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PLATES

I  Walking Man, Rodin, 1905, bronze.
II  The Three Graces, Rodin, 1890, bronze.
III  Flying Figure, Rodin, 1889-90, bronze.
IV  The Gates of Hell, Rodin, 1880-1917, bronze.
VI  Madman's Interior, Don Foulds, 1981, welded steel.
IX  Interior Flip, Don Foulds, 1981, welded steel.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this thesis is to clarify Rodin's influence upon my own work. He has been a strong influence throughout my development in that his attitudes affected the formulation of my attitudes toward sculpting. The key relationships involve personal expression, use of fragments, groupings and components, use of surface and working process. These relationships can best be shown by comparing a number of Rodin's sculptures to my own sculpture of 1980-81. Rather than trying to present a complete view of Rodin's sculpture or the philosophy behind it, I will concern myself only with the considerations that have affected my recent work. While the differences between our respective forms of sculpting are many, the similarities are strong enough to warrant a comparison.
2.0 PERSONAL EXPRESSION

2.1 Personal expression in Rodin's sculpture

Rodin's sense of expression showed itself in three ways. Firstly, he took responsibility for all aspects of his work and aimed at satisfying his personal attitudes about sculpting. The result was the creation of a private rather than a public based sculpture. Secondly, because of the subjective basis of Rodin's sculpture the viewer is also forced to be subjective in looking at his work. Finally, Rodin embued his sculpture with a quality that might be called 'personal touch'.

Rodin took responsibility for all aspects of his sculpture; from its conception, through its making, to the sculpture's placement in, and relationship to the world. This stemmed from his belief that an individual should find his own answers to the question of how to make sculpture. These answers should be inspired by the experiences of his senses in coordination with his mind, as these are brought in contact with life and thus with truth.¹ That Rodin wanted to find his own answers rather than adopt prescribed limits on such things as subject matter or form is shown in his attitude to adopting a prescribed style: "He who sells himself to a style turns his statues into bad literature."² The process of looking for the answers within himself made Rodin's a privately based sculpture that aimed at satisfying the sculptor himself.

Rodin's sculpture was also private in another sense, that is, as opposed to public. For example, classical Greek sculpture was public in that it focused on satisfying the needs of the State; the manner of expression was intended to benefit or influence the public and was
 impersonally based on public concerns such as a moral or an ideal.
The sculptor's sense of expression, although present, was not formative
or integral to the primary expression of the sculpture. However,
Rodin's philosophy made for sculpture that contained, in Barnett
Newman's words, "culture without cult". The sculptor's personal
sense of expression affected both the formation and final form of the
sculpture. For example, Rodin's Flying Figure (1890) contains various
surface marks that are unexplainable. On the back of the sculpture is
a large gouge and a mark as if an irregular block of wood had been
dragged and then pulled away from the surface. Although these marks
are "right" in the context of the sculpture, one cannot be certain of
Rodin's reason for putting them there as his decision to do so was a
subjective one.

The element of personal expression also affects the viewer's
relationship to the sculpture. In Flying Figure, the viewer is
encouraged to empathize with Rodin's expression of private feelings
and actions by interpreting the marks on the sculpture. Because
Rodin's decisions within the sculpture were subjective, the viewer's
reactions must also be subjective in interpreting them. This causes
the relationship between the viewer and the sculpture to be direct and
personal. As Rosalind Krauss stated in writing about Rodin, "This
picture of the self as enjoying a privileged and direct relationship
to the contents of its own consciousness is a picture of the self as
basically private and discrete."4

The final aspect of personal expression in Rodin's sculpture is a
quality of 'personal touch'. This quality must be intuitively felt
rather than logically formulated, and can only be described as the 'something significant' that makes an artist's work uniquely his own. In *Flying Figure* a particular sensitivity was present in the decision making process and its effects upon the sculpture. The marks could leave one feeling that something violent or ugly had happened to the sculpture; instead, one feels strength, dignity and a sense of articulation. The making of a 'Rodin' was not dependent upon the use of Rodin mannerisms but upon the qualities and attitudes that Rodin possessed and subsequently embued in his sculpture.

