

THE TEACHING OF NON-PROFESSIONAL ARTISTS
IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND

KIMBERLY MAE SLOAN

Voh1

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Westfield College
University of London
1986

ABSTRACT

The introductory chapter explains terms used throughout this thesis and why this period was chosen for study. The history of the introduction of drawing to the curriculum of Christ's Hospital, the Lens family who were the drawing masters there, and their drawing manuals and teaching methods are the subject of the second chapter. The third deals with the teaching of drawing at private academies, particularly Thomas Weston's in Greenwich, and with his and the Bickham family's activities as drawing masters to the pupils of this academy and the children at the Royal Naval Hospital. William and Sawrey Gilpin at Cheam Preparatory School are examined through the surviving correspondence of the Grimstons of Kilnwick in chapter four.

Alexander Cozens's activities as a drawing master occupy the remaining half of the thesis. Chapter five explains how he himself learnt to draw and describes his earliest known employment as a drawing master at Christ's Hospital from 1749 to 1754. Chapter six traces his activities through the 1750's as a private drawing master and as the author of publications intended to assist the artistic invention of amateurs and professionals alike. It also examines his relationship with his son, John Robert Cozens, with Sir George Beaumont at Eton College, and with Henry Stebbing who studied Cozens's 'blot' method. Chapter seven examines the activities of three of Cozens's private pupils through their surviving work and family papers in order to ascertain the element of original artistic creativity in the landscapes produced under his instruction.

The concluding chapter considers why art education gained considerable importance in the education of young gentlemen and gentlewomen during this period, and whether the drawing masters' methods of teaching them changed. Finally, the role of drawing masters as creators and disseminators of artistic theories and their contribution to the development of English landscape watercolour painting are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME I

Abbreviations.....	p. 4
Acknowledgements.....	p. 5
List of Illustrations.....	pp. 6-11
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	pp. 12-29
Chapter 2: Teaching Drawing at Christ's Hospital	pp. 30-70
Chapter 3: Teaching Drawing in Private Academies	pp. 71-112
Chapter 4: The Gilpins, Grimstons, and Cheam Preparatory School.....	pp. 113-142
Chapter 5: Alexander Cozens's Early Training....	pp. 143-177
Chapter 6: The Teaching Methods of Alexander Cozens.....	pp. 178-209
Chapter 7: Private Pupils of Drawing Masters, of Alexander Cozens in Particular.....	pp. 210-233
Chapter 8: Conclusion.....	pp. 234-250
Bibliography.....	pp. 251-265

VOLUME II

Appendix A: Drawing Masters in Eighteenth-Century Britain.....	pp. 266-308
Appendix B: Private Academies and Public Schools Where Drawing may have been Taught and the Names of their Drawing Masters..	pp. 309-318
Appendix C: The Lens Family.....	pp. 319-326
Appendix D: The Bickham Family.....	pp. 327-328
Appendix E: Subscribers, Pupils, and Patrons of Alexander Cozens.....	pp. 329-356
Appendix F: 'Drawing - A "Polite Recreation" in Eighteenth-Century England', Kim Sloan in <u>Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture</u> , Harry C. Payne (ed.), vol. 11 (Madison, 1982), pp. 217-40	
Appendix G: 'Thomas Weston and the Academy at Greenwich', Kim Sloan in <u>Transactions of the Greenwich and Lewisham Antiquarian Society</u> , vol. IX, no. 6 (1984), pp. 313-33	

Appendix H: 'A New Chronology for Alexander Cozens, Part I: 1717-59', Kim Sloan in Burlington Magazine, vol. CXXVII, no. 983 (1985), pp. 70-5

Appendix I: 'A New Chronology for Alexander Cozens, Part II: 1759-1786', Kim Sloan in Burlington Magazine, vol. CXXVII, no. 989 (1985), pp. 355-63

Illustrations.....1-110

ABBREVIATIONS

BAC	Yale Center for British Art, New Haven, Conn.
BM	British Museum
BML	British Museum Library
BM MSS	Department of Manuscripts, British Museum
BM P & D	Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum
DNB	Dictionary of National Biography
NAL	National Art Library, Victoria and Albert Museum
NLW	National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth
NMM	National Maritime Museum, Greenwich
VAM	Victoria and Albert Museum

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should first of all like to thank the Central Research Fund of the University of London for providing the financial assistance to carry out research for this thesis in the Hermitage and in record offices and museums all over Britain. The staff of the record offices at Bedford and Aylesbury were particularly helpful and patient. It should be noted here that, unless stated otherwise in the text or footnotes, quotations from manuscripts found in these record offices are, as far as can be established, unpublished.

I am very grateful to the staff of many art galleries, print rooms and libraries but I would especially like to thank those who gave me so much of their time in the British Museum Print Room, the Courtauld Library and Slide Library, Eton College Library and Gallery, the City of London Guildhall Manuscripts Department, the National Maritime Museum, the Paul Mellon Centre, the Department of Art Library of Queen's University at Kingston, the Royal Observatory, the Witt Library, 'Woodlands' Local History Library, Greenwich, and the Yale Center for British Art.

There is not room here to list all of the individuals who have replied to numerous enquiries, invited me into their homes to study their private collections, or suggested fruitful sources of information, but I would like to record my gratitude to the following in particular: David Alexander, Sir Francis Beaumont, T.R.C. Blofeld, Judy Egerton, Lady Elton, Ian Fleming-Williams, Joan Friedman, Asya Kantor-Gukovskaya, the Baroness Lucas, Professor Michael McCarthy, Dr. Tessa Murdoch, Sheila O'Connell, Felicity Owen, Nicholas Plumley, Bruce Robertson, Mr. and Mrs. Dudley Snelgrove, and Andrew Wilton.

The debt I owe Denys Oppé and the work of his father cannot be measured. Nor can I adequately thank my thesis supervisor, Dr. David Bindman, for his kind patience, advice and support. In many ways this thesis is as much my family's, especially my husband's, Paul Chaffe, as it is mine. Without their encouragement and help it could not have been finished. Finally, I would like to dedicate this thesis to the memory of Desmond Chaffe, Pat Holmes, and Isabel Sloan.

ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Lens The New and Compleat Drawing-Book (1750) un-
numbered plate (Christ's Hospital, Library, Horsham).
2. Lens The New and Compleat Drawing-Book (1750) un-
numbered plate (Christ's Hospital, Library, Horsham)
3. Lens The New and Compleat Drawing-Book (1750) un-
numbered plate (Christ's Hospital, Library, Horsham)
4. Lens The New and Compleat Drawing-Book (1750) un-
numbered plate (Christ's Hospital, Library, Horsham)
5. Lens The New and Compleat Drawing-Book (1750) un-
numbered plate
6. Bernard Lens Figure studies s. & d. 1704 (VAM)
7. Lens The New and Compleat Drawing-Book (1750) un-
numbered plate (Christ's Hospital, Library, Horsham)
8. Lens (attr.) Castle ruins n.d. (D.S. Snelgrove, Esq.)
9. George Bickham (engraver). Title-page to A Drawing-
Book, Part I, by Thomas Weston. (NAL, VAM)
10. Abraham Bloemaert Recueil de Principes pour Désigner
(1655) title-page to Part I (BM)
11. Thomas Weston (attr.) A Drawing-Book Composed for the
Use of the Young Gentlemen at the Academy in Greenwich
(1726) (NAL, VAM)
12. Abraham Bloemaert Recueil de Principes pour Désigner
(1655) plate 64 (BM)
13. Thomas Weston (attr.) A Drawing-Book Composed for...
(1726) (NAL, VAM)
14. Thomas Weston (attr.) A Drawing-Book Composed for...
(1726) (NAL, VAM)
15. Thomas Weston (attr.) A Drawing-Book Composed for...
(1726) (NAL, VAM)
16. Thomas Weston (attr.) A Drawing-Book Composed for...
(1726) (NAL, VAM)
17. Thomas Weston (attr.) A Drawing-Book Composed for...
(1726) (NAL, VAM)
18. George Bickham the Elder (attr.) The Drawing and
Writing Tutor (n.d.) title-page (NAL, VAM)
19. George Bickham the Elder (attr.) The Drawing and
Writing Tutor (n.d.) pl. 1 (NAL, VAM)
20. George Bickham the Elder (attr.) The Drawing and
Writing Tutor (n.d.) pl. 12 (NAL, VAM)

21. Sawrey Gilpin (etching) in Two Essays by William Gilpin (1804) pl. 1 (NAL, VAM)
22. Sawrey Gilpin (etching) in Two Essays by William Gilpin (1804), pl. 2 (NAL, VAM)
23. C. Yorke Sculpt., del. W. Gilpin Forest scene oval etching, p. 78 of A Collection of Prints Engraved by Various Persons of Quality [collected by Horace Walpole], vol. I (Lewis Walpole Library, Yale, Farmington, Conn.)
24. Alexander Cozens Windbreak of trees s. & d. 1736. pen, ink, and wash. (London, Christie's, 17 November, 1981, lot 52, repro.)
25. Alexander Cozens. Landscape s. & d. 1743. pen and ink (BM)
26. Alexander Cozens. Cottage amongst trees pen, ink, and wash (VAM)
27. Alexander Cozens. Landscape near Rome 1746. pen and ink (VAM)
28. John Pine, after Alexander Cozens The East View of Eton College detail. 1742. hand-coloured etching (BAC)
29. Alexander Cozens Roman Sketchbook p. 19v. 1746. pencil. (BAC)
30. Alexander Cozens Landscape with bathers ink and coloured wash (?) (ex. coll. Walker's Galleries, 1929)
31. Alexander Cozens Harbour scene with a tower (Priv. Coll. UK)
32. Alexander Cozens On the banks of a river ink wash (BM)
33. Alexander Cozens Roman Sketchbook p. 9r (detail). 1746. pencil (BAC)
34. Alexander Cozens Roman Sketchbook p. 2r. 1746. pencil (BAC)
35. Alexander Cozens Roman Sketchbook p. 20v. 1746. pencil (BAC)
36. Alexander Cozens Roman Sketchbook p. 60v. 1746. pencil (BAC)
37. Alexander Cozens Roman Sketchbook p. 3r. 1746. pencil (BAC)
38. Alexander Cozens Roman Sketchbook p. 33v. 1746. pencil (BAC)
39. James Elly Elements of Navigation 1755. pencil, pen and ink drawing opposite description of 'Oblique Sailing' (Christ's Hospital, Library, Horsham)

40. James Elly Elements of Navigation 1755. pencil, pen and ink drawing opposite description of 'Of Sailing Currents' (Christ's Hospital, Library, Horsham)
41. Charles Steevens Plan of Learning at the Royal Academy Portsmouth 1753. pencil, pen and ink drawing illustrating a mathematical 'proposition' (NMM)
42. Charles Steevens Plan of Learning at the Royal Academy Portsmouth 1753. pencil, pen and ink drawing illustrating a mathematical 'proposition' (NMM)
43. Charles Steevens Plan of Learning at the Royal Academy Portsmouth 1753. pencil, pen and ink drawing illustrating a fortification (detail) (NMM)
44. Charles Steevens Plan of Learning at the Royal Academy Portsmouth 1753. pencil, pen and ink drawing illustrating a 'Proposition of Motion' (detail) (NMM)
45. Charles Steevens Plan of Learning at the Royal Academy Portsmouth 1753. pencil, pen and ink drawing illustrating a mathematical 'proposition' (NMM)
46. Charles Steevens Plan of Learning at the Royal Academy Portsmouth 1753. pencil, pen and ink drawing illustrating a mathematical 'proposition' (detail) (NMM)
47. James Elly Elements of Navigation 1755. pen and ink drawing opposite 'Mercator's Sailing' (Christ's Hospital, Library, Horsham)
48. James Elly Elements of Navigation 1755. pen and ink drawing (Christ's Hospital, Library, Horsham)
49. James Elly Elements of Navigation 1755. pen and ink drawing (Christ's Hospital, Library, Horsham)
50. James Elly Elements of Navigation 1755. pen and ink drawing (Christ's Hospital, Library, Horsham)
51. Alexander Cozens Landscape with reeds c.1746. pencil, pen and ink (BM)
52. Alexander Cozens Near Spezia 1746. pen, ink and wash (BM)
53. Alexander Cozens Near Spezia 1746. pen, ink and wash (BM)
54. Alexander Cozens Ships at Gravesend pencil. p. 103(b) in Drawings Album 134 (NLW)
55. James Elly Elements of Navigation 1755. pen and ink (Christ's Hospital, Library, Horsham)
56. Alexander Cozens Landscape with water 1752. etching (VAM)
57. Alexander Cozens (attr.) Landscape with trees and pond n.d. pencil, f. 70 in Drawings Volume 134 (NLW)

58. Elizabeth Lee Blot for a landscape drawing black ink wash (Priv. Coll. UK)
59. Elizabeth Lee Blot for a landscape drawing black ink wash (Priv. Coll. UK)
60. Elizabeth Lee Mountainous river landscape (after blot) black and brown ink (Priv. Coll. UK)
61. Nathaniel Hone Portrait of Henry Angelo. 1760 (London, Sotheby's sale: 14 July, 1976, lot 105)
62. Alexander Cozens A ruin etching, from Aynscombe album (Hon. Christopher Lennox-Boyd)
63. William Austin, after Alexander Cozens. Four etchings from A series of Italian buildings and ruins, from Aynscombe album (Hon. Christopher Lennox-Boyd)
64. William Austin, after Alexander Cozens. Four etchings from A series of Italian buildings and ruins, from Aynscombe album (Hon. Christopher Lennox-Boyd)
65. Alexander Cozens A tree stump watercolour (Witt Collection, Courtauld Institute Galleries)
66. Henry Stebbing (attr.) Blot for 'Idea of a Welsh river' ink wash and pen and ink (Hermitage)
67. Henry Stebbing (attr.) Idea of a Welsh river pen and ink (Hermitage)
68. Henry Stebbing (attr.) Blot and drawing for 'Idea of a waterfall' brown ink wash and pen and ink (Hermitage)
69. Henry Stebbing (attr.) Blot and drawing for 'Idea of the exit from a Banditti Cave' ink wash and pen and ink (Hermitage)
70. Henry Stebbing (attr.) Landscapes suggested by a Tunbridge box pencil, pen and ink (Hermitage)
71. Henry Stebbing (attr.) Landscape suggested by the top of a Tunbridge Box pen, ink and wash (Hermitage)
72. Lady Amabel Polwarth Landscape with blasted tree etching after Alexander Cozens (BM)
73. Lady Amabel Polwarth Landscape with ruin overlooking bay etching after Alexander Cozens (BM)
74. Lady Amabel Polwarth Landscape with ruined tomb etching after Alexander Cozens (BM)
75. Lady Amabel Polwarth Landscape with a tree on right etching after Alexander Cozens (BM)
76. Lady Amabel Polwarth Rocky landscape with waterfall etching after James Bretherton (BM)

77. Lady Amabel Polwarth View in Studley Park etching after her own drawing (BM)
78. Lady Amabel Polwarth Oval landscape with cottage etching after her own drawing (BM)
79. Lady Amabel Polwarth Landscape with ruins and Landscape with cottage by a road etchings (BM)
80. Lady Amabel Polwarth Coastal landscape etching (BM)
81. A. Grey [later Lady Amabel Polwarth] Landscape with meadow etching after her own drawing (BM)
82. attr. to pupil of Alexander Cozens Landscape with cross on a hill ink wash (Priv. Coll. UK)
83. Lady Amabel Polwarth Landscape with river and farm inscribed 'A. Polwarth Invt. & delin.' pen and ink and wash (Newby Hall)
84. Lady Amabel Polwarth Landscape with river, farm, cows, and peasant woman with basket inscribed 'A Polwarth Invt. & delin' pen, ink and wash (Newby Hall)
85. Lady Amabel Polwarth Landscape with barns and cattle inscribed 'Ldy A Polwarth delin from Nature' pencil, pen, ink and wash (Newby Hall)
86. Lady Amabel Polwarth Landscape with fisherman by a lake inscribed 'Drawn from Nature A Polwarth' pencil, pen, ink and wash (Newby Hall)
87. Lady Amabel Polwarth (attr.) Classical female figure writing on a tree pen, ink and some coloured washes (Newby Hall)
88. Lady Amabel Polwarth (attr.) Landscape with rocks, river, waterfall and blasted tree pen, ink and wash (Newby Hall)
89. Lady Amabel Polwarth (attr.) River landscape by moonlight pen, in and wash (Newby Hall)
90. Lady Amabel Polwarth The bridge at Nice(?) pen, ink and wash (Newby Hall)
91. Lady Amabel Polwarth The bridge at Nice (?) pen, ink and wash (Newby Hall)
92. Alexander or John Robert Cozens Studies of cows pen and brush and ink. f. 76 in Drawings Volume 134 (NLW)
93. Alexander or John Robert Cozens Studies of cows pencil, pen and ink. f. 77 in Drawings Volume 134 (NLW)
94. Alexander or John Robert Cozens Studies of plants pen and ink. f. 92 in Drawings Volume 134 (NLW)
95. Alexander Cozens Domed building seen through trees chalk (Priv. Coll. UK)

96. Alexander Cozens Blot for Italian landscape with domed building ink wash (Leeds City Art Gallery)
97. Alexander Cozens Italian landscape with domed building pen, ink and wash (Leeds City Art Gallery)
98. Lady Elizabeth Lee Old man's head pencil and wash (Buckinghamshire Record Office, Aylesbury)
99. Lady Elizabeth Lee Landscape (after a print?) pencil and wash (Buckinghamshire Record Office, Aylesbury)
100. Lady Elizabeth Lee View of the Park at Stourhead 1779. pen, ink and wash (Buckinghamshire Record Office, Aylesbury)
101. Lady Elizabeth Lee Landscape with castle on hill above river pen, ink and watercolour (Buckinghamshire Record Office, Aylesbury)
102. Mary Harcourt View in Windsor c.1783. ink wash (Leeds City Art Gallery)
103. Alexander Cozens (here attributed to Mary Harcourt) The Rhone ink wash (Tate Gallery)
104. Paul Sandby Fox's Fool [William Austin] etching (BM)
105. Bernard Lens III A New Drawing Book for ye Use of His Royal Highness ye Duke of Cumberland... (1735) etching title page (BM)
106. Bernard Lens III A New Drawing Book for ye Use of His Royal Highness ye Duke of Cumberland... (1735) etching (BM)
107. Bernard Lens III A New Drawing Book for ye Use of His Royal Highness ye Duke of Cumberland... (1735) etching (BM)
108. John Lens Landscape with figures and trees along a road n.d. etching by John Cousse after John Lens (BM)
109. John (?) Lens A New and Easy Book of LANDSKIPS in Robert Sayers' The Compleat Drawing-Master (c.1766) etching by W. Austin after John (?) Lens title page (BAC)
110. John (?) Lens A New and Easy Book of LANDSKIPS in Robert Sayers' The Compleat Drawing-Master (c.1766) etching by W. Austin after John (?) Lens pl. 11 (BAC)

CHAPTER 1:

INTRODUCTION

There are perhaps four customary subjects of education, reading and writing, gymnastics, music and fourth, with some people, drawing; reading and writing and drawing being taught as being useful for the purposes of life and very serviceable...

...drawing also seems to be useful in making us better judges of the works of artists.

Aristotle, Politics, VIII.II.3 & 6

In The Compleat Gentleman (1622), the English seventeenth-century equivalent of Aristotle's Politics, Sir Henry Peacham stated that 'in ancient times painting had first place in the liberal arts, and throughout all Greece was taught to noblemen's children in schools'.¹ In the Renaissance, Baldassare Castiglione recommended that drawing and painting be included in the education of gentlemen and courtiers, and Peacham also noted several late princes of Europe who were accomplished artists. However, in seventeenth-century England drawing was not considered a subject worthy of study and Sir Henry Peacham felt the need to list the above authorities in order to defend the inclusion of drawing and painting in his book. Only seven years previously, as great an authority as Sir George Buc, the 'Master of Revels', had written that 'painting is now accounted base and mechanicall, and a mere mestier of an artificer, and handy craftsman. Insomuch as fewe or no Gentlemen or generous & liberall person will adventure y^e practising this art'.²

In 1750, after the changes brought about by men like John Locke and the Earl of Shaftesbury had considerably altered English life, philosophy and education, drawing was

still rarely included, or even accepted, as a relevant subject in the education of a gentleman. By 1780, however, only a few decades later, one drawing master, William Austin (see App.A), could claim to have had nearly four hundred pupils, male and female, nobility and gentry, and by 1800, drawing and painting in watercolours were nearly universal pastimes and accomplishments, among women especially. This thesis will trace the history of the teaching of drawing to amateurs, ie. non-professional artists, throughout the eighteenth century in order to explain how and why it came to be an accepted part of formal education.

This important period has been relatively little studied. The reasons why the teaching of drawing in the eighteenth-century should be carefully examined will be discussed below along with the existing literature on the subject, but first it will be useful to review briefly the history of the role of drawing and painting in English education before 1673, the year drawing was first introduced to the curriculum of a school.

The first English writer on education to recommend that drawing be taught to those children who were inclined to it by nature, was Sir Thomas Elyot in his Boke called the Gouvenour (1531). He cited examples of princes who were sculptors or painters and went on to discuss the usefulness of drawing in war, architecture, and the study of history. Other early writers on education, like Richard Mulcaster in the late sixteenth century, and Sir William Petty and John³ Drury in the seventeenth century, also recommended that drawing be taught to younger children, as it would assist them with their writing. However, the only schools in the

seventeenth century where drawing was taught fairly consistently were arithmetic schools where perspective and proportion were taught in connection with geometry, charts, maps, buildings, etc.⁴

The only English writer who had any significant influence in this matter was Sir Henry Peacham, mentioned above. By 1622, he had already written two drawing manuals and had also been the tutor to many noblemen's sons and accompanied several on their grand tours.⁵ In The Compleat Gentleman, Peacham hoped to improve the common education normally given to country gentlemen which prepared them only to 'wear best clothes, eat, sleep, drink much and to know nothing'.⁶ He included drawing and painting among the recommended subjects and, as well as quoting the classical precedents mentioned above, he claimed that every royal household in Europe had always had its own drawing master. He gave some practical instructions in drawing as well as some elementary art appreciation in the form of notices on Italian painters. Peacham's work was often reprinted in the seventeenth century and no doubt influenced subsequent attempts to establish a system of education specifically for the sons of the gentry and nobility.

Two known attempts were made before the disruption of the Civil War to establish academies where drawing was included in the curriculum. The first was in 1636 when Sir Francis Kynaston published the constitution of his academy, the Museum Minervae. In the preface, he assured the universities and inns of court that no rivalry was intended: only nobility and gentry were to be admitted, the object of the Academy being 'to give language and instruction with other ornaments of travell unto our Gentlemen... before

their undertaking any long journeys into forreigne parts'.⁷
Sir Francis died in 1642, but seven years later an academy was established in Bethnal Green by Sir Balthazar Gerbier with the same pupils in mind: young gentlemen intending to travel or merely those avid for learning. The subjects taught included astronomy, navigation, architecture, perspective, drawing, limning, engraving, the art of well-speaking, history, theatrics, and riding.⁸ Such an education was an obvious advantage to a young man about to travel or take up life on a country estate. Public schools or universities, where the classics were the sole subjects, were totally inadequate preparation for any young gentleman other than those intending to become schoolmasters, clergy, doctors or lawyers. The aim of Gerbier's academy was made clear by the fact that if the young men were of age, they were not expected to stay more than a month and if they were between sixteen and eighteen they were expected to remain a full quarter.⁹ That the Bethnal Green Academy failed was probably not due to the fact that parents did not see its advantages but rather that the Civil War had put an end to grand tours, and the normal pursuits of a country gentleman, for its duration and perhaps a decade afterwards.

The necessity for a more liberal education for the gentry and nobility was not forgotten, however, and in 1663 an academy was established in Hackney which remained in the hands of the Newcome family for one hundred and forty years.¹⁰ Unfortunately, the curriculum during the early years of this academy is unknown. This school at Hackney was, however, one of the earliest of a type which began to appear after the Civil War - the Dissenting Academies. The

curriculum at Hackney can be fairly well surmised from two other famous academies of this type, at Warrington and Hoxton (App. B), which were set up not only to provide a place of learning for non-Anglicans excluded from the grammar schools, but also to provide an education that mixed the classics with more useful modern subjects, like those that had been offered by Gerbier and Kynaston, as well as mathematics, geography, science, and drawing.

A few members of the gentry and nobility saw advantages to such an education and sent their sons to Dissenting Academies like Hackney, but these academies also provided the kind of education attractive to parents of the merchant or business class. The effect of these academies was to encourage individual teachers to set up private academies themselves that offered the same type of education, but without the Dissenting Academies' emphasis on religion. Other individuals set up private 'commercial' academies where they taught the more technical subjects like arithmetic, geography, accounts, book-keeping, navigation, and perspective.

These three kinds of private academies, which often included drawing in their curricula, appeared increasingly through the late seventeenth century and filled the need left by the public and grammar schools and universities for a more liberal, useful education for the young men of the middle and merchant classes and for the younger sons of the gentry who wished to embark on seafaring, military, technical, or mercantile careers. Ayres's Academy, which will be discussed in the next chapter, was a private academy of the more technical type and Weston's Academy in Greenwich, to be examined in chapter three of this thesis,

was intended for the education of young gentlemen.

Other private academies specialized in training pupils for one specific career, such as the school Lewis Maidwell attempted to set up in St. James's, Westminster. At first he had proposed to prepare sons of the gentry for university or public services, but when this scheme failed to secure approval he altered his proposals so that they recommended the establishment of a naval school to enable gentlemen's sons to become officers in the navy. The curriculum for this prospective academy, printed in 1705, included fortification, or military architecture, perspective and drawing, 'Which performs like Operations, as Perspective, by Observation, and the Power of Imitation, join'd with an Habit of the Hand, acquired by Care, and Exercise, and it is performed for the most part, without Ruler and Compass'.¹¹ Maidwell's scheme, however, did not succeed and his academy never came into being.

These private academies flourished in the eighteenth century, as will be seen in later chapters of this thesis, but they were not the only form of education available and, therefore, not the only places where drawing was taught.

The eighteenth century was a period of many changes in education and the universal inclusion of drawing among subjects taught was, to a great extent, the result of these shifts in educational thought. It is necessary, then, to provide an outline of the basic ways in which children could be educated in the century studied in this thesis and to familiarize the reader with the names and fundamental precepts of the men whose writings would have the most far-reaching effects.

It has already been noted that the increasing popularity of private academies was, in a large part, a reaction against the purely classical education provided by the public schools and universities. These two institutions are so familiar to us today as to need little explanation here. In the eighteenth century, however, they had very little structure, no exams, and the students, who were almost exclusively from the upper classes, had a great deal of free time. The public schools and universities had become so moribund by the end of the seventeenth century that even their traditional method of increasing enrollment (ie. if one good family sent their sons there, others would imitate) was no longer effective, and the enrolments dropped drastically. The public schools responded slowly to the challenge of private academies and new trends in educational thought, but as shall be seen in the chapter on Eton, they did gradually offer their students more modern subjects, including drawing.

Some grammar schools, traditionally educators of the middle and merchant classes, were bound by their statutes to teach only the classics and lost many children of these classes, whose parents tended to require a more practical education. Others began to teach the more modern subjects, and some turned themselves into fee-paying boarding schools for sons of the gentry and would-be gentry.

Private tutors in the home had traditionally been the method of education for most of the upper classes, but they were gradually becoming less popular. At the end of the seventeenth century, in his Some Thoughts Concerning Education (1693), John Locke stated that the public and grammar schools were not only too deeply rooted in

tradition, but also had a reputation for brutality among staff and pupils, and he recommended private tutors in the home as still the best method of education.

Locke's work became so well-known that the debate about private versus public education lasted right through the eighteenth century and this thesis will examine students who were taught by drawing masters at home and in schools. However, Locke's theory that children should be educated in such a manner as to produce men of benefit to society, not just to themselves, was actually a theory of social morality more far-reaching in its importance than his advocacy of private tutors; it was a call for reason in education, for the teaching of subjects which would be useful in promoting virtue, not just pleasure. He advocated that such practical subjects as mathematics, sciences, and the arts, including drawing, should be taught by private tutors in order to produce the next generation he envisioned of 'vertuous,¹³ useful and able Men in their distict Callings'.

The more particular effects of Locke's doctrine and that of his pupil, the Earl of Shaftesbury, will be discussed at greater length at the relevant place in this thesis. The influence of Locke on education in the first half of the century was not matched by another advocate of private tuition in the second, Jean Jacques Rousseau, but the public debates his writing sparked were no less vocal. Rousseau's ideas about education were mainly set forth in Emile, translated into English soon after its publication in France in 1762. Rousseau greatly admired Locke and duplicated many of his ideas, but they were put forward in such a radical way as to frighten off many English parents,

and the results of his work were not as immediately felt as those of Locke. Nevertheless, his advocacy of learning by experience and encouragement of subjects that promoted imagination and creativity, not simply virtue, in the pupil, may later in this thesis be seen to have had some effect on the teaching of drawing.

All of the educational theorists mentioned thus far have addressed themselves to a very small minority, only 4 to 5% of the total population of Britain. What was the form of education received by the remainder of the population? It was, of course, non-existent for the lower classes, while those just above them, tradesmen and farmers, were generally only given rudimentary education in 'dame' or village church schools before being apprenticed or being sent to work. Young girls also attended the dame or village schools, but were taught only enough to make them good wives: the few boarding schools for them which existed offered equally limited education. If their parents were of the upper classes, they had governesses and tutors at home to teach them reading and writing, household accounts and needlework. A few, with enlightened parents, were taught the classics and the accomplishments of drawing and dancing, but some, like Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, surreptitiously taught themselves.

A large number of charitable foundations had, for several centuries, taken in the children and orphans of the poor in cities all over Britain, and fed, clothed, housed and educated them for useful services. It was at one of these charitable schools, Christ's Hospital, that drawing was first taught to a large number of pupils - to the boys in its Royal Mathematical School, founded in 1673. It was

at that school that drawing first became established as an integral part of education. The history of the introduction of drawing to Christ's Hospital is complicated, but a careful examination should indicate why the Governors of the Hospital decided to have drawing taught to their pupils and should also reveal the methods the drawing masters used to teach them.

The importance of the teaching of drawing at Christ's Hospital cannot be over-emphasized. It has been discussed elsewhere only briefly, but it influenced several other institutions and individuals and was thus, to a large extent, ultimately responsible for drawing being introduced to the curricula of all schools. However, before examining this history in detail, it is necessary to explain some terms which will be used throughout this thesis, to examine the existing literature on the teaching of amateurs in the eighteenth century, and to explain the approach to the subject that this thesis will take.

In the eighteenth century, the period under discussion in this thesis, male and female amateur artists came mainly from the upper classes and will only be included if they painted or drew, not in order to sell their works, but for pleasure and, therefore, were non-professional artists. These two terms, 'amateur' and 'non-professional artist', also include the young men who learnt to draw at Christ's Hospital or in private academies or other types of schools. Drawing masters obviously taught drawing, but it is important to note that they often also taught engraving, writing, or mathematics. They were often also dealers or printsellers, or they taught drawing only to supplement the

income they earned as professional artists. Those professional artists who taught young men to become professional artists themselves, at art academies like the Academy in St. Martin's Lane or the Royal Academy, are not included in the term 'drawing master', nor will these professional art academies or their students be discussed in this thesis.

15

It would appear, at first, that there has been a large number of books written on the teaching of art: Art and Education by Michael Steveni (1968), For Art's Sake? by Jack Cross (1977), Stuart Macdonald, The History and Philosophy of Art Education (1970), and Richard Carline, Draw They Must: a History of the Teaching and Examining of Art (1968) to name only a handful. On closer examination, however, one finds that these books were written by historians of education or, in Carline's case, an artist and art teacher. None were written from the point of view of art education's contribution to the development and progress of art in Britain. Macdonald, for example, (page 5) admitted that 'A knowledge of the principles and methods of art education is essential for a true understanding of the art of different periods, and therefore for the art historian', but he also felt that art education is a branch of the subject education rather than the history of art and stated 'This is so evident as not to deserve mention.'

Macdonald confined his discussion of drawing masters, amateurs, and art in schools to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Carline's book, which contains the most detailed examination of the introduction of art to education, is written from the point of view of the educator rather than the art historian, and the resultant concentration is on

methods and their effect on the pupils, without consideration of their contribution or effect on the development of art as a whole. This thesis will make constant references to developments in education in the eighteenth century, the period that saw a decline in the number of children educated at home by tutors and an increase in the importance of schools and the introduction of 'modern' subjects to their curricula. Changes in education, however, were not the only important new developments to effect the teaching of non-professional artists in the eighteenth century: changes in philosophy, culture, economic conditions, and even at court, will all be shown to be influential in altering the public's attitude towards learning to draw and paint.

Art historians have not neglected the subject completely. Iolo Williams was the first author to briefly consider the contribution amateurs made to the development of watercolour painting, in the last few pages of his Early English Watercolours (1952). Martin Hardie had planned chapters on drawing masters and the amateur in his three-volume history of watercolour painting in Britain. They were substantially revised and enlarged after his death by Ian Fleming-Williams and appeared as Appendix I and II in the third volume. They are the most detailed art-historical considerations to appear thus far and contain a substantial amount of discussion about who was involved and why. As appendices, they are necessarily limited and contain fairly brief summaries of the large number of individuals that had to be considered in a period covering nearly two centuries. These appendices, however, represent many decades of

difficult research, since amateurs and drawing masters have been considered unimportant artists, if discussed at all: their lives are obscure and unstudied and information must be gleaned from parish registers, advertisements, and passing references in letters. Until recently, their drawings and watercolours were seldom to be found in museums or sale rooms, but rather in ephemeral drawing manuals and copy-books and attic-banished, dog-eared portfolios.

Their etchings survived in greater numbers than their drawings; there are large collections of them in the British Museum, the Yale Center for British Art, and the Lewis Walpole Library in Farmington, Connecticut. Paul Oppé saw the merit in the etchings and drawings of amateurs and their teachers. He wrote several articles in periodicals like the Print Collectors' Quarterly on previously obscure, but obviously talented amateurs like the Earl of Aylesford and John Clerk of Eldin and he was also responsible for bringing out of obscurity the activities of Alexander Cozens, the most important drawing master in the eighteenth century. More recently, Michael Clarke, in The Tempting Prospect: A Social History of English Watercolours (1982), devoted two chapters in the body of his book to amateurs and drawing masters, which contained several interesting new items of information.

Finally, art librarians have contributed in some measure to the subject of teaching non-professional artists in the eighteenth century. S. T. Lucas listed several drawing manuals in his Bibliography of Watercolour Painting and Painters (1976). John Roland Abbey's Scenery of Great Britain and Ireland in Aquatint and Lithography, 1770-1860 (1952) and Life in England in Aquatint and Lithography

(1953) catalogued several manuals in his collection, which is now at the Yale Center for British Art, to which constant additions are being made. Joan Friedman, in her article in Apollo (April, 1977), 'Every Lady Her Own Drawing Master', discussed several of the manuals in Abbey's collection and how they changed through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. She is currently writing a dissertation for Yale which will be an annotated bibliography of three centuries of drawing manuals and should prove invaluable to future research on this subject.

These earlier writers on the subject have indicated the enormous amount of new information that can be found in the study of the work of amateurs and their drawing masters. Out of necessity, they have approached the vast amount of material through scholarly chronological series of very short monographs on each drawing master, then on each amateur. These authors seldom had the opportunity to consider drawing masters, their methods and their pupils' works together so that the considerable and valuable contribution of these artists to the development of English eighteenth-century art has never been properly recognized. It is the intention of this thesis to demonstrate this contribution. It will focus on the drawing masters' methods as teachers and as artists themselves. It will examine the part amateurs played not only as patrons, which has thus far been considered their only contribution, but the vital financial, social, and even artistic importance of their particular contribution. Finally, this thesis should elucidate the all-pervasive consequences this activity had not only on the art of the time, but even in helping to

shape the social and cultural life of the Georgian age.

The approach which this thesis will take will be to study the five general types of students a drawing master might teach: 'vocational' pupils in a charitable foundation, young gentlemen at private academies, young boys in preparatory schools, pupils at public schools, and individual amateurs, male and female, tutored at home. This approach does not lend itself to a strictly chronological examination; although the chapters are arranged in a roughly chronological sequence, each chapter discusses the introduction of drawing to a type of student and thus contains its own progression of dates which will occasionally overlap those of other chapters. Approaching each of the five types of students, this thesis will examine how and whether the drawing master made his methods fit his particular type of student, the effects that the teaching of drawing had on the pupils' work and on his own, and finally, the effect that the teaching of drawing had on the development of art, connoisseurship and taste in the eighteenth century.

This approach to the subject of amateur artists and their teachers reflects the importance of the study of educational theories in trying to establish the reasons why drawing became so popular a pastime in the eighteenth century. However, socio-economic and historical factors are similarly relevant subjects to be considered when answering the problems posed in this thesis. It will be necessary to note such changes in people's lives as the increase of wealth and spare time which resulted in what J. H. Plumb described as 'the pursuit of happiness': an inalienable right, entangled in social emulation, and very highly

16
competitive.

At the beginning of this chapter, the brief overview of education, and the teaching of drawing in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England indicated that only a few members of the very upper classes were provided with the services of a drawing master. However, because they were the recipients the first time drawing was taught to a large number of children, the first type of student that will be considered in this thesis will be from quite a different level of the social scale: these first students we shall study were not the children of the aristocracy and landed gentry, but rather the orphans and children of the poor.

NOTES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

NB. Full publication details for all footnotes can be found in the Bibliography at the end of this thesis.

1. Sir Henry Peacham, The Compleat Gentleman, p. 104.
2. Sir George Buc, The Thirde Universitie of England (1615), transcribed by F. J. Levy in 'Henry Peacham and the Art of Drawing', p. 179.
3. See Foster Watson, The Beginnings of the Teaching of Modern Subjects, pp. 136-49 for more information about these educators and their works.
4. The concept of teaching drawing to arithmetic pupils to assist them with their studies was the reverse of a common Renaissance practice that contributed to the scientific revolution of the seventeenth century - the practice of artists being well versed in both the theory and practice of Euclidean geometry as an essential aid to the attainment of realistic perspective and proportion in their work. See John Axtell, John Locke's Thoughts Concerning Education, p. 265, n. 2.
5. For a thorough discussion of Peacham's life, publications and influences, see Levy, pp. 174-90.
6. Henry Peacham, The Compleat Gentleman, edited by Virgil B. Hertzell, p. xiii.
7. Sir Francis Kynaston, The Constitution of the Museum Minervae, preface, n.p.
8. Gilbert Benthall, 'Early Art Schools in London (1635-1770)', p. 4. See also Benthall's notes for this manuscript now in Westfield College Library.
9. *ibid.*, p. 5.
10. Edward Peel, Cheam School from 1645, pp. 2, 39. For a brief summary of these academies and their pupils, see Roy Porter, English Society in the Eighteenth Century, pp. 179-80 and pp. 398-9, where he lists books for further reading on this subject.
11. Lewis Maidwell, Essay on Education, pp. 56-7. For Maidwell as a mathematician, see E.G.R. Taylor, The Mathematical Practitioners of Tudor and Stuart England, nos. 520, 548, 571.
12. Porter, p. 176
13. Margaret J. M. Ezell, 'John Locke's Images of Childhood', p. 142. For a more detailed discussion of the effect of Locke's theory of 'usefulness' on his contemporaries and later writers on education, see George C. Brauer, The Education of a Gentleman, pp. 90-103.

14. Sir Charles Mallet, 'Education, Schools and Universities', p. 209 ff. gives the best brief summary of all of the types of education available in the early eighteenth century.

15. Ilaria Bignamini, a Ph.D. candidate at the Courtauld Institute of Art, is currently writing a thesis on this subject. The history of national art academies was discussed thoroughly by Nicholas Pevsner in Academies of Art, Past and Present (1940).

16. New Haven, exh: The Pursuit of Happiness (1978), p. 3.

CHAPTER 2:
TEACHING DRAWING AT CHRIST'S HOSPITAL

Christ's Hospital, a charity school which prepared children of the poor to be apprentices, was the first large school to include drawing in its course of studies. Apart from Gerbier's and Kynaston's short-lived academies, the sons of gentlemen and nobles were at this time still largely taught in their homes by private tutors before going to the universities or inns of court. The sons of craftsmen and tradesmen were usually first given an elementary education in reading, writing, and mathematics at a grammar or local school, and then were apprenticed to a master where they would learn by experience any extra skills necessary for their particular craft or trade. Why should a school whose pupils were mainly orphans be the first to introduce drawing lessons to its curriculum? The answer lies in the purpose of the school: the Royal Mathematical School at Christ's Hospital was founded in 1673 to train poor boys to be apprentices in one particular trade - seafaring.

Christ's Hospital had been established as one of the Royal Hospitals in 1553. At first the school had prepared a small number of boys for apprenticeships and more talented pupils for university but financial problems had limited the number of pupils that could be taken. In 1672, Samuel Pepys, Clerk of the Acts of the Navy, suggested to the Earl of Sandwich and to the Lord High Admiral (James, Duke of York) that it would be particularly useful to the nation if a school could be 'Erected of Children to be educated in Mathematicks for the particular Use and Service of

Naviga¹con'. Pepys had been greatly impressed with the navigational schools in Spain and France and he eventually persuaded King Charles II to give royal approval and an endowment of £7,000 to set up the Royal Mathematical School as a part of Christ's Hospital.²

Before the boys could enter this School, they already had a knowledge of writing, reading, Latin and arithmetic from the Writing and Grammar Schools in Christ's Hospital. In the Royal Mathematical School they were taught by the Mathematics Master and his assistant all the various subjects necessary for navigation such as geometry, trigonometry, astronomy, plain sailing and the reading and making of maps and charts. The Royal Charter had not specified more particular subjects than these but various mathematicians had drawn up courses of studies (none of them complete) for the Mathematics Master to follow. Drawing would, in any case, be implicit in the making of plans and charts and it is reasonable to expect the boys were also taught to draw harbours and fortifications in perspective and proportion. The 1680 logbook of one student of the Royal Mathematical School, Joseph Terry, is now in the Archives of Christ's Hospital and confirms that the 'Mathemats' were indeed taught to draw. The drawings in the margins, of ships and harbours, illustrate the type of work an apprentice seaman would be expected to produce: cross-sections of harbours and their entrances, views of towns, fortifications, etc.³ The degree of skill they would attain in these subjects would depend on the Mathematics Master's own drawing abilities and inclination. He was to train the boys sufficiently to pass the Trinity House examination and would arrange his course around this goal.

At least one history of the school confirms that 'the "Mathemats" prepared draughts of all kinds from the beginning [ie. from the foundation of the Royal Mathematical School in 1673] under the eye of their master...'⁴ Pepys too indicated that the 'Mathemats' were already receiving lessons in drawing; in a letter of 17th November, 1692, he gave his opinion on 'the usefulness of bestowing upon some of your children, besides those of the Mathematical foundation (who are provided for it already) the knowledge of Drawing'.⁵

In 1694, Edward Pagett, the Mathematics Master, obviously felt the need for the scheme of teaching to be clarified and put in writing and took it upon himself to produce one. It was sent to Sir Isaac Newton at Cambridge and Doctors Wallis and Gregory at Oxford⁶ for comparison with the old scheme and their comments. The old scheme is never detailed in the Christ's Hospital Minutes, although we know it included drawing in some form because of the statements of Pearce and Pepys above and because Newton noted in his letter that the old scheme did have an article 'of taking prospects'.⁷ The fourth article in Pagett's new scheme definitely states that it is the duty of the Mathematics Master to teach 'the description and proportion of figures (rectilinear and circular) in Perspective, with the Arts of designing and drawing'.⁸

Newton approved of the new scheme adding two suggestions of his own, but Wallis and Gregory's comments on each article are more expansive. Of the new fourth article,⁹ they wrote:

Perspective and designing are plainly ones business that would give any good account of what he has seen

and observed in his voyages and make others profit by his travels; and we know nobody that is not satisfied of the necessity of this. And even the doctrine of Projections, and the Art of making Charts, Mapps, etc. in the 8th article belong to this point of learning whose principles as well as the rest are borrowed from the elements of geometry and are unintelligible without them.

Their comments illustrate the contemporary idea that mathematics and drawing were clearly connected and mutually advantageous, with the emphasis on the technical and practical rather than creative aspect of drawing. This new emphasis which replaced Pagett's more general phrase 'Arts of designing and drawing' was understandable, even desirable, when one recalls that the Royal Mathematical School boys were being trained for careers in navigation.

The new teaching scheme was not finalized and approved until June, 1696 when the article on drawing had become the ninth and now stood as: 'The construction and use of right lined and circular Maps, the Practice of Drawing for laying down the appearance of lands; Moles and other objects worthy of notice'.¹⁰ The 'Arts of designing and drawing' had been altered to just one aspect of drawing: topographical and scientific recording. This change in the amount and type of drawing to be taught in the Royal Mathematical School was not only due to the influence of advice from prominent mathematicians, but was also due to changes in the curriculum of the other schools in Christ's Hospital.

The young boys at Christ's Hospital normally progressed through the Grammar School to the Writing School where they improved their reading and were taught writing, arithmetic and merchant's accounts. If they were promising scholars, they went from there to Oxford or Cambridge; otherwise, good students were promoted to the Royal Mathematical School.

The remainder, which was the majority of the boys, were apprenticed when masters could be found. In June, 1692, John Smith, who had been Writing Master for sixteen years, made a proposal to the Schools Committee that the children in the Writing School be taught drawing, which would highly recommend them to such as desire to become their Masters'.¹¹ He offered to show the work of ten pupils after three months trial and asked for £10 to buy books and instruments and defray the costs. Presumably, the cost he had to defray was the hiring of William Faithorne the Younger (1656-?1701) to teach the boys drawing for the three-month trial. This is the possible conclusion drawn from the statement in the minutes of December 7th, that Smith was to talk to Faithorne '(who now teaches them)' about the details of the proposals for teaching drawing - that is, before the Committee had finally reached their¹² decision to have drawing taught in the Writing School.

Only one week before this, on November 30th, 1692, Smith had shown the students' draughts, the results of the three-month trial in the Writing School, to the Schools Committee. The Treasurer, Nathaniel Hawes, had already shown them to the Governors, at a preliminary discussion at his home. They were asked to put their opinions on the subject in writing, and their letters were read at the¹³ Committee meeting.

Christopher Wren noted how accomplished English artists were at imitating, and even exceeding, patterns set by foreign artists. The fault, in his opinion, lay not in a lack of Genius in English artists but rather in want of 'education in that which is the foundation of all Mechanick Arts, a practice in designing or drawing, for which

everybody in Italy, France and the Low Countries pretend to more or less'. He thought the Committee would find many boys would have a natural genius for it and it would be a pity to stifle it. But more practically, it would prepare the boys of the Writing School for many trades, not just painting, sculpting and engraving, and masters would prefer them over older boys untaught in drawing. Consequently, there would be a good demand for them, they would be taken off the Hospital's hands earlier and at cheaper rates. 'No Art but will be mended and improved; By which not only ye Charity of the House will be enlarged, but the Nation advantaged, and this I am confident is obvious to any ingenious person who hath been abroad'.¹⁴

Wren, therefore, recommended the teaching of drawing to the Writing School boys who were to be apprenticed, not especially to encourage those with a natural inclination to art and to encourage imagination and creativity, but rather to facilitate finding masters for the boys and thus save the Hospital expenses by shortening the period they were under the Hospital's care. The improvement of the English nation as a whole by providing a fundamental skill which could place all English artisans on par with foreign ones, was also an important consideration to his mind, as it had been in Peacham's argument seventy years earlier.

Samuel Pepys, Secretary to the Admiralty in 1692, was a little less concerned with national benefit in his letter and showed more concern for the advantages that the ability to draw would give a boy once he had been apprenticed; an ability that he felt would stay with the boy all his life. Pepys, however, warned the Governors that this addition to

their other accomplishments might recommend them to persons of 'the best quality' as tutors or clerks. The boys from Christ's Hospital, he felt, were bred under strict discipline for plainer callings and the social betterment that came with working for people of quality would be short-lived because of a 'knowledge of liberty, and thoughts above their condition, and so to wantonness, and an early forgetting to provide for old age'.

