Article:
Melius, Jeremy Norman (2023) 'Fossil-creatures' and the 'mockeries of life': Ruskin at Verona. The Sculpture Journal. pp. 233-249. ISSN: 1366-2724

https://doi.org/10.3828/sj.2023.32.2.06

‘Fossil-creatures’ and the ‘mockeries of life’: Ruskin at Verona

Jeremy Melius

Sculpture Journal 32.2 (2023), 233-249. [Final accepted manuscript.]

1. On 4 February 1870, the Victorian critic John Ruskin delivered a lecture entitled ‘Verona, and its Rivers’ at the Royal Institution in London, before an audience made up of its scientific members as well as the general public. The lecture opens with characteristic immediacy, placing its audience in situ and then in motion:

> If you chance to be in Verona on a clear, warm summer’s day, and to be weary—as may well happen—at the end of it, take a light carriage, and drive out at the eastern gate…. You will see, fifty yards beyond the gate, a good road turning to the left—and from that, as immediately, another turning to the left again, which, by a gradual slope, begins to ascend the hill on which the eastern walls of Verona are built.[1]

The carriage-ride continues along the city’s wall towards a panoramic prospect, ‘almost on a mountain summit’, Ruskin says, ‘grey—or grey-purple—with the lurid but lovely blue of the field Eryngium.’ From here, taking in ‘all the plain between Alp and Apennine’, the traveler might look out over a landscape saturated with significance. ‘I do not think that there is any other rock in all the world, from which the places, and monuments, of so complex and deep a fragment of the histories of its ages can be visible’, Ruskin suggests: the ‘birthplaces of Virgil and of Livy, the homes of Dante and Petrarch’, the hills among which Mantegna, Titian, Correggio, and Veronese had all been born.[2]

In Ruskin’s geological metaphor, this ‘deep…fragment’ presents a kind of stratigraphic cross-section of the landscape, a sequential index of natural and cultural

histories. In approaching the promontory, further strata were exposed. The imaginary carriage rolled past fortifications excavated and built up in the early years of the fourteenth century, a massive feat of engineering overseen by Cangrande della Scala I (1291–1329): 'the form of Defence which rendered it possible for the life and the arts of Citizens to be preserved and practiced in an age of habitual war.' Here was the 'the cradle of civic life' as it emerged in Italy. The carriage had passed another set of fortifications, too, as the path turned towards a circular structure 'with embrasures for guns'—the 'cradle of modern war and all of its desolation', the lecture calls it: 'the first European tower for artillery: the beginning of fortification against gunpowder. The beginning, that is to say, of the end of *all* fortification…'[3] Ruskin understands Verona to offer an extraordinary cross-section of world-historical development. As '[t]he road ascends continually', the various foundations of modern life are laid bare.[4]

Questions of material integrity and survival across the flow of historical time haunt the opening of Ruskin's lecture, too. For in its first turnings out of Verona's gate, the carriage passes 'a steep…trench cut out of the solid rock', revealing, as it were, the site's most fundamental stratum:

> It was possible to cut that rock-trench…without gunpowder, because the rock is a soft and crumbling limestone, on which, when you see the dusty banks of it emerge under the hedges by the roadside, you, if a member of the Royal Institution, must look with great reverence. For in that white rock there are fossil-creatures, still so like the living creatures they were once, that there it first occurred to the human brain to imagine that the buried shapes were not mockeries of life, but had indeed once lived and died.

Even though the fossils in question only took on fuller significance in the sixteenth century, well after the raising of Cangrande's battlements, Ruskin places that discovery first, as the very ground of the histories of art, politics, and engineering which he asks Verona and its environs to disclose. For here, '[u]nder those white banks by the roadside was born', Ruskin says, 'the Modern Science of Geology.'[5]

It is within the forcefield of these associated concerns—with petrified remains and defensive structures; geologic time and the emergence of new forms of cultural life—that I wish to locate Ruskin's dealings with architectural sculpture at Verona. Studying monuments such as the city's imposing tombs of the della Scala family, or the mythical carved beasts supporting its churches' porticos, Ruskin came to develop a novel form of sculptural aesthetics, one based on an intuitive poetics of fossilization, fortification, and ambivalent reanimations of the dead. They made for a deeply nineteenth-century set of concerns, which Ruskin refracted through the high intensity of his own idiosyncratic modes of attending to works of art—as always, with surprising results. Artifacts of geologic pressure, the city's monuments were reshaped under the force of Ruskin's regard. Verona, though often overlooked in favour of the critic's long engagement with the city of Venice, came to feature prominently in his 'stony nineteenth century' (to borrow Isobel Armstrong's phrase).[6] From his first visit to the city in 1835, Ruskin pursued Verona's sculpture over four decades and across a variety of mediums—published writings, private correspondence, drawings, measurements, photographs—culminating in a period of concentrated study during the spring and summer of 1869 leading up to his lecture.[7] Taking his engagement with the city in this moment as a frame, I want to bring into view the special character of Ruskin's encounters with key sculptural monuments of Verona—the Scaligeri tombs and the griffins (to adopt Ruskin's own spelling) at the portal of the city's Duomo most of all (figs. 1–2).[8] As he wrote to his mother in June 1869, summarizing feelings long held, 'It is curious how exactly this

place unites all the things I have chiefly studied—so as to enable to bring myself *all* out, in what I shall have to say of it.'[9] Verona promised immediacy, self-disclosure, consolidation. Yet it would also be in the fragmentation of Ruskin's projects, and the gaps and mediations between his various practices of attention—charged intervals between looking, writing, and graphic depiction—that his novel approach to sculpture would emerge: an aesthetic vision in oscillation between vivid integration and the complex pleasures of coming apart.