2.2 Personal expression in my own sculpture

One way in which my working process of 1980-81 was similar to Rodin's was in its quest for an organically arrived at style. Rather than adopting a known style, I looked for my own way of making sculpture. This required a dependence upon intuition, which became an integral and significant part of my sculpting process. The consequence of this was the development of my own vision of sculptural direction.

My artistic development was not focused solely on the example of recent North American sculpture and its immediate stylistic predecessors. Rather, I had been exposed to sculptural styles from all over the world, from prehistoric to present-day sculpture. Through exhibitions, illustrations and travelling I had as easy access to African masks and Japanese haniwa as I did to contemporary Canadian art. My development of a sense of style was based on this exposure and my reactions to it. For the most part, I did not know the historical or philosophic context of these sculptural styles. My reaction to them was essentially intuitive. Rather than making
rational deductions about the development or philosophical significance of these styles, I reacted to specific aspects of sculpting within them. For example, Picasso is considered to be the originator of constructed metal sculpture; yet, by the time I understood his historical relevance I had intuitively looked to other sources for inspiration. In this way I was influenced by Rodin's assemblage of elements more than Picasso's even though the relationship of my sculpture to Rodin's is less logical than it is to Picasso's.

The deluge of styles and periods from around the world made it impossible to understand them fully or assimilate them completely. I absorbed only that which fit within my intuitive framework of understanding. Thus, rather than deliberately choosing to work within the constructed metal tradition, I worked in that medium because it allowed me to deal with those aspects of sculpting that most excited me.

In 1980 I realized fully my need to develop a personal sculpting process. However, without a prescribed method of working to guide me, I could only proceed by making sculpture and, as I worked, remain aware of my thoughts and feelings. This approach made sculpting an adventure, something that was new and had never happened to me before. In sculpting, sometimes the piece itself led the way; at other times my will imposed changes in direction upon it. The excitement and significance felt in this adventure was a part of my personal vision about sculpting; I wanted that vision to be integral and visible in the finished sculpture.
One way of attempting to do this was by minimizing the supportive aspects within the sculpture, thus causing a dependence upon relationships created by character interaction. For example, if an object was welded on top of a pole the supportive aspect of the relationship would dominate and one would see the pole primarily as a support. However, if the pole and the object were turned sideways, destroying the supportive aspect, some other aspect would have to unify the relationship. By minimizing the supportive aspect of the structure, the interaction of character becomes more vital and thus more conducive to an organically arrived at structure, a structure based on the involved characters.

By focusing attention on the intuitively arrived at characters and relationships, I also tried to focus attention on my personal involvement in the sculpture. This caused the sculpture to display a personal vision in the forming of the structure rather than an anonymous system of structure (i.e., stacking bricks exactly one on top of another, a system showing little choice or personality of the stacker). Thus, the choice of characters and their handling and arrangement, were of the utmost importance in forming my sculpture of 1980-81. For example, in Linda's Flower the final structure was organically developed from the separate characters of the component parts and their relationships. The use of the three-pronged burst component with its flower-like or budding quality was key to the development of the plant-like nature of the sculpture.
3.0 FRAGMENTS, COMPONENTS AND GROUPINGS

3.1 Use of fragments in Rodin's sculpture

"Beauty is like God; a fragment of beauty is complete."⁵

Fragment sculptures were those incomplete figures that Rodin considered as finished sculptures. Their completion was justified by the sculpture containing 'something significant' and on ordering the parts around it. For example, Walking Man was a fragment sculpture; it was presented as a finished sculpture, yet was headless and armless. The walking stride and balance of the sculpture were more effective without the head. The omission of the head was intended to satisfy the internal ordering of the parts in their quest for a stronger totality. Yet, what was the basis for Rodin's decision about which parts were necessary and which were not? The whole must have contained 'something significant', the successful expression of which caused the ordering of the parts. Any part's contribution to the 'something significant' was its reason for belonging to the whole sculpture.