Pepys obviously considered that a rise in social status would be a mistake and would lead to the boy's ultimate downfall. The 'Charity and Purse' of Christ's Hospital was better suited to finding them 'those honest and plainer callings'. He assured the Governors that Christ's Hospital boys with the ability to draw would be preferred by masters over any boys of equal ability save that one. Using his ability on the craftsman's level, drawing would benefit not only the boy but his master, the customer, and the quality of the product. Pepys did not mention general benefit to the nation as Wren had done, but he did note that foreign artisans, especially French, were always preferred over ¹⁵ native ones because of their ability to provide a design.

A week later, when Smith presented the details of his proposal for a drawing school, he too reported to the Committee that it would help to qualify the boys to 'the most ingenious employment...painters, gravers, carvers (in wood and stone), bricklayers, ¹⁶ carpenters, all handicrafts and maritime employments'. Another benefit he saw was that it would encourage the children to study, as they took such a delight in it, something sure to appease the Governors' worries over maintaining discipline. However, Smith's reluctance to teach drawing to more than five

students at first, his request for an extra half a year to teach it before the boys were apprenticed, and his estimated cost of £30 per year, led the Committee to think the disadvantages far exceeded the original merits of the idea.

Smith had several reasons for not wishing to teach more than five boys at a time. Even with Mr. Faithorne as Drawing Master at £20 per year, Smith said that he would need to expend his own skill and industry to promote and encourage the idea. He argued that the subject needed a degree of excellence one can only obtain with time and the boys had to show the master every part of the drawing to be corrected before they could proceed. The other £10 was needed to purchase prints and drawings and the necessary utensils. It would seem from this that the method of teaching they proposed to use was one of copying, not examples of the teacher's work, but that of other masters.

The method of teaching, however, was not what appeared to worry the members of the Committee who were more concerned about the number of pupils that could be taught, and they persuaded Smith to try to teach twelve boys at once. Smith had argued that they took up twice as much room as boys learning writing and, if there were more than five, the writers had to be put in windows and other inconvenient places.¹⁷ Richard Carline assumed that tables would be necessary, on which to place the objects such as cones or cylinders to be drawn, and it was this that took up extra space.¹⁸ There is no indication, however, that the pupils drew from objects such as these - only drawings and prints were mentioned by Smith as necessary purchases and it is more likely these that made the boys learning to draw

require twice as much space. Carline also wondered why Smith complained of putting boys in window seats and thought that places near the windows and light should have been coveted by the students. The room, however, was probably very cold, in which case students would shun the drafty windows. Also, Smith states that the boys were crowded 'in the windows', presumably on cramped, uncomfortable window seats or ledges, not 'near the windows' as Carline suggests. Carline based some of these interpretations on an Ackermann print showing the Writing School as it was in 1816, which was not the one being used by Smith in 1692.

The Committee insisted that Faithorne teach only under Smith's immediate supervision, and that Smith make up the list of boys for the Committee to choose from when filling vacancies. They also had trouble resolving the question of whether Smith or Faithorne should correct the students' work. From these indications at least, Faithorne's presence at the school from one to five p.m. every Monday, Wednesday and Friday seems to have been fairly superfluous.¹⁹

Faithorne's father, William Faithorne the Elder (c.1616-1691), was an engraver of note and a print seller, but he was also an excellent draughtsman, as several of his engraved portraits are after drawings he did himself. He illustrated several books, including one of his own, The Art of Graveing and Etching (1662) which was based on Abraham Bosse's Traicte des manières de graver (1645).²⁰ John Smith's portrait by Peter Van der Bank was engraved by Faithorne the Elder²¹ and his wife's portrait was mezzotinted by Faithorne the Younger. Old friendship, therefore, probably accounted for Smith's choice of Faithorne the Younger for the position of Drawing Master.

The Committee must have trusted his choice as no qualifications or details of previous experience were requested by them. They had cause to regret this later.

A month before the new Writing School donated by Sir John Moore was officially opened on April 11th, 1695, the Treasurer had heard that Faithorne was not discharging his duties and called the drawing master and his pupils before the Committee. He was severely reprimanded but the Committee agreed to keep him on, perhaps thinking matters would improve when the large new school was opened, where the drawing class could have its own room and the number of pupils could finally be increased.²²

In the following year, Smith, the Writing Master, tendered his resignation after a scandal involving his usher who was accused of stealing, and, unsupervised, Faithorne took the opportunity of frequently absenting himself and allowing the number of his pupils to drop to five. His negligence was discovered in March, 1696, when the Committee made a surprise visit to the drawing class. He had nothing to say for himself and again promised to be more diligent in the future. The Committee still apparently felt the ability to draw was a beneficial accomplishment for the pupils of the Writing School and decided to have its drawing class moved to the Royal Mathematical School where Faithorne could be watched by Samuel Newton, the Mathematics Master. As an added precaution, Faithorne's quarterly salary was withheld²³ until he proved himself.

Three months later, however, Newton complained that the presence of Faithorne teaching drawing to twelve Writing School boys was hindering his 'Mathemats'. He suggested an

easy solution (for him) of having Faithorne teach his boys drawing as well. Newton was reminded by the Committee that it was part of his duties to teach the 'Mathemats' drawing as far as needful for their exams at Trinity House. The Committee, therefore, saw no advantage to be gained from keeping Faithorne on and decided to dismiss him.²⁴ Thus ended the first attempt at Christ's Hospital to include drawing in the course of studies considered suitable and advantageous as preparation for the apprenticeship of pupils from the Writing School.

Richard Carline felt that the failure of the experiment may have been due to the fact that Faithorne was a sensitive artist who was unable to act the part of a stern schoolmaster to a number of unruly boys and whose artistic imagination was offended by 'the drudgery of correcting drawings of cones and cylinders'.²⁵ Certainly, the Writing School classes were large but the drawing class consisted of only twelve boys and these and Faithorne were in the same room as the rest of the Writing School where they were all under the supervision of the Writing Master, John Smith, and his two ushers. There should have been no problems with regard to discipline. When the class was removed to a room by itself and Smith had been dismissed, it appears as if it was Faithorne, not the pupils, who had needed discipline. As to the drudgery of correcting drawings of cones and cylinders, there is no proof that this is what the pupils were set to draw. The work of the next Drawing Master indicates that he could set what he liked for the pupils to copy. The conclusion that can be drawn, therefore, is that Faithorne had no interest at all in teaching drawing, and only taken the job out of necessity when his father died,

and took the first opportunity, when unsupervised, of doing as little as possible.

The new scheme of teaching or course of studies for the boys of the Royal Mathematical School, mentioned earlier in the discussion about teaching the Mathematical School boys to draw, had been completed and approved only a few weeks before Samuel Newton's proposal that Faithorne teach his 'Mathemats' to draw. The Committee had found it necessary to remind Newton of the articles in this new scheme, the ninth of which dictated the details of the amount of drawing he himself, as master of the 'Mathemats', was required to teach. In the years that followed, there were several complaints from the examiners at Trinity House that the boys from the Royal Mathematical School were not sufficiently prepared for their apprenticeships in navigation. On June 4th, 1703, Mr. Harris, a mathematician of note, was brought in to the Committee to vindicate Newton. He also took the opportunity to propose that Mr. John 'Lentz', who taught at 'Major Aires's' school, be brought in to teach the Mathematics boys drawing and designing. In October, the Committee once again had to remind Newton that this was his responsibility, but they put off making a final decision on the matter.

John Ayres was a Writing Master who flourished from 1680 to 1705, and who was often called 'Colonel' or 'Major' because of his position in the City Bands. He wrote several books on arithmetic, clerking, and writing, and as early as 1680 had his own school at the Hand and Pen near St. Paul's School. In the back of one of his books in 1697, he advertised that he taught writing, arithmetic and merchant's

accounts, and Thomas Ayres taught navigation, surveying, dialling, gauging, perspective, gunnery, algebra, geometry and other useful mathematics.²⁷ The purpose of the school was obviously quite similar to that of the Writing and Mathematics Schools at Christ's Hospital. Such subjects would prepare boys to be apprentices in mercantile fields as well as military and navigational. This seems to have been a popular type of school, as there were similar ones in Wapping and in Spitalfields at this time.²⁸

To teach drawing at a school like Major Ayres's, John 'Lentz' would have needed a knowledge of the military and navigational subjects for which the ability to draw would be of great assistance. A John 'Lense', son of Bernard and Mary 'Lense', had been christened on 24th of January, 1683 at St. Anne's Church, Blackfriars (see App.C). John's father, Bernard II, and his brothers, Bernard III and Edward, were all artists and it is not unlikely that he would have had at least the rudimentary skills of drawing.

It may at first appear strange that such a young man, only nineteen or twenty, would already be well-enough established at Ayres's school for such an eminent mathematician as Harris to recommend him for the position of Drawing Master at Christ's Hospital. However, it is possible that John Lens had already been teaching with Ayres for a few years. His father had run a drawing school near the same Hand and Pen in St. Paul's Churchyard since 1697 with a partner, John Sturt (1658-1730). The latter had engraved the frontispiece for Ayres's Tutor to Penmanship in 1698 and engraved the calligraphy in at least two of his writing copy-books.²⁹ Such strong ties could easily have obtained a position for John Lens at Ayres's school as early

as the age of sixteen or seventeen.

A miniature sold at Sotheby's on May 25th in 1964, had the following inscription on the reverse: 'John Lens, Aetatis 24 gunner/ Bernard Lens, Aetatis 26 fecit/ March ye 24 1708'.³⁰ Since nothing is known of John Ayres or his school after 1705, it seems reasonable that John Lens, either unable or unwilling to continue teaching, made use of his knowledge of military subjects and enlisted in the army (see App.C).

A curious decision by the Almoners Committee of Christ's Hospital, at a meeting in January 1705, was the resolution to recommend to the Court of Governors that 'it is highly necessary and will be of great use and advantage to the children of the Mathematical School that they should be instructed in the art of drawing and designing, in order to take draughts and prospects of harbours, views of Lands, ships, etc.' It appears that the Committee had finally recognized the fact that Newton, in spite of the articles set down in the teaching scheme which he was obliged to follow, had not been instructing his pupils in these matters and neither did he intend to do so. The Committee evidently still felt that the Writing School boys also needed the advantages that the ability to draw gave them, and consequently they decided to hire one drawing master to teach forty boys from both schools in the hopes that 'no one from either school shall be excluded from receiving the benefit of such instruction'.³¹

Once this decision had been made, the Committee lost no time hiring someone for the position. This time, however, they assured themselves that the man was qualified by

devising a test for the applicants. George Holmes and Bernard Lens were taken onto the roof of the Mathematical School and told to draw 'a view of Christchurch steeple and the prospect of the steeples as far as the Guildhall'. As Bernard Lens drew 'the quickest and the best, and having been a teacher of that art severall years', he was found to be 'much the better qualified'. He was to teach the same hours and days as Faithorne had, but for £10 more per year - not much considering he was to have four times as many pupils and no writing master to help him correct the work or supervise.³²

As Ian Fleming-Williams has so appropriately said, 'Care has to be exercised when referring to any member of the Lens family'.³³ There were four Bernard Lenses in as many generations, three of whom were artists, as were several relatives. Since there is no indication in the Christ's Hospital Minutes of which Bernard Lens was hired to teach the pupils there, it is necessary to review their dates and activities briefly here before going on to discuss the actual teaching methods he used.

Most of the information about the first Bernard Lens comes from George Vertue who, while visiting Lord Burlington at Chiswick, had seen a 'written autograph - belonging to the family'.³⁴ It stated that Bernard Lens I was a painter who had written four or five books in English which were relating to scriptural matters. He had died on the 5th of February, 1708 at the age of seventy-seven, and was buried in St. Bride's Church, Fleet Street. The DNB adds that he was of Netherlandish origin and that he was a painter in enamel who did not attain a great degree of excellence in his craft.

His son, Bernard Lens II, was born in London in 1659 and died, according to Vertue, on the 28th of April, 1725 at the age of sixty-six and was buried in the same church as his father. Vertue quotes the note as saying 'Bernard Lens his drawing Mr. and mezzotintor scraper, or teacher of Drawing'. The 'his' in this case may refer to Bernard Lens III or to the owner of the note, Lord Burlington.

The note went on to state that Bernard Lens III was limner to King George I or II and the children of George II (including Frederick, Prince of Wales) and he attained great fame and merit in limning and watercolours, etc. He had died at Knightsbridge and Walpole added to Vertue the note that Bernard Lens III was his drawing master. An earlier entry by Vertue stated that he was born on the 18th of October, 1681 and died a day or two before Christmas,³⁵ 1740.

Bernard Lens IV, the Burlington note added, was not an artist but was promoted to an office in the Exchequer 'by Mr. Walpole' (again added to Vertue's notes by Walpole). His two brothers, however, were excellent limners, etc.

The DNB states that Bernard Lens III taught at Christ's Hospital and drew a portrait of George Shelley, the Writing Master there, which was engraved by George Bickham. Writers since then saw no reason to doubt this assignation since Bernard Lens II had opened his own drawing school, as mentioned above, in 1697 and would presumably not be seeking employment as a drawing master at Christ's Hospital at the age of forty-six. A drawing book, published in 1750, written by, and with an engraved frontispiece of 'The late Mr. Lens, Miniature-Painter, and Drawing-Master to Christ's

Hospital', was also attributed to Bernard Lens III. Several authors, writing about the Lens family or one member, have repeated these attributions as fact, as late as 1977.³⁶ Ian Fleming-Williams, in 1968, was the first to correctly identify the man hired by Christ's Hospital in 1705 as the father, Bernard Lens II. However, he gave no proof of this identification and did not state which Lens he thought was the author of the drawing book.³⁷

An auction catalogue in the British Museum Library (S.c.550.(13)) corroborates Ian Fleming-Williams's identification of Bernard Lens II as the Drawing Master at Christ's Hospital.

A Catalogue of Curious Italian Drawings, etc. of Mr. Bernard Lens, Senr., Drawing Master of Christ's Hospital lately deceased. Being his Entire & Valuable Collection...upwards of forty Years collecting...sold by Auction...for the Benefit of his Children...on Wednesday, the Tenth of this instant November, 1725...Catalogues to be had at Mr. Bernard Lens's, Limner, at the Flower-Pot, in Great Queen-Street...

This, however, still does not identify the author of the 1750 drawing book but this should become evident if we continue with a more detailed study of the earlier activities and publications of Bernard Lens II and his sons.

Most of the work known to have been done by Bernard Lens II, before his appointment in 1705, consists of mezzotinted portraits, usually after drawings or paintings by other artists.³⁸ In 1697, however, he set up a drawing school with a fellow engraver, John Sturt. It was here that he gained the teaching experience that helped him obtain the position at Christ's Hospital.

As mentioned above, Sturt's and Lens's drawing school was located near the Hand and Pen in St. Paul's Church Yard, presumably very close to Major Ayres's school which taught

the subjects listed above. As far as we know now, there were no other drawing schools in London at the time or earlier (except possibly D'Agar's: see Appendix A). There were, however, several private schools for navigation and the uses of the compass, fair writing and arithmetic, fencing and the use of weapons, mathematics, and even schools for young women.³⁹ However, none of these schools, presumably even Major Ayres's, included the art of drawing in their curriculum at this time. It is probable that the Drawing School at the Hand and Pen was set up to complement, rather than rival, Ayres's school because Sturt had been engraving for Ayres since 1680 and continued to do so long after 1697.

John Sturt, only a year older than Lens, was an engraver and writing master. Besides his work for John Ayres, in 1688 he had issued a trade card that stated: 'Stenography or the Art of Short Writing Taught Abroad...also Writing and Arithmetic'. The trade card he issued for Lens and himself for their drawing school gave their addresses respectively as 'near the Ditch side in Black Friars' and in Red Cross Street.⁴⁰ The Blackfriars Ditch was one of the boundaries of the grounds of Christ's Hospital.

Sturt was also well-enough acquainted with Faithorne the Elder to have his portrait drawn by him in dry colours in 1697.⁴¹ Faithorne the Younger had lost his position at Christ's Hospital only a year before this and it is a possibility to be considered that conversations with him gave Sturt and Lens some encouragement to set up a private school of their own along the same lines as the drawing class in the Writing School at Christ's Hospital.

A hand-bill issued by the two men describes in full their reasons for founding this new school and points out to parents the advantages of sending their children there. In 1702, when John Strype was correcting and enlarging the 1598 edition of Stow's Survey of London, he was so impressed by Lens's drawing school that, although he had only made slight mention of the other new private schools in London at the time, he devoted nearly a full page to describing Lens's school (which he said was set up in 1697 by Mr. B. Lens, now or late living in Fleet Street), and its advantages, and quoting the handbill in full.⁴² The handbill he quotes from is a later version of the first one of 1697 and it is the earlier one I shall discuss first (BML 816.m.23(3)).

Lens and Sturt declared in their statement that 'the Design of this School is to have a constant Nursery or Breed of Youths proper for Artificers'. Their reasons, therefore, for founding their school were strikingly close to those of Smith, Pepys, and Wren at Christ's Hospital five years earlier - drawing was not taught to produce artists, painters, sculptors and develop creative imaginations but to produce artisans, craftsmen, and skilled apprentices more easily able to learn their trade. All the old arguments were revived: the ease with which a commission could be carried out, even across-country, if the craftsman himself could draw or understand another's design; the fact, at that time, that the ones who were the best in their craft were the ones who possessed that skill; the amount of errors and thus money that could be saved; and the preference of masters for an apprentice who could draw and thus learn in half the time. Some new arguments for learning drawing were

added by Lens and Sturt: they noted that it benefitted not only artisans, but also 'it is an Accomplishment for Noblemen and Gentlemen, Scholars, all students in Art or Nature; Generals, Engineers, Mathematicians, Surveyors, Surgeons', etc., and historical accounts needed illustrations as a 'great master of words cannot describe as accurately as a drawing'. Lens and Sturt did not limit themselves exclusively to the practical advantages of drawing. Perhaps borrowing from an argument used in Sir Henry Peacham's The Compleat Gentleman, Lens and Sturt described how throughout Greek and Roman history, artists and painters were always of the upper classes as drawing and painting was forbidden to servants and slaves, so artists were regarded with great veneration and esteem. They thus implied that to attain the skill taught at their school could add prestige to the pupil and enable him to command respect. To re-inforce this point, as Henry Peacham had done, they named several recent princes of Europe who excelled in this art.

They concluded with a statement which may be seen as a forerunner of the arguments for a Royal Academy: that the great height the French nation had attained in most arts was due to the public academies and schools for drawing and painting which the French king had erected at his own expense.

The hours they offered to teach were arranged to accommodate both children and people who already worked during the day. They were also willing to teach in the pupils' own home. The cost was five shillings entrance and five shillings per month. Unfortunately, we know nothing of what they taught, although it is possible to surmise that

there would be a little less emphasis on perspective and other strictly mathematical or topographical aspects of drawing, as these pupils were not training for life in the army or navy - that type of training would be available from Ayres's school next door and other schools like it. The basics of perspective and proportion would, however, still be necessary for such pupils who wished to become carpenters, joiners, jewellers, etc. The basics of figure and landscape drawing would also be taught. The method used was most probably one of copying, either examples set by Lens, possibly engraved by Sturt, and drawings and prints by other artists.

In 1700, the two men did issue a copy-book for use of pupils at their school. The book was advertised in the London Gazette, December 2 - 5, 1700 as: 'A New Drawing-Book Teaching the Grounds of that Art: Engraven in 52 Plates for the Use of the Drawing School near the Hand and Pen in St. Paul's Churchyard...by B. Lens Painter; and J. Sturt, Engraver'.⁴³ No copy of this book exists, which is unfortunate because it would serve to confirm the type and method of teaching they used at their school.

How long the school remained in operation is unknown. It is possible that Bernard Lens was still teaching at the Hand and Pen when he began at Christ's Hospital in 1705 because the hours would not have conflicted with those of his own school.

He taught three mornings a week and the other three days of the week he taught in the evenings. John Strype's account of the 'School for Drawing, Limning, Painting set up in 1697 by Mr. B. Lens...' gives several indications that,

at the time of writing (presumably anytime from the time Strype began to work on it in 1702 until its publication in 1720), Lens's school was still in existence. Strype does not mention Sturt at all, indeed says 'the professor of this art teacheth on Tuesdays, etc...price guinea entrance and a guinea a month' - well up from the 1697 broad sheet's fee of five shillings. Strype also quotes a new description of drawing that does not appear in the 1697 handbill.

An Art exceedingly useful for almost all Sorts of People; as for Gentlemen that travel to take Landskips of the Places of Remark, as Churches, Monastaries, Castles, Fortifications, Towns, Prospects, Rivers, Rareties, Antiquities, Ec. And for Tradesmen, such as are concerned in Building, as Masons, Carpenters...

The argument that young gentlemen should learn to draw for their travels had also been used by Peacham.⁴⁴ It is interesting to see his arguments revived a hundred years later, but it is impossible to state whether they had actually read Peacham's work or whether Sturt and Lens devised these arguments themselves from observing contemporary needs.

Although from the above discussion we may assume that Bernard Lens II still ran his own drawing school near the Hand and Pen while he taught at Christ's Hospital, there is more information available about his work at the latter. It is to the history of that school we must turn because the Committee Minutes again provide valuable information, this time about the method which Lens used to teach. This may, in turn, indicate whether Bernard Lens II was the author of the 1750 drawing book for the pupils of Christ's Hospital.

He had started in the Great Hall in June 1705 teaching twenty boys from the upper form of the Mathematical School. Two weeks later, ten boys from the Writing School were added

at the request of Gutter, the new Writing Master. It was up to Lens to provide the materials, pencils, etc.⁴⁵ A request made by him for compasses from the Rentor's Committee in April, 1706,⁴⁶ indicated that he was adjusting what he taught even more specifically to the requirements of the boys' future occupations, something which neither his predecessor, Faithorne, nor even the Mathematics Master, Newton, had apparently done. There were no longer complaints from Trinity House about that aspect of the boys' preparation.

At a meeting in 1706, Bernard Lens reminded the Committee that his year's trial at £30 was up, and complained that he spent 'more time at home making precedents and copies for the children to delineate after than he did teaching them' and 'much more yet had to be done to introduce a graceful manner of drawing'. The Committee's answer was that if he increased the number of pupils from his present forty to fifty, and if he spent the same amount of time plus what ever else he could spare, then they would raise his salary to £50 from Christmas. The Committee were, however, very reluctant to reward his good work and a year later, in January, 1708, Lens had to plead for his £50, even though he had long since increased his pupils to fifty, twenty-five from each Mathematics school.⁴⁷

Things must have progressed very smoothly for the drawing class and its master for the next eighteen years as there is not a single mention of either in the Committee minutes, not even a mention of Bernard Lens's death in 1725 after twenty years in the position. However, on the 1st of February, 1726, at a meeting of the Almoners Committee, we find that 'Mr. Edward Lens Drawing Master presented to this

Committee a Bill of Forty Two pounds and ten shillings for mending and Cleaning the Pictures in the Court Room, Counting house and Mathematical School and the Committee being satisfied that he had performed the same very well ordered that the said Bill be paid'.⁴⁸

Edward Lens has been described as both Bernard Lens II's brother and as his second son.⁴⁹ However, the parish registers of St. Ann's, Blackfriars confirm that he was neither: Edward 'Lense', baptised on the 3rd of February, 1685, was the third son of Bernard Lens II, and the brother of Bernard Lens III and the John Lens mentioned earlier.⁵⁰

Edward Lens must have had the same success with the pupils of Christ's Hospital as his father had, as he was not mentioned in the minutes again until his death in January, 1749.⁵¹

The drawing copy-book, the frontispiece of which was mentioned above and which has traditionally been attributed to Bernard Lens III, was first published in 1750, the year after the death of Edward Lens.

For the Curious Young Gentlemen and Ladies, That study and practice the noble and commendable Art of Drawing, Colouring and Japanning, A New and Compleat DRAWING-BOOK; Consisting of Variety of Classes, viz. Whole Figures in divers Positions, light, airy, loose Landskips; Perspective Views of Sea-Ports, Forts, Ruins, Ec. Being the close Study for a Series of Years, of the Late Mr. LENS, Miniature - Painter, and Drawing - Master to Christ's - Hospital. In Sixty-two Copper - Plates, engraved by himself. Design'd Chiefly for Young Beginners, and now first published from the Author's Originals, very necessary and useful for all Drawing - Schools, Boarding - Schools, Ec. London: Printed for B. Dickinson, at the Corner of Bell-Savage-Inn, on Ludgate-Hill, 1750

Since it has been established above that Bernard Lens III never taught at Christ's Hospital, he could not possibly be the author of this book. Bernard Lens II did teach

there, but it is very strange that publishers would wait until twenty-five years after his death to publish his work. Ian Fleming-Williams noted that Edward Lens's initials could be seen on two engravings in the drawing book but did not suggest who the author of the work might be.⁵² However, the 'late Mr. Lens' of the drawing book is not only described as 'Drawing-Master to Christ's-Hospital', but is also described as a 'Miniature-Painter', and although he did several mezzotint and engraved portraits, there are no records of any miniatures by Bernard Lens II. Edward, on the other hand, could be described as 'the late Mr. Lens' in 1750, he had been Drawing Master at Christ's Hospital for twenty-four years, and if he was capable of cleaning and repairing the paintings at Christ's Hospital, he may have also painted miniatures. It would appear very likely then that the author of the book and the subject of the portrait in the frontispiece may be Edward Lens and not his father or brother.

The book is divided into a forty-two page text followed by the sixty-two plates. The text was borrowed from other authors who are acknowledged on the title-pages of subsequent editions. Its purpose was to provide a lucid explanation of various useful methods and colours, for the benefit of those who bought the book and did not have a drawing master. The plates, however, do not relate to any specific passages in the text and were of subjects that would benefit a learner whether he did or did not have a master.

It was not unusual for the text of a drawing manual written before 1800, in England or on the continent, to bear no relationship to the plates. Instructions identical to

this, on how to mix colours, on proportion, grounds, light and shade, etc. were more often published with no plates at all and the opposite, plates with no text, were also often published. The first continental drawing manuals were one written by Dürer and those the Carracci made for the students in their academy in the sixteenth century, and they were followed in the seventeenth by many imitators in Italy, France, and Holland. By the beginning of the eighteenth century, several had been produced in England as well.⁵³

One or two of the plates in Lens's drawing manual are copied from old masters, and most of the figure drawings are identical to those found in continental drawing manuals from the previous century. But the rest of the plates, mainly landscapes, are distinctly different from any found in other drawing manuals and it would, therefore, appear that all of the plates in this book were probably chosen by Edward Lens as the ones which produced the best results in his experience as a teacher. An analysis of the text and plates of this New and Compleat Drawing Book ought to be very enlightening with respect to his teaching methods.

The book went through several editions - an indication of how useful drawing masters and their pupils found it.⁵⁴ The second edition was issued in 1751 with an addition to the title page which described the introduction and contents of the text and stated that it was 'Translated from the French of Monsieur Gerrard de Lairese, and improved with Extracts from C. A. DuFresnoy'. A list of subscribers on the second page declared that they 'having carefully perused the several Sheets herein contained, recommend them as very proper Pieces to initiate Youth in the Art of Drawing'.

They were all London engravers of some note: J. Faber, S.F. Ravenet, G. Scotin, L.O. Boitard (who engraved the frontispiece), S. Wale, and S. & N. Buck. The plates in this edition were still not numbered and one was misplaced. The 1752, third edition copy in Christ's Hospital adds 'Salmon, Ec. The Third Edition' after the name of DuFresnoy. The order of the plates has been changed but they have now been numbered. Dobai states there was a second edition in 1766,⁵⁵ but this probably refers to Carington Bowles's undated edition titled: Bowles New Preceptor in Drawing; Consisting of a Variety of Classes...Being the close Study...of the late Mr. Lens... London: Printed for and sold by the Proprietor Carington Bowles, at his Map and Print Warehouse, No. 69, St. Paul's Church Yard.

It has been noted that many eighteenth-century drawing manuals are mere paraphrases of others, sometimes acknowledged and sometimes offered anonymously by the publisher.⁵⁶ In the 1750 edition, the publisher had implied that Lens was the author of the text as well as plates, while in the next edition, he acknowledged the sources, although he did not make clear whether Lens or someone else was the translator and coalationist.

Joan Friedman, who assumed that Bernard Lens III was the author, stated that the text was almost entirely adapted from Lairese's work Het Groot Schilderboek of 1707 which had first appeared in English in 1738 as The Art of Painting.⁵⁷ If this were true, Lens could not even be credited with the translation. The text in Lens's book is not, however, from this work by Lairese, but rather is closely based on his Grondlegginge ter teekenkonst, etc. (Amsterdam, 1701)(BML 8532.b.9) which was translated in

French as Les Principes du Dessen, ou méthode courte et facile pour apprendre cet art en peu de temps (Amsterdam, 1719)(BML 561* f.21), a short work which was part-translated
58
into English by 1739 in

The Principles of Drawing: or, An Easy and Familiar Method whereby Youth are directed in the Practice of that useful Art, Being a Compleat Drawing Book:... after the Designs of Albert Dürer, Abrah. Bloemart, Carlo Morach, Le Clerc, Hollar, and other Great Masters. To which is prefix'd, An Introduction to Drawing;... Translated from the French of Monsieur Gerard de Lairese, and improved with Abstracts from C. A. Du Fresnoy. Part I. The Third Edition. London. Printed: and Sold by Thomas Bowles... M.DCC.XXXIX.

This work of 1739 was not a straightforward translation. As the publisher stated, it was improved with extracts from DuFresnoy. The latter had written a Latin poem, De Arte graphica, in 1668 which Dryden had translated into English and to which he had added his own Parallel betwixt Poetry and Painting and his translation, from French, of Roger de Piles's extensive comments on DuFresnoy's poem. The first edition of this translation by Dryden was in 1695 and the second in 1716. It was mainly from the latter that the 1739 translator of Lairese's book borrowed, but occasionally he went back to DuFresnoy and paraphrased sections of that to add to the Dryden version of 1716.

In his version of 1750, Lens borrowed extensively from the 1739 translation which he never acknowledged, probably because it was published anonymously. Lens, however, made his 1750 version different from the previous ones by taking the verses of classical poetry that had previously been set apart and used to separate paragraphs, and incorporating them into the body of his text. He also made his own version different by leaving out large portions of the

numbered lessons that were found in the text of the 1739 version of Lairesse.

Other entire sections in Lens's 1750 drawing book, such as the four new ways of taking a draught of any picture, rules for drawing landscapes, how to lay on washes, how to cleanse old paintings, fresco or painting on walls, and some of the new ideas on colours and varnishing, are not taken from the 1739 translation but are nearly identical to passages in William Salmon's book Polygraphice; or the Art of Drawing, Engraving, Etching... (first edition, 1692).

The author of Lens's text appears, therefore, to have borrowed extensively from the three best-known drawing manuals written in English before 1750: Dryden's version of DuFresnoy, the English translation of Lairesse, and Salmon's Polygraphice. It is quite possible that Edward Lens, or his father, was the author of this text which was, in the end, just a pastiche of three earlier books. It is unfortunate that no copy exists of the New Drawing Book published by Lens and Sturt in 1700. It is impossible to tell if it contained a text, although certainly if it had, it could not have been the same one issued in 1750, as Lairesse's book, the main text Lens borrowed from, did not appear, even in Dutch, until 1701. It might also give a clue as to the author of the plates of the later book.

At the bottom right-hand corner of each plate in the book are the words 'Lens fecit', dark and heavily engraved, as if added afterwards. The frontispiece has 'Lens pinxit' and 'Boitard Sculp' so that it can be inferred that the rest of the plates were both drawn and engraved by a Lens. Two of them, for certain, were drawn by Edward Lens because, as

noted above, his initials appear in the design. The subject and style of the rest may help to establish who was the author.

The arrangement of the plates follows the conventional seventeenth- and eighteenth-century pattern for drawing manuals, one that was the same in continental and in English drawing books: a series of plates depicting various parts of the body - eyes, ears, and mouths (Illus.1), hands and feet; plates covered with progressive studies of heads and shoulders from different angles (Illus.2); plates of outlined, full- and half-length figure studies from all angles, nude and draped (Illus.3 and App.F, fig.1); then a series of heads, fully-shaded, probably from old masters (Illus.4); and finally, landscapes, of which there are forty-two in this book (Illus.5 and App.F, fig.2).

The plates in the drawing manuals by Salmon and Lairesse (1739) provided many of the sources for the figural plates in Lens's book. Salmon and Lairesse, in turn, had based their figural plates on those found in continental drawing manuals dating from the early seventeenth century. Many of the plates originated in Odoardo Fialetti's Il vero modo et ordine per dissegнар tutte le parti et membra del
⁵⁹
corpo humano (1608). Lens re-arranged and re-copied them himself before etching them and his new versions were often better-drawn than the plates he had copied. However, the catalogue of an auction held by Bernard Lens III in 1737 (BML S.c. 330 (4)), consisted of limnings, paintings, drawings, prints, models, and casts, etc., a large number of which were originally owned by his father, and these, too, may have provided models for the plates in his 1750 drawing manual. Many of the prints and drawings were large lots of

works by one artist, such as: the series of academic figures by Serjeant [sic] Streeter, Cheron, Verdier, and Van Dyck; a series of one hundred and six anatomical prints by William Cowper; the passions of Le Brun, etc. by Picart; twenty-four prints by Lairese; and drawings by John Medina, Hollar and Inigo Jones. Several drawing books were also sold, including ones by Bischoff, Le Brun, Michelangelo, Stephano della Bella, Lairese, and one by Spagnoletti [Ribera]. A number of the plates of eyes, mouths and ears in both the 1739 Lairese and the 1750 Lens books appear to have been taken from etchings of the same prepared by Ribera for his students in 1622,⁶⁰ which he, in turn, originally copied from those by Fialetti of 1608.

As this large collection of prints and drawing books, possibly once owned by Bernard Lens II, was sold in 1737, Edward Lens would have had a limited time to make use of it while he was teaching at Christ's Hospital. This fact and a number of close similarities between the plates and various examples of drawings by Bernard Lens II suggests the possibility that the publisher of the 1750 book had merely re-issued the plates of the New Drawing-Book of 1700, adding new plates of landscape of Edward's design. Alternatively, Edward could have collected drawings by his father and himself, used throughout their careers as drawing masters, and it was these that were engraved and issued together with the new text, after his death.

A sheet of draped figure studies attributed to Bernard Lens II in the Victoria and Albert Museum (8675.A)(Illus.6) is remarkably close in style to the sheets of the same subjects in the New and Compleat Drawing-Book (Illus.3 and

App.F, fig.1). This sheet may have been one of the series prepared for the book but not used, or it may have been drawn as an example for pupils to copy. Works like this would have been easily kept in a class for continual use and passed on from one master to the next. Edward Lens may have often made use in class of drawings by his father, as well as himself. Their styles were probably quite similar.

Two series of pencil, indian ink wash and pen topographical landscapes in the British Museum Print Room are attributed to Bernard Lens II. The attribution is incorrect for the second series, as it is labelled 'Severall Prospects taken from the Life and Drawn by Bernard Lens Sen'r. in ye Years 1730 and 1731' which must refer to Bernard Lens III, who could be considered 'senior' at this date, as he already had a son of the same name. The style is identical to another series of 1731 and 1733 now in the Yale Center for British Art, New Haven and attributed to Bernard Lens III. What is puzzling, however, is that the other series in the British Museum, extremely similar in style and manner, is attributed to Bernard Lens II and this time the dates inscribed on the introductory cartouche are quite probable - 1718-1719.

There is a group of plates in the 1750 drawing book of five village or farm scenes which appear to be by a different artist than the rest of the landscapes which may indeed be after drawings by Bernard Lens II, as they are close in style to the group of 1718-1719 in the British Museum.

A large number of the other landscapes in the 1750 drawing book are of ruins or classical landscapes (Illus. 7). These may have been drawn by Edward Lens, as his

initials appear on one. They are quite similar to a final group of plates of castle- or fortress-type buildings (see App. F, fig. 2), which also appear to be by him, as one of these also bears his initials (Illus. 5). There is a view of Windsor in ink and wash attributed to Bernard Lens II by A.P.Oppé,⁶¹ which has a similar approach to the subject, but the drawing is not close to the outline landscapes in the 1750 manual. Dudley Snelgrove owns a drawing which is extremely close in style and subject to the initialled fortress plate and the group it is part of (Illus.8), and although Mr. Snelgrove's drawing is unsigned, it is probably by Edward Lens. This last group is the most indicative of his efforts to provide appropriate examples for his navigational pupils to copy.

It is unfortunate that Edward Lens's initials appear on only two of the plates. The style in all the plates is so uniformly simplified for the benefit of the pupils that individual hands are impossible to distinguish definitively. What does seem certain, however, is that the original drawings for the plates were by both Bernard Lens II and Edward Lens. Whether fifty-two or even any of them were originally published in 1700 cannot be resolved until a copy of the New Drawing-Book is discovered.

Although the text of the 1750 drawing book had been borrowed mainly from two authors, Lairesse and Salmon, it was not a slavish copy. If Edward Lens was the compiler, he chose from texts which best suited his purpose and pupils. Lairesse had already been translated into English, with additions from Du Fresnoy, but Lens had felt there were gaps that the text did not cover and carefully selected other

texts which did. When some areas were not adequately emphasized, or lucidly explained, or methods were not up to date, he corrected them with his own ideas. The text was organized so that it would be easy for the pupil to progress on his own or under the guidance of a teacher, step by step. As the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century continental drawing manuals indicate, students of drawing had always been taught to master the human body, its parts, proportions, and foreshortening, etc. before being allowed to progress to animals and other objects in nature and landscapes. Only after the pupil had mastered drawing was he taught how to mix and apply colours. Although students at Christ's Hospital were being trained to be apprenticed to craftsmen or to the navy, they would still be taught in this same traditional progression that had existed not only since the Renaissance, but even since classical times. Only when pupils had mastered drawing man were they allowed to proceed to their particular business - designs for the craftsmen to follow, or recording forts, castles, and making charts.

The plates in the 1750 New and Compleat Drawing-Book followed the same traditional process. What was new, however, was the attention paid to providing the specific type of drawing models required by the navigation students at Christ's Hospital - landscapes, harbours, and fortresses that had never before been included to such an extent in any earlier drawing manuals. Previously, the authors of drawing manuals merely selected a few existing landscape prints by Hollar, Berchem, etc. that were more decorative than useful. The Lenses invented, drew and engraved the type of simple, outline landscapes of forts, ruins, harbours, etc. that were most needed by their particular pupils. This was the first

time a drawing master had not only made his own landscape plates, but also let them outnumber and be emphasized over the figural models of the early lessons in the manual. The fact that there were many editions of this drawing book by several different publishers is indicative of the Lenses' success.

Unfortunately, none of the students' work at Christ's Hospital produced under the tutelage of either Lens can be found. Alexander Cozens succeeded Edward Lens as Drawing Master to Christ's Hospital on Edward's death in January, 1749. A John Lens, possibly Edward's son (b.1725, see App.B), had also applied for the post but Cozens's strong self-advertisement had easily secured the position⁶² and prevented the continuation of the Lens monopoly.

When Alexander Cozens applied for the position of Drawing Master to Christ's Hospital, four other artists had competed with him. £50 per year for three afternoons of teaching per week and the accompanying prestige were not scoffed at by the numerous artists trying to make a living by teaching and engraving, when portrait painters and foreign artists received a large proportion of the large commissions available and business was booming for dealers in old masters and fakes.

After Cozens's resignation in 1754, there were only two applicants, perhaps because one, Jacob Bonneau, a Frenchman, had a testimonial signed by thirty-five of London's finest artists and other artists did not dare to compete. Thomas Bisse, an unknown, was his only competitor for the position.⁶³ The Court Committee elected Bisse, by forty votes to fifteen, who discharged his duties to their

satisfaction until his death in 1766 when Benjamin Green (c.1736-c.1800) was given the position and the rent of Bisse's house in Townditch at £10 per annum.⁶⁴ Green published at least two drawing books, in 1780 and 1786, where he described himself as Drawing Master to Christ's Hospital. He retained the position until his death in 1798.

The concept of teaching drawing to mathematics students destined for a career in the navy had first been put into practice at the foundation of the Royal Mathematical School at Christ's Hospital in 1672. The obvious advantages were soon recognized by the enterprising men such as Major Ayres, who opened their own private schools on the model of the Royal Mathematical School, expanding them to include mercantile and military preparation as well. Their success led the government to found the schools and academies at Greenwich, Woolwich, and Portsmouth and drawing masters soon became part of the teaching staff at each.

Meanwhile, at Christ's Hospital, within two decades drawing was seen to be advantageous, not only to Royal Mathematical School pupils destined for seafaring, but a skill that would benefit children from the Writing School destined to be apprenticed to tradesmen and artisans. The mathematics master had been able to cope with teaching drawing to his boys but a separate drawing master had been required for the larger school. The advantages were again obvious to private entrepreneurs like Lens and Sturt and, after their example, a number of private and public academies were begun in the early eighteenth century, not only for future apprentices in trades, but for apprentice painters and sculptors, as well.

After an unsteady beginning, the position of drawing

master became established at Christ's Hospital, and other large schools, for poor children as well as rich, followed suit. By the middle of the century Eton, Oxford and probably St. Paul's and Westminster Schools, all had drawing masters available to give lessons to their pupils. The example set by Christ's Hospital helped to establish a new occupation for artists, one which brought in a comfortable income and a respected position in the community. But the long-range effects were far more important than this - drawing had finally been introduced as a subject to be taught in public and private schools. Although the benefits to children were seen at first as merely practical for their future occupations, art has since become an established part of the early school curriculum at least, and is seen as beneficial to the imaginative, creative and cultural development of children as well as a practical aid in all the other subjects they are taught.

The history of the introduction of the teaching of drawing to Christ's Hospital has thus proved to be extremely important, not only by indicating why and how it was taught, but because it was the beginning of a trend that had far-reaching consequences. The introduction of drawing to these other schools did not occur immediately, however; it was a half a century, if not more, before drawing lessons were widely available at schools or privately. Its introduction to these other types of students, during those fifty years, needs to be studied and traced as carefully as the history of its introduction to Christ's Hospital has been.

NOTES. CHAPTER 2:

TEACHING DRAWING AT CHRIST'S HOSPITAL

1. Magdalene College, Cambridge, Pepys MS 2612, p. 111, quoted in Nicholas Plumley, 'The Royal Mathematical School within Christ's Hospital', p. 52.
2. Plumley, pp. 51-2.
3. Two drawings from this log book are reproduced in Richard Carline, Draw They Must, pp. 23, 36. The first of these is just a calligraphic flourish, as Mr. Carline explains in p. 31, n. 1, but the other, of a ship, is the result of Terry's drawing lessons. Carline devoted an entire chapter (four, pp. 35-47) to the history of the teaching of drawing at Christ's Hospital, but both he and Ian Fleming-Williams, in Appendix I: 'Drawing Masters' in Martin Hardie's Watercolour Painting in Britain, vol. III, pp. 213-4 mistakenly state that drawing only began to be taught at Christ's Hospital in 1692. Ian Fleming-Williams expanded his history of the teaching of drawing at Christ's Hospital in a typescript essay which has never been published, 'Some Early Drawing Masters', which he very kindly allowed me to read.
4. E.H. Pearce, Annals of Christ's Hospital, p. 158.
5. London Guildhall Library, Archives, Christ's Hospital, Committee Minutes, (hereafter CH), MS 12,811, vol. 6 (1692), p.363.
6. Doctor John Wallis (1616-1703) was Professor of Geometry at Oxford and Doctor David Gregory (1661-1708) was Professor of Astronomy (DNB).
7. CH. MS 12,811, vol.6 (1694), p.495.
8. *ibid.*, (1695), p. 600.
9. *ibid.*, (1694), p. 501.
10. *ibid.*, (1696), p. 695. In his Dictionary, Dr. Johnson defined a mole as: 'from Moles, Latin, mole, French. A mound; a dyke. eg. in Addison on Italy and in Pope'.
11. *ibid.*, (1692), p. 331.
12. *ibid.*, (1692), p. 367. Fleming-Williams, 'Drawing Masters', p. 214, puts Faithorne's appointment at the following February, 1693, and Carline, pp. 35-7, is ambiguous about the actual date of Faithorne's appointment. It is interesting to note that the minutes of the Schools Committee meeting on the 24th of November state that there were not enough governors present to decide on the 'weighty matter of whether to introduce the art of drawing and plainsaying' (p.360). Plainsaying is not mentioned again in the discussions about drawing lessons to the Writing School.

13. Fleming-Williams, 'Drawing Masters', pp. 213-4, and Carline, pp. 36-7, quote portions of the letters of Wren and Peyps, but I shall quote from additional portions of their letters which place a slightly different interpretation on their meanings.
14. CH MS 12,811, vol. 6 (1692), pp. 362-3.
15. *ibid.*, (1692), pp. 363-4.
16. *ibid.*, (1692), pp. 366-7.
17. *ibid.*, (1693), pp. 375.
18. Carline, p. 38.
19. CH MS 12,811, vol. 6 (1693), pp. 375-8.
20. For William Faithorne the elder, see Richard Godfrey, Printmaking in Britain, pp. 26-7.
21. Reproduced in Carline, plate 3b. In his will, Faithorne the Elder described Smith as a 'loving friend': see Fleming-Williams, 'Some Early Drawing Masters', pp. 6-7.
22. CH MS 12,811, vol. 6 (1695), p. 565.
23. *ibid.*, (1696), pp. 670, 675.
24. *ibid.*, (1696), p. 699. The Committee therefore dismissed Faithorne after this meeting on June 25th, not in March as stated by Fleming-Williams, 'Drawing Masters', p. 214.
25. Carline, p. 39.
26. CH MS 12,811, vol. 7 (1703), pp. 260, 282. 'Mr. Harris' was probably John Harris (1667?-1719) a divine (from 1706) and author who lectured on mathematics in Birchin Lane, London (DNB).
27. Ambrose Heal, English Writing Masters, pp. xvii, 7-8.
28. W. Carew Hazlitt, Schools, School-Books and School Masters, p. 157. For other academies of this type, see Appendix B.
29. Heal, p. 7.
30. Daphne Foskett, Dictionary of Miniature Painters, vol. I, p. 379.
31. CH MS 12,811, vol. 7 (1705), pp. 369, 395.
32. *ibid.*, (1705), p. 397.
33. Fleming-Williams, 'Drawing Masters', p. 214.
34. George Vertue, Notebooks vol. V, p. 62. The dates mentioned are confirmed by the existing parish records (see

App. C).

35. *ibid.*, III, p. 100. For Bernard Lens III's activities as a private drawing master to Walpole, Edward Harley, and the Prince and Princesses, see Appendix C and Illustrations 104-6.

36. This frontispiece is reproduced by Carline, pl.1b. The authors who attributed the book to Bernard Lens III are: Basil Long, British Miniatures, p. 267; Graham Reynolds, English Portrait Miniatures, p. 107; Carline, pp. 40-2; Huon Mallalieu, Dictionary of British Watercolour Artists, p. 160; and Joan Friedman, 'Every Lady Her Own Drawing Master', p. 264.

37. Fleming-Williams, 'Drawing Masters', pp. 214-5.

38. See J. Chaloner-Smith, British Mezzotint Portraits. He, too, is confused as to which portraits are by Bernard II and III. For his small subject pieces, see Godfrey, p. 29 and Marcia Pointon, Milton and English Art, pp. 1-13, 23, 74 and M. Huber, Manuel des Curieux, p. 91.

39. See John Stow, Survey of London (1754), pp. 193-5 and Appendix A.

40. Heal, p. 106.

41. Vertue, Notebooks vol. IV, p. 62.

42. Stow, pp. 194-5.

43. H.V.S. and M.S. Ogden, 'A Bibliography of Seventeenth-Century Writings on the Pictorial Arts in England', p. 199.

44. Levy, p. 180.

45. CH MS 12,811, vol. 7 (1705), pp. 402, 404.

46. *ibid.*, (1706), p. 440.