2. Ruskin's emphasis on geology in 1870 was no mere scientistic conceit. The discipline had been a cornerstone of his intellectual development.[10] His evocation of the science in 'Verona, and its Rivers', moreover, conformed to his choice of site. The mountainous limestone terrain of the region had long been famous for the richness of its fossil-stores. Most prized were the remains of Eocene marine life found at Monte Baldo nearby, first excavated in the 1600s, later plundered by Napoleon, and now scattered across collections around the world: a strange distribution of skeletal fish, mollusc-shells, and crabs. And closer to the city itself, Verona's fossils had captured attention at least since 1517, as Ruskin himself notes, when repairs to the fortifications had exposed many fossils, and scholars began to recognize them as ancient lithic remains of ammonites, rather than marvellous formations of the rock itself.[11] In the 1830s, when Ruskin began his studies, writers like the polymath William Whewell and the controversial geologist Charles Lyell had emphasized Verona as a generative site for the development of geological science.[12] Even today, a casual stroll through its streets reveals a city paved everywhere with ghostly ammonite remains. Surrounded by such 'curious petrifactions', as Lyell called them, it was a setting in which questions of material permanence and impermanence, body and trace, could not help being raised.[13]

In Ruskin's lecture, the deep time of geologic development is everywhere evident across Veronese terrain. 'The rock of this promontory on which we are seated', he says,

‘hardens as we trace it back to the Alps, first into limestone…and in a few miles more into true marble, coloured by iron into a glowing orange, or pale warm red—the peach-blossom marble, of which Verona is chiefly built.’ This rock transforms

> into variegated marbles, so rich and grotesque in their veinings, and so fancifully lending themselves to decoration, that this last time of my stay at Verona, I was quite seriously impeded in my examinations of sculpture, and disturbed in what—at the age of 51—may yet be left in me of poetical sentiment, by involuntary misgivings whether the churches were real churches, or only museums of practical geology in connexion with that of Jermyn Street.[14]

In a playful turn, Ruskin figures the geological museum turned inside-out, displaying its holdings on exterior walls. Romantic values of ‘poetical sentiment’ and religious belief face off, in this passage, against science and its ‘practical’ application in industry.[15] Ruskin’s drawings of 1869 attest to this geological fascination, if not to his disturbance. He lingered for several days to record ‘the effect of differently coloured marbles arranged in carefully unequal masses’, on a corner of the city’s church of Sant’Anastasia, the natural variegation of the stone enhanced by the artificial ordering of the design (fig. 3).[16] The drawing seems to be after both phenomenal appearance—colour showing forth in layer upon layer—and material consistency, with the stones rendered hard and massive to the touch. The implied angle of vision, looking down on the motif, suggests both an actual point of view and a fantasy of chthonic emergence, as if these surfaces were slowly rising up out of the earth. As Ruskin put it in another lecture of 1871, where the drawing also served as an illustration, the sheet shows

'the tints literally "edified", and laid edge to edge as simply on the paper as the stones on the wall.'[17] Materiality and its human shaping come equally to the fore.

Such thoughts are pursued further in a cancelled section of Ruskin's lecture, previously unpublished. In this passage, which followed directly on the one quoted above, Ruskin examines the complex relations between 'civilization' and 'chemical facts':

> Now there is much great interest in noting how much of the character and arts of men have depended on the harmonies between their temper and the materials given them to work with. A great part of European civilization has depended on the chemical facts that—clay, artificially baked into brick, and limestone[,] naturally baked into marble, *change*, the one into a hue of subdued vermilion and the other, sometimes into purest white and sometimes into wild variegations, mostly of violet and purple…[18]

Culture depends on a natural world characterized by the kind of 'dynamic materiality', in Mark Frost's phrase, that had so fascinated early nineteenth-century practitioners of geology in its moment of critical ferment, and that Ruskin, so affected by that by that moment, continued to elaborate in his writings.[19] Studying the work of Jean-Baptiste Lamarck, Georges Cuvier, Louis Agassiz, and William Buckland, as well those of Lyell himself, Ruskin laid himself open to the full range of materialist concerns with 'living matter' and with 'nature's fluctuant multiplicity'.[20]

But Ruskin also extends the discourse of materialist science to grapple with its significance for spiritual and cultural life. A deep reciprocity between matter and human 'temper' has developed over time, Ruskin suggests. Colour marks the interface:

> [I]t is strange to reflect what delight the eyes of men seem to take in these variegated fancies of colour[,] whether in beautiful or terrible things[,] there seems to be a charm dependent on their sympathy [sic.] with them of our own anything but immaculate natures. Whatever the cause—it is a fact that at the period of the very finest art of Italy these […] marbles had an intense attraction [for] her best painters…[21]

It is unclear why Ruskin chose to cross the passage out when editing his lecture. Perhaps it seemed a digression too many in an already profoundly digressive text; perhaps having arrived at the idea, he did not feel inclined to show his preparatory work. Whatever the reason, these sentences make explicit a set of preoccupations implicit elsewhere in the lecture and across the critic's work about the dependencies between materiality and social life**.** This had found one kind of provisional expression in several texts of the 1850s, where it appeared as something like a proto-modernist doctrine of '"truth to material"', Clive Wilmer has suggested, 'never finally formulated in words'.[22] In *The Stones of Venice* 2 (1853), Ruskin speaks of the 'Gothic workman' as sensitive equally to 'the laws of his design' and to 'the nature of his material' in the construction of form, as Wilmer notes.[23] And in *Modern Painters* 4 (1856), Ruskin describes how 'the sculptor of granite is forced to confine himself to, and to seek for, certain types of form capable of expression in his material': a 'simplicity and magnitude' that prove to be 'exactly the characters necessary to show the granitic or porphyritic colour to the best advantage'. 'And thus we are guided, almost forced, by the laws of nature, to do right in art.'[24] Or consider 'The Work of Iron, in Nature, Art, and Policy', an unruly lecture of 1858. Here Ruskin articulates the 'principle' that 'whatever the material you choose to work with, your art is base if it does not bring out the distinctive qualities of that material.'[25] Ruskin offers this maxim as one node within a whole complex of

speculative linkages between the material properties of iron and the shaping of cultural practice.