3.2 Use of components and groupings in Rodin's sculpture

In Rodin's sculpture, the handling of components was similar to his handling of fragments. Components were organized by the 'something significant' achieved in the grouping, and by Rodin's intuitive sense of arrangement, movement and composition. The fulfillment of the 'something significant' would dictate either an addition or subtraction within the grouping. Rainer Maria Rilke, who at one time was secretary to Rodin, talked of how two figures were joined in Rodin's Kiss, but he could have been describing the figures in the Gates of Hell just as
easily:

As the human body is to Rodin an entity only so long as a common action stirs all the parts and forces, so on the other hand portions of different bodies that cling to one another from an inner necessity merge into one organism. A hand laid on another's shoulder or thigh does not any more belong to the body from which it came,...from this body and from the object which it touches or seizes something new originates, a new thing that has no name and belongs to no one. 6

This 'new thing' that Rilke mentions is similar to what I have called 'something significant'.

When speaking of the Gates of Hell, Rodin said, "There is no intention of classification or method of subject, no scheme of illustrations or intended moral purpose. I followed my imagination, my own sense of arrangement, movement and composition." 7 As he himself said, he was not trying to narrate or present some orderly sequence. Rather, he was trying to satisfy his personal attitudes about sculpting.

That the Gates were never finished might indicate that Rodin never found the 'something significant' to order the parts around; or perhaps too many parts and components were included and thus, could not be ordered to his satisfaction.

The Gates is an excellent example of the variety of ways in which Rodin used components. Firstly, he treated the figure as a component which could be used repetitively in a composition. In The Three Graces, a part of the larger Gates, and also a complete grouping on its own, Rodin placed three identical copies of The Shade in an arcing semi-circle forming a grouping. He felt 'something significant' in the grouping of the Shades and as such considered the grouping a finished sculpture - The Three Graces. Supposedly, one was to look
at and feel the forms, composition, or space displayed by the grouping. There was obviously no intended narration in time or logical ordering of the form from one figure to the next in a representational sense, but merely a repetition of the first Shade.

Secondly, Rodin treated the figure as a component to be combined with different figures. For example, many sculptures that were separate and complete on their own were used as components in the more complex Gates of Hell.

Finally, Rodin used parts of the figure as components and amassed drawers full of arms, legs, or hands that could be experimented with in various new situations or; if enough in themselves and they could not be added to without diminishing their power, Rodin would leave them as finished sculptures, such as The Clenched Hand.

Many aspects of Rodin's sculpting were incorporated in The Gates. A possible reason for this was to achieve personal stimulation and refreshment of his work. The interactions and relationships in The Gates caused the development of new figures which could be taken out and used as separate complete sculptures. Also, new figures were developed separately from The Gates and inserted, causing new interaction and stimulation within The Gates. This use of sculpture as components illuminated potential uses and thus characteristics of individual sculptures.

3.3 Use of components and groupings in my sculpture

In Rodin's sculpture the basis for the term fragment lay in its reference to the figure as the 'whole' or standard. As my sculpture was not illustrative of the figure and the 'whole' was organized by
other means the term fragment is not applicable. In 1980-81 my sculpture developed from an initial component, to which other components were added in the hope of finding 'something significant' in the relationships. Unlike its presence in Rodin's work, the 'something significant' did not require a figural representation to satisfy me.

The primary component adopted as a means of initiating working interactions and relationships within the sculpture was the spiral. Intended as a basic starting component, it could then be incorporated with other components. The spiral was used in ways unique to each sculpture, and each of these ways played upon a different potential capability of the spiral. Although the general characteristics of the spiral were initially known to me, these changed as it entered into new relationships with other components in various compositions. Starting with a relatively known component made me more aware of these changes and their significance, and heightened my ability to use the component in more unique and various ways.

