individual parts which are most exquisite. The four hanging lights - brass figures of angels holding flower-shaped contrivances of glass - are unique artistic achievements in their own line of action; while many bits of the wood-carving rival, if they do not surpass, the work of Grinling Gibbons, and are among the finest things done in this difficult medium since the Restoration period. All the partitions between the stalls are carved to represent different animals, and these, in every case, are marvels of combined realism and beauty. Now one is charmed by a rose or an acorn, now by a trellised plant, and now by a tiny angel which is fused with life; and all these details, with their varying degrees of aesthetic excellence, possess unquestionably the rare quality of distinction.

While he was creating all the maquettes for the chapel, Deuchars found time to exhibit his own pieces of sculpture, although not all of it was new. To the Society of Scottish Artists (a new venue for him), went ‘The Despair of Icarus’, which he had shown before, and ‘Diana’, possibly started while working with Colton (Cat. 53 & 63). In 1910, he sent work to four exhibitions. To the Royal Scottish Academy went ‘The Victory’ which must have been a large piece to be priced at
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£100 (Cat. 64). ‘Diana’ went to the Royal Glasgow Institute of Fine Art (Cat. 63).\(^9\) The Royal Academy had ‘The despair of Icarus’, which was subsequently sent to the Walker Art Gallery in the autumn (Cat. 53).\(^7\) The ultimate fate of this piece is debatable. 1910 was its last showing, by which time it had by appeared in all the major venues and may well have remained unsold. Despite Deuchars having his work consistently accepted for major exhibitions, nomination for membership of one of the art societies appears to have eluded him. However, ‘An Edinburgh Correspondent’ (probably Deuchars himself) wrote in *The Strathearn Herald*, that

> He has been offered, I believe, the honours of various Art Societies, but prefers still to be a free-lance. Especially pressing were the overtures of a French Academy who, for the excellence of his work, twice nominated him for membership.\(^8\)

There is probably more wishful thinking than truth attached to these assertions.

Deuchars was obviously struggling financially, since he remained in the rented tenement flat throughout this period. Compared to the farmhouse at Hughenden, it must have been extremely cramped, especially with four youngsters under the age of five. Although Deuchars had turned out for Lorimer literally hundreds of delightfully unique plaster models, which undoubtedly enhanced the architect’s Thistle Chapel design, Deuchars’s share of the fees apparently did little to improve the family’s standard of living.

---

\(^1\) Glasgow, Royal Glasgow Institute of Fine Art Exhibition 1909 Catalogue. Cat.no. 763.

\(^2\) Ibid., loc.cit.


\(^4\) Liverpool, Walker Art Gallery Exhibition Catalogue 1908. Cat.no. 2056.


\(^6\) McKinstry, op.cit., p.139.

\(^7\) [Anderson, Robert Rowand], ‘New School of Applied Art, Edinburgh. Opening Address. 21 October 1892’. Copy in NMRS, RCHAMS.


\(^10\) McKinstry, op.cit., pp.164,169.


\(^12\) ‘MEMORANDUM by SIR ROBERT LORIMER regarding certain STATEMENTS of three Sculptor Members of the Royal Scottish Academy.’ No date, but known to be 1918. Now in Library of R.S.A.

\(^13\) Ibid., loc.cit.
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123 Information supplied by Nancy Gilmartin.

124 Their stamp is on the reverse of a photograph of the lamp. From the Lorimer office collection of photographs, now in RCAHMS, NMRS. As part of the George V Memorial, Charles Henshaw Ltd. was asked to produce two further bronze lamps, using one of those in the chapel as a model.
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Lorimer's success in the Thistle Chapel resulted in a number of ecclesiastical commissions in the following years. St Andrew's Episcopal Church (now Cathedral) in Aberdeen was one of the first. Initiated in 1910, Lorimer's refurbishment of the interior was finally opened in September 1911. The woodwork consisted of a pulpit given in memory of members of the Warrack family (the same one as Lorimer's Edinburgh lawyer friend, John Warrack) and a Rood Screen with angels in the same style as Deuchars's modelling for the Thistle Chapel (Cat. 65, Pl. 104 & Pl. 105). In 1976, when the church interior was further altered, the screen was moved from the chancel to the side Suther Chapel, although the Rood was left suspended in its original position. Stylistically, it is very similar to one designed by Lorimer for St. Peter's in Edinburgh in 1908. The Evangelists for that one were modelled by Joseph Hayes, but the St. Andrew's Rood could have been done by Deuchars.

Some of Lorimer's commissions were comparatively small, as in the tiny Scottish Episcopalian church, St. Adamnan's in Kilmaveonaig, Perthshire (Cat. 66, Pl. 106). In October 1911, Nathaniel Grieve wrote to Lorimer, 'I note that Mr Deuchars will be modelling the figures for the Blair Atholl reredos'. To the simple panelling, Lorimer added three high-relief figures from Ober-Ammergau. For some reason, he could not leave this design alone and placed two three-dimensional angels (modelled by Deuchars) on the top of slow-turn columns inserted between the two smaller outer panels on each side of the reredos (Pl. 107). It is not known why he chose to import some of the carved figures, when he had two modelled especially at a total cost of £14, but it may have been a preference of the donor or of the priest at the time. The contrast in style is very noticeable.

However, Lorimer's greatest coup following on from his triumph with the Thistle Chapel was the commission for new woodwork for the choir of Dunblane Cathedral (Cat. 67). Lorimer had been the chief draughtsman when Rowand Anderson was responsible for the restoration of the cathedral between 1890 and 1893, during which time Anderson had had several disagreements with the
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Board of Manufactures. Perhaps this is why he was not automatically invited to continue his work. In March of 1911, Mr John Graham Stewart of Aultwharrie, chairman of Stewarts & Lloyds and Provost of Dunblane offered to pay for new furnishings for the choir. Lorimer became aware that there existed the chance to exercise his gothic design skills on a fairly large scale once again and sent the minister, Rev. Dr. Alexander Ritchie, (who had been the incumbent during the original restoration) the extract from The Builder about the Thistle Chapel. According to Christopher Hussey, Lorimer’s ‘fresh, albeit traditional, treatment of Gothic woodwork in the Thistle Chapel at St. Giles Cathedral was then the talk of Scotland.’

Lorimer’s efforts to secure the commission were successful and he was asked to design an organ case, choir stalls and a reredos screen. By November 1911, Hayes sent him a note of the cost of some ‘sketches, including casting’ for ‘angel figures’, ‘angel pendants’ and ‘seven acts of mercy’, presumably to illustrate to his clients what he intended. From the style of the modelling, when compared to the figures in the Thistle Chapel, it is obvious that Deuchars and not Hayes was responsible. In Dunblane Cathedral two sets of fifteenth century stalls with misericord seats had been preserved. The canopied Chisholm stalls had originally been in the choir, but Lorimer chose to design more comfortable seats for the twentieth century choristers and employed several design elements from the Thistle Chapel. However, in Dunblane, instead of Nathaniel Grieve, the firm of Scott Morton & Co. was selected for the oak woodwork, while the Clows were once again employed for the specialised carving and Moxon & Carfrae for the limed treatment of the wood.

Despite the fact that, less than twenty years before, Rowand Anderson had created an imposing gothic case for an organ by Eustace Ingram of London, Lorimer was allowed to replace it with his own interpretation, which he blended into the line of his stall canopies. Lorimer’s aim seems to have been to reduce the amount of space taken up by the organ in the choir and the resulting thirty foot high case protruded much less than its predecessor. The organ pipes were framed by four
vertical panels of carved gothic tracery, incorporating musical instruments and stylised foliage, framing the columns of organ pipes. Horizontal separation was achieved by similarly carved spandrels. The top of the case was finished in five steps of tracery panels (Pl. 108). Deuchars’s bas relief modelling skill was used to good effect in three figures. Surmounting the entire case and projecting above the tracery on the highest step, was a large kneeling angel, in high relief, playing a harp (Pl. 109). The spandrels above the largest pipes had two further demi-angels, the one on the right blowing a horn and the other on the left clashing symbols, above the grape-laden tracery. While the modelling of the harpist drew on the Pre-Raphaelites for inspiration, the other two displayed Deuchars’s individual, naturalistic, approach. Between the outer broad bands of carving and the organ pipes were two further angels, in high relief, blowing elongated horns. Probably modelled by Percy Portsmouth, they stood on brackets, formed by monkeys (possibly by Deuchars), clinging incongruously to vine stems (Pl. 110). Below the pipes was a band of plain oak above a further traceried border which was punctuated by eight of Deuchars’s pendant demi-angels (Pl. 111). Beneath this projecting part of the instrument seven niches were left for further figures, but despite Percy Portsmouth supplying several plaster models for these, only one, St. Cecilia, in classical dress and playing a lute, was subsequently carved. Unfortunately, however elegant Lorimer’s design for the organ case was, it necessitated removing the bulk of the organ ‘to the attic above the Chapter House - a room devoid of resonance and totally detached from the Cathedral building. Wind pressures were raised to the extraordinary level of 12 inches for the whole organ...’ Over the years Ingram’s instrument struggled to cope in its new environment, but in the late 1980’s a new organ was commissioned from the Dutch organ builders, Flentrop, who successfully incorporated and matched the carving of Lorimer’s design. It is somewhat ironic that Rowand Anderson’s ‘large and unsightly organ case of yellow oak, which projected far into the narrow choir,’ and was ‘swept away’ by Lorimer was actually much more sympathetic to the technical requirements of the musical instrument. The latest replacement organ case projects once again into the choir.
On either side of the choir, two rows of canopied stalls, punctuated by slow-turn columns, provided seating for a choir of about sixty. As in the Thistle Chapel, Lorimer incorporated pairs of Deuchars’s pendant demi-angels on the stalls and above the organ console (Cat. 68, Pls. 112, 113, 114 & 115). From the eight different compositions, seven of the pairs were exhibited in 1912 at the Arts & Crafts Exhibition Society in London. On that occasion, Deuchars was duly credited with their modelling. A plaster maquette of one of these may also have been what was shown later in the year in the exhibition of the Society of Scottish Artists under the title of ‘Cast of Wood Carving “Amorini”’. (These items may well have also featured among the work sent by Lorimer to the 1914 exhibition organised by Cecile Walton and Sarah Adamson in the New Galleries, Shandwick Place, Edinburgh.) In Dunblane, reflecting the Thistle Chapel design, a further nineteen of Deuchars’s angels, were incorporated into the haffits terminating the book boards (Pls. 116, 117, 118 & 119). The arm rests took the form of plump supine animals, which were very similar to the menagerie Lorimer had created in the Thistle Chapel, but a comparison between the two sets of animals reveals subtle differences (Pl. 120 & Pl. 121). Perhaps Lorimer did not have the foresight to preserve the plaster models for them, as he did with those of the saints in the chapel.

The Glasgow Herald reported,

Sir Robert Lorimer is particularly enchanting in his child-angels, innocent beings perhaps kneeling close-winged in prayer or adoration; in his birds and beasts, here treated with graciously decorative freedom, there as stirring grotesques on the misericords, or introduced, it may be, into some intricate arabesque. As to the carving, alike of the adoring figures, the animals and birds, the vital nature-growth, it breathes a spirit of combined passion and patience - may we not say of natural piety? - which is supposed to be non-existent to-day.

It was Lorimer’s habit to prepare extensive notes for the newspapers (the forerunner of today’s press release), but, since the original for this somewhat florid prose is not available, it is difficult to assess how much was his. However, it is significant that his contribution is acknowledged fulsomely, the Clows’ skill is hinted at, but credit to the sculptor was omitted.
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It was not just Deuchars who was ignored. As well as the figures on the organ case, Percy Portsmouth, Head of Sculpture at Edinburgh College of Art, modelled the bas relief panels of the Seven Acts of Mercy on the reredos which stretches across the entire east wall of the choir. It would appear that Deuchars, subcontracting from Hayes, made sketch models for these panels, but, despite his expectation that ‘he will also work out the “acts of mercy”’, for some reason he was not asked to do the final version. However, from the style of the modelling, it seems that he was given eight small figures, ‘On the two terminal and six dividing pilasters - set, as it were, to guard the Sacred Acts - are little angels, each holding a shield and a flower.’

Neither the contribution of Deuchars nor Portsmouth was acknowledged in The Glasgow Herald article, which lauded Lorimer as ‘an able organiser of corporate craftsmanship’ and went on,

It would be unjust to leave unnamed the zealous, highly skilled brothers Clow, and the twenty or more carvers who work with them, to whose interpretative renderings the designs of the architect owe incalculably much.

The Clows were undoubtedly extremely talented, especially in the way they faithfully reproduced in oak the sculptors’ plaster models. It is to the brothers’ credit that the different modelling styles can be clearly distinguished, but the figures and animals were always carved from maquettes. The reason for omitting the creative role of the sculptors in the press report is unknown.

All the woodwork was in place in time for the visit of the King and Queen to the cathedral on 11 July 1914. As in the Thistle Chapel, Lorimer was able to explain his work to their majesties and preserved in his collection of photographs is one ‘showing position of pendant Angels for new Choir Stalls’. A section of the stalls complete with all the carving including two animal arm rests and two pendant angels suspended from the canopy had been put together and set against the wall, illustrating the meticulous preparatory work which went into such commissions. On the reverse of the sepia print Lorimer wrote, ‘This is the photo which Queen Mary held when she visited Dunblane’.
Obviously, Lorimer preferred being in total control of a building and its contents, as with St. Peter’s Church in Morningside, Edinburgh. André Raffalovich, a wealthy Russian Jew, who had converted to Catholicism, provided a large part of the funding for the church where his friend, Father (later Canon) John Gray, was the first incumbent. The original building of the larger part of what exists today took place over the period from 1906 to 1907, but interior and exterior decoration took place over the following years, as and when funds became available. In the 1890’s, before taking holy orders, Father Gray (and Raffalovich) had moved in the literary and artistic circles of Oscar Wilde and Aubrey Beardsley. When Raffalovich moved to Whitehouse Terrace in Edinburgh, he continued to host salons, inviting artists and sculptors as well as authors. (Lorimer was asked to one in 1914 at which Eric Gill was present on the recommendation of D.Y. Cameron.)24 This provided Father Gray with a background which ensured that he took an active part in the design process of St. Peter’s. In July 1905, Gray wrote to Raffalovich,

> It will be well to have a secret reserve as it is no use taking the estimate à la lettre and we shall want something for luxuries, church chairs, road making and draining, pictures, statues, inscriptions and endless things. If we build up to the last penny of our cash and credit we shan’t be able to have two kinds of jam at breakfast.25

Certainly some kind of funding was available to add to the initial sculpture, which included a Crucifixion by Joseph Hayes on the gable of the Sanctuary and the wooden version which used to hang inside from the sanctuary arch.26 In September 1910 Father Gray wrote to Lorimer, ‘I have been offered a figure of St. Joseph for the niche on the house. Would you make a sketch to be carried out by Hayes.’27 However, before that commission was executed, it seems that a large high relief panel of the Annunciation was placed on the exterior wall of the church opposite the gate into the courtyard formed by the priest’s house, the church and the school hall (Cat. 69, Pl. 124). In February 1912, Hayes submitted the account for ‘carving and supplying the model of panel, “the Annunciation of Our Lady”’, but the model was by Louis Deuchars, according to a letter to the Editor of The Strathearn Herald in 1913.28 Father Gray wrote to Lorimer in December 1911 that
he would, ‘take the opportunity to see the sketch at Hayes’.29 Although subsequently Canon Gray
told Hayes’s daughter that the panel was by Deuchars, he omitted to give specific attribution for
any of the external stone sculpture in his book, St Peter’s, Edinburgh.30

Probably because of his success with the Annunciation, Deuchars went on to model the figure of
St. Joseph and the infant Christ for the niche which may have been originally reserved for ‘the
Blessed Virgin’ (Cat. 70, Pl. 125).31 The identity of the sponsor is not known, but it was probably
Raffalovich.32 So successful was Deuchars’s sensitive portrayal of the old man with the young
child that the plaster of ‘St Joseph’ was sent from the Dean Studio to the Society of Scottish Artists
Exhibition in 1912.33 Although both of these pieces were technically applied sculpture, they were,
nevertheless, considerable commissions, which should have enhanced Deuchars’s reputation. Other
pieces of sculpture on the exterior of St. Peter’s, dating from the early years, include an angel and
the Immaculate Lamb (Pl. 126 & Pl. 127).34 There is no record of the modeller, but they are
stylistically similar to Deuchars’s work.

As with Dunblane Cathedral, Lorimer was asked to ‘update’ Rowand Anderson’s work in St.
John’s church, Alloa, which had originally been opened in 1869. By the start of the twentieth
century, it would appear that Lorimer, (perhaps because of his family connection with the Earl of
Mar & Kellie, a prominent member of St. John’s) rather than the original architect, had been asked
to design a Boer War Memorial for the church.35 The church had many wealthy patrons and the
wrought iron rood screen by Thomas Hadden was given in memory of a member of the Younger
brewing family. Around the same time oak choir stalls were installed in memory of a previous
Rector. Both have small silver inscription panels with Phoebe Traquair panels in the top left-hand
corners.36 Towards the end of 1912, the earl approached Lorimer, saying that a member of the
church “of means” wished to support the “refurbishment” of St. John’s, specifically the chancel
roof and organ case.37 This person proved to be Mrs Annie Younger, sister-in-law of Sir George
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Younger. Documentary evidence is scarce, but it would appear that Lorimer was asked by the Earl of Mar & Kellie to attend at the church at the end of 1912. In the event, Lorimer was ill and did not visit until January 1913. The plans were approved in mid April, after Mrs Younger was able to view a model of the proposed chancel ceiling decoration in situ on the north side of the roof. She had reservations about the original design incorporating 106 bosses and 40 half bosses, but the work went ahead. Those involved were Nathaniel Grieve, William and Alexander Clow, and Moxon & Carfrae. The carved and decorated pointed wagon roof, which was installed over Rowand Anderson’s painted ‘choir of angels and the emblems of the passion’, is richly panelled with gilded mouldings demarcating the edges and diagonals of the panels and gilded decorative bosses at all the intersections (Cat. 71, Pl. 128). From the style of the modelling of the high relief angels in the ceilure over the communion rail and the other coloured bosses in the apex of the roof between the ceilure and the east gable wall, it appears that Deuchars was responsible (Pl. 129 & Pl. 130).

Mrs Younger also provided a new organ case in limed oak at St. John’s. Presumably, once again, Rowand Anderson’s work would have been removed. As a result, when viewed from the north aisle, the back of “the organ cutting across the rose window was an eyesore” according to the Earl of Mar & Kellie. Mrs Younger would have preferred to conceal it by the addition of some extra organ pipes, functioning if possible, rather than sham ones and was averse to the “grille” suggested by Lord Mar. However, when the pipes proved impracticable, she was persuaded that a plain vestry screen (not gilded, so that it would not compete with the chancel screen) be erected at the east end of the north aisle, with carved openings to let the sound out. This is the panelling now supporting the church’s 1914-18 War Memorial (Pl. 131). The woodwork was also by Nathaniel Grieve with the Clows carrying out the more specialist carving. The design of the organ case is similar to the treatment at Dunblane, but simpler, with the three columns of organ pipes framed by two broad vertical panels of carved gothic tracery. The top of the case terminates in five steps.
in Dunblane, horizontal separation is achieved by similarly carved spandrels, with four bas relief angles, whose modelling bears all the hallmarks of Deuchars’s hand (Pl. 132).

In 1920-1 the Crucifix and list of names of those killed in the First World War were added to the existing vestry screen in St. John’s, by substituting the name panels for existing ones.46 (Pl. 131) The figure of Christ seems to have been carved from the same model as that made by Deuchars for Lorimer in St. James the Great church in Cupar (where the figure is plain oak) (Pl. 211). Support for this theory comes from an estimate submitted by Scott Morton which refers to ‘carving including figure to model’.47 As there is no reference to a fee for the modelling, it would appear that the existing one by Deuchars was used. The emblems of the Apostles, are also stylistically similar to Deuchars’s modelling.

From all the decoration in the Thistle Chapel it would appear that two devices, namely the pediment in bas relief consisting of two kneeling angels supporting a crowned shield, and the pendant angels, became veritable “trademarks” of Lorimer’s work. They appear again and again in the commissions for carved oak church fittings. From the style of the figures, many are obviously based on Deuchars’s lively modelling, but whether he was actually asked to produce models each time or whether the Clows merely adapted existing ones is not known. Both devices were incorporated into the oak Chancel Screen commissioned in 1912 by Mrs Todd, in memory of her husband, John, for the Church of the Good Shepherd, Murrayfield, Edinburgh, a building originally designed by Lorimer (Cat. 72, Pl. 133 & Pl. 134). An examination of the surviving paperwork demonstrates how Lorimer got competing quotes from the Clow brothers and Thomas Good, another Edinburgh carver, who was usually cheaper. It appears he then persuaded the Clows to reduce their prices and gave the work to them.48 Mrs Todd had originally enquired if the screen could be provided for £100 and this was the amount paid to Nathaniel Grieve, the main contractor.49 However, on top of that, she had to pay Lorimer’s fee of twelve guineas.50
Nevertheless, the result was a satisfied client, who 'says that she and her family are delighted with the Screen and the beauty of the Carving.'

Since Lorimer had been appointed architect to St. Giles Cathedral, it was no surprise that he was able to pick up other decorative commissions for the building, on the strength of his Thistle Chapel work. In 1912, Nathaniel Grieve submitted his account for a new Communion Table, including 'Modeller supplying models of figures, etc.' The limed oak table, now standing close by the Thistle Chapel, (and, appropriately, in front of the unassuming memorial panel to Lorimer himself) has carving apparently modelled by Deuchars (Cat. 73, Pl. 135). There are four angels holding shields (Pl. 136), a large Agnus Dei, the symbols of the Evangelists and, at the rear, St Giles with his hind (Pl. 137). (The table was extended in 1953, probably by Scott Morton & Co., by empty niches on either side of the outer two angels so that the Honours of Scotland could be laid out for the Coronation) (Pl. 135).

In 1913, Lorimer designed a ceremonial chair for the Moderator to mark the office of Rev. Dr. Wallace Williamson in 1913 - 14. The minister expressed the opinion that the chair should not have a canopy for fear of competing with the Royal Pews, but proposed a moulding instead with 'little carved shield with the emblems'. The high-backed oak chair (and its matching prie dieu) has linenfold panels carved on the lower surfaces, while the back has three panels of gothic tracery with polychromed bas relief demi-angels stylistically similar to Deuchars's modelling (Cat. 73, Pl. 138). (Since the chair was originally made, a further panel of tracery, with two kneeling bas relief demi-angels holding a shield featuring the Burning Bush under a coronet has been added to the top rail of the back, but this was probably modelled and carved by Robert Young, foreman wood-carver at Scott Morton & Co.)

Lorimer seemed to be quite happy with Deuchars's individualistic style complementing his designs.
for church furnishings. Although Joseph Hayes’s modelling was extremely competent, it lacked the liveliness and charm which Deuchars seemed able to produce time after time (Pl. 139). Hayes would have had little choice but to accept the loss of the modelling contracts, although it appears that he continued to enjoy Lorimer’s patronage for stone carving.
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MEMORIALS AND SECULAR WORK IN THE DEAN STUDIO

Not only did Lorimer design churches and their furnishings, but he was also responsible for a number of memorials, often for the interior of churches. Joseph Hayes provided the estimate for 'a brass to the memory of the late Bishop Dowden, which is to be inserted into the floor of the Sanctuary of St. Mary's Cathedral', but it was Deuchars who actually modelled the bas relief full-length figure (Cat. 74, Pl. 140). After the inauguration of the memorial, set in a panel of Hoptonwood marble, on 27 October 1911, Dean Skinner Wilson was reported to have said 'It was a beautiful brass, and had been designed and executed in the city; a great achievement of what they might call Scottish art.' (Pl. 141) Despite these favourable comments, the model was rejected by the selection committee for the Royal Scottish Academy when it was submitted for the Summer Exhibition in 1914, 'chiefly owing to the objections of P. MacGillivray I believe (wrote Deuchars to Lorimer) - who said it was "a caricature" but I feel I can afford to ignore his criticism, but why is a man like this allowed to dominate the Academy!' Although Deuchars was naturally biased after Macgillivray's termination of his assistantship in his early days in Edinburgh, discussed in Chapter 8, it does appear that the established sculptor was engaged in some sort of continuing campaign against the incomer. The bitter tone of the letter may also owe something to Deuchars's unsuccessful nomination for Associateship of the Royal Scottish Academy earlier in 1914. One of the other two equally unsuccessful sculptor nominees was Kellock Brown, who was teaching at the Glasgow School of Art when Deuchars was there. That Deuchars had been proposed by Robert Gemmell Hutchison, the painter and seconded by William Grant Stevenson, the sculptor, demonstrated that he had some friends at the Academy.