But note that in the cancelled passage of the Verona lecture, the stone itself is not being worked: the affinity between its materiality and human life communicates across the medium of vision, the vehicle of a 'charm' and 'sympathy' that has developed over time. (One might think here of Marx's famous remark: 'The *forming* of the five senses is a labor of the history of the world down to the present.')[26] Ruskin's discussion suggests 'truth to materials' of another kind—the diffused effects of coloured marble on the bodily sensorium that takes it in. In this, the passage recalls the paean to rust at the opening of 'The Work of Iron.' There Ruskin figures a rapport between rust and the human frame in terms of their material intermingling. The 'ochreous dust' of rusted iron marks it as a metal 'with breath put into' it: a wondrous combination of '*iron and the air*.' Iron, the very mineral which makes Verona's 'peach-blossom marble' glow, takes its place as one of several 'metals which have undergone this, so to speak, vital change, and have been rendered fit for service of man by permanent unity with the purest air which he himself breathes'—metals that make up the very grounds of human life. Indeed, in another form the combination runs through our iron-rich, oxygenated blood: 'Is it not strange to find this stern and strong metal mingled so delicately in our human life that we cannot even blush without its help?'[27]

The bodily 'sympathy' between colourful stone and 'our own anything but immaculate natures', as the cancelled passage of the Verona lecture puts it, might thus be understood to run deep: a correspondence of material substance as much as of character. Fossilization had already offered such figures of combination in the lecture, with its mineral transformations of organic form. Taken together, stone and its appreciating eye might together form another kind of 'fossil', one brought into being by a history of social cultivation. Matter is constituted by its inherent dynamism, and art puts that dynamism to use.

And in the end, Ruskin's claim has less to do with the inherent agencies of matter, perhaps, than with their complex involvement in human action—a strange admixture of stone with the practices of human life.[28]

3. Along such lines Ruskin's attention radiates outward, taking in ever wider fields of concern. Yet it also comes in close, bringing the particulars of phenomena into view. In Verona, the confluence of material properties and human endeavour took no form more haunting than the fourteenth-century tombs of the Scaligeri, with their figures like lonely, armoured fossil-creatures long exposed to the air. By way of these tombs, Ruskin had much to say about the tribulations of the della Scala dynasty and its rule over Verona.[29] Under Cangrande—'Top Dog', the patron of Dante, Petrarch, and Giotto—Verona reached an early apogee of civilized life, Ruskin thought: a period marked by 'the central light of Italian chivalry.' But this turned out to be a double-edged sword. Cangrande stands for an age marked by 'joy, and courtesy, and hope', but also by fanatical persecution—and 'worse still', by the consequences of misplaced conviction: 'such confidence in the virtue of the Creed, that men…can do anything that is wrong, and be themselves for a word of faith pardoned.' This ambivalence played out across the lives of the Scaligeri, as rulership devolved from Cangrande to his descendants in a tangled saga of paranoia, hypocrisy, and fratricide. In light of that history, the tombs stood as morally overdetermined, to say the least. Cangrande's monument in particular possesses a poignant martial beauty (fig. 8): at once 'the tomb of a good knight and true, living…the busiest and the brightest life that you can find in the annals of chivalry', and an ever-present reminder of how precipitously the promise of that busy, bright life could fall.[30]

Such ambivalence ramified through the tombs of Cangrande's successors—Mastino II (1308–1351), followed by Cansignorio (1340–1376)—with each structure more elaborate

than the last. Ruskin had traced the development of this 'perfect type of the Gothic tomb' in the third volume of *The Stones of Venice* (1853), within an extended discussion of the emergence and decline of funerary sculpture in Venice.[31] These pages offer an extraordinary historical morphology of artistic and moral form. Within them the Veronese tombs offer a kind of 'interlude', standing somewhat apart even as they cannot help but participate in that larger story of artistic and cultural degeneration.[32] 'The tomb which stands beside that of Can Grande', Ruskin notes, 'nearest it in the little field of sleep, already shows the traces of erring ambition. It is the tomb of Mastino the Second, in whose reign began the decline of his family', (fig. 4). And yet, however 'feeble and wicked' its occupant, the monument remains, Ruskin also says, 'altogether exquisite as a work of art.'[33] Close by, he goes on, 'is another, the stateliest and most sumptuous of the three'—the tomb of Cansignorio, who put two of his brothers to death (fig. 5): 'a many pinnacled pile, surrounded by niches with statues of the warrior saints.'[34] With that word 'sumptuous', Ruskin's account gestures to the most degraded of the Venetian tombs, and Cansignorio's begins to slide towards inevitable spiritual decay: 'It is beautiful, for it still belongs to the noble time…; but its work is coarser than that of the other, and its pride may well prepare us to learn that it was built for himself, in his own lifetime, by the man whose statue crowns it'.[35] Artistic qualities phase in and out of alignment with moral ones in this account, leading to complexities that threaten to exceed a straightforward narrative of decline.

In a letter of June 1869, Ruskin described his experience of daily life among the 'unhappy people' of modern Verona as 'living in a city of the dead – disquieted and tombless. The *old* dead are so much more really living, by their work.'[36] Here as elsewhere for the critic, art modelled the complexities and ambivalences of social life. Sited at so prominent an intersection of the medieval city plan, and in such close proximity to the former palaces of their occupants, the tombs enact a simultaneity of past and present, life and death

as strange as any fossil's. This experience had its historically specific dimensions: Ruskin thought the juxtaposition enacted central aspects of Gothic character. As he put it in the Verona lecture, 'the loveliness of building which was before given to churches only, now is given to tombs, not merely as shrines of saints, but as the dwelling-places of those who have fallen asleep.' And so, 'the tomb-buildings of Verona are permitted to stand among its palaces, and, side by side, the presence chambers of the living and the dead.'[37]

For Ruskin, this uneasy simultaneity corresponds to a special historical sensibility: an affective dimension of the era's attitude towards death. But it also corresponds to his experience of the visual impact of the tombs themselves. For each of the Scaligeri appears twice on his own monument, once as a recumbent effigy and then again as a figure on horseback, towering in the air (fig. 6–7).[38] Ruskin attends to the effect in *The Stones of Venice*, looking up at Cangrande's monument from ground level:[39]

> Above, the Lord of Verona… is laid as asleep; his arms crossed upon his body, and his sword by his side. Above him, a bold arched canopy is sustained by two projecting shafts, and on the pinnacle of its roof is the statue of the knight on his war-horse; his helmet, dragon-winged and crested with the dog's head, tossed back behind his shoulders, and the broad and blazoned drapery floating back from his horse's breast,—so truly drawn by the old workman from the life, that it seems to wave in the wind, and the knight's spear to shake, and his marble horse to be evermore quickening its pace, and starting into heavier and hastier charge, as the silver clouds float past behind it in the sky.[40]

The passage is beautiful and evocative, bringing us before the structure in all its specificity, staging its powerful effects of life, motion, and participation in the world. Ruskin evidently took unusual trouble over its composition.[41] But the description seems to have struck him as inadequate almost as soon as he wrote it. For in the very next paragraph, turning to the tomb's moral resonance, he sets out to describe the effect of Cangrande's two bodies yet again, newly attentive to the affective qualities of their estrangement across space:

> [T]he principal aim of the monument is to direct the thoughts to his image as he lies in death, and to the expression of his hope of resurrection; while, seen as by the memory, far away, diminished in the brightness of the sky, there is set the likeness of his armed youth, stately, as it stood of old in the front of battle, and meet to be thus recorded for us, that we may now be able to remember the dignity of the frame, of which those who once looked upon it hardly remembered that it was dust.[42]

'Seen as by the memory, far away, diminished in the brightness of the sky': Ruskin captures here something of the figure's unsettling stillness and eerie charge, vertical distance staging temporal remoteness. Across that interval, from 'dignity' to 'dust', the passage describes a materiality becoming other to itself—a ghostly amalgamation of memory and space, stone and sky.