In comparing Rodin's Shade with my spiral, his sculpture, being a figurative representation, was capable of certain things that my spiral was not. However, just as Rodin decided to omit the head from the Walking Man as it was not an essential part of the whole, I felt it unnecessary to use a representation of the figure. The 'something significant' within a sculpture did not require a figural representation to satisfy me. Indeed, the figure's illustrative tendencies clouded the sculptural issues that excited me. For example, Rodin's Three Graces exhibits too much illustration in the components which, although
interesting within itself, did not benefit and was thus a distraction to the totality of the sculpture. The Shades are so complete in themselves that they contain, as separate parts, more strength than the totality. Rodin used the idea of a multiple component well, but not to its maximum potential; the illustrative aspect of the figure is the main cause of distraction in his usage of repetitive components.
4.0 SURFACE

4.1 The issue of surface in Rodin's sculpture

The surface of Rodin's sculpture was the primary vehicle to display the 'something significant' which ordered the parts and components into a whole. This use of surface shaped the form while causing the illustrative anatomical development of the figure to break down:

Rodin had now discovered the fundamental element of his art; as it were, the germ of his world. It was the surface, variedly accented, accurately measured, out of which everything must arise, - which was from this moment the subject of his art, the thing for which he had laboured, for which he suffered and for which he was awake.

These words by Rainer Maria Rilke concur with what excited me most about Rodin - his tremendous expressiveness and humanity. These qualities were made visible in great part by his use of surface, particularly in his mature work. Poise and grouping did not seem to matter to Rodin nearly as much as the vitality of the surface. The drama, the event, was in the surface, in even the smallest area of the surface, and thus the curtailment or extension of a sculpture to include more or less of the subject was not crucial. Roger Fry said of Rodin's sculpture, "Every part is instinct with the central idea, every detail of hand and foot is an epitome of the whole." The surface contained that central idea that animated, organized and held the parts together, and that central idea would be similar to what I have called the 'something significant'.

Surface cannot stand on its own and Rodin's three dimensional forms were integral to the development of the sculpture; however,
what happened on the surface organized and caused changes in the underlying forms to such an extent that they were rendered subordinate. This type of handling did not occur in all of Rodin's sculpture (i.e., *The Three Graces*), but it did occur in such works as *Flying Figure* and *Walking Man*. For example, *Flying Figure* featured a leg with a knife slash and a mark on the back; both of these surface marks disrupt the anatomical development of the form and cause a new organization based on the marks.

One effect of using surface as the primary vehicle was that as the surface became more animated with concerns of its own the figurative aspect of the form broke down. Although the surfaces of Rodin's sculpture become less anatomically literal, they still remain within our ability to empathize with them. But, what we receive is a radiation of human qualities, rather than an illustration of the figure. When the figure was truncated or the surface animated with unexplainable marks, to the point where anatomy was barely recognizable, the illustrating aspect of the figure was distorted. Yet, Rodin's ability to present human qualities within the sculpture was strengthened. For example, my reaction to the eroded, marred and yet dignified surface of Rodin's *Walking Man* was that the marks on the surface embued the sculpture with human character and dignity. It was a unique walking man before me, that had survived despite adversities.

4.2 The issue of surface in my sculpture

In my own sculpture surface was used to unify the parts or components, create relationships, develop forms, and show the inherent qualities of the material as a significant aspect of the sculpture.
Previous to 1980 I had been aware that if one type of metal or surface was present in all of the components, it gave the sculpture a unity through a similar feel or look. In 1980, however, I wanted to articulate different surfaces - forged surfaces, untouched factory made sheet metal, and sheet metal that was bent or crinkled. I wanted to organize the sculpture around surface relationships. However, this also meant dealing with form, as many of the surfaces could not be separated from the form or shape that the metal took on as the surface was developed. For example, in the 'bend' form used in this series, the initial impulse was to create a surface that had a different character from the original untouched sheet metal look. When the sheet metal was bent the surface became full of tension because of the metal's desire to spring back. This surface was what excited me and the form of the bend was a byproduct. By hammering on sheet metal to achieve a forged or beaten feel, a bowl was created. These forms have since been used for potential qualities other than surface, but at that period surface quality was primary and form was a byproduct.