47. *ibid.*, (1706), p. 477, and (1708), p. 570. A new Mathematical School had been founded at the Hospital in 1706 to provide some of the pupils of the Writing School with the advantages that would be gained there if they were not to go to the Royal Mathematical School. The Committee of Almoners ruled, in December of that year (p. 477), that only the boys from the Writing School that also attended the New Mathematical School would be taught drawing.

48. CH MS 12,811, vol. 9 (1726), p. 276.

49. Foskett, p. 379, and Fleming-Williams, 'Drawing Masters', p. 214.

50. See Appendix C for the dates and activities of the other members of the family.

51. CH MS 12,806, vol. 11 (1749), p. 12.

52. Fleming-Williams, 'Drawing Masters', p. 215.

53. See H.V.S. and M.S. Ogden, 'A Bibliography of Seventeenth-Century Writings...', pp. 196-201 and English Taste in Landscape in the Seventeenth Century by the same authors.

54. Copies of the first edition are rare and I know of only three: in the Library at Christ's Hospital, Horsham, in the Beinecke Rare Book Library, Yale, and in the City of New York Public Library.

55. Johannes Dobai, Die Kunstliteratur des Klassizismus und der Romantik in England, vol. II, p. 786.

56. Friedman, p. 263.

57. *ibid.*, p. 264.

58. The only copy of this book that I know of is in my collection. The words '3rd edition' are not to be trusted, as this was often a publisher's way of encouraging sales.

59. Fialetti's work is discussed, and many plates from it are reproduced in David Rosand, 'The Crisis of the Venetian Renaissance Tradition', L'arte, vol. 11-12 (1970), pp. 4-53.

60. These sheets of studies are reproduced in Elizabeth Trapier, Ribera, pp. 20-1, figs. 11-13.

61. A.P. Oppé, English Drawings at Windsor Castle, cat. no. 418, pl. 74. Dudley Snelgrove owns a similar drawing of a fortified harbour by the Duchess of Portland a pupil of a 'Mr. Lens'. (see App.C).

62. Fleming-Williams, 'Drawing Masters', p. 215.

63. CH MS 12,806, vol. 11 (1754), pp. 211-2.

64. *ibid.*, (1766), p. 470.

CHAPTER 3:
TEACHING DRAWING IN PRIVATE ACADEMIES

In 1705, the year in which Bernard Lens II was hired to teach drawing to navigational students at Christ's Hospital, the General Court of Greenwich Hospital resolved that provisions be made 'for putting out to sea or otherwise maintaining and Educating the Orphans or Children of poor disabled Sailors'.¹ Christopher Wren, whose advice had been instrumental in establishing the teaching of drawing at Christ's Hospital, was the Chairman of Directors at Greenwich when the above resolution was made. John Evelyn, a good friend of Samuel Pepys, the other advocate of drawing² at Christ's Hospital, was also present at the meeting. Nicholas Hawksmoor, at the time Deputy-Surveyor at Greenwich Hospital, often attended Court Committee meetings, although he was not present on this particular occasion. From this distinguished list, one would expect at least the assurance that drawing would be included on a curriculum proposed by them for navigational students at Greenwich Hospital. Unfortunately, however, funds were not forthcoming and the establishment of a school for 'orphans of the sea' was delayed ten years.

Evelyn was dead and Wren and Hawksmoor were no longer connected with Greenwich Hospital in 1715 when provisions were finally made for instructing ten boys³ in reading, writing, accounts, navigation and mathematics. The subject of drawing did not appear in the Hospital minutes until 1777, when the boys' master, Thomas Furber, wrote to the Directors stating that he had been teaching a few boys to

draw in their spare time and requesting that they be given prizes for their efforts.⁴

Although it is impossible to demonstrate conclusively, there is a strong possibility that the Greenwich Hospital boys were taught drawing for at least twenty years, from 1715 onwards and possibly longer. The Hospital boys' education was entrusted to the Masters of Greenwich Academy, a private academy near Greenwich Hospital, from the time provisions were made for them in November, 1715 until 1763. For the first twenty years, they were taught in the Greenwich Academy building itself where drawing was included in the curriculum for the regular pupils and that is why the possibility exists that the Hospital boys were taught drawing. The other reasons for believing drawing was taught to the Hospital boys will become evident later in this chapter. We have already examined the methods and type of drawing taught to charity boys intended for apprenticeship at sea in the chapter on Christ's Hospital. Therefore, in the present chapter it will only occasionally be necessary to refer to the Greenwich Hospital boys, who were also intended for the navy. Our main concern in this chapter will be with the education of young gentlemen at Greenwich Academy, the private academy run by Thomas Weston.

The Greenwich Academy for Young Gentlemen was founded sometime between 1706, the year Weston finished his apprenticeship with the Reverend John Flamsteed, the Astronomer Royal, and October, 1715. On the latter date, William Peachy of Petworth sold seven acres of land to the trustees of the Royal Hospital at Greenwich and the deed, in describing the various buildings and tenants on the land, specified: 'all that large Tenement with Stables, Outhouses,

Coach Houses, Yards, Court Yards, Orchards, Gardens and appurtenances whatsoever therewith used and enjoyed now or late in the tenure or occupation of Thomas Weston Gentleman⁵. This property was not only the largest on the seven acres, but it enjoyed a choice site, bounded by the Park Wall and Gate on the south and King Street on the west (see App.G, pl.4). The main building was a large, rambling Tudor mansion known as Copped Hall in the sixteenth century and Heyton Hall in the seventeenth, and with various important historical connections.⁶ It was an impressive situation for a private academy and indeed it was attended by 'the sons of the best families in Kent'.⁷

Drawing was an established subject on the curriculum at the Academy in 1726 when Weston published a large copy-book of Writing, Drawing and Ancient Arithmetick, composed for the use of, and dedicated to, 'the Young Gentlemen of the Academy in Greenwich'.⁸ Before studying this book in order to surmise how drawing was taught to young gentlemen in a private academy, it is important to understand why it was included on the curriculum at all, and whether this was an exception or the norm among private academies for young gentlemen in the eighteenth century.

Although Thomas Weston was well-known in the early eighteenth century in Greenwich as a mathematician and astronomer (see App.G, pl.3),⁹ it is perhaps significant that the first record of him there is as a draughtsman. John Flamsteed, the first Astronomer Royal, had taken pupils to supplement his income at the Royal Observatory since 1676. The pupils were sons of the gentry and nobility who later entered the navy, East India Company, or Ordnance

Office and some of whom stayed on as apprentices to Flamsteed, assisting him with observations, calculations, charts, etc. for his Atlas Coelestis. A list Flamsteed kept of the names, dates, and eventual occupations of his pupils, puts the date of Thomas Weston's arrival as February 2, 1698/9 and the date he left as May 12, 1706.¹⁰

In 1710, however, when Flamsteed was composing his manuscript 'A Short Note of Dates for my Works', he wrote that in 1696¹¹

I wanted some person that had a faculty of drawing, to design the figures of the constellations...The same Good Providence that furnished me with 2 or 3 calculators, sent me an ingenious but sickly youth (Mr. Weston) into my service, who was addicted to this practice: and by my directions drew the charts of the constellations so well, that a good designer said he needed no directions but his draughts to perfect them.

It is probable that 1698/9 is the correct date of Weston's arrival, as an apprenticeship was normally seven years, not ten. The later date is also indicated by a letter from Flamsteed to Doctor Wallis¹² in 1701 which mentions Weston as his 'youngest servant' who 'has been educated with learning, has a good talent at drawing, and I design to set him to draw the maps of the constellation this summer, and perhaps to engraving the plates for them; for those that draw well seldom fail of engraving as well'.¹³

That Thomas Weston was already well-educated and talented at drawing when he began his apprenticeship with Flamsteed, indicates that he had probably come from a well-to-do family and this is attested to by his appellation of 'Gentleman' on the Greenwich Hospital deed of 1715. These facts alone would have qualified him to be the master of a private academy at the beginning of the century, but during his years at the Observatory, Weston probably also assisted

with the teaching of Flamsteed's pupils. On at least one occasion, he accompanied the Astronomer Royal to Christ's Hospital to examine the boys of the Royal Mathematical School and, in 1719, he succeeded Flamsteed as the Examiner of the Mathematical School and remained in this position until his death.¹⁴ Another of Flamsteed's apprentices, James Hodgson, was a teacher of mathematics in London from the end of 1702, and Weston was often used as a messenger between the two. Hodgson taught at the Royal Mathematical School from 1709 and eventually became the Master there until his death in 1754.¹⁵ Weston knew his work quite well because in 1717 'Hogson's Navigation' was on the list of texts requested by Weston for the boys of Greenwich Hospital under his care.¹⁶

The valuable experience Thomas Weston gained during his apprenticeship with Flamsteed was not limited to assisting the preparation of young gentlemen for employment as clerks or in the navy. He also assisted with the preparation for publication of the Atlas Coelestis.

In 1704, he prepared charts for Paul Vansomer to draw anew some of the maps of the constellations which Weston had finished two years beforehand.¹⁷ The figures had to be redrawn because their positions were discovered to be wrong when further observations had been made. Weston had become ill with consumption in 1704 and his recovery was very slow, which was why Vansomer had been called in. The artist, however, was elderly and died after completing only a dozen figures, so the work fell again on Weston who was also responsible for the transcription of the observations and calculations for the press, as well as attending the presses¹⁸ to check and assist the work as it went on.

Weston's ability to draw made him invaluable to Flamsteed during his apprenticeship. It probably also assisted him in his studies of astronomy and mathematics under Flamsteed and, having been exposed to both young gentlemen and orphans intended for service at sea, he no doubt also was aware of the value of the ability to draw in the study of navigation. These factors, as well as the simple fact that he had been taught to draw in his own early education, would apparently explain why Thomas Weston would include it in the course of study for young gentlemen when he founded his own private academy.

As we have seen in the introductory chapter of this thesis, the teaching of drawing in schools of any kind was not wide-spread in the late seventeenth century. By the middle of the century, however, drawing was frequently found on the curricula of private academies and beginning to appear in public and grammar schools, and it is significant that the number of amateur draughtsmen proportionally increased. It is necessary then to attempt to account for the sudden respectability of drawing as a subject after its laying dormant for so long. By tracing the teaching of the subject at Greenwich Academy, we will attempt to explain how it was taught as the century progressed, but first it is necessary to understand why.

From the brief survey in the introductory chapter and a study of the types of academies listed in Appendix B, it seems that up to 1710, whenever drawing was taught in private academies like Ayres's and Maidwell's, that prepared young men for careers, it tended to be of technical nature for the purposes of recording data. However, in the other

type of private academies, like Gerbier's and Kynaston's, which prepared sons of nobility and gentry for the Grand Tour and life on estates, drawing would presumably have been less technical, though still utilitarian in that it was to enable young men to record sights or draw plans of buildings or gardens. On the whole, however, at the time of Weston's Academy, drawing was still a very rare subject to be found on the curriculum of any school.

Some reasons have been stated above as to why Weston, personally, would include drawing in his list of studies for young gentlemen. However, its inclusion in his academy in 1715 still would have been unusual if there had not been some previous recommendations by philosophers of education in order for the parents to recognize the value of drawing and approve of its inclusion on the curriculum of their child's prospective school.

Was there an increase at this time, c.1715-20, in the number of writers on education who suggested that drawing should be taught to young gentlemen? In his Some Thoughts Concerning Education, of 1693, John Locke gave voice to a growing feeling of discontent with the Grammar School system: the poor quality of some of the masters, the resultant laxity in morals and discipline, and the 'tyranny' of Latin and Greek.¹⁹ Private academies, with their more liberal subjects and smaller enrolments, provided a modern alternative to the public and grammar school curricula based on mediaeval precepts, and a cheaper method than the private tuition recommended by Locke. The number of private academies of all types, dissenting, 'finishing', and commercial or technical, understandably increased through the century. Undoubtedly, some of them must have modelled

their curriculum on the subjects suggested by Locke, whose Thoughts Concerning Education was an extremely well-known publication which provoked great public debate and went through twelve editions before the middle of the eighteenth century. Although Locke disapproved of a gentleman taking up accomplishments which were not actually useful, in particular painting because it was too sedentary an occupation and required too much time for one to become proficient, he did, however, recommend drawing as

20

very useful to a gentleman on several occasions, but especially if he travel...How many Buildings may a Man see, how many Machines and Habits meet with, the Ideas where of would be easily retain'd and communicated, by a little skill in Drawing; which being committed to words, are in danger to be lost, or at best but ill retained in the most exact Descriptions?...But so much insight into perspective and skill in drawing as will enable him to represent tolerably on paper anything he sees, except faces, may I think be got in a little time, especially if he have a genius to it.

Since Locke's theory of education aimed at producing virtuous men of use to themselves and society, not only drawing, but also gardening, general husbandry, carpentry or one of the decorative arts as hobbies, as well as some knowledge of merchants accounts, were all subjects in which Locke felt a gentleman should have some training. These subjects can, indeed, be found on the curricula of various private academies later in the century. However, at the time being considered here, c.1715, Locke's ideas on education were by no means universally accepted and only a very modern-thinking educator would include them on the list of subjects he proposed to teach at an academy where he hoped to attract the children of the upper classes. Apart from Locke and his few early followers, usefulness in education was still a concept very much confined to the

merchant classes.

However, two other writers of the 1710's can also be credited to some extent with the growth in the first half of the eighteenth century, in popularity and numbers, of private academies where modern subjects, including drawing, could be taught. They, like Locke, can also be given a great deal of credit for the increase during this period in the number of amateur draughtsmen and the growth of interest in art appreciation.

The education of Anthony Ashley Cooper, the third Earl of Shaftesbury (1671-1713), was supervised by John Locke. He was tutored privately in the classics until he was eleven, then sent to Winchester to be 'toughened', after which he spent three years in foreign travel mastering French and developing a love of the arts which solaced him until his death.²¹ In his Miscellaneous Reflections, first published in 1714, he defined 'Virtuosi' and 'Men of Taste'²² as those

Lovers of Art and Ingenuity...who had seen the world and informed themselves of the Manners and Customs of the several Nations of Europe, search'd into their Antiquitys and Records;...observ'd the Situation, Strength, and Ornaments of their Citys, their principle Arts, Studys and Amusements; their Architecture, Sculpture, Painting and Musick, and their Taste in Poetry, Learning, Language and Conversation.

These 'Men of Taste' always carried in their minds a model of what was beautiful and becoming according to truth and nature and they were thus well able to lay their garden, model their houses, fancy their equippage and appoint their table.²³

Thomas Weston may well have had the education of such gentlemen in mind when he established his academy in Greenwich, and he may also have hoped he was answering

Shaftesbury's plea for more 'Academys of Exercises' where the 'sprightly' arts and sciences were not severed from philosophy and the classics which were growing more and more pedantic and useless to the 'real Knowledge and Practice of the World and Mankind'.²⁴ Shaftesbury expressed a decided opinion in the debate on public versus private and modern versus classical education and from then on many writers added their voices in the form of articles, treatises, and even novels which discussed the subject, such as Swift's Gulliver's Travels, Goldsmith's Vicar of Wakefield, Richardson's Pamela, and Fielding's Joseph Andrews. By the middle of the century, such public dissatisfaction had resulted in many more parents than just those that were business-minded seeing the useful advantages of private academies and/or the learning of modern subjects and accomplishments, and they enrolled their children in Weston's and other private academies or ensured that they had some lessons in drawing, dancing, music, etc. Weston appears to have been one of the earliest educators in Britain to be aware of the stirrings of these new trends in educational thought which, in 1715 when he opened his academy, were only beginning to be brought to public attention.

Although not as influential on contemporary opinion as Shaftesbury and especially Locke, in his essay The Science of a Connoisseur (1719), Jonathan Richardson argued not for an entire scheme of education but rather pleaded that one subject in particular be introduced into the education of gentlemen - the appreciation of painting.²⁵

...if to learn to draw and to understand pictures and drawings, were made a part of the education of a gentleman, as their example would excite others to do

the like, it cannot be denied but that this would be a farther improvement even of this part of our people; the whole nation would by this means be removed some degrees higher into the rational state, and make a more considerable figure amongst the polite nations of the world.

He realized that, at the time he wrote, connoisseurship was an accomplishment not yet recognized as absolutely essential to a gentleman, although those who did possess it were always respected and esteemed. He predicted, however, that the time would come when it would be dishonourable and a sort of 'illiterature and unpoliteness' if one was not a connoisseur.²⁶

If indeed Weston did read Locke and establish his school along his liberal guideline, he would have been among a rather limited but growing number of men who saw a lucrative occupation in the opening of a private academy that satisfied an obvious need. But if Weston also had read Shaftesbury, whose Characteristics were only first published in 1711, then he was almost unique in the 1710's in establishing an academy which also took into account his recommendations in the education of young gentlemen to become 'Men of Taste' and 'Virtuosi'. The concept of 'Taste' did not really become popular until the late 1720's and Richardson was correct in predicting that to be a 'connoisseur' would become an essential accomplishment for a young gentleman, but this too did not occur until twenty years later.²⁷ It is apparent that Weston did read Locke, although whether he had also read Shaftesbury and Richardson is impossible to prove. Nevertheless, there is little doubt that the type of education he provided at the Greenwich Academy was as much in advance of the actual situation at the time, as were Richardson's and Shaftesbury's

recommendations.

Evidence that, apart from the fact that drawing was included among the subjects taught, Weston's Academy was in advance of others of his time is found in one aspect in Thomas Weston himself. It was rare in the eighteenth century for the master of an academy to be well known in his own right but that Thomas Weston was such a person is indicated by the presence of his portrait next to John Flamsteed in the painting by James Thornhill in the Great Hall at Greenwich Hospital. In his explanation of the painting, Thornhill described Weston as the Astronomer Royal's 'ingenious Disciple' and depicted him assisting with²⁸ observations of the Great Eclipse of April 22, 1715. Weston is also said to have succeeded Reverend Flamsteed in 1719 as Professor of Mathematics to Trinity House,²⁹ a position of no small importance. In 1716, Weston applied for a licence to teach from the Archbishop of Canterbury, perhaps believing it would add to the reputation of the academy, since very few schoolmasters bothered to obtain a³⁰ licence at this time.

Newspaper advertisements for the Academy indicate that he taught the usual subjects for young gentlemen, such as Latin and Greek, mathematics, English, and French, as well as the less usual, though suggested by Locke, subjects of merchants' accounts, dancing and drawing. In 1721, he erected a theatre 'for the use and diversion of young gentlemen under his tuition', who performed Tamberlaine³¹ before the Lords of the Admiralty 'with great applause'. All these factors indicate that the Academy, the Master and the subjects taught were all calculated to produce young gentlemen who were that much more 'accomplished' and

prepared for their future lives than those attending the normal grammar schools, universities and private academies of the day.

As the value of Locke's, Shaftesbury's, and possibly Richardson's advice grew more and more apparent through the first half of the eighteenth century, the number of academies where drawing was taught increased, as has already been stated.

At the beginning of the eighteenth century Greenwich was not only a port where a large number of the residents were seamen and naval officers, but it had also been, until 1694, a Royal residence, and was therefore the seat of many wealthy noblemen and gentlemen.³² If his academy was to prosper, Thomas Weston needed to attract the sons of both types of residents, by providing an education for both future naval officers and future grand tourists and gentlemen. That he succeeded in this, is suggested by the fact that his academy was attended by such famous Greenwich naval families as the Masons and Bretts and by Jack Jervis, later Admiral Lord St. Vincent, and James Wolfe, whose father moved to Greenwich partly so that his sons could attend the Academy there.³³ It gained such a reputation for this that it has been said that by Nelson's day 'half the flag-officers in the fleet had received their instruction at the Greenwich Academy started by Weston'.³⁴ Among the members of the gentry and nobility who attended were: Sir Ralph Payne (later Baron Lavington), William Wheatley, John Weller Adye, James Fisher, Thomas Fitzgerald and Charles Long.³⁵

One would presume that the type of drawing taught to

the two different types of young gentlemen would take into account their eventual occupations - a more technical approach with the emphasis on perspective, proportion, and topography for the naval students and a more classical one with the emphasis on figures, old masters and landscapes for those learning drawing as an accomplishment. This presumption is borne out to some extent by Weston's large copy-book of Writing, Drawing and Ancient Arithmetick (1726).

The book is prefixed by a portrait of Weston, painted by Michael Dahl and mezzotinted by John Faber in 1723 (App.G, pl.3). The objects on the table in front of him show him to be a man well-versed in astronomy and maths.³⁶ There is no title-page for the entire book, but instead only the dedication and a title-page for each of the three copy-books, with 'G. Bickham Sculp.' at the bottom of each. The writing copy-book contains beautiful examples in most of the different hands or styles, some of them signed with 'Thomas Weston scripsit' and the date. The drawing book, however, contains no signatures or initials at all except for 'G. Bickham sculp' on the title and last page.

The title-page of the Drawing Book is beautifully drawn and engraved (Illus.9). Four putti with the attributes of the four arts, painting, writing, sculpture, and arithmetic, surround a large shell-cartouche on which the title is written. The style of this title-page bears a resemblance to that in a book by George Bickham, The Drawing and Writing Tutor (Illus.18), which will be discussed later.

Like most authors of drawing books around this time, the first sections of Weston's book, dealing with drawing figures, draws heavily on plates in seventeenth-century

Italian and Netherlandish drawing books. Lens had borrowed from one by Ribera and Weston borrows copiously from it as well. Plates 2 (facial proportion), 3 and 4 (mouths, noses, and eyes), and 12 (hands), contain copies of features by Ribera, though not the same ones as those borrowed by Lens. The latter copied all of Ribera's drawings of eyes and ears, while Weston made a selection from other artists as well, notably Abraham Bloemaert and F.L.D. Ciartres. The latter's style of engraving is very sketchy, mostly unshaded outlines, and a number of Weston's plates have features identical to some found in Ciartres' book of 1644,³⁷ while others are only close in style.

The most beautiful faces and hands, however, are those copied from Bloemaert's Receuil de Principes pour Désigner (1655) (Illus.10), which had 173 plates in different sections. The copies are well done, though selections have been made and the objects re-arranged. Compare, for example, the two plates of arms by Weston and Bloemaert (Illus.11 and 12).

As might be expected, this first part of Weston's book contains drawings to show the shape and proportions of heads, then drawings of parts of the head, followed by drawings of men's and women's heads, contemporary and classical (Illus.13 and 14), plates of hands, arms, feet and legs, nude figures, putti and then classical statues. This is the usual formula in drawing copy-books but Weston's differs from the usual ones in that he devotes one page only to the shape and proportions of heads and only two pages to eyes, ears and mouths. Other authors of drawing books give these fundamental first lessons five to ten or even more

plates, while Weston's concentration is on heads and figures borrowed from old masters and the antique, and this would appear to be more in line with the type of drawing and connoisseurship advocated by Shaftesbury and Richardson.

In learning to draw in the eighteenth century, pupils were expected to master the depiction of the human body before being allowed to progress to other subjects. This process was the same as it had been in the Renaissance and Weston did not forego it altogether. He did, however, change its emphasis for the requirements of his pupils. If they perfected the three pages of examples of facial features he supplied, it would be sufficient for their needs³⁸ and they could concentrate on studies from old masters and the antique which would not only exercise their hands in the best possible way by copying works by the best masters, but also, at the same time, help to develop their taste and their abilities to recognize and appreciate good works of art. The same purpose would be served by Weston's inclusion at the end of Part I of four plates that were copies of three Dutch genre paintings and one of a religious subject. No other English author of a drawing book before this date included plates after paintings but most of the seventeenth-century European artists like Bloemaert, Ribera and Lairesse did.

The format of this first half of his drawing copy-book illustrates Weston's own knowledge and careful consideration of the best way to prepare his two types of students. Copying was the traditional, and indeed, at this date, still the only known way of teaching pupils to draw, no matter what type of artist they were to become. Richardson had supported this when he wrote that many great artists learnt

by copying the works of others and that 'a copy of a very
good picture is preferable to an indifferent original'.³⁹
Men of taste agreed that the antique was the highest
expression of beauty and next to it was the work of the
Roman, Florentine, Venetian, and Lombard schools.⁴⁰ To
learn to draw correctly then, all pupils should first learn
by copying, in the prescribed progression, the works after
the best masters.

A few seventeenth-century drawing books contained
landscapes, notably Lairese's and Bloemaert's, but they
tended to be few in number and of Dutch or decorative
subjects. Therefore, Weston was not only assisting those of
his students being prepared for their Grand Tours by making
the entire second part of his book landscapes largely of
ruins, towns and harbours, but he was also taking a step
towards a movement which was to become one of the most
significant developments in the eighteenth century - an
English school of landscape painting. Elizabeth Manwaring,
in her book Italian Landscapes in Eighteenth-Century
England, chronicles the development of English taste for
such Italian artists as Claude, Poussin, and Salvator Rosa
and mentions that Shaftesbury, lamenting in Rome the expense
of the great history paintings, recommended landscapes as
the next degree of painting, thus pointing to the beginnings
of a fast-growing taste.⁴¹

The majority of the landscapes in Part II of Weston's
book are much like the type of etchings produced by François
Vivares and J.B. Chatelain, peopled by peasants and
labourers and dotted with ruins and classical buildings.
This type of etching made up the largest portion of later

drawing manuals. Some are also reminiscent of such northern artists as Wenceslaus Hollar and Francis Place (Illus.15), whose works were the seventeenth-century predecessors of Vivares and Chatelain. The first two plates show concern for the beginner in that they are very simple landscapes done in outline first with a shaded version opposite, while others are engravings of works by Claude, Poussin, or Rosa to develop the taste of the future grand tourists and connoisseurs (Illus.16). All of these appear to be useful to the young gentlemen learning drawing as an accomplishment and to improve their 'taste', but the naval students were not neglected in this section and many of the plates were obviously selected with their needs also in mind. The title and end pages of Part II are very detailed engravings of courtyards with complicated architecture requiring a good command of perspective. The end page is divided vertically down the centre so that one half is outline only and the other shaded (App.F, fig.3). Several of the plates are topographical, many have detailed architecture and fortifications, and one depicts a harbour, castle, and ships (Illus.17).

Although the advertisement for Weston's Academy stated that it employed thirteen masters, we know from his copy-book that Weston himself was accomplished at maths, calligraphy and drawing, and he may have taught some of the students these subjects as well as giving the more advanced scientific and philosophical lectures he advertised that he taught himself. When Thomas Weston died in 1728 his brother John succeeded him as the Examiner of the Royal Mathematical School at Christ's Hospital and he petitioned the Governors of Greenwich Hospital to be employed as mathematics master

to their charity boys, as his brother had been. John Weston also took over the Academy so it is very likely that he had helped his brother in the Academy as an assistant master.

Hasted's History of Kent refers to the 'school of John Weston, Assistant Astronomer Royal',⁴³ but there is no record of John ever being at the Observatory so he has obviously been confused with Thomas. The title, too, is an error common in early histories and can safely be ignored.⁴⁴

Whether John had the capabilities or qualifications to take over the Academy and teach the same subjects as his brother cannot be known for certain. He employed a writing master, but it is impossible to surmise whether he taught the boys drawing as his brother probably had done. Samuel Vaux acted as Writing Master to the Academy in Greenwich and afterwards left to set up his own school, also in Greenwich, where he taught merchant's accounts and qualified boys for clerical work as well as instructing them in 'Latin, Greek, French and various branches of mathematics, by himself and the proper masters'.⁴⁵ There must have been a good demand for private education in Greenwich to allow for the existence of two academies, although Vaux seems to have left the education of gentlemen and future seamen to Weston.

Thomas Weston's copy-book, however, probably would continue to be used for boys in the Academy. The flyleaf of the Victoria and Albert copy bears the name of Thomas Howe and the date 173[9?] and there must have been some need for the book for it to run to a second edition in 1752.

It is very difficult to learn anything more of the teaching methods at the Academy apart from what can be

assumed from Thomas Weston's copy-book. Biographies of more famous pupils like James Wolfe and Lord St. Vincent give few details about their early school life, but in one instance, that of Sir William Norwich, the family accounts have been preserved and they not only provide a good indication of what was considered the 'proper' education for a young nobleman, but also a little insight into some of the subjects he was taught.

Sir William Norwich, fourth Bart., was sent to Weston's Academy from April to September, 1729 to learn 'the co-⁴⁶ordination of mental and physical activities'. He had already attended Eton and Harrow and after Weston's Academy went to Sir Charles Smith's in Islington for a half a year to learn fencing and dancing. The entire expense for his education from age thirteen to twenty, was over £702. Weston charged £80 per year for fees and boarding, but as Sir William was only there for one quarter, he only paid £10, plus £5 'upon entry'.

During his attendance at the Academy in Greenwich, Sir William made several trips to the Tower of London. The expense of these trips was not included in Weston's fees but, as the Ordnance Office was at the Tower and Thomas Weston was acquainted with the Surveyor-General of His Majesty's Ordnance,⁴⁷ it is tempting to assume that Academy pupils were sent there for extra training in chart-making and map-reading. Topographical drawing was also part of the business of the Ordnance Office, which would prove useful to both naval students as well as future grand tourists.

Unfortunately, however, this extra tuition was wasted on Sir William, an orphan, who, as he grew older, became more and more spoilt, spending beyond his allowance,

borrowing money or pawning his possessions, and becoming ill from over-indulgence. When he reached the age of majority, he did not follow any career, but instead wasted his fortune, ruined his family and his health, and died unmarried at the age of thirty-one.

Another pupil at Weston's Academy, Anthony Wilson (1747-1771), is known to us through two etchings in the Richard Bull collection of amateur etchings in the British Museum Print Room. ⁴⁸ A manuscript note above these two etchings reads:

Anthony Wilson Esq. Student at Christ Church Oxford, elected thither from Weston's School, etched 5 or 6 small Landscapes, all from nature, except one after a Drawing of the Present Earl of Aylesford's. He died young in consequence of a fever caused by sitting to draw when overheated by walking. He had a very elegant turn for the art and promised much.

Eight small landscape etchings by Wilson in an album of 'Prints by Notable Dilettante' at the Yale Center for British Art (B.1977.14.20064-70) indicate that he undoubtedly came under the influence of John Baptiste Malchair and his pupils. It was probably there rather than at Weston's that Wilson learnt to sketch out of doors. However, the fact that Wilson was in some debt to Weston is indicated by the similarity of his trees and approach to landscape in his early etchings in the Bull album to the first lessons in drawing landscape in Weston's copy-book.

Wilson's later etchings in the British Art Center indicate that, in spite of sketching out of doors, he does not appear to have developed his own style - his etchings merely acquired more detail and finish. They owed less to what he saw in nature than to drawings he had learnt to copy in the Academy in Greenwich and paintings he had seen in

various collection or prints. Wilson's landscapes of 1770 show him to be a typical result of the type of teaching methods used for amateurs in the first half of the eighteenth century. They were still taught along the lines of standard academic theory: that is, they were not taught to draw nature as they saw it but rather to copy other artists' work and, when drawing from nature, to keep in mind and transform nature into an 'ideal' beauty and attempt to attain that.

Shaftesbury had advised this goal in his Characteristicks and Richardson's comments explained how to achieve it.

49

Common nature is no more fit for a picture than plain narration is for a poem. A Painter must raise his ideas beyond what he sees, and form a model of perfection in his own mind which is not to be found in reality; but yet such a one as is probable and rational...What gives the Italians, and their masters, the ancients, the preference, is, that they have not servilely followed common Nature, but raised and improved, or at least have always made the best choice of it. This gives dignity to a low subject, and is the reason of the esteem we have for the landscapes of Salvator Rosa, Philippo Laura, Claude Lorrain, the Poussins.

When one takes into account the fact that the Earl of Aylesford did not begin to attend Oxford until 1767,⁵⁰ it is unlikely that Anthony Wilson attended Weston's Academy much earlier than 1760. John Weston had died in 1744, and the Reverend Samuel Francis Swinden, who had been one of the assistants at the Academy, took over the lease of the building and grounds and the mastership of the Academy.⁵¹ The education of the Greenwich Hospital boys, whose numbers had been increased to one hundred, was still under the direction of the master of Greenwich Academy. In 1735, a separate building had been erected for them on the Academy grounds (see App.G, pl.4)⁵² and it is impossible to know

whether they continued to be taught drawing, if indeed they ever had been. However, Anthony Wilson's etchings in the Bull album prove that drawing still continued to be taught to the young men attending the Academy and that Thomas Weston's copy-book continued to be used for that purpose.

In 1750, an advertisement appeared in the back of a book, The Beauties of Stow by George Bickham Junior: 'Prints and Books, Sold in May's Buildings Covent Garden. Printed for George Bickham, Engraver, late Drawing-Master to the Academy at Greenwich'. The fact that he advertised himself in this manner indicates the prestige accorded to such a position at this time. 'George Bickham' was noted in connection with the Greenwich Academy as early as 1726 when the name appeared as the engraver of Weston's copy-book, but that earlier George Bickham was probably the father of the one in the advertisement above. As both were drawing masters and authors of drawing books when the appellations 'Man of Taste' and 'Connoisseur' had become required attributes of young gentlemen, a brief review of their work might indicate whether the method of teaching drawing as an accomplishment had changed since Weston had begun to teach it at his Academy in the second decade of the century.

As with the Bernard Lenses, there is a great deal of confusion about the dates and activities of George Bickham, Senior and Junior. Neither used his 'Sr.' or 'Jun.' consistently. Succeeding generations of John Bickhams also cause confusion, as does the occasional use of the pseudonym 'George Johnson' and the initials 'G.J.B.'. I have made a search of relevant parish registers and correlated all the statements of various authors on the Bickhams (see App.D), and come to the conclusion that the most likely facts are

the following.

George Bickham Senior, son of John Bickham, was born c. 1683 and was taught writing and engraving by John Sturt. He was mainly an engraver of writing books but he also engraved drawing books, and at various times boarded youths in his home where he taught them writing, drawing, engraving, and accounts. His portrait was drawn and etched by his son, George Bickham Junior, c.1750. George Bickham Senior occasionally worked with John Bickham, an engraver who could have been his brother or his son, and, except for short periods in Brentford End, Middlesex and Hammersmith, the elder George Bickham lived most of his life in Clerkenwell, where he died of palsy and was buried in the churchyard of St. Luke's, Old Street on the 7th of May, 1758.⁵³

His son was probably born in 1704 and taught by his father. He was never as accomplished an engraver as George Bickham Senior and mainly etched and engraved illustrations and topographical views, rather than calligraphy. He later became well-known as a caricaturist and print-seller.⁵⁴ He occasionally labelled himself as 'Drawing Master' and does not appear ever to have taught writing, accounts or engraving. He was a prolific etcher and engraver, producing work of some kind nearly every year from 1735 until his death in Richmond in June, 1771. He lived most of the time, from 1735, in the Covent Garden area, and for a few years around 1763, he had a house and shop in both May's Buildings, Covent Garden, and Kew Lane, Richmond.

Very little is known about either George Bickham in the 1720's when Weston produced the copy-book for his students at Greenwich. George Junior would have been twenty-two

years of age and old enough to engrave such a work, but the skill with which it is engraved and the fact that no work is known to be by him until 1731, would point to the likelihood that it is the work of his father. By this time, George Bickham Senior had taught drawing and writing for several years and had engraved several writing books for other writing masters, as well as copy-books of his own on round-hand and round-text.⁵⁴ He knew Bernard Lens and George Shelley at Christ's Hospital and it was perhaps through them that Weston came to know of his work and engaged him to engrave his own writing, drawing, and mathematical copy-book. The fact that George Bickham the Elder never advertised that he had taught the gentlemen at Weston's Academy is another indication that Thomas Weston probably did this himself.

A trade card issued sometime between 1705-12 by George Bickham Senior, stated that 'Young Gentlemen and Ladies are carefully taught ye Whole Art of Drawing' at his house in Hatton Garden.⁵⁵ In 1712, he had moved to Brentford-End, Middlesex where he boarded youths and taught writing, drawing and engraving 'all sorts of works'.⁵⁷ At this early date, Locke's and Shaftesbury's recommendation for the inclusion of drawing in young gentlemen's educations would not yet have had a substantial effect on public opinion so Bickham would only have been hoping to attract such pupils as attended Lens and Sturt's Drawing School in St. Paul's Church Yard. Bickham would have known the school well, as Sturt had been his engraving master, and indeed Bickham's first trade card, advertising himself as a teacher of drawing and engraving, had appeared in 1705, about the time that Sturt and Lens's school ceased to exist. By 1720,

however, Bickham had ceased to advertise himself as a drawing master. A notice in the London Gazette, 23 November, 1723 stated that 'George Bickham, late of St. Leonard's, Shoreditch, Engraver is now an Insolvent Debtor in Prison'.⁵⁸ Perhaps this an indication that at this time there was still an insufficient number of parents who saw drawing lessons as worth the time and expense.

One drawing book by a 'George Bickham' may have been published by the elder Bickham during the period when he attempted to earn a living by teaching privately. The British Museum copy of this book, The Drawing and Writing Tutor (BML 1268.d.3(1)), has thirteen plates and was published by John Bowles. The Victoria and Albert Museum copy (NAL F.5.14) has a slightly different title-page (an advertisement has been added: see Illus. 18) and twenty-two plates, of which only eleven are numbered. Some of the unnumbered plates are signed 'George Bickham jun.' The advertisement included in the title-page is similar to one in the subscription for the publication of the British Monarchy in 1749.⁵⁹ Therefore, the VAM copy is probably a later edition which the younger Bickham issued with added plates by himself.

The reason I would attribute the original edition of this work to George Bickham Senior is because of its unique combination of writing and drawing on each plate, not to my knowledge found in a copy-book by anyone else.⁶⁰ Each plate has a writing example (either alphabet or verse) in the centre, with drawings surrounding it. The drawings follow the usual progression from facial features, to heads, to proportions, and then full-length nude and draped figures.

The first plate, however, (Illus. 19) is unusual in that it includes methods of shading and three-dimensional figures such as cones, cubes, balls, etc. A number of the figural drawings are borrowed from the same works by Bloemaert and Ribera that Weston had used and at least two of them are found later in Lens's 1750 drawing book.⁶¹ The skill with which they and the writing are engraved also point to the elder Bickham as the author.⁶²

The plates that were added in the NAL VAM copy are drawing examples with no calligraphy and they are all inserted so that the book has to be turned to look at them. One series of three plates depicts Jacob's Dream in three progressive stages: the first outline, the finished outline, and the completed, shaded drawing. Another three of the added plates, after drawings by Gravelot, were issued in The Oeconomy of Arts by George Bickham Junior, in 1747 as part of a set of four plates at the end of the drawing section. All of these later plates show an increased concern for the pupil, as the drawings are large and the various steps are made easier to comprehend and follow.

As stated above, it is impossible to say when George Bickham Junior began to teach drawing at Greenwich Academy. In 1731, he engraved an ambitious frontispiece for a book by his father showing that he was already capable of accurately engraving a large emblematic drawing including figures, architecture, landscape, the sea and ships.⁶³ Later in his career, he showed he was also capable of drawing and engraving portraits of soldiers in uniform and detailed, accurate topographical views - requisites of a drawing master at an academy which included pupils intended for the navy.

What may have been his first drawing book was published in 1732: A New Collection of Landskips Ec. Engraved by G. Bickham junr. (London).⁶⁴ It was not specifically called a drawing book, but consisted of twelve engravings after landscapes and genre paintings by Rosa, Barlow, Vanderbank, and his own drawings. Some bear the inscription 'George Bickham junr. Fecit 1730'. In 1733, a George Bickham advertised The Young Clerk's Assistant which contained seventy-three copper-plate examples of penmanship 'engraved by the best Hands' as well as 'A Curious Drawing Book of Modes designed by the famous Mr. Bernard Picart, and engrav'd by G. Bickham, jun. Ec. for the early Improvement of Young Gentlemen and Ladies in the Practice of the Pencil,⁶⁵ as well as the Pen'.

George Bickham Junior's first proper drawing manual was not published until 1737: a small twelve-page work, sandwiched between two volumes of fables collected and engraved by John Bickham and illustrated by George Bickham Junior (BML 12304.ee.15). The drawing book must have been fairly successful as it was published on its own c.1740 (BML 1422.e.2) and again in 1750 (NAL VAM 27.E.88). Its title indicates that George Bickham Junior already felt qualified as a drawing master: A New Introduction to the Art of Drawing. Collected from the Designs of the best Masters. With a short introduction for the Use of Schools. The preface stated that drawing was 'not only an innocent, useful amusement for young gentlemen and ladies but also a qualification highly expedient, if not absolutely necessary for most Mechanicks'. Instructions included progressing slowly in the order depicted, mastering each one before

proceeding, 'you cannot look too often at your originals', and practice makes perfect. The poorly-drawn and -engraved plates of heads and nude figures (there are no plates of eyes, ears, etc.) are in some cases the same as some found in Weston's book.⁶⁶ The landscapes are slightly better than the figures and, like the rest of the plates, drawn in outline only.⁶⁷

A political satire, issued in 1740, reproduced a shopcard: 'To Bickham, junr., Engraver and Drawing Ma'r. at his House in Exeter Change Strand' and in a later edition of the same print (1744), his address had been changed to May's Buildings, Covent Garden.⁶⁸ A directory of 1763, stated that he was a drawing master and engraver in Covent Garden and Richmond,⁶⁹ possibly indicating that being a drawing master was now his main profession. Through the 1740's, he had been the author of a stream of political satires and had a printing press on his premises, although the business of running the print shop was left to his wife.⁷⁰ It is conceivable, then, that he taught at Greenwich Academy during that decade, travelling there to teach one or two days of the week, and the rest of the time engraving or teaching in his home.⁷¹

In 1747, George Bickham Junior issued a drawing book which was conspicuously not advertised for use in schools. It was a part of his

Oeconomy of Arts: Or, A Companion for the Ingenious of Either Sex;... containing 1. The First Principles of Drawing to the most finish'd Pieces, the Nature and Beauty of Lights and Shadows; and Directions to Learn without a Master. 2. The Art of Penmanship... 3. The whole Art of Painting in Water Colours... 4. ...the Art of Japanning... 5. Painting on Mezzotintos... 6. Receipts for making the several sorts of Varnishes...The whole to be had together or single in their different Parts... (NAL VAM RC.E.35; BM, P & D 167*. b. 1., 1751 edition).

The introductory essay on drawing gives a brief history of the art, describing how it was limited to the upper classes and aristocracy in ancient Greece and Rome, how useful it was for transmitting history and religion, and expressing the hope of the author that youth would regard it as an 'Accomplishment as useful at least, and ornamental, as any other genteel Acquisition'⁷² There is no mention of the assistance that the ability to draw gives to students of accounts, mathematics, or military or naval subjects. The concentration is on its role as a 'genteel' accomplishment for such young ladies and gentlemen as Bickham would have been teaching in his or their homes or to those attending Greenwich Academy as a 'finishing school' rather than vocational academy.

In 1737, then, George Bickham Junior had composed a drawing book for both amateur and vocational pupils and, like his father, Lairesse, and Weston before him, he followed the set formula of parts of the human figure, then whole figures, followed by different types of landscapes. Weston had included a few paintings by old masters and two perspective plates, but, other than that and the inclusion of a few seascapes, their drawing books did not really represent much advancement, in catering to the needs of particular types of pupils, from the books produced in England and Europe in the seventeenth century. By 1747, however, 'connoisseurship' and 'taste' were much sought-after as appellations by young gentlemen and they attempted to acquire any accomplishments which would enable them to be considered as such. There was also an increase in the number of young men on the grand tour for whom drawing and

art appreciation were part of the preparation. Drawing had appeared on the curricula of a large number of private academies by then, and possibly at Eton, and the consequence of all these factors was an increased number of young men with some rudimentary ability to draw.

As an indication of this, John Russell, a young painter in Rome, wrote home in 1750 that: 'It is no small satisfaction to me to find that most young gentlemen, who come hither, shew so great a regard for the art which I study, as not only to admire and endeavour to understand it in theory, but even to amuse and divert themselves in the exercise and practice of it.'⁷³ As Bickham's Oeconomy of Arts was aimed solely at these amateurs, one would expect it to differ significantly from the others discussed in this chapter.

There are nineteen pages of introductory text and sixteen plates in the section on drawing. The essay included a 'short history and progress of drawing' and the exhortation that only those with a 'happy Genius' for drawing should attempt to learn it and that they should study the theory first before actually practicing it. The proportionally small number of plates to pages of text reinforces this emphasis on theory first. The parts of the face then body were, as always, the first lessons, followed by proportion and the relationship of parts to the whole. The first eight plates were devoted to these lessons alone and included detailed analyses of the depiction of motion in the human figure.

Four other main points were emphasized in the essay: to rely on nature as the main guide, keeping her image in mind; keep a memorandum book handy to sketch everything that's

worthy of notice before it escapes memory; chose your master carefully and seek the advice of the best artists; and avoid imbalance and everything broken, inhuman, shocking, and 'Gothick'. This sort of advice was obviously aimed at cultivating the taste of young men and improving their ability to benefit from the grand tour and would have been useless, for the main part, to any pupils learning drawing for technical or vocational purposes. The last eight of the plates corresponded with this in that they represent figures dressed in the height of fashion,⁷⁴ and picturesque Dutch and classical figural groups and landscapes.

A number of the plates, however, in both parts of the drawing book had been used before in the books by Lairesse, Weston and George Bickham Senior. Therefore, although the younger Bickham recognized that there was a new audience and market for drawing books, and he was prepared to make certain concessions for this, on the whole he did not feel it necessary to create new drawings for amateurs to copy or, indeed, to alter at all the traditional method of teaching that had been used since the Renaissance to train professional artists. Thus, he did not recognize a need for a new method of teaching this 'Accomplishment' to a different class of pupils which he himself described as 'genteel'.

However, the plates that he added to his father's Drawing and Writing Tutor in 1747 do indicate some concern towards the fact that this book was aimed at amateurs, rather than professionals. Six of the plates, three of Jacob's Dream and three after Gravelot, have already been discussed, but in the last plate, a female personification

of Art answers Youth's questions about an open book she holds on her lap entitled André Hay's Collection of Valuable Pictures (see Illus. 20).⁷⁵ This is possibly the first time that the appreciation of art and the study of famous collections, both qualities advocated for young gentlemen, are given specific emphasis in a drawing book for amateurs.

The names of George Bickham's successors as drawing masters to Greenwich Academy are unknown and, although we know the names of Reverend Swinden's successors as Masters of the Academy, none of their activities, except one, are of significance to the purposes of this chapter. The one item of interest is an advertisement in 1782 which indicates that the Reverend James, M.A. moved the Academy (where have been educated many gentlemen of distinguished rank, as well as many celebrated commanders both by land and sea...) to 'a commodious and elegant house at the bottom of Cromes Hill, lately occupied by John Savary'. He advertised this move because many were confusing the Academy with a new school opposite the Park Gate (not long since the Star and Garter Tavern)⁷⁶. The new school, owned by a Mr. Bakewell, was also a private academy which qualified boys for public schools and universities, the army and navy, and masters attended for drawing, music, dancing and fencing. This situation, where two private academies could exist within two minutes walk of each other in Greenwich, indicates the growth and continuous popularity of private academies, like Weston's right through the eighteenth century. Since, however, we know little of the teaching of drawing at Weston's Academy after 1760, we can no longer rely on it as a model through which to trace the development of the methods used in the last part of the century. By this

point, however, amateur artists had increased so significantly that private drawing masters were flourishing, and it was through them that one must follow developments in teaching methods and the general change in quality of the work done by amateurs from 1750 onwards.

The contribution, however, that private academies made to the teaching of drawing to amateurs in the eighteenth century is undeniable. They established a type of education only attempted unsuccessfully in the previous century, whereby, not only were the children of the merchant classes prepared for business and younger sons of the gentry prepared for the services, but also young gentlemen and nobles were prepared for their future lives as leaders of men politically and on estates, and as exemplars in culture, taste and refinement. Educators had often advocated that drawing be included in the education of these young men, but it took the combined recommendations of John Locke and such arbiters of culture as Jonathan Richardson and the Earl of Shaftesbury to convince the public of the advantages, and even then the process of its introduction was spread over several decades. In the first half of the eighteenth century, to attempt to introduce drawing to schools like Eton, Winchester, and Harrow where the classics still dominated, would have been unthinkable, and to hire a private drawing master for one's own son would have been too large a step from the type of education most parents of the upper classes still considered normal, acceptable, or even moral for their children.