The shifting strategies and material textures of Ruskin's drawings of 1869 respond to this complex figuration. Cangrande's figure recedes from us and then comes close, turning and fragmenting under Ruskin's gaze (figs. 8–9).[43] The totality of the monument breaks down, trailing off into its pieces, only to be regained as uncannily remote. From picture to picture, Ruskin seems intent on coming to grips with the structure completely, even as the

whole refuses reanimation, slipping out of his grasp. The close views fall apart; the farther views sustain the effects of distance, keeping the magical interval charged.[44] Ruskin seems interested as much in the non-solidity of worldly power as in the compromised survivals of material form. A visual rhetoric of scientific inquiry is at work in the drawings, as the curious configurations are piece by piece brought into view—the shapes of 'living creatures' that 'had indeed once lived and died'. A rhetoric thus of fossilization, too, with the picture surface staging some 'dusty' postdiluvian emergence, the ancient waters having long since receded from the earth.

4. In his repeated visits to Verona, Ruskin found an interpretive counterweight to the Scaliger tombs in a pair of early twelfth-century griffins supporting the Western porch of Verona's Duomo.[45] Weighed down by their heavy columns, they offered an inversion of the flying Scaligeri: mythical creatures of the air now brought down to earth. He returned especially to the creature on the left, proud and imperious, as its heavy paws hold down a small twisting dragon (fig. 2). In 1852, he took a daguerreotype of the sculpture (fig. 10).[46] And in 1856, it would go on to feature in a discussion of the category of the grotesque in *Modern Painters* volume 3: a 'true Griffin', reproduced from one of Ruskin's drawings, as opposed to a 'false' classical one, lithographed from a frieze on the temple of Antoninus and Faustina in Rome (fig. 11).[47] '[T]his classical griffin', Ruskin writes, is 'exceedingly fine in lines of composition, and…very exquisite in execution.' Yet, the 'rough truth' of its Lombard counterpart will always win out. The skilful 'classical workman' has 'fit' lion and eagle 'together in the most ornamental way possible', composing 'by line and rule'. But the medieval beast takes shape as a supercharged totality: 'He is not merely a bit of lion and a bit of eagle, but whole lion incorporate with whole eagle'—'the united *power of both*.' With its teeth, claws, and aerodynamic morphology, its leonine 'indolence' coinciding with an eagle's

perpetual ‘vigilance’, the medieval sculpture’s impossible integration strikes us with all the conviction of the real.[48]

For Ruskin the depiction has the power of direct observation, with the creature ‘carved… from the life’: ‘the Lombardic workman… never thought a bit about it. He simply saw the beast’. And not satisfied with mere appearance, this sculptural seeing takes on a haptic dimension—a vision of the figure unearthed:

> Now observe how in all this, through every separate part and action of the creature, the imagination is *always* right. It evidently *cannot* err; it meets every one of our requirements respecting the griffin as simply as if it were gathering up the bones of the real creature out of some ancient rock…. It knows simply what is there, and brings out the positive creature, errorless, unquestionable.[49]

Already in 1856, Ruskin turns to the poetics of fossilization to figure sculptural intensity at Verona. And not simply the negative indexical image of a trace fossil: within the sculpture we feel the ‘positive’ presence of the body fossil itself. Geology comes to figure the workings of the imagination. The griffin stands for such imagination’s truth, experienced as an irrefutable force.[50]

Fourteen years later, in the Verona lecture, the griffin comes to offer truth of another kind. The sculpture’s power now stems from its disclosure of historical belonging: a concentration in its figure of past ways of life. The meaning of signs is historically variable, Ruskin suggests: ‘the question is always… not what a symbol meant first, or meant elsewhere—but what it means now, and means here…. An angel, to Angelico, is an angel indeed; to Correggio it is a cupid; and a creature with eagle’s wings and lion’s limbs is, to a

Hebrew, a cherub,—to a Lombard a griffin.' He adds in a footnote: 'What it means, doubtful; but on the whole, grim power conquering pain and temptation, the pillars of the church borne up by it.' Such understanding required a sensitively balanced hermeneutics. Studied 'with sympathy', the art and material remnants of the era might tell us 'about these Lombards far more than they could know of themselves.' And what we might come to know, Ruskin thinks, would take us to the centre of the age's world-view: the 'Lombardic period… of Christianization' as 'one of savage but noble life gradually subject to law', and restaged in its art as the 'government and conquest of fearful dreams.' Amidst all this 'dragon and wild beast decoration' of the Lombard age, it was the griffin that stood as most telling.[51] Seen in this light, the relation of the sculpture to the Scaligeri tombs becomes almost archaeological in orientation. It is as if Ruskin were situating the griffin on a lower stratigraphic layer than the towering elaborations of Gothic monuments: a more fundamental Lombardic zone, still encumbered with the painful weight of its historical development, barely emergent from the earth.

And here the geologic composition of the griffin, so sensitively rendered by Ruskin in 1869, comes into play (fig. 12).[52] His fascination with marble's variegations, and the material histories they encode, play everywhere over this drawing's surface. The 'sympathy' spoken of in the Verona lecture abounds. Attention falls on the layering of colours inside the stone, as geological combinations help to stage mytho-zoological ones. On certain viewings, the griffin in Ruskin's drawing seems almost Janus-faced, a second set of mask-like features beginning to emerge on the back of its head. At its centre, the body splits open like a geode, as if to reveal more. On 21 June 1869, Ruskin writes to his mother from Verona: 'I am much enjoying my geology – in my old friend the Griffin's paws.' It is a wonderfully ambivalent phrase. He enjoys discerning the rock-forms he finds in the creature's paws, but also, it seems, enjoys just being in them, caught and held like the fragmentary dragon. The sculpture

is ‘an endless study.’[53] ‘I am ‘getting quite round’ my favourite Griffin’, he writes on the following day: ‘I am painting him on the other side from that I engraved in *Modern Painters*, and the marble of him comes all into beautiful orange and grey, and I’m continually finding out new feathers and sinews in him that I did not know of.’[54] Such interminable analysis promises disclosure without end. More keeps coming up to the surface, blossoming into colour, without ever letting go of its unfathomable identity in the ‘depths’.