Furthermore, the inherent qualities of the sculpting material affected the surface. For example, in the 'bend' form the tension that grew into the surface of the sheet metal as it was bent was a reaction to the metal's latent qualities. It was not an imitation; it was a real bend and the springy tension on the surface was unique to sheet metal. In contrast, a bend in another material, such as clay, would have been entirely different. Thus, the unique qualities of sheet metal were significant to the formation and finished character of the sculpture.
5.0 PROCESS

5.1 The nature of process in Rodin's sculpture

In Rodin's mature sculpture the sculpting process was clearly visible in the finished work and was used as 'something significant', something one empathized with, experienced, or recognized aspects of and drew meaning from. It also organized and gave the forms a sense of character and vitality. The sculpting process was a formative aspect of Rodin's sculpture in a number of ways: in his use of the inherent qualities of the material; in the action of his hand upon the material as a way of determining the form; in his use of surface marks that happened by either chance or choice; and in his use of the casting process as a part of the larger process of making sculpture.

In speaking about his attitudes towards sculpting, Rodin said:

I often begin with one intention and finish with another. While fashioning my clay, I see in fancy something that had been lying dormant in my memory and which rises up before me in what seems to be a vision created by myself. I know it is not this, but a suggested combination of form which I must have already perceived in nature, and which has never before aroused in me the image that corresponds to it. And then, I go on, and the execution becomes more complete, there is a sort of reverse process in my mind, and that which I have made reacts on my perception of nature, and I find resemblances and fresh analogies which fill me with joy.10

This explanation of Rodin's feelings shows his organic response to possibilities within the sculpture that were revealed by the act of sculpting. He often started with one intention and, in response to something in the sculpture, his intention changed; as he looked back at nature he realized that this change in intention had altered his vision of nature.
The organic process of developing the form and significance of the sculpture while sculpting is visible in many of Rodin's works. For example, in *Flying Figure*, the knife slash is an integral and organizing part of the whole. Yet, it obviously happened as a response to the sculpting process rather than being premeditated.

Rodin also found excitement and significance in the material he was working with. Mallarmé is supposed to have said to Rodin's contemporary and friend, Degas, "You can't make a poem with ideas ... you make it with words." Although not Rodin's statement, it speaks of a concern shared by him. It reveals how the material - clay for Rodin, words for Mallarmé - affects the making by its very nature, its structural qualities, limitations and possibilities. By its nature, clay responds to some uses but not others. For example, it would be futile to make clay into a half inch by three foot long rod and suspend it from its two ends. Thus, a sculptor has to be sensitive to the needs of the material rather than simply imposing an intention or idea upon the material. In Rodin's sculpture, the act of forming the clay was sensitive and exciting. William Tucker stated about Rodin's 1910-11 group of *Small Dancers*, "It is no longer anatomy but the action of the hand in clay that determined the form of the figure. The idea of 'making' could not be more directly fulfilled." Success or failure of the sculpture depended on the hand's action in the clay; it was there that the making happened. The process of forming was the key to the 'central idea' or 'something significant'. This was not an illustration of the traditional illusion of 'life' in the figure but rather life in the vitality of the marks and sculpting left by the
action and sensitivity of the hand in manipulating the clay.

From my own experience of sculpting in clay, I know that the marks left on Flying Figure could have been a result of routine work on the sculpture. For instance, when making clay sculpture, I used a knife to cut off parts and a board to scrape off areas where I wanted to remove a lot of clay quickly. Those marks on Rodin's sculpture could have come about that simply; however, the important point is that Rodin made no attempt to cover up these marks in the sculpture. The marks read as something that happened during the process of sculpting and were left as visible, significant traces of that process.

In a number of sculptures from this period, Rodin retained the marks or ridges made by the joints in the casts. He could easily have removed the ridges, as his contemporaries did, but he sometimes left them visible. Retaining the casting marks can only be taken as a conscious decision. Rodin saw them as an integral part of the sculpting process, a positive addition to the nature of the sculpture.