There are always exceptions to any rules and some families did indeed employ private drawing masters, such as

Bernard Lens III who taught the Royal Family, the Duchess of Portland, and Horace Walpole, among others (see App. C). It was not that the parents of these particular pupils were extremely wealthy and therefore could afford such lessons, but rather that they were willing to accept the idea that drawing could be a useful accomplishment. These few children who were privately tutored in drawing belong to the category of the fifth type of student a drawing master might encounter, which will be discussed at length in Chapters 6 and 7 of this thesis; however, in the first half of the century their numbers were so small that it is sufficient here to merely acknowledge that they existed. By the middle of the eighteenth century, the majority of wealthy parents still considered drawing an idle and frivolous pursuit apt to distract the pupil from more serious subjects. Many artists advertised that they gave drawing lessons at this time (see App. A), but, as we have seen, there were not sufficient numbers of families willing to employ them to enable drawing masters to make a secure living at it, and their activities as drawing masters were usually supplemented by engraving, printselling, portrait painting, etc. Only in the liberal atmosphere of a private academy could drawing be safely introduced to young gentlemen, and there it slowly became accepted and flourished along with the other 'polite' accomplishments with which it was always listed and consciously associated - dancing, music and fencing.

NOTES. CHAPTER 3:

TEACHING DRAWING IN PRIVATE ACADEMIES

1. Public Record Office, Admiralty Papers (hereafter ADM), ADM 67/3 (1705), p. 100.
2. John Evelyn, an amateur artist himself, in his work Sculptura, included an entire chapter (V) advocating the teaching of drawing to children and students, and quoted a statement by Thomas Earl of Arundel, Lord Marshall of England that 'one who could not Designe a little, would never make an honest man' (p. 103).
3. ADM 67/121 (1715), p. 53.
4. J.E. Evans, 'A History of the Royal Hospital School', vol. 1, no. 5, p. 3 and vol. 2, no. 12, p. 127. Evans reproduces the letter in full in Furbor's calligraphic writing and mentions that the prizes for the best three drawings from nature in 1782 were: a Halley's Quadrant, a case of instruments, and a copy of Robertson's Treatise on Navigation. According to Ambrose Heal, English Writing Masters, p. 51, Thomas Furbor had been a pupil at William Reeves' Academy in Bishopsgate Street and had presumably become a writing master, because at the end of the century Bowles and Carver published a Penman's Delight written by him.
5. ADM 75/154.
6. For the history of this building and the tracing of its ownership to Thomas Weston, see Appendix G, p. 331, n. 12.
7. J.W. Kirby, 'Early Greenwich Schools and Schoolmaster', p. 232.
8. For a discussion of the locations and editions of this book, see Appendix G, p. 332, n. 29. In describing the plates, I will be referring to them as they are in the VAM copy.
9. He is given these attributes in the frontispiece portrait of his copy-book.
10. Royal Greenwich Observatory, Herstmonceux, Flamsteed Papers, MS vol. 15. In 1835, Francis Baily published An Account of the Reverend John Flamsteed, including the transcriptions of the majority of these MSS. For Flamsteed's publications, see E.V.G. Taylor, The Mathematical Practitioners of Hanoverian England, no. 42.
11. Baily, p. 64.
12. For Doctor Wallis, see chapter two of this thesis.
13. Baily, p. 197.
14. See CH MS 12,811, vol. 9 (1719), p. 26 and the entries for this every March and October until October, 1728, when

he is replaced by his brother, John Weston (p. 396).

15. Plumley, p. 57.

16. ADM 67/121, p.195. For James Hodgson (1672-1754) and his Theory of Navigation (1738), see Taylor, no. 68.

17. Baily, p. 65. Paul Vansomer arrived in England in 1678 as a mezzotint artist of no great fame. According to Horace Walpole's Anecdotes of Painting, vol. III, pp. 226-7, Vertue stated that about the year 1690, Verrio, Cooke, and Laguerre could find no better persons to engrave their designs than S. Gribelin and Paul Vansomer and the art of mezzotinting had sunk very low.

18. I have tried to trace the whereabouts of these drawings, but have been unable to do so. Miss J. Dudley, the Librarian and Archivist of the Royal Greenwich Observatory suggested that they were taken from the Observatory by Margaret Flamsteed after her husband's death when she removed everything she possibly could, including all his instruments, books and papers...their present whereabouts, as with many things associated with John Flamsteed, is unknown (letter to author). The first edition of the Atlas Coelisticus was published in 1712, but it did not contain any maps of the constellations. A 'deluxe' edition published posthumously in 1729 did have large plates of the constellations with outline figures of Taurus, Leo, Gemini, etc., but these figures had been drawn by Thornhill and engraved by Vertue, Nutting, Vandergucht Junior, and others. See Baily, pp. 340-62. For further details of Weston's apprenticeship see Baily, pp. 218-57 and for a summary of the information contained there and further details about Flamsteed's relationship with Weston, see Appendix G, pp. 314-18.

19. Charles Mallet, 'Education, Schools and Universities', p. 215.

20. Axtell, pp. 265, 358. See also Margaret J. M. Ezell, 'John Locke's Images of Childhood', pp. 139-46. For a discussion of contemporary opinion on the desirability of teaching young gentlemen polite accomplishments, see George Brauer, The Education of a Gentleman, pp. 90-103.

21. John Robertson, editor, Characteristics, p. x.

22. Anthony, Earl of Shaftesbury, Characteristicks, vol. III, p. 108.

23. *ibid.*, pp. 111, 116.

24. *ibid.*, vol. I, p. 225. The 1728 Evening Post advertisement for Weston's Academy, transcribed in Appendix G, pp. 321-2, indicates that Weston did indeed ensure that the arts and sciences were not divorced from philosophy and the classics.

25. Jonathan Richardson the Younger, editor, The Works of Jonathan Richardson, p. 271. Richardson's essay The Science of a Connoisseur was originally part of his Two Discourses:

I. The Connoisseur: An Essay on the Whole Art of Criticism as it relates to Painting... II. An Argument on behalf of the Science of a Connoisseur; Wherein is shewn the Dignity, Certainty, Pleasure and Advantage of it (1719). Carol Gibson-Wood, in her article 'Jonathan Richardson and the Rationalization of Connoisseurship' (Art History vol. 7, no. 1, (1984), pp. 38-56) carefully examined this work in its philosophical and historical context, especially concentrating on Richardson's attempt to express his argument for the 'science' of connoisseurship in Lockean philosophical terms. Apparently, Richardson was attempting to make use of Locke's current popularity among the 'coffee-house set' but Locke's approach, combined with Richardson's own 'rustic prose', made The Discourses popular but also sometimes a source of ridicule and Richardson therefore abandoned this Lockean approach in later editions.

26. *ibid.*, pp. 336-7.

27. Christopher Hussey, The Picturesque, p. 29: 'The year 1730 may, in fact, be taken as the date by which Taste, Connoisseurship, and the connections with landscape painting was generally recognized. In 1734 the Dilettante Society was founded and set a seal on Taste as a fashionable necessity.' The concepts of taste and connoisseurship are basically indefinable and consequently very complicated. The most recent discussions are by Carol Gibson-Wood in her article, mentioned above (fn. 25), and her unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, 'Studies in the Theory of Connoisseurship from Vasari to Morelli' (Warburg Institute, University of London, 1982).

28. See Appendix G, p. 330, n. 10 for the entire quotation.

29. Kirby, pp. 231-2. I have been unable to confirm this in the Trinity House records, but as we have seen above, Weston did succeed Flamsteed as the Mathematics examiner of the Christ's Hospital Royal Mathematical School. There is no mention of Weston in Eva Taylor's books on Stuart and Hanoverian Mathematicians.

30. The obtaining of references to his loyalty, character, and experience, the granting of the licence, transcripts of the recommendations, and subsequent problems concerning the revoking of the licence, are summarized in Appendix G, pp. 318-20.

31. 'Woodlands', Greenwich Local History Library, Archives, Folder on Weston's Academy (hereafter Weston's Academy Folder), advertisement clipping from The London Journal, December 23, 1721.

32. In this year, William and Mary granted the Queen's House to the nation to be used as a Royal Hospital for naval pensioners, widows, and their children.

33. M. C. Mathews, 'Greenwich in North America', p. 195.

34. Beryl Platts, History of Greenwich, p. 212.

35. Weston's Academy Folder.

36. There are two books of this nature known to have been written by Thomas Weston: Mathematical Discourses concerning Two New Sciences..., (1730) (copy in BML) and A Treatise of Arithmetick... (1730 and 1736) (copy in University of Birmingham, Faculty of Education Library).
37. F.L.D. Ciartres, Le Livre Original de la Portraiture pour La Jeunesse tiré de F. Bologne et autres bons peintres (Paris, 1644) (BML 683.e.22 (1))
38. It is interesting to recall here Locke's comment that young gentlemen needn't be able to draw faces.
39. Richardson, p. 225.
40. John Steegman, The Rule of Taste from George I to IV, p. 12.
41. Elizabeth Manwaring, Italian Landscape in Eighteenth-Century England, p. 17.
42. ADM 67/7, August 3, 1728, p. 112.
43. Kirby, p. 232.
44. Letter to the author from Miss J. Dudley, Royal Greenwich Observatory.
45. Heal, p. 110. It is interesting to note that this broadsheet was engraved by Bickham.
46. F. W. Steer, 'The Account Book of William Norwich', p. 130.
47. The book entitled Mathematical Discourses, written by Thomas Weston and published posthumously in 1730 by his brother John, was dedicated to the Hon. Col. John Armstrong, Surveyor-General of His Majesty's Ordnance as John knew that Thomas had intended to dedicate it to him.
48. Richard Bull, 'Etchings and Engravings done by the Nobility and Gentry of England - or by Persons not exercising the Art as a Trade', vol I (BM P & D 189*b.22), p. 208, nos. 227, 229.
49. Richardson, p. 93.
50. Ian Fleming-Wiliams, 'The Amateur', Appendix II in Martin Hardie, The History of Watercolour Painting in Britain vol. III (hereafter 'The Amateur'), p.261.
51. ADM 67/19, June 23, 1744, p. 22 and December 19, 1744, p. 44. Swinden was distantly related to the Westons through an interim master, James Rossam. For these family connections see Appendix G, p. 330, n. 2 and p. 333, n. 44.
52. ADM 67/237, January 4, 1735.
53. The details of his and his sons' lives are discussed

most thoroughly by Heal, pp. 14-17, 170 (list of works) and the portrait of the younger Bickham is reproduced there in pl. II.

54. For an account of the younger Bickham as a caricaturist and print seller, see H. Atherton, Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth, pp. 14-6, 78-81, 200-1 and English Caricature 1620 to the Present, exhibition catalogue, Victoria and Albert Museum (1984).

55. Heal, p. 167.

56. *ibid.*, p. 15.

57. His father John was a church warden in New Brentford, Middlesex in 1706 (see Jane Houston, Index of Cases in the Records of the Court of Arches at Lambeth Palace Library, 1660-1913, no. 9231).

58. British Museum, Print Room, Francis Buckley, 'Advertisements of Engravers' (typescript) (hereafter Buckley BM), pp. 8, 8a.

59. British Museum, Print Room, 'Papers relating to the Society of Artists', vol. I, p. 92.

60. In 1733, in a letter to subscribers to The Universal Penman, he wrote:

Writing is the first step, and Essential in furnishing out the Man of Business.. Drawing is another necessary Qualification, and therefore, I have attempted to make the Decorations of this Work fit for the imitation of those whose Genius prompts them to the Study of that Art. But as Writing is the most useful Accomplishment of ye two, I have given a larger Number of Specimens for that purpose...

In this work, Bickham's drawing examples are vignettes, placed at the top or bottom of the writing examples and they are not introductory drawing lessons, as found in The Drawing and Writing Tutor. Reproductions of the title page and three others from The Universal Penman can be found in figures 57-60 in Nancy R. Davison, 'Bickham's Musical Entertainer' in J. D. Dolmetsch's Eighteenth-Century Prints from Colonial America.

61. Bickham's engraving of these two figures (one gesturing and one with a jug) is much more detailed than Lens's (which is reproduced in Friedman, p. 262, fig. 2), and therefore, it cannot be inferred that one saw the other's, but instead, it is likely there is a third version of these figures by another artist.

62. The title-page (reproduced in Illus. 18) is interesting because it depicts an engraver's study, showing his tools and equipment and walls lined with shelves filled with boxes of prints. The labels of each box are clearly legible, thus giving an excellent list of the type of prints used by engravers and drawing masters in the first half of the eighteenth century.

63. Penmanship in its Utmost Beauty and Extent (BML

c.141.c.19).

64. The only copy is in the Beinecke Rare Book Library, Yale University, New Haven (Folio 168) and once belonged to Elizabeth Manwaring.

65. Davison, p. 105.

66. These same figures are also in the 1739 and 1777 editions of Lairesse's Principles of Design as well as in Lens's 1750 New and Compleat Drawing-Book..., indicating that all these engravers were using a book by another artist which I have not been able to find.

67. Again, it is the title-page which proves most interesting, as it is a shaded, carefully-engraved detail of the painting Zeuxis and the Maidens of Croton, by Francesco Solimena, an artist whose work was highly regarded in England at this time and who was also well-known for his drawings, academy figures, and copy-books. Nagler recorded that this painting was in the Duke of Devonshire's collection with an engraving after it by Joseph Goupy (see Nichola Spinosa, 'More Unpublished Works by F. Solimena', Burlington Magazine, vol. CXXI, April, 1979, p. 212, n. 10, reproduced on cover and in figure 4). It was possibly the latter which Bickham saw and adapted for the title to his book.

68. Dorothy George, Catalogue of the Prints and Drawings in the British Museum, Political and Personal Satires, vol. III, Part I, nos. 2452 and 2453: The Champion (reproduced in Atherton, figure 31).

69. Thomas Mortimer, The Universal Director, p. 5.

70. Atherton, p. 80.

71. Buckley BM, p. 84 found an advertisement in The Westminster Journal, 28th December, 1745 in which Bickham indicates the type of work he would carry out at the business. In the advertisement, he described himself as 'Engraver, May's Buildings Covent Garden, where all sorts of Picture work as well as writing and shopkeeper's Bills are executed and printed'.

72. Bickham, Oeconomy of Arts, Drawing Book, pp. 3-5. The essays in this book are all dated 1747 on their title-pages, while the plates bear the date 1751.

73. Manwaring, pp. 31-2.

74. These may be from Bickham's earlier Drawing Book of Modes, after Bernard Picart. Buckley BM, p. 8 records a later advertisement for these plates: 'engr'd by George Bickham corner of Bedford Bury, New St., Covent Gdn' (London Evening Post, 12th January, 1738).

75. Andrew Hay (fl.1710- d.1754) was a Scottish portrait painter who by the 1720's gave up painting for picture dealing while on his travels in Italy (see Ellis Waterhouse, Dictionary of British Painters in Oil and Crayons).

76. Weston's Academy Folder, letter about the Academy. These gentlemen, the Reverend William James and John Tanzia Savary, were Directors of the Royal Hospital, Greenwich, in 1775. See also Appendix G, p. 329 and n. 54.

CHAPTER 4:

THE GILPINS, GRIMSTONS AND CHEAM PREPARATORY SCHOOL

The previous chapter discussed how drawing was taught in the type of private academies that prepared the sons of the merchant classes for business and the younger sons of the gentry for the army or navy. Using Weston's Academy in Greenwich as the main example, chapter three also illustrated how drawing began to be taught to the sons of some of the nobility and gentry in these academies. However, this type of academy was rare in the first half of the eighteenth century and the sort of liberal education that it offered was not fully appreciated and utilized until after 1750. Thomas Weston was a unique educator, very much in advance of his peers in offering such modern subjects, and only a few of the upper classes took advantage of it: throughout the first half of the century, this type of modern education was mainly reserved for the other type of 'vocational' pupil mentioned above.

The teaching of drawing to amateurs before the middle of the century advanced slowly and in a manner almost parallel to the development of the new liberal education and, in spite of the terms 'connoisseur' and 'man of taste' being in use from the 1730's, it was not until 1747 that a drawing book had been produced for the use of amateurs alone - George Bickham Junior's The Oeconomy of Arts. From the discussion of this book in the previous chapter, it is evident that Bickham made little attempt to alter the method of teaching drawing that had been the same for several centuries: that is, setting engravings and drawings for the pupils to copy and then correcting them. However, when one

compares the teaching methods we have already discussed in Bickham's books and others, and the relatively small number of non-professional artists in England in the first half of the century to the methods and number of amateurs in the second half, it is obvious that an enormous change had occurred. Can this increase in the number of amateurs be partly attributed to a change in the methods of teaching drawing? What made drawing such a popular pastime, almost¹ obsession, with so many people after 1750?

The developments in the teaching of drawing to non-professional artists will be seen to parallel the new developments in education in the second half of the century, as they have already been seen to do in the first half. In this chapter, I will begin to discuss the development of art education after 1750 by discussing drawing as it was introduced to the third type of amateur a drawing master would teach at another type of private academy beginning to flourish at this time - the so-called 'preparatory school'.

By mid-century, the nobility and landed gentry had the choice of sending their sons to a public school, private academy, or tutored at home. If they chose a public school, as the majority did, they sometimes felt that their sons first needed to be prepared for the educational, physical and emotional rigours of these schools. If this was the case, the son was first sent to a new type of private school such as Mr. Fountayne's in Marylebone, the Reverend Goodenough's in Ealing, or the Reverend William Gilpin's in² Cheam.

Although they were privately run by individuals, they were not run entirely along the same lines as the private

academies discussed in the previous chapter. Cheam, for instance, had begun in the mid-seventeenth century as a private school catering for the needs of Nonsuch Palace nearby, educating gentlemen and preparing young men for the universities, but as early as 1682, it was known to prepare boys for Eton.³ When William Gilpin became Headmaster in 1752, he considered Cheam 'in the light of something between a school to qualify for business, and the public school, in which classical learning only is attained to'.⁴ But his emphasis on morals and character soon gained this school a reputation as a preparatory school, and other schools, founded specifically for this purpose, soon sprang up to fill the new demand. They took on boys as young as four or five years of age, who were intended to go to Eton or Harrow, and prepared them by getting them used to being away from home and giving them good groundings in reading and writing, as well as English, Latin, Greek, some history, geography and religion. Extras like French, dancing and drawing were provided for by having the masters come to the schools once or twice a week, but if a parent objected to these 'frivolous' pursuits, attendance was not compulsory.

In his school regulations, William Gilpin mentioned specifically, under the heading of 'Amusements', that excercises were encouraged, especially gardening in the less active children, and 'drawing too is much recommended as a useful amusement. If any hath a genius for it, it is encouraged'.⁵ In fact, drawing lessons had been available to pupils at Cheam at least as early as 1731.⁶

It is possible, then, that the introduction of modern subjects such as drawing into these new private preparatory schools for younger upper class children created a demand

for continued lessons in their next stage of education, whether at public schools like Eton or, if their education up to the age of sixteen had been completely at one of these preparatory academies, then at Cambridge or Oxford? If not the sole reason for the dramatic increase in the demand for drawing masters and the numbers of amateurs as the century progressed, then this must certainly have been one of the major contributing factors.

When William Gilpin took over Cheam School in 1752, the number of pupils had dropped to fifteen, and it did not rise to significant proportions until well into the 1760's, when his reputation for preparing boys for public school was established. Parents were attracted not only by the novel method of self-government with which he ran the school, but also by the broad education he offered.⁷ All the subjects mentioned above in respect to preparatory schools in general, were taught by Gilpin, as well as drawing, his opinion of which I have already quoted. Why did he single out drawing in particular as a 'useful amusement'?

William Gilpin's father, Captain John Bernard Gilpin (1701-1776), had been an amateur artist who ensured that his children were taught to draw and even gave lessons to their tutor, Dr. John Brown (1715-1766). This encouragement in his own early years is certainly significant in respect to William Gilpin's desire to teach it to his own pupils. However, even more important to our argument here is the fact that, as Carl Paul Barbier has pointed out, John Bernard Gilpin and Dr. John Brown were strongly influenced by Shaftesbury and Hutcheson, and at Oxford these authors, as well as Addison, Pope, and Locke, chiefly moulded

8

William's outlook. Barbier discusses their effect on Gilpin's moral and aesthetic theories and early writings, but it is similarly arguable that his ideas on education could not help but be dictated by these authors, especially Shaftesbury, the strongest influence in these early years. In the chapter on private academies such as Weston's in Greenwich, I could only speculate on the influence of these authors, Locke and Shaftesbury in particular, on the establishment and growth in the first half of the century of liberal education which included drawing. Here, in the 1750's, is evidence that they were instrumental, in Gilpin's case at least, in establishing an important place for drawing in his school's curriculum.

William Gilpin did not begin his teaching career with the idea of preparing boys for Eton and Harrow. Indeed, he thought that public schools led to vice and folly if one did not make good friends afterwards, and he had little good to say for them.¹⁰ As mentioned above, he thought of his school as something between a business school and a public school where nothing but the classics were studied. The first documented instance of his preparing a boy for Eton was in 1767 when he was requested by John Grimston to prepare his son Thomas for entrance there.¹¹ Barbier has partially documented Thomas's drawing lessons at Cheam,¹² but it should prove useful to look more closely at the Grimston family letters now in the Humberside County Record Office at Beverley, as they seem particularly relevant in this instance.

Let us examine why John Grimston chose Cheam for his son in 1761, keeping in mind that I am trying to argue that one of the main reasons why drawing became so popular a

recreation in the second half of the century was because a liberal education which included drawing at an early age encouraged a desire for further instruction at the next stage of education.

John Grimston (1725-1780) was the son of a 'connoisseur', as attested by the sale catalogues in the Grimston family papers and the itinerary that Thomas Grimston (1702-1751) suggested for his son John's grand tour of 1751-52.¹³ A letter from Philip Harcourt of Ankersdyke of the 28th of June, 1751 to John Grimston on his tour in Amsterdam indicates that John was already a connoisseur and amateur artist himself. Harcourt wrote of an excursion to Flanders with Mr. Thomas Turner¹⁴

wch shall likely make if you'll admitt us to accompany you whn you next Visit Those Divine Paintings, for one cursory View of them we are certain cannot satisfy you...Your Camera Obscura I've greatly pleas'd my Kinsman L.d Newnham w'th., & thro' Ye Interest of Mr. Cooper, Ye Entertainmt. was much brighten'd in looking over some Fine Prints Mr Wheatly lent me, wch added to wt You left, took up above 3 hours in viewing.

John Grimston was fond of drawing caricatures, corresponded regularly with print dealers, and acted as patron to Sawrey Gilpin, James Hopwood, and, most importantly, to Alexander Cozens.¹⁵

In 1761, when considering where to send his son Thomas (1753-1821) to school, John Grimston made enquiries about two: Cheam, recommended by his friend W.C.Williams, and Marylebone, which his cousin and ward Robert Grimston (1747-1790) had attended from 1754 until 1759, when he was sent to Eton, and which was recommended by Mr. Bagnall, Thomas's godfather. Only a part of Mr. Williams's letter has been published, but Bagnall's not at all, and they are both worth quoting at length here as they give an excellent view of the

way the schools were run and contemporary opinion of them.

[August 1761?]

Dear Grimston

I have taken the first Opportunity of Sending You the Terms & Regulations of Cheam School... The School is in a very thriving Condition &, I think has every Recommendation that a private School can have. The Master applies his whole Time & Thought to the care of his Pupils & his liberal Method of education there... admirable Effect in instilling early Instruments of true Honour & Veracity into the Youngsters & I think I can take upon me to recommend this School in every respect & hope You will send Tom & a Cargo of others to Cheam...

London Jan'y. 1762

[Bagnall mentions that his son is at Marylebone and he likes the fact that they are taught to speak French there all the time]...I am oblig'd to you for any hint you give me on the subject of his [his son's] education, & assure myself you mean by it that we sho'd jointly appeal to reason & strictly abide by its' decision. Now concerning the article of drawing you mention (& the same is applicable to musick) tho' to arrive at excellence in it, much advantage is to be had from beginning early, yet I am extremely cautious of recommending any of these, w'ch tho' elegant accomplishmts., are not the essentials upon w'ch the formation of the mind depends, till I am invited to it by some undoubted indication that there is a natural propensity & passion for it, in wch case ther is no fear but much improvemt. will be made, & satisfaction deriv'd from it. - Thus, tho' I am myself very fond of musick, it wo'd be meer weakness in me to predestinate him to be a future musician...& unless he desires being taught I shall never make a point of his learning it. As to drawing I think he has a very good eye, but unless his passion for it was very strong indeed (in w'ch case I sho'd certainly not prevent[?] him) I think at present it wo'd tend rather to draw off his attention from persuits w'ch to me are more essential...

It would appear from these letters that opinion was divided as to the value of drawing lessons or other elegant, though not essential accomplishments at an early age. It is clear that the choice of whether to take them or not was left to the parent. Gilpin and Grimston seem to have been of one mind, however, and Thomas was sent to Cheam in the autumn of 1762 and his letters and Gilpin's contain many
17
references to his drawing.

In January, 1763, only three or four months after

Thomas started at Cheam, William Gilpin wrote to John Grimston, in reply to an enquiry about Thomas's progress in drawing, that he was afraid he could give 'but a poor acc't of drawing. You are mistaken sir, if you think he hath more time upon his hands in ye holydays than in school-time... I put him in mind of his pencil now & then, but I go no further. I will try my interest howsoever to procure a piece from him; w'ch I doubt not, you will value as a Michael Angelo'.¹⁸ It is evident from this letter that William Gilpin himself taught the younger boys, although, as Barbier points out, Alexander Cozens was commissioned to send paints to Thomas in 1767 and Sawrey Gilpin did some of the teaching from the latter year at least. The letters Barbier quotes indicate that the method of learning to draw appears to have been to copy from drawings by Sawrey Gilpin, but later that year he notes that they attempted to draw houses and horses from nature.

In November, 1768, Thomas's brother Harry, now also attending Cheam, 'quite out of his own head desired I [Thomas] would ask you if he might learn to draw but I shall not say whether I think he had better or no but you may do as you like'.¹⁹ Thomas's doubts appear to have been well-founded for a year later William Gilpin wrote to John Grimston concerning Harry and mentioned that 'in drawing, my brother [Sawrey] tells me he [Harry] is rather careless'.²⁰ It is evident from this that Sawrey was by that date at least, 1769, doing all the teaching in drawing, including the youngest boys, and William, now with sixty pupils to cope with, was no longer directly aware of the progress of each in drawing, as he had been with Thomas six years earlier.

In 1767 when Thomas was fourteen, his father was considering the next stage in his education and made enquiries about both Eton and Harrow. In February, Thomas had requested that his father fix him a place at Eton (wishing perhaps to emulate his cousin Robert Grimston who had attended Eton before going on to Cambridge), but Gilpin wrote to Thomas's father that he did not know much about the method of teaching at Eton. However, Gilpin made enquiries about how classics were taught at Eton and prepared Thomas for entrance there.²¹ John Grimston wrote to Robert, who at that time was on his grand tour in Turin, and said that he would keep Thomas at Cheam until Robert returned and could introduce him at Eton.²² Robert returned a year later but there had been unrest at Eton through the 1760's which finally erupted in the notorious boys rebellion of November 1768.²³ A letter from Gilpin in July, 1769, indicated that it had been decided to send Thomas to Harrow instead: a decision none too popular with Gilpin after having taken extra pains to train Thomas in the Eton grammar.²⁴

On delivering Thomas to Harrow in October, 1769, a friend wrote to John Grimston that 'Your favourite Accomplishment of drawing is not taught at Harrow & indeed besides the usual School Learning & Writing ec. I believe nothing is taught but dancing...'²⁵

This omission was soon remedied, however, as Thomas's brother Harry was taking drawing lessons there in the Michaelmas term of 1774.²⁶ The cost of the lessons, a guinea and a half per quarter, is mentioned, but the name of the drawing master is not. The DNB states that John 'Inigo' Spilsbury (1730-c.1795) is known to have taught at Harrow

but it is not clear when. However, since there is a large amount of information available about teaching drawing at Eton, which will be discussed in a later chapter, there is no need to speculate further here about who the drawing masters were at Harrow or about their possible teaching methods.

As to the drawing lessons at Cheam, we know something of Sawrey Gilpin's method of teaching how to draw from William's precis of the method at the end of his essay 'The principles on which rough sketches are composed'.²⁸

In this essay, William Gilpin discussed his own theory that in a picture the detail is the inferior part and it is the whole effect, ie. whether it is well-designed and composed, which gives us pleasure. He stated that it was of no matter that the parts were inaccurately or roughly executed as long as the whole was not ill-conceived. He cited as an illustration of this, the case of a gentleman who thought himself a better artist after his hand had begun to shake and his eyes to fail - his stroke became more free and his eyes were impressed with the whole, not the detail, of objects. This approach is a significant departure from that of the first half of the century with its concentration on accurate depiction of the human form and exact copying of statues before being allowed to copy a print with an entire picture or compose one's own. William Gilpin also mentioned that 'If legs and arms be not well set on, they are certainly better concealed' in a cloak, for example.²⁹ He then went on to discuss what his brother considered the easiest mode of sketching figures.

Sawrey had pointed out that the balance of figures was of great consequence and advocated that one should always

first draw a central line of balance when sketching figures (see Illus. 21 for examples). He also stated that figures in landscape need not be exact in anatomy, but a small degree of disproportion, in the head and limbs especially, would strike the eye with disgust. He then noted that:

To attempt finishing the limbs at first would lead to stiffness. If the figures are placed near the eye, a little attention in drawing is requisite: and the simplest, perhaps the best method, will be to sketch them in lines nearly straight...a little swelling of the muscles, and a few touches to mark the extremities, the articulations of the joints, and the sharp folds of the drapery, may afterwards be given and will be sufficient.

The form of figures depended on rules but their grouping depended more on taste. The plates illustrating these points (Illus. 21 & 22) show that Sawrey did not work in a solid outline manner, but rather sketched the form of the figures with short strokes of the pencil. William, too, did not draw figures carefully and recommended that his drawings be viewed by candlelight which would but show the effect `in which chiefly consists the little merit they have; and will likewise conceal the faultiness of the execution in the several details`.

At the beginning of this chapter, the question was raised as to whether changes in the method of teaching drawing might partially account for the increased number of amateurs. Certainly William Gilpin's emphasis on the whole effect of a picture, his leniency as to the correctness of detail, and both he and Sawrey's lack of concern about accurate outline was a significant change from the copying methods with which drawing had previously been taught. Copying and re-copying prints of eyes, noses, antique statues and old masters until they were exact replicas could not have been enjoyable for young drawing pupils. This is

one of the earliest evidences of a new method in use. Unfortunately, although Thomas Grimston must have produced several drawings at Cheam, in a variety of media and including compositions from nature, in spite of his descriptions of them in the family letters, they themselves do not appear to have survived.³³

Thomas Grimston's ability to draw is proof of one aspect of his art education, but there are also indications that he had been inculcated with a proper respect for the work of professional artists. In a letter to his father from Cambridge in 1773, he wrote: 'I think you are very lucky in general in buying Pictures. To understand them well must I think be no small Acquisition to the knowledge of a Gentleman.'³⁴

That Thomas Grimston had, by the age of twenty-three, already become a discerning man of taste as his father had intended, is revealed in an unpublished letter he wrote to his father from London in May 1776, reviewing the Royal Academy exhibition and another.³⁵

...You will doubtless expect that I should mention something about the Exhibitions; the one in Pall Mall I believe is thought to be a good one, Sr. J. Reynolds seems to have outdone his usual outdoings West does not seem backwards & is much liked. Angelica Kauffman seems to deserve praise likewise. But Dance sh'd be mentioned who has painted one good Picture of ye Death of Mark Anthony tho' it does not seem quite without Fault. Young Cozens has astonished every one by a very good Landscape with ye March on Hannibal over ye Alps, this picture is in his Father's style and really thought good - ... Cozens shew'd me his new Scheme in wch. he accounts for different Beauties, it is not bad, but don't you think it rather Chimerical? In ye other Exhibition there are few good things tho' some invite you still to look at them; as for Instance Wright, Marlow, Gilpin, Wheatley & Tafsaert [sic].

The same year, Thomas sat for his portrait to Francis Wheatley³⁶ and expressed a desire for a grand tour even

though his father feared that England might soon be at war with France. Thomas's letters of the following year indicate that he got his wish.³⁷

Thomas Grimston's respect for works of art was probably an inheritance from his father in the most part, but he may also have learned something of connoisseurship as an older boy at Cheam. William Gilpin's Essay on Prints was published in 1768, the year before Thomas left for Harrow, and no doubt Gilpin would have imparted some of his ideas to the older boys while engaged on its research and preparation for publication.

In his preface to the second edition, which also appeared in 1768, Gilpin stated that the work 'hath lain by the author at least fifteen years' and since nothing else on the subject had appeared in print, he took the liberty of offering it to the public as it was. His friends offered criticisms and suggestions and, bearing these in mind, he brought out the second edition within a number of months. His main purpose in writing the book had been to rationalize 'the elegant amusement of collecting prints' and to give the inexperienced collector some principles upon which to proceed, mainly by applying the principles used for painting.³⁸ In the second edition, he included descriptions of specific prints and artists. In this work, because Gilpin was using the same principles to judge prints as he did for paintings, it is not surprising to find that he regards 'unity' or 'wholeness' the chief element to search for in a print, just as it was in his description of his and his brother's methods of drawing. 'Drawing, expression, grace and perspective - in order they are inferior to the other [wholeness].'³⁹ 'The eye must be able to comprehend

the picture as one object, or it cannot be satisfied.⁴⁰

Thomas Grimston's father, John, was an avid collector of prints and no doubt both father and son would be interested in Gilpin's theories. John Grimston certainly must have felt admiration for William and Sawrey Gilpin's approaches to their art, since he was a loyal patron of both until his death. In 1771, a letter to him from Sawrey indicates that Grimston had not only purchased one of his oil paintings (of foxes and dogs), but offered to interest the gentlemen of his neighbourhood on Sawrey's behalf and apparently sent him a book comparing ancient and modern painters.⁴¹ In 1780, we find William Mason sending Grimston the manuscripts of William Gilpin's tours and answering Grimston's request for an account of Gilpin's new work on forest scenery. However, John Grimston died later that year and Mason and Gilpin were worried that they would have a difficult time getting the manuscripts of the tours back from Grimston's heir, presumably Thomas.⁴²

Thomas Grimston as an adult was the result of his father's and William Gilpin's efforts which began when he was nine years of age, to create a moral, liberally-educated, 'man of taste' as expounded by the educational philosophers of their time - Locke and Shaftesbury. Thomas, in turn, ensured that his children were given the same type of education he had been given, except for the fact that he sent them to Eton, his own first choice as a student, instead of Harrow, and afterwards to an academy instead of a university. In this chapter, Thomas Grimston was chosen as the example of a young boy taught drawing at a preparatory school because his education was well-documented. It

remains necessary to establish whether Thomas was exceptional in his education because of his father's particular wish that he learn to draw, or whether other pupils who attended Cheam also became amateur artists or, at least, 'men of taste' and that this type of education for young boys was a genuine trend in the second half of the century.

In his Memoirs, William Gilpin limits himself to mentioning only a few of his pupils at Cheam.⁴³ Two of the young men he states were educated only at Cheam were John Mitford, later Lord Redesdale (1748-1830) and his brother William Mitford (1744-1827), a Lieutenant Colonel of the South Hampshire Militia. Gilpin himself described the latter as the author of the treatise The Harmony of Language (1774) 'a work of uncommon merit... Mr. Mitford has kept much company, is a soldier, a country-gentleman, a farmer, a sportsman, very musical, well skilled in painting, at the head of a family of six children, and not yet thirty years of age'.⁴⁴ William Lock II, the son of the owner of Norbury Park, was also educated solely at Cheam, although under the headmastership of Gilpin's son. Had he not been a gentleman, he would have become a talented artist, towards which end William Gilpin had worked and advised without payment.⁴⁵

William Legge, Lord Dartmouth (1731-1801) sent three sons to Gilpin at Cheam, as did Charles Yorke (1722-1770), the brother of the second Earl of Hardwicke. The Earl of Dartmouth helped Gilpin find Royal approval for his tours when he showed them to Lord Stratford, the Earl of Warwick,⁴⁶ and George III in 1776. Charles Yorke's sons went on to Harrow from Cheam in the 1770's. The eldest, Philip, became

the third Earl of Hardwicke, a well-known patron of the arts, Sir John Soane in particular, while Charles, Joseph, and their sister Caroline were all amateur artists whose work Gilpin was kept informed of by their mother Agnetta Yorke, also an amateur. In 1785, we find her writing that Joseph, who had entered the navy and was home on leave, 'desires his humble respects to Lady Bell [his aunt] and takes the liberty to send her a small specimen of his present studies in the drawing way from Mr. Gilpin and hopes she will find him improved'.⁴⁷

It should be evident from this list of amateurs and patrons that Thomas Grimston was not an isolated instance of a young man who was taught to draw at a preparatory school while very young and for whom the arts became a pervasive influence on his later life. Cheam has been used as a convenient example but the other schools mentioned earlier, like Goodenough's at Ealing and Fountayne's at Marylebone, also provided drawing masters. A list of these preparatory schools and other private academies and the names of the masters who taught drawing there is provided in Appendix B.

I have already noted that when Thomas Grimston was sent to Harrow in 1769, the classics were still the main emphasis of that school's curriculum. With regard to tuition in the 'modern' subjects necessary to the 'man of taste', only dancing lessons were provided. Harrow was reticent to participate in the educational reformation which had already begun in the private academies like Weston's and preparatory schools like Cheam. Other public schools, like Eton, Westminster, and Rugby were not quite so slow.

The mention of payments made to 'Lens' for drawing

lessons given at Eton in 1751 is the earliest reference I have found of a drawing master's name in connection with any public school.⁴⁸ Alexander Cozens (1717-1786) is also known to have been at Eton a decade later. The papers and family records of several of Cozens's Eton pupils still survive. Alexander Cozens, therefore, is the drawing master whose teaching methods will be examined when considering the fourth type of amateur pupil eighteenth-century drawing masters would encounter - the students of public schools.

In the private and preparatory academies discussed above, drawing masters were not 'on the staff', as masters or ushers would be, but rather were 'provided' or 'attended three times a week'. Unfortunately, there is no list of masters at Eton until 1766 when Alexander Cozens was listed as drawing master under the 'extra masters' along with the writing, French, dancing and fencing masters.⁴⁹ It is impossible to say whether the authorities at Eton ensured that these 'extra masters' were available or whether individual parents had requested they give lessons to their sons. School bills always indicate one payment of fees to Eton which would include all the subjects taught by their masters and the rest of the payments were made to individual tutors or dames, as required. Family account books which survive indicate separate payments to a writing master as early as 1725,⁵⁰ a French master, Francis Julien, as early as 1734,⁵¹ and a different one, M. Lemoine, in 1746.⁵² In 1708, a writing master, Ralph Bragge, gentleman, rented the Corner House. Although there are no records of students' payments, he obviously found a good business there as he renewed his lease in 1715 and did not leave Eton until 1721.⁵³ Writing masters cannot be considered tutors of

modern subjects, but French was certainly an extra subject required by parents who were more modern in their thinking about education.

Sir John Clerk of Penicuik sent his son a plan of learning which indicated that he was aware of the availability of subjects such as French, fencing, and dancing at Eton as early as 1715. However, he recommended that his son avoid the first 'until a more fit opportunity' and the second 'until his body were better knit' and not to spend too much time on the third.⁵⁴

Therefore, on the basis of Eton, the indications are that the modern thinking about school curricula which was so much in evidence in the advertisements of private academies, had not infiltrated the public schools quite as thoroughly. Some parents were obviously aware of the changes taking place in educational theory and were willing to make some concessions according to their personal inclinations. On the whole, however, they felt the emphasis of education should be on the classical, traditional subjects and this was why they sent their sons to a public school.

When did the necessity of their sons being 'men of taste' and connoisseurs become important enough to the parents of public school boys that they saw modern subjects as important as traditional? The evidence at Eton indicates an early, if limited, awareness towards French, fencing and dancing, but what of such truly 'idle' pursuits as music and drawing?

It has been suggested by Michael McCarthy, in his thesis on amateur architects in England, that architectural drawing may have been taught at Eton in the first half of

the century. A drawing in the Worsley collection at Hovingham Hall is signed and dated 'T.W.Etonensis 1728'. This pen, ink and wash drawing of the capital and base of a column led McCarthy to assume that the first architectural training for the future surveyor of the King's works, Thomas Worsley (1710-1778), was at Eton. On this basis, McCarthy also suggested that John Chute (1701-1776), the future architect of Strawberry Hill, may also have had some architectural training during his year at Eton in 1717, although in this case there is even less evidence: no drawings from his Eton period and no reference in his letters.

56

McCarthy found a further interesting reference to a young amateur at Eton. He noted that Horace Walpole, in his manuscript 'Book of Materials' (1759), mentioned that Richard, second Lord Edgecombe (1716-1761), was the best genius for drawing he knew, but seldom practiced it and, at the age of fifteen, painted stage sets for plays at Eton.⁵⁷ On such evidence, it would be an exaggeration to state any more than that some young men who attended Eton became amateur architects and several more, certainly, became patrons of the arts. There is really no evidence to indicate that Eton was responsible for creating these early 'men of taste'. It is more likely in these particular cases that their interests and abilities were the products of the circle of friends they moved in rather than a modern education received at Eton.

These young men's interests and abilities to draw may also have been the result of drawing lessons received at home. As mentioned earlier, this was not a widespread practice in the first half of the century, but nevertheless,

some children were provided with drawing masters or given perhaps one session of lessons with one before going to school or while at home on holidays. Horace Walpole was one of these children. He received lessons from Bernard Lens III at home when he was very young: a drawing by Lens of Walpole aged about four, drawing under a table, is now at Chewton Priory. It has already been noted in an earlier chapter that in his annotations to Vertue's notebooks, Walpole described Lens as his drawing master. A drawing by Lens, now in the Lewis Walpole Library at Farmington (see App.C), is inscribed by Walpole 'Drawn about 1732 to adorn a copy of Bacchus Verses'. These verses were composed by pupils and hung in the hall at Eton. The more wealthy pupils had the theme illustrated at the top of the roll by professional artists (see App.C). As a contemporary saw Lens giving Walpole instructions at this time, at his father's house in London, it would seem that Walpole did indeed receive private lessons at home and certainly that Lens was not a drawing master at Eton giving lessons to all the boys there. It is also worth noting that it was probably Lens who taught Walpole to make miniature copies in watercolour of paintings by Watteau and Parmigianino. Two of these, which he made with his mother in 1736 during visits home from Cambridge, are now in the Lewis Walpole Collection at Farmington.

58

With the Welby family account book, however, comes concrete evidence that by the middle of the century, drawing lessons were being provided to at least one Eton collegier while actually at Eton. William Welby (1734-1801) of Denton, Lincolnshire, had attended Mr. King's School, Colly

59

Weston, Northamptonshire, from May 1742 to October 1744, when he went on to Grantham School only a few miles from Denton. In September, 1748, he was sent to the Academy at Heath, Chesterfield. It appears from the Whichcote and Monson family papers now in the Lincolnshire County Record Office (see App.E), that it was quite common for boys from the area to be educated at a local school first before being sent on to London.

In January 1750, Welby was sent to Eton and lodged at Pote the bookseller's. Eleven months later, a letter to his father from the Reverend J. Ewer, the Canon of Windsor (a former assistant master and private tutor at Eton) indicated that although the boy did 'pretty well', his teachers reported that he was heedless and did not improve himself as much as expected. The tutor recommended that William apply himself 'singly and closely to his School-Business, neglecting for the present other studies, my reason for this is, that I look upon School Learning as the Foundation, and other parts of Knowledge as Super-structure, I would therefore lay the Foundation firm, before I thought of binding anything upon it'. The Canon's advice indicates that he was of the old school and did not hold with the modern education evidently being provided William, and thought that, at the age of seventeen, William still had not enough of the 'foundation' subjects.

The advice was partially heeded in that the music lessons by Mr. Scammardine of Grantham took place at home only during the holidays. There are payments, however, to 'Mr. Lens for teaching my Son to draw' in May and July, 1751. No further extra tuition is recorded in the account book and in 1753 William went on to Clare Hall, Cambridge.

In 1801, he was created a Baronet and from 1802 to 1806 he was the M.P. for Grantham. The Welby family papers are presently unavailable so it is impossible to state which Lens it may have been that taught William while he was at Eton in 1751. In Appendix C some attempt has been made to ascertain which Lenses were working where at this period and what type of drawings and drawing manuals they were producing.

Drawing lessons available at Oxford and Cambridge are discussed elsewhere by Ian Fleming-Williams,⁶⁰ but, as William Welby had begun drawing lessons at Eton and may have wished to continue them at Cambridge in 1753, it is worth noting briefly here that another family advisor, the Earl of Chatham, asked his nephew, Thomas Pitt, to 'forbear drawing⁶¹ totally, while you are at Cambridge'. However, recommended or not, drawing masters were certainly available to students at Eton in 1751, and they were well-established at Eton by the end of that decade. Robert Grimston, whose family is discussed above and who attended Eton from 1759-64, took lessons there from Alexander Cozens (see App.I, p.359).⁶² Oppé in his monograph on the Cozenses, transcribes a letter to another student at Eton, Ralph Grey, who thought his new drawing master, from whom he had taken a few lessons, better than the other (they are not named).

It appears from this brief discussion that there was an increase in demand at Eton in the 1750's for drawing lessons for pupils there. Whether they had already received lessons elsewhere is not known. However, a drawing master appeared at Harrow shortly after the arrival of Thomas Grimston in 1769, who had had drawing lessons at his previous school - a

private preparatory school, Cheam. It would seem, then, that the availability of drawing lessons to students at public schools like Eton and Harrow was possibly the result of an indirect pressure from private academies and preparatory schools, as well as the increasing social pressure to produce young gentlemen of taste and connoisseurs.

Having established some reasons why and when drawing was introduced to the guardians of the classical tradition of education, the public schools, I would like to look in depth at Eton and the activities of the first drawing master there about whom we know enough to make the study profitable: Alexander Cozens. By examining the evidence left by his art and publications and the work and letters of his pupils, we should be able to establish whether the methods he used to teach drawing reflected the educational reforms which had already begun in private academies and preparatory schools.

Earlier in this chapter, for example, we noted that Sawrey Gilpin had taken his young students out of doors to draw from nature and he had reduced the amount of copying and the emphasis on the necessity of precise outlines. What would the young men, who were a product of these new methods, expect and receive when their drawing lessons were continued in the next stage of their education, at Eton?

To answer this question we must examine the exact nature of the methods Cozens used to teach drawing to the pupils at Eton and whether these methods differed from the traditional ones used in the first half of the century. If Cozens's methods were different, then we must examine whether this was because of the particular needs of his

pupils at Eton, or because Cozens himself had been trained in an unusual way and he was simply passing it on to his students.

THE GILPINS, GRIMSTONS, AND CHEAM PREPARATORY SCHOOL

1. I doubt, for example, whether any drawing master in the first half of the century would have been able to produce such an extensive list of pupils as that advertised by William Austin in 1768, which contained no less than four hundred names (see App.A). The use of the date 1750 here is only a convenience and is not intended to be the specific date that this change took place.
2. For information about Fountayne and Goodenough's and other preparatory schools, see Appendix B.
3. Peel, p. 22.
4. *ibid.*, pp. 43-4.
5. William Gilpin, Regulations of a Private School at Cheam in Surrey (1752), p. 4.
6. Peel, p. 30. For the cost of drawing lessons at this time, see Appendix F, p. 222.
7. See Carl Paul Barbier, William Gilpin (1963), (hereafter Barbier, 1963) p. 27, and William D. Templeman, The Life and Work of William Gilpin, pp. 67-77.
8. Barbier, 1963, pp. 6, 22. In the 'Memoirs of Dr. Richard Gilpin' by William Gilpin, p. 75, Gilpin specifically discusses Dr. John Brown as the author of The Estimate and Examination of Lord Shaftesbury's Philosophy (1757).
9. It is important to note that most art historians discussing Locke's influence on artistic theories in the eighteenth century, base their discussions on Locke's theories of association and his philosophical, methodological approach, mainly as found in his Essay Concerning Human Understanding (1690). See for example Dr. Carol Gibson-Wood's discussion of Locke's influence on Jonathan Richardson mentioned in chapter three of this thesis and Carter Radcliffe's discussion of Locke's influence on Gilpin's theory of picturesque beauty in 'Pastoral Properties', Art in America, vol. 69, November (1981), pp. 151-5. The influence on Gilpin that I claim for Locke and Shaftesbury is more direct - their exhortations to include drawing in a gentleman's or even a child's education.
10. Peel, p. 43.
11. Humberside County Record Office, Grimston Papers (hereafter DDGR) 42/33, February 5, 1767.
12. See Barbier, 1963, p. 37. There is a very large number of letters from Cheam and Barbier could really only mention a few in passing. I shall quote from these papers extensively and it should be understood that if Barbier is not footnoted or mentioned, then the letter in question is

not discussed by him, nor to my knowledge has it been published by any other author.