At the same time, Ruskin shows the interruption of sculptural depiction by the great fissure that opens at the figure’s centre. Here the drawing’s brushwork seems to grow hesitant, as though unsure of what exactly it wants to show. Are we invited to look at stone’s inertness, a materiality undoing figuration? Or does the traumatic cleaving rock offer further evidence of its inherent dynamism—an expression of material ‘vitality’ breaking out? On these points the depiction proves suggestive but finally mute. We come up against a gap in the griffin’s ‘geologic’ record: some uninterpretable remainder within the form.[55] ‘Consider for a moment the historical result of the variegations of marble’, Ruskin wrote in that cancelled passage of ‘Verona, and its Rivers’:

> It is a quite mysterious physical fact, to begin with—no mineralogist knows how it is contrived—any more than the botanists know how the veining of petals is contrived or the zoologists can explain the speckling of a bird[’]s breast or spotting of a trout. All that can yet be told you is that assuredly this drying of the marble is carried on through vast periods of time, and that it is the last finish of mountains beautifully made to be pencilled with these purple veins and ripplings —as of the clouds that rest upon them.[56]

The secrets of the earth are also its 'last finish': a coming forth of colour, mysterious as the weather.

Towards the end of his stay in Verona in 1869, Ruskin at last found 'the stone mason who long ago restored the broken pieces of the tomb of Can Signorio, and got from him one of the original little shafts of the niches…in a splendid, largely crystalline white marble': 'It is only about a yard high—and I shall carry it home myself like a barometer—wrapt in paper.'[57] If history takes form in the spatial elaborations of the Scaligeri tombs, its columns and figures threading through the pressurized air, it also subsists as a material density internal to the griffin's body, slowly showing forth in every modulation of its surface: a cultural history evinced in 'chemical facts.' In his writings and drawings, Ruskin stages sculpture's modes of being in time—modes that emerge in the space of his bearing witness. History silts up into its various depositions; air eats away at vulnerable stone. The gaps and losses of the past unfold into the present of Ruskin's attention, where the activity of life settles into its never quite posthumous forms: 'presence chambers of the living and the dead.'

For their helpful responses to earlier versions of this text, I am grateful to Sarah Betzer, Ellery Foutch, Melissa Haynes, Jessica Keating, Megan Luke, Jennifer Nelson, Nick Robbins, David Russell, and two anonymous readers, as well as to the editors of *Sculpture Journal*.

[1] J. Ruskin, *The Complete Works of John Ruskin*, E.T. Cook and A. Wedderburn (eds), London, George Allen, 1903–12, vol. 19, p. 429 ('Verona, and its Rivers', 1870). The previous year, Ruskin had begun a lecture at the Royal Institution, on the cathedral at Abbeville, with comparable immediacy: 'You stopped at the brow of the hill to put the drag on, and looked up to see where you were:—and there lay beneath you, far as eye could reach

on either side, this wonderful valley of the Somme…', vol. 19, p. 453 ('The Flamboyant Architecture of the Valley of the Somme', 1869).

[2] Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 19, pp. 431, 433–4. The list of sacred sites visible from the promontory goes on.

[3] Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 19, pp. 430–31. Ruskin refers to the defensive structures built by Michele Sanmichele (1484–1559), Verona's most important architect of the era, based on designs by his teacher Giorgio Martini (d. 1505). For a history of Verona's fortifications, see J. A. Gray, *The Walls of Verona*, Venice and New York, International Fund for Monuments, Venice Committee, 1954.

[4] Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 19 pp. 430.

[5] Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 19, pp. 429–30.

[6] I. Armstrong, *Victorian Poetry: Poetry, Poetics, and Politics*, London, Routledge, 1993, p. 249.

[7] On various aspects of Ruskin's attachment to Verona, see: T. Mullaly (ed.), *Ruskin a Verona* (exh. cat.), Verona, Museo di Castelvecchio, 1960; P. Walton, *Master Drawings by John Ruskin: Selections from the David Thomas Collection*, London, Pilkington Press, 2000, pp. 148–163; S. Wildman, *'My Dearest Place in Italy': Ruskin in Verona* (exh. pamphlet), Lancaster, Ruskin Library, Lancaster University, 2005; C. Wilmer, 'A Venetian Excursion: John Ruskin in Verona', *Prose Studies* XXXI, 2, August 2009, pp. 92–101; S. Kite, *Building Ruskin's Italy: Watching Architecture*, Farnham, Ashgate, 2012, pp. 173–192—notable for its comparison between Ruskin and Adrian Stokes; G. Sandrini, 'Per un pellegrinaggio ruskiniano', in J. Ruskin, G. Sandrini (ed.), *Lettere da Verona*, Verona, alba pratalia, 2013, pp. 147–215; G. Sandrini, 'Per la Verona di Ruskin. Nuove testimonianze dalla Morgan Library', *Verona Illustrata* XXIX, 2016, pp. 103–11.

[8] Space prevents me from discussing Ruskin's engagement with other Veronese monuments here, such as the Castelbarco Tomb outside the church of Sant'Anastasia—long admired by the critic—or from offering a treatment of the Verona lecture as a whole.

[9] Letter to Margaret Ruskin, 28 June 1869, in Ruskin, as at note 7, p. 68.

[10] Ruskin's first publications were on geological matters, beginning at the age of fifteen; he was elected a Fellow of the Geological Society in 1840; and as his father noted in correspondence to a family friend in 1858, 'From Boyhood he has been artist, but he has been a geologist from Infancy', Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 26 p. xxvi. These interests have received extensive mention in the literature, beginning with W. G. Collingwood, *The Life and Work of John Ruskin*, London, Methuen, 1893, vol. 2, pp. 27–35. But there remains much to be said.