5.2 The nature of process in my sculpture

Aspects of the process of sculpting have been integral to my work. The degree of sensitivity, perceptiveness and courage in the process of sculpting was visible in the finished sculpture and contributed to its character and success. Concern for this prompted me to try to incorporate a search for the sublime as a part of making sculpture, a search which would be more meaningful to the sculpture's character. To maximize this, I allowed my intuition free rein in following my needs or desire, and the needs of the sculpture as well. Following my intuition caused several things to happen: the organization of the
sculpting around 'something significant'; the development of a personal interaction with the sculpture's qualities and needs; a sense of being in touch or in tune with what was significant, unique and personal in the sculpture; and finally, the development of a vocabulary of my own components, methods of sculpting, and a sense of personal touch.

In 1980-81 I quite often continued working on a sculpture long after I would have previously considered it complete. My intuition demanded a continuation of the sculpture, without knowing why or to what end. I destroyed or came close to destroying many of the sculptures I was working on. Yet, it was through continuing on from a point where the sculpture could have been considered finished that successes were achieved which truly excited me. I found myself criticizing most of my past sculpture in that the process hadn't gone far enough. I was not criticizing my past use of surface or component; rather, I now felt capable of continuing the same process further in terms of the degree of my sensitivity, perceptiveness and courage. For example, to put a considerable amount of work into a sculpture and then have to risk making choices which might either improve or ruin the sculpture, took courage. Yet, I demanded of myself this courage to push the process further. This pursuit of the sublime while sculpting embued the sculpting itself with character and significance. For example, in Madman's Interior, components from previous styles were incorporated into the whole. This was really nothing new; however, the large number and diversity of components intensified the challenge and demanded much more from me in order to create a successful sculpture. The degree of challenge dealt with in the
sculpting was conducive to evoking feelings of excitement and admiration on a grand scale within the viewer.

In my sculpture prior to 1980, I had cut the degree of character in my components to a minimum. I used anonymous shapes such as imperfect rectangles, that did not refer to or invoke outside references, and concerned myself with achieving a significant whole. Often I arrived at the whole quickly. This resulted in an enormous amount of sculpture, out of which I could pick a few successful sculptures which had staying power. As a result, these sculptures were light and had the freshness of sketches.

In 1980-81 I grew tired of this 'sketch quality' and wanted the sculptures to be more substantial and ambitious in scope. To achieve this, I attempted to incorporate as much and as many kinds of character as possible in the sculpture. I allowed my intuition free rein and, as components were suggested, spent as much time as necessary to create them. I didn't question whether it would be compatible with how the sculpture looked or might look. As I spontaneously envisioned conceptions I acted upon them, regardless of how absurd they may have seemed at the time. For example, the wrapped component in Linda's Flower is a complex component that took a great deal of time and energy to make. I had no idea how it could be incorporated into the sculpture or what its effect would be, yet I spent the time required to make it. This was based on an intuitive whim.

Following my intuition led me to a way of working in which, by balancing decisions made in the sculpture, I was able to naturally and spontaneously deal with a large number of components and relationships.
The more decisions made within a sculpture, the more precise they became. I continually checked and related these decisions to previous ones that could still be felt in the sculpture. Some decisions moved the sculpture too far too quickly and would have finished the piece before it developed significant character. Other decisions were insignificant and had no clear effect, but simply confused and cluttered the sculpture. Sometimes a piece was started with such grandiose intentions that nothing could follow them; either there were not enough materials or I could not find compatible ways of continuing. I realized that many diverse components could be handled, provided decisions about them were kept within a limited framework. Also, a wide range of characters could be dealt with provided each was given an appropriate amount of importance within the whole. For example, if a small proportion of active character was placed beside a large proportion of quiet character neither would dominate; thus, each character could be clearly seen. When the proportion and thus the importance of characters were balanced each could play a significant part in the forming of the whole. In this way, the sculpture could successfully contain diverse characters. Indeed, I sent so far as to incorporate entire past sculptures into the sculpture under construction. In my studio at this time there were a number of incomplete sculptures from past series; one such piece was a series of metal 'bends' jammed together. I incorporated this piece into Madman's Interior; however, because it dominated the composition, I cut into the 'bends' component severely. The character of the component was still present, but it now balanced with other components and could relate in a give-and-take
sort of way with the other elements of the sculpture. Parts were also
cut off the 'bends' component to open it up and make it less self-
contained and finished. This forced the 'bends' to depend upon, or
relate more actively to the other elements of the sculpture. Madman's
Interior contained a number of areas of diverse character which were
at one time complete, independent sculptures, but now contribute a
small part to the finished sculpture.