Following Deuchars's success with Bishop Dowden, Lorimer asked him to do another three bronze bas relief panels. Also located in St. Mary's Episcopal Cathedral, Edinburgh, the first one, on the outer wall of the Lady Chapel, is a memorial to John Fitzstephen Keating, a previous Rector, executed in 1912 (Cat. 75, Pl. 142).
St. Giles' Cathedral houses the second panel, in memory of Sophia Jex-Blake, (Cat. 76, Pl. 143). The Managing Board of the cathedral approved the request by her brother (retired Dean of Wells) to place a small memorial brass in the building and Lorimer was asked to propose a design in March, 1912. For some reason, Lorimer proposed a stained-glass window, which was sharply turned down by the Reverend Jex-Blake, who went on to set a limit of £25 and requested a simple design with no allegorical figures and 'certainly no coat of arms'. He suggested the inscription 'Sacred to the memory of Sophia Louisa Jex-Blake M.D. By whose energy courage self-sacrifice and perseverance the science of medicine and the art of healing were opened to women B. Jan. 21. 1840. D. Jan. 10. 1912'. Lorimer sent a very rough sketch showing an angel lifting a figure 'out of the deep' in a hemisphere above a rectangle containing the inscription and 'arms in a lozenge'. Reverend Jex-Blake thought it 'very good indeed' but 'I do not think the youngest daughter of a youngest son - a landless lady - really needs a coat of arms'. Sir Charles Dalrymple (who had 'acted in a small way as a go-between with the Cathedral Board at St. Giles', in reference to my venerable friend' and who had met Lorimer socially) had to intervene on behalf of the aged cleric to reinforce this instruction. Lorimer went on to refine the design and quote a price of twenty four or twenty five pounds, both to the liking of Reverend Jex-Blake. The drawing was submitted to the Managing Board in March 1912, but it appears it was not considered until October 1912, when the Secretary wrote to Lorimer, 'The Board while approving generally of the design could not see their way to accept the proposed inscription in its entirety, and they also did not approve the style of lettering proposed.' In the intervening period, the Reverend Jex-Blake tried repeatedly to obtain information from Lorimer, aided again by the Honourable Sir Charles Dalrymple, but to no avail. It appears that the delay was caused by William Hole, artistic adviser to the cathedral. He opined, 'the claim made in the inscription...is not altogether justified by the facts'. By this time the panel had been cast, but the Secretary had no option but to support Hole and pointed out to Lorimer that 'it will be well in future not to have any work which is under the jurisdiction of the Board proceeded with until it has been expressly approved of and sanctioned'. The resolution was the
insertion of the words ‘in Scotland’ at the end of the inscription with the result, presumably, that the panel had to be remodelled and recast. In January of 1913 Deuchars was reported to have ‘in hand a memorial to the late Mrs Fox (sic) Blake, the first lady doctor’ (Pl. 143). At last, Rev. Jex-Blake was able to send twenty pounds to Charles Henshaw and four guineas to Lorimer, all within his original budget. So, it appears that the architect must have had to pay for the reworking of the memorial.

Lorimer was able to indulge his penchant for a coat of arms in the third bronze panel modelled by Deuchars in this period. Early in 1912, the widow of William Playfair, a London doctor, began a correspondence with Lorimer regarding a memorial to her late husband to be placed in Holy Trinity Church in St. Andrews. (The Playfair family had connections with the town and Lorimer had designed other memorials for them.) Mrs Playfair hesitated about going ahead on grounds of cost, but relented and, on 14 March 1912, Charles Henshaw acknowledged the acceptance of the estimate, adding, ‘I will get the Model put in hands at once’ (Cat. 77). It would appear that the task was entrusted to Deuchars. Mrs Playfair wrote to Lorimer in November that she was pleased the panel was nearing completion and added, ‘I will go to the Arts & Crafts (Exhibition)’. Presumably Lorimer had told her that the Thistle Chapel lamp and Dunblane pendant angels by Deuchars were on show in London. She wrote to him in January 1913 that she was glad the tablet was up and was coming to see it. There is no record of what she thought of the finished memorial, but contemporary comment was that ‘Mr Deuchars has been very successful in the angel figures’ (Pl. 144 & Pl. 144a).

The reputation gained from the work in the Thistle Chapel resulted in another commission. In November 1910, in Carnbee Church, close to Kellie Castle, a memorial was being considered as a tribute to their recently deceased long-serving organist. The minister wrote to Lorimer,

Lady im Thum has written to me about the man working at the Thistle Chapel and conveying your suggestion that he should be asked to model something as a
memorial to Miss Fairweather....The more inexpensive (substituted for 'cheaper')
the memorial is - consistent with good taste - the better; we shall not be able to
raise a large sum....You know the church and we are confident that what is
modelled will be in all respects suitable. If we could have a sketch of what is
proposed and an estimate of the probable cost they would be of much service.23

Lady im Thurn, wife of Sir Everard, was Hannah, one of Lorimer’s sisters. The architect replied to
the minister’s letter, offering to design the memorial, waiving his fee and contributing one pound to
the fund. The minister thought that the congregation should be able to raise twelve pounds or even
a little more and added,

Lady im Thurn’s idea of it being in oak with a little colour seems a very good one.
We leave it, however, with confidence in your hands.24

In his next letter, the minister returned Lorimer’s very rudimentary sketch, with the comment that
he liked it very much and ‘as...desired’ had not shown it to anyone. The inscription and a suitable
text was agreed.25 The resulting rectangular limed oak panel lacks the colour suggested, possibly
on cost grounds, but the general design is close to Lorimer’s drawing (Cat. 77, Pl. 145). Three of
Deuchars’s demi-angels, as lively as those admired in the Thistle Chapel, were incorporated. The
panel was shown in the Architectural Section of the Royal Scottish Academy Summer Exhibition in
1911, when the catalogue entry was under Lorimer’s name and included the Clows as the carvers,
but made no reference to Deuchars’s modelling (Pl. 145a).26

Towards the end of 1911, a patron of St. John’s Episcopal Church in Selkirk, Mrs Scott-Plummer
of Sunderland Hall, provided funds for Lorimer to design an oak lectern, taking the form of the
Pelican in her Piety, in memory of her husband (Cat. 79, Pl. 146). As the bird and its young bear
strong similarities to the small version modelled by Deuchars for the Thistle Chapel bronze light
fitting (Pl. 98), it seems reasonable to assume that he was also responsible for the Pelican on the
lectern, which emanated from ‘Mr Hayes Studio’ at the Dean Studio.27

No commission was too small for Lorimer. Early in 1911, R.W. MacKenzie, for whom he had
refurbished Earlshall near Leuchars, asked him to design a Seal for the Shetland Pony Stud Book
Joseph Hayes estimated £4 for a nine inch model and Lorimer wrote back accepting this offer,

I enclose two illustrations of Shetland Ponies which Mr. Mackenzie (sic) has sent me.

In working out the design, I think a cross between my drawing shown on the envelope, and Mr. Mackenzie’s sketch that I have marked, could be adopted, but you will see this better when you get it roughed out.

I think who ever (sic) is to make the model ought to look at the collection of Casts from Italian models that there is in the corridor of the College.28

This appears to hint at a modeller other than Hayes and, from the original, naturalistic approach, especially as adopted in the ponies, and Deuchars’s recognised skill with bas relief, it seems reasonable to assume that he was the modeller (Fig. 17). Alex. Kirkwood & Son reduced the model to two and a half inches diameter and produced the intaglio seal die which is still used by the Society to this day.

Lorimer had been commissioned by his best man, John Holms, a wealthy stockbroker, to create the perfect setting for his art treasures at Formakin estate in Renfrewshire. Work had progressed from the gardens and estate buildings to the Scots Baronial mansion itself in 1910. As he had done at Earlshall, Lorimer introduced monkeys on to the roofs of various outbuildings (by Thomas Beattie and Joseph Hayes) and it was no surprise when these appeared again on the fireplace in the Great Hall, designed to display Holms’s tapestries to best effect. In November 1911, Lorimer wrote to his client, ‘...I came across drawings of the fireplace in the Parliament Hall at Linlithgow Palace which is treated in three bays’.29 Although Holms was at times very demanding of his friend and architect, insisting on his own ideas, it seems that he accepted Lorimer’s suggestion and the red sandstone fireplace was built as outlined in the letter (Pl. 147). A central panel above the fireplace was presumably to have had a coat of arms inserted, but Formakin was never finished, since Holms ran out of money in 1913. However, four stylised monkeys, possibly attributable to Deuchars, surmounting pedimented demi-columns, separating the three bays were carved (Cat. 81, Pl. 147a).
Lorimer designed a similar fireplace for Lennoxlove, where four different animals bearing shields demarcated the three bays and the Hamilton coat of arms was installed above the fire. However, judging by the less lively style, it would appear that Hayes carried out all the modelling himself (Pl. 148).  

Rhu-na-Haven, a granite house by Lorimer at Aboyne, was built between 1907 and 1908, but in 1912, the Library was reworked. Oak panelling was supplied by Scott Morton & Co. and two cartouches, a musical one with Bacchanalian overtones and the other featuring dolphins, both modelled by Deuchars, were added to the two existing fireplaces in Hoptonwood and Verde Antico (Cat. 82, Pl. 149a, Cat. 83, Pl. 150). He showed the maquettes of both panels at the Society of Scottish Artists annual exhibition at the end of 1912, each under the title, 'Model for Carved Panel in marble chimney piece from sketch by Sir Robert Lorimer.' (Pl. 149 & Pl. 151) Lorimer subsequently had second Hoptonwood carvings made from the models for alterations he carried out in the following year to two large houses in Murrayfield. The musical group was for the Kinellan diningroom (Pl. 152) and the dolphins for St. Leonards (Pl. 153), but there is no evidence of the sculptor receiving a second fee.

Dolphins also featured in Lorimer’s treatment of improvements carried out between 1912 and 1913 to an area of central Galashiels. An old corn mill and other buildings were pulled down and there was great debate about what to do with the cleared site. According to The Border Telegraph, ‘it was said at one time that each of the fifteen members of the Council had a pet scheme of his own.’ There was a proposal that the mill stream be culverted and a garden laid out, but Lorimer insisted that a feature should be made of the water. A model was prepared by Hayes in conjunction with Scott Morton & Co. and Moxon & Carfrae in June 1912. This must have been accepted and Lorimer went on to create what could have been one of the first traffic roundabouts in the country, with paved areas on either side of the stream. The two water basins, octagonal and round are
surrounded by a low wall pierced in part by balustrades (Cat. 84, Pl. 154). At the time, the stream was used by other mills downstream, so that the flow between the two basins was punctuated by little waterfalls and a sluice. To add interest to the scheme, in the octagonal basin, Lorimer placed a tall feature, modelled and carved in stone by Thomas Beattie.35 Joseph Hayes estimated for other pieces of sculpture which can only be seen by leaning over the low wall. Two figures of boys astride dolphins are placed on large demi-columns on either side of the circular basin. Originally, water diverted upstream, flowed out of the dolphins’ mouths, but this part of the scheme no longer functions. Before the official opening of the square in June 1913, The Border Telegraph reported that ‘the figures have been executed by Mr Hayes’.36 However, the strong modelling of the figure and dolphin on the north side is unmistakably by Louis Deuchars (Pl. 155).

Early in 1912 Lorimer received a commission for a memorial in South Leith Parish Church to the late Dr James Mitchell, who had been the minister there for forty years until 1903. During that period he had been instrumental in setting up a soup kitchen and a clothing society to help alleviate some of the grinding poverty among the dock workers of his parish, which led to him founding the Leith Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor. He had also been actively involved in Leith Hospital Board, the Leith School of Science and Art and other areas of public life.37 It is little wonder, then, that the architect of the Thistle Chapel was selected to create a memorial to such ‘a phenomenon’.38 In March 1912, Lorimer attended a meeting of the Memorial Committee, where he submitted estimates and left them with a drawing, photographs and patterns of some material.39 This original plan involved moving a door, but John Warrack, wrote to him that this had not found favour with the members and he was asked to present a revised proposal. Warrack also wrote, ‘I should mention that some of the Committee had heard suggestions that the figure of Charity might be construed as an image, and as it seems Jacob Primmer is a member of the Church they want to be careful that it cannot be taken for a saint.’40 Lorimer prepared another drawing and it was
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‘placed in situ in the church...so that all interested might have an opportunity of inspecting it.’

Joseph Hayes submitted an estimate of £291, including £110 for Allans ‘for supplying the material, masonwork and erecting’ (to which Lorimer added £40 for his fee), on 2 May 1912. Warrack’s earlier concern was followed up in June by the minister’s.

The debate in the General Assembly on the St. Cuthbert Font must have reminded you of my anxiety that the allegorical figure of Charity in the Mitchell Memorial should have nothing whatever about it suggesting of a Madonna and Child. I am depending on you therefore to have an original design, which will be quite free from anything that suggests Romanism. It is simply my desire 1. to remain true to the Reformed Faith and 2. to maintain peace here that prompts me to send you this little reminder.

Obviously the Church of Scotland was still extremely touchy about what Primmer might do. However, Lorimer’s revised design must have met with approval and work began. The minister enquired in July if it might be finished by October and asked if any friends of the late Dr Mitchell were required to see the portrait medallion while it was being executed. In October a number of photographs of the deceased were sent for the benefit of the sculptor. By the beginning of the following year, all was ready to be erected in the church.

The impressive memorial, featuring Deuchars’s unmistakable modelling, on the wall of the south aisle was unveiled on 2 February 1913 by Dr Wallace Williamson (Cat. 85, Pl. 157). The relief group in the niche in the upper panel, entitled ‘Charity’, about which the Presbyterians were so concerned, consists of a female figure, holding a baby, while two other toddlers cling to either side of her dress (Pl. 157a). With the three naturalistically modelled children, there could be no claim that the composition was a representation of the Madonna and Child, nor a saint. Apparently, Deuchars did all the figures and the bas relief portrait of the good doctor, although the claim that ‘it is expected that this will be the most impressive and artistic monument in Edinburgh’ was somewhat exaggerated. Lorimer had to be reminded to return the photographs ‘which were sent to the sculptor’.
While Deuchars probably preferred these grand pieces, it seems that he could turn out effortlessly the small demi-angels much used by Lorimer in his ecclesiastical commissions. Despite the large number of them, no two are the same. A particularly charming one was subsequently carved in oak in 1913 for a memorial to 'the Revd. Robert Paul' a past minister of Dollar Free Church.\(^{50}\) Another panel showing signs of Deuchars's bas relief modelling is a carved oak panel in Caputh Church, near Dunkeld, to Mary Caroline Graham Murray, who was the daughter of Lord and Lady Dunedin of Stenton (Cat. 86, Pl. 158). As the family was friendly with Lorimer, it was natural that her sister asked him to design a suitable testament. The main contractor was Nathaniel Grieve who estimated in July 1913, based on a very rudimentary sketch by Lorimer.\(^{51}\) Lord Dunedin wanted gold, only on the lettering, but his daughter won the argument and Moxon & Carfrae were employed to colour and gild other parts too.\(^{52}\) Lorimer appears to have incorporated several of the design elements developed in the Thistle Chapel within this relatively small panel. So skilful was the craftsmanship that the whole extremely decorative memorial still positively sings on the north wall of the modest parish church in Perthshire (Pl. 158).

As well as exhibiting works he had done for Lorimer, Deuchars also sent, using Dean Studio as his address, some of his own pieces to the galleries. In 1911, in the Society of Scottish Artists Exhibition he had 'The late G.F. Watts, R.A. (statuette) modelled from life at Limnerslease 1898 (Property of Mrs Alex Whyte)' (Cat. 87).\(^{53}\) This must have been a casting of one of the versions of the statuette, but in this case, the interest lies in the owner. Dr Alex Whyte, Principal of New College, minister of St George's Free Church in Shandwick Place, Edinburgh, and his wife, Jane Barbour, were close friends of Phoebe Traquair (who may originally have been instrumental in bringing Deuchars to the attention of Lorimer).\(^{54}\) The Whytes were also friendly with Mrs Haldane of Cloanden, Auchterarder, whose bas relief portrait (Cat. 6, Pl. 1) was modelled by Deuchars at the start of his career, discussed in chapter 2.\(^{55}\) Either connection could have brought him to the attention of the Whytes. The statuette had obviously been purchased from him prior to the
exhibition, yet Mrs Whyte allowed him to show it. *The Scotsman* reported, 'Some fine heads and statuettes in bronze, marble and plaster are contributed by......Mr Louis R. Deuchars.' The following year he sent to the Glasgow exhibition of the Royal Scottish Society of Painters in Watercolour, 'The Rev. Alexander Whyte D.D. (bronze) (£50)', which could well have been commissioned by Mrs Whyte after she had purchased the Watts statuette (Cat. 88). Earlier that year in the Royal Scottish Academy Summer Exhibition, Deuchars showed 'The Dawn (coloured plaster) £15' (Cat. 89) and 'Orpheus & Euridice (coloured plaster), £25 plaster, £50 Bronze' (Cat. 90). Obviously Pittendrigh Macgillivray did not succeed in vetoing these works, but there is no record of a sale.

In 1913, also in the Royal Scottish Academy, Deuchars showed one of his bronze bas relief portraits, created posthumously from a photograph, in this case, of John Warrack, who had made his money in ship-building in Leith and had been an elder of Pilrig Church (Cat. 91, Pl. 159). Grace Warrack, his daughter, who commissioned it, was another friend of Phoebe Traquair. Her brother was also John Warrack, who had also been involved in the Mitchell memorial for South Leith Parish Church (discussed earlier). Either of these connections could have resulted in Deuchars coming to the attention of Grace Warrack. Perhaps she had seen the portrait medallion of Dr Mitchell being worked on in the Dean Studio.

It would appear that Deuchars was quite at home there in the artistic milieu, where the arrangement of subcontracting modelling for Lorimer via Joseph Hayes provided a reasonably secure income, while still allowing him to produce works of his own. When he sold something from an exhibition, he would return to the family home with a bundle of white Bank of England five pound notes, which were spread out on the dining table for all the family to see. Then there would be food and drink a plenty. Somewhere between his strict temperance upbringing and subsequent life as a practising sculptor, he gained a taste for French brandy. It is not known if his father, Andrew, ever
knew that his son had fallen under the spell of ‘the demon drink’, but Kathleen Deuchars used to say that Louis did his best work after a few glasses of brandy.61

---

2 ‘Memorial to the late Bishop Dowden’ The Scotsman, 28 October 1911.
3 Letter from Deuchars to Lorimer, May 1914. GEN 1963/53. U.L.P.
4 Royal Scottish Academy. List of Nominations. 1914.
5 ‘Letters to the Editor, A Noted Artist - A Native of Comrie’, Strathearn Herald, 11 January 1913.
8 Letter from Rev. Jex-Blake to Lorimer, 10 March 1912. GEN 1963/44/51. U.L.P.
9 Lorimer’s rough sketch. GEN 1963/44/67. U.L.P.
10 Letter from Rev. Jex-Blake, 10 March 1912.
11 Letter from Dalrymple to Lorimer, 12 March 1912. GEN 1963/44/52. U.L.P.
13 Letters from J.A.S. Millar to Lorimer, W.S., Secretary to St. Giles Cathedral Managing Board, 27 March 1912. GEN 1963/44/54. U.L.P. Also, 23 October 1912. P.C.
15 Letter from Hole to Lorimer, 6 January 1913. GEN 1963/44/62. U.L.P.
16 Letter from Millar to Lorimer, 7 January 1913. GEN 1963/44/63. U.L.P.
17 ‘Letters to the Editor, A Noted Artist - A Native of Comrie’, Strathearn Herald, 11 January 1913.
21 Letter from Mrs Playfair, 21 November 1912. GEN 1963/44/203. U.L.P.
26 ‘Memorial Panel to Miss Fairweather for Carnbee Church, Fife, (carved by W. & A. Clow, Esq.)’ Edinburgh, Royal Scottish Academy Summer Exhibition Catalogue, 1911. Cat.no. 472.
30 ‘Modelling: - Time of self...’ Copy Estimate from Hayes, 8 August 1912. GEN 1963/18/262. L.P.
34 Hayes’s Account, June 1912. GEN 1963/15/230. L.P.
35 Beattie’s estimate, 4 January 1913. GEN 1963/15/225. Also, Beattie’s letter to Lorimer. GEN 1963/15/221. L.P.
36 The Border Telegraph, 27 May 1913.
38 Ibid., p.185.
39 Lorimer’s memo. 18 March 1912. GEN 1963/44/22. U.L.P.
Letter from Warrack to Lorimer, 1 April 1912. GEN 1963/44/23. U.L.P.

Letter from D. McLeod, South Leith Parish Church, to Lorimer, 2 May 1912. GEN 1963/44/25. U.L.P.


Letter from D. McLeod, South Leith Parish Church, to Lorimer, 2 May 1912. GEN 1963/44/25. U.L.P.


Letter from Joseph Hayes to Lorimer, 6 January 1913. GEN 1963/44/33. U.L.P.

Marshall, op.cit., p.197.

A Noted Artist - A Native of Comrie', 'Letters to the Editor', The Strathearn Herald, 11 January 1913.

Letter from Robertson to Lorimer, 24 February 1913. GEN 1963/44/37. L.P.

Grieve’s estimate, 15 April 1913, GEN 1963/4/363. Also, Grieve’s copy account, GEN 1963/4/366. L.P. Photograph of memorial in collection of Lorimer photographs, 1990/54. RCAHMS, NMRS. The church has been converted to housing and the whereabouts of the memorial is unknown.

Grieve’s estimate, 31 July 1913. GEN 1963/33/142. Lorimer’s sketch. GEN 1963/33/138. L.P.

Letter from Lord Dunedin to Lorimer, 6 August 1914. GEN 1963/33/144. Letter from Miss Graham Murray to Lorimer, 17 August 1914. GEN 1963/33/145. L.P.

Edinburgh, Society of Scottish Artists Exhibition Catalogue, 1911. Cat.no. 299.

Cumming, Elizabeth, Phoebe Anna Traquair (Edinburgh 1993) p.21.


'Society of Scottish Artists Exhibition', The Scotsman, 29 September 1911.

Glasgow, Royal Scottish Society of Painters in Watercolour Exhibition Catalogue, 1912. Cat.no. 256.

Edinburgh, Royal Scottish Academy Summer Exhibition Catalogue, 1912. Cat.nos. 642, 674.

'The late Mr John Warrack prop. of Miss Grace Warrack', Edinburgh, Royal Scottish Academy Summer Exhibition Catalogue, 1913. Cat.no. 694.

Cumming, op.cit, p.33.