[11] As he put it to his mother, in a first formulation of the lecture's conceit: 'The rock on which [Verona's] walls are built was the first in which fossil remains were ever studied; here, first, it was suggested that they were remains of real shells and not mere illusions of chance', Letter to Margaret Ruskin, 28 June 1869, in Ruskin, as at note 7, p. 68.

[12] In an editorial note to Ruskin's lecture, Cook and Wedderburn suggest William Whewell's great *History of the Inductive Sciences* (1837) as one source for this discussion: Ruskin, as at vol. 19, p. 430, n.1. To this we may add a passage from the first volume of Charles Lyell's *Principles of Geology* discussing the excavations of 1517: C. Lyell, *Principles of Geology, Being an Attempt to Explain the Former Changes of the Earth's Surface, by Reference to Causes Now in Operation*, London, John Murray, 1839, vol. 1, pp. 23–24. For several, sometimes competing, accounts of Ruskin's attitudes towards Lyell, see V. A. Burd, 'Ruskin and his "Good Master", William Buckland', *Victorian Literature and Culture* XXXVI, 2008, pp. 299–315; M. Frost, '"The Circles of Vitality": Ruskin, Science, and Dynamic Materiality', *Victorian Literature and Culture* XXXIX, 2011, pp. 367–383; K. Krieg, 'Ruskin, Darwin, and Looking Beneath Surfaces', *Victorian Literature and Culture* XLV,

2017, pp. 709–726. As Clive Wilmer notes, Ruskin 'kept a polite silence' about Lyell's findings in his published writings—perhaps out of respect for his Evangelical mother—despite the appreciation evident from private correspondence: see C. Wilmer, '"No Such Thing as a Flower […] No Such Thing as a Man": John Ruskin's Response to Darwin', in V. Purton (ed.), *Darwin, Tennyson, and Their Readers: Explorations in Victorian Literature and Science*, London, Anthem, 2013, p. 98.

[13] Lyell, as at note 12, p. 23.

[14] Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 19, p. 432.

[15] Founded as The Museum of Economic Geology in 1835, The Museum of Practical Geology opened in new premises on Jermyn Street in 1851 and under its new name, having changed it sometime in the late 1840s. Both the Royal School of Mines and the Mining Records Office were housed in the Jermyn Street building. As its keeper of mine records Robert Hunt described it in a popular guidebook, 'The Museum of Practical Geology is intended… to exemplify the application of the Mineral productions of these Islands to purposes of use and ornament:—to show, in fact, the results which have been obtained from the efforts of thought and industry brought to bear upon the raw materials with which Nature has supplied us', R. Hunt, *A Descriptive Guide to the Museum of Practical Geology, etc.*, 3rd edition, London, George E. Eyre and William Spottiswoode, 1867, p. 1. The museum also displayed the spoils of colonial extraction, including 'Foreign and Colonial Minerals' in its exhibits. A visitor entered via a 'Hall of Marbles' on the ground floor, having passed through a portal made up of specimens of English stone: as Hunt put it, the museum 'itself must be regarded as one of the illustrations of the main object in view', p. 10. For discussion of the institution's architecture and aims, see P. S. Doughty, 'Museums and Geology', in S. Pearce (ed.), *Exploring Science in Museums*, London, Athlone, 1996, pp. 5–8; C. Yanni, *Nature's Museums: Victorian Science the Architecture of Display*, New York, Princeton Architectural

Press, 1999, pp. 51–61; S. Forgan, 'Bricks and Bones: Architecture and Science in Victorian Britain', in P. Galison and E. Thompson (eds), *The Architecture of Science*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 1999, pp. 193–202.

[16] Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 19, p. 457 (*Drawings and Photographs, Illustrative of the Architecture of Verona, shown at the Royal Institution, Feb. 4th 1870*, 1870). To compliment Ruskin's lecture, a selection of pictures went on display in a room adjacent to the Royal Institution's lecture theatre.

[17] Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 22, p. 55 (*Lectures on Landscape*, 1871). Quoted in Kite, as at note 7, p. 180.

[18] J. Ruskin, 'Verona and its rivers: lecture delivered at the Royal Institution, 4 Feb. 1870', Princeton University Library, Special Collections, C0199 no. 935, fols. 7–8, emphasis and additional punctuation added for ease of reading. The manuscript consists of a fair copy of Ruskin's text in the hand of Frederick Crawley, Ruskin's servant of many years, for use in delivering the lecture. It also contains local corrections in Ruskin's hand. This suggests that the passage was crossed out very late in the lecture's composition. Cook and Wedderburn based their text for the *Works of John Ruskin* on this manuscript, following W. G. Collingwood, who first published an edition of the lecture in a volume of 1894. Neither publication, however, mentions the cancelled section.

[19] Frost, as at note 12. For surveys of geological thought during this crucial period of formation, see M. J. S. Rudwick, *Bursting the Limits of Time: The Reconstruction of Geohistory in the Age of Revolution*, Chicago, Chicago University Press, 2005, and M. J. S. Rudwick, *Worlds Before Adam: The Reconstruction of Geohistory in the Age of Reform*, Chicago, Chicago University Press, 2008, as well as the essays collected in M. J. S. Rudwick, *The New Science of Geology: Studies in Earth Sciences in the Age of Revolution*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2004, and M. J. S. Rudwick, *Lyell and Darwin, Geologists: Studies in the Earth*

Sciences in the Age of Reform, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2005. On Ruskin's continued commitments to geology during the latter part of his career, see C. Trowbridge, '"Speakers Concerning the Earth": Ruskin's Geology After 1860', in D. Clifford, E. Wadge, and A. Warwick (eds), *Repositioning Victorian Sciences: Shifting Centres in Nineteenth-Century Thinking*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012, pp. 17–30.

[20] 'Living matter': Frost, as at note 12, p. 376; 'nature's fluctuant multiplicity': S. Emerson, 'The Authorization of Form: Ruskin and the Science of Chaos', in K. N. Hayles (ed.), *Chaos and Order: Complex Dynamics in Literature and Science*, Chicago, Chicago University Press, 1991, p. 152. See also the discussion in Wilmer, as at note 12, p. 102.

[21] Ruskin, as at note 18, fol. 9.

[22] C. Wilmer, 'Was Ruskin a Materialist?', in M. Wheeler (ed.), *Time and Tide: Ruskin and Science*, London, Pilkington Press, 1996, p. 95.