At this point I realized that this adding process could go on
forever; indeed, I was enjoying it so much that I was almost tempted
to allow it. However, as the sculpting continued, many of the
original decisions and characters disappeared. These initial decisions
had played a foundation role, but had been cut up so much that they
were no longer present. As more sculptures were made in this way, I
realized that I was becoming sloppy and insensitive in dealing with
the initial characters and decisions, as there would probably be a
continuation of decisions and more characters added, and the initial
moves would likely disappear or become insignificant. I became aware
that I did not want to aim for the completion of the sculpture
immediately, nor did I want to resist the sculpture's completion.
Rather, I wanted to watch and feel and at the point that 'something
significant' was showing itself, I would organize the parts around
the 'something significant' and complete the sculpture.

To perceive the 'something significant' in a work, I had to be
in touch with the sculpture's particular set of circumstances. I
could not refer to other sculptures or ways of sculpting, or to their
degree of success in another circumstance or time. Being in touch was
key to tuning in to what was significant and unique to a particular set of parts, and their potential to make a significant whole.

Furthermore, certain characters or components recurred and became central to the significance of my sculpture. Although incorporating many characters into my sculpture, I unconsciously allowed certain ones to remain more central. I did not know why these central characters emerged, but I accepted them and adopted them as a vocabulary of characters that I came to know. By being sensitive to them, I could use them in more varied and exciting ways. Not only the characters themselves, but also the handling of them was important. For example, I used the spiral as a base for various ways of sculpting. By handling the same component in different ways I came to see more clearly my preference for its use and thus could see my own character more clearly.

Working in the ways mentioned above developed the unexplainable characteristic of 'personal touch' in me and my sculpture. It did this by sharpening my sense of intuition about that which was personal and significant in my sculpture. By using characters, components and ways of sculpting that were personal, that I had developed and was sensitive to, I could be more spontaneous and natural. This allowed the quality of 'personal touch' to enter more fully into my sculpture.
6.0 SUMMARY

The most important aspect that Rodin and I shared was our approach to sculpting; an approach based on belief in intuition and personal reaction. This was essential in all aspects of Rodin's sculpture. Seeing this approach in his work was influential in my coming to trust my intuition and reactions, and from that, to finding a way of working that gave me access to components, characters and ways of working which were significant and personal.

Secondly, both Rodin and I took responsibility for all aspects of the sculpting process and the finished sculpture. This affected the sculpture, making it a privately based sculpture.

Finally, Rodin and I shared a similar attitude about the use of many aspects of sculpting; use of components and groupings, use of surface, and use of process. A significant difference between our two forms of sculpting was Rodin's usage of the figure. He utilized the illustrative aspect of the figure as well as embueing human qualities into his work. For example, a schematic diagram can illustrate the figure; however, in the embuement of human qualities into an object figurative representation is not necessary - an old pair of shoes can be embued with human qualities. I was primarily concerned with embueing human qualities into my sculpture rather than dealing with figurative illustration.
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The Walking Man (enlarged scale). 1905.
Bronze, 83½" high.
The Three Shades. 1880. Bronze,
74 1/4" high on base 71" long x 30" deep x 7" high.
Flying Figure. c.1890-91. Bronze, 20\(\frac{3}{4}\)" high x 30" wide x 11\(\frac{3}{4}\)" deep.
The Gates of Hell. 1880-1917. Bronze, 216 x 144 x 33 inches.
Madman's Interior, 1981. Steel,
82.5 x 97.3 x 61.4 cm.
Fragmented Interior, 1981. Steel, 20.3 x 57.1 x 42.0 cm.

Spiral Interior, 1981. Steel, 30.5 x 69.2 x 28.3 cm.
Interior Flip, 1981. Steel, 104.3 x 80.0 x 40.6 cm.
Edge of the Interior, 1981. Steel, 73.0 x 65.4 x 46.3 cm.