Reminiscences of Margaret Deuchars (second daughter).
CHAPTER 12

THE GREAT WAR AND LORIMER'S GRAND HOUSES

By 1914 Deuchars and his growing family had moved from 13 to 7 Caledonian Place, Edinburgh, a maindoor flat with more accommodation. There his third son and fifth child, Andrew Baillie (whom Louis named after his own father, in failing health by that time), was born in April. Up to and including 1913, it appears that Deuchars was happy to work for Lorimer on the basis of subcontracting from Joseph Hayes. However, in May of 1914 there is evidence that Lorimer had contacted him directly. Deuchars replied, 'I shall be pleased to model the angel figures you wrote of and shall be delighted to call and see the drawing and design should you care to name the hour.' He also took the opportunity to try to interest Lorimer in a painting 'a picture in oils of woodland bogs - a small work decorative in colour scheme - which I should like you to see - if you care to see it. I shall be pleased to submit it if you could make use of it - but sent back to me also from the Academy.' It is probable that Lorimer declined this opportunity, but Deuchars did go on to work on the angels which appear to have been models for woodcarvings in the Music Room in Marchmont. At the same time it seems that he was also doing work for Midfield in Midlothian. It is not known why Lorimer chose to approach Deuchars without going through Hayes, but it may have been because Hayes had other work on at the time. In 1915, Hayes, despite being beyond the age of military service and having a family to support, volunteered to serve in the Great War and sadly, was killed in the Battle of the Somme in 1916, causing his business, which had been kept going by his men, to be given up.²

In 1913 Robert McEwen, had bought Marchmont, an eighteenth-century country house in Berwickshire, built to Thomas Gibson's design, although Lord Polwarth, later second Earl of Marchmont, had had plans drawn up by William Adam.³ McEwen was already the owner of an Ayrshire house, Bardrochat, which Lorimer had extended eight years previously. Therefore it is not surprising that in November 1913 he asked Lorimer to 'modernise' his new home. The work went on from 1914 until 1920. Although this covers the period of the war, there is no record of any problems in obtaining materials for this job. Lorimer increased the size of upper floor windows,
added another storey to the house, moved the entrance down to the ground floor and remodelled the wings. The interiors probably designed by, but executed after, the death of William Adam were left largely untouched, but some of Beattie’s and Wilson’s plasterwork had to blend in with the original. Since McEwen’s two main interests were hunting and music, Lorimer attempted to incorporate both into the new parts of the house. Deuchars’s involvement was the Orpheus cartouche in the dining-room chimneypiece, another in the boudoir and, in the music room created in one of the wings, the Orpheus fireback and the modelling of the putti and fauns, subsequently carved by the Clows.

It appears that Deuchars started on the dining-room panel before ‘the angels’. In May 1914, intending to use a suitable quotation over the door to the music room, Lorimer received some lines from John Warrack, who wrote, jokingly, that he hoped they were from Ovid and not written by himself.

He was said to make the woods and rocks follow him, To tame the wild beasts, to make the rivers linger in their courses With his voice, and with his singing to hold back even the wandering birds.

Warrack commented that, as they were too good for his own work, they must be by Ovid.4

Deuchars could well have been guided by this quotation in his high relief modelling of the cartouche of Orpheus, whom he placed sitting astride a tree trunk in a rather exotic forest, surrounded by all manner of birds and beasts (Cat. 92, Pl. 160). The panel was subsequently carved in Hoptonwood marble by Allan & Sons (Pl. 161).5 Deuchars must have finished modelling by 17 February 1915, for he requested Lorimer to ‘kindly give me an order on Allan for the balance of the ‘Orpheus’ panel’. In the same letter he stated that he had ‘got a place fixed up at Grieve’s and got to work. I would like you to come Friday morning if you can manage - kindly ring up what hour’.6 In a list of expenses, one and sixpence was the cost of the taxi for ‘Sir Robert inspecting Deuchars models at Grieve’s’.7 Deuchars did not use the Dean Studio for the work for Marchmont, as he had to work
closely with the joiners at Nathaniel Grieve's for both the chimneypiece panel and the figures for the music room. Grieve's accounts over more than two years document the work involved from the original 'clearing out space in Workshops for Modeller and erecting stand, etc. for him', through the constant adjustments to the models and their fixings, to the final movement of the plaster cast of the Orpheus panel to the painter in June 1917. A total rent of three pounds was charged for Deuchars's use of the space at Grieve's, which was very close to his flat.

In the boudoir there is another panel carved in Hoptonwood (Cat. 93, Pl. 162), obviously modelled by Deuchars, and carved from a maquette probably prepared for the identical one in the drawing room at Midfield, Midlothian, another large house refurbishment on which Lorimer was working at the same time, discussed below (Pl. 174). Lorimer's letter to Deuchars in April 1915 told him, 'Regarding payment for the work you are doing, you can be paid for the Midfield drawing room panel whenever it is done.' Both circular cartouches are set in rose and Hoptonwood marble fireplaces, which are themselves slightly different in design. This is yet another example of Lorimer using the same model in two different houses.

On 12 March 1915, Deuchars's father, Andrew, died. Louis went to Comrie for the funeral and was later reprimanded by his financially hard-pressed wife for returning with only his father's large scrapbook of cuttings as his share of the household contents. The obituary notice in The Strathearn Herald mentioned that he left 'three sons one of whom is Mr Louis R. Deuchars, a pupil of the late G.F. Watts, R.A.' Deuchars sent the cutting to Lorimer, who replied that he 'was greatly interested to read the account of your father who must have been a charming and interesting character.' Dropping a heavy hint, he went on, 'I was also interested to see that he was a strong advocate of temperance.' In the same letter Lorimer referred to 'Marchmont panels....for the woodcarvers they do not need to be highly finished - merely closely roughed in.' Obviously referring to Deuchars's profligacy, he cautioned, 'I cannot too strongly impress upon you the...
necessity of husbanding your resources, especially at a time like the present - when every body (sic) is crying out for work & so very little of it going about. There are a number of things still to do for Marchmont, but times often come when I have no work of this sort to pass round for months. I would like you to try one of the corner pilasters for Marchmont...’ Finally, Lorimer told Deuchars, ‘Mr Deas was here today and was very pleased with your Orpheus model.’

Apparently, Deuchars had been working on the series of angels for the carved frieze in the music room since 8 March 1915 when Watherston & Sons (the main contractors) had advanced him five pounds (Cat. 94). By 12 May, he had completed ‘two boy angels (including sketch model and casting in plaster)’ for ten pounds ‘as agreed’ and the corner group mentioned by Lorimer in his letter, for which Deuchars was paid twelve pounds (Pl. 163). In June, he told Lorimer that

There are now four casts at Grieve’s - three corner pieces and one further piece. I am well on with the remaining corner which you might kindly come and see - about the end of next week, those casts - four - should perhaps be removed as they are not very safe. I suppose the enclosed is in order. May I call regarding same on Saturday first at Watherston’s?

The ‘enclosed’ was his account for ‘Modelling two corner brackets as agreed twelve pounds each - total £24.0.0’ Lorimer had marked ‘Paid £20’. It appears he wrote to Deuchars informing him of this and other payments he could expect. This brought a swift response from Deuchars.

I have your letter of the 15th regarding Marchmont. My note of account referred only to the corner pieces - four of which only were wanted I think and which were more difficult than the sample first pieces. I beg to enclose your letter of the 23rd April shall we agree to what you say there?

In that letter Lorimer had suggested ‘£8 to £10 for the Marchmont panels as there are a lot of them’. In August Deuchars submitted a confused account for ‘Modelling corner piece and casting as agreed - £10 and Modelling cornice piece and casting £18’. Lorimer amended this to twelve pounds for the corner piece and ten pounds for the other. Thereafter he was paid at the rate of ten pounds for the frieze pieces until all six were finished (Pl. 164). Lorimer then requested that Deuchars turn his attention to figures for the top of the organ case and he submitted his account for
the first one on 27 December at a price of seventeen pounds. This was 'reduced to £15 with Mr Deuchars on 'phone' and 'the others (six in all) to be done at the same rate'. When they were completed Deuchars modelled four swags connecting the figures at a cost of fifteen shillings each. Finally, he produced a centre group for thirty pounds, of which he received twenty pounds immediately and Lorimer noted 'cost to be discussed before passing bal. for payment'. Deuchars must have won that battle for he received the remaining ten pounds on 15 June 1916.20

The figures were used to add decorative touches to the plain oak panelling of the double cube music room, although the Clows did not complete the carving until 1919.21 Those modelled first by Deuchars were placed at intervals along the frieze. All the putti are in his unmistakable naturalistic style, some are single figures (Pl. 165), while others are groups of two, reminiscent of his work for Dunblane Cathedral. According to Hussey, 'Messrs. Clow pointed out to me that Lorimer would never allow any repetition or even reversal of patterns', but in fact each frieze piece was used twice.22 Although Lorimer had Deuchars model four corner pieces, only two were actually carved: one was the first piece of 'three boy angels' (Pl. 166) and the other of two figures with a dog. It appears that Lorimer may have originally planned to have the frieze all round the room, but once he found out the technical specification of the organ, he decided to have a grand carved and pierced screen across the whole width of the room with larger figures cavorting along the top of it (Pl. 167). There are three each side of the banks of organ pipes, linked by the swags of flowers. In his 1925 Country Life article about Marchmont, among a number of criticisms, Hussey complained that 'the carved wood figures along the top are charming in themselves, but not quite satisfactorily linked by rather sausage-like swags.'23 In a spirited defence of his work, Lorimer berated Hussey,

A man like myself, who must have been a practising architect, producing work long before you were born, spends several years over the designs and superintending the carrying out of the work for a place like Marchmont; then a young spark like you, who has never been ground through the architectural mill, spends a few hours roaming about the place and taking a few notes, then months after when the whole impression has faded, starts to write up an article and thinks he is in a position to make a reasoned criticism of the character of the work.
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However, in one of the many defensive points he went on to make, he conceded

I admit the swags are rather sausage-like but if you look at some of the finest examples of Italian Renaissance swags you will see that they are treated in much the same manner. I wanted to have them well tied together and not undercut Grinling Gibbons type of thing which I detest.24

This was a strange comment to make since, in 1913, Lorimer had included carving very much in the style of Grinling Gibbons in the New Club and also the carving around the panel above the chimneypiece in the music room at Marchmont shows traces of the same influence. While Hussey went on to make most of his original criticisms in his article, he gave in to Lorimer’s request that, ‘I do not wish the name of Deuchars mentioned.’25 This antagonism is very similar to that engendered in Mary Watts over a quarter of a century earlier when another author proposed to recognise Deuchars’s artistic contribution. Either he was extremely unfortunate in the people he worked for, or his work rightly deserved the recognition, yet something, perhaps jealousy, militated against this due reward. However, in Hussey’s 1931 book on Lorimer, written after the architect’s death, mention was made of Deuchars with the comment that ‘along the parapet six exquisite little fauns carved in the round gambol with engaging innocence’. In fact, only the two outer ones of the six are actually fauns (Pl. 168) while the others are young children (Pl. 169).26 Deuchars’s centre group of two young angels in long robes ‘as beautiful as their Della Robbia prototypes’ surmounts the organ pipes (Pl. 170).27 It appears that, when he had finished modelling the pair, Deuchars had second thoughts about them, for he wrote to Lorimer in May 1916, ‘I saw the group in position and thought that some minor folds round the knee of the right hand figure might be altogether removed though I am not quite sure.’28 However, this concern may have been motivated more from a desire to secure extra payment than from aesthetic reasons, for the group is so high up on the screen that such detail would scarcely be noticed from the floor (Pl. 167). (In his book, Hussey incorrectly credited Hayes with some of the modelling and mistakenly attributed the centre group to Pilkington Jackson.29) Finally, although there is no record of who modelled them, it appears that the two putti, displaying a scroll of music above the organ console doors, were also by Deuchars (Pl. 171).
Surviving papers suggest that there were problems between Lorimer and Norman & Beard, the organ builders, over the space allowed for the instrument, but by late 1919 McEwen wrote to Lorimer that

The organ case gets on apace now. But we are all of one mind that the one mistake in the design as it stands is that the two angels at the top (above the coat of arms) seem detached and out of touch with the rest of your beautiful design. I quite see it is right that there should be something here - and after thinking over the matter my idea is that you yourself will agree that what is wanted is a figure on each side of the central group.

McEwen went on to suggest that one of the figures should be playing an old kind of violin and the other a lute. By that time Deuchars was out of favour with Lorimer and Pilkington Jackson modelled the two figures flanking the central pair (Pl. 167).

McEwen had doubts about having so much Orpheus around and it seems that the lines from Ovid were eventually omitted, but the Orpheus theme was repeated in the cast iron fireback for the music room (Cat. 95, Pl. 172). Lorimer's rough sketch shows the outline of the upright rectangular design, indicating the double ogee curves at the top of the back, based on Dutch designs where the subject matter tended to be allegorical. He submitted his account for twenty-five pounds for the modelling and five pounds for casting the plaster in November 1916. Lorimer appeared to be delighted with the result for he had three casts made by the Carron Company - one for Midfield and two for Marchmont (one for the music room and one for the hall) and subsequently went on to have another two cast for Dunrobin. However, there is no record of Deuchars being paid any repeat fees.

In parallel with the Marchmont work, Deuchars was also doing modelling for Midfield in Midlothian. The house had caught fire in March 1914 and Lorimer had been asked to restore it by James Archibald Hood, chairman and manager of the Lothian Coal Company. While the
restoration was in the spirit of the original late eighteenth century design, Lorimer was also required to ensure that the building was as fireproof as possible. The first mention of Deuchars’s involvement was in Lorimer’s letter to him in April 1915 regarding the Midfield drawing room panel. The circular bas relief cartouche in the centre of the rose and white marble chimneypiece allowed Deuchars yet another opportunity to create a Bacchanalian scene (Cat. 96, Pl. 174). (This panel was also used in Marchmont, discussed earlier.) In what was the ‘boudoir’ is another panel - oval in this case - in a Hoptonwood and yellow agate chimneypiece (Pl. 175). This follows a similar theme with a larger number of figures and animals. Both panels display Deuchars’s lively style. The third cast of the Orpheus fireback, originally modelled by Deuchars for Marchmont, was placed in the hall at Midfield (Pl. 172). Thus, Marchmont and Midfield have in common two pieces of work modelled by Deuchars.

It seems that Deuchars was not only working in Grieve’s workshop, for in 1916 he wrote to Lorimer,

I have been expecting a call from you to the Dean Studio for some days...I have begun work on the fountain boy for Midfield, - the little model came back to me in bits and I have now put this all right. The damage looked greater than it really was. I suppose you have heard regarding the matter. I understand the lady was pleased with the idea.

This gives the impression that the design was Deuchars’s, rather than Lorimer’s, although the entry in the Royal Scottish Academy catalogue in 1917 was sufficiently vague, ‘The Miracle (modelled for a garden fountain by Sir Robert Lorimer a jet of water spouts from the frog’s mouth to a height of five feet.)’ (Cat. 97) The group was in place in 1947, but has since disappeared, probably on the grounds of safety during the period the house was used as a children’s home. However, from a few indistinct photographs, it appears that the fountain outside the ‘boudoir’ consisted of a boy about three feet high and a frog (Pl. 176).

Deuchars’s other main commission for Midfield was a group of three standing nude figures
consisting of a woman, with two of his typical young children (a boy and a girl) for a niche high up on the wall at the rear of the house over the loggia (Cat. 98, Pl. 177). Deuchars was paid for repairing his model in April 1919 and Henshaw finally cast the group and the fountain in lead in August 1920.42

Despite Lorimer’s warning that he might not have much modelling work to pass around, Deuchars was kept busy. In March 1915, Mrs Harris, for whose husband Lorimer had designed Brackenburgh (near Penrith) at the start of the century, wrote that her friend, Lady Mabel Howard of Greystoke Castle, wished a small memorial to her late husband to be placed in the local church. Lorimer duly visited Greystoke to view the proposed position for the memorial. As a result, stone with a bronze portrait medallion was decided upon and Deuchars was asked to produce the bas relief representation of the deceased, presumably once again from a photograph (Cat. 99). In August he took the model to Greystoke and was able to report later, ‘I saw Lady Mabel yesterday. She is fairly well pleased with the portrait but I have still something more to do which will make it as satisfactory as is possible.’ He went on that he thought Lorimer should not take the model back down to Greystoke the following week since time was running short and asked him to check with William Macdonald how long was required to cast the piece in bronze (Pl. 178). The memorial was unveiled by the Speaker of that time and Lady Mabel wrote to Lorimer on 30 August, ‘We had the church crowded...I am so grateful for all the trouble you have taken.’43 Deuchars received the ten pounds he had estimated plus one pound and twelve shillings for his trip to Greystoke.44 The ‘Portrait in low relief’ exhibited in the Royal Academy in 1917 may well have been Howard.45

Another large house, which Lorimer was engaged to restore after a fire, was Dunrobin in Sutherland. Lady Mar and Kellie recommended Lorimer for the work in June 1915. However, it was not completed until 1921, partly due to the extensive nature of the alterations, but also because
of the difficulties Lorimer encountered in obtaining permission to use building materials during the First World War, in direct contrast to his experience at Marchmont. Dunrobin had been used as a military hospital and the range of public rooms was among the extensive damage. Initially, ‘The Ministry of Munitions gave permission for such protective works to be done as would save the house from further destruction.’ Concrete fire-proof floors were installed, stonework rebuilt and the roof replaced. Then work was shut down until February 1919, when the finishing was undertaken. Among many structural interior alterations, Lorimer removed a dividing wall between two drawing rooms to make one long light room which retained the two original chimney openings.

For these, Lorimer designed two impressive chimneypieces in Hoptonwood and beautifully veined Verde Antico marble. Although work on the house stopped once it was wind and watertight, Lorimer commissioned some items for the interior, ‘such as ceilings, fireplaces, etc.....thus giving most useful work to the men who were too old to give assistance in connection with the war.’

Deuchars was forty six when, in 1917, he modelled decorative cartouches in high relief for the chimneypieces destined for the new drawing room (Cat. 100, Pl. 179, Pl. 180 & Pl. 181). He was actually a year younger than Joseph Hayes, who had signed up for service, but Deuchars chose not to volunteer and remained to provide for his family, if somewhat precariously. At the beginning of February Deuchars received fifteen pounds on account from Allen’s and by 10 March he was pleading, ‘It will take me a week or two yet to finish the panel for the mantelpiece and I beg to ask you if you will kindly let me have a draw of twenty pounds before the 15th. I will be much obliged.’ Lorimer marked the letter, ‘give half’ which appears to have resulted in a change of gear by Deuchars who was able to finish by 24 March and ask, ‘Will you kindly give my girl a certificate for the remainder of the money for the Dunrobin panel and much oblige.’ Lorimer marked, ‘£15 more’. Deuchars’s ‘girl’ was his second daughter, Margaret, aged ten at that time. She was often sent on such errands for her father. There is no record of the total cost of the modelling, which was subsequently carved in Hoptonwood by Allan & Sons.
Deuchars ceased to work for Lorimer in 1919, but that did not prevent the architect from having two more casts of the Orpheus fireback, originally modelled by Deuchars for Marchmont, cast by Carron in 1920 and placed in the firewells under the cartouches in Dunrobin (Pl. 172). Lorimer was surely not concerned that the three owners of Marchmont, Midfield and Dunrobin might visit each other and compare notes on what each believed to be their exclusively designed firebacks. Ever the efficient self-publicist, he penned some words intended for an article on Dunrobin which appeared in *Country Life*.

The beauty of the material used and the quality of the craftsmanship throughout the new work is remarkable. It is interesting to note that all this beautiful detail - the plaster ceilings, the chimneypieces, the oak work, the wood carving, the cast ironwork - was carried out in Edinburgh which, under the fostering care of Sir Robert Lorimer has become a centre for fine craftsmanship.

Lorimer loved to restore old properties and if he found a likely prospect, he would look around for someone with enough capital to pay for his services. Balmanno near Glenfarg, and William Miller, a Glasgow steamship owner, were brought together in such a way. The sixteenth century tower house had been used as a farmhouse, but Lorimer saw its potential for dramatic impact on the countryside. Miller bought it in 1916 and Lorimer spent the next five years perfecting the country seat. Of all the restorations, this was the one he would most have liked to live in and was decidedly upset when Mrs Miller refused to leave her Pollokshields flat for the depths of Perthshire.

In his youth Deuchars had shown an early appreciation of a similar large house. In a poem about Aberuchill Castle near Comrie, he wrote

Three centuries has it stood,  
Defying time, and storm, and flood:  
The walls and workmanship are good  
Of Aberuchill
Again, once more, the old domain,
Its famous prestige to maintain,
Renewing and renewed again
Is Aberuchill.

The old grim fortalice is there,
Restored and added to with care:
Since Sixteen - Twelve a castle fair,
Is Aberuchill.

Aberuchill Castle has many similarities to Balmanno in that it is a white-harled tower house to which other accommodation and embellishments such as pepper-pot towers have been added.

‘A small but delightful innovation, very typical of Lorimer, is the series of grotesque beasts set at intervals on the ridge of the roof from models by...Louis Deuchars’, thus wrote Hussey of Balmanno (Cat. 101). Lorimer placed monkeys on the roofs of the lodges of several of his earlier commissions, including Formakin, but Balmanno was the first house to be treated in this way. Over six weeks from December 1916 until January 1917, Deuchars modelled four monkeys at the rate of six pounds and ten shillings each. Once transformed into stone, four cling precariously along the ridges looking down on alternate sides of each leg of the L-plan (Pl. 182). Another two sit up proudly gazing out over the hills to the west and south. Since only four were modelled, two must be repeats. In February Deuchars modelled a baboon finial for the top of the crowstep gables above the arched gateway in the lodge. The animal squats on the topmost stone holding a square block on which is carved the year 1917 (Pl. 182a). The same model was used for both front and back of the gateway.

Lorimer was also entrusted with laying out the gardens where once there was an old moat. As with all his designs, he provided decorative touches, including ornamental stone baskets of flowers modelled by Thomas Beattie. From Deuchars he commissioned two child figures which originally stood on pedestals, but are now in front of the gate piers to the inner courtyard (Cat. 102, Pl. 183 & Pl. 184). On 12 March, Deuchars wrote to Lorimer,
I am confined to the house - can't walk out - a bad foot and I can just hobble about here. I brought the head and neck of the boy from Cruikshanks and am working at it and - if I am still unable to get about in a day or two I shall have the arms here also - the joints at the wrist and elbow requiring referring to nature as I understand now that you want the figure carried further than at first intended. I find the scale is larger than life and the figure ought to measure about three feet if he stood upright.

I have been about a month at this job - my money is exhausted. May I have a draw of fifteen pounds, the figures ought to be thirty when completed. As I am rather anxious about money my little girl will wait a message.

Margaret, must have been sent with the letter, but the family had to wait until he was rewarded with a cheque for ten pounds sent via Cruikshank (the main building contractor) on 14 March.

When Deuchars submitted his final account in April, including five pounds for casting, Lorimer instructed Cruikshank to pay another fifteen pounds and he only received the remaining ten pounds the following month, presumably after the models had been inspected by Lorimer. The resulting naturalistic figures were subsequently carved by Allen & Sons in pink sandstone.

Lorimer seemed happy to make constant use of Deuchars’s talents. As Hussey later wrote,

By the time Lorimer took Balmanno and Dunrobin in hand his team of craftsmen had been working with him for a decade and knew their parts perfectly. It was only necessary for him to give dimensions and perhaps a rough sketch, and each carried on with his task in his own way, but inspired by what they had learnt from him.

However, it appears that Deuchars still hankered after success in his own right and continued to produce pieces for exhibition. In the Summer Exhibition of the Royal Scottish Academy in 1917, he had ‘Rebirth of Goodwill - a dedication to France’ (Cat. 103). Obviously reacting to the horrors of the War, this allegorical work, with its various fragile components, is probably the one depicted in a photograph held in the Conway Library (Pl. 185). It is worth conjecturing just how Deuchars got the plaster to the R.S.A. in one piece. Did he sit with it on his knee in a taxi, or did he hire a cart, or did he get it transported along with Lorimer’s commission ‘The Miracle’?

Perhaps that was why Lorimer’s name was included in the title of the latter piece.

---

1 Letter from Deuchars to Lorimer, undated, but ‘May, 1914’ typed on by Lorimer’s clerkess. L.P.
2 Information supplied by Elaine McQuillan, Hayes’s daughter.
CHAPTER 12

THE GREAT WAR AND LORIMER’S GRAND HOUSES

4 ‘Lines from Ovid’ sent by Mr Warrack, 28 July 1914. GEN 1963/36/13. L.P.
5 Deuchars was paid £25 for modelling and Allan got the same amount for carving the Orpheus cartouche. Allan & Sons Account. GEN 1963/38/43b. L.P.
6 Letter from Deuchars to Lorimer, 17 February 1915. GEN 1963/36/24. L.P.
7 Letter from Deuchars to Lorimer, 15 June 1915. GEN 1963/37/151. L.P.
8 Letter from Deuchars to Lorimer, 18 June 1915. GEN 1963/37/158. L.P.
9 Deuchars’s account, 5 August 1915. GEN 1963/37/153. L.P.
10 Deuchars’s account, 27 December 1915. GEN 1963/37/158. L.P.
11 Deuchars’s account, 18 May 1916. GEN 1963/37/163. L.P.
12 Clows’ account, 1919. GEN 1963/38/16. L.P.
15 Copy letter to Hussey from Lorimer, 24 January 1925. P.C.
16 Ibid.
18 Ibid. Loc.cit.
19 Letter from Deuchars to Lorimer, 18 May 1916. P.C.
22 Correspondence among deposit of Pilkington Jackson’s papers in NLS. ACC 7445/31A.
23 Copy Acceptance, 29 April 1915. GEN 1963/36/136b. L.P.
25 Deuchars’s account 22 November 1916. GEN 1963/37/90. L.P.
26 The two casts for Marchmont were sold in the mid 1980’s, prior to the house becoming a Sue Ryder Home.
27 Midfield Mansion-house destroyed by Fire’, The Dalkeith Advertiser, 2 April 1914.
28 Letter from Lorimer to Deuchars, 23 April 1915. GEN 1963/37/149. L.P.
29 Between 1946 and 1981 the house was used as a children’s home and unfortunately, this Hoptonwood panel had suffered some damage. The house was subsequently converted to private flats and the present condition is not known.
30 Savage, Peter, Lorimer and the Edinburgh Craft Designers (Edinburgh, 1980) pl.249. This is wrongly captioned as in the drawing rooms.
31 Letter from Deuchars to Lorimer, 18 May 1916. P.C.
32 Edinburgh, Royal Scottish Academy Summer Exhibition Catalogue, 1917. ‘The Miracle (modelled for a garden fountain by Sir Robert Lorimer)’. Cat.no. 44.

‘Greystoke Memorial to the late Mr Howard’, *The Cumberland & Westmorland Herald*, 4 September 1915.

Information from papers relating to Lorimer and the Howard Memorial. GEN 1963/52. U.L.P.

London, Royal Academy Summer Exhibition Catalogue 1917. Cat.no. 1507.

Information obtained from papers relating to Dunrobin. GEN 1963/57. U.L.P.

Not all of Lorimer’s material was used in the article. ‘Dunrobin Castle - 1 Sutherlandshire Seat of the Duke of Sutherland’, *Country Life*, vol.L, no.1287, 3 September 1921, p.288.


‘Aberuchill Castle’, *Strathearn Herald*, 30 April 1887.

Aberuchill Castle was badly damaged by fire in February 1994.


Letter from W.S. Cruikshank & Son to Lorimer, 22 December 1916. GEN 1963/30/35. L.P. Also, Accounts from Deuchars and further letter from Cruikshank. GEN 1963/56. U.L.P.

Information obtained from papers relating to Dunrobin. GEN 1963/56. U.L.P.


Edinburgh, Royal Scottish Academy Summer Exhibition Catalogue, 1917. Cat.no.42.

Discovered by Philip Ward-Jackson, Conway Library, Courtauld Institute of Art. Neg.no. L12/26 (33).
Lorimer continued to pick up commissions for church furnishings on the basis of his Thistle Chapel triumph. The one for Holy Trinity Church, Darlington, took a long time to come to fruition (Cat. 104). Miss H. Forster, who appears to have been an acquaintance of Lorimer’s wife, first contacted him in May 1911, but it was not until January 1916 when she wrote that,

Our parents have both passed away and we feel that we should like to place some memorial in the Church to their memory.

The idea that appeals to us is that of carrying out your proposal with regard to the Sanctuary - that would be, a new carved oak reredos, and oak panelling...

I shall be very grateful if you will kindly give me your candid opinion as to the wisdom and possibility of carrying out this idea at the present time.....

What about wood carvers & workers, are they available? As things are so different both with regard to expense of material & labour just now, would you advise any modification of the original plan for the reredos in fact for the whole scheme ....

Obviously Miss Forster was concerned that such work would be a problem during war-time conditions, but Lorimer seemed able to secure the necessary materials.

The reredos was a relatively simple design of oak panelling around a painting by John Duncan, surmounted by a broad cornice, with carved bosses on the intersections of decorative ribs (Pl. 186). On the pierced and carved cresting was the customary Lorimer motif of two bas relief angels, supporting a crowned shield, with the Trinity, obviously from Deuchars’s model (Pl. 187). Lorimer appears to have approached Duncan late in 1915 with a view to making a replica of his painting ‘The Adoration of the Magi’. Instead of designing the reredos around the picture’s dimensions, Lorimer wanted Duncan to accommodate him. The artist who was already experiencing financial difficulties protested,

In contemplating an increase in size in the picture we, of course, face a corresponding increase in cost. I offered to do the replica at your own price, which was already considerably under half of the price, and an increase in size amounts to a further reduction of the price which I think is hardly to be expected.

It is not known whether the price was increased as a result, but Miss Forster wrote to Lorimer in April that she was ‘glad Mr Duncan will make the picture all right to suit the proportions of the
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reredos.' By September, Duncan wrote to Lorimer that the painting was well advanced. Short of funds, he was anxious to be paid, but Lorimer had said he did not require it until the end of the year. Nevertheless, Duncan received sixty pounds for the completed work in November 1916. However the replica lacks some of the sparkle of the original work and the increased proportions did not improve the composition (Pl. 188). There is no surviving paperwork about a sedilia with three angels terminating the elbow rests, but it must be by Lorimer and the chubby, eager-faced figures are unmistakably by Deuchars (Pl. 189).

Another church with a Lorimer reredos incorporating paintings by John Duncan is St. Mary’s in Broughty Ferry (Cat. 105, Pl. 190). It too has the bas relief motif of two angels supporting a crowned shield, still in the original coloured and gilded finish by Moxon and Carfrae, which complements beautifully the delicate tones of Duncan’s paintings of Christ enthroned and the four supporting archangels (Pl. 191). The angel supporters appear to be more of Deuchars’s work, as do the two plain carved oak angels bearing candlesticks which terminate the outer slow turned columns of the reredos (Pl. 192). In the same manner as the Blair Atholl reredos, the addition of these two figures appears an unnecessary embellishment, but Deuchars must have been only too delighted to have the work. The Bishop’s chair by Lorimer, with carved mitre and staff on the back, has within the loop of the staff a beautifully modelled and carved miniature representation of the Annunciation, which could be more of Deuchars’s work (Pl. 193). The church also has a carved oak pulpit designed by Lorimer and unveiled at Easter 1915. Stylistically, the renderings of the four Apostles and other animals appear to have been by Deuchars. Finally Lorimer designed the Chancel screen war memorial dedicated in November 1921. It too has two bas relief angels supporting a shield and a pendant angel terminating the tracery above the arch. At first glance these also seem to have been by Deuchars, but since he was not working for Lorimer by that time, it appears that the Clows may well have used earlier maquettes, as over the years, they must have accumulated quite a few from which to choose (Pl. 194).
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The third reredos designed by Lorimer to incorporate a painting by John Duncan and modelling by Deuchars was a commission for St. Andrew’s (Aberdeen) which had been given cathedral status in 1913 (Cat. 106).12 For its enhanced role, it was reported by the correspondent of The Church Times in September that,

The proposal now is to enlarge the chancel....One of the most able of Scottish architects, Sir Robert Lorimer, has drawn plans for the extension. Filled with the true Gothic spirit, rich in imagination, and with wide experience, Sir Robert Lorimer is a man in whom Church-people can place entire confidence. The chapel of the Knights of the Thistle recently added to St. Giles’, Edinburgh, and the new work at Alloa and Broughty Ferry, besides the screen in St. Andrew’s itself, affords ample proof of what he can do.13

Despite this glowing testimony, it appears that the grand enlargement never took place, but at the end of 1915, Canon Erskine Hill wrote to Lorimer that a Mrs Cay was very interested in the plans he had sent and conjectured that although ‘she will only do the reredos to begin with she will not stop there.’14 The lady decided to dedicate the reredos for the Lady Chapel in the north aisle to the memory of her husband.15 On the envelope containing Nathaniel Grieve’s estimate for the work, someone had written ‘Canon Erskine Hill knows that Deuchars work is an “extra”. N. Grieve to pay £1 for casting Madonna & child & charge to job.’16 The Clow brothers estimate for the carving included ‘Madonna & 2 Side Figures’.17 Lorimer explained,

Immediately above the Altar I have shown the centre panel which could form a door of a small safe for reserving the sacrament if wished to do that at this Altar. At either side, the panels would be carved with shields blazoned with the emblems of the passion. Above is a panel which might ultimately contain a picture, but could at present be filled with a fabric. Above is a niche with the Madonna and Child and on either side angels holding shields. You might be able to advise what these shields should be blazoned with. I thought the arms of the Diocese might go on one. The panels would contain pierced carving, and the cresting along the top would also be pierced.18

Essentially this design was executed, with the only slight alteration being the increased width of the carved and pierced panels separating the niches containing the figures in the upper part (Pl. 195).

By 7 August 1917, Deuchars had been paid £15 in two equal instalments for his modelling of the Madonna and Child (Pl. 196) and two angels (Pl. 197), which would indicate that the plaster
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maquettes had been passed to the Clow brothers for carving. In the same month, Canon Erskine Hill wrote to Lorimer that the dedication had been arranged for 1 November 1917. However, by the beginning of October he was getting anxious and wrote,

...there are one or two matters on which time presses. I saw Clow & rang up Grieve about the reredos. The latter promised to lose no time in getting the work "treated" & Clow told me that if the figures were not ready the casts could be given a colour wash & be put up temporarily for 1st Nov. the date of the Dedication. I presume I can reckon definitely on the reredos being erected by that date?

Unfortunately, it appears the cleric's concern was justified, for he sent a post card on 25 November, asking, 'Could you give me a definite date by which I could be sure of the reredos in the Lady Chapel being erected? Mrs Cay is anxious to arrange about the Dedication, preacher, etc.'

This must have had the desired effect since Mrs Cay sent Lorimer a note of the inscription, which read, 'To the Glory of God and Sacred to the memory of Alexander Cay (1854-1912) for many years Trustee and Churchwarden of St. Andrew's Church, this reredos was erected by his widow and dedicated 23rd December 1917.' There is no record as to whether the carved oak figures were in place or if the plaster casts had to be used.

These delays did not appear to have deterred Mrs Cay from proceeding to fund the picture for the panel above the altar and John Duncan got the commission, despite Canon Perry (apparently Canon Erskine Hill's predecessor, who had a continuing interest in the cathedral fabric, and was advising on the scheme) asking Lorimer to view paintings by William Hole. Duncan's original sketch of 'The Flight into Egypt' with its donkey was not found suitable, but Canon Perry seems to have been content to fall in with idea of Gethsemane. In May he wrote enthusiastically about the new sketch which he thought 'should be fine for these days' and 'will be Mr Duncan's best'. By November 1918 the artist (still having financial difficulties) pointed out that he had been paid in instalments for the two previous reredos paintings and asked for a payment of £75, being half the total price. The finished painting (Pl. 198) lived up to Canon Perry's expectations, but unfortunately, as with Lorimer's screen in the Aberdeen Cathedral, Moxon and Carfrae's delicate
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colouring of the carving (but fortunately not the figures, which were left in natural oak) has been subsequently overpainted in garish enamels, completely swamping the delicate colouring of Duncan’s painting (Pl. 195).

Although Deuchars had been concentrating on his sculpture work, it appears that he also continued to paint in oils. Two relatively small paintings of around 1916-17 on the subject of the Crucifixion may have been his attempt to show Lorimer that he could cope with ecclesiastical subjects (Cat. 107).27 He was no stranger to the idiom, as, very early in his career, he had contributed a large oil painting on a similar theme to the Lodge of the Good Templars in Auchterarder, discussed in chapter 2 (Cat. 5). Of the Edinburgh works, one was a rather dark ‘Entombment of Christ’ (Pl. 199), while the other, similar in style to that of John Duncan, was ‘The Empty Tomb’ (Pl. 200). Although they were ultimately sold, Lorimer does not seem to have been tempted to commission Deuchars to paint for a reredos.

Deuchars’s bas relief angels appear on a number of smaller First World War carved oak memorial panels, such as that for Lieutenant Magnus Gray in Loretto Chapel (Pl. 201), Sir Schomberg McDonnell in Glenarn Church, Co. Antrim (the latter had overseen the Thistle Chapel on behalf of the Office of Works, but had rejoined the army when war broke out) and Murrayfield church.28 A larger shrine to Lieutenant Eric Dobson originally for the chapel at Stonyhurst School is a carved and pierced oak canopy over a small altar (Cat. 108).29 Among the tracery of the canopy are two of Deuchars’s angel supporters and two pendant angels (Pl. 202). The oak has darkened considerably since new in 1917, which may indicate that it was not treated with Lorimer’s bleaching recipe.30

Another casualty of the war was Mark, second son of Frank Tennant, for whom Lorimer had remodelled Lympne Castle in Kent. The family also owned Innes House near Elgin and it was
there that Mrs Tennant wished to place a memorial to her son. In April 1917, Mr and Mrs Tennant inspected a model of a cross, but this idea was replaced by a shrine in the wall of a garden, after much agonising by Mrs Tennant as to the exact design. Lorimer had to make three sketches before it was just right. Perhaps to ensure that he kept at it, he was tantalised with the prospect of a new church and two farmhouses for the estate, but these came to nothing. The shrine in red sandstone is shaped like a well, except that there are flowers in the basin (Cat. 109). It incorporates a child’s head which appears to have been modelled by Deuchars (Pl. 203). There is no documentation to indicate who the sculptor was, but a small debt decree for six pounds granted on 25 February 1918 in favour of Allan & Sons (stone carvers, normally used by Lorimer) against Deuchars, would tend to indicate that he was probably involved. The date is appropriate and there is no evidence that Deuchars was working on any other stone sculpture at that time. Possibly he had been overpaid in error, but because of his permanently impecunious state, he had been unable to repay the money. Since there is no room for sentiment in business, Allan & Son had had to resort to the court to recover what was rightfully theirs. In the arrestment of wages document, Lorimer was ordered to withhold four pounds until the remaining £3.16.5 was recovered. It would appear that the problem was not immediately resolved for there is an entry in Lorimer’s Office Diary for 12 July 1918, which noted, ‘Allens after lunch re. Deuchars a/c’. The last occasion when Deuchars was involved in major church furnishings for Lorimer was in St James the Great, Cupar (Cat. 110). This is yet another example of Lorimer adding to a Rowand Anderson design (1886-8). The tragedy of the First World War for one family is commemorated by the carved oak screen and hanging rood, together with a reredos (Pl. 204). Mrs Gilroy of Clatto (south of Cupar) lost her sons, while her daughter, Mrs Forrester, was widowed. Lorimer prepared sketches and they were considered by the Vestry on 26 April 1917. Following the meeting, the Rector, returning the sketches, wrote to Lorimer that F. B. Sharp of Hill of Tarvit (the house near Cupar which Lorimer had altered considerably) was going to call on Lorimer ‘to discuss
CHAPTER 13

CHURCH FURNISHINGS AND MEMORIALS FOR LORIMER

certain matters regarding them.38 The Bishop of St. Andrews also became involved and wrote to him that he was going to talk to Mrs Forrester about them. He hoped that,

she may be persuaded to accept the whole design which would lose very much in every way if the poor were omitted. It has occurred to me that if the figure say of St. Andrew (for the Black Watch) & St. George - so as to introduce a soldier - were added - it might suggest the connection between the memorial & the poor.39

Whether she appreciated the connection is not documented, but she did agree that the two figures (Pl. 206 & Pl. 207) should be on the screen together with St. Mary and St. John (Pl. 208 & Pl. 209), the two figures traditionally at the base of the Cross (Pl. 210). Deuchars modelled the figures, including pendant angels (Pl. 205) and probably the Clow brothers were responsible for the specialised carving. Mrs Gilroy commissioned the reredos and panelling (Pl. 212). Deuchars was ultimately paid forty five pounds, through Nathaniel Grieve, for modelling the figures on the screen, but as usual received it in instalments.40 In March 1918, a letter to Lorimer signed ‘per L.R. Deuchars’ (probably his hard-pressed wife, Kathleen) asked ‘if you can kindly send me the balance due for St. Andrew, £5.0.0 the casting is 25/-’. Lorimer had written on the bottom, ‘What was the agreed on sum’.41 He was not going to pay any more than the predetermined amount. As there is no mention on Grieve’s final account of any payment to the Clows for the carving of the figures, that must have been settled separately and also Deuchars’s modelling of the four angels on the reredos (Pl. 213).42

Because of the carnage of the war, Deuchars could have been forgiven for believing that there would be a continuing flow of such commissions. However, things got so bad that Lorimer closed the office for a year in 1917, although Deuchars was kept busy with the various jobs started earlier.43

1 Letter to Lorimer from Miss Forster, 3 January 1916. GEN 1963/47/225. U.L.P.
3 Kemplay, op.cit. p.85. Also, letter from Duncan to Lorimer, 1 February 1916. GEN 1963/47/229. U.L.P.
4 Letter to Lorimer from Miss Forster, 3 April 1916. GEN 1963/47/238. U.L.P.
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6 Kemplay, op.cit. p.92.
9 Clows’ account for carving two side figures for reredos, no date. GEN 1963/49/91. U.L.P.
10 Letter to Lorimer from Ferguson, 26 September 1916. GEN 1963/23/19. L.P.
11 Murray, op.cit. p.12.
12 Letter to Lorimer from Canon Erskine Hill, 18 September 1913. GEN 1963/19/246. L.P.
13 Cutting from The Church Times, c. September 1913. GEN 1963/19/247. L.P.
14 Letter to Lorimer from Canon Hill, 21 December 1915. GEN 1963/19/298. L.P.
15 Letter to Lorimer from Canon Hill, 4 March 1916. GEN 1963/19/301. L.P.
16 Grieve’s Estimate, 16 November 1916. GEN 1963/20/71. L.P.
17 Clows’ Estimate, 7 November 1916. GEN 1963/20/76. L.P.
18 Letter from Lorimer to Canon Hill, 12 December 1916. GEN 1963/20/72a&b. L.P.
19 Note by JFM (John Matthew, Lorimer’s partner). GEN 1963/20/75. L.P.
20 Letter to Lorimer from Canon Hill, 30 August 1917. GEN 1963/19/310. L.P.
21 Letter to Lorimer from Canon Hill, 9 October 1917. GEN 1963/19/264. L.P.
22 Post card to Lorimer from Canon Hill, 25 November 1917. GEN 1963/19/288. L.P.
23 Letter to Lorimer from Mrs Cay, 1 February 1918. GEN 1963/19/293b. L.P.
24 Letter to Lorimer from Mrs Cay, 2 May 1918. GEN 1963/19/258. Memo re St. Andrew’s Aberdeen, 12 April 1918. GEN 1963/19/289. L.P.
25 Letter to Lorimer from Canon Perry, 10 May 1918. GEN 1963/19/300. L.P.
26 Letter to Lorimer from Duncan, 4 November 1918. GEN 1965/19/261. L.P.
27 P.C.
29 Ibid, pl.210C. The shrine is now in a gallery outside the chapel.
31 ‘Memo Re proposed Cross at Innes’, 29 April 1917. GEN 1963/1/12. Letters to Lorimer from Mrs Tennant, c. June 1917, 29 August 1917 and 25 October 1917. GEN 1963/1/5,6,7. L.P.
32 ‘Memo re visit to Innes, 4th - 6th February -18’. GEN 1963/1/13. L.P.
33 Registered Copy of Arrestment of Wages Order by Sheriff-Officer, 2 April 1918. P.C.
34 Lorimer’s Office Diary, 12 July 1918. P.C.
36 Memo. re Cupar Episcopal Church. 8 February 1917. GEN 1963/3/91. L.P.
37 Minutes of St. James Church, 23 April 1917. P.C.
38 Letter from G.W. Patterson to Lorimer, 23 April 1917. GEN 1963/3/88. L.P.
40 ‘St James Church, Cupar, A/C N. Grieve for Reredos, wall panelling, Chancel Screen & Rood’, 14 November 1919. GEN 1963/3/87. L.P.
41 Letter to Lorimer as from L.R. Deuchars, 26 March 1918. GEN 1963/3/95. L.P.
42 Grieve’s Account. L.P.
43 Savage, op.cit. p.126.
In the ten years since Deuchars first worked on the Thistle Chapel for Lorimer he also received other commissions. The first one was unusual since it came, not from an architect, nor from a private client, but from the carvers, the Clow brothers, shortly after they and Deuchars had finished working on the chapel.

At the end of 1910, W. T. Oldrieve, the principal Architect for Scotland to H. M. Office of Works, was responsible for replacing the roofs of Glasgow Cathedral. At that time, plaster ceilings were hung beneath the fifteenth century roof timbers and inspection had revealed that in the Choir, ‘the original rafters had been shaped so as to form a trefoil or cusped roof.’ In addition, ‘the position of the peg-holes indicated where the carved bosses had been fixed at the junctions of the moulded ribs’. Thus the replacement roof ‘was lined in oak in the form of a pointed trefoil, with ridge and rib and intermediate and diagonal ribs.’ However, as there was no evidence of what the subject matter of the original bosses might have been, Oldrieve arranged ‘to carry out this part of the work, keeping, so far as is practicable, to the Early English type of work.....because it is in harmony with the general character of the architecture of the cathedral.’

Originally, it was intended to install a cusped roof in the Nave as well as the Choir and the Biblical subjects of the bosses for both roofs had been decided by Oldrieve, but this plan had to be changed once the true nature of the old roof had been investigated and the open timber medieval style was adopted instead. Thus the planned ‘Old Testament Characters’ and ‘Apostles’ had to be abandoned and some aspects of the ‘Life of Christ’ omitted.

On 2 December 1910 a ‘Specification of Oak Carving on Ceiling’ drawn up by Oldrieve was submitted to the Contracts Branch, with the request that the tendering process be limited to five firms of wood carvers. Only three actually submitted tenders, of whom John Crawford of Glasgow was by far the cheapest at £634.5., with the Clow brothers estimating £1022 (including £36 for the clay models). Each firm had to submit one quarter size sketch models for each type of boss for
CHAPTER 14
OTHER ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONS

the Nave, the Transepts and the Choir so that the quality of work being offered could be assessed, subject to the proviso that one quarter of the carving would be given to the firm submitting the lowest tender.6 Oldrieve later wrote, 'Firms of high standing as modellers and carvers were invited to submit sketch models and tenders, the result being that the work has been divided between Glasgow and Edinburgh firms.'7 Crawford had to be content with the simpler foliated bosses, while the models submitted by the Clows ensured that they won the lion's share of the work.8 It seems they employed Deuchars of whom it was later reported, 'in Glasgow Cathedral he designed and modelled the most difficult bosses of the restoration.'9 (Cat. 111, Pl. 214, Pl. 215 & Pl. 216)

This partnership appears to contradict the Clows' reported remarks to Hussey, in respect of their relationship with Lorimer, that 'We worked for him exclusively....Aye, for thirty years we worked for nobody else.'10 Savage was given a similar story by James Richardson (H. M. Inspector of Ancient Monuments), who said of the Clows, 'They had become part of Lorimer and worked for no-one else.'11 Yet it appears that they were quite happy to tender for and accept the commission for the cathedral roof carving. Their success in landing such a prestigious job could not have been kept a secret and, once the job was complete, The Glasgow Herald reported that the carving had been done by 'Mr Clow, of Edinburgh, and Mr Crawford, Glasgow.'12 Since the Clows obviously continued to enjoy Lorimer's patronage, it would appear that the relationship was unaffected by this show of independence. Perhaps Lorimer only became concerned when other architects attempted to commission them, as when Richardson tried to get them to carve a memorial for him and Lorimer forbade it.13

In January 1913, Deuchars was reported to be 'at present engaged on a memorial in bronze to celebrate the centenary of David Livingstone, which is to be erected in Central Africa. He had the other day the pleasure of meeting two grandchildren of the famous explorer.'14 It is not known how Deuchars came to the attention of the Edinburgh architect, Harold Tarbolton, but he modelled for him the bronze bas relief tablet, which was cast by Charles Henshaw of Edinburgh (Cat. 112, Pl.
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217). It could possibly have been as a result of the bronze, for Lorimer, of Bishop Dowden, which was also cast by Henshaw. Apparently, in 1913 Hubert and Ruth Wilson, two of Livingstone’s grandchildren, went out to Chitambo Mission Station to start work as doctor and nurse and it must have been they who put up the tablet in what was then the Church of Scotland Mission in Blantyre, Nyasaland (now Malawi). The church is still Presbyterian, but is now called St. Michael & All Angels.

Another possible commission for Tarbolton was some woodcarving in 1913 on a Rood Screen in St. James the Less church in Penicuik (Cat. 113). The work was done by Thomas Good of Riego Street, Edinburgh (Pl. 218, Pl. 219 & Pl. 220). Although there are three grounds to support Deuchars’s possible involvement: he was known to have frequented Good’s workshop in his later years; he was given the modelling of the Livingstone memorial by Tarbolton; and there are stylistic similarities with Deuchars’s other work, there is no definite evidence to link him with the Penicuik church. Alexander Carrick, another sculptor, shared workshops with Good at that time and he might have done the modelling, although he mainly worked in stone.

Tarbolton was also responsible for three carved oak figures on a Rood Beam in St Bride’s, Hyndland Road, Glasgow (Cat. 113). In that case the carving of was done around 1914 by Scott Morton & Co. (who would have known of Deuchars’s work from Dunblane Cathedral, discussed in Chapter 10). The church was originally designed by Bodley in 1903, but later added to by Tarbolton. Again, although there is no documentation to link Deuchars with the modelling, the figures bear similarities to other ones by him for Lorimer (Pl. 221).

Perhaps as a result of his work in the Thistle Chapel, Deuchars came to the attention of Sir Robert Rowand Anderson, who, between 1880 and 1885, designed and supervised the building of Mount Stuart, an impressive Gothic mansion, for the Third Marquess of Bute. Situated south west of
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Rothesay, the house replaced (except for two wings) an earlier Palladian one by Alexander McGill.20 A private chapel, with elements drawn from Spain, France, Italy and Russia was added in the 1890's. Like the main house, the apsidal chapel, with its French Gothic east end, is in red sandstone, and lined with white Carrara marble. The octagonal vaulted tower and lantern is based on La Seo Cathedral at Zaragoza, while the ruby red glass in the clerestory was inspired by the Byzantine churches in Russia.21 In 1900, Lord Bute died, but his son, the Fourth Marquess continued the close relationship with Anderson so that work continued on the house and the chapel.22

From the surviving drawings, it appears that Anderson originally designed a Gothic Baldacchino for the chapel. It included four statuettes and was surmounted by a Madonna and Child. A relatively plain altar with a reredos of bas relief panels was added, but by January 1909, elements of the Baldacchino had been incorporated into a Gothic altar with bronze pinnacled canopy over a monstrance. The retable had bas relief panels (apparently elements of the Last Supper) in rose marble on either side of the tabernacle. The marble was continued on the end panels and top, which was supported by slender pillars and Gothic arches apparently in bronze. The front was divided into three elements with three arches flanking a traceried panel containing a bas relief of the Madonna and Child. Each side had two arches, with niches provided on the angles for statuettes.23

The altar design appears to have evolved from the carved and painted oak one Anderson executed at the end of the last century for St. Cuthbert's Episcopal Church in Colinton, Edinburgh.

By May 1911, a full-size model for the Gothic bronze altar was erected in the chapel at Mount Stuart, so that its impact could be judged (Cat. 114, Pl. 222).24 It was largely similar to the 1909 design, except that most of the structure was intended to be in bronze, with rose marble only retained for the top. The carved wood, painted to resemble bronze, was studded with figures of saints and angels and bas relief panels all executed by Louis Deuchars in plaster (Pl. 222a). It
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would appear that he carried out that modelling after the Thistle Chapel for Lorimer. Considering that, during the same period, he also worked for the Clows on the Choir roof of Glasgow Cathedral and produced further work for Lorimer, it appears that his work rate was extremely high. The basic carved frame was executed by Scott Morton & Co. in their Tynecastle workshops, to where it was returned to await its final casting. That proved to a considerable time, during which the carvers complained bitterly that their ‘breeks’ were at risk from the sharp points of the Gothic tracery.25 R. Laidlaw & Son (Edinburgh) Ltd, a firm of brassfounders, were contracted to cast the frame in January 1912.26

It is not known why the altar was not immediately cast. Perhaps Lord Bute wished alterations made after he had seen it in the chapel. Anderson was not in the best of health at that time and it may have taken him some time to oversee any changes. Then with the outbreak of the Great War in 1914 came restrictions on the supply of metals. Lord Bute had secured a commission in the Welsh Regiment and, on 26 October 1916, wrote to William Skeoch Cumming (the designer of the first tapestry, ‘The Lord of the Hunt’, woven at the Dovecot Studios in Corstorphine),

I am quite out of touch with such matters in Edinburgh....How I am to take up threads again I don’t know - but perhaps I wont (sic) be called upon to do so. However I hope against expectation to again take up some day and finish my 2 great works in Edinburgh - the tapestry (sic) and the Altar - although I fear that Mount Stuart cannot now be their home. But each will have had so much thought, time and anxious labour lavished on it to make it supreme in itself.27

However, Mount Stuart was indeed the eventual home for both of them. The altar, reworked in part, was finally cast in bronze. Its basic frame was stored at the Dovecot Studios before it was adorned by statuettes and bas reliefs in silvered bronze and bas relief panels in copper, but Anderson, who died in 1921, did not live to see it finally in situ (Pl. 223).28 One of Deuchars’s copper bas relief panels is dated 1923, the year he exhibited at the RSA Summer Exhibition, ‘The miracle at the marriage feast’, the right-hand scene (bearing his initials, but no date).29 (Pl. 224)

Therefore, the execution of the altar must have been ongoing around that time, some thirteen years after it was begun.30 The matching left-hand panel is ‘Feeding the Multitude’ (Pl. 226). Accounts
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for the period indicate payments were made from the Marquess’s Cardiff office for work on the altar from 1922 to 1926 and newspaper reports put the total cost at £50,000.31 However, it was not until the middle of June 1928 that it was finally installed in the chapel at Mount Stuart, nearly a year after Deuchars himself died. Thus neither of its creators survived to see its completion. The first use was at the wedding of Lady Jean Crichton Stuart, younger daughter of the Fourth Marquess of Bute, when it was described as ‘a remarkable piece of craftsmanship, in which beaten gold, silver, brass and enamel have all been utilised’.32 Since Laidlaw & Son were still in existence at that time, it seems reasonable to assume that they were entrusted with the casting of the bronze case, which involved some very intricate modelling (Pl. 227).33 However, the silvered bronze figures may have been cast by Macdonald & Creswick of Edinburgh, who specialised in the lost wax method (Pl. 225).

The finished altar serves as a fitting testament to Deuchars’s association with another great exponent of the Gothic revival style. It allowed the sculptor to demonstrate his facility with bas relief and statuettes to the full. Since Anderson died before the date on the new bas relief panels, it must be assumed that it was Lord Bute who oversaw the changes. Louis Deuchars was reputed to have produced other things for him, and Deuchars’s daughter was sent along to Bute House in Charlotte Square, Edinburgh on several occasions, but it was probably to receive financial support when the family fell on hard times.34 One of the last works Deuchars exhibited was entitled, ‘An early celtic missionary’, priced at £50 (Cat. 114).35 This could have been one of the discarded figures from the altar which Lord Bute allowed him to show in the hope that he could sell it to help with the family income.

3 Oldrieve, op.cit., p.413.
4 Ibid., loc.cit. and Waddell, op.cit.
5 Oldrieve, op.cit., p.413.
6 ‘Specification of Oak Carving on Ceiling’, 2 December 1910. ‘Memoranda’ from Oldrieve to the
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Secretary, 30 November 1910. SC 21865 MW1/173, SRO. The five firms were: W. & A. Clow, Edinburgh; Edward Griffith, London; John Crawford, Glasgow; H. H. Martyn, Glasgow; Ernest Gimson, Cirencester.

1 Oldrieve, op.cit. p.413.
2 Memorandum from Oldrieve, 31 October 1911. SC 21865 MW1/172, SRO.
3 "A Noted Artist - A Native of Comrie", 'Letters to the Editor', The Strathern Herald, 11 January 1913.
6 Waddell, op.cit.
7 Savage, op.cit., p.86-87.
8 'A Noted Artist - A Native of Comrie', 'Letters to the Editor', The Strathern Herald, 11 January 1913.
10 Information about Deuchars being at Good's workshop from the late John Smith, a carver employed by Good.
12 The present clergy of the church have no documentation relating to the figures.
15 Descriptions based on drawings in the archives of Mount Stuart, Isle of Bute.
16 'A Scottish Peer's Private Chapel', The Scots Pictorial, 27 May 1911, p.81.
17 Information supplied by Deuchars's son-in-law, Frank Wilson, a wood-machinist in Scott Morton & Co. from 1914 to 1965.
18 'Bronze Altar for Chapel Mount Stuart', 19 and 22 January 1912. Bute Archives.
20 Photograph showing artists in Dovecot Studios, with altar frame in background, c.1920. Bute archives.
21 Edinburgh, Royal Scottish Academy Summer Exhibition Catalogue, 1923. Cat.no.18.
22 This is supported by the statement, made to a visiting group of horticulturists in 1954, by John McVey, formerly head gardener at Mount Stuart, that one man had worked on and off for fourteen years. Information supplied by his nephew, also John McVey.
23 Bute Archives. 'Gold Altar for Bride', The Sunday Chronicle, 3 June 1928 and 'Marquis of Bute's Daughter. Wedding preparations at Mount Stuart', Northern Daily Telegraph, 7 June 1928.
26 Memories of the late Margaret Wilson, nee Deuchars.
27 Edinburgh, Royal Scottish Academy Summer Exhibition Catalogue, 1924. Cat.no.74.
In his career with Lorimer, Deuchars had modelled some minor statuary, such as the fountain figure (Cat. 97, Pl. 176) and the group in the wall niche at Midfield (Cat. 98, Pl. 177) and the two children in the garden at Balmanno (Cat. 102, Pl. 183 & Pl. 184), but in 1917 Deuchars embarked on what was to be his greatest work for Sir Robert Lorimer - the Glenelg war memorial (Cat. 115). On 1 December 1916 Lorimer's memo recorded that 'H. J. Hebeler, 26 Northumberland Street, called regarding proposed memorial that Lady Scott proposes to erect at Glenelg village'. This was followed by a long letter, giving further details, from the lady herself. (As well as her Guildford address, Lady Scott also lived at Eilanreach estate, one mile south of Glenelg.) Mr Hebeler had reported to her that Lorimer was due to go to Dunrobin (discussed in chapter 12) shortly and presumably Lorimer had suggested that he might also go to Glenelg to see the proposed site. She told him that she hesitated to ask him to make the journey in mid-winter, as it required taking the train to Kyle of Lochalsh and then a motor boat round to Glenelg. In any case, the local minister had suggested that there was 'ample space between the flag staff & the road for the monument. It is a distance of 13 paces with a breadth of about 7 paces.' Lady Scott went on to explain that 'this special piece of land on which the Flag Staff is juts out into the Loch, where the ships pass by, going between Mallaig and the Kyle of Lochalsh.' She hoped that the wives and mothers of those villagers who had died in the war might gather at the monument to remember their lost ones. 'Also the happiest days of my son & my son-in-law were spent at Glenelg and I should like their names also on the monument.' She suggested that the memorial might take the form of 'a central column with say a Highlander and an English soldier at the base' and quoted an available sum of £1000 - £1200.

It is not known whether Lorimer made the journey north, but, by the end of June, Deuchars had executed a sketch model for the memorial, for which he was subsequently paid £10. Lorimer had typed up a rough estimate, prepared by Deuchars, of the cost of having the full-size
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maquette made (Cat. 115);

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modelling</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casting</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turntable</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£434</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is the first time that fees for models were mentioned. Previously he seems to have used members of his family.

When Deuchars was at Dores, he had modelled a commemorative piece for the Lovat Scouts and it was cast by Alexander Parlanti of Parson’s Green Lane, Fulham, discussed in chapter 5 (Cat. 33, Pl. 28). It seems that, on Deuchars’s advice, Lorimer had sent a photograph of the sketch model to the same firm, who gave an approximate estimate of £375 for casting the heroic group (three figures representing ‘Peace and Victory coming to the aid of stricken Humanity’) in bronze, assuming the weight of the metal to be twelve to fifteen hundredweights. From comments by J.F. Carruthers Bell, it appears that Lorimer may have got an estimate from another firm, possibly Charles Henshaw or R. Laidlaw & Son, in Edinburgh, for a much greater weight of metal. Carruthers Bell wrote that ‘the weight will be under one Ton. This class of work is a fine art as regards method of casting (Sand & Wax) & is not generally understood by ordinary Founders, which accounts for the great difference in weight.’ He went on to mention that he had had ‘several sporting trips to Glenelg & Loch Shiel’ and thus was aware of ‘the difficulty of transport over wild mountain roads, so that this was taken into consideration, consistent with strength & durability’. Lorimer was assured that ‘the cost will not be materially affected after the war’. Allowing for a stone pedestal, the total should have been well within the sum indicated by Lady Scott.
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On 21 August 1917, Lorimer wrote to Deuchars confirming the arrangement he had made.

Deuchars was asked
to execute the Modelling of the large Group in your studio at Hope Crescent and as arranged you will get the necessary turntable etc. required - and a start made as soon as possible. Whenever there is evidence of progress being made you are to receive payments at the RATE of Six Pounds (£6) per week, which, as explained is conditional on the steady progress you make with the work.....you are to understand that the figures named in the estimate must not be exceeded.

My client is anxious that the modelling of the Group should be completed at as early a date as possible and I trust you will see your way and so arrange it that it may be completed by not later than APRIL of next year.10

The studio at Hope Crescent was the one previously occupied by Joseph Hayes. (His men continued the firm while he was on active service during the war, but, once the news of his death was confirmed, it was wound up.) It appears that Deuchars had persuaded Lorimer to rent the premises for him and also to give him a weekly sum, since did not have the funds to support his family while this large modelling task was undertaken.11

Meanwhile, Lorimer went ahead and got an estimate for the stone pedestal from L. Maclean & Son of Inverness. They also undertook ‘to ship bronze group at Kyle of Lochalsh and place same in position on pedestal for the sum of One hundred and seventeen pounds, eleven shillings and four pence.”12 Thus the total estimate for completion of the work was £927, allowing an ample amount for Lorimer’s fee and still well within the allotted sum. Despite Carruthers Bell’s comments about the Highland roads, it would appear that the intention was to transport the bronze from London by train to Kyle of Lochalsh.

Presumably Lorimer would have discussed with Deuchars the estimate for casting he had received from Carruthers Bell of Parlanti. This must have puzzled Deuchars, since Alexander Parlanti had been in charge when he had sent work to the firm from Dores. Perhaps after prompting by Deuchars, Lorimer seems to have discovered that Alexander had sold the firm, but that his brother, E.J. Parlanti was in business at ‘The Art Bronze Foundry’ in West
Kensington. Unfortunately, when Lorimer paid it a visit early in 1918, the proprietor was absent. Somewhat agitated at missing such a promising piece of work, Parlanti hastened to write to Lorimer,

I was exceedingly sorry that I was not in when you called the other day as I had not received any intimation of your coming. My man told me that you would write to me, and I was hoping that I could see you here in London by appointment. I should be glad to be here at your disposal for any information with reference to the casting of the group which you are doing now.

My experiences in castings dates as far back as about twenty years ago when we did some castings for the late Harry Bates A.R.A. Onslow Ford R.A. etc. and in Edinburgh itself you can see an equestrian Statue which I cast a few years ago for Mr Birnie Rhind who, no doubt, you know.

I understand that Mr. Deucher (sic) is modelling this group for you. Mr. Deucher knows that in connection with my brother Alex. Parlanti (who at that time was in London) we cast at Parsons Green the “Physical Energy” by the late Frank (sic) Watts R.A. and as I have the pleasure to be known personally by Mr. Deucher, no doubt he will give you all the wanted reference on my behalf.

I am at present at the above address (Beaumont Road, West Kensington) where I am engaged exclusively on Artistic castings, the Parsons Green works having a little time ago passed in new hands altogether. I should be glad if you will allow me the opportunity of quoting for this group when I feel sure that you will find it to your advantage.

It seems that, since Lorimer had not been involved in the casting of such a large piece of sculpture before, he had gone to the Parlanti foundry at Parson’s Green on the advice of Deuchars, who had dealt with them previously. However, it was only when the estimate came in, that the change of ownership became apparent. Lorimer appears to have investigated E. J. Parlanti’s studio, but nevertheless decided to stick with Carruthers Bell at Fulham.

After all the years of struggling to support his growing family from rather precarious earnings, Deuchars must have felt that this large commission would make his reputation. He would have relished having the large studio in which to work instead of the shared space in the Dean Studio or the ‘front room’ of his flat in Caledonian Place. Since the group is an allegorical work, it would appear that Lorimer left the design entirely to Deuchars. The only element remaining
from Lady Scott’s original idea was the Highlander, representing ‘Peace’, beside a semi-nude female, ‘Humanity’, while, towering over both of them, is the winged figure of ‘Victory’ (Pl. 228 & Pl. 229). Although Deuchars never served in the armed forces, he was fascinated by uniforms, and took great trouble to portray accurately the soldier, a Cameronian, which is probably why he needed a model for this figure. In 1918, a small boy visiting the capital from his native Comrie, watched him working on it, while a kilted soldier posed patiently in the studio.14

Meanwhile, on 23 March 1918, Maclean wrote to Lorimer, urging him to confirm his acceptance of the estimate for the stonework. He emphasised that, although the railway and shipping were controlled, he should be able to get the stone through ‘when the harbour at Kyle of Lochalsh is not fully occupied with Government traffic.’ Because the workforce at the quarry had been severely depleted by the men going off to the war, he requested as much notice as possible. Another effect of the war was the rise in wages which increased the estimate to £150, a price which could not be guaranteed for long.15 Accepting it on 28 March, Lorimer noted that ‘the Group is now entirely modelled and just about ready for casting in bronze’.16

However, it appears that Lorimer’s confidence was misplaced. On 20 June, Carruthers Bell wrote to Lorimer,

I am sorry to hear that Mr Deuchars is causing you so much trouble. In all cases we have been connected with it has always been unsatisfactory to allow Sculptors to draw on A/C without an agreement in writing, similar to a building contract, limiting the payment to defined stages, one third when clay modelling is completed, one third when plaster cast is finished and the balance on completion, otherwise the constant and increasing demands generally acceded to from mistaken ideas of sympathy usually result in all or most of the money being paid when the work is only half complete owing to there being no more or very little balance to pay on completion, one can get rid of a Builder under similar conditions, but when a Sculptor is overdrawn there is unfortunately no remedy.'
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Part of the trouble would have been the requirement placed on Lorimer to arrest Deuchars’s wages in April 1918, discussed in chapter 13. In addition, the sculptor must have realised that his six pounds per week (nearly double the wage of a stone-mason or joiner at that time) was going to disappear if he finished the modelling by April, as originally stipulated, and had found ways of prolonging the task. As Carruthers Bell pointed out, there was little Lorimer could do, if he wanted his modelling completed. Perhaps Deuchars was even relishing getting extra finance out of him after all the occasions when his estimates were knocked down. It appears that Deuchars succeeded in delaying the completion of the work for several months.

There are regular entries in Lorimer’s office diaries during 1918 and 1919 as the architect or John Matthew, his partner, made regular visits to the studio to monitor progress. On two consecutive days in July 1918, Carruthers Bell was also there, it must be assumed, to assess the work for casting. Matthew was sent to check progress in September 1918 and in October, during Lorimer’s absence in Italy, Matthew ‘visited Deuchars. He has been busy latterly with the wings and drum, pigeon, etc.’ This was followed by a cheque to the sculptor the next day. Eventually the work in the studio was drawing to a close by early the following year, when Lorimer went to the studio with ‘Fisher (who would have been involved with the plaster cast) Sloan and Insurance man’. There is also a note ‘(see letter to Deuchars)’, but it is not known what the contents were. A month later Lorimer took a photographer to the studio to prepare to photograph the group (Pl. 228 & Pl. 229). Finally, the plaster cast was sent off to London and in February 1919 Parlanti wrote to Lorimer,

We have now set up the model which is rather scamped in parts for a plaster model; the crown of the head of Victory is open together with a portion of the back between the wings and much of the drapery and wings are composed of sacking: but there will be no necessity for Mr Deuchars to come to London as we can do all that is necessary ourselves while Mr Deuchars might take months, in fact we do not take at all kindly to the idea of his coming to London. As we mentioned there is a lot of unnecessary undercutting to drapery & feathers of wings which will necessitate castings solid together with much other detail.
Carruthers Bell used this to justify a considerable increase in his price, from the £375 plus 12½% for increased wages (£421.17.0) to £679.17.0, for a revised weight estimate of thirty hundredweights. Pointing out that metal was still controlled, he assured Lorimer that, as he had already earmarked three tons of metal, there was ample for the job. Faced with no feasible alternative, Lorimer had little option but to accept this inflated figure. However, he trusted that ‘this may be regarded as a final and fixed price for the work.’ Nevertheless, when Carruthers Bell replied, he included a rider that the price was based on the assumption of thirty hundredweights. He went on to add, ‘there will be a small item for repairing and fitting together the plaster model, as there were many breakages to the finer portion of the wings, but nothing of consequence - £12 to £15 will cover this.’ Maclean, the builder, was also forced to increase his price to £194.5.6 as a result of the post-war inflation which was starting to take hold. It is not known whether Lady Scott was aware at that stage of the radically increased cost of the memorial, but on 10 August 1919 she wrote to Lorimer from her daughter’s house, ‘Quarter’ near Broughton, that she had heard that the work was nearing completion and was anxious to see it. This could have been because one of the photographs taken earlier, in the studio, appeared in The Evening Dispatch on 26 June 1919. Lady Scott gave Lorimer the details for the inscription panel, which was cast the following year by Charles Henshaw of Edinburgh.

However, in London, the preparation of the maquette for casting seems to have dragged on. In May 1920, Carruthers Bell wrote again to Lorimer, giving an approximate cost of £40 to £50 for remodelling an arm. Comparison of the bronze group with the photograph of the original as modelled by Deuchars reveals that, not only was the arm redone, but the figure of ‘Victory’ was given an extra layer of curls on the head (Pl. 230 & Pl. 231). At last, in late August, the bronze, having travelled by train to Kyle of Lochalsh and thereafter by boat, arrived at Glenelg where Carruthers Bell supervised its installation. He wrote to Lorimer that ‘It is within 3 feet..."
of the top of the Pedestal as I write & will be up after lunch.... The tablet with the names & inscription I have not seen yet but a case was landed this morning from the steamer which I think contains the tablet & everything will be up & completed by the time (31st) you arrive.' He promised to write a description as requested by Lady Scott. As an afterthought at the end of his letter he added, 'I have a nice Bronze for you, G. F. Watts R. A. when I get back to London.34 It appears that Lorimer did not make it to Glenelg for Carruthers Bell wrote again on 5 September, from Bridge of Orchy, to report that before he had left the site all the 'rubbish, planks, etc.' had been cleared away and 'The memorial looks very fine.' He had taken three photographs and promised to write an accompanying article for 'The Builder' or 'Architects Journal'. Throwing in the names of George Frampton, Eric Aston Webb and Alfred Dury, prominent sculptors of the day, who had given him work, and probably looking for some repeat business from Lorimer, he suggested that the architect might like to lunch with him at his club in London. As an added enticement, he added, 'The bronze I mentioned is a good one & the late Mr Watts used to sell them for 100 guineas each. As the Royalty is unexpired we must not sell, but I can give one left on our hands some time ago...35 It is not known if Lorimer ever accepted the gift, but Watts was certainly very protective of his copyright (discussed earlier in chapter 4). In fact, the bronze was probably cast when Alex. Parlanti owned the foundry and it may have still been the property of Mrs Watts, whom Lorimer knew.

Carruthers Bell could have been attempting to assuage Lorimer's wrath at the ultimate price of casting the group. In a series of notes about the mounting costs, Lorimer observed that from the original estimate on 4 July 1917 of £375, to £679 : 17/- on 18 February 1919, an account for £1129 was rendered, but it was followed by a letter on 17 September saying that the work had cost nearly £1500. He ended by noting that,

It will not be an easy matter to explain to Lady Scott how work originally estimated at £375 has turned out at from £1100 to £1500, even allowing that the original est. was only an approx. one and that it did not include packing.
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... carriage, sending men to Glenelg and erection.  

His list of accounts (allowing £1500 for the casting) produced a grand total of £2610 14/-, as compared to the original £1000 to £1200 Lady Scott had indicated was available.  

It seems that Lorimer succeeded in persuading Carruthers Bell to accept £1450, bringing the final total to £2560 13/6, plus Lorimer's fee of £277.  

(Although the final cost was nearly three times Lorimer's original estimate, it was well within the range of £2,500 to £3,000, charged for other war memorials consisting of sculptural groups, with the exception of Alexander Proudfoot's monumental work at Greenock, which cost £10,000.  

As well as Deuchars's six pounds per week, other payments, included in the total of £699 12/6 for modelling, were to Fisher (for the plaster casting), Grieve (joiner work), Williamson, Miss Farquharson, Black and Locke, plus 'rent & taxes for studio'. Some of the latter names may refer to the models employed for Deuchars.  

Thus, the original estimate of £434 increased by over 50%, but it is not possible to work out exactly how much of this is directly attributable to Deuchars's tardiness in completing his modelling. However, this increase in cost has also to be set against the high post war inflation (reaching 18-20% per annum) during the latter part of the period covered by the execution of the commission.

The memorial was unveiled at the end of September 1920 by Sir John Banner of Arnisdale, but it was not quite as Deuchars had intended (Pl. 230 & Pl. 231). The fulsome extra layer of curls added to the head of the winged figure, as a result of the attentions of Carruthers Bell, overwhelmed Deuchars's original delicate treatment of the hair (Pl. 228 & Pl. 229). However, the sculptor was never able to travel to Glenelg to view the bronze heroic group in situ.  

The typescript of Carruthers Bell's article described the memorial in rather flowery language.  

...The bronze group is placed on a stone pedestal, simple and dignified in design and in harmony with its rugged environment; the whole ensemble forming a conspicuous landmark, rising some 18 feet above road level and an object of interest to the numerous tourist steamers passing through the narrow sound separating Glenelg from the Isle of Skye. The bronze group is one of
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the largest ever erected in the Western Highlands and consists of three colossal figures symbolic of the Great War - a typical Cameron Highlander stands on guard in a dignified pose in full fighting kit with both hands resting on the barrel of his rifle, at ease, while a kneeling female figure mutely appeals to the winged figure of peace (sic) bearing aloft (sic) with the right arm extended a bronze wreath. The total height of the bronze group is ten feet and it was modelled by Mr Louis R. Deuchars and is an impressive composition...

Carruthers Bell had mistakenly attributed ‘peace’ to the winged figure, but the balance of probability is that Deuchars intended the angel to represent ‘Victory’. If it had been ‘Peace’, then the soldier would have had to represent ‘Victory’, an unlikely allegory, given the soldier’s ‘at ease’ pose. The article went on,

The Memorial has been carried out from the designs of Sir Robert Lorimer, A.R.A., F.R.I.B.A. Architect.

The pedestal has been erected by Messrs Maclean & Son, Builders of Inverness and the colossal group of figures as already stated has been modelled by Mr L.R. Deuchars and cast in bronze by The Albion Art Foundry Ltd. of Parsons Green, London, under the personal supervision of J.F. Carruthers Bell who also directed the erection and fitting together of the group at Glenelg.42

The piece was subsequently published, almost verbatim, in The Builder on 22 October 1920.

It was accompanied by one of Lorimer’s photographs of the full-size group in the studio at Hope Crescent and another rather indistinct one of the memorial on its pedestal at Glenelg.43

Lorimer had cause to reflect long and hard on the troublesome project, discussed later in chapter 16. Those tourists, who venture over Mam Ratagan today and wonder at the allegorical group somewhat at odds with its surroundings, little realise its significance to the debate on the relationship between sculptors and architects (Pl. 232).

---

1 Memo by Lorimer, 1 December 1916. GEN 1963/9/85 L.P.
2 According to Glenelg Postmistress, 16 April 1987.
3 There is an undocumented story in Glenelg village that Lady Scott offered a pier as a war memorial, but the villagers declined that option and chose the sculpture instead.
4 Her son-in-law was probably Captain Roland Stuart Hebeler, the second name on the list on the memorial, immediately above her son, Captain Henry Hall Scott.
5 Letter from Lady Scott to Lorimer, n.d., but probably late December or early January 1916 according to contents. GEN 1963/9/86b. L.P.
6 Letter from Lorimer to Deuchars, 21 August 1917. GEN 1963/9/104. L.P.
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3. Letter from Parlanti to Lorimer, 9 July 1917. GEN 1963/9/90. L.P.
4. Letter from Lorimer to Deuchars, 21 August 1917. GEN 1963/9/104. L.P.
7. Letter from E.J. Parlanti to Lorimer, 4 February 1918. GEN 1963/9/91. L.P.
9. Letter from Maclean & Son to Lorimer, 23 March 1918. GEN 1963/9/92a,b,c. L.P.
11. Letter from Carruthers Bell, 20 June 1918. GEN 1963/9/82. L.P.
12. Registered Copy of Arrestment of Wages Order by Sheriff John Hall, 2 April 1918. P.C.
14. Lorimer’s Office Diaries for 1918 & 1919. P.C.
15. Lorimer’s Office Diaries, 23 & 24 July 1918. P.C.
16. Lorimer’s Office Diaries, 5 September & 16 October 1918. P.C.
17. Lorimer’s Office Diaries, 17 October 1918. P.C.
19. Lorimer’s Office Diaries, 17 February 1919. P.C.
20. Letter from Carruthers Bell, 18 February 1919. GEN 1963/9/102. L.P.
24. ‘To the Fallen Brave’, The Evening Dispatch, Edinburgh, 26 June 1919, p.4. The caption read, ‘The above is a design of the Glenelg (Inverness-shire) war memorial, which is the work of Mr L. R. Deuchars, 20 Hope Crescent, Edinburgh. The group, which is in bronze and granite, represents Peace and Victory coming to the aid of stricken Humanity, and is to be erected to the memory of Highlanders who fell in the war.’
25. Letter from Lady Scott to Lorimer, 10 August 1919. GEN 1963/9/87. L.P. Among those commemorated are Captain G. H. H. Scott (her son) and Major Fleming, D.S.O., M.P., the Laird of Arnisdale Estate, and member of the banking family, who was the father of Ian Fleming, the author, ‘Glenelg Memorial Account’, 24 August 1920. GEN 1963/9/100. L.P.
27. It is somewhat ironic that the landing of such an awkward cargo would have been greatly facilitated by the pier originally offered by Lady Scott.
32. ‘Glenelg’, Lorimer’s Account Book. P.C.
33. Information obtained from Gilbert Bell’s research for his unpublished thesis, Monuments to the Fallen - Scottish War Memorials of the Great War, Strathclyde University, 1993.
35. Information supplied by his daughter, Margaret Wilson (now debrid.)
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Around the middle of the nineteenth century, applied decoration on buildings was designed by architects and carried out by craftsmen carvers. Gradually, over the remainder of the century, more and more established sculptors were employed. According to Susan Beattie, the journal *British Architect* consistently advocated co-operation between architects and sculptors to achieve the best possible integration between the two arts, but there is evidence that tensions existed as to who should have the lead role.1 Spielmann’s standard work on sculpture (1901) included a section on ‘The Sculptor v. the Architect’, where he opined that ‘Architects, nevertheless, are apt to assume the lead and dictate to the sculptor.’ Although writing from the sculptor’s perspective, he conceded that where a small sculptural detail was required for a building, then the architect should be in charge, while the large public monument should rightly be led by the sculptor. Finally, he concluded with an observation and some advice,

> It is a perennial struggle that is here touched upon; and the sculptor must be strong, indeed, if he is to assert himself against the man who is artist, builder, and business man in one.²

Evidence of the continuing friction can be found in 1916 in *The Relation of Sculpture to Architecture*, by T. P. Bennett, an architect. Having explored all the issues in detail, he advocated the same division of labour as Spielmann, but went on to make a plea for some degree of cross fertilisation to be introduced into the education of both architects and sculptors. Once a commission was secured, he recommended caution in choosing a partner to ensure harmony as the work proceeded and gave advice to both,

> Let the architect work in co-operation with the sculptor, and upon all points relating to attitude, the detail and the arrangement of the drapery in the figure or group accept his superior knowledge and experience without question. The sculptor should also have an absolutely free hand in the final treatment of the detail. The best result will probably be produced if small-scale drawings embodying the whole scheme are first prepared by the architect, then a sketch-model put up by the sculptor, and the design thereafter developed upon the model. The final full-size, with the exception of the contour of the mouldings, should be left entirely in the hands of the sculptor.³

On the Glenelg memorial Deuchars was given a free hand with the sculpture, but others were none too happy about the way Lorimer had engaged him for the work. In the artistic milieu of
Edinburgh such a large piece would not have gone unnoticed and Deuchars was a sociable individual especially when he had a ready supply of his beloved brandy. His activities had come to the attention of Pittendrigh Macgillivray, who had originally brought Deuchars to Edinburgh, discussed in chapter 8. Evidence of the continuing friction between the two sculptors was discussed in chapter 11.\textsuperscript{4} Lorimer’s lead role in the Glenelg memorial, with its ideal sculpture, incensed Macgillivray, who felt that a sculptor should have received the commission instead. Whether old jealousies against Deuchars’s modelling talent played a part, or whether the venom was aimed solely at Lorimer, Macgillivray seized an opportunity to bring the matter to the attention of both professions via the Royal Scottish Academy. Also involved were two other sculptors, William Birnie Rhind, R.S.A., another prickly character, and Henry Snell Gamley, an Associate.

The Academy was due to meet on 13 February 1918 to elect three new Members from among the ranks of the Associates. Lorimer had been nominated for one of the vacancies. Shortly before the meeting began, a letter addressed to the President and Council was placed before the Secretary, W. D. Mackay.

We the undersigned members of the Sculpture Section of the Academy, beg to lodge herewith a formal protest against the nomination of Sir Robert Lorimer, A.R.S.A. Architect; for the rank of membership of our Academy: on the ground of conduct outside the recognised etiquette of his profession. His behaviour in dealing with commissions for works of Sculpture is doubtless quite legal, but, according to our information, it is not such as can be tolerated within the ranks of an Academy of the Fine Arts.

The honours and fellowship of our Academy can only be allowed, we contend, to those who scrupulously respect and uphold the professional rights, welfare, and dignity of their fellow members; in so far as these are recognised, conserved, and made a matter of just and decent order under the Royal Charter of our Academy, and according to the meaning of the terms used in the Diploma granted to its members.

In order to substantiate more definitely the grounds of our protest we request the favour of a meeting with the Council of the Academy.\textsuperscript{5}

The President, Sir James Guthrie, seemed about to read it to the assembled membership, then hesitated, when Macgillivray went over to him and said that he did not wish it to be read. He later
wrote that, 'We had in view that it would be read; but, afterwards realising the matter was too complex for the opening of an election meeting; we regretted having restricted our protest to one against "nomination".'6 The meeting went ahead without the letter being read and after the vote Lorimer was not one of those elected to Member status.

However, unable to let the matter rest, Macgillivray wrote again on 16 February to Mackay to request that the meeting with the Council be held, allowing the signatories ten days to prepare a statement.7 In the meantime, Macgillivray was busy attempting to gather supporting evidence. It appears that he had contacted E. J. Parlanti, tempting him with the possibility of casting some of his work. Parlanti replied,

With reference to Sir Robert Lorimer, I wrote to him as I told you I would, but received no reply from him or from Deuchers (sic). Sir Robert Lorimer called here unexpectedly a fortnight ago, but unfortunately I was out as I had no knowledge of his being in London. I wrote to him after this but up to now I have received no reply. Perhaps he might have settled already with my newly born relations at Parsons Green. If he called there, as no doubt he did, Mr C. Bell has surely managed his best artistic vocabulary on him with success. I shall certainly know this later on.8

Having failed in that direction, Macgillivray then sought information about Lady Scott and Glenelg. He discovered where she lived, but he was told by Rhind, who had been in touch with her Factor’s office, that he was ‘finding difficulty in getting the information I promised you’.9 He added that he had ‘not yet got the number of the “British Architect” with the article we desire....Another architectural friend is trying to get it for me.’ They may have been looking for one of the earlier copies of that publication which tended to be supportive of the sculptors’ cause, but more likely it was Goscombe John’s review of Bennett’s book in the Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects.10 However, it is doubtful if it would have been of use to them, since the sculptor, writing in the architects’ journal, was careful not to be too contentious, preferring to support Mr Bennett’s plea for understanding and co-operation between the professions. Rhind went on to ask Macgillivray when he could see ‘your draft of your statement to be laid before the Academy’. Finally he added a note of caution, ‘I had a chat with Washington Browne this
This advice was well timed, for Lorimer had been sent copies of the original letters to the Council and wrote to Mackay complaining that 'the charges therein have been made without intimation or warning to me of any kind and without explanations'. He therefore requested that he be present at the meeting on 7 March accompanied by an advisor and a shorthand writer. Mackay, sensing that the matter was becoming serious, wrote to Macgillivray that the Council had acceded to Lorimer's request and that the Academy's own lawyer would also be present. This incensed Macgillivray who fired off letters to Mackay, Guthrie and Garson (the Academy's lawyer) complaining that a private communication to the Council had been given to a third party. Obviously realising that the original protest could be deemed an attempt to sway the vote for new Members, and as such, might result in legal action from Lorimer, Macgillivray was at pains to point out to Guthrie that 'I did not wish you to read it before the election - so it had no influence on the voting.' Macgillivray said if Lorimer and his lawyer were present, the sculptors would not appear. If not in attendance, the sculptors were willing to attend with a written statement. Alternatively, they were prepared to send a written statement at a later date. The President and Council opted for the last option and when Mackay wrote to inform Macgillivray on the eve of the planned meeting, he also told him that such a statement, while a private document would have to be available for 'Sir Robert's private use'.

Macgillivray set to work on his statement, which began with a plea for the Council to support the equality of all three sections in the Academy (painting, sculpture and architecture), followed by an outline of the state of the sculpture profession in Scotland. Possibly drawing on his family background (his father and brother were both sculptors), he felt that the number of practitioners had declined considerably over the previous forty years, especially when compared to the success of the London scene. Apparently oblivious to any charges of defamation which might be brought
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against him, he went on to state the case against Lorimer.

We are informed that he is at present engaged on carrying out a commission for a large memorial in Sculpture for a client in Glenelg. It takes the form of a group to be cast in bronze, about 12ft. in height. It embodies three figures, one Victory, in scale, about 9ft; and two Life size figures: the whole to be mounted on a pedestal and erected at the site of Glenelg.

From the detailed nature of his statements it appears that someone had been into the Hope Crescent studio, or else Deuchars had been boasting of his work.

Our professional estimate of the value of such a commission - that is the fee we should ask for the execution of such a group in bronze and its pedestal - apart from cost of transport to site and erection would not be less than £3000. We need scarcely point out that the foregoing details indicate the possibility of an important work of Art and a native commission of the first order to Scottish Sculptors of standing. Granted that such a commission may have come by open and natural ways to Sir Robert Lorimer as an architect instead of to a representative Sculptor, members of the Academy would naturally expect Sir Robert to go about the execution of the commission in the most worthy manner. His fellowship of the R.I.B.A., his diploma from the Academy, and his honour of knighthood; left him, one would imagine, little option but to consult with some leading Sculptor in the country - if not exactly in Edinburgh. We take him to be sufficiently educated and au courant in affairs of Art culture to know well enough what procedure he ought to have adopted in such an affair...

Macgillivray alleged that Lorimer had committed 'a breach of his professional order as defined by the Laws of the R.I.B.A.' and suggested that the Academy should not condone such behaviour. He went on,

...Sir R. Lorimer did not consult any sculptor of standing in Scotland...he appears to have employed, directly, a person named Deuchars, to do the work, at a wage rate of £6 per week paid fortnightly. The payments so made to be limited, it is said, to a total of £400, for the making of the model, which is, of course, the principal part of the work.

The estimation of the total payments to Deuchars exceeds the original £350, but Lorimer may have been forced to agree to the extra £50 to get the work completed. The statement continued,

The man Deuchars has frequently been employed by Sir R. Lorimer on petty jobs. He is not a person one would describe as of satisfactory character and his intemperate habits are well known. The work on the group in question, we have been reliably informed, has been carried out in exceedingly cramped circumstances and in a technically incompetent manner, indicating such limited conditions and professional capacity as the work in question ought not to have been subjected to.

We understand that the rent of the place where Deuchars works is paid by Sir R. Lorimer. Seemingly the plaster casting or waste-moulding, of the model, was not
entrusted to Deuchars; and we have learnt that Sir R. Lorimer has been in treaty with and visited bronze founders with a view to arranging directly for the metal casting. These works of casting involving professional knowledge and skilled oversight are in normal cases left to the handling and responsibility of the Sculptor, but the Sculptor in the present case does not seem to be a person on whom the architect may implicitly rely for the handling of sub-contracts.16

In another hand-written, undated document, Macgillivray repeated the allegations of inferior practices,

We know that this work has been done, and that, from a technical point of view, it has been carried out by what may be described as curious technical methods, and in incompetent conditions.

We have certain evidence of eyewitneses on the subject, and we know a number of facts on which we base our action, but...the work in question has been carried out with privacy, and we cannot compel any witnesses to appear before the committee with evidence.17

From these comments, it seems that neither Macgillivray nor Rhind had been in the Hope Crescent studio, which was certainly not small, having been the workplace of several men employed by Joseph Hayes. The allegations that the work was not technically competent are equally wide of the mark, since Deuchars had spent a total of five years working with Goscombe John and Colton. Deuchars was perfectly capable of making the plaster cast, but the cost of the material for such a large piece was probably beyond him. Finally, when he was with Watts, he had worked with Parlanti on the casting of ‘Physical Energy’ and he had also overseen the casting of his own Lovat Scouts commemorative piece by the same bronze foundry. Having thoroughly denigrated Deuchars and his work, Macgillivray then turned to the question of money.

We do not yet know the terms of the contract between Sir R. Lorimer and his client, but taking the sum paid to Deuchars at £400, and making reasonable allowance for casting in plaster and in bronze, and for a granite pedestal; we estimate the cost of the work at say £1,300 - without erection. This leaves a balance of £1,700 over from our estimated value of £3,000 - without erection.

To sum up we cannot regard it as a laudable thing on the part of Sir Robert, to have come between his Sculptor fellow-Academicians and this commission especially at such a time of difficulty for them as the present. If, on the other hand, Sir Robert believed he was employing in Deuchars an artist superior to any of the recognised sculptors in Scotland we must then think it a mean thing on his part to take advantage of the man’s poor circumstances by allowing him only about a quarter of what his part in the work should have been worth. We also
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submit that Sir Robert’s client probably relied on him to get the work done in the best manner available and we question if his client is aware of the commercial methods he has adopted.\textsuperscript{18}

In these paragraphs the real reason for Macgillivray’s protest is unveiled. What he considered a major work of sculpture was not offered to him, nor Rhind, the leaders of the profession in Scotland. Why Gamley got sucked into their scheme is hard to understand for he was reputed to be ‘so generally beloved’ at the Academy.\textsuperscript{19} Macgillivray’s contention that the sculptors were experiencing such a ‘time of difficulty for them as at present’ seems at odds with the increasing number of war memorials then being commissioned. The main thrust of their argument appears to be that, by employing Deuchars, Lorimer was supplying a major piece of sculpture to a client at a cut price and, in so doing, enhancing his own reputation.

Macgillivray was at pains to point out that there was ‘no suggestion intended of any illegal practices on the part of Sir R. Lorimer’, but the statement went on to argue that the ‘“obnoxious” professional conduct’ on the part of the architect contravened the professional standards of the Academy. It ended by proposing that ‘the matter be remitted to a committee of five members three painters, one sculptor, and one architect - these to be chosen from the membership by the council’.

In an attempt to influence the agenda for the committee, ten ‘Interrogations’ were put forward which were aimed at discovering the exact nature of the relationship between Lorimer and Deuchars. Consideration of the propriety of this agreement in relation to the professional code of conduct of the R.I.B.A. and that of the Academy was to be given.\textsuperscript{20} As this paper is not among the archives of the R.S.A., it appears that wiser counsel prevailed and that document was never despatched. Instead, Macgillivray wrote to Mackay with his proposal for the committee, adding that ‘The painter members ...to declare themselves without prejudice and to have the voting power. The sculptor and architect being appointed for assistance on technical points’. He was at pains to point out that ‘our action is free from personal considerations and that we are merely doing an unpleasant duty by the Academy and the interests of our profession.’ Realising that the sculptors
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might find themselves on the receiving end of a civil suit, the letter explained that their original intention by presenting their protest at the election meeting was not to influence the voting. He explained, 'The urgent action we thought necessary caused lack of consideration in respect of form and circumstances.' Although the statement was not submitted, it appears that it was circulated beyond the membership of the Academy. Stewart Carmichael, a Dundee-based artist who had trained in architecture, had been given an opportunity to look over Macgillivray's document. In his two-page letter of support, he told Macgillivray that, 'It seems to be a flagrant example of money making at the expense of real artists...we in Dundee have had that matter before us - only the artists in question were not Academicians of Scotland representative of all that that stands for.'

For various reasons it proved impossible to assemble the requested committee and matters dragged on until May with sporadic representations to the Secretary from both sides. By that time most of the sculptor members, with the exception of 'one member who is unfit to attend to business, and one associate elect who is in France and would join us were he here' (Carrick, who was in the army), had lined up with the three original protesters. Even Percy Portsmouth, Head of Sculpture at Edinburgh College of Art, who had in the past received work from Lorimer, added his support 'at the eleventh hour', albeit not totally unqualified, after Macgillivray had exerted considerable persuasion on him. While anxious to depersonalise the issue, Portsmouth pointed out that

The subordinate and often undignified position that most sculptors at some period experienced in their dealings with architects, has at all times been a sore point and a cause of contention....When an architect is dealing more particularly with a commission for a work of pure sculpture the element of friction is obviously increased but the relationship is more easily defined, for then the architect is more clearly seen to be infringing on the domain of the sculptor.

Finally, Mackay wrote to Macgillivray, 'Owing to the failure of the Sculptor Members to comply with the order of the Committee appointed to deal with the subject, of date 7th. inst., the Council resolved to submit the whole question to an Assembly of Academicians to be held on Wednesday 29th. inst. at 2.30 p.m.' The business of the meeting was to be 'Submission to Assembly of
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charges brought by certain Sculptor Members of the Academy against an Architect Member, the specific nature of which the Sculptors have declined to submit to a Committee appointed by the Council to investigate the matter.124

Gamley was unable to be present at the meeting, but wrote to Mackay expressing 'the hope that the Academy will do something to straighten out the difficulty between Sculptors and Architects.' He went on to suggest that bye-laws could be drawn up to give guidance in future. However, despite the conciliatory nature of his letter, he concluded by reiterating his unqualified support for Macgillivray.29 At the meeting, the Chairman outlined the business before them and, after emphasising that the meeting was concerned only with procedure, he asked Macgillivray whether he wished to make a statement. The sculptor began to read from a lengthy document, which started in fairly general terms about principles of professionalism to be upheld by the Academy. However, Macgillivray soon introduced

a little personal explanation in answer to an attempt on the other side to discredit me by giving new currency to an old lie. It was said within these walls recently by a member, that the poor incompetent creature the Architect in question has deigned to employ as a Sculptor, was once in my employment with a two year's engagement and that after a fortnight or three weeks I broke the engagement and threw him on to the street, where he was in due course found by the benevolent Architect who has since fostered him. The man explained that he had lost his precious letter of engagement and therefore had no power of redress. I take this opportunity of nailing down once more this absolute lie, and I would ask Mr. Rhind if he ever heard of a Sculptor giving a written engagement of years to any employee, especially in the case where the Sculptor had never seen the man to be engaged nor any example of his work. I do not pause to deal further with the man than to add that I placed his case in the hands of A. Menzies, W.S., Rutland Street, who settled him.30

Macgillivray's rough treatment of Deuchars may have been well known in artistic circles in Edinburgh and those sympathetic to Lorimer's case could have resurrected the gossip, although it would appear that there was more than a grain of truth in it if a solicitor was required to settle the matter. However, the member referred to could have been Lorimer's painter brother, John, a member of the Council, who had offered his resignation when he was asked to stand down as a member of an earlier committee appointed to consider the affair.31 Tempers were becoming
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Inflamed on both sides. Macgillivray went on to refer to an anonymous letter which he had received earlier that month from ‘the other side’. In an elegant flowing hand, it read,

Once upon a time there was a Good Sculptor  
Who an Envious Person made into a Catspaw  
And the Envious Person said to the Good Sculptor  
Draw I pray thee three Chestnuts from the fire for me  
And the Good Sculptor drew them  
And the Chestnuts were Done .... and so was He.32

Macgillivray insisted that he was ‘quite unconscious of being anyone’s “cats paw” and acted on his own judgement. Then returning to the specifics of the case, he questioned the right of an architect ‘to take on directly a commission for a work of Sculpture and then employ modellers at weeks wages to make the model; plaster moulders to cast it; bronze founders to found it; and monumental masons to make the whole work’. At that point he was interrupted by a protest from James Paterson, the painter. Macgillivray asserted that he was making a hypothetical case, but Garson, the Academy’s solicitor opined that, while he considered the statement to be rather closer to reality, it was up to the members to decide.33

If Macgillivray had been allowed to continue he would have gone on to argue that the matter was one of principle. The sculptors were only trying to ensure that their professionalism was protected.

On the other hand the fashionable Architect tends to become a business man... as against painter or sculptor artists the fashionable modern architect tends, instead of ways of personal and autographic art, to adopt the manipulative methods and mercantile profits of the entrepreneur of commerce and so ceases to be an artist in the Academic sense of the term.

The result of this state of affairs is from the Academy point of view very unfortunate for the Sculptor. In respect of the monumental and decorative regions of his work he becomes a victim of exploitation on the part of the entrepreneur architect. He is kept apart from the client and the full values of his proper opportunities and profits are intercepted and appropriated by the architect.

It is possible for the type of Architect I have in view to employ the Sculptor at a wage or to bargain privately for a fixed sum and then to account for the work at double the cost to the client.34

Had Macgillivray gone on to make these highly inflammatory statements, he would probably have been sued for defamation by Lorimer, yet his allegations were not so wide of the mark. In all the
years that Lorimer had given work to Deuchars, he had repeatedly beaten down the payment to the sculptor, although there is no evidence that the architect then went on to inflate his fee to the client. It seems that Lorimer only took advantage of Deuchars’s weak bargaining power to keep down the final price to the client, who got an exclusive piece of work instead of a mass-produced decorative piece which Lorimer might have bought in. Somewhat high-mindedly, Macgillivray insisted that ‘we have no consuming desire to urge this action vindictively against an individual, however unsatisfactory, inartistic, and selfish we consider his doings to have been. We are without his explanations and he has probably found time since the date of our protest to reconsider the professional rectitude of his doings.’ Although he appeared to concede that it would be better for the sculptors to drop the matter, he suggested that a committee, consisting of two sculptors and two architects (an associate and member from each section), plus the Deputy President and Secretary, should be set up to draft bye-laws to deal with the matters they raised and also to formulate procedures for such protests.35 In the event, his plea went unheard. Both he and Rhind left the meeting, after ‘Rhind made some fatuous statements’.36 Following considerable discussion, it was resolved that the Academy approved the actions of its Council and the Committee which had been set up to deal with the matter. It was decided to take no further action and the resolution went on to regret that members had made charges against one of their number, but had failed to substantiate them.37

Despite receiving written confirmation of this conclusion, Macgillivray would not give up and drafted a two-page document, on behalf of Rhind and probably based on conversations with him. It reveals that it was Rhind who had brought the matter to the attention of Macgillivray. He had then taken up the cause with alacrity, perhaps still bearing a grudge towards Deuchars who had stayed around to remind him of his rather less than professional behaviour in terminating his assistantship in 1908. Whoever sent the anonymous letter, alleging that Macgillivray was a ‘catspaw’, must have suspected that it was Rhind who had originally objected to Deuchars doing the Glenelg
memorial. Although Rhind had not received any work from Lorimer since the Alloa Boer War Memorial, perhaps he lived in hope of another commission and did not wish to be seen as the leading protagonist, or perhaps he recognised Macgillivray's superior facility with words and his enthusiastic readiness to take up the cudgels for a cause. Macgillivray's statement ended with another plea for bye-laws 'to define the professional relationship of Sculptors and Architect within the ranks of the Academy'.

Rhind returned the document to Macgillivray with the comment, 'I quite approve of the enclosed, it is quite to the point though of course in face of the Academy's resolution it is a waste of energy.'

The result of the meeting was also communicated to Lorimer by James Paterson. He pointed out that,

This is the full length the Assembly could go under the Charter. - Disciplinary power can only be exercised at a Meeting called 14 days before and must be confirmed at a subsequent meeting - a two thirds majority being required to expel, suspend or censure a Member.

I don't (sic) know if you will let the matter stand at this, but thought it right to tell you roughly what has been done.

It has been an intolerable business - Macgillivray's behaviour all through has been worse than German.

The outcome must have been quite a relief for Lorimer, who had been enlisting support from among the membership of the Academy. His brother, John, the painter resigned his membership over the issue, although there is evidence that he tried to withdraw the resignation on the advice of his brother, who felt that resignation could be interpreted as an indication of something to hide.

Lorimer had sought the sympathy of another painter, D.Y. Cameron, by sending him 'typed correspondence'. However, Cameron replied that he could not take part in the discussion at the May meeting, nor vote because he was then only an Academician elect. Wishing that all would go well for Lorimer, he concluded that the material Lorimer had sent him revealed 'a cowardice & meanness inconceivable on the Sculptors' part.' Perhaps based on that collected material Lorimer had typed a comprehensive chronological account of the events that had followed from the original
communication to him on 27 February 1918. It was aimed at the membership of the Academy and it would appear that he intended to read it at a meeting. As there is no record in the minutes and since the only copy was among Lorimer’s office papers, it appears that it was never delivered to its intended audience.\(^42\) After quoting most of the correspondence verbatim, Lorimer went on to defend himself against the complaint, asserting that the first letter of 12 February was ‘calculated to convey the totally erroneous impression that I had the opportunity of passing round numerous important commissions for Sculpture and it is inferred that I was to be penalised because I had not availed myself of the services of the three signatories to the letter.’ He went on to detail what he saw as the facts, pointing out that in his twenty five years in practice in Edinburgh he could ‘only recall five occasions when any opportunity occurred of working along with a Sculptor and on three of the occasions the work was carried out by members of the R.S.A. In two of the cases the work was “applied” Architectural modelling intimately connected with and related to Architectural detail.’ There followed an amplification of the five occasions.

(1) The first occasion was a South African War memorial at Alloa which consisted of a pedestal surmounted by a bronze group - I got in touch with Mr Birnie Rhind: he designed the group - I designed the pedestal. We worked in perfect harmony and the work was duly carried out.

(2) Some years before the War I was engaged on an important woodwork contract in connection with Dunblane Cathedral, consisting of choir stalls, organ case and East end Screen. In the Screen are panels in low relief representing the Seven acts of Mercy. In the organ case are various applied angel figures playing musical instruments. All the modelling in connection with the work was done to my entire satisfaction by Mr Percy Portsmouth. His models being used by the wood carvers and ultimately produced in oak by W. & A. Clow.

Here Lorimer was not giving the entire story. Deuchars modelled animal arm rests for the stalls, bas relief figures on the organ, pendant angels all along the stall canopies and more angels between the Acts of Mercy. At the time, Portsmouth was not mentioned in any of the written material, but Deuchars’s name was included in the catalogue entry for the pendant angels exhibited at the Arts & Crafts Exhibition (all discussed earlier in chapter 10).
CHAPTER 16

SCULPTORS v. ARCHITECTS

Lorimer's third point referred to the lead statue in the garden at Westerlea (Murrayfield, Edinburgh). The owner, J. J. Cowan had specifically asked for his friend, Charles Mackie to have that commission.

The fourth occasion considered by Lorimer was the Thistle Chapel, where he outlined how Deuchars had come to his attention, after the latter had been dismissed so abruptly by Macgillivray, discussed fully in chapter 9. Lorimer explained how he had

instructed Mr Hayes to give him a trial. He very soon got into the type of work that was wanted and ultimately modelled the figure work both stone and wood, which work it should be remarked was not "free" sculpture but sculpture "in service" associated with and attached to the mouldings and other features on the stonework and woodwork, and had to be modelled in conjunction therewith.

Shortly after the Thistle Chapel was completed Mr Hayes unfortunately allowed his business to go to pieces, he later joined the army - went to France and was killed.

It is somewhat ironical for Lorimer to assert that Hayes let his business go to pieces when Lorimer had transferred all his modelling commissions to Deuchars and was merely using Hayes as a paymaster.43

The sculptor referred to again found himself without employment. I was able to give him a certain amount of architectural modelling to do - panels for chimney pieces, models for wood carving and one or two small figures for gardens - a class of work for which he undoubtedly has the flare.

Lorimer's tone implies that he was carrying out a charitable function in continuing to give Deuchars modelling work. However, before Deuchars came along, he had bought marble fireplace panels from Italy and also garden statuary from the Bromsgrove Guild of Fine Art. Therefore, Lorimer can only have continued to offer Deuchars commissions because his naturalistic style enhanced Lorimer's designs and he was able to have the work done at a relatively low price, exploiting to some extent Deuchars's financial situation.

Finally Lorimer came to the Glenelg memorial.

About 18 months ago a lady wrote to me regarding a War Memorial she wished to
erect in a remote village in Invernesshire (sic). As the same sculptor had nothing to do at the moment I explained to him the type of thing the lady wished. I said if he liked to make a small plasticene sketch I would see he was adequately paid for his sketch, in the event of the work not going on. He made the sketch, the lady was charmed by it and instructed me to get estimates for carrying out the design. I explained that the Sculptor in question not being a man of means payments to account would require to be frequent and this the lady readily agreed to. The estimates were approved and the work proceeded with.

In this paragraph, Lorimer admits that the design for the Glenelg memorial was mainly Deuchars’s.

Therefore, it appears that Macgillivray and the other sculptors had some grounds for complaint since Lorimer’s fee of £277 was mainly for designing the supporting stonework and instructing Henshaw to make the inscription panel.

After summarising all five cases, Lorimer went on to claim, ‘In all cases referred to there was no question of cutting down prices. There was no lack of money and the sculptors concerned were adequately paid for their work.’ This is blatantly untrue, since most of the accounts submitted by Deuchars were queried by Lorimer and more often than not reduced.

The memorandum submitted that had the sculptors requested a meeting with him to discuss their grievances, ‘the whole matter could have been cleared up in half an hour’. Given Lorimer’s inclination to resort to his lawyers at the least hint of anything contentious, it is doubtful that the sculptors would have had satisfaction so easily. However, because of the way they had handled matters, Lorimer was able to assume the high moral ground and concluded by expressing his regret that ‘the time and temper of the Council and Members of the R.S.A. should have been spent over this business’. He thanked them for their final resolution on 29 May 1918. It would appear that he never had the opportunity of delivering his version of the story to the Academy and that he decided to let matters rest.

Macgillivray continued to attempt to revive interest in his cause. In a reply to him on 6 July 1918, Sir James Guthrie, the President, wrote, ‘...I am sorry I cannot go back to this Lorimer matter now.'
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Except for this base fact of the Academicians' decisions, its later doings are unknown to me.' He went on to repeat, somewhat wearily, that he had said that the original letter to the Members must not be read. Then he commented, 'I am sorry that you think Walton's attitude hostile...I have never had any ground to consider him other than well disposed to you. He is my oldest friend in Art and tho' I have seen little of him for some time I don't think him likely to be uncharitable or unfair in his judgements personally whether we agree with them or no.' From this exchange it appears that the painter, E. A. Walton, disagreed with Macgillivray's position. Possibly he could have taken that stand if Deuchars had worked for his brother, the architect, George Walton, when he started out with his decorating business in Glasgow in 1898, discussed in chapter 2. Guthrie assured Macgillivray that no one who knew him would believe that he had taken 'such matter up for material advantage.' However, he declared 'That is all I can say on the subject.' and drew a line between that sentence and the rest of his letter. Nevertheless, at the beginning he had indicated that 'such as it has been, my share in Art administration is now over, so I am only waiting a convenient reason for its formal termination'. Thus Guthrie was another casualty of the affair. It appears that some sort of uneasy truce between Lorimer and Rhind came about. On February 1919, Guthrie, although no longer President, when replying to Lorimer's letter about the R.S.A. election, said he quite understood Lorimer's position and that 'Both Rhind & yourself are wanted. I wish that simple issue could have been before the members. Failing that the best thing is the spirit in which you both look at the matter.' In 1921 Lorimer was duly elected to full membership of the Academy.

Deuchars, possibly believing that the Glenelg memorial was such a prestigious work that he could survive without Lorimer's help, gave The Evening Dispatch one of the studio photographs of the heroic group. The caption made no mention of Lorimer, who was understandably furious. If the encounter with the sculptors had made Lorimer doubt the wisdom of ever having employed Deuchars, then this snub ensured that the latter never received any sizeable commissions after the
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Glenelg memorial plaster was dispatched to London to be cast in bronze in early 1919.49

Deuchars continued to have work accepted for the Summer Exhibition at the Royal Scottish Academy. In 1919, he exhibited only one small piece ‘Chevie’ (Cat. 116), but the following year he showed five pieces (Cat. 114, Cat. 115 & Cat. 118).50

The Glenelg war memorial with its heroic group, set against the backdrop of the Skye hills, is an incongruous testament to the battle of the sculptors and the architects. There were no winners. The various protagonists went their separate ways. In a letter (22 April 1919) to his friend Robin Dods, Lorimer wrote, “Then every day - I seem to turn out about 2 war memorials - of all possible shapes & sizes & prices - additions to churches, screens, reredos, pulpit - wall tablets - stone pillars - every kind of thing’. At that time he had prepared a design for the Scottish National War Memorial at Edinburgh Castle, and commented to Dods, ‘Oh! it will be fine if it comes off & what a smack in the eye to the “enemy” - who have been trying hard to wreck it, undoubtedly with the hope of wrecking me. But seeing I’ve prospects of being busier than I’ve ever been, they haven’t got me down & out just yet.’51 The “enemy” were not successful and Lorimer received the commission. In it he employed several, mainly new sculptors, but was careful to ensure that their contributions were fully attributed. Neither Macgillivray, nor Rhind was among them. Of the sculptors who had lined up against Lorimer in the Academy, only Percy Portsmouth received a commission. Deuchars found it inconceivable that there was nothing for him and made such a nuisance of himself outside Lorimer’s Edinburgh house that the police had to be called.52

Macgillivray attempted to resign from the Academy over the issue. On 10 December 1918, in reply to a letter from the Secretary, he restated his case, giving vent to self-righteous indignation. Attempting moral blackmail, he indicated that if the Academy preferred Lorimer to him, then so be it. The minimum he looked for was the drawing up of bye-laws to cover the relationship between
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sculptor and architect. However, it seems that Macgillivray had second thoughts, for he has written on the typescript, 'Withdrawn'. Perhaps this was because he had partly got his way.

Under the umbrella of the R.S.A., but having representation from 'public bodies throughout Scotland, including Burghs, Churches and Universities', the Scottish War Memorials Advisory Committee had been set up under the chairmanship of the Right Hon. Earl of Moray to give advice on the appropriateness of proposed designs for memorials. Representatives of the Academy included the sculptors, Macgillivray, Rhind and Portsmouth and the painters, D. Y. Cameron and John Duncan, but not Lorimer. The largest section of the results of their deliberations, published in March 1919, was given over to sculpture and its relationship to architecture. Among Macgillivray's papers is his hand-written draft for the section, which was included almost verbatim. It started off.

The proper artist to entrust with the design and execution of a monumental Memorial is either a Sculptor or an Architect, or representatives of both these professions working in collaboration.

Macgillivray went on to categorise five combinations of the two professions working on a memorial.

1. Architectural monuments with Sculpture.
2. Sculptural monuments with Architecture.
3. The purely sculptural monument in the form of a statue or group of figures erected on a pedestal of elementary simplicity.
4. The purely architectural monument with or without ornamental decoration.
5. The shaped or sculptured monolith such as the Egyptian obelisk, the Greek stele, the Celtic cross.

In each of these, Macgillivray gave precise guidelines as to the relative roles of the two professions. For class one, the architect was to take the lead with the freedom to appoint the sculptor of his choice and in the second vice versa. Only Macgillivray could have made the fine distinction between categories two and three. Obviously drawing on the Glenelg debacle, he insisted, 'For class three, which might be termed an affair of personal expression, a Sculptor should be appointed and all details relating to design and execution of a work left to his untrammelled judgement, with ample time allowed for proper execution' (possibly harking back to those who attempted to hurry...
him on with the Gladstone memorial, discussed in chapter 8). Macgillivray conceded that for class four the architect could have as much freedom as the sculptor in class three. For the last class he was willing to allow either profession to have the work or even, ‘firms of Monument Sculptors, or masons of good repute, who produce high-class works from the antique examples or designs they have commissioned from Architects of standing.’ After considering the durability of the various materials which could be used, a list of ‘artist Sculptors who are in active practice in Scotland’ was given. Macgillivray’s hand-written list was relatively short, while another typewritten draft lists those in practice, those newly entered into the profession and ‘Modellers and Carvers of Decoration’, with the caveat that the list was not exhaustive. The final printed booklet omitted the last group which included Thomas Beattie, Sam Wilson (plaster modellers used by Lorimer), Thomas Good (wood-carver) and Burns & Donaldson (interior decorators) from Edinburgh. Also the rider that there might be other practitioners was omitted. Needless to say, Deuchars did not feature in any list. The next section dealt with Architecture and the type of memorials that might be commissioned for various settings. The list of Edinburgh architects did include Lorimer. The use of painting, mosaic or stained glass and their exponents were also covered. Thus Macgillivray was able to set down in print part of what he was complaining about, but in the highly competitive post-war period, it is doubtful if the guidelines were scrupulously followed.

Despite this somewhat hollow victory, Macgillivray still refused to let the matter rest and continued to try to enlist support for a number of years after the Academy’s decision to ignore the protests of himself and the other sculptors. In February 1923, the Ayr architect, James Morris, A.R.S.A., wrote to Macgillivray that he had ‘read your statement carefully’. He went on to agree that the matter should have been fully aired in the Academy. If Macgillivray had been wrong, he would have given a ready apology (doubtful, in view of the nature of the personality involved), but if correct, then rules for future guidance could have been drawn up. However, Morris did point out that ‘Architect and Sculptor may and often do collaborate working hand in hand upon a joint
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production, each having his own share of the credit or discredit, as well as of direct remuneration for his individual work. Even in handicraft, it is advisable also to give the executant craftsman's name to the client, with the amount of the craftsman's charge. In Deuchars's case Lorimer had not been even-handed in giving credit, but that was not the point that Macgillivray had been attempting to make. Morris ended his comments on the statement by hoping that he had covered 'in principle the points raised, but I did not gather from you whether the matter was of quite recent or remote date.'

Given that he had been elected an Associate in 1916, it is somewhat surprising that he had heard nothing of the furore in 1918.

Since Rhind and Gamley both secured commissions for war memorials, while Macgillivray received none, it is perhaps not surprising that later in the twenties Macgillivray attacked the two colleagues who had joined him in the original protest against Lorimer, referring to Rhind as 'a pig of the most obtuse type' and Gamley as 'a mutton head'. Not for nothing was Macgillivray himself nicknamed 'Macdevily'.

2 Spielmann, M.H., British Sculpture and Sculptors of To-day (London, 1901) pp.10-11.
5 Letter from Macgillivray, Rhind & Gamley, 12 February 1918. Dep. 349/92, Pittendrigh Macgillivray Papers. Dept. of Manuscripts, NLS.
11 Letter from Rhind, no date but probably 28 February 1918. Pittendrigh Macgillivray Papers. Dep. 349/92.
16 Copy of statement to the President and Council of the Royal Scottish Academy, unsigned and undated. Pittendrigh Macgillivray Papers. Dep. 349/92.
18 Ibid.
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Throughout all the years that Deuchars worked for Lorimer, he continued to create original pieces and have them exhibited, but the main source of family income was the steady stream of commissions from the architect. In 1920 another daughter, Dora Reid, the sixth child, was born, increasing the burden on their finances.\(^1\) Fortunately, by that time the two elder children were in a position to help. Frances, the eldest, had obtained an apprenticeship with an Edinburgh hairdressing salon and George had joined the embryo Royal Air Force as a boy entrant. Both had previously brought in small amounts through their employment as message boy/girl while still at school and it is likely that the third child, Albert was probably similarly deployed by 1920, when he would have been thirteen. With one fewer in the household and others bringing in small amounts, the family was able to survive, although Deuchars’s increasing alcoholism was a further strain.