[23] Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 10, p. 236 (*The Stones of Venice* vol. 2, 1853).

[24] Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 6, p.143 (*Modern Painters* vol. 4, 1856).

[25] Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 16, pp. 375–411 (*The Two Paths*, 1859), quotation at p. 386.

[26] K. Marx, *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, M. Martin (trans.), Amherst, NY, Prometheus Books, 1988, p.109, emphasis in original.

[27] Ruskin as at note 1, vol. 16, pp. 377, 384, emphasis in original. See the excellent discussion in Frost, as at note 12, p. 378. A similar comingling is explored in the artist Deborah Jack's series of collages, *The salt in our blood, the salt in the sea, the sea in our blood* (2021).

[28] However tempting it might seem to align Ruskin with the new materialism of Jane Bennett, Timothy Morton, and company, for instance, this would be a mistake. Attentive to the life of matter, he finally remains committed to the distinctive epistemological and experiential parameters of *human* making. For an attempt to square Ruskin with Bennett—in part by way

of ‘The Work of Iron’—see D. K. Kreisel, ‘“Form Against Force”: Sustainability and Organicism in the Work of John Ruskin’, in Nathan K. Hensley and Phillip Steer (eds.), *Ecological Form: System and Aesthetics in the Age of Empire*, New York, Fordham University Press, 2019, pp. 101–20.

[29] For a more recent compendium of perspectives on the della Scala family’s reign, see G. M. Varanini (ed.) *Gli Scaligeri, 1287–1387*, Verona, A. Mondadori, 1988.

[30] Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 19, pp. 434, 437, 441. Clive Wilmer has suggested that in relation to ‘the seductive charms’ of a feminized Venice, Ruskin ‘found in Verona…a number of masculine virtues’, including fortification and chivalry: Wilmer, as at note 7, p. 97. Wilmer’s intuition corresponds to a period view of the city’s monuments, as in Henry James’s account of ‘the Tombs of the Scaligers’ in 1872: ‘Nowhere else is such a wealth of artist achievement crowded into so narrow a space; nowhere else are the daily comings and goings of men blessed with the presence of *manlier* art’, ‘Venice: an Early Impression’ (1872), in H. James, *Italian Hours*, London, William Heinemann, 1909, p. 62, emphasis in original.

[31] Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 10, pp. 81–114 (*The Stones of Venice* vol. 3, 1853), quotation at p. 84.

[32] The term is Cook and Wedderburn’s, describing Ruskin’s earlier, more expansive plans for the chapter: see Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 10, p. 81, n. 3.

[33] Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 10, p. 89–90. In a notebook of 1849–50, kept during a trip to Italy, Ruskin calls Mastino II’s ‘the most beautiful of the three Scala tombs’, J. Ruskin, ‘Notebook M’, 1849–50, The Ruskin: Library, Museum & Research Centre, University of Lancaster, fol. 23.

[34] Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 10, p. 90.

[35] Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 10, p. 90. In his final example of the decline of Venetian tomb sculpture—Andrea Tirali’s gargantuan *Monument to the Valier Family* (1705-8) in Santi

Giovanni e Paolo, Venice—Ruskin emphasizes the 'pride' and 'sumptuousness of the sepulchre', Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 10, p. 114. For discussion of Ruskin's ideas about form in his account of Venetian tombs, see T. Hughes, 'Curious Beauty: John Ruskin, Walter Pater, Aestheticism', unpub. PhD thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art, 2017, pp. 34–41.

[36] Letter to Margaret Ruskin, 22 June 1869, in Ruskin, as at note 7, p. 58.

[37] Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 19, p. 439.

[38] As Panofsky put it, 'In North Italy,…beginning with the Scaligeri tombs at Verona, we can observe what amounts to an Ascension of the Horse', E. Panofsky, *Tomb Sculpture: Four Lectures on its Changing Aspects from Ancient Egypt to Bernini*, New York, Harry N. Abrams, 1964, p. 84.

[39] In 1850-51, Ruskin already emphasizes this view from below: 'I was disappointed in the Effigy of Can Grande to-day: the face is huge featured coarse, and with an unmeaning smile on it—but seen from below, the general placing of the figure is touching beyond description—not a fold—not a line is lost, no one wrong—and this may perhaps seem still more singular, considering that the figure is entirely separate from the couch on which it is placed. It is worked in a separate piece and the whole body forms a kind of arch—from the feet to the shoulder…', J. Ruskin, 'Notebook M2: J. Ruskin Architectural Note-Book Italy 1850–1851', Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University, MS Vault Section 14 Drawer 2 Box 4, fol. 123.

[40] Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 10, p. 88.

[41] Cook and Wedderburn reproduce an earlier version of the description from a manuscript, allowing readers to track Ruskin's careful re-calibrations of his text: Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 10, p. 88, n. 1.

[42] Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 10, p. 89. Ruskin echoes the language of Psalm 103.13–14: 'Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him. / For he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust.'

[43] Stephen Wildman counts 'nearly 50 known drawings of the monuments, their sculpture and decorative detail' by Ruskin, 'mostly dating from 1869': S. Wildman, *An Instinct to Draw: John Ruskin's Drawings in the Ashmolean Museum*, Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, 2021, p. 48.

[44] In his remarkable architectural staging of Cangrande's equestrian statue at the Museo di Castelvecchio in Verona (part of his renovations of the building in 1963–4), Carlo Scarpa recaptures some of these effects, offering a multiplicity of views that can never be fully integrated as the viewer moves through the building, glimpsing the sculpture from a distance as well as studying it up close. On the architect's work on the museum, see R. Murphy, *Carlo Scarpa and the Castelvecchio*, London, Butterworth Architecture, 1990, esp. pp. 88–121, and R. Murphy, *Carlo Scarpa and the Castelvecchio Revisited*, Edinburgh: Breakfast Mission Publishing, 2017.