13. For sale catalogues see DDGR 38/4-7. For suggested grand tour itinerary see DDGR 41/8. General biographical information about the Grimston family can be found in M. E. Ingram, Leaves from a Family Tree.

14. DDGR 42/1. 'Lord Newnham' mentioned in the letter is George Simon, Viscount Nuneham, later second Earl Harcourt (1736-1809) whose activities as an amateur artist will be discussed later in this thesis.

15. For reference to John Grimston drawing caricatures, see DDGR 42/20, letter of January 20, 1770; for correspondence with print dealer Robert Dingley, see DDGR 42/3 (5th May, 1753), 42/4 (16 November, 1754), with Peter Mazell see 42/18 (3rd May, 1768), John Boydell, 42/19 (1st July, 1769), Thomas Fentham, 42/23 (19th October, 1773), Valentine Green, 42/23 (23rd October, 1773), Rod. Valtravers, 42/23 (11th November, 1773) and 42/24 (19th April, 1774); as patron to Sawrey Gilpin, 42/21 (7th July, 1771); and finally, as patron to James Hopwood, 42/26 (1st April, 1776), whom Grimston had sent to Benjamin West for advice. (His patronage of Alexander Cozens will be discussed later.)

16. DDGR 42/11 and 12. Ingram, p. 80, transcribes part of Williams's letter. Another letter discussing what subjects ought to be taught at preparatory schools is transcribed in Appendix A. It concerns the curriculum at Doctor Goodenough's school at Ealing fifteen years later.

17. There are several excerpts from these letters in Barbier (1963), p. 37, but those quoted here are not mentioned by him.

18. DDGR 42/13, 12th January, 1763.

19. DDGR 42/33, November, 1768.

20. DDGR 42/33, 20th November, 1769.

21. DDGR 42/33, 5th February, 1767 and 19th April, 1767.

22. DDGR 42/17, 22nd August, 1767.

23. See A. Macnaghten, Windsor and Eton in Georgian Times, p.33.

24. DDGR 42/33, July, 1769.

25. DDGR 42/19, 2nd October, 1769, quoted by Ingram, pp. 85-6. The letter is signed with the initials W.W. who may be W.C. Williams mentioned in connection with Cheam, or William Whately, who appears to have acted as London agent for John Grimston. Incidentally, this letter continues: 'Tassoni the Dancer being lately engaged as Dancing Master to the School', which refutes the statement in W.T.J. Gun's Harrow School Register, p. 158 that Tasoni was the drawing master there in 1770.

26. DDGR 42/24. Letter from Benjamin Heath to John Grimston from Harrow, 27th January, 1775: `...the Drawing Master has made a mistake in his Bill having put Christmas instead of Michelmas...`.
27. See Appendix A. There is some confusion about which John Spilsbury taught at Harrow, as R. Young, in her biography Father and Daughter (1952), p. 5, states that Jonathan Spilsbury's brother died young at about the age of thirty. It is doubtful, then that he taught at Harrow. Jonathan practiced miniature painting and did all kinds of engravings. There are examples by him and his brother in the British Museum Print Room (Eng. Etch. c.6* and Engr. C. 18*). Some of the etchings are of heads done in a Rembrandtesque manner, some are numbered, and some are bound in a paper cover, intended perhaps to be a form of drawing book (1861-4-13-528-33, inscribed `J Spilsbury fecit 1776`).
28. William Gilpin, Two Essays: one, on the author's mode of executing rough sketches; the other on the principles on which they are composed (1804).
29. *ibid.*, p. 38.
30. *ibid.*, pp. 40-1.
31. *ibid.*, p. 42.
32. *ibid.*, p. 43.
33. Ingram, p. 104 mentions that two of Thomas Grimston's notebooks from Trinity Hall, Cambridge (1773 and 1774) contain lecture notes interspersed with drawings of poultry, dogs, people, etc. `showing the owner was not always an assiduous scholar`. The notebooks are now in the Hull Central Library. Upon examining photocopies of the drawings, it was clear from the costumes that, although they were college characters, they dated from the 1830's. When I enquired whether the lecture notes were dated, Michael Boardman, the Director of Leisure Services informed me (by letter, 6th June, 1983) that the 1774 book had apparently later been turned upside down and used from the back, one note including a reference to some books discovered at Turin in 1817.
34. DDGR 42/23, 25th April, 1773.
35. DDGR 42/26, 11th May, 1776.
36. Ingram, p. 111.
37. DDGR 42/26, 27.
38. William Gilpin, An Essay upon Prints: containing Remarks upon the Principles of Picturesque Beauty; the Different Kinds of Prints;... (1768, 2nd edition), Preface, pp.iii-iv.
39. *ibid.*, (1768, 1st edition), p. 23.
40. *ibid.*, (1768, 1st edition), p. 9.

41. DDGR 42/21, 7th July, 1771.
42. DDGR 42/30, 21st May, 1780 and Bodleian Library, Gilpin Papers (hereafter Bodleian), MSS Eng. Misc. d. 570a, f. 109, 110. This was probably either a misunderstanding or a delay caused by the amount of time that it took to get John Grimston's affairs in order.
43. Gilpin, Memoirs, pp. 134-5.
44. Bodleian, MSS Eng. Misc. d. 570, f. 54 (letter to William Mason from Gilpin at Cheam, 10th July, 1776). The DNB states that Mitford wrote The History of Greece (1784-1810) at Gibbon's suggestion and was also the author of several miscellaneous works which included Principles of design in Architecture (1824).
45. Barbier, 1963, pp. 158-61.
46. Bodleian, MSS Eng. Misc. d. 570, f. 40 (letter to William Mason from Gilpin at Cheam, 6th January, 1776).
47. Bedfordshire Record Office, Wrest Park (Lucas) Papers (hereafter L), L30/9/97/108. The correspondence between Agnetta Yorke, née Johnson (fl. from 1771-d.1820), her children, and Gilpin is scattered but the letters are full of interesting details concerning the type of advice Gilpin was giving amateurs at this later period. Agnetta Yorke was an Honorary Exhibitor of landscapes in crayons at the Society of Arts from 1771-75. Barbier, 1963, transcribes part of the 1788 correspondence on p. 156 but the other letters of this date are in the Bodleian: MSS Eng. Misc. c. 390, f. 371-82. One of these letters may refer to an etching now in the Lewis Walpole Library, Farmington (Illus.23).

Dear Sir,

Your flattering Acceptance and Approbation of some little Works I sent you last year emboldens me to take the same Liberty again, and I hope you will think I have made some progress in the art I am so fond of. It is indeed highly necessary that I should bespeak your Candor & friendship on the Occasion, since I have been so presumptuous as to aim at aplying [sic] the uncommon force & spirit of one of your drawings in a common Etching - I wish my Vanity could head me so far as to fancy I had succeeded, but alas! on this Occasion it entirely fails me, as I am too sensible that the Attempt only serves to display my Inability... (Bodleian, MSS Eng. Misc. c. 390, f. 379).

There are much earlier letters, dating from the time Charles attended Cheam (from June, 1771), in L30/9/97/15, 31. Others (L30/9/97/77, 108, 192) date from 1781, when Gilpin sent sketches from several of his tours to Agnetta Yorke and she advised that he publish them in aquatint 'as a manner most likely to preserve the spirit of his drawings' (L 30/9/97/77). At this time, Charles, Caroline and their mother, all were making drawings or etchings in the style of, or after, Gilpin's drawings. Several of their etchings

and aquatints are preserved in the British Museum Print Room folders of English etchings, in the Lewis Walpole Library volumes of amateur etchings collected by Walpole, and in an album of family etchings and drawings in the possession of their descendant, Baroness Lucas.

48. 'An Eton Boy's Accounts', Etoniana, no. 47, (October 4, 1929), p. 742. The boy who received the lessons was William Earle Welby. The implications of these accounts will be discussed in more detail later.

49. 'Nugae Etonensis', Etoniana, no. 4 (3rd June, 1905), p. 61.

50. *ibid.*, p. 64.

51. Etoniana, no. 76 (11th November, 1939), p. 401.

52. 'Assistant Masters at Eton', Etoniana, no. 85 (1st March, 1941), p. 551.

53. 'Buildings at Eton', Etoniana (1st February, 1946), p. 25.

54. 'A Scotch Boy at Eton in the Early Eighteenth Century', Etoniana, no. 124 (27th November, 1971), p. 370.

55. Michael McCarthy, 'Amateur Architects in England 1740-1770' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, 1972), p. 18.

56. *ibid.* Chute's cousin, Thomas Barrett-Lennard (1717-1786), later Lord Dacre, was another member of this amateur circle who at Harrow 'learnt surveying and drawing on half holidays'. The letter which this information is taken from, is published in full in An Account of the Families of Barrett-Lennard by Thomas Barrett-Lennard (1908), p. 582. However, from the names mentioned in the letter (Weston, Rossam), I think it must have been written at Weston's Academy in Greenwich, rather than from Harrow. This would seem to reinforce my premise that the private academies were well-ahead of Harrow and other public schools in their introduction of such modern subjects.

57. *ibid.*, p. 17. The MS is in the Lewis Walpole Library, Farmington.

58. Wilmarth Sheldon Lewis, Horace Walpole, p. 16, reproduced plate 5.

59. 'An Eton Boy's Accounts 1750-2', Etoniana no. 42 (4th October, 1929), pp. 740-44.

60. Fleming-Williams, 'Drawing Masters', pp. 221, 228-34 and 'The Amateur', pp.

61. Noted by McCarthy, p. 17 from Lord Grenville, editor, Letters written by the Late Earl of Chatham to his Nephew Thos. Pitt, Esq... 3rd edition (1804) London, pp. 15-17. Chatham's recommended course of study was: Euclid, Logic, Locke, Horace, Virgil, Tully, Sallust, History of England,

French, and Addison's Spectator. Thomas was not to meddle in Greek or Italian. 'I hope this little course will soon be run through: I intend it as a general foundation for many things of infinite utility, to come as soon as this is finished'.

62. A. Paul Oppé, Alexander and John Robert Cozens, p. 26.

CHAPTER 5:

ALEXANDER COZENS'S EARLY TRAINING

It has always been assumed that Alexander Cozens received his first artistic training in Russia, where he was known to have been born to English parents c.1717. The first evidence until now of his presence in England was the 1742 engraving of Eton College by John Pine (1690-1756), inscribed 'A Cozens delin.'¹ There were no contemporary or earlier references to Cozens in the London art world before this engraving of 1742, which appeared to be after a drawing by a competent, fully-formed artist in his mid-twenties. This led A.P.Oppé to discuss what form Cozens's training in Russia might have taken during this formative period.²

In the past few years, however, evidence has come to light that brings some of Oppé's assumptions and conclusions into question and demands a new review of Cozens's early and formative years. A document was discovered in Leningrad which indicated that Alexander Cozens was sent to England at the age of ten, in 1726, by his father Richard. Alexander was still there in 1736 when his recently-widowed mother in Archangel petitioned the Czarina Anne for financial assistance to continue his and his brother's educations in London. In her petition, Mrs. Cozens stated that Alexander was studying painting and his brother Peter was studying Latin.³

It is not known where Alexander was studying painting in London in 1736 or which school he had attended before beginning these studies - that is, up to the age of thirteen or fourteen when an apprenticeship would have begun. Weston's Academy in Greenwich suggests itself naturally as

an answer to this question. His parents' relatives were still in Deptford and Woolwich where Weston's school was well-known, especially to seafaring families, many members of which were in Russia with Richard Cozens. It is likely that Alexander's younger brother, Peter, attended the same school, perhaps concentrating on the more traditional subjects.

John Pine might be suggested as a possible master to whom Alexander might have been apprenticed, not only because the later connections with the Pine family were so strong, but also because a recently-discovered item in the Museum of London (A.24225)(App.H, pl.2 & 3) might indicate that Cozens⁴ trained as an etcher.

The item was originally catalogued as a token but it is, in fact, a re-etched worn ha'penny from the reign of William III.⁵ The coin is etched in reverse: the recto has a typically Cozens landscape with a building and windblown trees and hills in the distance, circumscribed by a double line, with the inscription 'A Cozen²..fecit 1733' and the verso depicts a three-quarters view of a bearded old man's head, within a thicker single line encircling it and the inscription 'A Cozen⁸.~'.

The depth of the acid-biting on the verso and the incorrect direction of the 's' indicate that Cozens was still a student of the etching process. George Stubbs mentioned that he had been taught to etch on worn, worthless coins in Leeds in 1747, so it is quite possible that this⁶ was not an uncommon step in learning to etch.

John Pine was an engraver who had probably been taught by John Sturt, a silver- and copper-plate engraver, who was

mentioned earlier in connection with the school he ran with Bernard Lens II. Pine was later the King's signet and die maker,⁷ and, as many artists (Stubbs and Hogarth to name only two) learned to etch before they learned to paint, it is tempting to see Alexander Cozens apprenticed to Pine and attending evening life-drawing classes.

It is interesting that this etched ha'penny, the first example of Cozens's work, contains a landscape. John Pine executed topographical drawings (although only his engravings after them survive), but this landscape appears to be an imaginary one. George Lambert and William Taverner were almost the only English landscapists at this early date, yet this seems to be Cozens's preferred subject, as the next example of work by him, three years later, is also a landscape - a windbreak of trees (Illus. 24). It is difficult to make stylistic comparisons with the work of the two artists mentioned above because so few of their pen and ink drawings survive, but Cozens's work has many of the same characteristics as that of a contemporary amateur, J. Hadley (fl.1729-58). His landscape drawings now in the Victoria and Albert Museum have the same rough hatching and loopy foliage as Cozens's landscape on the etched coin in particular, but they also compare favourably with The windbreak of trees.⁸ This drawing is signed and dated 1736 - the year of his mother's petition which stated that he was studying painting. It is idle to speculate further whether Cozens had been studying etching or painting in London in the 1730's, but he certainly appears to have concentrated on the latter by the evidence of his drawing of Eton and his activities in Italy in 1746.⁹

However, what is important for our purpose here, is

that he returned to Russia sometime after the Eton drawing and before the Italian trip, since he sailed from St. Petersburg to Leghorn.¹⁰ In 1737, the Czarina, via the Russian Admiralty, had agreed to give Mrs. Cozens financial assistance, if her sons would return to St. Petersburg to study shipbuilding. Mrs. Cozens had promised their return, in any case, since she was their sole support - the only question that now remains being when.

Asya Kantor-Gukovskaya thinks a visit took place between 1734 and 1741, her cut-off date being a return to England to draw the Eton print published in 1742. I believe it unlikely, however, that Cozens would have returned such a long way for a short visit before his mother's petition of 1736, which stated he was in London, and I also think it unlikely he would return to Russia in 1737 or '38, when the authorities wished him to change his already-established apprenticeship or career from painting to shipbuilding. Instead, I would like to propose that he stayed on in England to finish his studies or apprenticeship until he was capable of earning a living, and then returned to Russia to help his mother, who is not recorded to have received the financial assistance she had requested.

The drawing of Eton may have been one of these attempts at financial independence, and the fact that it was published in 1742 does not necessarily mean that it was drawn that year. It was published by William Collier in the same year as a plan of Windsor Little Park and Eton, which was surveyed and drawn by Collier and also engraved by Pine. This project may have taken a few years to complete and Alexander Cozens could easily have made the drawing and left

England two or three years before the two prints were published in 1742. I think it likely that he returned to Russia c.1739 or '40, to Archangel first where his mother lived and where William Beckford mentioned he had arrived, and then on to St. Petersburg where there would be more opportunities of employment in the artistic field.

There was an art department in the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg, and, as it was the only place in Russia producing secular works of art, it is probable that he worked there. Since previous writers have assumed that Cozens was in Russia earlier or for a shorter period, the possible influence of the artists working in Russia at this period, c.1739-46, has never been discussed.

Only one signed and dated drawing of this period by Cozens survives. It is again a landscape, this time of a house on the banks of a river with a large tree in the left foreground and mountains in the distance (BM P & D 1923-10-16-2)(Illus. 25). It is in pen and ink and signed and dated 1743. Whereas the 1736 drawing of a windbreak of trees was done in sketchy pen and ink with wash and looks a distinctly English landscape, the 1743 one is a careful, unwashed, line drawing and the walled house with its steeply-pitched roof looks decidedly northern-European in character. There is an early drawing in the Victoria and Albert Museum (E.2765-1930)(Illus. 26) of a house amongst trees which fits the 1736 drawing in style, but fits the later one in subject.

The British Museum and Victoria and Albert drawings have something of the character and style of the popular Flemish and Dutch real and imaginary landscape engravings, often reproduced in drawing books: indeed, Oppé thought the 1743 drawing might be a direct copy of a seventeenth-century

11
print. The 1736 drawing, on the other hand, has quite a different character and is probably drawn from nature. The presence of Francis Vivares and J.B. Chatelin in London in the 1730's, and Alexander's evident later recommendation to a student to study prints by Anthonie Waterloo, would seem to point to a very strong early influence on Cozens of this type of landscape print.¹²

Netherlandish art was also very popular in Russia in the first half of the century because of Peter the Great's fondness for it, but through his and his successors's reigns, the type of Netherlandish art preferred took on a strongly rococo flavour due to French style's influence. Blue and white Dutch tiles covered the tall corner ovens and even lined the rooms in the palaces and homes of wealthy Russians. Peterhof was decorated with rococo carving by Nicholas Pineau (1684-1754), and Monplaisir had seventeenth-century Dutch paintings inserted in the wall-panels and ceilings painted with peacocks, parrots and Watteauesque figures by Philippe Pillement (in Russia from 1717). Louis Caravaque (to Russia 1717, d.1754) was the chief painter in oils for nearly fifty years, ensuring the continuance of French influence. In 1735, Bartolomeo Tarsia (to Russia c.1725, d.1765) was recalled by Czarina Anne from Italy where he had been banished by her predecessor. He was responsible for the extremely rococo style of the decorations of her ceilings and murals, and was a good draughtsman.¹³

Italian influence on the development of art in Russia was also exerted by Giuseppi Valeriani (in Russia 1742, d.1761), the Professor of Perspective at the Academy of

Sciences, who was also responsible for some remarkable stage designs. The most influential engraver in Russia was a German, C.A. Wortmann (1692-1760), and the instructor of the life drawing classes was the Austrian, Elias Grimmel (1703-¹⁴ 1759).

Nicholas Pevsner, in his discussion of the Academy of Art in St. Petersburg, which had been founded in 1757, mentioned that there had been a drawing class for engravers in the Imperial Printing Press from 1717, and a fine art class in the Academy of Science from 1725, but these did not¹⁵ develop satisfactorily. Pevsner's concern was with national academies of art, such as the Royal Academy in England, and he, therefore, concentrated on the Academy of Art founded in St. Petersburg in 1757. Julius Hassleblatt indicated, however, that far from not developing satisfactorily, the Art Department in the Academy of Sciences thrived. Every student at the Academy of Sciences, no matter what their main field of study was, had to draw from nature three times a week. Several of the artists¹⁶ mentioned above were teachers in this department.

A description of the Imperial Academy of Science, published in 1741, detailed two thriving art departments,¹⁷ for the fine and mechanical arts. The names of the instructors are not included but there is an extensive list of the numbers of master, associate, and apprentice painters, draughtsmen, engravers, copper-plate engravers, printmakers, and so on - a total of sixty-eight in the fine arts department alone. A school or 'gymnaseum' for the soldiers' children in the Academy of Sciences had French, dancing, and drawing masters, a Rector, as well as a Russian priest, and of the one hundred and thirteen pupils named,

several were English and German. If Alexander Cozens had returned to Russia after his education, to serve the Czarina as his mother had promised in 1736, then there would have been ample opportunity at the Academy of Sciences.

Alexander Cozens's early years have been re-traced with the new evidence in order to discover something of the methods with which he himself had learned to draw, and thus perhaps shed some light on his own teaching methods. We have found that during the ten or fifteen years of his education in England, he learned to etch (whether he was self-taught or apprenticed remains open to speculation) and to draw landscapes from nature as well as compose his own. His style tended towards the Northern European version of rococo and the view of Eton showed him to be a competent topographical draughtsman with a knowledge of perspective and the English and Dutch predilection for enlivening, anecdotal staffage in the foreground. The one drawing most likely to have been made in Russia, in 1743, with its careful pen and ink outline appears to have been intended to be etched or engraved as the Eton drawing had been. The influence of the Russian years should be very evident in the drawings Cozens produced in Italy in 1746. I have mentioned the artists with whom Cozens would have come in contact in Russia in the 1740's and where: it remains, then, to look at their work.

The work of the art department of the Academy of Sciences was to produce illustrations for the Academy's publications. This 'hack' work mainly consisted of portraits, views, plans of towns and architecture, maps, and historical scenes. They were also responsible for designing

the allegorical figures and motifs which were presented as illuminations or fireworks four or five times a year. Individual artistic expression was not encouraged and as a result the only type of art that flourished was copper-plate engraving.¹⁸

The best examples of the work produced by the art department of the Academy of Sciences are to be found in the 1741 description of the Academy mentioned above, and in a number of engravings by M. Makhaev of 1753, which commemorated the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of St. Petersburg.¹⁹ These engravings provide the best evidence of the type of work that Cozens would have done in Russia because they were drawn and engraved by men who would have been his contemporaries at the Academy in the 1740's.

Valeriani had taught them well, as their perspective on such difficult prospects as the fortress of SS. Peter and Paul seems faultless. The buildings of Eton college, the houses in the early landscapes, the buildings he drew in Italy, and, indeed, the lost publication of 1765,²⁰ all show that Cozens had a good grasp of the theories and practice of perspective. The original drawings for Makhaev's engraved views of St. Petersburg must have been careful pen and ink ones, much like Cozens's own Eton and 1743 drawings and several he produced in Rome (see Illus. 27 for example)²¹ with attention paid to the details, texture, and shading of all the objects depicted, whether buildings, water, or sky. The figures, however, are often slightly awkward in their bundled shapes and poses - copies of drawing manual figures, without the accuracy and proportions of the originals. Cozens's clothed figures are passable in his Eton and Italian view, but the bathers in the foreground of the Eton

engraving (Illus. 28) and all nude figures he attempted in the Italian sketchbook now at Yale (Illus. 29 & 36) as well as later scenes with bathers (Illus. 30) gave him a great deal of trouble.

The first definite evidence we have about Alexander's learning process in becoming an artist, is from his visit to Italy in 1746. According to the above-mentioned letter from William Beckford, Cozens sailed from St. Petersburg via Norway and Finland, past England, where he had many friends, through the Straits of Gibraltar, then past Corsica to land at Leghorn. The sketchbook he used in Italy is full of notes to himself about what to study and lists of methods to facilitate the process of sketching from nature and making finished drawings from these.²²

The possible identity of the people Cozens mentions in the sketchbook and the lists of methods for sketching and drawing are thoroughly discussed by Oppé in his 1952 monograph in the chapter on Rome. He all but dismisses the idea that Joseph Vernet (1714-89), mentioned by Cozens as his tutor in landscapes, had any influence on Cozens's Roman drawings. Oppé allows only that 'the regular attendance would have familiarized him with the management of scenes on canvas for which the Frenchman was rightly famous, and with the manipulation of brush and oil paint',²³ and he also suggested that Cozens's later abstinence from colour may have been due to his reliance on memory - 'part of Vernet's teaching, because the effects of nature are frequently too fugitive to be copied on the spot'.²⁴

New research necessitates the re-examination of Oppé's conclusions concerning Vernet's influence. The exhibition

of the latter's work at Kenwood in 1976, organized by Philip Conisbee, included a selection of his drawings which had never been studied before.²⁵ When one sees a group of these, it is immediately evident that Vernet did exert an influence in media, style and composition on Cozens's work in Italy and later.

The similarity of Cozens's wash drawing style and blots to the drawings of Claude Lorrain have often been remarked upon: most extensively by Luke Herrmann, who found it 'difficult not to see Cozens's brown works as a deliberate and systematic attempt to emulate the manifold lessons of Claude Lorrain's rich and varied draughtsmanship', and stated that 'Cozens saw and recorded nature with Claude uppermost in his mind'.²⁶ Deborah Howard, however, has argued that Cozens could not have seen any of Claude's drawings in England or Italy before 1746 and, in any case, his Roman drawings did not resemble Claude's and it was only with his later blot drawings that he began to look at drawings by the seventeenth-century artist.²⁷

Before reaching these conclusions, however, Deborah Howard did admit that Cozens had worked with 'the French Claude', Vernet, and he did sketch from nature, as Claude had done. I think it is important, in this argument, to stress two of Conisbee's statements in his section on Vernet's drawings: that Vernet had attended the French Academy at Rome, where he would have been encouraged as a landscape draughtsman (ie. not just to paint in oils from nature, as has been stressed too often), and that Vernet's drawing style was comparable with that of Gaspar van Wittel, 'Vanvitelli', which, in turn, derived from 'traditions established by Claude and other northern draughtsmen in

Italy during the seventeenth century'.²⁸ Cozens, therefore, did not need to study original drawings or paintings by Claude in order to be steeped in his style, composition and way of looking at and sketching from nature. That he was, indeed, completely familiar with these characteristics of Claude's work by the early 1750's (even then still possibly without having seen original drawings by Claude), will become evident in my later discussion about his teaching during that decade.

It is easy to draw attention to several specific influences of Vernet on Cozens. Vernet's early and pre-Roman style is very rococo and decorative, something Cozens would feel familiar with from his early training in England and the decorative works on public display in Russia. The three earliest landscapes by Cozens (Illus. 24-6) are characterized by 'loopy' foliage, as well as careful outlines and loose washes, also found in Vernet's work. One motif in particular recurs frequently with prominence in both their work, the knotty or blasted tree as a framing device or in the centre foreground, and it is interesting to note that both artists produced series of drawings of studies of both trees and ships.²⁹ It is also worth remembering that Vernet did topographical landscapes as well as imaginary ones.

The choice of view points from which to draw, sometimes even of the same subjects, is probably explicable by a closer relationship than the fact that they were more than just acquaintances in Rome.³⁰ Oppé mentioned that the Harbour scene, with a tower on the right (Illus. 31) was a distillation of Cozens's Roman Italian experience,³¹ but it

is so remarkably close in composition to Vernet's Seaport: morning (Vernet cat.no.29) that it is more likely a distillation of what Cozens knew of Vernet's works. Among the so-called 'snuff-box' drawings in Mr. Oppé's collection, there was a view of a harbour that was close compositionally to another oil in Vernet's studio at this time - Harbour scene with a round tower: morning (Vernet cat.no.14).

Even more important, however, is Cozens's experimentation with materials and techniques in his drawings from Italy. The pen and ink line drawings at which he was already adept recur with the most frequency in his Italian work and make up the majority of them, along with the loosely drawn, loosely washed drawings. Vernet's drawings contain many examples in pen and ink with brown and/or grey wash like many of Cozens's works in the British Museum (L.B.15a, 16b for example), but there are also some in brown wash with little or no pen work (Vernet cat.no.56 for example) which approach Claude's work very closely. There is at least one attempt by Cozens in this manner, albeit with grey wash and less success, in the BM: On the banks of a river (Illus. 32). This is one of his first blots, in that it is a drawing without an underlying pencil or ink sketch. However, Cozens's experimentation with yet another technique is perhaps even more important. At least one Vernet drawing, of figures by a tree (Vernet cat.no.64), was drawn with pen and ink on paper that was still wet. This was, apparently, a popular technique with the Roman followers of the seventeenth-century tradition, and interestingly two of Cozens's drawings in the BM (LB. 30a,b) show a similar idea - grey wash was applied to sepia outlines while they were still wet.

Vernet's reliance on brown and grey washes in his drawings from nature may have influenced Cozens's own palette and account for the infrequent presence of colour in his work, rather than a reliance on memory, which was suggested by Oppé (above). In later life, Cozens stated that his preference for grey or black washes was due to a wish to 'block out' and emphasize light and shade and this was probably Vernet's purpose too.

Having established Vernet's role in Cozens's Italian oeuvre, it will be easier to recognize it when we come to discuss Cozens's own teaching methods. Meanwhile, what of Cozens's other artistic activities in Rome, known from his sketchbook - the landscape systems, the vow to 'etch much', and the figural drawings it contains?

Although the landscape systems in the Roman sketchbook have been discussed in the literature, it would be appropriate to re-evaluate them here with regard to their future application in his teaching. Several methods or systems of drawing landscapes are listed in the Roman sketchbook and their numbering is not clear until one reaches the fourth, for travelling, on page 12r. Up until this method, they are basically the same, with variations according to whether the paper is coloured or white, or the lighting of the landscape is fixed, as on a summer's day, or fine or very bright. These factors determine which tint to use on the sky or landscape in the three degrees of ground - distant, middle and foreground. The methods also vary slightly according to whether the drawing is to be finished in pen and ink, wash, or dry colours.

The basic method is found on page 7r and consists of

the following seven steps: 1. sketch from life 2. enlarge the parts at home 3. correct these enlarged parts from life 4. correct the whole from these parts with ink at home 5. shade the whole with lead pencil from life 6. finish with indian ink at home 7. colour from life with dry colours and leather stumps. Cozens was placing a traditional emphasis upon the three distances or tints, the correctness of the details, and the accuracy of the lighting.

Methods four to six are for drawing while travelling, number five being the best while one is actually moving, and number six for a quick sketch, once one is in a fixed place. This latter method involved thirty watercolours in bottles in a frame and no pencil sketch at all, but starting with the tint for distance, one sketched in the general masses and then the details, repeating this for the middle and foreground tints. The method for painting in oil (page 13r) was similar except not only did one work through the three tints, but when doing the details, one did the shades first then the lights.

Oppé felt that Cozens had, on the whole, followed his own precepts in his Italian drawings.³² Certainly, the careful pen and ink drawings appear to fit the described method and a few first sketches exist that are overlaid with grids to enlarge them (for example, Landscape with figures, BM P & D LB.31). The numerous washed drawings which have pencil and pen outlines also conform to the required steps.

However, no watercolour drawings survive which could have been done by method six, for sketching while travelling, without an outline first. Also, the unfinished dry colour drawings do not conform to the required steps, as colouring was done in the foreground first, before the

distance had even been completed with a careful, corrected pen outline, nor had they been shaded with lead pencil before colouring. Cozens seems to have found that some of his methods worked in theory, but were not convenient to use in practice. Although he lists so many methods and the differences seem myriad, in fact they all conform to a traditional type, and there is nothing particularly new in any of them.

Vernet's technique, for example, was 'pen and ink over a pencil beginning, with additions of brown wash and occasionally other colour washes'.³³ Anyone who trained as an etcher in the first half of the century would use the methods of dividing into parts, enlarging and correcting, and would have paid the same attention to light and shade. As for painting in watercolours and oils without an underdrawing, this was unusual in the eighteenth century and may have been picked up from Vernet, who often advocated painting, in oils or watercolours, directly from nature,³⁴ without a previous sketch. The existing landscapes done in Rome by Cozens are, on the whole, of actual buildings and views, and not imaginary, composed landscapes, as had been suggested. It is, I think, reading too much into the systems and the traditional framing devices, etc. to see them as attempts 'to produce a pictorial formula which would create not only stable idealized landscapes but also ones that would be finally realized by the most spontaneous and audacious methods'.³⁵

There are several figural sketches in the Roman sketchbook now at Yale that throw an interesting light on this mixture of traditional and innovative techniques.

Several of the studies of female heads (Illus. 33 & 34), and one sheet in particular, of a hand, nose and tree (Illus. 35) are direct copies from drawing copy-books, such as Weston's, who in turn took his examples from seventeenth-century Netherlandish ones by Bloemaert, Ribera, etc. Two drawings of nude male figures (Illus. 29 & 36) are in completely different styles, suggesting an earlier date for Illustration 29, but are obviously studies from life, antique statues, or copy-books. The monumental figure on page 60v. (Illus. 36) is divided by horizontal lines into the traditional proportions. The drawings of the cellist (Illus. 37) and the young men sketching by a column (Illus. 38) were evidently done from life.

Either some of these figures were drawn early in his career, and the book not used again until the trip to Rome, or else Cozens, aware of his ineptitude at figure drawing, made an extra effort to study its basics while in Rome. In any case, the fact that he did them at all demonstrates that he was aware of the traditional necessity for staffage in landscapes and that his training had been a traditional one, as it had, at some stage, involved working on the figure, normally the first step in learning to draw.

Thus, up to and including his trip to Italy of 1746, none of Cozens's own training appears to have been anything but traditional. The framing devices he uses in his landscape sketches in his Italian work are derivative of 'classical' seventeenth-century landscapists like Claude, Poussin and Dughet and were probably passed on to him by exposure to these artists in Italy and especially through the drawings and oils of Vernet. His training in England and Russia appears to have consisted of at least a small

amount of all the elements we have come to expect of developing landscape artists of the first half of the eighteenth century: some rococo flourishes in the style, a little training in etching, a solid grounding in perspective and topographical drawing, and a careful attention to details and shading in pen and ink drawings. Although he was sketching from nature in Italy, the topographical aspect of his drawing becomes subordinate to framing and composition, and atmosphere tentatively begins to show itself in his landscapes. This was a fairly typical reaction of an Englishman to the Italian scenery and to the classical Italian landscape painting of Claude, the Poussins, etc. as attested by Cozens's followers to Italy: Thomas Skelton, Richard Wilson, 'Warwick' Smith, Francis Towne, and even his own son, John Robert Cozens.

The various methods listed in the Roman sketchbook are the earliest expression of Cozens's systematizing which has been remarked upon by many writers as very unusual in the eighteenth century. It is wrong, however, to see him as an inventor of systems so deeply involved in them that they merely propagated one after the other, losing all sense of their original purpose. Instead, as the various lists in the Roman notebook indicate, Cozens had a passion for putting methods in writing so that they could be easily modified and corrected in practice and so that no step of a process would be left out.

There are indications that several other artists of the century were inclined towards systematization, although one does not normally think of them as compulsive methodizers, as one does with Cozens, because their systems did not

manifest themselves in methods as unusual or 'modern' as his blots. The theories of the other artists, however, like Hogarth and Giles Hussey, were more concerned with analyzing beauty than landscape composition.

But in his Discourses of the 1770's, Joshua Reynolds was calling out for rules and methods that could be used by students of all types of art, so that by the 1790's new methods for inventing landscapes were very numerous, especially in the work of David Cox, Richard Glover, and even a Cozens imitator, Ferdinand Becker in Bath. ³⁶

Cozens's passion for systematizing resulted in the earliest application of systems to landscape in England, but he took the title of his New Method of Assisting the Invention..., if not the original idea from Leonardo da Vinci's own 'new Method'. That system was published by Cozens in 1759, five years after he had finished teaching the boys of Christ's Hospital. Was this first published system the refinement of the methods listed in the Roman sketchbook or the result of the teaching methods he used for the boys of Christ's Hospital where he began teaching in January, 1749? ³⁷

Ian Fleming-Williams and Richard Carline discuss the election of Cozens to this position at a meeting of the Governors of Christ's Hospital on Thursday, the 18th of January, 1749, but they were not aware of the advertisement he placed in the General Advertiser before the election: ³⁸

To the Right Worshipful the President, Treasurer and Governors of Christ Hospital.

GENTLEMEN,

THE Place of Drawing-Master to your Hospital being Vacant by the Death of Mr. Edward Lens, I take the Liberty of applying for your Votes and Interest to succeed him. I humbly apprehend myself the better

qualified for the same, by reason of the many Coasting Prospects I have taken at Sea, in the Course of several Voyages, the last of which was to Rome, Where I studied Drawing and Painting for the Space of two Years.

I am GENTLEMEN,

Your most obedient Servant
Alexander Cozens

Apart from this indication that he was to teach coastal prospects, Cozens's duties do not appear to have been outlined for him upon taking up the position, since they are not recorded in any of the Hospital Minutes. Indeed, as I mentioned in the chapter on Christ's Hospital, there was no mention at all of the drawing master, Edward Lens, from 1726, when he was paid for mending and cleaning the Hospital's pictures, until the court was summoned on January 18th, 1749 to elect a chief Clerk and 'a Drawing Master in the Room of Mr. Edward Lens Deceased'. The only other mention of the drawing classes during this period, was during the twice-yearly visitation to the Hospital by the Governors, who made an identical report every time to the Almoner's Committee: 'As to the performances of the Boys of the Writing and Drawing Schools, the Governors now present are well Satisfied'. These visitations are recorded as continuing through Cozens's period there and the wording of the report for the 3rd of April, 1754, one month before his resignation, is exactly the same as it had always been.

The last time that the drawing master's duties had been discussed by the committee had been in 1706 when Bernard Lens II was ordered to teach twenty-five boys from the Writing School and twenty-five from the Royal Mathematical School 'the art of drawing and designing, in order to take draughts and prospects of harbours, views of Lands, ships, etc.'. He taught them all together in the Drawing School from one until five on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday

afternoons and was paid £50 per annum. It will be remembered that the official Royal Mathematical School scheme of instruction, laid down in 1696, stated specifically in Article nine that the pupils should be taught 'the construction and use of right lined and circular Maps, the Practice of Drawing for laying down the appearance of lands; Moles, and other objects worthy of notice'. The only examinations to be passed were those given by Trinity House to the boys from the Mathematical School before they were sent to be apprenticed at sea. In light of Cozens's own experience at drawing coastal views, it is very surprising to learn from previous writers on this subject that it was in this part of his teaching that Trinity House considered him to have failed his duty to the Royal Mathematical School boys. It should be useful, then, to examine the work produced by one of his pupils for Trinity House and compare it with that produced by a student from the Royal Naval Academy, Portsmouth, whose students were also examined by Trinity House.

Before making this comparison, however, it should be noted that Christ's Hospital's Royal Mathematical School was a school to train the best of the Hospital's pupils, who were all orphans and children of charity, for apprenticeship at sea. The Royal Academy at Portsmouth was established for educating 'Young Gentlemen to the Sea Service'; specifically, the sons of nobles or gentlemen not under twelve or over fifteen, except for fifteen sons of sea-officers aged between seven and fifteen. They were to stay at the Academy for two to five years and went to sea as volunteers, were rated as midshipmen after two years and

would eventually rise to lieutenants. They were taught French, dancing and fencing, as well as the regular subjects of writing, arithmetic, drawing, navigation, gunnery, fortification and other useful parts of mathematics,⁴¹ and they were obliged by their captains to keep journals, and to draw the Appearances of Head-Lands, Coasts, Bays, and such-like...'.⁴² The work of the pupils at Greenwich Hospital, who were 'orphans of the sea' would have made a more balanced comparison with the pupils of Christ's Hospital, but, as discussed in the chapter on Greenwich Academy, their work does not survive, nor were there any guidelines laid down by the Governors which stated exactly what they should be taught.

One of the earliest drawing masters, if not the first, at Portsmouth Academy after its foundation in 1724, was Jeremiah Andrews (1710-1760), a pupil of Christ's Hospital.⁴³ Unfortunately, none of his work nor his pupils' survives, so we are unable to ascertain how useful Edward Lens's instructions were in Andrews's own teaching experience.

I have chosen Charles Steevens's Plan of Learning at the Royal Academy, Portsmouth of 1753 (NMM STV/101) to compare with James Slater Elly's Elements of Navigation as taught at Christ's Hospital in 1755.⁴⁴ Both volumes contained the student's manuscript exercises and illustrations in pencil, pen, ink and wash, as they were taught in their final year and which were submitted to Trinity House to determine whether they were ready for binding out to sea.

James Elly (baptised March 23, 1739/40) had entered Christ's Hospital as a King's ward in 1751 and was

apprenticed in January, 1756, aged fifteen, to Sir William Burnaby, Commander of H.M.S. Jersey, with whom he was to serve seven years.⁴⁵ Of Charles Steevens, we know even less, although by the articles set down in the Rules and Orders, he could not have been older than eighteen.

The most obvious difference between the two volumes is that the drawings in Steevens's book are illustrations of the problems set, 'propositions', while Elly's bear no relation to his text at all, with the possible exception of those opposite 'Oblique Sailing' and 'Of Sailing Currents' (Illus. 39 & 40). The drawings of both students have views of coastal fortresses or towers, with or without ships sailing by, but Steevens's (Illus. 41 & 42) are transversed by lines labelled 'AB', 'AC', etc. to be used for calculating distances, trajectories, or angles, and these diagrams are accompanied by the neatly-written propositions and their solutions. The section on fortification is illustrated by elaborate ground plans with measurements of heights of ramparts, etc. (Illus. 43), and the section on 'Propositions of Motion' is accompanied by classically draped, half-nude figures of men using pulleys, wedges, and fulcrums, etc. (Illus. 44). It is apparent from these particular examples that figural drawing was not a priority at Portsmouth.

Although all of Steevens's drawings were obviously copies of examples set by his drawing master (whether they were the master's own invention or prints provided by him is difficult to determine), and the landscapes were enlivened by the addition of picturesque trees, rocks, and even ducks (see Illus. 45), they nevertheless revealed an integral

connection with what he was being taught by his other masters: mathematics, gunnery, fortification and navigation (see Illus. 46 for an example of a log book entry).

James Elly, on the other hand, was provided with drawings to copy which contained coastal fortresses, towers, and various types of ships, etc. but they bear no relation at all to his text (with the possible exception of the two drawings mentioned above: Illus. 39 & 40). Some, indeed, bear no relation at all to what would normally be a seaman's concern: for example, a landscape with nude and half-draped bathers (Illus. 47) makes a very strange companion to a text on 'Mercator's Sailing'. There was obviously no connection at Christ's Hospital between what was being taught by Alexander Cozens in his drawing school and what was taught in the Royal Mathematical School. The pupils at Christ's Hospital were not, however, lacking in naval theory, as Elly's text indicates that he was also taught navigation, spherical trigonometry, astronomy, geography, chronology, etc.

Apart from the practical, visual application of these theories, the drawing pupils at Christ's Hospital were not at a particular disadvantage in comparison with the Portsmouth ones. In fact, the drawing lessons provided by Alexander Cozens were, in a way, better than those provided at Portsmouth, because Cozens included a selection of works by other artists, as well as himself, for the students to copy. Three of Elly's drawings are copies of the best plates of fortresses and classical buildings in Lens's drawing book of 1750. The depiction of waves and their motion is very clear in the first and the perspective nearly faultless in all three. One of Elly's other drawings is of

the ruin of a square tower on a river bank and three distinctly different types of trees (Illus. 48). This type of tower occurs frequently in Cozens's later work (Illus. 62)⁴⁶ and his concern with trees, is well-known from his 1771 publication. There are no ruins in the Portsmouth drawings and the trees are all of one anonymous type and it seems evident therefore that Cozens saw an advantage in a naval man being able to record items of antiquarian, historical, and natural interest and chose appropriate examples from his own work as well as that of Lens and other artists. That Cozens saw an advantage for naval men to be able to record such items is reinforced by Elly's simplified and reversed copy of a print from the copy-book of another drawing master, Thomas Weston, who had his book published for his pupils at Greenwich Academy in 1725 (Illus. 49 & 17). The fortress is identifiable as that of Belle Isle on the Tagus in Spain - a fairly likely place for navigational students to eventually visit and be required to draw.⁴⁷

The rather distinctive reeds and grasses in the foreground of several of the other drawings indicate that they too may be copies of works by Cozens himself. Compare, for example, the composition and the familiar motifs in Illustrations 39, 47 & 50 by Elly with the Cozens drawing of bathers (Illus. 30) and his pen and ink drawings of a cistern in Rome of 1746 (Illus. 27) and another view in Italy (Illus. 51). Cozens's own experience and capability of drawing sea ramparts and fortifications is clear in the drawings in the British Museum of harbour fortifications around Spezia (Illus. 52 & 53).

It is also obvious from this that, as well as using

other artists' work for pupils to copy, Cozens made drawings himself specifically for his Christ's Hospital pupils - possibly touring English coastal fortresses himself as well as looking for good examples in the work of other artists. There are three pencil sketches of ships, labelled 'A Cozens - at Gravesend' (Illus. 54) in the album of drawings that was recently uncovered at the National Library of Wales (Drawings Volume 134), indicating they were drawn from life, which closely resemble those in one of Elly's drawings (Illus. 55), and the album contains no less than thirty-eight drawings and sketches and tracings of ships, some of which are obviously tracings from prints by other artists.

Finally, Elly's drawing of bathers (Illus. 47) shows the typical drawing master's concern with teaching his pupils something of the basics of figure drawing - normally the first concern of drawing masters, but as figure drawing was not specifically stated in the Christ's Hospital articles that outlined what the drawing master was to teach, Cozens was willing to sublimate it here to the more important concern of landscapes, fortresses, and ships. That this drawing was after one by Cozens, can be fairly clearly ascertained by comparison with his other works discussed earlier, containing figures of bathers and
48
nudes.

It is evident from the conscientious way in which Cozens approached his work as drawing master at Christ's Hospital, that his motives in taking the job were not entirely mercenary, as has been implied by all the previous writers on this subject. Nor was he unqualified for the position and unable to provide the kind of teaching required by the Hospital. As we have seen, the drawings he set as

examples for the pupils to copy were no less applicable or adequate than Lens's had been and the Governors had never received or instigated any complaints about the teaching of the latter. In fact, Cozens may have been even more qualified for the position than most. His father, Richard Cozens, and grandfather, Robert Davenport, had been important shipbuilders in Russia's new British-run navy for thirty-five years. As he had advertised when applying for the post, he had undertaken several voyages⁴⁹ which made him familiar with the type of harbours, towns, ruins, coastlines, and items of antiquity that someone in the navy would be likely to encounter and need to know how to draw. He was also, therefore, undoubtedly familiar with the processes of navigation, the keeping of logs and the recording of coastlines, etc.

In 1698, Christ's Hospital had sent two of its Royal Mathematical School pupils, having been passed by Trinity House, to accompany as assistants Mr. Ferguson, a mathematics master who had been summoned to Russia by Peter the Great. The British community was not large in Russia at this time and Mr. Ferguson and his two assistants, especially the fate of one, who was set upon and murdered by robbers in Moscow in 1709, would have been well-known to Richard Cozens. It is not unlikely that Alexander knew Ferguson, who died in 1739, or his assistant Gwynn, and may even have had some early lessons in mathematics from them, before 1727 or after his return c.1740, when Gwynn was connected with the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg that Alexander may have worked in himself. Cozens was certainly familiar with the rules of perspective,⁵⁰ and the

first lot in his son's sale at Greenwood's in 1794 (which probably contained items which had once belonged to Alexander) was a large parcel of various prints and 'a roll of maps'. Alexander's later work includes no less than ten landscapes containing coastal fortresses or harbours (apart from the many coastal or river scenes or scenes with fishermen).

Therefore, Cozens not only understood what needed to be taught to these students and made a conscientious effort to provide the necessary type of examples, he was also in a large measure, a successful drawing master. Three of the fifteen-year-old Elly's landscape drawings (Illus. 39, 48 & 50) would do justice to any aspiring artist and compare very favourably with Society of Arts premium-winning examples by William Pars and Michael Rooker in 1759, when they were aged ⁵¹ seventeen and sixteen respectively.

One must assume then, that Cozens was only telling the truth and not making excuses when, explaining why Trinity House had found that five of the Royal Mathematical School students' drawings were 'worse than heretofore', he stated that 'three of the said Children were very dull and the ⁵² other Two but indifferent'. In spite of their complaints about Cozens's teaching, Trinity House had passed the five boys on the 21st of December, 1753, the 17th of January, and the 30th of May, 1754. Cozens resigned by letter at a meeting of the Almoner's Committee on May 10th, 1754, and the resignation was accepted by vote at a meeting of the General Court on May 22nd.

From the discussion in this chapter of Cozens's qualifications, abilities, and methods of teaching drawing at Christ's Hospital, it is evident that he was as capable,

if not a better teacher than any other drawing masters at Christ's Hospital or Portsmouth. The usual reason for his resignation, being that he resigned before he was dismissed, can no longer be accepted on its own, if at all. His letter has not been published elsewhere, and merits transcription here as an indication of more than this usually accepted
51
reason for his resignation.

Gent.

As I am Summoned to Appear before you, and I learn that it is on a Fresh Complaint I would do everything in my Power to shew my Duty in attending you, but something intervening which makes it impossible for me to wait on You. I hope Your Goodness which I have experienced so often will Admit this as an Apologie.

Gent'n,

I take this Opportunity to return You my most hearty Thanks for the Honour done me by those Gentlemen who thought fit to choose me your Drawing Master and likewise to those who have been so kind to give me Countenance and Protection since I shall ever remain Sensible tho' with fruitless Gratitude of such Favours.

I beg leave to inform you Gentlemen my Affairs are so Circumstanced that I cannot attend Your School any longer, but as I would leave nothing undone which is in my Power to give Satisfaction or prevent Trouble I will perform the Office of my Place if you permit me untill the Election of a New Master, I am

Gentlemen.

Your most Obedt. most
humble and Obliged
Servt.

Alexr. Cozens

9 May, 1754

Thomas Bisse was elected the new drawing master at
54
Christ's Hospital on the 13th of June, 1754.

ALEXANDER COZENS'S EARLY TRAINING

1. Andrew Wilton, The Art of Alexander and John Robert Cozens, exhibition catalogue, Yale Center for British Art, New Haven (1980) (hereafter Wilton, 1980), p. 19, no. 1, reproduced plate 1. Wilton's catalogue is the most up-to-date bibliographically and therefore I shall use it as a source wherever possible and the complete literature on the particular subject can be found in his catalogue entries.
2. Oppé, Alexander and John Robert Cozens (hereafter Oppé, 1952), Chapter 1, pp. 1-10 where he discusses Cozens's parentage, possible place and date of birth and speculates on Cozens's early life and training in Russia.
3. The phrase 'studying Latin' is a literal translation from the Russian and, in context, may also be taken to mean that he was at a school where he studied what we now term as 'the classics'. This new information about Cozens was published in Russian in an article by Asya Kantor Gukovskaya in the Hermitage Journal, vol. XXIII, 1982: 'Drawings by Alexander Cozens in the Hermitage, connected with his Method of Composing Landscapes', pp. 88-89. For a more detailed discussion of her findings and additional information which I found about his parentage, see Appendix H. I have tried as far as possible to avoid repeating information published in that article in this chapter but, inevitably, there is some overlap. I will footnote the article only where it elaborates further upon information not particularly relevant here.
4. The possibility that Cozens was Pine's apprentice is even suggested by the fact that Cozens married Pine's daughter. According to plate 6 in Hogarth's Industry and Idleness, it was not uncommon for an apprentice to marry his master's daughter.
5. This conclusion was reached after comparison with the collection of etched pennies in the British Museum Department of Coins and Medals where Miss Miriam Archibald pointed out their similarity in size and materials. None of the British Museum's, however, were etched in reverse and it was obvious that Cozens's had a different purpose than those in their collection.
6. Joseph Mayer, Memoirs of Thomas Dodd, William Upcot, and George Stubbs, R.A., pp. 9-10.
7. Robert G. Steward, Robert Edge Pine, A British Portrait Painter in America, 1784-1788, pp. 13, 14.
8. Hadley's work is discussed briefly in M. Hardie, vol. I, pp. 71-2, and A landscape with church and buildings is reproduced there in pl 42.
9. Mention should be made here of an oil painting on panel in the Eton College Collection which is either a copy of, or the original from which the 1742 Eton etching was made. Sir Geoffrey Agnew wrote to the author (22nd March, 1984) 'I had

forgotten it followed the engraving fairly closely but I am sure it has nothing else to do with Cozens except being based on the engraving'. An inscription on the frame reads: 'Purchased from an old house in Great Yarmouth by R.H.T. Heygate Esq. & given to Eton College by Mrs. Mounsey Heygate in 1908'. Further investigation of the authorship of this painting is necessary in light of a portrait of Alexander Cozens's sister, Sarah Cozens Cayley (1732-1803), now in the possession of her descendants and which appears to have been painted in Russia c. 1745-50. The possibility that this portrait may be by Cozens cannot yet be ruled out.

10. The information about his route comes from a letter from William Beckford which also gives further information about Cozens's life in Russia and is transcribed in A. Morrison, Collection of Autograph Letters and Historical Documents, vol. I, pp. 198-9 and in part, with corrections, in Boyd Alexander, England's Wealthiest Son, pp. 46-7.

11. Oppé, 1952, p. 77.

12. Wilton, 1980, p. 52, nos. 139-40 noted the influence of these engravers on Cozens's work around 1746 and later. A series of etchings by Waterloo were found in the Aynscombe album once belonging to a pupil of Cozens, sold at Christie's on the 15th of June, 1982 (lot 10). A print sold by Vivares was recently found in album of Cozens drawings in the National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth (Drawings Volume 134).

13. Christopher Marsden, Palmyra of the North, pp. 59, 68-9, 203.

14. *ibid.*, pp. 73, 204, 207.

15. Nicholas Pevsner, Academies of Art, Past and Present, pp. 140, 181.

16. Julius Hasselblatt, Historischer Ueberblick der Entwicklung der Kaiserlich Russischen Akademie der Künste in St. Petersburg (1886), pp. 38-40. See also Appendix H, p. 73.

17. BML Map Library, K.6.Tab.27, Gebäude der Kayserlichen Academie der Wissenschaften den Bibliothec und Kunst-kammer in St. Petersburg (1741).

18. Hasselblatt, pp. 39-42. Portrait painting was well-patronized by the Imperial family and military but did not really develop stylistically until the second half of the century. See Fedora Davidov, Russian Painting in the 18th and 19th Centuries (Moscow, 1953), p. 227. The portrait of Alexander Cozens's sister must be regarded in this context first before comparing it to contemporary English work.

19. The engravings are in the Hermitage and are reproduced in Galina Komelova, Views of St. Petersburg and Surroundings in the middle of the 18th Century. Other engravers and artists who worked on this project were G. A. Kachalov, Y. V. Vasilyev, E. G. Vinegradov and I. P. Elyakov. Further information about these engravers can be found in D. A.

Rovinski, Podrobnyi Slovar russkikh graverov XVI-XIX BB. and reproductions of other works by Cozens's contemporaries can be found in George Heard Hamilton, The Art and Architecture of Russia (see App.H, n. 17).

20. Treatise on Perspective and Rules for Shading by Invention (1765), see Oppé, 1952, pp. 27-8, 45.

21. For further examples see Oppé, 1952, View in Rome, plate 1, opposite p. 68, and Sta. Maria Maggiore and Porta Pinciana, reproduced in the catalogue of the loan exhibition at the Institute of Art Research, Ueno, Tokoyo (1929).

22. This sketchbook was discussed thoroughly by Oppé in 'A Roman Sketchbook by Alexander Cozens', pp. 81-93, and Oppé, 1952, pp. 11-20, and Wilton, 1980, pp. 19-23, where he transcribed the notes and described the drawings on every page.

23. Oppé, 1952, p. 15.

24. *ibid.*, p. 104.

25. London, GLC, Iveagh Bequest exhibition: Claude-Joseph Vernet, 1714-1789 by Philip Conisbee (1976). The pages in this catalogue are not numbered. The drawings are catalogue nos. 50-64.

26. Luke Herrmann, British Landscape Painting of the Eighteenth Century, p. 50.

27. Deborah Howard, 'Some Eighteenth-Century English Followers of Claude', pp. 726-28.

28. London, GLC, Vernet exhibition (1976) n.p. (section on Vernet's drawings).

29. See *ibid.*, no. 55, where Conisbee notes fifty-seven studies of trees in lot 52 of the Vernet sale in 1790 and no. 62 where Conisbee notes a series of drawings of ships. Cozens's tree studies were published as The Shape, Skeleton and Foliage of Thirty-Two Species of Trees (1771) (see Wilton, 1980, no. 18) and a large number of studies of ships was found on folios 97-103 of the National Library of Wales, Drawing Volume 134.

30. Compare for example, Vernet's early drawing of the Garden of the Villa Mattei (fig. 8 in London, GLC, Vernet exhibition (1976) with Cozens's View in Rome (plate 1 in Oppé, 1952).

31. Oppé, 1952, p. 95.

32. *ibid.*, pp. 77-81.

33. London, GLC, Vernet exhibition (1976) n.p. (section on drawings).

34. See the discussion about Vernet's advice for making oil studies after nature in the introduction to the Vernet catalogue by Conisbee, and the transcription of Vernet's

letter to Diderot in the appendix there, the general principle of which was to 'always study nature'.

35. Sotheby's Sale, 16th March, 1978 (lot 46).

36. In Bath in 1794, Ferdinand Becker advertised that he had found a new mode to facilitate the art of drawing and assist natural genius by blots (see App.A).

37. Wilton, 1980, assigned three drawings (no. 4-6, reproduced on plates 3 and 4) to the years immediately after Cozens's return to London. No concrete evidence exists, however, in the way of documentation or dated drawings, to indicate Cozens's activities from 1746 to January, 1749 and it is dangerous to assign drawings to this period. The medium and style of Wilton, 1980, no. 4, In Hyde Park, is compatible with drawings dated 1772 by John Robert Cozens in the unpublished album in the National Library of Wales. No. 5, Building by a river with hills in the background, may belong to a group of chalk drawings which can be associated with a later period. I will discuss this drawing and no. 6, Landscape with a ruined temple, in the next chapter.

38. General Advertiser, January 11, 16, 17, and 18, 1749. I am very grateful to David Alexander for bringing this advertisement to my attention. The references for the two authors who discuss Cozens's activities at Christ's Hospital are: Fleming-Williams, 'Drawing Masters', p. 215 and Carline, pp. 43-9. These authors do not, however, give the detailed references to the Christ's Hospital Minute Books, which are as follows: Cozens's election, CH MS 12,806 vol. 11 (18th January, 1749), pp. 90-1; complaints received, CH MS 12,811 vol.11 (3rd July, 1753, when read letter from Trinity House dated 9th June, 1753), pp. 549-50; and Cozens's resignation, CH MS 12,806 vol. 11 (the Almoner's Committee reported to the General Court that at a meeting of the Almoner's Committee on 10th of May, 1754, they had received his letter and this letter was transcribed in the General Court Minutes on 22nd of May, 1754 at which meeting they voted to accept his resignation), pp. 209-10. A copy of the printed circular which Cozens sent to the Governors to petition their votes, was sold at Christie's, 14th June, 1977, (lot 172, reproduced in catalogue). It had a blot drawing on the reverse of Trees beside a lake, numbered in pencil '3' and in brown and grey wash on yellow prepared paper.

39. CH MS 12,811 vol.11, 3rd April, 1754, p. 2.

40. Admiralty Office, Rules and Orders relating to the Royal Academy...at Portsmouth, Article I, p. 2.

41. *ibid.*, Article XIII, p. 7.

42. *ibid.*, Article XXXV, p. 15.

43. Heal, p. 5 states that Andrews was apprenticed to Mr. Stotherd near St. James's Square ('a schoolmaster of note') (see App. B) and then went to Portsmouth Royal Naval Academy where he was the drawing and writing master, and from there was made writing master to the Prince of Wales (later George

III) and Prince Edward. Fleming-Williams, 'Drawing Masters', p. 220, briefly discusses later drawing masters at Portsmouth from Richard Clarke (1769-74) onwards, but he did not know the names of the earliest instructors of drawing who apparently also taught French and were paid £100 per annum.

44. There are several Portsmouth pupils' Plans of Learning at the National Maritime Museum; the earliest is dated 1746. Elly's volume is in the Archives in the Library of Christ's Hospital, Horsham. It is mentioned and one drawing from it is illustrated in Carline (pp. 49, 295-6, plate 6b: Young men bathing in the river). This drawing is also reproduced here in Illustration 47.

45. CH MS 12,818, vol. 9, Register of Admissions: April 1751, no. 22 and Discharges: 10th January, 1756, p. 243. Ten years later James Elly was married at Bermondsley, St. Olave's, where the register states that he was a bachelor of that parish. A son with the same name was born in 1771.

46. See also Robert Wark, Early English Drawings in the Huntington Collection, p. 23: Alexander Cozens C. Landscape with ruins (reproduced).

47. John Cleveley, Lord Grantham, and Colonel Burgoyne all visited and sketched in the area in the 1760's and '70's. John Robert Cozens's sale at Greenwood's in 1794 contained several books that may have come from Alexander's library on subjects such as geography, Roman History, natural history, antiquities and architecture.

48. Figure drawing could be of some use to artists aboard ships. Those that accompanied Captain Cook, for instance, probably found any training in drawing figures very useful when recording the costumes and physical appearance of the natives they met. See for example, Jane Roundell, 'William Hodges' Paintings of the South Pacific', in Connoisseur, vol. 200, no. 804, February, 1979, pp. 85-9. Hodges was of course a professional painter but they were not always hired to accompany these voyages and the drawings would often have to be made by officers on board.

49. The three voyages would have been when he was sent by his father from St. Petersburg to England to go to school in 1727, when he returned from England to Archangel to his mother some time after his father's death in 1735, and the voyage described by Beckford from St. Petersburg to Leghorn, Italy in 1746.

50. As noted earlier, Cozens published a treatise on perspective in 1765 and there was a number of copper plates of perspective diagrams in the sale at Greenwood's in 1794.

51. These drawings are reproduced in Carline, plates 7a, 7b. He devoted an entire chapter to the activities of the drawing masters at the Society of Arts and D. G. Allan, in his monograph on William Shipley also discusses them.

52. CH MS 12,811, vol. 11, 3rd July, 1753, p. 549.

53. CH MS 12,806, vol. 11, 22nd May, 1754, pp. 209-10.
54. CH MS 12,806, vol. 11, 13th June, 1754, p. 211.

CHAPTER 6:

THE TEACHING METHODS OF ALEXANDER COZENS

My purpose in retracing Alexander Cozens's career this far was to establish, in light of new evidence about his early life, whether there was any clue there as to why his teaching at Eton should be so radically different from methods used by the drawing masters discussed in connection with Christ's Hospital, Greenwich Academy and Cheam. There has been no evidence thus far that his unusual methods of teaching the pupils at Eton was the result of unusual methods in his own artistic training.¹ However, I have demonstrated that at Christ's Hospital he did respond to a certain extent to the particular requirements of the type of student that he found there. This, then, is the first indication that the different teaching methods at Eton may have been a response to the type of student that he found attending a public school.

Roughly a decade passed between Cozens's resignation at Christ's Hospital and his appearance at Eton. This period has been considered before by others, albeit briefly, due to the lack of information, but again much new evidence has surfaced and it demands a new consideration.

The place to begin is, perhaps, with the reasons for his resignation at Christ's Hospital since his letter indicated that there were more reasons for leaving than cowardice about facing the disapproval of Trinity House. It cannot be coincidence, cowardice or mere courtesy that this, the earliest known letter written by him, contains the phrases `something intervening which makes it impossible for

me to wait on you' and 'my Affairs are so Circumstanced that I cannot attend Your School any longer'. Every letter to Mr. Hoare at Bath, transcribed by Andrew Wilton in his 1980 catalogue (no's.69-72), and every letter in the unpublished correspondence with John Grimston of Kilnwick (to be discussed later) contains an apology for being late with something and an excuse concerning the pressure of business.² Quite simply, Cozens may have not been able to spare the required three afternoons a week at Christ's Hospital. The salary, too, may not have been worth the time, as it appears to have still only been £50 per annum.

Arthur S. Marks, in assigning a date of c.1753-4 to the anatomical drawing Cozens made for William Hunter's treatise on midwifery, suggested that this drawing alone may have earned Cozens between £50 to £100 and the time he spent working on it may have interfered with his teaching at Christ's Hospital.³ However, this work alone would not have been sufficiently time-consuming for it to encroach upon his activities at Christ's Hospital. He would have needed more substantial financial security than this and, as he does not appear to have done anything else of this nature, it could not be the cause of his 'Affairs being so Circumstanced' that he could no longer attend.

Oppé noted that Cozens's signed and dated etching of 1752 (Illus. 56) may have been intended as a drawing copy for students at Christ's Hospital. He argued convincingly that its flat, uniform line meant that 'its use for instructional purposes, as a model for the pupil to copy, would be obvious'.⁴ I think, however, that comparison with the drawings made by Elly, which were mostly coastal, makes it clear that the 1752 etching was intended for another type

of student. There is a substantial group of drawings which are close enough in style, medium, and subject matter to be placed with this etching as probable teaching copies. They are two finished pencil, pen and ink drawings found in the Aynscombe album sold at Christie's (15.6.1982(10), repro.p.14) (see also App.I, fig.20) and a pencil drawing found on folio 70 of the newly-discovered album in the National Library of Wales (Drawings Volume 134)(Illus. 57). Their style would seem to owe more to the finished pen and ink drawings of his Roman trip than to his activities at Christ's Hospital, indicating, as with the etching, a different type of pupil. They are not topographical, but rather classical, using a tree on one side as the traditional framing device with the centre ground occupied by bodies of water or hills or Italianate round towers and long tile-roofed buildings.

The kind of pupil that would require this type of drawing to copy would be the kind who learnt to draw for the reasons discussed in chapter three on teaching drawing in private academies. In the following chapter, it was noted that those parents who did not agree with educating young children in schools or academies, but still wished them to have a 'modern' education, would have the various tutors, including the drawing master, attend their children privately in their homes. Other parents had drawing and music masters attend their children while they were at home from their schools on holidays. Increasingly throughout the century, young women who were not publicly educated (private academies for young women being a development of the later part of the century) required drawing masters at their

homes. As drawing became a popular 'polite recreation' for young women through the century, the number of drawing masters increased proportionally. The reasons for it becoming such a popular pursuit will be discussed in a later chapter.

Since there is no reason to believe that Alexander Cozens was connected with an academy or school during the decade after 1754, it is probably this type of individual, private student that he was teaching if active as a drawing master during this decade. The landscape etching and drawings discussed above would seem to indicate that he was. However, since the copy books, instructions in drawing manuals, and contemporary accounts all indicate that these private pupils, in the second half of the eighteenth century, still learnt to draw in the traditional manner, by mastering the human figure first and 'proceeding by degrees', then why are there no figure drawings of this traditional type in Cozens's oeuvre, apart from those few rough sketches found in his Roman sketchbook?

The reason is that Cozens was one of a number of drawing masters becoming increasingly evident in this period whose activities diverged from the traditional role of drawing master. They specialized in a certain kind of drawing lessons - in Cozens's case, it was landscape.

At about this time we begin to see that amateurs did not have single drawing masters who took them through all the stages, as earlier masters had done, but rather they appear to have had a succession of drawing masters, each of whom specialized in teaching a certain kind of drawing: ie. one drawing master for heads, another for figures, one for flowers, one for landscapes, etc.

Clear evidence of this can be found in letters written by George Simon, Viscount Nuneham (1736-1809, later second Earl Harcourt), while on his grand tour in 1755-56, to his sister, the Hon. Elizabeth Harcourt (1739-1811, later wife of Sir William Lee, Bt.) in Cavendish Square. I shall quote them nearly in full, as they are unpublished and give a detailed account of the activities of a young grand tourist whose education had included drawing and who was obviously cultivating a 'fondness for Painting and Antiquities'.⁵

Vienna. Sept. 14, 1755

...I am in high spirits at the thought of seeing Italy in so short a time, ever since I can remember I have been wishing to go into a Countrey, where my fondness for Painting & Antiquities will be so indulged, I expect every day a letter from Mr Knapton with a Catalogue of all the finest Galleries & his remarks on them, for I intend not only to improve my taste, but my judgement, by the fine originals I expect to see there, I have attempted all sorts of Painting since I left England as to watercolours I could never do anything that had the likeness of anything that is in heaven above or the earth beneath, but for Crayons I have without a Master or any instructions some Landscapes that were more tollerable, particularly one large one of a veiw [sic] upon the Rhine, which I have never seen since the instant I finished it, & I believe it is torn or lost, Landscapes in Crayons are things almost unknown & I never knew but Knapton & the D. of Weimar that did them so that I fear I shall even find difficulty in Italy to get an instructor, I want to know how you succeed in heads, I am glad you undertook them, as I think by what I could judge your genius was properer for that kind of drawing than the other, besides Dalton is a great master of them, & but an indifferent one of Landscapes, and of all the masters I have seen & learned of Cozens was the only one that had a taste or thoroughly understood the business he professed.

Rome Feb 10, 1756.

[re friend in Derbyshire]...I find clever in drawing since she could take so difficult a view, without having had other instructions than what Andrew is capable of giving; I have painted a large picture in crayons, & am going to do its companion, I think I have succeeded, tollerably considering it is the first regular one I have done in that way, & as I never had the least instructions; it is much more easy to do than in oyles, but never looks near so well as you have hardly any greens, but I might make something tollerable in time was I not obliged to invent & have nothing in that style of painting to copy from, which must always be the case

for those colours are so improper for Landscapes that I ever met with but one or two painters who knew how to do them; & those were only for their amusement, & to try the experiment.

Rome April 9, 1756

...I fancy you must find Perspective a very difficult Study, I have got Kerby's [sic] book which is esteemed a very good one, I suppose you draw Landscapes with him, to amuse you a little, or that you have another Master, pray when you see Dalton give my Compliments to him, he is a very ingenious and Shy Man, & has an exceedingly good Character. I wish he may succeed but his Vatican Tapestry [torn] Devil. I hope my Papa will subscribe to Stuart [James Stuart and Nicholas Revett's Antiquities of Athens (1762)]. James Gray, who corresponds with him and is an excellent judge says he is a most surprising Genius.

It has long been known that Lord Nuneham was a friend, patron and pupil of Paul Sandby, as he had published views of the Ruins at Stanton Harcourt which he had etched in 1763 after drawings by Sandby of 1760. His sister-in-law, Mary (1749-1833), wife of General William Harcourt (1743-1830, later third Earl) was a pupil of Alexander Cozens from about ⁶1779. The above letters, however, indicate that Lord Nuneham had had several drawing masters, including Cozens, before Sandby, and more importantly, they provide the earliest evidence of Cozens, not only as a private drawing master, but one who specialized in landscapes. Unfortunately, there are no works by Lord Nuneham as early as this in public collections, so it has been impossible to compare his work with that of Cozens and thus demonstrate the purpose of the 1752 etching and above-mentioned similar drawings.

What is also clear is that Cozens had taught landscape drawing to at least one private pupil very near to the date of his resignation from Christ's Hospital in May, 1754. A growing private clientele or decision to devote himself to that type of student (certainly less inclined to be `dull or

indifferent' as he complained of the Christ's Hospital students) would easily explain the new circumstances in his affairs which he stated accounted for his resignation.

A drawing by Alexander Cozens, Landscape with fishermen, signed and dated 1751 and squared for transfer (App.H, fig.4), was sold at Spinks in 1982, and bore the following inscription on the verso: 'found in a portfolio at Hartwell of Lady Elizabeth Lee 1828. J. Lee'.⁷ The indication here, that Viscount Nuneham's sister, the Honorable Elizabeth Harcourt,⁸ also took drawing lessons from Cozens is confirmed by two pairs of oval drawings consisting of two blots and two landscapes after them, which are similarly inscribed: '...found at Hartwell among some papers of the late Lady Elizabeth Lee. There are several similar at Hartwell framed.'⁹ (see Illus. 58-60 and App.H, figs.5 & 6). The above-mentioned portfolio, still containing several drawings, was deposited on loan to the Buckinghamshire Record Office in 1979. There is no direct connection between the 1751 Cozens drawing and those by Lady Lee, apart from the fact that they were found in the same portfolio, so we cannot say that she was a pupil from 1751, but the connection with her brother before 1755 and the fact that she was drawing landscapes with Joshua Kirby or another master early in 1756, all point to the strong possibility that she took landscape lessons from Cozens as early as this decade.

Alexander Cozens's newly re-discovered Essay to Facilitate the Inventing of Landskips, intended for Students in the Art (1759) (reproduced and transcribed in App.I, p. 360, App.A and figs.6-17) helps us to reconstruct the methods he used to teach these private pupils in the 1750's.

As the text of the 1759 Essay to Facilitate the Inventing of Landskips was confined to only two pages of text, it is easier to understand than his later New Method of Assisting the Invention in Drawing Original Compositions of Landscape (1786).¹⁰ However, the actual instructions in the two pages of the earlier Essay are still a little obscure. Cozens begins with the quotation about assisting the invention from Leonardo da Vinci's Treatise on Painting, specifically the 1724 English translation, which Cozens says he has improved upon. In the New Method, Cozens was at pains to assure readers that he had happened upon the method while teaching a pupil of 'great natural capacity' (p.4) and afterwards had been pleased to hear that an authority of such great regard as Leonardo reinforced the idea. In the 1759 Essay, he goes on to explain how he has improved upon Leonardo's hint by making the accidental forms on purpose rather than having to rely upon finding them in nature. In fact, he improves upon accidents found in nature by making his imperfect forms have 'some degree of design'. This degree of design he sees as 'stiles' of composition or 'manners of disposing the principal objects' based on the works of old masters. He illustrates them with eight examples of his imperfect forms (which he calls 'rude black sketches' or 'blots') that conform to these eight 'stiles' of composition and an outline landscape he has made from each.

He very awkwardly explains how to make the outline landscapes from the blot sketch before he has explained how to make the blot itself. Both instructions are very brief and occur at unexpected places in the text. It is obvious

from his text that this Essay was published in as quick and economical a format as possible, in order to deliver it to a public which he felt had an immediate need for it. He stated that he would publish larger, more finished examples as soon as he had the time and, in the meanwhile, one or two were on display at Austin's and Boydell's where the Essay was sold.

A beginner, or even an artist who purchased this Essay without previous knowledge of Cozens or this new system, would find the Essay rather difficult to follow but, by constantly referring back to the illustrations, the reader would eventually be able to decipher them. The examples at Boydell's and Austin's would give an indication of what the artist, amateur, or professional, was to aim for. If the signed and dated 1757 River landscape, once owned by Sydney Rowlatt (App.I, fig.19), is an example of one of those on display, then it would have proved a great incentive for amateurs or artists to try the method. For amateurs it would be an especially attractive method by which to learn to draw, since the first stage at least, the blot sketch, did not require any previously acquired, well-practiced skills. Professional artists would be more interested in the advantages of a quick, easy way of inventing new compositions. Up to this time, Cozens's fellow landscape artists were producing topographical views or imaginary landscapes which took their composition from the Dutch or Italian masters and their details from observed details found in the English countryside. Cozens's influence upon his contemporary artists has been discussed elsewhere, but no doubt the opportunity he gave them in this Essay for inventing purely original landscapes was seized upon with

eagerness by several.

It was, however, the opportunity for amateurs to make acceptable landscapes out of 'great splashes of brown'¹² that was remarked upon most frequently and thus what Cozens became best known for. Early misunderstandings that arose out of the brevity of the 1759 Essay,¹³ which nevertheless attracted a contemporary reviewer,¹³ were compounded by Cozens's later inability to express himself clearly and failure to publish the promised full explanation with shaded, finished examples. People had to rely upon the explanations and promises of new, even more complicated systems that he conveyed to fellow artists in his letters, and the resultant rumours that passed amongst them second-hand. The only concrete evidence that was available to enlighten people about these tantalizing systems was his exhibited work, the accounts of his method that spread amongst his pupils,¹⁴ and the exhibited results of their efforts.¹⁴

Henry Angelo, who did not fully understand the purpose of the blots or was unable, due to lack of talent or application, to turn them into landscape drawings, was the only pupil whose account of Cozens's teaching was taken notice of. In the next century, Angelo's misleading statements led to the dismissal of Cozens's exercise of making blots as the gimmick of a charlatan who had tried to obtain as many pupils as possible from the bored leisure classes looking for some diversion.¹⁵

I have explained in Appendix I the process by which Cozens eventually produced his subsequent systems: The Treatise on Perspective and Rules for Shading by Invention

(1765), The Shape, Skeleton and Foliage of Thirty-Two Species of Trees (1771), The Various Species of Composition in Nature (ante 1775), The Principles of Beauty (1778), and A New Method of Assisting the Invention in Drawing Original Compositions of Landscape (1786). The greater part of the knowledge that we have about these systems has come from the activities of his pupils who used his systems and faithfully bought and preserved his publications. There were nearly three-hundred subscribers to The Principles of Beauty, who, with a considerable number of others, are all listed in Appendix E, where it appears that they bought his work out of an interest in furthering their own abilities as artists or connoisseurs. Their numbers and social class are an impressive indication of the regard with which his theories were held. Pupils may not, in the end, have understood it, but they felt it was necessary, as artists or patrons, to make the initial effort.

Something else indicated by Appendix E, is that a large number of the subscribers must have first known Alexander Cozens at Eton. My purpose in discussing his activities in the 1750's was to establish whether his blot method for teaching drawing, which we knew of from Angelo's account, had evolved from the new type of students he encountered there. It was evident, however, that the system was fully evolved by 1757 (the date of the Rowlatt watercolour), and was therefore the outcome of his private teaching before the earliest known date that he was at Eton. ¹⁶ When he began to work at Eton, it must have seemed a great opportunity to experiment with his new method on a large number of pupils at once.

According to Angelo, at Eton Cozens himself made a

series of accidental blots in black, brown, and gray with such full wet brushes that another piece of paper could be pressed on them and the design would be transferred. This he would work up with imagination into landscapes with blue and gray blots to form the mountains, clouds and skies. An improvement upon this method was to splash the bottom of earthen-plates with blots of 'all colours of the rainbow' and stamp impressions onto sheets of dampened paper. 'It should be observed that where his pupils failed, his masterly hand touched their works into something like an appearance, as he used to say, and superadded on the seas, lakes, rocks and promontories, ships, boats, trees and figures, as circumstances permitted'.¹⁷

Almost no Eton pupil's work survives with which to see the progress they made or the extent to which Angelo's account was exaggerated. When Angelo discussed the pupils' abilities to make sense of Cozens's methods, he stated merely that Lord Maynard was adept at sketching groups of horses, and that the two Willis brothers were clever with their chalks. Angelo's own drawing skills, as evidenced by Nathaniel Hone's portrait of him in 1768 (Illus. 61), were not as discreditable as he would make out, although the landscape Angelo is drawing in this portrait bears a closer resemblance to a drawing by Gainsborough or Rosa than Cozens.

According to Angelo, Sir George Beaumont was 'the only disciple who could make anything of the matter': it is fortunate, then, that one notebook from his days at Eton, 1764-69, is still in the possession of his descendants.¹⁸ The book does not contain any landscapes that could have

even remotely resulted from Cozens's blot method nor are the landscapes that it does contain of any exceptional merit. Nevertheless, it provides valuable indications of how and what Cozens taught the Eton pupils.

From the drawings in this notebook, it is evident that Alexander Cozens had his students at Eton copying from drawing manuals much like those used by the Lenses and Thomas Weston in the first half of the century. There are several drawings of heads and figures of that type in Beaumont's book. It also contains outline drawings of coastal scenes remarkably like those that James Elly produced under Cozens's tutelage at Christ's Hospital. One of the coastal views closely resembles an outline tracing by a student in the Aynscombe album and there are also at least two pencil copies by Beaumont of etchings that were also found in the Aynscombe album. One of these etchings is of a ruin (Illus. 62) and appears to be related to a finished wash drawing by Cozens now in the Huntington Art Gallery, San Marino. The other pencil copy by Beaumont is of a small Italianate etching which is one of a series found in the Aynscombe album (Illus. 63 & 64: Beaumont copied the one on the bottom right of Illus. 63). This etching and another (bottom right of Illus. 64) are identical to two in a series of sixteen etchings in the British Museum which were apparently etched by William Austin for Alexander Cozens.

Sir George's Eton sketchbook also contains an outline drawing by him that is an exact copy of a well-known watercolour by Alexander Cozens of a tree stump (Illus. 65) (Witt Collection, Courtauld Institute of Art). Beaumont's outline drawings in this sketchbook are weak and hesitant, precisely what one would expect of an eleven- or twelve-

year-old learning to draw by copying his teacher's work.

In 1952, Oppé stated that the account of Cozens's unusual methods of teaching landscape related by Henry Angelo in his Reminiscences, was not of Angelo's own recollection, but culled from Edwards and W.H. Pyne in the Somerset House Gazette. It would seem from the above accounts of the work of other pupils, especially Sir George Beaumont's, that Cozens did not use his new blot method all of the time when teaching, and Angelo, searching for items of interest to his readers, would conveniently forget tedious hours spent in copying drawings and prints set before them by their drawing master. Therefore, it would be reasonable to conclude that at Eton Cozens would not be able to teach only landscape drawing, as he appears to have been able to do with the Harcourt's in the 1750's and with his private pupils at this date (see later discussion of Polwarth correspondence). Instead, teaching a large class of various ages and abilities, he was compelled, as all the previously-discussed eighteenth-century drawing masters had been, to teach the rudiments first - figure drawings after the antique, copies of old master prints (such as the 'Rosa' in Angelo's hands in Hone's portrait), and prints or drawings with animals like those produced by Lord Maynard. A copy by Cozens of a drawing by Marco Ricci was found in Queen Charlotte's portfolio at Windsor. This, with a view of Kew Green (1785) in the Bull volume in the Print Room of the British Museum (p.27) by Edward, Duke of Kent, who was also under Cozens's tuition from 1778, indicates that he proceeded in this traditional manner with the Royal family and other pupils as well. There should be no doubt,

however, that once a student or class was advanced enough from copying drawings to proceed to drawing landscapes, Cozens would attempt to teach them his blot method, published in the 1759 Essay. It was probably these classes that Angelo so conveniently, if inaccurately, remembered.

The Grimston papers contain indications that Cozens did indeed use his blotting method with at least one pupil at Eton. Robert Grimston attended Eton from 1759 to '64, and went from there to Cambridge and on to his grand tour. In 1768, the year he returned, Cozens wrote to his guardian, John Grimston, expressing the hope that his family enjoyed perfect health 'particularly my once companion and scholar in Blotting, to whom pray be pleas'd to present my compliments'.¹⁹ No landscape drawings by any members of the Grimston family survive.

A much later drawing by Sir George Beaumont, of a view looking out of the mouth of a cave, inscribed 'From an Accidental blot of Indian Ink on a Palate [sic] Coleorton Oct.6,1806', indicates that not only did Cozens occasionally teach with his blot method at Eton, but he even used the particular blot method of colours mixed on a plate that Angelo describes.

Although there is only the evidence discussed above of Cozens's teaching at Eton, there cannot be any doubt that he was one of the strongest influences on Beaumont's career as an amateur and patron. Several dated drawings in the album of Beaumont's sketches now in the Victoria and Albert Museum bear very close resemblances to various 'stiles' of composition in Cozens's 1759 Essay, although the style of the drawings may indicate a much later date. Beaumont's often remarked-upon fondness for Claude, may have been passed on

to him by Cozens.

There are drawings by Beaumont done in the Lake District in August 1781, in a sketchbook now in the Clevedon Court Archives, which show a strong debt to Cozens's approach to mountainous scenery and valleys as evidenced in the latter's publication, Various Species, which Beaumont probably knew well.²⁰ In these landscapes, Sir George's style, medium, composition, and approach to the views, show a remarkable similarity to that of Cozens's closest pupil, his son John Robert Cozens. This was before Sir George Beaumont and John Robert Cozens met and worked together in Italy, late in 1782. The closeness of Beaumont's drawings of the early 1780's in the Clevedon album to the Cozenses' approach of the 1770's is even more remarkable when one recalls that Beaumont had been taught by Malchair at Oxford after he left Eton in 1769, and had also been strongly impressed by the work of Thomas Hearne and, of course, Oldfield Bowles and Richard Wilson.

Beaumont's tutor, the Reverend Charles Davy, was a subscriber in 1776, along with Beaumont, to Cozens's Principles of Beauty. Beaumont must have purchased and studied carefully Cozens's Various Species with Davy, when it appeared while he was at Oxford, since Davy's notes on Various Species are mixed in with Constable's.²¹ The printed list of Various Species found in the Grimston papers (reproduced in App.I, fig.18) contains the lists found on sheets 1, 2, and 7 of Constable's notes, but not sheets 5 verso and 6. They may have belonged to a published part of Various Species that has not survived or, as Wilton suggests, may have been recollections of Cozens's theories

by a student. That his students at Eton were inculcated with ideas of this sort - the distinctions between beauty, greatness, and simplicity, is evident from the letter from a pupil in Devon in 1781, transcribed by Whitley.²² These ideas were part of his teaching of the 1770's and it is doubtful that Beaumont would have learnt much of them at Eton before 1769 and must, therefore, have studied Various Species carefully with Davy or with Cozens himself.

The implications of Cozens teaching this sort of aesthetic theory and taste to his pupils at Eton in the 1770's will be discussed in the next chapter, but I would like to use the rest of the present one to discuss one of the few of Cozens's students whose drawings are now in a public collection.

The work of only four of his amateur pupils survives in a sufficient amount to be worth studying, and, as always with work connected with Cozens, there are a few vital facts missing in each case to make guesswork and inference necessary. Henry Stebbing's volume of eighty blots, with drawings after the blots, now in the Hermitage, presents the most complete record of a student's progress under Cozens, but we are without any letters by him and possess only a few of the dates and basic facts of his life. Lady Amabel Polwarth's letters survive and chronicle her relationship with Cozens as a pupil, but her undated drawings, only a handful of which survive, could have been the product of lessons with any one of her five or so drawing masters. Lady Elizabeth Lee's drawings also survive, but there are no letters to enlighten us about her work except the above-mentioned ones of her brother, Viscount Nuneham. Some letters and some drawings by her sister-in-law, the Hon.

Mary Harcourt, do survive, but she did not begin to draw until about 1780, only six years before Cozens's death. I will discuss the work of these three women in the following chapter, but it is the work of Henry Stebbing that I will deal with here.

Andrew Wilton, in his 1980 catalogue of the Cozenses' work, was the first to mention an album in the Hermitage bearing the 'ex libris' of 'Henricus Stebbing Grayensis Anno 1769' and containing what seemed to be a draft relating to the New Method and a group of blots with drawings derived from them.²³ In 1983, in her article on all three albums relating to Cozens in the Hermitage, Asya Kantor postulated that this album (which she called 'Miscellaneous Thoughts on Landscape', after the title of the manuscript draft Wilton mentioned) contained blots by Alexander Cozens and drawings after them by another unknown artist.²⁴ She noted that the drawings were overloaded with unnecessary details, in contrast to the exhortation of the manuscript notes to rely, not on details, but on unity in composition for effect. She also noted that the 'over-detailed, expressionless, monotonous drawings' contrasted strongly with the blots in the album, which had a 'breadth of generalization and unusually bold, fearless, large-scale brushwork'. She thought that the blots, therefore, may have been made by Cozens and the graphic artist filled the album with his own drawings. 'We doubt that the name of this artist will ever be discovered. But it is clear that he was one of the zealous but talentless admirers of Cozens's method. The only thing that brings him and Cozens together is the same method of classification of kind and styles of landscapes,

which are set forth in the Essay of 1759 and in the New Method'.

Noting Henry Stebbing's 'ex libris', Mrs. Kantor thought that perhaps the blot on the back of a letter-cover addressed to him (H.41690), as well as many of the others, had come into his hands via Beckford or Cozens. This argument was rather tenuously based on a connection with Beckford through the latter having to register his property rights at Chancery Lane and the fact that the two other albums in the Hermitage with works by Cozens once belonged to Beckford.

With Henry Stebbing, we encounter again the problem of sorting through successive generations with identical names. Fortunately, however, the dates of Henry Stebbing I and II are clear: the DNB states them respectively as 1687-1763 and 1716-1787. Both were preachers to the Society of Gray's Inn and both wrote tracts on theological subjects. Those of Henry Stebbing II were published in three volumes from 1788-90, with a memoir by his son, Henry Stebbing III, who was not a preacher but a barrister. He mentions nothing in this memoir of his father being an amateur artist, but then, neither does he mention his activities as a Fellow of the Royal and Antiquarian Societies. As we shall see, Henry Stebbing III was an active amateur artist and, in the absence of the prefix 'Rev.', it must be his bookplate in the Hermitage album. His father married in 1751, and the baptism of Henry Stebbing, son of Henry and Ann Stebbing, is recorded at St. Andrew's, Holborn, on the 17th of April, 1752. Henry Stebbing was, therefore, an exact contemporary of Alexander Cozens's son, John Robert. On the 17th of
25
November, 1770, Henry Stebbing was admitted to Gray's Inn.

The catalogue of the sale held after his death in 1818, firmly established that Henry Stebbing III was the owner of the Hermitage album, the author of its manuscript essay 'Miscellaneous Thoughts on Landscape', and the artist of the drawings, if not also the blots, and, incidentally, the information from the sale precludes the necessity of any connection with Beckford. In this 'Catalogue of the Small but very interesting Collection of Original Drawings and Sketches of the late Henry Stebbing, Esq...',²⁶ under the catalogue sub-heading 'Original Sketches and Drawings, by Mr. Stebbing', lot 228 (p.9) consisted of 'Outlines, Landscapes, composed and designed from Blots. Miscellaneous Reflections on Landscape - quarto' (sold to 'Lloyd' for 10s. 6d.).²⁷

This sale establishes not only the provenance of this album now in the Hermitage, but of several other now important and well-known collections of drawings by Cozens himself. I list the relevant lots here in order to help elucidate the provenance of several works by Cozens and also to establish that he is the artist of other works whose attributions have previously not been clear.

OCTAVO ET INFRA

p.6, lot 171. An essay to facilitate the Inventing of Landscapes, 1759 - A new method of Ditto, by Cozens, plates, russia. Bt. Spreckly. 6s.

[Possibly the one now in the Hermitage from Beckford's sale, 1882, 9th day, p.163, lot 2221. (See the Wilton Cozens catalogue, p.7). The Hermitage album, however, was bound in 1795, including the Trees, and there is no mention of these in the Stebbing sale. The possibility arises, therefore, that Stebbing's copy of the 1759 Essay and the New Method are still to be discovered.]

PRINTS

p.6, lot 195. Cozens's Blots, Trees and Clouds. Bt. Spreckly. 14s.

lot 196. Cozens's Large Trees. Bt. Spreckly. 9s. 6d.

ON THE SACRED WRITINGS by Mr. Stebbing

p.8, lot 222. Reflections on Some of the Properties of Beauty and Sublimity, with other Memoranda - in a case. Bt. Lloyd. 1s. 6d.

[Although this is not by Cozens, I mention it because its discovery may prove that it was strongly influenced by Cozens.]

p.9, lot 223. Cozens's Variations of the Human Features, and a Collection of Tracings from Dresses, ec. Bt. Pawnall. 3s.

[Presumably, the Principles of Beauty, to which Stebbing subscribed.]

ORIGINAL SKETCHES AND DRAWINGS BY MR. STEBBING

p. 9, lot 228. [As above, lot 223]

lot 241-3. Three volumes of Sketches c.1800 in the vicinity of Tunbridge Wells, Brighton, Hastings, etc. Bt. Dr. Curry.

[They occur in Curry's sale in lots 3045-47, where the artist's name was not mentioned.]

lot 244. Studies from the Antique, by Cozens. Bt. Dr. Curry. 10s.

[At Curry's sale this was lot 3049, Bt. Evans. 5s. 6d. In Curry's sale it was described as 'A Volume of Ancient Heads and Antiquities of Heathen Dieties, Heroes, Philosophers, etc.' and the artist's name was not stated.]

lot 245. Eighty Designs and Sketches, by Cozens, in pen and bistre, etc. - folio. Bt. Dr. Curry. 2/ 8s.

[At Dr. Curry's sale it was lot 3048 and was Bt. by William Mackworth Praed. 5/ 5s. and was described as 'A Volume Containing Designs and Studies by Cozens'. It is now in a private collection, U.K. - see Oppé, p.83, n.2 where he notes the previous owner's inscription on the title sheet 'Bought at Greenwood's, July 1794'. This previous owner was Stebbing who was also, therefore, the author of the manuscript verbatim copy of the 'Rules for the New Method' which Oppé ascribes to William Mackworth Praed (p.66).]

lot 246. Sketches of Studies, by Cozens, in pencil, ink, etc. - folio. Bt. Hawkins. 2/ 9s.

[I have not been able to trace the Hawkin's sale, but the recently-discovered album of sketches in the National Library of Wales has an identical binding to the above Praed album now in the private collection. 'COZENS'S SKETCHES, EC.' is written on the spine, and below a torn label on the title page with the words ['Sketches'] by COZENS, is the inscription 'Bought at Greenwood's July 1794', in identical handwriting to the Praed album.]

Stebbing's name also occurs as the purchaser of three lots in Alexander Cozens's sale at Christie's in 1787: lot 4. Two outlines. Bt. Stebbing. 5s.; lot 36. Four Sketches

of trees. Bt. Stebbing. 9s.; lot 75. One slight drawing, in brown. Bt. Stebbing. 16s.

There is one further intriguing, if tenuous, possible connection of Stebbing with Cozens, deriving from a letter to John Grimston at Kilnwick from P. Panton, Holywell, March 7, 1768:²⁸

... - if you do go to London I know you will call on my Eldest Daughter who is with two Ladies of my acquaintance at the home of Stebbing in Great Queen's Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields - the better to find them enquire for the celebrated Mrs. Clives, who lives next door to them...

Cozens was in close contact with Grimston that year and the 'celebrated Mrs. Clives' who lived next door to the Stebbings was another pupil of Cozens (see App.E). Could Grimston have recommended Cozens to the Stebbings as a drawing master for the three ladies and Henry Stebbing, a young man of sixteen years of age at the time? Stebbing did not attend Eton, so the connection between Cozens and himself did not begin there. The book plate in the Hermitage album is dated 1769 and the paper in the album bears quite a different watermark to the other albums containing works by Cozens. The latter were purchased at Greenwood's in 1794 and mounted on paper watermarked 1795.

All of the evidence thus far indicates that Henry Stebbing III was a private pupil of Cozens's from about 1768/9, who purchased all of Cozens's systems, studied them carefully, composed his own elaborations of the theories, and was a serious collector of Cozens's works after his death. His manuscript notes and the drawings in the Hermitage album, therefore, provide a unique opportunity to study the effect of Cozens's methods of teaching landscape to a private amateur pupil.

The general progression of the blots in Stebbing's album is similar to that of the development of Cozens's own blots. That is: they proceed from the fairly thin strokes that indicate everything except the finest details of the finished outline, as illustrated in the 1759 Essay; through the rougher sort of sketch that we find in the British Museum sketchbook acquired in 1888 that contains his blots for Various Species; to the wrinkled-paper, dark, massing blots of the New Method. The ink progresses too from the indian ink suggested in the 1759 Essay, to the lamp-black of the New Method. Two letters in the correspondence between William Mason and William Gilpin put the date of the change in the colour of ink used at about 1772.²⁹ Several of the blots can be found to conform compositionally with the suggested eight and then sixteen types or 'stiles' of composition of the three publications, again in a roughly chronological order. One can also discern the recommended movements of the hand to be observed in making blots, that are mentioned by Oppé in his discussion of the manuscript note in the Praed album,³⁰ namely 'trembling', 'long and horizontal', and 'dabbling', and the downwards serrated line for trees and bushes, and horizontal parallel hatching for ground, rocks, buildings and woods, etc.

Although a comparison with a large number of blots by Cozens himself indicates that the description in Stebbing's sale catalogue is correct and they are by a different artist, Henry Stebbing, they nevertheless are bold and unified in composition, as Mrs. Kantor described them, and, as such, are a credit to the initial stages of Cozens's method. They tend to come in groups, indicating, as Cozens

himself recommended, that a large number were made at separate times, Stebbing thus acquiring by frequent use, 'freedom of hand, a knowledge of proportion, and a facility of execution' (New Method, p.24).

However, when making his blots, has Stebbing kept to the rule that Cozens emphasized strongly in both the 1759 Essay and the New Method (p.23, Rule III, 1 & 2): 'confining the Dispositon of the Whole to the general Form in the Example which you Chuse for your Stile of Composition' and 'Possess your mind strongly with a subject [the sixteen kinds listed being an aid in furnishing a subject]...make all possible variety of shapes and strokes upon your paper, confining the disposition of the whole to the general subject in your mind'? The fact that titles are inscribed above several of Stebbing's finished drawings, would seem to indicate that Stebbing had, in fact, done this. (See for examples Illus. 67 & 68: 'Idea of a Welsh river' and 'Idea of a Waterfall'). One wonders, however, whether, in some cases, Stebbing had some of his ideas for what the blots would represent after he had actually made them. This is suggested partially by the fact that not all of Stebbing's blots are labelled in this way, and also by the fact that when one looks at Cozens's blots, the finished drawings are always discernable, whereas Stebbing's blots are much less obvious.

Perhaps part of the indubitable failure of Stebbing's drawings is that he allowed the blots to dictate the composition, outline, and some of the details of the finished drawings, but took no account of the contrasting dark and light masses in the blot which were so much a part of interpreting the blot into a landscape. 'A true blot is

an assemblage of dark Shapes or masses made with ink upon a piece of paper, and likewise of lighter ones produced by the paper being left blank. (New Method, p.7). Rule IV. 4. (p.27) stated specifically that one was to fix the transparent paper over the blot and with black lead pencil draw the outlines of the figures and animals to be introduced and then, deciding from which direction the light would come, with almost black drawing ink, make out and improve the light and dark masses that appear in the foreground and retouch them, especially trees and shrubs, when dry. With a slightly lighter colour one was to do the same with the next ground, and so on with lighter shades each time. Rule V was finishing, this time from light to dark, with a camel's hair brush.

Granted that the instructions and illustrations of the 1759 Essay do not go as far as this, but there was an indication at the end of that Essay that this was not the entire process. Stebbing, however far he progressed with his blots, did not get beyond the stage of the earliest Essay with the drawings in this album. Very few of his drawings were done on paper made transparent for tracing, or on sheets with the light behind them, but rather were done directly in the album; the blots had been done on separate sheets then placed under a page and the outline traced and then the blots were mounted on the pages opposite the outlines. In only one drawing, 'the Idea of the exit from a Banditti Cave' (Illus. 69), did Stebbing allow the dark and light areas of the blot to properly dictate the composition and shading of the final drawing.

Another error in Stebbing's drawings is that he used

pen and ink to delineate the entire drawing, rather than the New Method suggestion of confining such detail to figures and animals drawn in black-lead pencil while the rest was done with two sizes of camel's hair brush.

Stebbing's drawings would seem to indicate that Cozens encouraged his pupils' imaginations in forming the composition of their landscapes, but did not encourage them to proceed to the more advanced steps of washing and shading their outline drawings until a much later stage. Alternatively, Stebbing may have transferred and enlarged some of these drawings on separate sheets and then shaded and finished them as Cozens suggested. In the absence of finished drawings by Stebbing, this must remain conjecture.

A few drawings of c.1800 in the back of Stebbing's album show that he also attempted to compose drawings from Leonardo's suggestion of looking directly at accidents in nature. These drawings, some of them carefully shaded and washed, were suggested by the grain in Sienna marble and the wood on the lid of tunbridge boxes (Illus. 70 & 71).³¹

That Stebbing experimented further on his own with the blotting method, after carefully studying Cozens's and Leonardo's suggestions, is also indicated by his brief manuscript essay 'Miscellaneous Thoughts on Landscape' with which he prefaced his blots and drawings in the album and which I transcribe here.³²

The method of Blotting was first suggested by - Leonardo da Vinci, and afterwards pursued and improved by the fertile genius of Alexander Cozens. but neither of these artists have given the principle [sic] on which it is founded, which I take to be this -

That a landscape or View, may, by omitting the detail of small parts, be resolvable into general masses - & That several Landscapes & Views, by such omission, may be resolved into general masses of the same kind or character. Therefore -

General Masses, by adding different details of small

parts, may be formed into different Landscapes and Views.

To exemplify the former of these propositions we have but to discover the face of nature in the morning twilight. when the quantity of light is not sufficient to be reflected from the smaller parts - Thus we have the general masses only of which the Landscape is composed - these general masses [p.2] may therefore be called the Blot - as the light increases the detail of the smaller parts becomes more and more particular - and this answers to the making out the Blot in the method taught by Cozens.

I have ever found it to be a sure test of the goodness of a composition that it looks well in Blot - that is - when it is seen in such a first and ambiguous light as is sufficient to manifest only the grand masses and principal component parts - If on the contrary it does not strike under these circumstances I have always found it to be faulty. To instance in the works of Teniers & of Salvator Rosi [sic] - The former seldom gives effect under this trial, the latter seldom fails - in the one we are struck with the penciling and discrimination of minute parts - in the other we feel the force of the general grand design of the whole -

I prefer the morning twilight for making the above experiment in preference to the evening because the progress of the encreasing light encreases the picturesque effect untill the complete landscape be formed - whereas - in the evening the effect is gradually dying away - many [p.3] very excellent appearance may however be observed at this time from which the eye of the artist will reap great advantage toward the true conception of Composition.

The wording of this essay is almost as confusing and ambiguous as Cozens's own descriptions. It is unclear whether it is merely a connoisseurship exercise - an attempt to explain the principle of blotting and its application in judging the merits of the composition of given paintings. With the last paragraph, however, it becomes unclear whether 'the above experiment' refers to how he judges paintings or whether he actually experiments as an artist himself by making blots from nature in the morning light. Although ambiguous, I think Stebbing is offering connoisseurs, not a new method of blotting, but a true test of taste when they are judging existing paintings of landscapes. This test is based on the fundamental principle of blotting which he feels Cozens and Leonardo did not

explain sufficiently for connoisseurs to perceive this particular utilitarian aspect of blotting.

However, Cozens had indeed imparted something similar to this idea himself in the New Method and it is possible that either Stebbing wrote this before the latter was published, from hints given verbally by his drawing master, or else he had received the idea from Cozens's writing but had not realized its source as Cozens himself. On page 8 of the New Method, Cozens explained:

...If a finished drawing be gradually removed from the eye, its smaller parts will be less and less expressive; and when they are wholly undistinguished, and the largest parts alone remain visible, the drawing will then represent a blot, with the appearance of some degree of keeping. On the contrary, if a blot be placed at such a distance that the harshness of the parts should disappear, it would represent a finished drawing, but with the appearance of uncommon spirit.

It is to be greatly regretted that more of Stebbing's works and especially his correspondence and own writings did not survive. It is evident from the volumes of drawings of landscapes, natural history, and anatomy that were listed in the sale after his death as by him, that Stebbing was a dedicated amateur artist and student of natural and physical sciences, and, from his own manuscripts listed in the sale, he appears to have also been a keen follower and even original thinker on the popular contemporary themes of different kinds of beauty, especially the picturesque and sublime. However, one of the most important results of this examination of Stebbing is the indication from his sale and the now known albums which have come from it, that he was a keen student of Cozens's theories in particular and probably the greatest of Cozens's contemporary admirers and collectors of his works. The Mackworth Praed and National

Library of Wales albums have enabled us to deduce more of Cozens's methods than nearly any other collection. Even more important than all of this, however, is the resultant picture of the type of student Cozens attracted and the obvious admiration in which Cozens and his theories were held.

NOTES CHAPTER 6:

THE TEACHING METHODS OF ALEXANDER COZENS

1. The main descriptions of his methods of teaching at Eton are: Henry Angelo, Reminiscences, 2 vols. 1828 edition, vol. I, pp. 212-216 and 1904 edition, vol. I, pp. 163-67, and Oppé, 1952, pp. 26, 27, 41, 43.
2. The image of a good-natured, mild-mannered, excessively polite, even by eighteenth-century standards, little man who was absent-mindedly preoccupied with his systems and consequently forever rushing about, is irresistible from these letters and the description of him by Angelo, (1904) vol. II, p. 126. Not only did Beckford suggest that, as he crept about 'like a domestic Animal - t'woud be no bad scheme to cut a little cat's door for him in the great Portals of the Saloon' (Oppé, 1952, p. 36), but Mrs. Jeffreys, in a letter to the Marchioness Grey (App. I, n. 19), used the term 'poor creature' in a fond way.
3. Marks, 'An Anatomical Drawing by Alexander Cozens', p. 436.
4. Oppé, 1952, p. 86.
5. Buckinghamshire Record Office, Aylesbury: Lee Papers (hereafter DLE) E.2.16, 18 & 19
6. Mallalieu, p. 122, and Williams, p. 39.
7. Early English Watercolours, Spink and Son, Ltd., Annual Exhibition, 13 April - 8 May, 1981, no. 18, reproduced p. 7.
8. Elizabeth Harcourt was, with her future sister-in-law, Mary Danby Lockhart, a Lady-in-Waiting to Queen Charlotte at her wedding in 1761. All of the Harcourts moved in Court circles (her father had been George III's governor when he was Prince of Wales). For an account of the Harcourt family see The Harcourt Papers, edited by Edward William Harcourt, (1880-1905) 14 vols. In 1763 Elizabeth Harcourt married William Lee of Hartwell, 4th Bt. For an account of their activities as amateurs, see W. H. Smith, Aedes Hartwellianae (1851).
9. Williams, p. 39. One of these pairs is now in a private collection, U. K., and the other is now in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts.
10. The New Method is reproduced in full in the appendix of Oppé's monograph, 1952, pp. 163-87. It is discussed in detail and the plates are reproduced in Wilton, 1980, nos. 26-68, pp. 31-5. Paddington Press (Wisbech, Cambs.) have produced a reprint (1977) with an introduction by Michael Marquesee.
11. Three very important British landscapists were known to have made blots in Cozens's manner: William Gilpin, Joseph Wright of Derby, and John Constable.

12. Lady Amabel Polwarth, 1774: see Appendix I, p. 356.
13. In the Monthly Review, XX, 1759. For transcription see Appendix I, n. 1.
14. See for example, Sawrey Gilpin's letters to his father (App. I, p. 356) and the letters about Cozens's scheme for the Principles of Beauty from Thomas Grimston to his father, quoted in chapter four and the Marchioness Grey's letter to her daughter which will be transcribed in the next chapter. Algernon Graves's Exhibitors at the Society of Artists, etc. contains several references to Honorary Exhibitors, whose work could fit subjects taught by Cozens such as the 1768 Hon. Exh. G. Crawford (special) 221. A drawing (by invention) of a landskip by the seaside. He may later have been a subscriber to Cozens's Principles of Beauty (see App.E).
15. Oppé, 1952, p. 41.
16. Oppé, 1952, p. 26 puts this date possibly as early as 1763. That date is also put in doubt by Mortimer's Universal Director of 1763 in which Cozens is listed (p. 8) as a 'Landscape Ptr in Tottenham Ct. Rd.'. If he was teaching boys at Eton he would surely have advertised this.
17. Angelo, (1828), vol. I, pp. 213-15.
18. *ibid.*, p. 214. The notebook was mentioned briefly in the short biography by Mrs. Felicity Owen in the Manning Galleries Beaumont exhibition catalogue (1969): Sir George Beaumont, Artist and Patron, p. 5. Mrs. Owen very kindly arranged for me to see this sketchbook now in the possession of Sir George's descendant, Sir Francis Beaumont. I am very grateful to them both. A set of photographs of the album is now in the Witt Library at the Courtauld Institute, London.
19. See Appendix I, pp. 359 App. B.1.
20. Constable's copy of Various Species (the drawings of which are now in a private collection, U. K. and Fogg Art Museum, Harvard) may have been made on one of his visits to Sir George Beaumont's home, Coleorton.
21. See Wilton, 1980, no. 13, p. 26, who transcribes all of Constable's notes and mentions, but does not transcribe, Davy's metrical version of Various Species.
22. W. T. Whitley, Artists and their Friends in England, 1700-1799, vol. II, p. 318. Oppé, 1952, p. 39, thought Whitley had transcribed incorrectly and 'simplicity' should read 'sublimity'. However, the word 'simplicity' occurs several times in the Constable notes mentioned above, sheet 6. The word 'sublime' does not occur in them and may be taken to be represented by the word 'greatness' which is repeated several times accompanied by 'awe'. The letter defending Cozens transcribed by Whitley, was written by a former student then in Devon and may therefore have been written by Arthur Holdsworth or William Mackworth Praed, both well-known pupils discussed by Oppé (see App.E).

23. Wilton, 1980, p. 7.
24. Asya Kantor Gukovskaya, pp. 92-95 and un-numbered figs. on pp. 94-5. The article is written in Russian and the following summary of her text on these pages is a rough translation.
25. The date of Henry Stebbing's baptism was obtained from the Mormon Microfiche of the Parish Registers for the City of London in the Guildhall Library. The date of his entry to Gray's Inn is from Joseph Foster The Register of Admissions to Gray's Inn, 1521-1889 (1889), p. 386. This book also contains short biographies of all the Preachers of the Honorable Society of Gray's Inn by Archdeacon Hessey, including Henry Stebbing's father and grandfather. Both were Chaplain in Ordinary to the King (1731-2 and 1757).
26. The description of the catalogue continues: 'Consisting of highly finished Drawings of Objects in Natural History with Accounts and Descriptions by Himself; chiefly consisting of Insects, with Microscopic Dissections of the Various Parts: and of Animals and Anatomical Proportions, ec. likewise finished Views and Sketches in England and Wales, made on various Tours: also his original Notes and Readings in the Holy Scriptures, ec, ec.'
27. The torn label on the spine of the Hermitage album still has the letters ^{an} r_om which could be seen to fit the sale catalogue's title of the album, ie. ...Designed from Blots.
28. DDGR 42/18.
29. Barbier, 1963, p. 51 n. 1.
30. Oppé, 1952, p. 66.
31. Tunbridge ware is a special form of inlay developed at Tunbridge Wells c.1650 using minute strips of wood in a variety of natural colours to build up patterns.
32. Since the author refers to the 'fertile genius of Alexander Cozens' it is obvious that it was not written by Cozens himself. The handwriting compares favourably with the inscriptions on the blots and the inscriptions on the title pages of the Mackworth Praed and National Library of Wales albums.

CHAPTER 7:
PRIVATE PUPILS OF DRAWING MASTERS,
OF ALEXANDER COZENS IN PARTICULAR

At the end of his 'Note on Amateurs', Iolo Williams advanced an opinion which was shared by the majority of art historians:¹

There is an incidental thought which occurs to me, upon reading through this chapter, and that is how small a part women have played in the development of watercolour in England. Among the amateurs, at least, one might have expected to find many skillful women practitioners, since so very many ladies have had lessons in the medium. Yet, in fact, hardly any of the better amateurs were women...the total contribution of women to watercolour art up to the first half of the nineteenth century seems curiously unimpressive.

The explanation as to why Williams had this thought may be very simple indeed. Firstly, it has been evident from this thesis as well as the few other serious, if brief, considerations of the work of amateurs that there were far more male amateurs, especially in the eighteenth century, than has previously been assumed. It may be seen from Appendix A, that there were several drawing masters in the first half of the eighteenth century, who advertised that they would teach young gentlemen and ladies privately in their own homes. They were not as numerous before the middle of the century as they were after, but there is no doubt that the Lenses, Bickhams, and Goupys taught as many wealthy young men as they did women. The little information that is available about the drawing masters and their wealthy private pupils in the first half of the eighteenth century can be found in Appendix A. In this chapter, it should be more rewarding to study their activities in the second half of the century, when drawing masters and their

private pupils became so numerous. In Appendix F, I have argued that the idea that female amateurs were exceptionally numerous is a misconception due, to a large extent, to the type of amateurs found in the late eighteenth and all of the nineteenth centuries. This type of amateur was popularized in novels, and it was the novelists' portrayal of them that has tainted twentieth-century art historians' view of amateurs.

Secondly, it might also be argued that the actual work of eighteenth-century male amateurs that does survive, even the best, did not make a significant contribution to the development of eighteenth-century English painting: even those amateurs like Lord Aylesford and Sir George Beaumont, who were certainly talented, merely accepted without question ideas on landscape given to them by professional artists and perhaps made their contribution by exposing these ideas to a wider audience. It was, without doubt, as patrons and connoisseurs that they made their most significant contributions to the development of eighteenth-century art.

Thirdly, the work of amateurs, male or female, was viewed with a sentimental rather than artistic regard and kept, if at all, for sentimental reasons. If framed or carefully preserved by the artist and his/her immediate family, these works were soon removed from the walls or their portfolios stored in the attics by the next generation, since, not being by famous artists, they had no material value. As a result, the drawings, watercolours, and paintings of amateurs rarely survive and, when they do, they are often unsigned and poorly cared for - kept, if at all, in an attic with the family papers and not, usually,

given to a museum. A museum would not, until recently, even if they had the space, particularly want the work of amateurs in their collections. County record offices, the other most frequent recipients of these works, have difficulty classifying such objects and the attention paid to these works by the archivists is from a completely different point of view than that of an art historian. Finally, there is the historical fact that the work of women artists has always been considered of secondary or 'novelty' importance and, therefore, the work of a woman amateur would receive even less attention unless it was exceptional.

Because of the misconceptions nineteenth-century novelists have given us about private drawing masters, the work of the latter also seldom survives. In his appendix on drawing masters, Ian Fleming-Williams discussed the activities of the best known of these men who made the rounds of the country houses and spas, and he noted that it was not often that a sufficient living and proper respect could be gained from private teaching alone. Alexander Cozens is only one artist who taught at schools the same time he taught private pupils and he again provides the most rewarding drawing master to study. The remainder of this chapter will be devoted to an examination of his methods of teaching private pupils from the wealthy upper classes. His pupils and patrons are listed in Appendix E, where it can be seen that they numbered as many men as women. However, most of the information that is available concerns his women pupils: the study of their work may go some way to establishing just how important a role they did play in the development of eighteenth-century English art.

With Lady Amabel Grey (1751-1833), we have an amateur who possessed some talent and whose letters indicate that she, her mother, and her friends were very serious students of taste and aesthetic theory.² Her work is represented by only a handful of etchings in two public collections: the Print Room of the British Museum and Walpole's volumes of amateur etchers in the Lewis Walpole Library, Farmington.³ Examples of her work were very difficult to locate and the question arises, therefore, of how much of the work by accomplished amateurs is hidden away in attics and, even more important, how many letters in record offices or still in private hands indicate the important role that women amateurs played as patrons of artists and disseminators of their theories?

Because Lady Amabel Grey's father, Philip Yorke, second Earl Hardwicke, was so important politically and his papers survived in large quantities in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum, a great deal has been written about his life, especially about his activities with Catherine Talbot and Daniel Wray, as the publishers of the Athenian Letters (1736). This circle, especially Wray, had extensive dealings with artists of the first half of the century, in particular George Knapp⁴ and Arthur Pond. The article written by Joyce Godber on Lord Hardwicke and his wife, the Marchioness Grey, gives several indications of their interest in many of the arts, especially those of antiquities and gardening.⁵ The Marchioness was an amateur herself and an especially keen collector of paintings, prints and drawings. In 1752, her sister-in-law, Lady Anson, was working on an amazingly complex Dictionary of Taste with Mr. Anson, and her best friend, Catherine Talbot,

was a respected classical scholar who not only worked with Lord Hardwicke and Daniel Wray on their Athenian Letters but she was also, incidentally, an amateur artist.⁶

Amabel and her younger sister Mary were left in Catherine Talbot's care when their parents were at Wimpole or on various tours about the country, and she was, to a large extent, responsible for the type of classical and modern education that they received. In her article, Joyce Godber mentioned that Amabel was taking drawing lessons from James Basire (1730-1802) as early as 1761,⁷ but further unpublished letters reveal that in May, 1763 he arranged their admission to the exhibition of the Free Society of Artists and Amabel wrote a very creditable critique praising especially the pictures of Miss Read and landscapes by 'Mr. Deviz'.⁸

In a letter to Miss Talbot from Wrest Park four years later, in September, 1767, Amabel's mother wrote:⁹

My Designer indeed has chosen Places to sit in, that both the Sun & Wind have assaulted violently, but what One likes to do they say never hurts one. She has taken some little sketches that are like and I think pretty, but she still complains of the want of Mr. Cozens's freedom of Manner, & believes he won't be satisfied with them. She desires You may be told that as to Caractacus [possibly by William Mason (1759)], she has read it Times at least by the Dozen, & still remembers the Odes which she had learnt all by Heart.

Amabel's artistic pursuits were apparently well-offset by a good grounding in the classics ensured by Catharine Talbot, while her mother no doubt imparted something of her own connoisseurship of paintings and well-developed appreciation of prospects of all sorts 'Quiet and Pastoral...Rough and Wild' and others where 'even the Lights through the Trees seem almost copied from the Landscapes of Poussin and Rubens'. The Marchioness's turn of phrase and

vocabulary for describing scenery was well-tuned and showed a knowledge of all the latest texts on taste, sublimity, etc. This is especially evident in her description of Matlock in 1763:¹⁰

whose wild Romantic Beauties are more Charming than can be described. A Narrow Valley between Rocks of immense Height cover'd with Wood & a fine River winding in the bottom, sometimes smooth and peaceful like a Mirror, sometimes foaming & trembling over the stones it meets in its way & frequent little Cascades gushing from the Rocks above, though they are the Outlines of the Picture, will not give you any Idea of its Beauty. Mr. Anson, from Mr. [James] Stuart's Authority, says it is the exact resemblance of the Valley of Tempe...

If Amabel began her lessons with Cozens in the mid-1760's, they continued at least until her marriage in 1772 to Alexander Hume-Campbell, Lord Polwarth. On a tour to his relatives in Scotland shortly after their marriage, Amabel's letters showed that she was fascinated by an East India officer's impressive collection of Persian manuscripts, Chinese paintings on glass, and a great number of Indian paintings of which she apparently had enough previous knowledge to recognize and compare one artist's work, Durbar, with examples she was already familiar with at Windsor.¹¹ There was, admittedly, a taste for this type of work among connoisseurs at the time, but one cannot help remembering William Beckford's pet name, 'the Persian', for Cozens in the later 1770's.

In the same letter, from Marchmont House, Amabel wrote that she had encountered 'a whole famly of Pringles. It is one of them who is my scholar for blotting, - she visited us again the other day, with another family of Pringles and she told me she was practising in the same manner. I shall want to see her performances.'

Amabel's interest in Cozens continued through this

decade, since, in 1774, we find her intending to subscribe to what was probably a new landscape system proposed by Cozens (see App.I, pp.356-7). By April 1776, there had been a break in her lessons with Cozens, apparently due to longer residence in Wimpole or Wrest. This was evident in the letter her mother wrote her from London about Cozens's latest schemes:

12
...Perhaps now, there being no Standard for Happiness yet settled as Mr. Cozens thinks he has found for Beauty, & no Treatise yet compiled like his to show how you may Rise from the Simple to the Complex Idea, We in Town & Country may differ in our Ideas on the subject; and as Fox Hunters [referring to Lord Polwarth] are a discontented Race, they may be Repining at present at the very Weather that seems to me so Enviaible...Yesterday, we staid at home & saw only Mrs. J. Yorke, who brought some very pretty Drawings she had taken in Wales, & which she intends she says to show you, on purpose to make you impatient to see the Country. A Visiter I have had this Morning will explain to you how I come to think about Mr. Cozens & Beauty. He has just called upon me with his proposals, taken my Subscription, as he will have yours. he enquired kindly after you & if you continued Drawing, intends to Wait upon you, when, I answered for you that you would shew him your works, & he will bring or send us his Specimens of Beauty to see.

That Amabel had concentrated on landscapes for a long time but had once learnt to draw figures, can be gleaned from a letter of 1775 when she was keeping herself occupied at Wrest by reading Warton's Old English Quotations, de Retz, and drawing a small Hygeia from Mariette's Gems.

13
Apart from the above indications that Cozens taught Lady Polwarth landscape drawing, there is, in the Wrest Park bequest to the British Museum, a significant indication that he may have also taught her to etch. In the folder of etchings by her, there are four small landscapes that are inscribed, in the plate, 'Cozens inv. Ldy. A P sculp.' (Illus. 72-5). The lettering was obviously etched by a professional writing engraver after the proofs, of which

there are several examples. They, therefore, must be dated after her marriage in 1772. There is also a series of etchings after 'JB' (Illus. 76), James Bretherton. The earliest mention of him in the correspondence is 1778.¹⁴ The bequest also included two oval views of Studley and Newby Parks, which must date from after her sister's marriage to Thomas Robinson, second Lord Grantham (1738-86), in 1780 (Illus. 77). Two other imaginary oval landscapes, two square ones of a picturesque ruin and a cottage, as well as a coastal view and a view of Wrest Park Canal, may date from earlier periods (Illus. 78-80). A landscape signed in ink 'A Grey, delin et sculp.' is pre-1772 by this inscription and by its very rough style (Illus. 81).

The four etchings after Cozens are very curious in their exceptionally low horizon lines and resultant vast expanses of sky which are not utilized to their full extent as one would expect, knowing of Cozens's interest in sky studies in the early 1770's. The use of an object such as a blasted tree trunk or a ruin is quite common in his work but rarely seen with such extensive, very low views in the distance.¹⁵ There is some resemblance, especially in the tree forms, to the first composition in the New Method, but there was no view into the distance there. The closest that these works come to one of Cozens's is a drawing of a cross on a hill with a view of mountains beyond, in the Praed album, but it is, I believe, the work of another pupil (Illus. 82).¹⁶ It is obvious, however, from the motif of broken trees and the shape of the ruin in Lady Polwarth's etching (a sort of Virgil's tomb that occurs elsewhere) that the original drawing was by Cozens, as the inscription

indicates. Could they perhaps indicate a part of a landscape system that he was working on at the time, in connection with Various Species, that was later discarded? In any case, the etchings are quite competent and certainly show a mastery and confidence in the medium not evident in her etchings listed above.

Lady Polwarth referred to several portfolios of sketches and framed drawings in her letters but the only portfolio which appears to have survived is at Newby Hall, in the possession of descendants of Lord Grantham. Although not one of the portfolios Lady Polwarth described in her letters, it does nevertheless contain several signed, finished drawings by her, as well as one or two by Lord Grantham, several by her nephew who was later Earl Grey, and one by William Burgess, a drawing master who taught the family in the early nineteenth century (App.A).

All of Lady Polwarth's works in this portfolio are illustrated here in colour in order to indicate the washes that amateurs were permitted to use and the methods of laying them on that Cozens taught his pupils. Two of the landscapes in this portfolio are signed 'A Polwarth inv't & delin' (Illus. 83 & 84) and are based on river scenes, classically composed with picturesque figures and thatched cottages. The trees may have been selected from Cozens's Thirty-Two Species of Trees (1771), but it is easy to imagine that the 'objects' were drawn from parts of other prints or drawings, as Cozens recommended in his teaching (New Method, p.27). Two others are drawn from nature (Illus. 85 & 86): one is a picturesque view of barns and cattle through trees and the other a more direct view taken from the end of a canal or lake (possibly at Wrest), but

with picturesque figures added which again closely resemble staffage found in prints and echo Cozens's recommendation of
17
'constant use and close observation of parts of Objects'.

Another drawing (Illus. 87), unsigned but with a similar style in the drawing of the landscape in the background, is probably a direct copy of a print or painting, the animals bearing a remarkable resemblance to similar groups in prints by Vivares, etc. One of these prints was found in the album in the National Library of Wales along with sheets of examples of various animals (mainly cattle, goats, sheep and dogs) traced or copied from prints or copy books or sometimes from nature. This, once again, underlines the fact that Cozens recommended the use of the work of other artists for beginners, even to the extent of suggesting that they 'place [in front of them] good prints, drawings, or paintings, or something similar to the same kind of subject of your sketch' while they are making out the sketch from a blot (New Method, p.27). In the manuscript notes which Oppé found in the Praed album, Cozens even recommended tracing 'to lay up a plentiful store of ideas of ye forms of Objects' since it was the quickest and best method to collect a large number of these as close
18
to the original as possible, especially in proportion.

However, from the beginning, the mainstay of Cozens's teaching was the original composition of landscape, 'in contradiction to copying'. He argued that it was possible for anyone to copy landscape from nature but this only formed the habit of imitating what the draughtsman sees before him, 'which anyone may learn through practice'. The best way to learn landscape was to become used to composing

landscapes by blotting; drawing from nature could be learnt easily after this. But if one learnt to draw views found in nature first, one would need a great deal more time and practice to obtain a power of composing by invention (New Method, p.14).

One drawing of Lady Polwarth's stands out from all the others as evidence of this method and dictum of Cozens's. It looks, by its style, to be one of her earliest and it was most probably based on a blot (Illus. 88). The composition she kept in mind when drawing the blot was 'stile' three or six from the 1759 Essay, confirming that it is an earlier attempt. The composition is one of Cozens's own favourites and can be found throughout his own work (eg. in the oils of Matlock and the Rowlatt watercolour, App.I, fig.19) and in examples of most of his students' known work (see for example Illus. 102 and App. H, fig. 7).

The repoussoir rocks to the top on one side are balanced by a repoussoir blasted tree in the foreground. There are rocks with their characteristic horizontal shading in the middle ground, and a mountainous coast, dotted with buildings in the distance, all proceeding from dark to light as recommended by Cozens.

A moody, romantic drawing of a moonlit landscape with a river, house, and dominant tree in the foreground (Illus. 89) owes a great deal, I feel, to what Lady Polwarth had learnt from Cozens in powers of invention, but its style and medium, of black and grey ink wash, places it much later than the above work.

In the late 1770's, she was preoccupied with her husband's health, and accompanied him to Nice in hope of improving it. She drew there too, although her heart was

not in it. Two views, in sepia ink and wash, were probably done on this visit to Nice and are much more topographical in character than the two above-mentioned drawings (Illus. 90 & 91). On their return, Lord Polwarth worsened and died, but in the 1780's Amabel's activities as an amateur and a connoisseur continued. To illustrate this, I shall list a few excerpts from her family's correspondence, since they provide an unique indication of not only her dedication, but also the extent of the involvement and interest of other members of her family in the activity of drawing and painting.

In 1780, Lady Polwarth wrote: 'Indeed, I believe it would be long enough before...I should lay blue and green enough on my palette to emulate Miss Delane [sic: Mary Delany]¹⁹ in the imitation of Nature'. The following year, she asked her sister, Lady Grantham, to tell Bretherton that she would desire two lessons if she came to visit her.²⁰ When she did visit Newby in 1783, she found Lord Grantham had a really fine collection of prints 'but more curious than beautiful...as there are a great number of Marc-Antoine's [sic] and other old Engravers...I have found out the unintelligible Tintoret [sic] at Wimple, and that it is the subject which I guess'd on reading Tintoret's life in Roger's book. A servant protected by St. Mark against the cruelty of his master...'.²¹ In 1784, she was still dedicated enough to her drawing to be annoyed when her sister would not let her take her drawing book on a visit to Hackfall, and the next day she took one anyway in the rain. When prevented from going out, she took views from her sister's window.²² The following year she asked for a piece

of vellum 'as I have a mind to copy Gems'.

In the same decade, her aunt, Agnetta Yorke (d.1820), established a correspondence with William Gilpin about his tours and, with her daughter Caroline and son Joseph, drew and etched views for him to criticize. Cozens's method was not forgotten, or perhaps his theories had become universal, since in 1789 we find Agnetta Yorke writing 'I long to show her [Lady Grantham] and Lady Bell some of the Blots I made in Devonshire. I have been very industrious this summer'.

The British Museum and Baroness Lucas, Lady Polwarth's descendant, have oval aquatints of very creditable views along a river, drawn by Agnetta Yorke in Gilpin's manner and aquatinted by her daughter Caroline. The presence of Samuel Alken's name in the correspondence indicates that he may have been the one to teach them in this period. Another aunt, Mary Yorke, also drew and encouraged her son in this form of entertainment when he went on a ramble in Monmouth 'armed with Gilpin and a tin case with drawing materials'.

In the 1790's, we find Lady Polwarth engraving her late brother-in-law's views on the Tagus which he had drawn in 1777 from sketches he had made in Spain in the 1760's. The British Museum has several early aquatints by him, including one of Hendon Lodge, drawn apparently while on his honeymoon there in 1780. His son, Thomas Philip Robinson (1781-1859), the third Lord Grantham and the inheritor of the title Earl Grey after the death of his aunt, Amabel, was an even more accomplished artist than any of his predecessors, as attested by several albums of drawings done on tour, several architectural drawings, and an album of views of Wrest Park, all in the possession of Baroness Lucas except for one or two drawings in the Newby Hall portfolio.

This discussion of privately owned, previously unpublished works by members of the Grey family illustrates the wealth and type of information about amateurs and the artists they patronized that can be found in record offices and private collections.

There are twelve etchings in the British Museum from the Wrest Park collection which deserve particular attention, especially when one recalls the four by Lady Polwarth after Cozens (Illus. 72-5) that may have been part of an idea for Various Species. They are the twelve small etchings, on three sheets, etched by Austin (three have his signature 'Austin f' in the landscapes) but inscribed, in ink, 'Cozens inv.' They were mentioned earlier in connection with Sir George Beaumont's Eton sketchbook (for two of them, see Illus. 63 & 64; bottom right of each). The idea that this inscription could be correct is encouraged by the presence of other works by Cozens in the British Museum from this Wrest Park collection, the above-mentioned four etchings by Lady Polwarth especially. Austin was known for etching landscapes, particularly for drawing books (see App.A) and in 1759 he sold Cozens's Essay at his shop in Hanover Street, and displayed there some of Cozens's finished examples for the Essay. Cozens's authorship is confirmed, however, not only by the fact that Beaumont copied one in his sketchbook, but also by the presence of two of these small etched landscapes, along with six others of the same size and style (Illus. 63 & 64), in the album, mentioned earlier, of another pupil, Charlotte Aynscome, which was sold at Christie's in June, 1982.

Those etchings in the latter album were marked along

the edges for squaring off and had clouds pencilled in. I am inclined to view this series of landscapes, dominated by rather classical buildings and ruins, as part of one of Cozens's systems, especially as examples of the sort of thing he recommends that artists and amateurs use as 'objects' in their landscapes, after they have made the basic composition by using a blot. They are basically outlines and too small to be the promised shaded examples to follow the 1759 Essay. It is easier to see them in connection with the schemes for the Various Species or, even more likely, along the lines of the Thirty-Two Species of Trees and series of twenty skies that he published for artists to use in their composed landscapes. All one would need to complete this series of objects, for finishing landscapes, would be a series of sixteen or so plates of figures and animals, which may yet be found, especially in light of the group of drawings and tracings at the back of the National Library of Wales album (Illus. 92 & 93) along with a set of twenty-two drawings after plants, which were obviously meant to be engraved (see Illus. 94).

The domed building in one of the small landscapes etched by Austin (Illus. 64, bot. rt.) may owe its origin to the church in Ariccia which Cozens may have seen on his visit to Italy in 1746. There is a chalk drawing of a similar building seen through trees in a private collection (Illus. 95) and a similar one again occurs in the coastal 'stile' one of the 1759 Essay. The group occurs in a different form in the top right landscape on sheet three of the Austin etchings and again in the Aynscome album (Illus. 64 bot. rt.). In the latter, however, it has shifted in the plate, being given more hillside to the left and shading and

figures have been added in ink. Clouds are pencilled in and the edges are marked for squaring. A blot in the City Art Gallery of Leeds (Illus. 96) has the same outline of buildings and even clouds, and an outline pen and ink drawing from the blot (Illus. 97) reproduces the buildings and clouds in a form very close to that in the Aynscome album etching. An outline tracing in pencil in the Aynscome album may be the intermediate stage between the blot and final drawing.

The compositional format and style and medium of the finished drawing in Leeds appears closer to the work of the early 1770's than to the landscape versions of Various Species, but it is closer to that system than anything in the New Method. That he abandoned this scheme of providing series of plants, trees, skies, buildings, and figures for use in landscapes composed on the blot method, is apparent from the fact that he does not mention it in the New Method where he was given an ample opportunity.

The reason for this may have been because he was never able to publish all of those series, but it may also have been because the landscapes of the New Method were composed on such a monumental scale and were such a departure and advance from his earlier work, that they no longer required outfitting with such insignificant features. They were useful to him while he was mainly a drawing master and concerned with ways of helping his students, but the work he was producing for the New Method was on a more elevated scale and perhaps of more service for mature, professional artists, at least one of whom found it of some use - Joseph Wright of Derby.

With the Aynscome album, it is difficult to decipher which drawings, if any, were actually used by Cozens with his pupil, or whether they were all purchased at the two sales of the Cozenses' effects. It does seem though, as if some were done in Cozens's company, since there is a blot and a finished drawing of a villa, accompanied by a pupil's drawing. The paper of the pupil's drawing is a very bright white, as with several of the others labelled 'old Cozens' and 'John Cozens' so that the possibility remains that they were all drawn after the Cozens's sale. The handwriting on the envelope addressed to Miss Aynscome closely resembles Cozens's own.

The most interesting of all the pupil's efforts in this album is the finished drawing inscribed 'after Cozens' (App.I, fig.21), again in that favourite compositional 'stile' three of the 1759 Essay. The series of etchings by Anthonie Waterloo in this album may have been bought at Cozens's sale or, as the Christie's catalogue suggests, bought by the pupil on Cozens's recommendation to study the work of other artists. It was a very curious album indeed and it was certainly a loss to students of eighteenth-century art that it was broken up before it could be examined properly in its entirety.

The portfolio of Lady Elizabeth Lee was likewise broken up and some of its contents dispersed by later descendants before the remainder was deposited in the Buckinghamshire Record Office. The fact that two or three more drawings were deposited at an even later date indicates that there
28
may be more about.

I have already mentioned this amateur in connection with her brother, George Simon, Viscount Nuneham, later Earl

Harcourt. The drawings that remain in the portfolio are not inscribed but there are the typical amateur copies from drawing books and prints (Illus. 98 & 99), rubbings of flowers such as those used by Mrs. Delany, and at least one view of the gardens at Stourhead, dated 1779 (Illus. 100). One or two might be said to be the products of Cozens's blot teaching since their compositions are again close to that of 'stile' three or six in the 1759 Essay (App.H,fig.7). Some works are topographical, local views (eg. Aylesbury, Hartwell House, etc.), but others are mountainous views done in monochrome sepia and black ink. Two others are coloured, one is brighter (Illus. 101), but both are compositionally reminiscent of Cozens. Most telling, however, are the pairs of oval drawings, two blots and two drawings after them, now in a private collection, U.K. and the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (Illus. 59 & 60 and App.H, figs.5 & 6). That they are by Lady Lee is clear from the foliage with its characteristic 'fingers' and the buildings with gaping black holes for windows and doors.

I once thought that these drawings might be by the same artist as the so-called 'Rhone' group of drawings, but Wilton has convincingly argued that the latter are by the Hon. Mary Harcourt, and a comparison of her foliage (Illus. 102) with Lady Elizabeth Lee's does indeed show them to be different. The use by both of them of sepia and black ink on varnished paper is a characteristic common to most of Cozens's pupils, as can be seen in the colour illustrations to this chapter and the works by her illustrated in the 1980 Cozens exhibition catalogue by Wilton. Mary Harcourt did not begin to draw until about 1779 and her connection with

Cozens appears to have been through Beckford or in town where her husband was the Lt. Col. of the 16th Queen's Dragoons, Col. Burgoyne's old regiment (see App.E). Her activities as an artist are well-discussed by Wilton and also by Oppé.²⁹ Now that so many of her drawings are known at Yale and Leeds, we have a good idea of why they made such an impression on Walpole and Sophie von La Roche. Apart from their manneristic treatment of foliage, their darkness may also seem objectionable to us, but it must be remembered that the varnish that makes them so dark now, was clear when they were painted. Their compositions, especially, are a credit to Cozens's systems and the faultiness in executing buildings, especially in the drawings of Lady Elizabeth Lee, is easily understood by their eagerness to paint landscapes before spending time on such uninteresting basics as perspective and learning to draw figures. Cozens himself encouraged this approach with his teaching method and it was these amateurs that he had in mind when devising his systems of trees, plants and classical buildings to be inserted in the appropriate places in landscapes designed from blots.

Looking at Lady Lee's oval blots, it is evident that they have the spirit and boldness of composition that Cozens was trying to develop in his pupils. It was noted above, that he felt that the ability to draw and copy nature was easier to accomplish after one had learnt to compose. That he took this approach with Lady Lee and Harcourt is obvious. If he had developed his smaller systems further, they could have filled their landscapes with copies of plants, animals, figures, etc. before they had learnt to draw those objects from nature.

The discussion of the work of the three women amateurs

in this chapter has proved useful in two ways. First of all, it has provided practical examples of Cozens's teaching method, how he applied it, how well it worked, and where it failed. Previous brief studies of the work of his known pupils like Sir George Beaumont, produced no certain evidence of the use of blots and very few works which could be said to have derived directly from his teaching. It took a great deal of research and time to reveal some concrete evidence of Cozens's connection in a drawing master/pupil relationship with the Grimstons, Greys, Yorkes, Polwarths, and Harcourts, but the rewards have been manifold in the contribution to a new understanding of Cozens's methods as a teacher, deviser of systems, and artist in his own right. In Appendix E are listed the names of all pupils and/or subscribers to the Principles of Beauty and undoubtedly there is still a wealth of information to be discovered about Cozens's methods, pupils, their work, and perhaps even works by him still unrecognized in private hands.

It may be significant that the information that has emerged about Cozens's teaching activities has been mainly through the work of his women pupils. This is the second way in which the discoveries of this chapter have proved useful: it is an indication of the extent of the contribution women amateurs may have made. The potential importance of this contribution is indicated by the fact that the Tate Gallery recently cleaned a 'Cozens' drawing in the Herbert Powell Bequest (Illus. 103) which must belong to the Rhone group of drawings, now recognized as probably by Mary Harcourt.³⁰ Its resemblance to Cozens's own work has always been so convincing (and this was especially renewed

after cleaning) that it is still hung with Cozens's works in the Tate collection, under a label with his name. It may yet be proven that it is indeed by him, or perhaps even an early work by his son, but the simple fact that its attribution is in doubt and it is now seen as the work of a mere pupil, is surely an indication of the power of his teaching methods and the potentially important role that amateurs, both male and female, can play in the study of British art.

NOTES. CHAPTER 7:

PRIVATE PUPILS OF DRAWING MASTERS,
OF ALEXANDER COZENS IN PARTICULAR

1. Williams, p. 248.
2. For details of her family and dates, see Appendix I, p. 356, n. 10 and Joyce Godber, 'The Marchioness Grey of Wrest Park'.
3. The only reason that her etchings were preserved in the British Museum was because they were mounted in an album by another member of the family who was an amateur and who also collected examples of the works of other amateurs. He bound them in an album which was included in the donation of all the drawings, prints, etc. still in Wrest Park just after the first world war. The very strong collection had been formed, on the whole, by the female amateurs and patrons of the family. If these amateur etchings had not been preserved in an album they would not have reached a public collection. If the present Baroness Lucas had not recalled seeing a portfolio of drawings in the possession of another branch of the family, at Newby Hall, I would not have learnt of the only known surviving drawings by Lady Amabel Polwarth.
4. See Louise Lippincott, Selling Art in Georgian London, the Rise of Arthur Pond, pp. 46-7. Miss Lippincott is not aware, however, of the Wrest Park Papers in Bedford where there is a great deal of additional unpublished information about this subject, notably Pond's trip to Wimpole to clean paintings and Hardwicke's patronage of John Russell, who worked in crayons and who was a pupil of Knapton's pupil, Francis Cotes, recommended by Daniel Wray (Bedfordshire County Record Office, Bedford, Wrest Park Papers (henceforward L), L30/9/94/2, 1772).
5. Godber, pp. 44-6, 52, 62.
6. For the Marchioness's painting by Claude Lorrain, see the letters L30/9/40/1, 1769, and L30/9/3/2 & 6. As to her activities as an amateur artist see L30/9/3/15 & 17. Lady Anson's 'Dictionary of Taste' is described in L30/9/3/33 and Catherine Talbot's references to her own drawings are found in L30/9/97/8.
7. Godber, p. 71.
8. L30/9/50/10 & 12.
9. L30/9a/9, pp.1, 4, 5.
10. L30/9a/8, pp. 116, 126-7.
11. L30/9/60/3. The collection belonged to Mr. Swithun. The letter was written from Marchmont House, September 3, 1772.

12. L30/11/122/99. Written from St. James's Square or Richmond, April 3, 1776.
13. L30/9/60/55: `...am glad to find I can draw Figures again, though I find them rather slow work. - & though not dissatisfied with my Performance, yet I suspect the Goddess pokes a little.'
14. L30/11/122/185. Letter from Richmond, December 4, 1778, when they asked him to make a frame for a small drawing. Later letters, in the 1780's, refer to drawing lessons.
15. John Robert Cozens was fond of exceptionally low horizons, even in the early work found in the album in the National Library of Wales.
16. The reason I believe this to be the work of a pupil is that it is one of a group of similar drawings in the Praed album, and one of these is a rather poor copy of a finished wash drawing by Alexander Cozens in the Graves Art Gallery, Sheffield.
17. Oppé, 1952, p. 76. I am very grateful to the present Baroness Lucas for telling me about this portfolio and to the present owners for kindly permitting me to examine and photograph it.
18. *ibid.*
19. L30/9/60/220.
20. L30/9/60/267.
21. L30/9/60/289.
22. L30/9/81/75 & 77.
23. L30/9/60/320.
24. L30/9/97/119. Some of the correspondence between the Yorkes and Gilpin now in the Bodleian was transcribed by Barbier, 1963, p. 156, but there is still a great deal of information to be had from their letters in the Wrest Park Papers, eg: L30/9/97/72, 92, 108 & 192.
25. L30/9/111/269 & 270.
26. Finished drawings for this work are reproduced in Oppé, 1952, plates 7, 11, 13 and Wilton, 1980, nos. 21, 23.
27. See Benedict Nicolson, Joseph Wright of Derby, vol. I, pp. 75, 88, 125, 127.
28. Buckinghamshire Record Office, Aylesbury. AR 121/79 is the first group of nine watercolours and three pencil sketches of landscapes, etc. by Lady Elizabeth Lee (all undated except one of 1779 of Stourhead) which were deposited on loan with their original leather portfolio in 1979. The second deposit, D/LE/169/81, was of two inscribed views of Aylesbury and Aylesbury Church from the grounds of

Hartwell House by Lady Elizabeth Lee. There is a view of Nuneham Church, Oxford in the BM P & D (1876-5-10-924) by Lady Betty Harcourt and there are two views of castles on hills in a private collection, G.B., also by Lady Elizabeth Harcourt. In both of these instances, I believe the works are by Lady Elizabeth Harcourt, née Vernon, wife of George Simon, Viscount Nuneham, later second Earl Harcourt.

29. Oppé, 1952, pp. 34-5, 91n. and Wilton, 1980, nos. 156-9, reproduced on plates 26 and 27. Iolo Williams once owned no. 156 An arch in the vault of an overgrown ruin and presumably attributed it to her, but did not mention her in his discussion of amateurs.

30. See Wilton, 1980, nos. 155, 158, 159 (all now attributed to Mary Harcourt).

CHAPTER 8:

CONCLUSION

Certainly, it was still true that drawing was not taught universally in the eighteenth century and Aristotle's statement, quoted at the beginning of this thesis, that drawing was a customary subject of education with some people, still held true even by 1800. The opinions of several educators were quoted who felt that drawing was a trivial pursuit and apt to distract students from their foundation subjects. By the middle of the nineteenth century drawing was finally considered important enough for it to be introduced, by legislation, universally to all schools in Britain. What this thesis has made clear, however, is that during the first three-quarters of the eighteenth century drawing became introduced to a sufficient number of pupils, at school or privately, for general opinion to become aware of its benefits, and it was particularly between 1750 and 1770 that the numbers who learnt it for a pastime or in their schools increased so astonishingly. Reasons for this have been discussed throughout this thesis, but there remains a need that they be summarized together here in order to establish whether the reasons already stated are sufficient to account for this mid-eighteenth-century phenomenon.

The first and strongest reason why drawing was taught to pupils in any large numbers was because of its usefulness, particularly for apprentices in trades and for assisting mathematics pupils in the comprehension of geometry. These benefits were realized by men such as Samuel Pepys and Christopher Wren who had in mind the good

of the pupils of Christ's Hospital in particular and the English nation in general. Drawing's usefulness to students learning to write was recognized shortly afterwards by the Governors of the Hospital and these three reasons had certainly always been the first to be stated whenever any one was called upon to defend the inclusion of drawing in education. Writing and mathematics masters were traditionally often teachers of drawing as well.

At the same time as Christ's Hospital was deciding to include drawing in its curriculum, philosophers of education like John Locke and the Earl of Shaftesbury were recommending it be taught to gentlemen's sons, for the reasons of usefulness stated above and for the additional reason that a drawing was often better than any number of words in describing something and it would prove especially useful to a gentleman on his grand tour. It is hoped that this thesis has demonstrated beyond doubt that the introduction of drawing to large numbers of people in the eighteenth century was inextricably tied up with fundamental changes in education which occurred at the same time, especially the introduction of 'modern' subjects, first to the private academies and preparatory schools, and then to the public schools and universities which had traditionally provided classical education. In fact, one of the reasons why drawing was finally available at schools like Eton and Harrow, as well as Oxford and Cambridge, may be because their pupils had already had some lessons in drawing in their earlier educations at home or at preparatory schools like Cheam. These students would naturally request further lessons at their next schools.

Peer pressure was, no doubt, also to an enormous extent responsible for the increased number of amateurs. If one student was receiving drawing lessons, his brother, as in the case of Thomas and Harry Grimston, or his fellow pupils would also want to take lessons. If such important people as the Duchess of Portland, Alexander Pope, Horace Walpole and his mother, and even the Royal Family were learning to draw, then those who admired or wished to emulate them would be certain to follow suit. As soon as anything was seen to become fashionable with the nobility, it was not long before it filtered down to the gentry; the list of subscribers to Alexander Cozens's Principles of Beauty (App.E) is ample proof of this fact.

The role that fashion, in the form of pressure from peers, played in the phenomenal increase in the number of non-professional artists is evident in the development of the ideas of connoisseurship and taste which, increasingly through the century from Richardson on, demanded that men be deserving of these appellations. If a man should earn such a title, he would demand that his son also earn it, and he would ensure, as John Grimston did, that his son's education included his favourite arts.

Before the foundation of the Royal Academy, which helped enormously to gentrify painting and bring artists and the pursuit of painting up to a higher social level and more into the public eye, the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures, and Commerce was already well-established. Like the Royal Academy Schools, the drawing school run by William Shipley and William and Henry Pars (App.A) for the Society of Arts was not attended by amateurs so has not been discussed in this thesis. In any case,

Richard Carline devoted half of his fifth chapter to the Society's school and D.G.C. Allan also made references to it in his monograph on Shipley. The Society of Arts was, however, attempting to 'Promote a Love of the Polite Arts and excite Emulation among the Nobility' and, in 1763, in order to accomplish this, the Committee of the Society of Arts advertized prizes for drawings of any kind by sons and daughters of Peers and Peeresses in their own right.¹ Increased exposure to the activities of artists, through these venues and the new annual exhibitions of the Society of Artists and the Free Society, as well as royal patronage in the form of the King's support for the Royal Academy, all helped to bring artists and their works more into the public sphere and it became quite fashionable to be seen at, or participate in, these exhibitions.

In the previous chapter, all of the examples of private pupils that were available for study were female. In discussing the reasons why drawing became such a popular pastime, we must also address the question of why it was particularly popular with women. Here again, the most powerful reason must have been fashion. Their unthinking following of fashion, instead of true desire and inclination to learn drawing, led to the conclusion of Iolo Williams and the sarcastic opinion of female amateurs that has prevailed from the late eighteenth century through to our own. Elizabeth Manwaring assumed that 'the fashionable damsel² depicted by Hannah More in Coelebs' was exaggerated:

Then comes my drawing master; he teaches me to paint flowers and shells, and to draw ruins and buildings, and to take pictures, and half a dozen fire screens which I began for mama...I learn varnishing, and gilding, and japanning, and next winter I shall learn modelling, and etching, and engraving in mezzotinto, and aquatinto, for

Lady Di Dash learns etching, and mama says as I shall have a better fortune than Lady Di, she vows I shall learn everything she does.

Miss Manwaring thought that the accomplishment of etching was rather rare, but from the evidence of the Harcourts, Polwarths and Yorkes, whose lessons and correspondence have been described in earlier chapters, it is clear that their drawing lessons included all of the various mediums described above, and Hannah More's young lady was certainly fashionable, but not at all exaggerated.

John Steegman, in The Rule of Taste, indicated another reason why women in particular were so inclined to this accomplishment. He noted that with the relaxing of the rules of the well-ordered Augustans, who had left little room for the intrusion of women, 'came the assertive, talented troops of females bearing their pencils, their pens, their lexicons, painting, writing, translating, talking, surrounding Dr. Johnson or Mrs Montagu or Samuel Richardson...'. He went on to list a number of these women who all 'achieved fame among their contemporaries, not because they excelled in their particular accomplishments, but because they were females, and the Romantic spring already to be felt in the air was especially suited to the Feminine...'.³

Changes in education meant that more women were being educated with modern subjects in private academies and this too accounts for why female amateurs were so numerous. This type of education was percolating down to the daughters of the middle classes as well. The economy was in a good state and there was more leisure time for all than there had ever been previously. According to The Polite Lady or a Course of Feminine Education (c.1770) 'no young lady deserves the

honourable character of an accomplished woman without a competent knowledge in the art of drawing...Drawing is not only an innocent Amusement, it is more; it is a useful qualification, will improve the imagination and strengthen the judgement by obliging you to examine the object you copy with greater care.⁴

In this thesis, one of the arguments mentioned for the increase in popularity of drawing lessons was the relaxation of the actual way one learnt to draw. It was suggested that William and Sawrey Gilpin's insistence on the importance of the effect of the whole in a drawing and on capturing the 'idea' of a landscape, rather than correctly and meticulously delineating the details, might have been very popular with their pupils who would traditionally, and with other contemporary drawing masters, have had to learn by constantly and carefully copying drawings and prints set before them. Alexander Cozens also would be popular with his private pupils, who, unlike his students at Christ's Hospital and Eton who had to copy from manuals and Cozens's own drawings and etchings, were encouraged to get used to composing landscapes by making blots before they had to learn to draw from nature. The purpose of this method was to encourage composing by invention, rather than tamely delineating what was before them or copying other artists.

Cozens and Gilpin, then, were the first in a line of a new type of drawing master with new methods which eventually resulted in the way children are taught to draw today. Free expression is now encouraged; instead of being told to copy their teachers' drawings of houses, people, etc., today's children are not shown any examples at all and are told to

draw their own 'idea' of a house, animal, etc. This was not at all the method that Cozens and Gilpin actually employed, although they have often mistakenly been credited for it, but they definitely can be given credit for being the first teachers of drawing to free their pupils from meticulous copying.

William Austin, perhaps through the influence of Cozens's 1759 Essay, also encouraged his pupils to 'sketch', particularly in his Specimen for Sketching Landscapes in a New and Easy Manner (ante 1763, see App.A). Austin's popularity as a drawing master, with his advertized list of four-hundred pupils, cannot be doubted. Ferdinand Becker in Bath (see App.A) and Mary Gartside both used blots to teach their particular types of drawing. In the early nineteenth century so many drawing masters were using 'tricks' as methods of teaching drawing that W.H. Pyne, under the pseudonym 'Ephraim Hardcastle' devoted several of his weekly series on the rise and progress of watercolour painting in England to decrying the effects of such 'tricks' on the development of watercolour painting and warning amateurs and
5
other artists to avoid them.

Certain professors, even of original capacity and talent, seeking profit rather than fame, lent themselves to this perversion of style, by sedulously studying how to substitute incoherency and scrawling, for correctness of drawing; and blotting and sponging, for precision of touch, as though the ultimatum of art consisted in proving to the world how little it depended upon science; a species of quackery which might long since have been expected to expose itself to ridicule in the execrable trash which has been exhibited, in the multiplied copies and imitations of such exemplars, by such a host of senseless disciples...he that expects to meet with patrons among such fashionable diletante, must debase his art down to the level of their capacities. Indeed, it is a fatal truth that not one amateur in fifty can now be found who will endure to copy a correct and highly finished work of art...it is now the custom to 'begin at the ending', namely, by pretending to teach them composition, light, shadow,

colouring, and effect, without the previous study of drawing a correct outline, of a single lesson on perspective, or any one grammatical trait of the art. Hence, the half-accomplished sylphs play [music] like angels, and paint, or rather smudge, like Chimney sweeps.

The blame for these defects was laid at the doors of the academies, colleges, and public schools who apparently still did not instill their pupils with sufficient taste, on the authors of the drawing manuals that promulgated these 'tricks', and, ultimately, on the methods of Gainsborough and Cozens, followed by Payne and Glover; the latter's 'incorrectness' and 'fortuitous scumbling' having prompted Pyne to write this series of invectives.

The endless copying done by amateurs in the eighteenth century which, if followed, produced creditable results, would not gain a drawing master any private pupils in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. When drawing became a popular amusement, a drawing master had to make it fun and easy to learn to draw in order to attract these wealthy amateurs. Pyne obviously believed that many drawing masters were charlatans, in fact he accused Cozens specifically, and many of Pyne's contemporaries came to a similar conclusion with the result that 'serious-minded artists ranked drawing masters as the lowest of their kind'.⁶ Earlier drawing masters had gained a measure of respectability when they were salaried teachers at schools and they advertised these appointments to gain private pupils. But when drawing masters held their salaried positions teaching members of trades and professions in schools at the same time as teaching wealthy private pupils, the distinctions between the methods used for the different types of pupils gradually disappeared. By 1802, the

attitude to drawing masters had sunk so low that John Constable was urged by Joseph Farington and Benjamin West to refuse the post of drawing master at the new Military College at Marlow for fear of ruining his reputation and because 'it would have been a death blow to all my prospects of perfection in the Art I love'.⁷

In the second half of the eighteenth century, however, drawing masters were not yet regarded with quite so much contempt, although, on at least two occasions, one of them was the butt of his fellow artists' humour. William Austin was caricatured as 'Fox's Fool' (Illus. 104) and as a violent lunatic by Paul Sandby and an anonymous contemporary.⁸ From letters quoted in earlier chapters, there is no doubt that Cozens was looked upon with fondness by his students, who also admired his works, but it must be admitted that his schemes occasionally aroused in them a rather baffled admiration.

Drawing mistresses also came to be very much in evidence in the second half of the century. Some became teachers because their works were admired, like Miss Mary Black, who taught Mrs. Weddell; but she allowed her position more self-esteem than she ought and Lady Grantham felt she acted 'above her station' (see App.A). Others, like Miss Crabtree, were in straightened circumstances and taught drawing to earn a living, totally dependant upon the kindness and patronage of their pupils (see App.A).

By this time, drawing masters and mistresses were specializing in teaching certain types of art, such as landscape painting (Cozens), portraits in chalks (Mary Black), and flower painting (Mary Gartside). However, even at the beginning of the century, schools like Christ's

Hospital sent applicants up on the roof to be certain they were capable of drawing architecture and topographical views, and Bickham was adept at figural and decorative drawings. The teachers at Woolwich, John Fayram and Paul Sandby, were topographers and the Harcourts hired Richard Dalton for heads and Joshua Kirby for perspective (see App. A for all of these teachers). Drawing masters in these positions commanded some respect in their artistic communities and by the end of the century these positions were still held in some esteem and were even coveted by some artists, as indicated by J.T. Smith's letter concerning his application for the post at Christ's Hospital which is transcribed in Appendix A.

The methods of teaching at Christ's Hospital and the military and naval academies did not change in the eighteenth century: it was the privately tutored pupils who were guilty of being taken in by the charlatans and their tricks condemned by Pyne. Yet, as mentioned above, it was these 'tricks' of Cozens and Gilpin that made learning to draw more easy, therefore, more enjoyable. Cozens and Gilpin alone were not responsible for the changes in the way amateurs were taught and the resultant popularity of learning to draw; there must have been more changes taking place in the second half of the century than those reasons we have already discussed, for the number of amateurs to increase so rapidly in those few decades just after 1750.

It has been made quite clear that Locke and other advocates of the inclusion of modern subjects in education were responsible to a large extent for the introduction of drawing to academies and schools whose purpose was to

produce connoisseurs and men of taste. In the second half of the century many young women also received the benefits of these changes in educational theory. But in the 1770's there was a new philosophy that came to have a very strong effect upon education in general and the popularity and methods of teaching drawing in particular - a theory of education the effects of which were as far-reaching for the second half of the century as Locke and Shaftesbury's had been for the first: the revolutionary educational philosophy of Jean Jacques Rousseau, which he formally set out in his treatise Emile.

Richard Carline argued that the effects of this work on art education were very slow to be realized. He felt that Rousseau's encouragement to 'search out the secrets of nature', and to daub in colour in order to copy 'their whole appearance, not merely their shape' would have been read with great anxiety by eighteenth-century parents and school masters. Carline stated that these activities had to await the impetus of Ruskin to be put in use and the only immediate recipients of the benefit of Rousseau's ideas were the young ladies who could now do their flower painting from nature instead of from copy-books. Then, with no mention of Gilpin and a leap of thirty years to the Regency period, Carline credited Rousseau's summons 'Back to Nature' and its effect on young women, with singlehandedly giving landscape its hold on the popular taste for the 'picturesque' and changing the course of art teaching. 'The pursuit of art...came to mean..an escape into this romantic world opened up by Rousseau, divorced from the practical work of the drawing school' and Rousseau's female readers 'were soon clamouring for lessons in the drawing of waterfalls, ruined

abbeys and woodland glades'.

Can these claims of Carline's be substantiated - that Rousseau's ideas were not heeded at first, and then, from 1790, were totally responsible for the popularity and number of young women sketching landscapes out of doors?

Sawrey Gilpin was taking his students out to draw horses and houses from nature in 1767, the year before the first complete English translation of Emile. Sawrey's brother William placed an emphasis on the importance of the whole effect of a drawing rather than its parts, but neither Gilpin would have considered having a pupil abandon copying altogether, at least not until his hand was trained. From an early date, in all of this they appear to be fairly close to Rousseau's demand that teaching should be adapted to a child's needs, as all children pass through distinct phases of development. Cozens, too, did not abandon copying and, before allowing pupils to draw from nature, he encouraged them to learn to compose by using blots. Carline stated that if these precepts of Rousseau's had been applied from the 1760's, the history of the teaching of art would have been transformed. Yet, from a time even possibly before Emile appeared and certainly through the two decades of its appearance and strongest influence, all three of these teachers seem to be quite close to Rousseau's idea of adapting the method to the child and not being governed by fixed rules of teaching as art academies were.

Whether the Gilpins and Cozens taught the way they did from their own experience or because of an admiration for Rousseau, cannot be proved from the facts currently available, but Carline was mistaken in his belief that

teaching to draw from nature was not popular until 1790 and that the precepts of adapting the pupil's needs to the methods were not applied until Ruskin's time. The activities of Cozens and the Gilpins prove that theories like Rousseau's were in use during the period when drawing came to be such a popular amusement and these new precepts and new methods of teaching were to a great extent responsible for its popularity.

Whether due to the precepts of Rousseau or the genuine concern of drawing masters for their pupils, the most significant development, then, in the teaching of drawing in the middle of the eighteenth century was the change in the actual methods of teaching. Students were lifting their eyes from their copy-books and looking at the works of contemporary artists in exhibitions and at nature itself. Even when looking at nature, they were discouraged from copying it: in 1768, Gilpin stated that 'we should not copy with that painful exactness with which Quentin Matsis, for example, painted a face. This is a sort of plagiarism below the dignity of painting'.¹⁰ His pupils were to look for nature expressive of that kind of beauty which is agreeable in a picture and if nature did not exist in such perfection, it could be altered on paper or canvas or in the mind's eye until it conformed. Cozens's pupils, having invented compositions with blots, were then sent out to nature to find objects there that could be incorporated into a format already planned. These pupils were being taught to see and look for themselves, to develop their own creative processes. Their drawing masters were artists first and teachers second and it was their own artistic theories that were passed on to their pupils. Thus, rather than pedants

guarding over roomfuls of pupils with their eyes down and their pencils copying eyes, ears, heads, and figures from drawing manuals, these later eighteenth-century drawing masters were disseminators of artistic theory. Herein lies their greatest contribution to the development of English art.

Alexander Cozens attempted to teach his students to appreciate the qualities of simplicity, beauty, and greatness in landscapes in pencil, wash, oil, and in nature, and he encouraged them to try to achieve these qualities in their own work. Gilpin's theory of the picturesque was explained, elaborated, and illustrated by him and other artists many times in his letters and publications, until not only his students, but society as a whole knew and understood it. But he did not confine himself only to picturesque beauty; he admired even more landscapes consisting of lakes, rocks and mountains that had grandeur, rather than just variety, so that Gilpin was also a proponent of the sublime to his students and readers. Even those who could not draw, discussed his ideas and learnt to look at nature his way, and Cozens's patrons were often the same. But if these two men had not taught and had to set down their theories so that admirers and pupils could follow them, their ideas would have been less understood and reached a much smaller audience. In fact, if it were not for Praed, Stebbing, Beckford, Angelo, and others who were taught by Cozens, bought the New Method, or subscribed to the Principles of Beauty, these works would not even survive. The effects of the theories of William Gilpin on the development of English landscape painting are

indisputable and well-known. Yet he was, in effect, an amateur drawing master and his theories would not be known nor would they have had any influence if it were not for his 'disciples', patrons and pupils.

These two artists, at least, were responsible to a large extent for the contemporary definitions and popularity of the sublime, the picturesque, and the beautiful in landscape in nature and in art. How much did John Robert Cozens's watercolour landscapes owe to his father's activity as a drawing master and the theories he evolved out of his teaching? The watercolours that Alexander Cozens produced to illustrate the New Method came closer to the effect of landscapes in oil than any earlier watercolourist. He taught his son to lay on watercolours as if they were oils, to paint in light and dark, and to use underlying tones to add depth and atmosphere. It can therefore be claimed that Turner and Girtin would not have painted in the manner they did in the 1790's, if Alexander Cozens and William Gilpin had not taught. There is no doubt now that these two artists who were drawing masters had a profound effect upon the development of English art in the eighteenth century and the continued unexamination of other so-called 'secondary' or 'minor' artists cannot be justified.

This thesis first raised the question of why drawing was taught to non-professional artists in the eighteenth century. The history of its introduction to schools and to private individuals was examined in order to attempt to answer this question. The approach taken to this history was not through a chronological, art-historical discussion of individual drawing masters and then their pupils, but rather a more socio-historical approach which examined the

general types of students a drawing master might encounter. It came to be seen that the main reasons why drawing was introduced into the education of young people and became so popular, were because of changes in educational theory, changes in fashion, and also changes in the methods used to teach drawing. This thesis has also discussed briefly the important results of teaching drawing on the development of art in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Finally, with the discussion of drawing masters as disseminators of artistic theories, their main contribution to English art, it is apparent that the reasons for certain important developments in English painting can be discovered from the study of the drawing masters, their pupils and their patrons of the eighteenth century.

NOTES CHAPTER 8:

CONCLUSION

1. Royal Society of Arts, Archives, MS Committee of the Society of Arts, vol. 1761-62, p. 37.
2. Manwaring, pp. 89-90.
3. Steegman, p. 123.
4. H. A. Hammelmann, 'Some Eighteenth-Century Drawing Books', p. 1756.
5. W. H. Pyne (editor), 'The Rise and Progress of Watercolour Painting in England', pp. 145-6.
6. Fleming-Williams, 'Drawing Masters', p. 225.
7. *ibid.*, p. 218.
8. London, VAM exhibition: English Caricature 1620 to the Present, (1984), no. 14, p. 34, plate 6.
9. London, GLC, Iveagh Bequest exhibition: William Gilpin and the Picturesque, (1959), p. 4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

a) Printed Books

[NB. No location given if published in London]

Abbey, John Roland, Scenery of Great Britain and Ireland in Aquatint and Lithography, 1770-1860 (1952)

Life in England in Aquatint and Lithography (1953)

Admiralty Office, Establishment for Admitting, Maintaining and Educating of Poor Boys, in the Royal Hospital for Seamen at Greenwich... (1731)

Rules and Orders relating to the Royal Academy Established in Her Majesty's Dock-Yard at Portsmouth, for Educating Young Gentlemen to the Sea Service (1767)

Alexander, Boyd, England's Wealthiest Son - A Study of William Beckford (1962)

Allan, D.G.C., William Shipley, Founder of the Royal Society of Arts (1968)

Angelo, Henry, The Reminiscences of Henry Angelo, 2 vols. (1828, 2nd edition 1904)

Archer, R.L. (ed.), Jean Jacques Rousseau; his Educational Theories, Selected from Emile, Julie, and Other Writings (Woodbury, N.Y., 1964)

Atherton, Henry, Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth (Oxford, 1974)

Axtell, James, ed., The Educational Writings of John Locke: a critical edition with introduction and notes (Cambridge, 1968)

Baily, Francis, An Account of the Reverend John Flamsteed (1835)

Barbier, Carl Paul, William Gilpin: His Drawings, Teaching, and Theory of the Picturesque (Oxford, 1963)

Barclay, James, A Treatise on Education... introducing children to the knowledge of History, Geography, Mythology: Antiquities, etc. With reflections on Taste, Poetry, Natural History, etc. (Edinburgh, 1745)

Barry, James, An Inquiry into the Real and Imaginary Obstructions to the Acquisition of Arts in England (1775)

Berckman, Evelyn, Nelson's Dear Lord: a Portrait of St. Vincent (1962)

Bickham, George, The Drawing and Writing Tutor (c.1740)

Bickham, George, Junior, A New Collection of Landskips, Ec. (1732)

A New Introduction to the Art of Drawing (c.1740)

The Oeconomy of Arts: or a Companion for the Ingenious of Either Sex... (1747)

The Beauties of Stowe (1750)

Binyon, Laurence, Catalogue of Drawings by British Artists and Artists of Foreign Origin working in Great Britain in the Department of Prints and Drawings of the British Museum, Vol. I (1898)

Bloemaert, Abraham, Receuil de Principes pour Désigner (Paris, 1655)

Bramston, James, The Man of Taste. Occasioned by an Epistle of Mr. Pope's on that Subject (1733)

Brauer, George C., Jr., The Education of a Gentleman: Theories of Gentlemanly Education In England, 1660-1775 (N.Y., 1959)

Brown, David Blayney, Oxford Ashmolean Catalogue of Drawings, Vol. IV, Earlier British Drawings by Artists born before 1775 (Oxford, 1982)

Burke, Edmund, A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and the Beautiful (1757)

Burke, Joseph, English Art, 1714-1800 (Oxford, 1976)

Camper, Peter, Petri Camperi Itinera in Angliam, Vol. 15 of Opuscula Selecta Neerlandicorum de Arte Medica (Amsterdam, 1939)

Carline, Richard, Draw They Must: a History of the Teaching and Examining of Art (1968)

Ciartres, F.L.D. [Francois Langlois], Le Livre Original de la Portraiture pour La Jeunesse Tiré de F. Bologne et autres bons peintres (Paris, 1644)

Clarke, George B., Introduction to George Bickham's The Beauties of Stowe (1750, reprint Los Angeles, William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, no. 185-6, 1977), pp. i-xiv

Clarke, John, An Essay upon the Education of Youth in Grammar Schools 3rd edition (1740)

Clarke, Michael, Tempting Prospect: a Social History of English Watercolours (1982)

Conner, Patrick, Michael Angelo Rooker, 1746-1801 (1984)

Constable, W.G., The Painter's Workshop (Oxford, 1954)

Cozens, Alexander, An Essay to Assist the Invention of Landskips (1759)

The Principles of Beauty Relative to the Human Head (1778)

A New Method of Assisting the Invention in Drawing Original Compositions of Landscape (c.1786)

Cross, Jack, For Art's Sake? (1977)

Davidov, Fedora, Russian Painting in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries (Moscow, 1953)

Davison, Nancy R., 'Bickham's Musical Entertainer and Other Curiosities' in Eighteenth-Century Prints in Colonial America: to Educate and Decorate, Joan D. Dolmetsch, ed., (Williamsburg, 1979), pp. 98-122

Dobai, Johannes, Die Kunstliteratur des Klassizismus und der Romantik in England, 3 vols.: I, 1700-1750; II, 1750-1790; III, 1790-1840 (1974, 1975, 1977)

Dossie, Robert, Memoirs of Agriculture and Other Oeconomical Arts, Vol. III (1782)

Drake, Henry H., ed., Hasted's History of Kent, vol. I (1886)

Dryden, John, trans., C.A. Dufresnoy, De Arte Graphica. The Art of Painting...trans...with an original preface containing a Parallel betwixt Poetry and Painting (1716)

Etoniana, 'Nugae Etonenses', no. 4 (3 June, 1905), pp. 61-5

'An Eton Boy's Accounts', no. 47 (4 October, 1929), pp. 740-44

'Plumptre Correspondence', no. 76 (11 November, 1939), p. 401

'Eton Houses: Corner House', no. 102 (1 February, 1946), p. 25

'A Scotch Boy at Eton in the Early Eighteenth Century', no. 124 (27 November, 1971), pp. 369-73

Evans, J. E., 'A History of the Royal Hospital School, Greenwich', The Royal Hospital School Magazine, (series of articles from no. 1, 1907 to no. 19, 1912)

Evelyn, John, Sculptura: or the History and Art of Chalcography and Engraving in Copper... (1662)

Ezell, Margaret J.M., 'John Locke's Images of Childhood', Eighteenth-Century Studies, Vol. 17, no. 2 (1983/4), pp. 139-55

Farington, Joseph, The Diary of Joseph Farington, edited by Kenneth Garlick and Angus Macintyre, VI Vols. (1978-present)

Fawcett, Trevor, 'Eighteenth-Century Art in Norwich', Walpole Society, Vol. XLVI (1976-78), pp. 71-90

Fialetti, Odordo, Il vero modo et ordine per dissegнар tutte le parti et membra del corpo humano (Venice, 1608)

Fleming-Williams, Ian, 'Drawing Masters', Appendix I in The History of English Water-Colour Painting by Martin Hardie, vol. III, pp. 212-44 (1968)

'The Amateur', Appendix II in The History of English Water-Colour Painting by Martin Hardie, vol. III, pp. 245-67 (1968)

Ford, Brinsley, 'Sir Watkin Williams-Wynn - A Welsh Maecenas', Apollo, Vol. 99 (June, 1974), pp. 435-39

Ford, John, Ackermann 1783-1983, the Business of Art (1983)

Foskett, Daphne, British Portrait Miniatures - A History (1963, 2nd edition 1968)

A Dictionary of British Miniature Painters, 2 vols., (1972)

Foster, Joseph, The Register of Admissions to Gray's Inn, 1521-1889 (1889)

Fothergill, Brian, Sir William Hamilton, Envoy Extraordinary (N.Y., 1969)

Friedman, Joan, 'Every Lady Her Own Drawing Master', Apollo, vol. 105, no. 182 (1977), pp. 262-7

George, M. Dorothy, Catalogue of the Prints and Drawings in the British Museum: Division I, Political and Personal Satires, vol. III, pt. I 1734-50, pt. 1750 (1870)

Gibson-Wood, Carol, 'Jonathan Richardson and the Rationalization of Connoisseurship', Art History, Vol. 7, no. 1 (1984), pp. 38-56

Gilpin, William, Regulations of a Private School at Cheam in Surrey (1752)

An Essay upon Prints: containing Remarks upon the Principles of Picturesque Beauty; the Different Kinds of Prints;... (1768, 1st and 2nd editions)

'Memoirs of Dr. Richard Gilpin of Scaleby Castle in Cumberland; and his posterity in the two succeeding Generations; written in the year 1791...', Cumberland and Westmoreland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society, extra series no. 2 (Carlisle, 1879)

Two Essays; one, on the author's mode of executing rough sketches; the other on the principles on which they are composed (1802, 2nd edition 1804)

Godber, Joyce, 'The Marchioness Grey of Wrest Park', Publications of the Bedfordshire Historical Record Society, vol. XLVII (Bedford, 1968)

Godfrey, Richard, Printmaking in Britain (1978)

Goulding, Richard W., 'Welbeck Abbey Miniatures', Walpole

Society, Vol. IV (1914-15)

Graves, Algernon, The Society of Artists of Great Britain, 1760-1791, the Free Society of Artists, 1761-1783; a complete dictionary of contributors and their work from the foundation of the societies to 1791 (1907, Bath Kingsmead Reprint 1969)

Green, Mrs. Amos [Harriet Lister], A Memoir of Amos Green, Esq. (York, 1823)

Grundy, C.R., 'An Action brought against Joseph Goupy, 1738', Walpole Society, Vol. IX (1920-21), pp. 77-88

Gun, W. T. J., Harrow School Register, 1571-1800 (1934)

Gwynn, John, An Essay on Design, including Proposals for erecting a Public Academy... (1749)

Hamilton, George Heard, The Art and Architecture of Russia (1954)

Hammelmann, H. A., 'Some Eighteenth-Century Drawing Books', Country Life, vol. CXVI (November, 18, 1954), pp. 1756-7

and T. S. R. Boase, Book Illustrators in Eighteenth-Century England (1975)

Harcourt, Edward William (ed.), The Harcourt Papers 14 Vols. (Oxford, 1880-1905)

Hardie, Martin, The History of Water-Colour Painting in Britain, 3 vols. (1966-68)

Harris, John, Sir William Chambers, Knight of the Polar Star (1970)

Hasselblatt, Julius, Historischer Ueberblick der Entwicklung der Kaiserlich Russischen Akademie der Künste in St. Petersburg (1886)

Hawcroft, Francis, 'A View of Greenwich by Alexander Cozens', Burlington, Vol. 102 (1960), pp. 486-89

Hayes, John, The Drawings of Thomas Gainsborough, 2 Vols. (1970)

Hazlitt, W. Carew, Schools, School-Books and School Masters (1888)

Heal, Sir Ambrose, The English Writing Masters and Their Copy-Books, 1570-1800 (Cambridge, 1931)

Herrmann, Luke, British Landscape Painting of the Eighteenth Century (1973)

Houston, Jane, Index of Cases in the Records of the Court of Arches at Lambeth Palace Library 1660-1913

Howard, Deborah, 'Some Eighteenth-Century English Followers of Claude', Burlington Magazine, vol. CXI (1969), pp. 726-33

Huber, M. and C.G. Martini, Manuel des Curieux et des Amateurs de l'art contenant une notice abrégé des principaux Graveurs, et une Catalogue raisonné..., vol. 9 (Zurich, 1808)

Hughes, P., 'Paul Sandby and Sir Watkin Williams-Wynn', Burlington, Vol. 114, no. 832 (1972), pp. 459-66

Hussey, Christopher, The Picturesque (1927, 2nd edition 1967)

Ingram, M. Edward, Leaves from a Family Tree: Correspondence of an East-Riding Family (1951)

Irwin, Francina, 'Lady Amateurs and Their Masters in Scotts Edinburgh', Connoisseur, Vol. 187 (1974), pp. 232-37

Jones, E. Alfred, 'Newcome's Academy and Its Plays', Transactions of the Bibliographical Society (Oxford, Dec. 1933), pp. 342-47

Jones, M.G., The Charity School Movement in the Eighteenth Century (Cambridge, 1938)

Kantor-Gukovskaya, Asya, 'Drawings by Alexander Cozens in the Hermitage concerned with his method of composing landscapes', Trudi Eremitazha, vol. XXII (Leningrad, 1982), pp. 88-98

Kauffmann, Michael, John Varley (1778-1842) (1984)

Kirby, J. W., 'Early Greenwich Schools and Schoolmasters', Proceedings of the Greenwich and Lewisham Antiquarian Society, vol. II, no. 5 (1929), pp. 218-36

Knight, C., The Windsor Guide (1783)

Komelova, Galina Nikolaevna, Views of St. Petersburg and surroundings in the middle of the Eighteenth Century (Leningrad, 1968)

Kynaston, Sir Balthasar, The Constitution of the Museum Minervae (1636)

Lairesse, Gerard de, Grondlegginge ter teeken konst, etc. (Amsterdam, 1701)

Het Groot Schilderboek (Amsterdam, 1707)

Les Principes du Dessen, ou méthode courte et facile pour apprendre cet art en peu de temps (Amsterdam, 1719)

The Art of Painting (1738)

(after), A Compleat Drawing Book (Thomas Bowles, 3rd edition, 1739)

Lees-Milne, James, and David Ford, Images of Bath (Richmond, 1982)

- Leigh, Richard A. Austin, Eton College Register 1753-90 (1921)
- Lens, Bernard III, A New Drawing Book for ye Use of His Royal Highness ye Duke of Cumberland, their Royal Highness the Princess Mary, and Princess Louisa (1735)
- Lens, Bernard II and Edward, A New and Compleat Drawing-Book (1750, 1751, 1752, 1766, etc.)
- Levy, F. J., 'Henry Peacham and the Art of Drawing' Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol. XXXVII (1970), pp. 174-90
- Lewis, Wilmarth Sheldon, Horace Walpole (1961)
- Lippincott, Louise, Selling Art in Georgian London: The Rise of Arthur Pond (1983)
- Locke, John, Some Thoughts Concerning Education (1693), edited by James Axtell (Cambridge, 1968)
- Long, Basil, British Miniatures (1929)
- Lucas, S.T., Bibliography of Watercolour Painting and Painters (1976)
- Macdonald, Mrs., The Letters of Eliza Pierce 1751-77 (1927)
- Macdonald, Stuart, The History and Philosophy of Art Education (1970)
- Macnaghten, Angus, Windsor and Eton in Georgian Times (1976)
- Maidwell, Lewis, An Essay Upon the Necessity and Excellency of Education (1705)
- Mallalieu, H. L., The Dictionary of British Watercolour Artists up to 1920 (Woodbridge, 1976)
- Mallet, Sir Charles, 'Education, Schools and Universities' in Johnson's England, A. S. Tuberville, ed. (Oxford, 1933)
- Manwaring, Elizabeth, Italian Landscape in Eighteenth Century England (1925)
- Marks, Arthur S., 'An Anatomical Drawing by Alexander Cozens', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol. XXX (1967), pp. 434-48
- Marsden, Christopher, Palmyra of the North: The First Days of St. Petersburg (1942)
- Mathews, Col. M. C., 'Greenwich in North America', Proceedings of the Greenwich and Lewisham Antiquarian Society, vol. III, no. 5 (1930), p. 195
- Mayer, Joseph, Memoirs of Thomas Dodd, William Upcot, and George Stubbs, R. A. (Liverpool, 1879)
- McCarthy, Michael, 'Amateur Architects in England 1740-

1770', Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation for Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London (1972)

McLachlan, H., English Education under the Test Acts; being the History of Non-Conformist Academies 1662-1820 (Manchester, 1931)

McPharlin, Paul, 'John Pine's Horace 1733-1737', Publishers Weekly (2 September, 1944)

Mild, Warren, 'Susanna Highmore's Literary Reputation', Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 122, no. 6 (1978), pp. 377-84

Mingay, G.E., English Landed Society in the Eighteenth Century (1963)

Morrison, A., Collection of Autograph Letters and Historical Documents, second series, vol. I (1893)

Mortimer, Thomas, The Universal Director, or the Nobleman and Gentleman's True Guide to the Masters and Professors of the Liberal and Polite Arts and Sciences 3 Vols. (1763)

Nicolson, Benedict, Joseph Wright of Derby, Painter of Light, 2 Vols. (1968)

Notes and Queries, J.C.J., 'Bernard Laus', 4th Series, Vol. VIII, no. 196 (Sept. 30, 1871), p. 262

Ogden, Henry V. S. and Margaret S., 'A Bibliography of Seventeenth-Century Writings on the Pictorial Arts in English', Art Bulletin, vol. 29 (1947), pp. 196-201

English Taste in Landscape in the Seventeenth Century (Ann Arbor, 1955)

Oliphant, James, The Educational Writings of Richard Mulcaster (1903)

Oppé, A. Paul, 'A Roman Sketchbook by Alexander Cozens', Walpole Society, vol. XVI (1927-28), pp. 81-93

'Robert Adam's Picturesque Compositions', Burlington, Vol. LXXX, no. CDLXVIII (1942), pp. 56-9

English Drawings, Stuart and Georgian Periods, in the Collection of His Majesty the King at Windsor Castle (1950)

Alexander and John Robert Cozens (1952)

Paulson, Ronald, Hogarth: His Life, Art and Times 2 Vols. (1971)

Peacham, Sir Henry, The Compleat Gentleman (1622)

The Compleat Gentleman, The Truth of our Times, The Art of Limning in London, Virgil B. Heltzed, ed. (New York, 1962)

Pearce, E. H., Annals of Christ's Hospital (1908)

- Peel, Edward, Cheam School from 1645 (Gloucester, 1974)
- Pevsner, Nicholas, Academies of Art, Past and Present (Cambridge, 1940)
- Platts, Beryl, History of Greenwich (Newton Abbot, 1973)
- Plumley, Nicholas, 'The Royal Mathematical School Within Christ's Hospital', Vistas in Astronomy, vol. 20 (1976), pp. 51-9
- Pointon, Marcia, Milton and English Art (Manchester, 1970)
- Porter, Roy, English Society in the Eighteenth Century (1982)
- Pott, Joseph Holden, An Essay on Landscape Painting (1782)
- Pye, John, Patronage of British Art, An Historical Sketch (1845)
- Pyne, W. H. [pseudonym 'Ephram Hardcastle'], 'The Rise and Progress of Watercolour Painting in England', Somerset House Gazette, vol. I (1823), pp. 132-3, 145-6, 161-3, 177-9.
- Reynolds, Graham, English Portrait Miniatures (1952)
- Reynolds, Joshua, Discourses on Art, Robert Wark, ed. (1975)
- Richardson, Jonathan the Younger (ed.), The Works of Jonathan Richardson (1773)
- Rimbault, E.F., Soho and its Associations, historical, literary, and artistic (1895)
- Robertson, John M. (ed.), Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times, etc. by Rt. Hon. Anthony Earl of Shaftesbury (1900)
- Rovinski, D. A., Podrobnyi slovar russkikh graverov XVI-XIX BB., 2 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1895)
- Royal Military Academy, Woolwich, Records, 1741-1892 (2nd edition 1895)
- Salmon, William, Polygraphice; or the Art of Drawing, Engraving, Etching... (1692)
- Sayer, Robert, and Bennett, Sayer and Bennett's Catalogue of Prints for the year 1775 (reprint 1970)
- Shaftesbury, Anthony, Earl of, Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times, etc., 3 vols. (1749)
- Sheridan, Thomas, A Plan of Education for the Young Nobility and Gentry of G.B. (1769)
- Smith, W.H., Aedes Hartwellianae (1851)
- Spinoza, Nichola, 'More Unpublished Works by Francesco

Solimena', Burlington, vol. CXXI (April, 1979), pp. 211-2

Steegman, John, The Rule of Taste from George I to IV (1936, revised edition 1968)

Steer, F. W., 'The Account Book of William Norwich', Notes and Queries (1958), p. 484 (1959), pp. 9-11, 113-5, 130-1, 181-2, 221-2

Steveni, Michael, Art and Education (1968)

Stow, John, A Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster (and the Borough of Southwark), (1598), Corrected, Improved, Enlarged and brought down to the present day in 1720 by John Strype, 6 books in 2 vols. (6th edition, 1754)

Survey of London, Vol. XXXIV: The Parish of St. Anne Soho, F.H.W.Sheppard, general editor (1966)

Sutton, Gordon, Artisan or Artist? A History of the Teaching of Art and Crafts in English Schools (Oxford, 1967)

Taylor, E.V.G., The Mathematical Practitioners of Tudor and Stuart England (Cambridge, 1954)

The Mathematical Practitioners of Hanoverian England (Cambridge, 1966)

Templeman, Wm. D., The Life and Work of William Gilpin (1724-1804), Master of the Picturesque and Vicar of Boldre, Vol. XXIV, nos. 3-4 of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, (Urbana, Ill. 1939)

Thornhill, Sir James, An Explanation of the Painting in the Royal Hospital at Greenwich (1729)

Trapier, Elizabeth du Gué, Ribera (New York, 1952)

Turner, Rev. William, The Warrington Academy 1757-1786 (1957)

Vertue, George, 'The Notebooks of George Vertue (I-V)' Walpole Society, vols. 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 29 (Oxford, 1930-47)

Vigor, Mrs., Letters from a Lady who resided some years in Russia (1775, 2nd edition, with eleven additional letters, 1777)

Walpole, Horace, Anecdotes of Painting in England 3 Vols. (1888 edition)

The Yale Edition of Walpole's Correspondence XLVIII Vols. edited by W.S. Lewis (Oxford, 1937-83)

Wark, Robert, Early English Drawings in the Huntington Collection 1600-1750 (1969)

Waterhouse, Ellis, Painting in Britain 1530-1790 (1978)

Dictionary of Eighteenth-Century British Painters in

Oils and Crayons (Woodbridge, 1983)

Watson, Foster, The Beginnings of the Teaching of Modern Subjects in England (1909)

Weston, Thomas, Writing, Drawing and Ancient Arithmetick (1726)

Whinney, Margaret, and Oliver Millar, English Art 1625-1714 (Oxford, 1957)

Whitley, W. T., Artists and Their Friends in England 1700-1799, 2 vols. (1928)

Williams, Iolo, Early English Watercolours and some Cognate Drawings by Artists born not later than 1785 (1952, reprint Bath 1970)

Williamson, R., A Short Account of Westminster School (1845)

Wilson, Beckles, The Life and Letters of James Wolfe (1909)

Wood, H.T., History of the Royal Society of Arts (1913)

Wortley, Clare Stuart, 'Amateur Etchers', Print Collector Quarterly (July, 1932), pp. 188-211

Young, Ruth, Father and Daughter - Jonathan and Maria Spilsbury 1737-1812 (1952)

b) Exhibition Catalogues

[arranged by location, and within location by year]

Halesowen. Council House, Festival [of Britain] Exhibition of Pictures by the Eighteenth-Century Halesowen Artists, James, Amos and Benjamin Green, Johnson Ball (1951)

Leicester. Museum and Art Gallery, Sir George Beaumont of Coleorton, Leicestershire, Luke Herrmann and Felicity Owen (n.d.)

London. Burlington Fine Arts Club, An Exhibition of the Herbert Horne Collection, Laurence Binyon (1916)

London. Courtauld Institute of Art, Exhibition of Books on the Practice of Drawing and Painting from 1650 to 1850, Frederic Schmid (1934)

London. Greater London Council, Iveagh Bequest, Kenwood, William Gilpin and the Picturesque, Carl Paul Barbier (1959)

British Artists in Rome 1700-1800, Lindsay Stainton (1974)

Claude Joseph Vernet 1714-1789, Philip Conisbee (1976)

London. Manning Galleries, Sir George Beaumont, Artist and Patron, Felicity Owen (1969)

London. Museum of London, The Quiet Conquest, The Huguenots 1685 to 1985, Tessa Murdoch (1985)

London. National Portrait Gallery, Johann Zoffany 1733-1810, Mary Webster (1977)

London. Tate Gallery, Landscape in Britain 1750 to 1850, Leslie Parris and Conal Shields (1973)

London. Victoria and Albert Museum, Drawing Technique and Purpose, Susan Woodforde (1981)

Rococo Art and Design in Hogarth's England, Michael Snodin (ed.) (1984)

English Caricature, 1620 to the Present, Richard Godfrey (1985)

New Haven, Conn. Yale Center for British Art, The Pursuit of Happiness: A View of Life in Georgian England, J.H. Plumb (1977)

English Portrait Drawings and Miniatures, Patrick Noon (1979)

The Art of Alexander and John Robert Cozens, Andrew Wilton (1980)

The English Miniature, John Murdoch, Jim Murrell, Patrick Noon, and Roy Strong (1981)

Works of Splendor and Imagination: The Exhibition
Watercolour 1770-1870, Jane Baynard (1981)

Oxford. Wolfson College, Amateurs and Printmaking in
England 1750-1830, David Alexander (1983)

Sheffield. Graves Art Gallery, Alexander Cozens, A.P. Oppé
(1946)

Washington, D.C. National Portrait Gallery, Robert Edge
Pine, An British Portrait Painter in America 1784-1788,
Robert G. Stewart (1979)

c) Manuscript and Typescript Sources

Aberystwyth. National Library of Wales. Powis Papers (POW);
Wynnstay Papers (WYN)

Aylesbury. Buckinghamshire Record Office. Lee of Hartwell
Papers (DLE)

Bath. Holburne of Menstrie Museum. 'Index of Bath Artists'
(typescript)

Ian Fleming-Williams. 'Some Early Drawing
Masters' (typescript), by Ian Fleming-Williams

Bedford. Bedford County Record Office. Lucas/Wrest Park
Papers (L)

Belfast. Public Record Office of Northern Ireland.
Walsingham Papers (D)

Beverley. Humberside County Record Office. Grimston Papers
(DDGR)

Cambridge. Magdalene College. Pepys Papers

Chelmsford. Essex County Record Office. Braybrook Papers
(DBy)

Clevedon Court. Archives. Sketchbooks by Oldfield Bowles
and Sir George Beaumont

Farmington, Conn. Lewis Walpole Library. 'A Collection of
Prints Engraved by Various Persons of Quality' (2 albums),
collected by Horace Walpole

Kingston-upon-Thames. Surrey Records Office. Richmond
Parish Registers

Lincoln. Lincolnshire County Record Office.
Whichcote of Aswarby Papers (ASW); Monson Papers (MON)

London. British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings.
'Engravers Advertisements' (typescript), by Francis Buckley;
'Etchings and Engravings done by the Nobility and Gentry of
England - or by Persons not exercising the Art as a Trade'
(2 albums), collected by Richard Bull

Chancery Lane, Public Record Office. Probate

Greater London Records Office. St. Luke's and St.
James, Clerkenwell, Parish Registers; Archdeaconry Court of
Surrey

Greenwich, 'Woodlands', Greenwich Local History
Library and Art Gallery. Folders on Weston's and Burney's
Schools

Greenwich, National Maritime Museum. Greenwich
Hospital Plans (3 vols.), by Robert Mylne

Guildhall, Archives. Christ's Hospital Records;

Mormon Collection of City of London Parish Registers
(Microfiche)

Guildhall, Department of Prints, Drawings and
Maps. Stone Collection of Tradesmen's Bills, etc.

Hackney Borough Library, Archives. 'Index to the
names of pupils mentioned as having taken part in plays
performed at Newcome's School' (manuscript)

Kew, Public Record Office. Admiralty Records of
the Royal Naval Hospital, Greenwich

Lambeth Palace Library. Records of the Court of
Arches; General Administration, Province of Canterbury,
Licences to Teach

Marylebone, Holy Trinity Church. Archives of the
Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge. Newman
Papers

Royal Greenwich Observatory. Flamsteed Papers
(photocopies of originals in Herstmonceux)

Royal Society of Arts, Library and Archives.
Minutes, Transactions and Records of the Society

Victoria and Albert Museum, Library. 'Early Art
Schools in London (1635-1770)' (typescript), by Gilbert
Benthall; 'Early Advertisements by British Miniature
Painters' (typescript), by Francis Buckley

Westfield College, University of London, Library.
'Notes on Early Art Schools in London 1626-1780'
(manuscript, 4 vols.)

New Haven, Conn. Yale Center for British Art, Department of
Prints and Drawings. 'Collection of Prints by Notable
Dilettante' (2 albums), collected by Rev. James Chelsum

Nottingham. Nottinghamshire Record Office. Foljambe of
Osberton Papers (DDGF)

University of Nottingham, Library, Department
of Manuscripts. Portland Papers (P)

Warwick. Warwick County Record Office. Greathead Papers
(CR); Feilding Papers (CR)