However, it appears that, after the Glenelg group, he succeeded in obtaining a commission for a large piece of memorial sculpture, a Madonna and Child for Old St. Paul’s, Edinburgh (Cat. 117). Mary Dalrymple Maclagan, a member of a prominent Episcopalian Comrie family, had died in 1915 and her family had wished to commemorate her suitably in the Edinburgh church where she had worshipped, but it was reported that ‘the war conditions’ had delayed the implementation of their wishes.\(^2\) Since the prevailing economic climate did not appear to affect Lorimer’s ability to turn out memorials, the delay may have been because Deuchars was engaged on the Glenelg piece. As he could not have created the life-size maquette in his small flat, he may even have been working on it at the same time as Lorimer’s commission in the studio in Hope Crescent, or he may have returned to the Dean Studio. A surviving photograph of the work appears to indicate that it was in some sort of studio rather than a house (Pl. 233).\(^3\) It is not known how Deuchars came to the attention of the Maclagans, but there could have been a long-standing connection between the two families, or it could have been at the time of his father’s funeral at Comrie in March 1915, discussed in Chapter 12.
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The full-size plaster model, 'Madonna & Child - to be carved and placed in niche of Old St. Paul's' was shown at the Royal Scottish Academy’s Summer Exhibition in 1920, where it 'won considerable comment by its beauty and devotional feeling' (Pl. 233).\(^4\) In August it was reported that, 'It is now being executed in stone and will soon be ready for its final position, which is likely to be the east wall of the nave'.\(^5\) Carved in white limestone, it was placed in a niche which appears to have been specially created for it (Pl. 234).\(^6\) As Deuchars had never managed that sort of project before, it seems reasonable to assume that the family had engaged an architect and stone mason to ensure that the sculpture was carved and sited in an appropriate setting. (Possibly they had also paid for the plaster model to be transported to the R.S.A. and thereafter to the carver’s workshop, since Deuchars may not have had the necessary finance.)

After the Madonna and Child, Deuchars was working on the Mount Stuart altar (Cat. 114), and with five pieces of sculpture in the Summer Exhibition at the Royal Scottish Academy in 1920 (Cat. 114, Cat. 115 & Cat. 118), his reputation did not appear to have suffered from the row between the sculptors and the architects, but the demands of his family meant that the search for work had to go on. In the twenties, one of the woodcarvers with Thomas Good, of Edinburgh, noticed Deuchars at the workshop with a small painting, possibly for sale or a sketch for a larger work which Good might have been able to incorporate in an ecclesiastical setting.\(^7\) It is not known how successful those overtures might have been.

However, he had more luck with Charles Henshaw, the Edinburgh firm of architectural metalworkers. As his earlier pieces for both Lorimer and Tarbolton over the years had been cast by Henshaw, the firm knew his work and he secured a number of modelling jobs from them. It appears that he was one of those referred to in a newspaper article in 1928.

Staff artists are employed who embody in plaster the ideas suggested by possible clients. Draughtsmen prepare drawings to scale of work required. It is thus seen that the definite stages in the production of, say, a war memorial plaque or an ornate piece of metal construction can be carried out by the workshops concerned.
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from beginning to end.4

Apparently Deuchars modelled the bas relief figures of a soldier and sailor on the bronze war memorial on the wall of the Tolbooth, Canongate, Edinburgh (Cat. 119, Pl. 235, Pl. 236 & Pl. 237).9 He may also have been involved in Henshaw’s bronze memorial plaques of Church of Scotland ministers, which incorporated their bas relief portraits (Cat. 120). His skills in modelling posthumously from a photograph would have been known to the firm from the period with Lorimer when he modelled the memorials to Bishop Dowden (Cat. 74, Pl. 140), Dr. Mitchell (Cat. 91, Pl. 157), and Henry Howard (Cat. 99, Pl. 178), discussed in Chapters 11 and 12, respectively. In Henshaw’s catalogue it was emphasised that ‘for this type of memorial the best available photographs are essential, and models are submitted for approval before reproducing in bronze’. Examination of those in the catalogue with dates between 1919 and 1926, points to three which could have been by Deuchars, based on both the portrait modelling and the typeface used (Pl. 239). Those for the Reverends George Wilson, (Pl. 240), Alexander Hardie, (Pl. 241) and Charles Dick (Pl. 239) are noticeably different from the others shown in the catalogue.10 The bronze 1914-18 war memorial in Newbattle Church is another piece in which Deuchars may have had a hand (Pl. 242 & Pl. 243).

George Mancini was the proprietor of a fine art foundry at 30 Dundee Street, Edinburgh for nearly fifty years until 1974 and during that period also had sub-contract work from Henshaw. In his youth Mancini had learned his trade with his father who had his own foundry in London where he had worked with Sir Alfred Gilbert on his statue ‘Eros’. Mancini remembered seeing Deuchars in the 1920’s with a statuette of a seated soldier, which could have been ‘A War Memorial’ (£25) exhibited by Deuchars in the Royal Scottish Academy Summer Exhibition in 1922 (Cat. 121).11 Mancini had ‘great respect for his work’ adding that, ‘nobody appreciated him.’12

Mancini recalled another life-size statue by Deuchars of a nude female child (Cat. 122, Pl. 244)
which appeared in an advertisement carried by the 1922/3 fixture card of Edinburgh University Rugby Club. Deuchars probably used his daughter Dora, then aged two, as a model. Still the financial pressures mounted with the birth of another daughter and seventh child, Evelyn Cameron, in November 1922.

However, the flow of work from Henshaw appeared to be fairly steady. Deuchars’s small-scale modelling skill was demonstrated in a pair of fauns, part of a collection of ‘bronze motor mascots’ advertised in 1925 (Cat. 123, Pl. 245).13 The casting of the figures was actually subcontracted by Henshaw to Macdonald & Creswick of Harrison Road, Edinburgh, since they were specialists in lost wax casting of objects d’art. According to a friend of the late Charles Creswick, the fauns were cast by him.14 Deuchars was well known to the partnership since Macdonald had cast the bronze medallion for the Howard memorial at Greystoke (Cat. 99, Pl. 178), discussed in Chapter 12. Charles Creswick and his wife Nora said that Deuchars was around the workshop quite a lot, especially in his later years. They spoke warmly of his modelling skills. Macdonald & Creswick may also have cast a small dish in the form of three putti holding a large sea-shell (Cat. 124, Pl. 246).

It appears that Deuchars was going through his past for inspiration around that time. In 1923 he painted ‘Love took up the glass of time and turned it in his glowing hands’ (Cat. 125, Pl. 247), a small oil copy of the figure on the lithographed invitation which Watts had created for Queen Victoria’s Jubilee in 1897 (Cat. 14, Fig. 13), discussed in Chapter 4. According to Margaret, Deuchars’s second daughter, a large version of this work was produced for an Edinburgh dentist, who shared the same surname, for his waiting room.15 Deuchars also produced his own interpretation of Watts’s theme in a much more lively version in pencil. (Cat. 126, Pl. 248).16

John Matthew, Lorimer’s partner, had always thought a great deal of Deuchars’s work and stored a
large number of the plaster maquettes, including the saints carved for the Thistle Chapel, fireplace cartouches and putti for the Marchmont frieze. He also had an unsigned oil painting, paper on panel, of a head, gazing upwards (Cat. 127, Pl. 249), which could have been inspired by the youthful nude figure in the 1887 painting by G. F. Watts, ‘Love and Death’ (Pl. 250 & Pl. 250a).

Deuchars knew the work well and wrote about it in a newspaper article, discussed in Chapter 4 (Cat. 17, Fig. 14). Matthew could have purchased Deuchars’s painting out of sympathy for the sculptor, who had served the architectural partnership well for so many years, despite his personal failings. It is just conceivable that the work could have been ‘News from Nowhere’ shown at the S.S.A exhibition in 1922.

Deuchars continued to have work accepted for the Summer Exhibition at the Royal Scottish Academy. In 1922 he showed ‘Memories (sculpture)’ (Cat. 128) and the following year there was ‘A study for heroic group on War Memorial - courage, vitality & endurance’ (Cat. 129, Pl. 253).

In 1924 Deuchars showed two more pieces of sculpture, ‘There’s a piper playing - £38’ (Cat. 130), and ‘a celtic missionary’, the latter probably from the Mount Stuart altar (Cat. 114), but his last work in the Royal Scottish Academy Summer Exhibition the following year was an oil painting, ‘The humming bird moth’ (£50) (Cat. 131). This change of medium could have been because materials for a painting were much cheaper than those required to produce a piece of sculpture.

Deuchars was nominated a second time for election as an Associate, in 1924, when Gemmell Hutchison again showed his support, on that occasion, as seconder. James Paterson, the painter, who had a minor role in the sculptors versus architect row, discussed in Chapter 16, made the nomination. Ironically, no elections took place, since the meeting had to be declared inquorate and, despite protests in The Scotsman, the decision stood. Following the change in the Academy’s practice in 1918, nominations remained current during the lifetime and residence in Scotland of the artist, but Deuchars was never to be elected. (Neither was Kellock Brown, nominated many times including 1924.) That Deuchars was again put forward by two prominent
members, when it must have been obvious that he was past his best, suggests a lingering sympathy for him in the Academy.

Although the relationship with Lorimer cooled after the R.S.A. row, it seems that John Matthew continued to give Deuchars small pieces, especially the angel supporters of arms on shields, as in the war memorial in St. Mary’s Episcopal Cathedral, Edinburgh (Pl. 254 & Pl. 255) where the figures appear to be extremely similar to the many turned out over the years by Deuchars for Lorimer. Furthermore, there are three pendant angels on the memorial (very similar to those in the Thistle Chapel) whose modelling is again almost certainly by Deuchars (Pl. 256). His angel supporters also appear on the war memorial for St. Luke’s church, Kew Gardens. Lorimer had other commissions for the church, including a pulpit, rood screen, altar and curtains supported by oak carved pillars, with surmounting angel figures. Among surviving photographs from Lorimer’s office is a small one of a clay model for a standing angel holding a shield (Pl. 257a). According to a hand-written note on the reverse, it was a ‘sketch for an angel’ for ‘St. Luke’s Church’, but it was ‘not approved’. It is interesting to note that one wing has been modelled in detail, whereas the other has only been roughly suggested. The two figures carved from the model (mirror images of each other) have crossed arms (Pl. 257b) because the church treasurer, Dr Hill, did ‘not like the shields, the folk look rather like shop walkers or ladies at a store displaying a new fabric!’ Deuchars’s model of the little angel, holding the PAX ribbon across her chest, originally produced for the bronze door handles of the Thistle Chapel, was re-used (Cat. 58, Pl. 99). It appeared as another bronze handle on the doors of St. Baldred’s church, North Berwick in 1924 (Pl. 258a). Then in 1931, after Lorimer’s death, Matthew utilised it yet again as the handle of a commemorative trowel for the laying of the foundation stone of St. Margaret’s church, Knightswood, Glasgow (Pl. 258b). So, despite Lorimer’s claim in January 1925 that Deuchars ‘was always a most tiresome and difficult person to work with’, it seems he was quite happy to have small pieces of Deuchars’s work in his commissions. However, Lorimer’s comment that ‘He
is unfortunately addicted to the bottle and has now become quite hopeless’ was sadly only too true. Whether Deuchars’s addiction would have been as destructive had he continued to receive major work from Lorimer can only be conjecture, but he was certainly unwilling to accept that he could not contribute to Lorimer’s Scottish National War Memorial.

With a wife and five dependent children to provide for, the money brought in by Deuchars in the mid 1920’s was inadequate, even without his chronic dependency on alcohol. His second daughter, Margaret was frequently sent round to the Marquess of Bute in Charlotte Square, possibly for advances and payments for the work on the altar, but she felt at times that these errands were close to begging. Items of any worth in the family home found their way on a one-way trip to the pawnbrokers and, towards the end of his life, Deuchars even took to pledging some of Margaret’s own things. By that time she had obtained a job as a shop assistant in Princes Street and, at seventeen years of age, in order to preserve the few possessions she had acquired, she moved out of the family home, which helped the accommodation crisis, but not the family finances. Eventually, Deuchars’s alcoholism became so bad that, on 27 February 1927, he was admitted under certification to Bangour Village Hospital, then known as the Edinburgh District Asylum. According to the family, it was Lorimer who had Deuchars certified, following the disturbance he created outside Lorimer’s house. As far as possible, patients were given practical work to do and it seems that Deuchars’s modelling skills could have been put to use in the new Romanesque church being built in the grounds (1924-1930). The architect was Harold Tarbolton, who also designed the oak furnishings, reputedly ‘carved by the hospital woodworkers’. Since Tarbolton knew of Deuchars’s work, discussed in Chapter 14, it is possible that the latter modelled animals and birds for the carving, since many are stylistically similar to Deuchars’s earlier work. On the pulpit panels there is a menagerie of animals (Pls. 259a & 259b), some real, some imagined, possibly harking back to carvings in the Thistle Chapel (Cat. 58) and Dunblane Cathedral (Cat. 67). Other animals and birds are scattered among the traceryed carving in the chancel. This modelling could
have been Deuchars’s last work, for his mental and physical health continued to decline after admission to Bangour and he died there on 19 September 1927. The death certificate recorded only too well the toll that alcohol had taken over the years - ‘arterio sclerosis, cirrhosis of the liver and renal cirrhosis’. His occupation was given as ‘artist in sculpture’, but his first name was mis-spelt as ‘Lewis’. His wish, expressed in his youthful poem, to be laid to rest in Comrie churchyard (quoted in Chapter 1), was not to be.\textsuperscript{31} Louis Reid Deuchars was buried in Saughton Cemetery in Edinburgh. Among the graveside mourners were members of the artistic community, including Pittendrigh Macgillivray and Birnie Rhind, who offered their sympathies to Mrs Deuchars and her family. Kathleen would have preferred it if Jimmy ‘Deas’ (her version of Pittendrigh Macgillivray’s name) had paid the money she believed was owed to her husband. For the sculptor whose art had commemorated so many over the years, there was no memorial headstone.

\textsuperscript{1} Family tradition is that she was named after the Defence of the Realm Act, but it was in 1914. Her second name is the same as her father’s, indicating the continuing significance of the name within the family.
\textsuperscript{2} ‘Macleagan Memorial’, \textit{The White Rose}, 23 August 1920. (Magazine of Old St. Paul’s.)
\textsuperscript{3} P.C.
\textsuperscript{4} Edinburgh, Royal Scottish Academy Summer Exhibition Catalogue, 1920. Cat.no.16. Also, \textit{The White Rose}. loc.cit.
\textsuperscript{5} \textit{The White Rose}. loc.cit.
\textsuperscript{6} The pointing between the stones immediately surrounding the niche is grey as opposed to white and the stonework above has been built up so that it obscures a stained glass window, which was observed from outside to be still in place. The sculpture stands on a plinth which follows the lines of its base.
\textsuperscript{7} Information about Deuchars being at Good’s workshop from the late John Smith, a carver employed by Good.
\textsuperscript{9} Information from John Smith.
\textsuperscript{10} ‘Mural Tablets by Henshaw of Edinburgh’, no date but, according to the contents, it must be the late 1930’s, p.16. The prices quoted were; No.3288, Wilson - £85, No.3289, Hardie - £60, No.3802, Dick - £70. The locations are, Wilson - St. Michael’s Parish Church, Slateford Road, Edinburgh, Hardie - Newbattle Church, Midlothian and Dick - Bishopbriggs Kenmure Church, Glasgow (information provided by Rev. D.F.M. Macdonald, Principal Clerk to the Church of Scotland General Assembly).
\textsuperscript{11} Edinburgh, Royal Scottish Academy Summer Exhibition Catalogue, 1922. Cat.no. 24. This maquette does not appear to have been cast.
\textsuperscript{12} Comments made by Mancini, 1981.
\textsuperscript{13} Charles Henshaw advertisement, \textit{Country Life}, vol.LVIII, no 1508, 28 November 1925.
\textsuperscript{14} Information supplied in 1980 by a friend of the late Charles & Nora Creswick.
\textsuperscript{15} Untraced.
\textsuperscript{16} P.C.
\textsuperscript{17} All are no longer in the family and are in various private collections.
\textsuperscript{18} Deuchars's family collection of cuttings. n.d. No source.
\textsuperscript{19} Edinburgh, Society of Scottish Artists Exhibition Catalogue, 1922. Cat.no. 153.
\textsuperscript{20} Edinburgh, Royal Scottish Academy Summer Exhibition Catalogue, 1922. Cat.no. 24. Edinburgh,
Royal Scottish Academy Summer Exhibition Catalogue, 1923. Cat.no. 49.
21 Edinburgh, Royal Scottish Academy Summer Exhibition Catalogues : 1924, Cat.nos. 42,74; 1925, Cat.no. 289.
22 Royal Scottish Academy. List of Nominations. 1924.
24 'Kew War Memorial', Clows estimate, 12 August 1919. GEN 1963/13/125. L.P.
25 Photograph among a collection from Lorimer's office in RCAHMS, NMRS. Ref. 1990/54.
26 Letter from Dr Hill, 24 January 1926. GEN 1963/1/69. L.P.
28 Letter from Lorimer to Christopher Hussey, 24 January 1925. P.C.
29 Bangour Village Hospital Records.
30 McWilliam, Colin, The Buildings of Scotland : Lothian, 2nd ed., (Middlesex, 1980) p.91. It has not been possible to trace the original source of this information, as the hospital is in the process of being closed.
31 'Comrie Churchyard - May 22D, 1887', Strathearn Herald, 28 May 1887.
CONCLUSIONS

The early drawings of Louis Reid Deuchars had a freedom verging on Impressionism, demonstrating a willingness to depart from the strict draughtsmanship taught in the Glasgow School of Art. Given the right opportunity at that time, his career might have developed along the lines of the Scottish Colourists. However, under the tutelage of G. F. Watts his style regressed, becoming overworked and fussy. Nevertheless the original spontaneity found expression in sculpture, albeit tempered by the requirements of the master sculptors for whom he worked. He developed a lively naturalistic style, best seen in his appealing portrayals of children. At several points in his life Deuchars appeared poised to make the transition from comparative obscurity to the fame he so craved, yet instead he was largely destined to enhance the work and reputation of others, with little recognition for his contribution.

Because of the nature of the art, with its requirement for investment in clay, plaster, marble, bronze and tools, training traditionally took place in the studios of established sculptors. As well as absorbing the techniques, the pupils or assistants were able to move in the social circles that included both maestros and potential patrons. Capital was required to set up independently and aspirant sculptors hoped to catch the attention of rich sponsors. Many employed in sculptors' studios were craftsmen, who were quite content to work on the more basic, but essential, aspects. However, most of the prominent Victorian sculptors began their careers as assistants. There was considerable variation in the length of time before an assistant was able to set up on his own. Some stayed for a comparatively short period, like Alfred Gilbert, who remained only three years with Joseph Edgar Boehm, while Robert Glassby appeared content to remain in the supporting role for nearly thirty years.¹ If Deuchars's business acumen had matched his creative talent, he might have built an independent career. Instead he spent over twelve years as an assistant, with Watts, Goscombe John, Colton and, briefly Macgillivray, before circumstances forced him to settle for modelling work from architects.
CHAPTER 18

CONCLUSIONS

The contribution of sculpture to architecture has been a disputed area over the years. This tension was evidenced in various publications and even in Colton’s obituary, discussed in Chapters 16 and 7 respectively. During most of the nineteenth century, in accordance with Victorian taste for decoration, a great deal of sculpture was applied to buildings. Spandrels, friezes, caryatids, tympana, and the animals and figures encrusting Gothic revival buildings all provided work for skilled craftsmen and sculptors, yet almost without exception their work was not signed. At the time of building they might merit a mention in a newspaper article, but more than likely their involvement was overlooked. Deuchars’s role was never fully recognised, but he was not the first sculptor to have his contribution suppressed. Although both Hayes and Beattie made models for Lorimer, it was for their stone-carving and decorative plasterwork that they were respectively acknowledged. Equally, Percy Portsmouth’s work for Dunblane Cathedral remained anonymous. Deuchars would have preferred to have been designing ideal sculpture, but he found himself on several occasions in his career, producing work which was destined to decorate others’ buildings, from the Compton Chapel to Lorimer’s churches and houses.

Possibly Deuchars lived in hope that once he got the family established in Edinburgh, he could use the money from Lorimer to set up in his own right. He never gave up creating his own pieces for exhibitions where they were often sold and enough was thought of his work to warrant his nomination twice for Associateship of the Royal Scottish Academy. However, since the flow of commissions from Lorimer and other architects was fairly steady and it provided a reasonable income for the ever-expanding family, the modelling that started as a temporary expediency extended to ten years. Unfortunately, neither Deuchars nor his wife were good at managing money. As it came in, so it was spent. Lorimer played on this failing to ensure that Deuchars continued to work almost exclusively for him. He paid Deuchars by instalments, often reducing the amount, so that the sculptor became dependent on the commissions to support his family.
Lorimer recognised that Deuchars’s special talent for appealing, characterful and lively child studies added considerably to his designs. Previously Lorimer had used Joseph Hayes to model putti and cherubs (Pl. 139), but they lacked the vivacity of those by Deuchars. Hayes tended to put old faces on young bodies, whereas Deuchars’s charmingly realistic compositions convey impressions of youthful energy and joie de vivre, in the manner of Luca della Robbia, Donatello and Verrocchio. What Deuchars did fell in exactly with Lorimer’s ideas and it was all too easy to rely on the work from the architect. It is doubtful if Deuchars was aware of the nature of the relationship between himself and Lorimer, but he was delighted when asked to produce some true sculpture, such as the lead figures for the niche and the boy with the frog for the fountain at Midfield, and the children at Balmanno. It is little wonder that two of the best-known Scottish sculptors of the day, Birmie Rhind and Pittendrigh Macgillivray, watched with growing annoyance as Deuchars, without the overheads which they had to carry, received these commissions. The Glenelg War Memorial was the final straw. Although the two sculptors balked at airing their disquiet publicly, Lorimer realised that continuing to give Deuchars significant pieces might cost him his Membership of the Royal Scottish Academy. Deuchars was almost fifty with a wife and five children to provide for. It was far too late to succeed as a sculptor in his own right, although he did secure the large-scale ‘Madonna and Child’ for Old St. Paul’s. That apart, the family had to survive on what income was brought in by the small commissions from Matthew and Henshaw.

Lorimer won the battle of the architect versus the sculptors at the Royal Scottish Academy, but when he completed the Scottish National War Memorial at the Castle, every piece of sculpture and craftsmanship was duly attributed. Lorimer had found other talents to foster, among them, Phyllis Bone, skilled at portraying animals. Alexander Carrick, Percy Portsmouth and George Salvesen were responsible for some of the exterior figures and items in the interior, Hazel Kennedy did a bronze panel, but the bulk of the sculpture work was divided between Charles d’Orville Pilkington Jackson and Alice Meredith-Williams (even the designs and cartoons of her husband Morris were fully acknowledged). Perhaps this is what led Sir John Stirling Maxwell in his Shrines and Homes
of Scotland to write that Lorimer ‘never claimed credit for the craftsman’s success. On the contrary, he gave full credit to the craftsman, even where his own guidance had been essential.’

This was certainly not true in Deuchars’s case. When the concept of the National Memorial was first mooted in 1917, Deuchars believed that he would be among those given commissions. It was not to be. Even if he had continued to work for Lorimer, perhaps Deuchars’s rather romantic sentimental style would have been out of place in such a sombre building, where there is a hard edge to some of the modelling, especially Meredith Williams’s, although it is probably more appropriate to the subject matter (Pl. 260 & Pl. 261).

The moral victory which Deuchars had won indirectly for the sculptors who came after him ensured that their reputations could benefit equally from commissions for both ideal and architectural sculpture. However, the Scottish National War Memorial was probably the swan-song of Gothic Revival. Although John Matthew carried on the architectural practice after Lorimer’s sudden death in 1929, the taste for highly decorative work declined. In the 1930’s, the streamlined approach of modernism and Art Deco in architecture reduced the demand for applied sculpture. Even Pittendrigh Macgillivray, Sculptor in Ordinary to His Majesty for Scotland, found it difficult to secure commissions. Today Deuchars’s work may be largely unknown and unsung, but paradoxically that anonymity is testament to the recognition the succeeding generations of sculptors were accorded by architects.

---
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