[45] On the execution of the portico's sculpture by the Lombard artist Nicholaus (Niccolò) and his workshop, see C. V. Bornstein, *Portals and Politics in the Early Italian City-State: The Sculpture of Nicholaus in Context*, Parma, Instituto di Storia dell'Arte, 1988, pp. 122–36. For other studies of Nicholaus's work, see A. M. Romanini (ed.), *Nicholaus e l'arte del suo tempo*, Ferrara, Corbo, 1985, 3 vols.; E. Kain, 'The Sculpture of Nicholaus and the Development of a North Italian Romanesque', *Dissertationen zur Kunstgeschichte* XXIV, Vienna, Böhlau, 1986; C. R. Lakey, *Sculptural Seeing: Relief, Optics, and the Rise of Perspective in Medieval Italy*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2018, pp. 78–109. For early studies recovering the sculptor as a major 'artistic personality' in the Berensonian mode, see D. Robb, 'Niccolò: A North Italian Sculptor of the Twelfth Century',

The Art Bulletin XII, 4, December 1930, pp. 374–420, quotation at p. 420, and T. Krautheimer-Hess, 'The Original Porta dei Mesi at Ferrarra and the Art of Niccolò', *The Art Bulletin* XXVI, 3, September 1944, pp. 152–74.

[46] In their important study, Ken and Jenny Jacobsen record sixteen extant and twenty-four lost daguerreotypes Ruskin made or collected of subjects in Verona, including four that featured the Duomo's griffins (two extant and two missing): see K. Jacobsen and J. Jacobsen, *Carrying off the Palaces: John Ruskin's Lost Daguerreotypes*, London, Quaritch, 2015, pp. 282–84, 330–31.

[47] As Ruskin puts it in a note on his illustrations: 'If there be any inaccuracy in the right-hand griffin, I am sorry, but am not answerable for it, as the plate has been faithfully reduced from a large French lithograph, the best I could find. The other is from a sketch of my own', Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 5, p. 141 (*Modern Painters* vol. 3, 1856).

[48] Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 5, pp. 141–2, 144. Ruskin imagines the false griffin, with its pointy ears, agonized by the actual experience of flight: 'there would be a continual humming of the wind on each side of his head, and he would have an infallible ear-ache when he got home', vol. 5, pp. 143–4. On the relation of the Veronese griffin to the social vision of Ruskin's primitivism, see F. S. Connelly, 'Ruskin and the Savage Gothic', *Journal of Art Historiography* 12, June 2015, pp. 5, 10.

[49] Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 5, pp. 141, 143, 145.

[50] In *Modern Painters* vol. 4 (1856), Ruskin would go on to use similar language to characterize J. M. W. Turner as 'possess[ed]' by 'an entirely imperative dream' when depicting the mountain pass at Faido: 'I say he "*thinks*" this, and "introduces" that. But, strictly speaking, he does not think at all…All these changes come into his head involuntarily; … he can see, and do, no otherwise than as the dream directs', Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 6, p. 38.

[51] Ruskin, as at note 1, vol. 19, pp. 435–7.

[52] This drawing was among those exhibited at the Royal Institution during Ruskin's lecture. As he wrote to his mother, 'every piece of sculpture here is as interesting in mineralogy as in art', Letter to Margaret Ruskin, 16 May 1869, in Ruskin, as at note 7, p. 12.

[53] Letter to Margaret Ruskin, 21 June 1869, in Ruskin, as at note 7, p. 56.

[54] Letter to Margaret Ruskin, 22 June 1869, in Ruskin, as at note 7, p. 58.

[55] Such a 'gap' could be productively juxtaposed with Lyell's abiding sense of the limitations imposed on knowledge by discontinuities in the geologic record—his evocation of 'a world of non sequitur', as Isobel Armstrong memorably puts it in a discussion of his text's cultural effects, Armstrong, as at note 6, p. 262.

[56] Ruskin, as at note 18, fols. 8-9.

[57] Letter to Margaret Ruskin, 25 July 1869, in Ruskin, as at note 7, p. 104.

Captions:

Fig. 1. Photographer unknown, *The Tombs of the Scaligeri*, c. 1875. Albumen print (photo: courtesy of author)

Fig. 2. Detail of west porch, Duomo di Verona, 12th century (photo: author)

Fig. 3. John Ruskin, *Marbles at Verona: Base of Pilaster on the Façade of Sant' Anastasia*, 1869. Watercolour and bodycolour over graphite on paper, 53.6 x 35.4 cm. Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (photo: © Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford)

Fig. 4. John Ruskin, John Hobbs, *Verona. The Tomb of Can Mastino II della Scala*, 1852. 1996D0042. Half-plate daguerreotype, laterally reversed. The Ruskin—Museum and Research Centre, Lancaster (photo: © The Ruskin, Lancaster University).

Fig. 5. John Ruskin, Le Cavalier Iller, *Verona. The Tomb of Can Signorio della Scala*, 1846. 1996D0041. Half-plate daguerreotype. The Ruskin—Museum and Research Centre, Lancaster (photo: © The Ruskin, Lancaster University)

Fig. 6. John Ruskin, *Study for Detail of the Sarcophagus and Canopy of the Tomb of Mastino II della Scala at Verona*, 1852. Graphite and watercolour on wove paper, 45.9 x 36 cm. Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (photo: © Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford)

Fig. 7. John Ruskin, *Study of the North Gable of the Tomb of Mastino II della Scala, Verona*, 1869. Watercolour over graphite on wove paper. 40.6 x 27.3 cm. Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (photo: © Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford)

Fig. 8. John Ruskin, *Study of the Tomb of Can Grande della Scala at Verona*, 1869. Graphite on paper, 50.7 x 32.3 cm. Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (photo: © Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford)

Fig. 9. John Ruskin, *Detail of the Equestrian Statue on the Summit of the Tomb of Cangrade I della Scala, Verona*, 1869. Graphite, watercolour and ink on wove paper, 18.1 x 23.6 cm. Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (photo: © Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford)

Fig. 10. John Ruskin, John Hobbs, *Verona. The Cathedral Front Portal, Griffin and Columns*, 1852. 1996D0030. Half-plate daguerreotype, laterally reversed. The Ruskin—Museum and Research Centre, Lancaster (photo: © The Ruskin, Lancaster University)

Fig. 11. John Ruskin and R. P. Cuff, *True and False Griffins*. Woodcut reproduced in *Modern Painters* 3 (1856). *The Complete Works of John Ruskin*, ed. E. T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn, London: George Allen, 1903-12, plate 1, facing 5.140 (photo: public domain)

Fig. 12. *The Griffin bearing the north Shaft of the west Entrance of the Duomo, Verona*, 1869. Watercolour and bodycolour over graphite on wove paper, 22.1 x 35.9 cm. Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (photo: © Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford)